APPENDIX
JII
.π

Appendix

Tribute to Senator Talmadge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article about one of our ablest young Senators, written by the Associated Press, which appeared in the July 19 issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

The article covers the activities of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 19, 1958]

WASHINGTON, July 18.—When Senator HERMAN TADMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, rode into the Senate 2 years ago, a lot of people figured he would lose little time establishing himself as a fire-breather, particularly on racial issues.

Instead, the former Georgia governor has been quiet and modest, as befits a freshman Senator. His few speeches struck observers as well thought out and moderate. They marked him as a champion of States rights, opponent of nonmilitary foreign aid, and backer of higher support prices for farm products.

LAUDED BY RAYBURN

And in the civil rights debate in the Senate last year, Senator TALMADGE spoke with restraint, avoiding impassioned oratory and stressing constitutional points.

"HERMAN TALMADGE," says Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, "has fooled a lot of people by turning out to be a student of government, a convincing speaker, and not a hell raiser, as some of his critics had billed him."

Some political observers say Senator TALMADGE has changed since he came to the Senate. He disagrees. He's older, he says, and "I hope I've grown some," but he insists his position on major issues has remained the same.

Foremost among these are integration and what Senator TALMADGE calls the "usurpation of power" by the Supreme Court through its segregation and other decisions.

Pending in the Senate is a bill by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, that would limit Supreme Court powers in several areas. Senator TALMADGE is expected to play a vocal role on the side of those favoring restrictions for the tribunal.

VIEW ON SUPERIORITY

Critics have often referred to Senator TALMADGE as a "white supremacy" advocate, a label he rejects.

While he's militantly prosegregationist, the Senator contends he doesn't believe in the superiority of any race. "You'll find superior white, Negro, and yellow people, depending on the character, intelligence, and initiative of the individual," he says.

Mr. TALMADGE was Governor in 1954 when the Supreme Court ruled segregated schools unconstitutional. He likes to point out that more money was spent for new schools—most of them Negro schools—during his 6 years as Governor than in all previous administrations combined.

In the face of the Supreme Court ruling, Senator TALMADGE considers a private school system to keep the races separated as the best answer to the South's problem.

ONCE PUBLISHED WEEKLY

Politically, Senator TALMADGE says speculation about a possible Southern third-party movement in 1960 is premature.

"We're going to stay in the house of our fathers as long as we can," he declared. "But if the candidate and the issues become intolerable, we'll take the best means of protecting the integrity of our people and our States."

At 44, HERMAN TALMADGE has covered a lot of ground: Governor, Senator, editor, insurance company executive, farmer.

He once published a newspaper weekly, the Statesman. And he is chairman of the board of the United American Life Insurance Co. He and his wife, Betty, whom he married in 1941, operate two farms in Georgia and a ham-curing business. They have 2 sons, Gene, 15, and Bobby, 12.

Northwest Ruralite Endorses Columbia River Regional Power Corporation Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, impressive editorial support for the proposal to establish a Regional Power Corporation in the Columbia River Basin has come from the July issue of the Northwest Ruralite, which is capably edited by Henry Alderman, who served for many years as assistant to Dr. Paul J. Raver, when the latter was administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

In a thoughtful editorial, Mr. Alderman has stressed two of the paramount purposes of a regional corporation such as we propose and regarding which hearings recently were held before a Senate Public Works Subcommittee. They are these:

First. Because the present Federal power system in the Northwest has no utility responsibility to provide sufficient energy to keep pace with growing regional requirements; and

Second. Because the present Federal power system cannot use its own very substantial and prosperous revenues for the purpose of adding new generating capacity as it is needed.

In his monthly newspaper, the Ruralite, Mr. Alderman speaks for the leaders and members of the great rural electric cooperative movement in the Pacific Northwest, which has brought the modern miracle of electricity and its attendant comforts to so many farm homes.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial endorsement of the Regional Power Corporation, as exemplified in Senate bill S. 3114, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. President. Title of the editorial, appropriately, is "Corporate Idea."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE IDEA

There appears to be growing support in the region for the bill introduced to the United States Senate by Oregon's R. L. NEUBERGER, to establish a regional power corporation, owned by the Federal Government, to take over the functions of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Many of you may remember that BPA was established by the Congress in 1937 as an agency in the Department of the Interior to sell power from Bonneville and other Federal dams.

That 1937 law clearly states that BPA was to be a provisional agency—that is, it was simply a temporary expedient to be superseded when the time is right by a permanent agency.

NEUBERGER's new regional corporation bill is a proposal for a permanent agency.

Notwithstanding its provisional status, BPA's 21 years of operation have been, in the main, highly successful.

But experience has shown two basic weaknesses:

1. The law does not grant Bonneville any utility responsibility. This means that Bonneville can initiate no new generating projects to meet local needs. Without this responsibility, Bonneville can only sell such power as the Congress, from time to time, decides to develop.

2. Bonneville has no independent financial status. Although it is a big utility business, it has no control over its own very considerable income. Although it may make huge profits, it cannot spend these profits for new dams or transmission. It must pay its profits into the United States Treasury each year and then must wait for the Congress to appropriate money for both its capital and operations needs.

These two weaknesses in the Bonneville law are serious. The membership of the Congress changes every 2 years. Some Congresses have Members who have a better understanding and sympathy for the power needs of this region than do other Congresses. The result of this continual shift in congressional sentiment makes for uneconomic and spotty development of the Columbia River, with no clear direction of utility responsibility.

NEUBERGER's new corporation bill is designed to correct this. The principal practical difference between this bill and the present Bonneville law lies in the power given to the proposed new corporation to issue and sell revenue bonds to finance new dams and transmission lines. The proposed new law would also permit the agency super-

seding Bonneville to spend its own profits, if any, for such purposes.

Several weeks ago Senator NEUBERGER'S corporation bill came up for public hearing before a Senate committee. Both the Oregon and Washington State administrations went on record favoring its passage.

Representatives of the region's electric cooperatives and public-utility districts and municipal power systems also supported it.

The power companies opposed it as socialism.

A number of conservative interests in the two States supported the bill in principle. That is, they agreed the new agency was needed in order to get the power job done but they disagreed with some of the provisions in the Neuberger bill.

Although a Senate committee has held a hearing on this measure, there is no thought in Congress that either House will pass the measure during this session.

However, a new Congress will be elected in November and will meet next January. The bill probably will be reintroduced with hope of congressional action on it sometime during the next 3 years.

Passage of Air Safety Bill—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the extremely active interest of the membership of the Senate in the passage of the bill providing for air safety, and the overwhelming support of the press in the interest of passing the bill at this session, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials:

Air Safety Progress, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 19, 1958; Policing the Skyways, published in the Washington Post of July 20, 1958; New Air Agency, published in the New York Times of recent date; Consolidation for Air Safety, published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 26, 1958; Too Many Misses Too Near, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of June 28, 1958; Unified Plan for Air Safety, published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of June 21, 1958; Need Swift Action on Air Agency Plan, published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of June 19, 1958; New Air Safety Measures, published in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of June 18, 1958; Unified Air Agency, published in the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of June 22, 1958; and Toward Stronger Safeguards, published in the Mobile (Ala.) Press of June 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 19, 1958]

AIR SAFETY PROGRESS

The Senate's passage of the bill to create a Federal Aviation Agency is an important first step in the urgently needed drive to reduce traffic hazards on the Nation's airways. In this single agency would be lodged all the currently diversified governmental responsibilities for air safety, including the control and allocation of airspace for civilian and military aircraft alike. The tragic series of recent air disasters involving military and commercial planes has more than demonstrated the need for such coordinated supervision. As approved, the Senate bill effectively provides for it. We hope the House concurs, without major changes in the Senate version.

Fortunately, hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a companion bill are virtually completed. And next week, its able chairman, Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, intends to call a final hearing session. Time, however, is of the essence. For the period remaining before adjournment is short, and if Congress leaves without completing action this critically needed legislation will be dead. With air congestion increasing at its present alarming rates, the Nation can ill afford a delay until next year.

During the Senate hearings, witnesses proposed a large number of modifications, many of them seemingly minor in nature. In the aggregate, however, they could seriously have diminished the bill's effectiveness. Wisely, most of these proposals were rejected by the Senate committee, headed by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. We hope Mr. HARRIS' committee likewise will permit nothing to vitiate in any way the essential authority and powers of the new agency.

As congressional sponsors have enphasized, the creation of this agency cannot alone accomplish miracles in lessening the dangers of flight congestion. Many technical improvements are needed in the modernization of airway operations and control. These will take time. The important thing, however, is that the new centralized agency will provide the essential administrative direction through which these improvements can best be effected. President Eisenhower recognized the emergency nature of the problem in his strong request last month for the legislation. Its immediate approval is clearly in the national interest.

[From the Washington Post of July 20, 1958]

POLICING THE SKYWAYS

Senate approval of a bill creating a new Federal Aviation Agency promises to be a landmark in the long campaign to bring greater order into our crowded skies. If and when the House approves a similar measure, the prospects are excellent of ending the near-anarchy which now prevails in the air—a condition which has contributed to the recent grim series of mid-air collisions.

The Senate bill, introduced by Senator MONRONEY, would unite in a single Federal Aviation Agency the specific safety and traffic control functions now scattered among a half-dozen Federal instruments. Under a civilian Administrator, the new Agency would be armed with broad powers to allocate and control airspace, make and enforce safety rules, and develop a common system of air navigation facilities. For the first time, it would empower a single policeman to coordintae the traffic in the air.

Most important, these powers would be exerted over both civil and military aircraft. One grievous shortcoming of the present system is that 30,000 military planes have been, in Mr. MONRONEY'S words, "largely exempt from effective air traffic control." The Senate bill would give the Agency Administrator plenary authority over airspace, with proper allowance made for the requirements of national defense and the right of public to travel freely through the air. To insure military accountability, the bill provides that military personnel assigned to the Agency would be responsible to the civilian chief and not to their respective services.

It is a great pity that this rudimentary administrative reform has taken so long to approach realization. All too soon, commercail jet transports will be streaking through the skies at speeds of 600 miles per hour, increasing collision dangers. Because of past delays, the country lags badly in developing facilities adequate to monitor all aircraft flying in good weather. But the Monroney bill provides a framework for achieving this end in a prompt and sensible manner. The Oklahoma Senator deserves credit for his part in shaping this legislation, as do such pioneers in air safety as Edward P. Curtis, the President's special assistant on aviation. Commendably, all sectors of the aviation world cooperated in framing the bill.

Prompt passage of the House bill, sponsored by Representative OREN HARRIS, is among the most urgent business before Congress. It is unsettling to find the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee delaying hearings. Surely the House will see the compelling need for action on a bill which makes the skies safer for all Americans who venture aloft.

[From the New York Times]

NEW AIR AGENCY

An encouraging step toward the long-range mastery of the complex air-traffic situation has been taken with Senate passage of the bill to create a Federal Aviation Agency. The measure is designed to consolidate in a single organ of Government the hitherto diffused responsibilities for making the best and safest use of the Nation's air space.

It is to be hoped that nothing will interfere with parallel House action at the current session. There is an immense amount of research and planning to be done to make the traffic-handling system equal to the changing character (just airline operations begin here in November) and expanding volume of air traffic. To delay modernising the governmental apparatus another year would be appallingly shortsighted.

On the other hand, if final passage does come, as expected, at the current session, no one will be justified in expecting the unsatisfactory air-traffic situation to clear up overnight. Though the agency must be created within 90 days of the bill's enactment, its main impact on traffic control will not be felt for years. It will take a long time to devise, perfect, and install radically new tools. We will have to live for a while with a more-than-minimal degree of collision hazard and economically wasteful traffic delays.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 26, 1958]

CONSOLIDATION FOR AIR SAFETY

Too often the answer to some urgent need in the field of government seems to be, "Create another agency." Without question, the need for better control of air traffic over the United States in the interest of safety is urgent. Fortunately, though, the remedy advanced by President Eisenhower and by Senators conversant with the problem lies not in the direction of greater government complexity but in simplification and consolidation.

A White House message now before Congress proposes establishment of a Federal Aviation Agency which would take over all the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Airways Modernization Board, and the rulemaking powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board. This would include air traffic research, control, and modernization, airport design, and safety regulations. It would leave to the CAB only regulatory authority on routes, fares, and subsidies.

Important to the concept of the new agency is the intent that it shall be able to correlate and control use of the national airspace by military as well as civil aviation insofar as this may be necessary for safety. The President recommends that the new agency be given paramount authority except in case of military emergency.

Almost complete agreement is said to exist between the President's advisers and a large congressional group, including Senate MIKE MONRONEY, chief sponsor of a bill on the subject. We hope predictions are right which forecast enactment of the legislation and inauguration of the new agency before the end of 1958.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of June 28, 1958]

TOO MANY MISSES TOO NEAR

The Congress has no pending legislation more important than the Monroney-Harris bills for promoting greater air safety and creating an independent control agency responsible to the President and Congress.

The lawmakers should not even think of adjourning until the measures have been enacted.

While the parliamentary processes are working to that end the country is getting almost daily reminders of the need for vastly improved air safety control which will prevent military and private craft from intruding on the lanes of scheduled air transports.

Scheduled air travel is as safe as any other form of transportation, and safer than most, but it will not continue so unless the checks provided by the Monroney-Harris bills are enacted and that soon. Every day of delay invites more collision tragedies.

There was another near miss Wednesday, and this time near enough for the control-tower staff at Lambert-St. Louis Field to witness it. An American Airlines plane had just taken off for Fort Worth and was at approximately a 500-foot altitude when a Navy plane appeared out of the 1,000-foot ceiling and passed over the airliner.

The Navy plane had been en route to Scott Air Force Base but had changed destination to Lambert-St. Louis Field because of bad weather. The pilot said his attempt to reach the tower there by radio was futile because of heavy radio traffic.

On June 9, the pilot of an American Airlines DC-7, with 50 persons aboard, had to make a quick dive to avoid collision with a military transport plane from Scott Air Base. Six persons on the airliner were injured in the 500-foot dive. The Air Force said it would discipline the pilot and copilot.

When 49 lives were lost as a result of an Air Force jet plane plunging into a United Air Lines scheduled transport in April, Representative HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, publicly asserted that military aircraft "had no business over a regular airway" and that the attitude of the Armed Forces in disregarding air safety rules was "intolerable."

It still is intolerable as a practice and from the viewpoint of scheduled air transport passengers who are the sitting ducks in too many near misses occurring too frequently.

The Monroney-Harris bills have all the authoritative backing they should require—that of the air industry, the pilots and, to a great degree, the White House. What is needed is greater legislative speed. Let's have it.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of June 21, 1958]

UNIFIED PLAN FOR AIR SAFETY

Congress should take no more time than absolutely necessary in authorizing a unified Federal Aviation Agency as requested recently by President Eisenhower in the interest of greater air safety.

While the new coast-to-coast expressways plan is now in use, spokesmen for the airlines assert that it will not reduce the chances of midair collisions for the bulk of commercial planes flying the skies today. The expressways are expected to improve safety for the planes which use the 40-mile corridors at altitudes of 17,000 to 22,000 feet. However, airline experts insist that operations for most commercial flights will continue largely as before—with the same safety rules and the same hazards. These are the planes which carry passengers at altitudes below 17,000 feet.

In most respects, the President's program, based on studies which began nearly 2 years ago, is similar to the ideas now being considered by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at the urging of Senator MONRONEY. For the most part the differences involve the extent of military participation and the designation of authority for rule making.

In view of public pressure as the result of tragic air collisions Congress should not permit these minor differences to delay action.

Both plans propose a combination of several Government agencies which now have authority over traffic control, air traffic research and modernization, airport construction and safety regulations. The unified agency would go directly to the President instead of through the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense. The Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Airways Modernization Board, an independent agency which was set up last August, would be absorbed outright.

As the President emphasized, air congestion has reached the point where immediate regulatory action is essential. The record of collisions and near collisions proves it. At the same time, development of airports, navigation aids, and especially the air traffic control system, has lagged behind aeronautical advancements.

For this reason the President advanced his air safety recommendations which he originally planned to submit to Congres at the next session. The shocking loss of life, Mr. Eisenhower explained, "has made it apparent that the need for an adequate control program is so urgent that the consolidation of agencies should be undertaken now."

To set up the proposed safety system and to train the personnel needed to operate it efficiently will not be an overnight job. Hence the need for speedy action by Congress. Regulations of air space should not be left indefinitely to chance or the visual abilities of pilots.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer-Press of June 19, 1958]

NEED SWIFT ACTION ON AIR AGENCY PLAN

Congress should act with the utmost speed on passage of the bill creating a single Federal agency with authority over air-traffic control and safety regulations.

President Eisenhower wisely urged fast action on such legislation last week when he recommended combining activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Airways Modernization Board into a Federal Aviation Agency to handle traffic, research, airport construction, and safety rules. Fortunately, there is already a bill before Congress carrying the basic essentials of the Eisenhower proposal. Called the Monroney bill (it was introduced by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma), the measure differs only in two areas from the administration proposal and is now in the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Both the Monroney bill and the administration plan call for establishing one agency under a single administrator to handle air safety and related problems. The administration would like greater military participation in agency activities than that proposed by the Senator and would limit appeals of regulations to the courts. The Monroney bill would allow appeals to be made to the Civil Aeronautics Board, which will retain its basic regulatory authority over airline routes, fares, and subsidies. The President also has indicated he wants the power to transfer certain functions of the Defense Department into the new agency once it is created. He has not mentioned any specific functions as yet, but his major concern in this area is that there be no "impairment of national defense."

Since there are so few differences in the two proposals and since there is general agreement that some such agency must be developed to reduce the dangers of air travel, the matter should be handled swiftly.

There is no reason why the Federal Aviation Agency cannot be in operation this year, if Congress is truly awake to the dangers overhead.

[From the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of June 18, 1958]

NEW AIR SAFETY MEASURES

There is no real disagreement with President Eisenhower's proposal for a new Federal Aviation Agency to promote air safety.

The ideas embodied in the President's special message to Congress do not differ in essence from those that a Senate Commerce Subcommittee has been working out in a series of hearings over the last month. Senator MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma, subcommittee chairman, and 32 other Senators have drafted a bill to solve air traffic problems. MONRONEY says he is "delighted to have the President's strong statement" on the subject and his support of the objectives of the bill.

Greater urgency in consideration of the bill has resulted, of course, from the two recent disasters, one over Nevada and the other over Maryland, in which civilian airliners were involved in collisions. Air transport development has progressed more rapidly than anyone foresaw. Traffic has become so heavy that present methods of regulating it are inadequate. The imminence of the jet transport age, as well as the presence of jet military aircraft in large numbers, makes the problem still more pressing.

Mr. Eisenhower says he had not planned to send his message to Congress till next year. But, he adds, "Recent midair collisions of aircraft, occasioning tragic losses of human life, have emphasized the need for a system of air traffic management which will prevent, within the limits of human ingenuity, a recurrence of such accidents."

The President points out that overlapping of authority and duplicating of functions is one of the biggest handicaps of the present system of air traffic control. His plan, like that of the Senate subcommittee, would combine various existing agencies and centralize authority in a single agency responsible directly to the President, instead of the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce.

The new agency would take over and absorb outright the present duties of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and Airways Modernization Board. It would leave the Civil Aeronautics Board in charge of airline routes, fares and subsidies, but would take over its safety rule-making functions and its research activities.

Mr. Eisenhower urges that there be "a genuine civil-military partnership" in the new agency but is somewhat vague on how this is to be established. The White House appears to want a greater degree of military participation in the new agency than the Monroney bill would provide or than some of its sponsors want. The present CAB also objects to some of the curtailments that would be imposed upon it by the Senate bill and the President's plan.

It is to be hoped that disagreements on details such as these will not delay creation

of the new regulatory agency, since there is no real opposition to its aims. MONRONEY has pledged all possible speed on the legislation.

Meanwhile, the new program of sky superhighways connecting New York and Washington with west coast cities has been put in effect to give maximum protection under the present setup against air collisions. The new arrangement should be helpful pending the establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of June 22, 1958]

UNIFIED AIR AGENCY

One of the most promising developments to emerge as a reaction to several recent midair plane collisons is the proposal that there be created a unified Federal agency to handle both civilian and military air traffic problems. A bill to create such an agency has been submitted to the Senate by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY and 52 other Senators. A similar plan has been suggested by President Eisenhower.

Such an agency might be a far better vehicle than the United States now has for moving rapidly toward air traffic control adequate in the jet age. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has made progress toward this end, especially during the past few months, but it has simply not kept pace with the rising need.

The prospects that this could be done in a short time, even by a modified agency, are not at all good. One major handicap is that large quantities of complex equipment will be needed, and it is not the sort of equipment that can be purchased at the nearest department store. At best, several years probably will pass before the Nation has an air traffic control system fully up to handling demands made on it.

That is no reason for slackening the effort; quite the contrary. And the best bet is some sort of unified agency combining the present functions of both the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Airways Modernization Board. The military should have the fair say about regulations and the kind of control system adopted. The essential thing is that with a unified agency both military and civilian flights would be subject to overall control, and the public would benefit accordingly.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press of June 26, 1958]

TOWARD STRONGER SAFEGUARDS

Congress has moved a step further toward more unified air traffic control to strengthen safeguards against midair collisions such as have recently occurred between military and commercial aircraft.

A bill calling for regulation of both civilian and military air traffic by a new Federal agency that would function largely in accordance with White House recommendations has been approved by a Senate aviation subcommittee headed by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

Introduced in its original form by Mr. MONRONEY and cosponsored by 32 other Senators, the bill was revised in certain respects by the subcommittee to conform with administration views, although in other respects administration views were not adopted.

Under the subcommittee-approved version, decisions of the agency administrator on air safety regulations would be final, except for the privilege of appealing to courts. This provision was asked by the Eisenhower administration.

Congress should move without undue delay in enacting needed legislation for strengthened safeguards for air traffic.

McGregor Reports to His District, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the people I am privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States should have an opportunity to know of my activities and my position on various issues. For this reason, I am today including in the RECORD excerpts of my remarks during the 85th Congress on some of the issues in which our people are most vitally interested.

DON'T FORGET OUR ROTATION-CROP FARMERS, MARCH 6, 1957

Mr. Speaker, regardless of who is the author of a bill, regardless of whether he is a Democrat, New Dealer, or a Republican, certainly the time has arrived that we recognize the serious predicament in which the farmer finds himself. It is time that we give some consideration to the rotation crop farmer.

We must recognize, and at once, that we cannot allow the product which a farmer has to buy to continue to increase in cost and allow the product that the farmer sells to go lower and lower. Mr. Speaker, there is just too wide a spread between what the farmer received and what he has to pay out.

I sincerely hope that the membership of Congress will not delay in giving recognition to the rotation-crop farmer and give him the much needed assistance he needs so that he might again enjoy the freedoms that once were his.

TRUTH ABOUT TAX REDUCTION, MARCH 17, 1958

Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of interest that some New Deal orators have been telling the public with the usual extravagant political claims of being the party of the "little man" in tax-reduction measures.

Let us look at the record. It is factual, it will speak for itself and it will show that under New Deal philosophies the so-called "little fellow" has had to pay higher taxes. The records will show it has been the Republican Party which has cut taxes for the lower income groups. Let us not forget that it was a Democrat Congress in 1913 that put on the statute books the first income tax law. Since that time there have been 15 income tax increases. Democrat Congresses voted all but one of these increases.

The New Dealers put the low income people and wage earners on the tax roll. In 1932 there were 1,900,000 taxable Federal returns. In 1952 there were 46,800,000 such returns. Republicans did the cutting 7 out of the 10 times that income taxes have been reduced since 1913.

In 1954, during the 80th Congress, when the Republicans were in the majority, taxes were reduced by a total of $7.4 billion—the largest cut in any 1 year in history. The Republicans reduced taxes on electric-light bulbs, stoves, refrigerators, electric toasters, telephone and telegraph bills, pharmaceutical supplies, and many other excise taxes. This cut benefited all taxpayers.

During the Republican controlled Congress legislation was put into law which gave 62 cents out of each dollar of tax reduction to individuals with approximately 25 cents of this going to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000.

The New Dealers have been endeavoring to play politics with tax legislation, claiming that they want to decrease income tax exemptions. Again, I say, let's look at the record. The following chart shows the exemptions from 1931 to 1954:

	Republican	Democratic					Republican
	1925–31	1932–39	1940	1941	1942	1944	1948
Single	$1,500	$1,000	$800	$750	$500	$500	$600
Married	3,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,200	1,000	1,200
Dependent	400	400	400	400	350	500	600

INTERNATIONAL TRADE—LET'S KEEP IT RECIPROCAL, JUNE 10, 1958

Mr. Speaker, for several days I have listened very attentively to the debate on the so-called reciprocal trade agreements legislation. I am sure my record in Congress will justify the statement that I believe in world trade. I favor world trade and all domestic trade possible but I do not believe it is fair to our citizens of this country to create a condition of unemployment in any part of the United States and ship goods to any Member's district to provide employment to some men working in foreign countries and force local citizens to be unemployed.

I do not want unemployment anywhere in the world. I deplore it, but I am going to be honest and say that if there must be unemployment somewhere I would prefer it in some other country rather than in the United States. It is unfair to force our American people out of jobs and to increase our taxes to pay unemployment insurance when the unemployment is caused by bringing in products from foreign countries produced by low-wage-rate labor. Our American farmers, labor, and industry are certainly at least entitled to equal recognition and should not be forced to go on unemployment because of imports of products into this country far below the price at which they can be produced here.

I believe in reciprocal trade, but let us make it reciprocal.

OUR FARMERS WANT FREEDOM, JUNE 27, 1958

Mr. Speaker, fortunately for the American farmer, the House of Representatives has defeated the attempt to force through the passage of a bill which Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson himself called a political hodgepodge, and which Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, branded as a complete monstrosity.

If there is anything that the farmers in my 17th Ohio District do not want, Mr. Speaker, it is more quotas, more con-

trols, more Government regulation. In my 1958 questionnaire poll on national issues, 64 percent of all the farmers who responded voted for the removal of all Federal controls on farm products. Since then, many individual farmers have written or spoken to me about this problem of excessive Federal controls, and just this week I have received a wire from the vice president of the Ohio Farm Bureau, who farms in our district, urging that I oppose this so-called omnibus farm bill as unsound farm legislation.

I did oppose it, Mr. Speaker, as I will continue to oppose all legislation in the future which attempts to tie the hands of our farmers who have always been the strong, independent backbone of our economy. To attempt to solve the problems of the freedom-loving farmer by heaping upon him more and more Government controls will never work, Mr. Speaker. We have found that out the hard way, and I hope we have learned the lesson well.

I sincerely hope that steps will be taken immediately to get our farm program rolling in the right direction—away from Federal controls and toward freedom and prosperity for our farmers. I will certainly lend every possible support to this kind of program.

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR OUR VETERANS, JUNE 27, 1958

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's veterans, together with their families, comprise more than 40 percent of the total population of the United States. The 85th Congress has enacted legislation which, taken as a whole, will vitally affect these 22,700,000 living American veterans.

By a vote of 389 to 2, the House passed H. R. 11077 to incorporate the Veterans of World War I. Previous legislation had already incorporated Civil War veterans and Spanish-American War veterans' organizations, and under this bill, we men who fought in World War I to preserve and defend our country will be able to keep alive our own identity. The friendships that have sprung from a common experience will be strengthened. Of even greater importance, however, is the fact that we will now be represented by an organization exclusively our own in all legislation concerning veterans of 1917 and 1918, their dependents and widows. A national charter will not only bind us together, but will offer a channel through which our problems and needs can be made known and remedied.

To date, American veterans have, due to congressional legislation, received many richly deserved benefits. Approximately 6 million veterans hold GI insurance policies valued at nearly $44 billion. VA operates 173 hospitals for the care of ill and disabled veterans. On any average day, VA's patient load approached 115,000 with the yearly average running to nearly half a million. More than 10 million veterans so far have been trained under the 4 educational programs, 4 times the total enrollments in every college and university in the United States. Through this additional education, veterans have become better prepared to exercise their civic responsibility and have added to our stockpile of trained manpower.

SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDS AN OVERHAULING, JUNE 27, 1958

Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been my belief that the Congress has a solemn responsibility to see that none of our elderly citizens are forced to live out their lives in poverty, hardship, or deprivation. Yet a look at the record of our present social-security program clearly reveals that we are not facing up to the needs of millions of our citizens, and that a comprehensive and far-reaching revision of that program is long overdue.

To my way of thinking, there is absolutely no excuse for citizens of this great land to live in misery and poverty, most of which results from illness, constant decreases in purchasing power caused by inflation, and other such circumstances over which our elderly people have little or no control. Justice requires the elimination of this sorry situation. Sound economics likewise demands the raising of these substandard living conditions.

But the challenge to us is more than justice alone, and more than sound economics. We live in a critical moment in history, when our system is being totally challenged on every front. As a great freedom-loving Republic, we are championing the cause of democracy as a way of life, and during the course of the next few years, the one-third of the world's people who are as yet uncommitted will make their choice between our democratic way of life and the way of life of the totalitarians. Our fate as a Nation will depend in no small measure on the choice they make. We must, therefore, present a crystal-clear picture of a society not only able but willing to face up to the needs of all of our people, and I sincerely hope that action can be taken, and now, to remedy some of the most pressing problems of our elderly citizens.

M'GREGOR OPPOSES SOCIALIZED MEDICINE SCHEMES, JULY 16, 1958

Mr. Speaker, the hearings just completed by the Ways and Means Committee on all titles of the Social Security Act have once again focused attention on the many problems of our wage earners and retired citizens. Of all of our problems, however, none deserves more careful attention than that of adequate medical care for our people, and no one is more eager than I am to see that such medical care is available.

However, I am at the same time deeply alarmed by some of the proposals now being offered in the Congress, which, I am afraid, could easily lead to a complete socialization of medicine throughout the entire country, with a resulting deterioration in standards of medical care.

If some of this legislation is enacted, we all will become, in effect, wards of a gigantic bureaucracy which is already far too big for its own good. I am extremely fearful that under this legislation we will lose our freedom of choice in selecting doctors and dentists, and I will do everything within my power to prevent such an outcome.

Furthermore, I am just as afraid that should some of these programs be accepted, our doctors and dentists will find that their income depends on which political candidates they support, and not on their medical skill. For under these programs, not all doctors—and hospitals—would be allowed to participate, and even those who were allowed to take part in the program would have to depend on some bureaucratic Government agency for their fees.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect to find political solutions to serious health problems. We only create more serious difficulties by trying to do so. I am convinced that we can solve our medical problems, but not by imposing compulsory Government programs. Such programs, if enacted, will deprive all people, and especially the aged, of their independence, will force our doctors to rely on the whims of some bureaucratic agency for their livelihood, and will eventually result in inferior health facilities for us all. Mr. Speaker, I have always fought such programs, and I will continue to fight against socialized medicine.

M'GREGOR RECOGNIZES HIGHWAY PROBLEMS

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Public Works Committee ever since I came to Congress. These years of service on that committee have now served to make me senior minority member on the full commitee, which handles legislation relative to public roads, public buildings and grounds, rivers and harbors, and flood control.

The records will show that I was especially active and took the initiative in provisions which will give additional Federal assistance to city streets and the farm-to-market roads. This legislation permits the State highway departments and local authorities to use Federal funds on city, county, and township roads. The specifications covering these roads can be drawn by the local county engineers, with the approval of the highway department, and need only meet the requirements of the local communities.

This means that Federal highway funds can be used on city streets and farm-to-market roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past, because of the exorbitant cost, have prevented the construction of needed streets and roads in many sections of our cities and rural areas.

I greatly appreciate the many letters and words of commendation I have received because of my activities on this legislation.

M'GREGOR URGES MAIL SERVICE TO ALL

Mr. Speaker, I am again calling attention to the proper committee of Congress and am asking for action on H. R. 766, a bill which I introduced that would give rural mail delivery as nearly as practicable to the entire rural population of the United States.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Post Office Department in which they advise that they have no objections to the bill and in reality favor its passage. I have long believed that all citizens are entitled to mail service either by rural carrier or door-to-door delivery. With the Post Office Department in accord

with this view, I respectfully urge that hearings be held immediately so that the legislation can be put into effect prior to the adjournment of Congress.

M'GREGOR URGES ALL TO EXERCISE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. Speaker, a day of decision will be election day, November 4, 1958. We have become a great Nation because our citizens are interested, and each and every one play an important part in our Government. We can continue to be a great Nation only if every qualified voter regards it as his duty to exercise his franchise and prove to the world that Americans value their right to take part directly in the election of Government officials and in the management and control of our Republic. The number of ballots cast will demonstrate to the world how much we value that privilege, and will emphasize that the American form of Government marches forward with determination, vigor, and strength. Everyone should carefully analyze the candidates to determine whether or not they believe in the philosophy of Government that has made America a great Nation. Every candidate should make known his position on the issues confronting us, and also make known his record. My record is public and I invite your investigation. The record will show that we are winning the greatest battle of all time in preserving our form of Government. The continuation of this program calls for outstanding leadership, honesty, integrity, careful planning, and judicial administration of the law. You will be assuming your proportionate share of this responsibility when you go to the polls on Tuesday, November 4, and vote for the candidate of your choice.

Be sure and vote Tuesday, November 4,

Detroit Starts Recovery From Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following article by John R. Stewart entitled "Detroit Starts Recovery From Recession" and which appeared in the July 14, 1958, issue of the Detroiter, a weekly publication of the Board of Commerce:

DETROIT STARTS RECOVERY FROM RECESSION
(By John R. Stewart)

Business and industrial activity in the Detroit area has passed the low point of the current recession and is now headed upward. The fact that all phases of local activity improved in June over May is highly encouraging. Also encouraging is the contraseasonal nature of most of these gains and the fact that many of them follow April to May increases.

The largest June gain recorded was in value of new building for which permits were issued. At $9,223,232, the June figure for Detroit was 61 percent over May and 58 percent over April, previously the best month of 1958. Local steel mills operated at 67 percent of capacity, this year's best level. Industrial power consumption rose for the second consecutive month with June topping May by 20 percent.

Employment totaled 1,240,000 on June 15 as compared with 1,229,000 in May. This rise, while small, is significant in that it marks an end to the steady downtrend of the previous 6 months. Unemployment, likewise, broke the adverse trend of earlier months as it recorded its first month-to-month decline in 1958. The May to June increase in bank debits was only 2 percent. This gain, however, becomes more impressive when it is noted that Detroit bank debits usually decline substantally over that period. Both department store sales and new passenger car sales—the only indexes of retail sales currently available—showed a May to June increase.

Comparisons on a year-to-year basis showed a marked improvement between May and June and between April and June. Industrial power consumption rose from 32 percent below a year ago in May to 20 percent below in June and bank debits were only 6 percent below a year ago in June as compared with 15 percent below in May. The value of new buildings started in Detroit changed from a minus 51 percent to a plus 9 percent between May and June on the year-to-year comparison.

Outlook for the remainder of 1953 is clouded by the unsettled labor situation in the automobile industry. A strike, especially at Ford or Chrysler, during the preparations for new model introductions would seriously hamper Detroit's comback. Barring strikes, economic conditions in Detroit should show some improvement in the current quarter, after adjustment for model change shutdowns and other seasonal factors. Fourth quarter improvement should be more marked with earlier introduction of new automobile models adding substantially to October's factory payroll. Business and industrial activity in the Detroit area should be closer in 1957 levels than in any previous quarter of this year.

Only confidence is needed to bring Detroit out of this recession. Bank savings have skyrocketed over the past 4 months and are now at an all-time peake, approximately $100 million higher than at any time prior to last February. Some of the hesitancy to spend has been due to fears engendered by the possibility of strikes in the motor vehicle industry. An immediate, peaceful settlement of contract negotiations would remove one of the factors depressing Detroit's economy and go far to insure continued recovery in coming months.

Detroit area business barometers	June 1958	Change from May	Year-to-year change		
			April 1957–58	May 1957–58	June 1957–58
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total employment (area)—MESC	1,240,000	+0.8	−12.4	−13.1	−11.7
Unemployment (area)—MESC	275,000	−1.8	+180.5	+169.3	+150.6
Power consumption, 1935–39=100 (area)	282	+19.9	−31.6	−32.1	−19.7
Steel rate, percent of capacity (area)	67	+63.5	−85.4	−51.2	−34.3
Department store sales, 1947–49=100 (area)	[1] 122	+5.2	−16.9	−8.7	−7.7
New passenger car sales (area)	11,529	+3.7	−32.9	−38.5	−37.0
Bank debits (city)	$6,086,479,000	+1.7	−11.7	−15.4	−6.5
Bank savings (city)	$1,423,000	+2.2	+3.4	+4.8	+7.2
New building value (city)	$9,223,232	+60.7	−48.9	−51.5	+9.2
Car and truck output (United States)—wards	407,187	−3.9	−40.1	−33.0	−31.3

[1] Preliminary.

Ideal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 21, 1958:

IDEAL AID

One example of United States activity which is strengthening this Nation's ties with a neighbor to the south, and at the same time helping the neighbor's economy, was pointed up in the capture by Cuban rebels of several United States mining officials. Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, entered some observations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after the men, employes of Cuban American Nickel Co., a subsidiary of Freeport Sulphur Co., were released.

The mining project, Representative BOGGS said, currently employs some 2,500 Cubans in construction jobs. After the $75 million investment it completed to the operational stage, it will employ more than 1,000 natives the year around. The project at Moa Bay is converting a wilderness into a source of stable employment. Service industries, tax payments and increased purchases will further enrich the Cubans, Representative BOGGS pointed out.

That the Cubans generally appreciate the value of the project, according to Representative BOGGS, was indicated at the height of the rebel activity. Although the top management had been spirited away, Cuban construction crews kept the work on schedule. A group of native foremen, stranded in Santiago during the trouble undertook to charter a plane to the job site in order that the work would not lag.

But Cubans are not the only ones who will benefit from the investment, the Representative added. It will provide some 600 jobs in Louisiana and will give the United States a new source of strategic nickel. The conclusion is that solid, businesslike ventures of mutual benefit to the governments and to the people of both nations is the most effective form of "foreign aid."

Diplomatic Blunder in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an edito-

rial entitled "A Tragic Diplomatic Blunder," which relates to the current situation in the Middle East, and which was published in the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star of July 16, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRAGIC DIPLOMATIC BLUNDER

The sudden landing of the United States Marines in the little Middle Eastern country of Lebanon constitutes a tragic diplomatic blunder that will cost dearly the future of American interests in that strategic area. As an ill-prepared act of foreign policy, with a pitifully shallow pretext to justify the action, it will serve no other purpose than to accelerate the driving of the Arabs of that area into the arms of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union will scarcely go to war on this matter. It does not have to. It can win what it wants by our own stupidity and reckless action. It can accuse America of the very thing America has accused it of doing—of invading militarily a little country on the invitation of a wobbly government.

Why have we acted with such haste? The people of our country had been assured that America would act through the United Nations, and now our Government asks the United Nations to support an act as lawless as that of the invasion of Egypt in 1956.

Why was this matter not taken before Congress? We did it immediately in the case of Korea. We even got the sanction of the United Nations then.

To say that American lives were in peril does not match with the daily reports that have come in. These reports have emphasized that the fanatical Moslems have rebelled against a calmer, Christian government, but a government that has only meekly been supported by its army. There has been no Communist infiltration.

Let one of the experts on this country, Cyrus Sulzberger of the New York Times, speak. As recently as last Saturday he wrote in a full column published down the center of the Times' editorial page the following:

"The United Nations has in some respects thrived on the crisis of the past few years.

"But it has demonstrated both its survival capacity and its use in preventing civilization from toppling over a series of war brinks. In doing so it has gained vigor. * * *

"Much credit for this restraining effect should go to Secretary General Hammarskjold. He has developed it into a diplomatic post of real significance.

"He has come to have the accepted right to deal directly in the name of U. N., representing this earth as a whole and no single individual nation.

"An example of how this can apply was shown in the instance of Lebanon. By persistent behind-the-scenes maneuvers Hammarskjold managed to keep the lid from blowing off until he himself could travel to Cairo and Beirut.

"During that trip he helped establish enough of a supervisory organization to check deterioration. Thereafter, merely by not becoming worse, the crisis became better."

The only thing that has happened since has been the rebellion in Iraq, which the Arizona Daily Star frequently has said would happen. The venomous hatred of nearly all Arabs, primarily against Israel, but also increasingly against the United States for its support of Israel, is deep and widespread. No amount of military support or occupation of this vast area will ever be able to subdue permanently this basic hatred. We soon will turn Lebanon into a hornet's nest of grassroots stings of continuous undercover rebellion.

American policy should be one of standing by Israel, but also one of giving equal assurance that Israel would not be permitted to attack any Arab nation. It should be one of an interested observer of an Arab revolt that has a long time and a long way to go. It should be our policy to be friends with the Arabs, but never allow them, or any other nation, to blackmail us on account of the friends we have.

Now all of this has been lost. Arab hatred of Americans will be intensified. Confronted with no other place to look for help, they will do what Mr. Churchill did when, in those dark hours of Britain in 1941, he frankly said he would make and alliance with the devil, the Soviet Union, in order to defeat Germany. That working alliance did not mean that the Soviet Union was taking over Britain. Neither will it mean that the Soviet Union will be taking over the Middle East. It does mean that we have lost the friendship and confidence of what should be the growing United Arab Republic.

It would be to our interest to see such a country grow and prosper, and thus provide a buffer zone between the West and the Soviet Union. Now it means we have extended the active American military frontier to a little enclave in that area amid a population that will grow more and more hostile.

We will pay dearly for such an unfortunate and unnecessary mistake. A government that lands marines in that remote place on such a shallow excuse, yet allows its citizens to be kidnaped, and held prisoner by a rebel government in Cuba, cannot expect or deserve the confidence of law-abiding Americans or other people anywhere.

It negates completely a basic American principle of promoting the worldwide rule of law among nations, which requires that those who sponsor such a movement set an example by living by it.

Proposed Humane Slaughter Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at the request of Mr. Lloyd Stacy, president of the Washington State Federation of Humane Societies, two editorials from the Tacoma News Tribune and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer concerning humane slaughter legislation.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News Tribune of June 30, 1958]

THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILLS

More than a half century ago, the novelist Upton Sinclair wrote a potent book called The Jungle. Potent is the word. He portrayed so vividly the unsanitary conditions in the meat packing industry that a Government commission was named to investigate. The upshot of it all was that on June 30, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Meat Inspection Act, which brought tremendous reform.

Since that time the meatpacking industry has remarkably improved its techniques. The great bulk of meat and meat products served on American tables is fresh, sanitary, and wholesome.

Yet though the situation today bears almost no resemblance to that which aroused Upton Sinclair's angry scorn decades ago, it must be said that the industry has lagged in one important respect. With exceptions in some of the modern plants, methods of slaughter are not much more humane than they were at the turn of the century. The public apparently has become more aware of this in 1958 than in any previous year. In consequence legislation has passed the lower House of Congress which provides that the Federal Government will not, after the end of 1959, buy meat from packers who do not use the humane methods of slaughter prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. A companion bill reposes in the Senate Agriculture Committee, as well as another bill which merely calls for a 2-year study by the Department. Recently the committee indicated it will ask the Senate to go for the study bill.

Those persons who believe animals should be rendered unconscious before slaughter and who believe there already has been plenty of study are pressing to have the humane slaughter bill passed. They would like to see it done by June 30, the anniversary of the Meat Inspection Act. The packing industry, however, has raised the question of discrimination. "How about the branding of animals?" it asks. "The bill makes no mention of that, yet it is more inhumane than the old slaughter methods." Will the law be made to apply to farmers who slaughter on their farms? Industry spokesmen pointed out that some plants have installed carbon dioxide anaesthesia for the smaller animals, captive-bolt pistols for beef animals, and that modernization will spread through the industry. Apparently they convinced two-thirds of the Senate committee more study is required to make the law apply to everyone.

There can be no doubt that committees are necessary in the workings of Congress. But in this instance we see again how a committee can prevent a bill favored by a large section of the public from even coming to a vote, depriving the public from knowing how its Senators stand on the subject.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of June 30, 1958]

AROUND AND AROUND

It is unnecessary to point out the merits of the humane slaughter bill which would forbid United States Government agencies to buy meat from packers not using humane methods of killing meat animals.

Elimination of needless suffering by these animals in the slaughterhouse should make this legislation acceptable to any person who considers himself civilized.

Yes, the humane slaughter bill, already passed by the House, has been kicked around for some time now by the Senate Agricultural Committee.

And it may be doomed, since the committee has approved a substitute bill directing the Secretary of Agriculture to study the subject for 2 years and submit a proposal to Congress.

We don't quite get this. The Secretary will study the subject for 2 years and resubmit the same proposals to Congress which are already before it. And around and around we go.

Surely, the successful use of humane slaughtering methods by some packers for many years should be proof enough that such legislation should be passed without any drawn out, expensive and wholly unnecessary studies.

The Senate should disregard this conscience-saving substitute measure and pass the humane slaughter bill without delay.

Record and Experience of State of Oregon in Programs for Mentally Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we become civilized and enlightened, our approach to the problem of mentally retarded people—and especially children who are mentally retarded—is a matter of increasing concern to an ever larger number of citizens. My own State of Oregon has demonstrated commendable and urgent interest in this field. The Fairview Home for mentally retarded children, near Salem, is a model for the Nation in progressive therapy under its able medical director, Dr. Irvin Hill—although we might wish that it had more beds and other facilities available. Dr. Hill has distinguished himself in the pioneering use of drugs which offer some hope and promise in the field of mental disturbances.

This realm has been especially significant for me, because my wife, Maurine, as a member of Oregon's State Legislature, was the author of the first legislation in Oregon history to establish pilot courses for the teaching and aid of mentally retarded children. This program has since been expanded and enlarged, fortunately. Indeed, when Mrs. Neuberger and I were participants in a nationally televised entertainment show, we asked that the so-called prize fund from our appearance be designated for the Oregon Society for Retarded Children.

My interest in the question does not stop at the State boundary of Oregon, of course. On February 7, 1957, I introduced in the Senate a bill to provide for the expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children, through the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This bill is S. 1092. It is my opinion—and that of others—that it already has helped to encourage expansion of Federal appropriations for such purposes, although not on the scale we hope for and for which we will continue to work and agitate.

Because this issue very much confronts us of the Senate and the House, I desire that my colleagues shall know of Oregon's specific efforts to assist retarded children and their parents. Our State legislature has created a special interim committee on mentally retarded problems, and it is headed by two legislators of enlightenment and of broad humanitarian views regarding social-welfare matters; they are State Senator Carl Francis, Republican of Yamhill County, and State Representative Grace O. Peck, Democrat of Multnomah County. The membership of the committee also includes some outstanding Oregon citizens who have dedicated their careers to the improvement of mentally retarded children, and these people owe their presence on the committee to the discriminating and careful choices made for membership by our Governor, the Honorable Robert D. Holmes.

In the issue of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, of July 10, 1958, appeared a most thorough and comprehensive article describing the work of the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Mentally Retarded Children. The author of the article is Mrs. Dorothy Lois Smith, capable staff writer of the Journal. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, entitled "Oregon's Approach to Mentally Retarded—Shall We Build a Fence?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S APPROACH TO MENTALLY RETARDED—SHALL WE BUILD A FENCE?

(By Dorothy Lois Smith)

(This is the first of two articles reporting findings and impressions of the Oregon interim committee on mental retardation and emotional disturbance.)

Will Oregon "build a fence on the cliff rather than maintain an ambulance down in the valley" in handling its responsibility toward the mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed? Will the State gain distinction as a leader in the challenging field or attempt to meet the challenge by a hit-and-miss, trial-and-error method?

The legislative interim committee is attempting to find a formula that will care for these citizens in the most effective manner possible, both from the standpoint of humanity and economics. It is attempting to determine the extent of the responsibility of the State, and plan that methods to meet this responsibility may be in keeping with long-range interests of the retarded and disturbed and be in accordance with the resources of the State. When the committee refers to "the State" the term includes the political subdivisions—statewide and on county and local levels.

Fairview Home near Salem is the chief refuge and hope for these persons and their families, but the figures concerning its accommodations and waiting list are staggering.

On June 30, 1956, there were 1,977 mentally retarded persons being cared for at the home, and an additional 324 who had been committed and whose names were on the waiting list for admission but for whom no facilities were available. On February 20, 1958, there were 2,034 resident-patients, 85 on parole, escaped, etc., and the waiting list stood at 388.

It is estimated that by July 1, 1959, the number of persons committed to Fairview—in residence and on the waiting list—will be 2,919. This figure—according to the scientific estimate—will increase to 3,372 by July 1, 1961, and to 3,852 by July 1, 1963. By July 1, 1965, facilities will be needed for the institutional care of some 4,358 mentally retarded persons in this State. These are the most accurate—though alarming—estimates available. And in addition to these figures, many other persons will require supervision, special care and other special services.

By 1965, then, approximately 2,500 more beds will be needed at Fairview Home than are now existent. The 1957 State legislature appropriated funds for construction to accommodate 400 additional patients at the home. This construction will be completed within the next 13 months.

Just what proportion of care to meet these staggering demands should be met by the State, county, and local community. Should it be partially cared for by centers located in various areas of the State? Should Fairview Home itself be the center of all expansion, or should another such home be founded?

Senator Carl H. Francis, of Dayton, is chairman of the committee studying these vital questions, and Representative Grace Peck, of Portland, is vice chairman. Other members are Gerson Goldsmith, Dr. Forrest E. Rieke, Mrs. Sylvia Capper, Senator Jean L. Lewis, Mrs. John Myles, and Representative William A. Grenfell, all of Portland; Don Dawson, Fairview home staff representative; Mrs. Elisabeth Waechter, Eugene; Mrs. Joy Hills Gubser, Representative Sidney Schlesinger, and Dr. James H. Stewart, all of Salem; Representative Jess Savage, Albany, and Mrs. Lewis D. Reavis, McMinnville. Executive secretary is Dr. John O'Donahue of Eugene.

Senator Francis reports that "it is good to see the various professional disciplines exhibiting a willingness to share responsibility."

"An example," he says, "is the suggestion of multipurpose regional centers that would offer—among other things—diagnostic and treatment services. To such centers referrals could be made by any agency concerned with children, and here the different professions working with these problems would work in teamwork fashion. Importantly, the home also would be playing a role in this approach."

A program for child service centers might be set up on an exploratory basis to determine whether aid from such centers is a feasible program. "Certainly," he points out, "the expenditure of preventative dollars would be both humanitarian and good economics; it is like the old comparison of building the fence on the cliff rather than maintain the ambulance down in the valley. Some way should be developed by the legislature for more coordination of the several groups in State government sincerely—but to a degree independently working in these fields."

Mrs. Peck is vice chairman of the committee and chairman of 2 subcommittees—1 on commitment procedures and institutions, and 1 which is investigating the possibility of using whichever of the State's tuberculosis hospitals is abandoned (the hospitals are located at Salem and The Dalles) as quarters to care for the long list of persons needing special treatment.

"We will recommend a voluntary commitment, which would mean that instead of going through the courts—as is now the method—parents or guardians of the individual could get a physician's recommendation and go directly to Fairview Home or whatever place they wish to commit the person and place him there. The same procedure would apply in removing them from their place of care.

"At present," Mrs. Peck explained, "we have the court commitment in which judicial procedure is used, and some persons feel a stigma in taking youngsters, particularly, to court.

"Court commitment in Oregon is a life commitment," she added. "This is really for the protection of the child, for in many instances he could really suffer if removed from Fairview, for example. This could easily happen if the child were orphaned and the guardians did not understand his particular problem. We are working on as wise a commitment setup as we can draw to recommend to the next session of the State legislature."

As to the possibility of securing the grounds and buildings of the TB hospital at Salem or that at The Dalles, the committee's application for them is "at the top of the list for consideration," she reports.

"We are weighing both the efficiency and the economy of expansion at such a site or of expanding on the present Fairview where grounds will permit more buildings and where the core of operations is already established."

In a recent session of the interim committee it was agreed to recommend that an Interdepartmental Resources Board, with a limited life of no more than 4 years, be appointed to study the child-service-centers question. The Board would have representatives of the State health, education, and welfare departments, plus a superintendent of the State hospital and the superintendent of Fairview Home as members.

The interim committee will recommend that the Board set up no more than two child-service centers on a pilot-study basis and a child-care center for severely retarded youngsters on the same basis. The Board will serve as a coordinating body between departments and between the State and communities in which centers are founded. These centers would be operated by the local communities and would be eligible for State matching funds.

Psychiatric, psychological, general medical, nursing, and social-worker services would be offered. It is estimated that such a center could be operated at no less cost than $50,000 a year.

The Juvenile Courts Association has recommended the establishment of these centers for diagnostic, treatment, and detention services. The Oregon Psychological Association, the Oregon Guidance Clinics Association, and the Eugene Representative Council for Special Services to Children support the committee's recommendations on "the level of generality in which they are now stated," the committee reports.

The committee has 1 of 2 recommendations to make concerning the much-debated question of whether special education classes for the educable mentally retarded being held in public schools: (1) Such classes should be mandatory after a 5-year planning period, or (2) such classes should not be made mandatory. Another prime point the committee is trying to determine is whether the services for the trainable mentally retarded (the severely retarded) are legitimately a responsibility of the public schools or should be vested elsewhere.

Protest by States Against Over-Centralization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last week the House of Representatives passed H. R. 3, a bill to prevent the Congress from unintentionally usurping the rights and powers of the States.

The bill is one of great importance in maintaining the proper balance of power between the States and the Federal Government, and I hope that it will be brought to a vote in the Senate at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the State, of Columbia, S. C., for July 16, 1958, entitled "States Versus Federal." The editorial discusses the bill in a clear and candid manner, and it should be of interest to every Senator.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VERSUS FEDERAL

An act introduced by Virginia's Chairman SMITH, of the House Rules Committee, apparently intended to limit the scope of Federal legislation as applied to State laws has started widespread controversy in the legislative halls. Even the meaning of the 74-word measure is controversial. Representatives are arguing over what it means. It barely cleared the committee by 1 vote—6 to 5.

Mr. SMITH says the bill means just what it says and it was intended to keep State sedition laws effective. Its introduction followed a ruling by the Supreme Court that a Federal antisedition law preempted that field and invalidated a Pennsylvania law on the subject.

Since Pennsylvania is a contender in the melee it cannot be said that the law is a part of the war between the sections. It is a part of the war between Federal predominance and State authority, in which the South has been the chief exponent throughout our history. In recent years States in other sections have also shown an interest in their own independence of thought and government, and it is good to have a powerful Commonwealth like Pennsylvania on our side.

Unfortunately opposition by the Justice and Labor Departments to the bill indicate it would be vetoed by the President even if it should survive Congress. It would therefore seem to be no more than a running skirmish. But it is an indication of how the States feel—a gesture of protest against overcentralization of Government. And if it is defeated now, there will be other battles.

Need for Housing for Unattached and Elderly Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is one type of housing about which we do not hear very much—a type for which there is a definite need.

Recently there appeared in the Washington Daily News a column by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt pointing to this need and to the fact that it had not been sufficiently covered in legislation.

There also appeared on June 16, 1958, in the Anniston (Ala.) Star an article by Esther Tufty, the well-known newspaper woman, under the heading "Single-Unit Housing Plea of Woman Gains Attention." She discusses the same type of housing and the need for it.

I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of June 12, 1958]

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S DAY—HOUSING BILL MISSES NEED

NEW YORK.—There is one courageous lady, I think, who deserves credit for persistence in her efforts on behalf of women's welfare. Her name is Mrs. Jency Price Houser, and for 10 years she has appeared before almost every housing committee because of her conviction that there is one need which all the housing bills overlook. This is the need for providing good but inexpensive apartments for single women, for widows living on pensions, for women no longer able to work, and for those living on social security.

Often these are women who were accustomed to greater comforts when they were young and earning high salaries, or when their husbands were alive. Now that they are left alone, they often pay prices all out of proportion to their income for even a semidecent place in which to live. They never know when the rents will be raised and they will have to move, just as they are also forced to move if the house in which they have an apartment is sold or if the management is changed and essential services are reduced to practically nothing.

These women are not all older people. Some of them are still working, but cannot meet the difficulties in finding good housing that exist in almost every city.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of June 16, 1958]

SINGLE-UNIT HOUSING PLEA OF WOMAN GAINS ATTENTION

(By Esther Tufty)

WASHINGTON.—Lobbyist Jency Price Houser looks like, and is, a middle-aged, middle-income housewife. She's something different in lobbying, but maybe that's why the men in Congress listen to her plea for more housing designed for single persons, "especially business, professional, and retired women."

Just last week Alabama Congressman GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., of Birmingham, wrote her: "I personally appreciate your splendid efforts in behalf of this badly needed legislation to provide housing for unattached persons, and especially the elderly."

HUSBAND IS ASSOCIATED

Oddly, she isn't a single person herself, but married to Thomas Houser, a former Government official, who became so enthusiastic about her cause he is her associate.

She's met with some success. In 1950, she managed to get single individuals designated as "a family unit" in the National Housing Act, thus making them eligible for the insurance of a mortgage. But she must keep fighting, she says, "to retain the wording in every new housing bill." JOHN SPARKMAN has introduced supporting legislation.

The turn of events, plus a determined push from the gentle Jency, has at least changed the attitude of Congress toward housing for the aged. The need is recognized now.

Typically, Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri says: "Most older people are on fixed incomes. Pensions, social security, or retirements of some sort. These plans have been thrown out of kilter because they live longer and inflation has cruelly cut their savings in half.

Mrs. Houser took a survey of single persons and found that only 32 percent pay as little as 20 percent of their income for rent. But the single person housing envisioned by this lobbyist isn't just for the elderly.

Under the same housing development she would have one-third retired or elderly and two-thirds working persons. She calls this a "natural and happy way of living" for single people, men or women.

As an Alabama example she quotes Harold Harper, executive director of the Birmingham Housing Authority: "There are an estimated 1,300 single persons in this community who need housing: 750 of these are single women, 500 are below 60 years of age. An estimated 50 percent of the 1,300 receive less than $2,000 a year, 25 percent receive between $2,000 and $3,500, and only 25 percent over $3,500."

Troops and Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "Troops and Policy," written by C. P. Ives, and published in the Baltimore Sun of July 21, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONDAY MORNING VIEW
(By C. P. Ives)
TROOPS AND POLICY

Two points in particular are urged against the administration's Middle East policy in the wake of the marine landing. Critics say the use of troops proves the policy's failure. And they say it has failed because it ignored the aspirations of the Arab common people.

But the fact that troops are used does not mean that a policy has failed. Troops are an instrument of policy. Diplomacy is always to be preferred. But military establishments are maintained to support policy.

Certainly the ends of American policy in the Middle East are not yet lost. We have stood for the independence of the Arab peoples. That meant we were against the Communist colonialism that would turn them into eastern versions of the European satellites.

We have stood for the maintenance of the East-West oil trade on which the economies of our NATO friends—and of several Arab nations—depend. That was another application of our general stand for the independence of nations against the new Red colonialism.

But it is argued that in resisting Nasser we resist Arab nationalism. The unstated premise is that Nasser is the sole authentic nationalist in the Middle East. Yet "If I could sum up my conclusions in a single embracing simplification," Lord Birdwood wrote in the London Daily Telegraph, "I would claim that no man * * * worked more devotedly for the cause of Arab unity than did Nuri Pasha [the veteran Iraqi Premier assassinated last week].

"Insofar as friendship with the West served his cause, that friendship was to be cultivated. But Arab unity was his first loyalty and his abiding mission.

"Compared with [Nuri's] early wisdom, his tenacity and his final abhorrence of the emergence of the State of Israel as the negation of his dreams, the postures of Nasser will be seen, in the perspective of history, as only the maneuvers of a consummate opportunist.

"For Nasser the creation of Israel was a shortcut to Arab leadership. For Nuri it was the frustration of his life's work."

In sum, the question of Israel aside, where all Arabs agree, the American friendship with Nuri was a friendship with a stabler and wiser and more authentic Arab nationalism—stabler, wiser, and more authentic because it steered clear of the new Soviet form of colonialism. That Nuri is dead does not mean his kind of Arab nationalism is dead or that Mr. Dulles had any true choice in preferring his kind.

But what of the other claim—that the Americans have dealt too much with the Arab elite and too little with the common people? This is one of Senator FULBRIGHT'S favorite allegations.

Yet observers of the Middle East as well informed as Senator FULBRIGHT report that the anti-Americanism in those parts is not among the country and common people, the nomads of the old tribal communities, but among the slick young men of their Nasser generation who inhabit the feverish Arab cities.

And about these slick young men there is authoritative testimony to which Senator FULBRIGHT, a former college president and inventor of the Fulbright exchange scholarships, should pay special heed. It comes from Dr. Charles Malik, now Foreign Minister of Lebanon, who is by profession a college teacher.

"The state of mind of Asia's intellectuals today is not a happy commentary on the West's influence to date," Dr. Malik wrote 5 years ago. "Many of them, after devoting years to learning in European or American universities, returned to Asia afflicted with a great intellectual restlessness.

"Some of them sincerely thought they found solace only in Marxism; others were the clever, self-seeking radicals familiar enough in the West. In the light of all this there is reason for the universities of the West to meditate upon their failings in the past—as well as their opportunities for the future."

But if some of the more restless Arab leaders have learned their restlessness in the West, the West must still have faith that they learned other lessons as well. Certainly the teachers whom they remember as philosophical Marxoids (or worse) have been relearning other lessons—the murder of Imre Nagy only the other day shook another batch of them at least temporarily off the Marxoid bandwagon.

The main question in the Middle East and everywhere outside Sovietia is the awful shortness of time, whether miscalculation of men and doctrines can be corrected before the bombs fall, whether things like the Marine landing will slow events enough to let men un-think error and re-think elementals.

The American Exhibition at the Brussels World Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 2 news articles, 1 from the July 15 issue of the Star, of Chicago Heights, Ill., and the other from the July 15 issue of the Harvey Tribune, of Harvey, Ill.

Both of these articles refer to a letter written to me by a well-known businessman of Chicago Heights and a distinguished member of the Illinois State Senate, the Honorable Hayes Robertson. Senator Robertson's letter, which contained a penetrating analysis of his observations at the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Fair, was of such interest that I brought it to the personal attention of the President, who, in turn, directed Mr. George V. Allen, head of the United States Information Agency, to inspect the various exhibits at the American Pavilion and to report to the President personally.

I believe that material contained in these news articles merits the attention of Members of Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Heights (Ill.) Star of July 15, 1958]

LAMBASTS FAIR EXHIBIT—ATTENTION GIVEN CRITICISM AMAZING TO ROBERTSON

State Senator Hayes Robertson, whose criticism of the American exhibit at the Brussels International Fair caused the President to send a troubleshooter to the scene and drew nationwide comment, this week released the text of his letter, along with comments on its reception.

Senator Robertson, Republican, of Flossmore, who is president of Brummer Seal Company of Chicago Heights, touched off the debate with a letter to United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Senate GOP policy committee chairman, after a visit to the international fair during a European tour this summer.

After Senator BRIDGES read the letter to the President, the head of the United States Information Agency was sent to the fair for an official investigation.

Picked up by newspapers across the country, the letter was the subject of a critical editorial in a national magazine.

"I was amazed my letter would create so much attention," Robertson said this week.

"In my letter I tried to describe our display exactly as I remembered it, and I must have been reasonably accurate because no one I know of has denied any of the allegations of facts which I made.

"However, many have disagreed with my conclusions," he said.

"Many of the critics of my remarks have failed entirely to recognize the real purpose of the complaint," continued Robertson. "I am not nearly as concerned over the nude Indian maiden and her cannibal tribesmen, or the abstract art, or the floating orange peels as I am over the fact that the United States Information Agency doesn't seem to have the remotest idea of what the great majority of United States citizens consider American culture, or of what in our culture would be most likely to appeal to the people of Europe and the rest of the world.

"It must be remembered that Europeans are living in great fear of being caught in the middle of a shooting war between Russia and the United States. While their present governments are our allies under the NATO agreement, the people know that in every European country there is a strong Communist minority actively working in politics and with propaganda against the United States.

"The majority of Europeans want to believe that we are stronger than Russia. They know we are friendlier and less serious, but being less serious worries the farmer and common man of Europe. It may cause the intellectuals to chuckle but they are already our friends. Nevertheless, our USIA put on an exhibit, which, if it has any theme at all, is designed to show Americans as carefree, nonchalant, slaphappy folks whose only cares are internal affairs in which they admit we are not yet quite civilized.

"I have never felt that our foreign aid program was worth the cost to American taxpayers. I am now convinced that the purchasing agents we have hired to buy world friendship don't know what it is that they are supposed to be buying.

"They should be winning the friendship and admiration of the people of the world. Instead they are catering to the intellectual funny bone of the embassy staffs and the social courts of the present governments of Europe and Asia. There is a great difference."

When asked about the comments of former Postmaster General James A. Farley and

former President Herbert Hoover, in which they each expressed approval of the fair, Robertson replied, "I have the highest respect for the opinions of both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Farley, but I am sure that they each received a conducted tour which would have precluded any chance of seeing the exhibit as others see it."

Robertson added he hoped the controversy would prompt some changes in the exhibit and more important even some changes in the personnel of the USIA.

[From the Harvey (Ill.) Tribune of July 15, 1958]

LETTER TO SENATOR BRIDGES CREATES STIR IN WASHINGTON

State Senator Hayes Robertson has been in the news lately because of a letter he wrote to United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, about the American exhibit at the Brussels Fair. Robertson, who represents the eighth district and lives in Flossmoor, visited the fair last May on a European tour.

His letter was read to President Eisenhower by Senator BRIDGES at a policy committee meeting and the President sent George V. Allen, the Director of the United States Information Agency which was responsible for the exhibit, to Brussels to inspect the fair and make a report.

This action and excerpts from Senator Robertson's letter were noted in the New York Times and many papers over the country. Time magazine carried a story on June 30 and last week Life magazine criticized Robertson's comments editorially.

Said Life: "The Robertson view of the fair is shared by many Americans who have seen it, and Allen has said he will make a few changes on the basis of his own survey. We trust he will not make too many, and none that might change the basic character of the United States exhibit. For most of its American critics, including Mr. Robertson, are way off base."

Life conceded that "some of the United States exhibits to be sure, are baffling or trivial or unimaginatively presented and there are inevitable omissions. Mr. Robertson, for instance, complains that the only American automobile shown is a 1903 model and that 'no exhibit shows how we tax ourselves to help the other people of the world.'"

Life says "these criticisms are not heard from Europeans" and agrees with former President Herbert Hoover that "the spirit of compassion spreads from every American home to all mankind," and that the exhibit portrays this compassion honestly.

"The moral," Life says, "will get across."

The tribune asked Senator Robertson what his reaction was to the controversy that arose from his letter.

"I was amazed that my letter would create so much attention. There had been many people before me who had registered their complaints of the American exhibit," said Robertson. "In my letter I tried to describe our display exactly as I remembered it, and I must have been reasonably accurate because no one I know of has denied any of the allegations which I made. However, many have disagreed with my conclusions.

"Many of my critics have failed entirely to recognize the real purpose of the complaint," continued Robertson. "I am not nearly as concerned over the nude Indian maiden and her cannibal tribesmen, or the abstract art, or the floating orange peels, as I am over the fact that the United States Information Agency doesn't seem to have the remotest idea of what the great majority of United States citizens consider American culture, or of what in our culture would be most likely to appeal to the people of Europe and the rest of the world.

"It must be remembered that Europeans are living in great fear of being caught in the middle of a shooting war between Russia and the United States. While their present Governments are our allies under the NATO agreement, the people know that in every European country there is a strong Communist minority actively working in politics and with propaganda against the United States.

"The majority of Europeans want to believe that we are stronger than Russia. They know we are friendlier and less serious, but being less serious worries the farmer and common man of Europe. It may cause the intellectuals to chuckle but they are already our friends. Nevertheless, our USIA put on an exhibit, which, if it has any theme at all, is designed to show Americans as carefree, nonchalant, slaphappy folks whose only cares are internal affairs in which the USIA admits we are not yet quite civilized.

"I have never felt that our foreign-aid program was worth the cost to American taxpayers. I am now convinced that the purchasing agents we have hired to buy world friendship don't know what it is that they are supposed to be buying.

"They should be winning the friendship and admiration of the people of the world. Instead, they are catering to the intellectual funny bone of the Embassy staffs and the social courts of the present governments of Europe and Asia. There is a great difference."

When asked about the comments of former Postmaster General James A. Farley and former President Herbert Hoover in which they each expressed approval of the fair, Robertson replied, "I have the highest respect for the opinions of both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Farley but I am sure that they each received a conducted tour which would have precluded any chance of seeing the exhibit as others see it."

Robertson added that he hoped the controversy would prompt some changes in the exhibit and, more important, even some changes in the personnel of the USIA.

Celebration by the Elbeetian Legion of the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of W. D. Boyce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I believe it is pretty well known that it was the late W. D. Boyce, Chicago publisher and philanthropist, who brought the idea and the organization of the Boy Scout movement to this country from England in 1909.

Several years later, on learning that the Boy Scout movement as then organized was not reaching boys on the farms and in the smaller communities, Mr. Boyce founded the Lone Scouts, a similar organization that would reach these rural youths. This new organization grew rapidly, and at the time of its merger with the Boy Scouts in 1924, it had upwards of 500,000 members. Today the adults who belonged to the Lone Scouts in their youth have perpetuated the memory of that organization in the Elbeetian Legion.

The legion is this year honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mr. Boyce. To present a fuller picture of the matter I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Jack Standard, Texas chairman of the Elbeetian Legion, to the Governor of Texas, requesting that the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mr. Boyce be recognized by appropriate proclamation, and a copy of the proclamation which was thereupon issued by the Governor.

There being no objection, the letter and proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPLE, TEX., *May 15, 1958.*

Hon. PRICE DANIEL,
Governor of the State of Texas,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR SIR: June 16, 1958, is the 100th anniversary of the birth of W. D. Boyce, founder of the Boy Scouts of America, and the Lone Scouts of America. We are asking each governor to proclaim June 15 through June 21, 1958, as W. D. Boyce Week, to honor this man who has done so much for the youth of America.

I am sure you are familiar with the story:

In 1909, W. D. Boyce, a Chicago publisher and philanthropist, was instrumental in the founding of Boy Scouts of America because of his chance meeting when lost in the fog in London, with an English scout who guided him to his destination and then refused a tip, saying that that was his good deed for the day.

Mr. Boyce was so impressed that he contacted the founder of Boy Scouts, Baden-Powell, and on his return to Chicago, interested other men in the idea, organized the Boy Scouts of America, largely financing it himself for 2 years.

Leaving on one of his exploring trips, he returned to find that the Boy Scouts of America setup did not include the lonely farm boy or boys in the smaller communities who could not gather enough for a patrol. So, in 1915, he chartered the Lone Scouts of America, supporting it alone until it had grown to more than a half million boys by 1924 when it merged with Boy Scouts of America.

A group of old Lone Scouts, known as the Elbeetian Legion feel that William Dickson Boyce should be honored, for no single American has done a greater service for the boys of America than when he brought scouting to our country, interesting other men in the idea, helping to organize the Boy Scouts of America in 1910 and the Lone Scouts of America in 1915, largely financing both organizations himself at their start.

You know what scouting has meant to our boys the past 47 years. Had a certain unhappy Austrian lad by the name of Adolf been a Boy Scout, he might have found a joyous boyhood, full of the ideals of brotherhood, good will, and kindness. And the world would have been different. Every boy is an atom bomb in human history. Under the kind of scoutmaster we have today, a certain Russian boy might have learned the lessons of democratic cooperation, and perhaps we would never have known about Iron Curtains. Boys are the makers of history and the builders of tomorrow.

All America is grateful to the man who brought scouting and its ideals to the youth of our country. To me, as a country boy back in the hills of Lampasas County, the Lone Scouts opened up a new world. It taught patriotism, self-reliance, and as it was for country boys with no scoutmasters it instilled in us the honor system. The advancement was by degrees. There were seven degrees, and each one was designed to cover a specific phase of life in the great outdoors.

When the Lone Scouts merged with the Boy Scouts, it had a membership of about 500,000. There were thousands of Lone Scouts in Texas. Today in the ranks of the

Elbeetian Legion, which is the alumni organization of the old Lone Scouts of America, there are a representative cross section of this great Republic. From just plain citizens like myself to Senators, professors, editors, famous cartoonists, authors, and what have you.

We, therefore, respectfully request that you proclaim this week of June 15 to June 21, 1958 as W. D. Boyce Week.

Enclosed is a copy of the proclamation of Governor Griffin, of Georgia.

Sincerely,

JACK STANDARD,
Texas Chairman, National Committee To Honor W. D. Boyce, Founder of the Boy Scouts and Lone Scouts of America.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM BY PRICE DANIEL, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEX.

Greetings: June 16, 1958, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late William Dickson Boyce, Chicago publisher and philanthropist whose vision and generosity made possible the organization of the Boy Scouts of America.

One evening in 1909, Boyce became lost in a London fog and a small boy led him through the fog to his destination. The boy declined a tip for his services, telling Boyce that "I am a scout, and scouts do not accept tips for courtesies." Impressed with the London scout doing his daily good turn, the American publisher went to the founder of the British Boy Scouts, Sir Richard S. S. Baden-Powell, who explained the scout movement and gave Boyce a truckload of Boy Scout pamphlets and literature.

W. D. Boyce returned to America and incorporated, with others, the Boy Scouts of America on February 10, 1910. For the first 2 years he largely financed the organization with his own funds.

In 1915, Boyce founded the Lone Scouts of America, so that scouting could be enjoyed by boys in the country and remote places. The Lone Scouts had grown to a membership of half million boys by 1924 when it merged with the Boy Scouts.

Many Texans were Lone Scouts, and today there is a large alumni group known as the Elbeetian Legion. The legion this year is sponsoring a special observance commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of W. D. Boyce.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate Monday, June 16, 1958, as W. D. Boyce Day in Texas.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 28th day of May 1958.

PRICE DANIEL,
Governor of Texas.

Farmers' Net Income Reveals 22 Percent Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following newspaper article by Ovid A. Martin, entitled "Farmers' Net Income Reveals 22 Percent Increase":

FARMERS' NET INCOME REVEALS 22 PERCENT INCREASE

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department reported today that farmers' realized net income in the first half of 1958 was 22 percent higher than in the first half of 1957.

But in arriving at this increase, the Department revised downward previous estimates of income earned last year.

Of the 22 percent increase, about 15 percent reflected actual gains over last year's tentative figures, and 7 percent reflected revisions in last year's estimates.

The Department said realized net income—the amount available for spending after deduction of all production expenses—was at the annual rate of $13,300,000,000 the first half of this year.

It said the income during the first half of 1957 had been at the annual rate of $10,850,000,000 instead of the 11½ billions previously estimated.

This downgrading of last year's earnings, along with revisions in data supplied by the 1954 census of agriculture, as well as better information on the quantity and value of of home-consumed farm products, and some increases in production expenses.

The revised figure put the net realized income for the full year last year at $10,800,000,000 compared with 11½ billions previously estimated.

This put last year's earnings down 10 percent from the previous year instead of 4 percent reported earlier.

A part of the big increase this year over last year's revised income estimate reflected delayed marketings of some crops, such as corn and cotton, from last year's late harvests.

The Department said farm production expenses during the first half of this year were 4 percent higher than in the like period last year.

Truman Would Invite Nasser to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an article written by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, our courageous and beloved former president, which article appeared in the Washington Star of July 20, 1958, as well as other newspapers throughout the country.

TRUMAN WOULD INVITE NASSER TO WASHINGTON—URGES SUPPORT OF LEBANON INTERVENTION; FIRM STAND AGAINST REDS SEEN VITAL

(By Harry S. Truman)

The situation in the Middle East is one of extreme danger, and the President having taken a first and necessary step, the United States and the free nations of the West must be alert, determined and exceedingly careful not to leave any room for misunderstanding as to what we are prepared to do at all stages.

Our objective is to prevent a third world war. Our aim is to insure the peace of the world, and we have devoted our wealth and energies to that end at great sacrifice.

The President has made a momentous decision and proclaimed a policy which every citizen of the United States should support.

I hope, too, that we will find a way to create an atmosphere of genuine bipartisanship in which our foreign policy can be supported by all citizens. For it is necessary that those who are trying to destroy the free world clearly understand that we will unanimously support the man who takes the leadership—and that man necessarily will have to be the President of the United States.

CONCERNED ABOUT U. N.

For some time I have been worried about the steadily worsening prospects for peace and for the arrangements and organizations we have set up to help keep the peace of the world.

I have been frankly concerned that the same fate that overtook the League of Nations of Woodrow Wilson might also befall the United Nations. This would be a great tragedy, and I expect that many anxious generations would pass before there could be built another international organization to cope with the recurring dangers of war.

It was in that troubled mood that I recently returned from a visit to the Mediterranean where I thought about the trend of events as they concerned us and the other free nations in that part of the world.

I would have preferred, as I am sure the President would, to call first upon the United Nations for action on the plea of President Chamoun, of Lebanon, for help. But under the circumstances, there was no time to deal with the emergency, because it was obvious that the Russians would have delayed any action in the Security Council until help of any kind would have been rendered futile.

KOREAN CRISIS RECALLED

At the time of the Korean crisis, we were able to get quick action in the United Nations because Russia was then boycotting the Security Council. Today, however, the situation is different, with Russia again actively present and disrupting the work of this organization for peace.

In the recent past, I have been openly critical of some of the misjudgments and the drift in the conduct of our international policies. But this is no time to dwell on the past. The President, it is now evident, has adopted a policy of positive action.

Positive action, of course, does involve certain risks, but we have learned from experience that there are far greater risks in failure to act or in hesitation to act when we have to deal with the Soviet Union.

I, therefore, believe that the President—considering all the circumstances—had no alternative than to respond to the call of the President of Lebanon to dispatch troops to that troubled country. And the British were in the same situation with regard to Jordan.

The President is right in proposing that American troops should be withdrawn as soon as the United Nations can make provision to send an international force to take their place.

FIRM STAND HELD VITAL

Having taken this action in Lebanon, I think it is necessary that we make it clear to the Soviet Government that the free world means business in its determination to stop Communist intrigue and subversion in the Mediterranean. This should be done through formal diplomatic representation in concert with our allies.

Time and again we have seen that when the Kremlin is convinced that we mean business and are determined to back it up with action, it will back down. This happened in Iran, and this happened in Greece and Turkey.

Moscow once again must be reminded that we stand ready—whatever the cost or consequences—to back up our commitments for peace.

And I think this may be a good time for a new approach in Egypt. Under proper conditions, it might prove useful to a peaceful resolution of the Middle Eastern crisis to invite President Nasser to Washington for a frank and friendly discussion.

I wish we could have invited him much earlier—during the beginning of the Middle Eastern crisis.

WOULD INVITE OTHER LEADERS

One of the things President Nasser does not seem to understand is that the hope for improvement of the lot of his people lies in his working with the West. On the other hand, if he keeps on flirting with the Russians and encourages them in their sinister campaign of indirect aggression, he stands a good change of turning his country into a Mediterranean Hungary or Poland.

Arab nationalism can have no future in the plans of Russian imperialism. Nor is there any hope for a better future for the Arabs if, on the pretense of freedom, so-called republics are set up by brutal military coups, such as occurred in Iraq.

I think we would have a better opportunity to learn from President Nasser at first hand exactly what his aims are. At the same time, we ought to invite and welcome other recognized Arab leaders to come here so as to give full and equal consideration to their aims and problems.

MANY WAYS TO HELP

There are many ways in which we could be helpful to the Arabs in their quest for security and freedom and a decent standard of living, and we ought to explore every opportunity to help.

I think we ought to make it clear to Nasser and other Arab leaders that the free nations of the world cannot be politically blackmailed because of their need for oil from the Middle East. The fact is that the free world now has access to ample oil resources outside the Middle East from which they can supply all their industrial, domestic, and strategic requirements.

It would, therefore, be foolhardy for extremist Arab nationalists to cut off the supply of oil to the West. This would result only in chaos and economic disaster to them.

Before anyone in the Middle East is tempted to risk another crisis like Suez, I hope that he will think twice, because it will not work again.

I think the times are serious, and it is dangerous to minimize the difficulties we face. But I also think we have an opportunity to clear the air of many wrong and false assumptions in our dealings with the Middle East.

We can now stand on firmer ground and seek to follow through in a policy of dealing resolutely and realistically with the Soviet challenge in that explosive part of the world.

Deterioration of Veterans' Medical Program Under Federal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article appearing in the American Legion magazine for July 1958 is a subject of proper concern for all those interested in adequate medical care for the veterans. This article points out that the Veterans' Administration is closing from daily use 850 hospital beds for 1958–59. The national executive committee of the American Legion in may of 1958 reported a waiting list of veterans waiting to get into veterans hospitals of over 28,000 This was the known list. It did not include the numberless cases where calls were made by physicians to Veterans' Administration hospitals and when being told that there is no room, no application is filed. This article points out the tremendous slash in the number of beds for tuberculosis treatment. Over 550 TB beds were eliminated. It may be that TB needs have slackened off. These same beds could be used for other pressing needs such as care of the chronically ill and the aged among our veterans.

We recently had the experience in Wisconsin of the Waukesha Veterans Hospital having its staff and its patient load drastically reduced. Waukesha is a veterans tuberculosis hospital. I asked that consideration be given to devoting the Waukesha facilities and the skill of its fine staff for other veteran medical needs.

Everywhere across the country there is a need for more bed space for the chronically ill, the mentally ill, the aged and senile cases. If Veterans' Administration can, because of progress in treatment, afford to eliminate tuberculosis beds, then certainly every effort should be made to use these facilities, on which the taxpayers have spent millions of dollars, for other types of treatment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred from the July issue of the American Legion magazine entitled "Dry Rot Eating Vets Program Under Hidden Federal Policies," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRY ROT EATING VETS' PROGRAM UNDER HIDDEN FEDERAL POLICIES

The United States veterans' medical program, once the pride of the world, moves into the Government fiscal year of 1959 suffering dry rot as the result of deliberate but undeclared Federal policies of erosion and attrition of its staff, facilities, and services.

The Veterans' Administration is closing from daily use some 850 of its hospital beds for 1958–59. There is no declared policy of the Congress or the President to close the beds, simply a denial of funds to keep them open.

The use of nearly 5,000 VA hospital beds was denied eligible patients in recent years without any declared policy of the Congress or the administration to deny it.

As the beds are closed out, VA staff members who man them are discharged or transferred, without any declared policy of the Congress or the President to reduce the staff.

As some VA staff members are let out in the contining attrition, the morale of the remaining staff dwindles and they look around for new places to work before the hidden axe swung by undeclared policy catches them unprepared.

The Veterans' Administration has not recommended any policy of closing hospital beds, firing staff, or demoralizing the remaining staff. When he knew he was going to resign, the last Administrator publicly declared himself in favor of opening more beds—in the face of a waiting list of eligible patients now swelled to 27,000 of whom some 16,000 or more are mental cases.

The VA hospital system has a rated capacity of some 128,000 beds. Its daily patient load is now some 17,000 below rated capacity. The daily load is shrinking not for want of eligible patients, but through fiscal policies imposed by the Bureau of the Budget, unsanctioned by any law or any publicly declared policy of the President or the Congress.

The physical plant of the United States veterans hospitals is beginning to deteriorate, bit by bit, for lack of proper current maintenance and modernization.

There is no declared policy of the President to permit the splendid plant to deteriorate.

There is a definite policy of the Congress to maintain and modernize the physical plant of the hospitals.

Ordinary maintenance of the physical plant is suffering because of under-budgeting by the Budget Bureau.

In some instances, funds appropriated by Congress for plant improvement have gone unspent by delaying tactics of the Budget Bureau—such as quibbling from 1 year's end to the next about minor technicalities of new construction such as the width of corridors or the size of doors.

OWN POLICY

Apparently the Budget Breau has a policy of its own, which it prefers to that of the Congress. A year or so ago, Assistant Budget Director Robert Merriam, told the House Committee on Veterans Affairs that there should be 40,000 VA hospital beds, instead of the 128,000 which the Congress had provided. The present pattern smacks of outright conspiracy of the Budget Bureau to impose its own legislative policy, eroding the veterans' hospitals down to size by financial neglect, through practices completely contrary to the true purpose of a Budget Bureau. Beyond question this assumption of devious legislative powers by the Bureau must erupt in a public scandal, a congressional rebellion and possible reorganization of the Budget Bureau with tighter legal controls on its authority, given only time.

Having been denied the use of 5,000-odd available beds in recent years under budgetary pressure, the Veterans' Administration continued in May and June to close down more beds in anticipation of the 1959 budget.

The new withdrawal of operating beds was spread around the country—5 here, 10 there, 90 elsewhere.

TB beds got the biggest slash (550 more beds closing down). TB needs have slackened off, but the VA could convert the beds to more pressing needs, especially for the chronically ill and the aged. To check any such progressive step, the Budget Bureau recently ordered the VA not to convert any TB beds to other uses—in short, to compel the national investment in the TB beds to become useless.

Beds for mental patients were being cut back by 250 in the face of a waiting list of 16,000. General medical beds felt a 150 bed reduction. With the beds went more staff—doctors, nurses, technicians who had manned them.

Some national economy groups had been asking for such savings. They presumably admired the budgetary way of doing the job expeditiously without any annoying public debate or congressional sanction.

Nationally, the chamber of commerce was among those which had asked month in and month out that the Federal veterans program be cut back in some such way.

Locally, it was a different picture. When the VA began shutting down 90 beds at its Martinsburg, W. Va., hospital and laid off 48 employees, the Martinsburg Chamber of Commerce became the spokesman of many local protesting groups.

But there was small chance that the 90 beds would be restored to Martinsburg. VA Administrator Summer Whittier was there in person to explain the technicalities to the local people. Only hope seemed to be that Congress would pass specific laws to reopen the particular beds and provide money that the Budget Bureau wasn't asking for and wouldn't let the VA request. That's the

kind of legislation that amounts to congressional war with the administration. But some Congressmen were ready for it.

The citizens and businessmen of Martinsburg would feel the cutback in business lost, employed persons suddenly unemployed or gone elsewhere, Federal funds that used to be spent not being spent.

Something was said now and then about the sick veterans who would be denied care at Martinsburg, but mostly the talk was about what was good for business, how the local economy would be hurt, how little money the VA had.

SIDETRACK

Somehow, both sides of the argument revolved around the interests of everyone but the patients in need of the beds. It was a not-so-funny frame of reference for discussion of a hospital operation.

Meanwhile, not only in Martinsburg but elsewhere around the country, it seemed that the dairy and pharmaceutical businesses were being hurt, too.

Was it true that less milk was being sold to the VA hospitals? Visitors reported that patients in the remaining beds were being denied their usual glass of milk at bedtime and other rations were being curtailed.

Was it true that less medicine was being sold to the VA? Reports were going the rounds that veterans entitled to medicine from the VA were getting it slower—and slower meant less of it.

Veterans entitled to outpatient care were being cut down in the frequency of their visits, it was reported.

Those in the know confirmed some of the rumors, and said it was a helluva way to run a hospital.

They included the 23 managers of VA hospitals in 7 Western States who got up on their hind legs in March and laid it on the line.

The 23 managers said they could neither maintain the quality of medical nor the condition of their hospital buildings and facilities on the amount of money the Budget Bureau was letting the VA request to carry out its program.

By 1960, said the 23 managers, they would need $10 million more for their 23 hospitals alone than they got in 1958. It was a plain public statement which showed that the 23 managers had the guts, if not the money, to do their jobs.

But as the new budget for 1959 shaped up, they were again getting less, not more. Hence the new wave of cutbacks.

THE $64 QUESTION

Representative OLIN TEAGUE of Texas, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, said flatly that the cutbacks and the scrimping were not the policy of Congress. They were contrary to existing law, he said, and the Budget Bureau was responsible.

On April 22 he wrote the President, cited the laws being obstructed, stated that the President's Budget Bureau was doing the obstructing, and asked the President directly if the Bureau were obstructing the law with the President's knowledge and approval.

That was the $64 question. When the executive branch of the Government pledges to carry out the laws of the land, may it abandon any laws for which it lacks enthusiasm by the ruse of not asking for the money to carry them out, or refusing the money to the responsible agency?

That is what the Budget Bureau is doing, TEAGUE told the President. The law authorizes the Veterans' Administration to put its available beds to use for the care of eligible patients. The Congress has made the beds available. The Budget Bureau, with its financial control over VA operations, has on its own initiative made about 6,000 of the beds unavailable over recent years.

TEAGUE offered to make the question clearer. He would offer bills in Congress to spell out exactly how many beds the VA would operate, but would delay introducing such drastic legislation pending an answer from the President as to his future plans.

By June 1, TEAGUE had not reported any answer from the President, and the VA was continuing to close out more beds.

THE LEGION'S POSITION

In the face of the continued erosion of VA hospital facilities and staff, the national executive committee of the American Legion passed the following resolution in May, and National Commander Gleason immediately wrote the President urging that he take appropriate action:

Resolution 37, national executive committee, May 1958:

"The certified waiting list of eligible applicants for hospitalization at VA hospitals as of April 24, 1958 has grown to more than 28,000.

"This eligible list does not reflect the true number of prospective needy applicants (seriously ill veterans) for whom local physicians call VA hospitals and no applications are filed because there are no beds available in the foreseeable future, thus increasing the burden in already overcrowded local hospitals and on the local taxpayer.

"The need for VA hospital beds is accentuated by the economic distress many veterans are suffering.

"The Budget Bureau has denied VA that latitude of action which would permit VA to utilize for the care of long-term chronic and other seriously ill patients a TB or other type bed not currently needed as such.

"The chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee has clearly and fully pointed out to the President that current policies being followed by the VA at the direction of the Budget Bureau have resulted in the withdrawal from use by veterans effective December 31, 1957, nearly 5,000 beds (4,974).

"One thousand six hundred eighty-two beds were closed in the VA system during fiscal year 1957.

"The Budget Bureau plans for a further decrease in the number of beds available to veterans for fiscal year 1959.

"The American Legion urges the President to reverse the Budget Bureau policy of constantly and continuously reducing the number of beds available for care and treatment of sick and disabled veterans, through the control of fiscal policy, and further; that the President use the power of his office to secure an increase, rather than a decrease, in the number of usable VA beds in fiscal year 1959."

Outrage in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial "Outrage in Moscow," appearing in the Washington Star of July 19, 1958.

This organized outrage and dispicable attack on American prestige and sovereignty should not pass unnoticed.

To say the least, an immedite apology should be demanded, and definite assurances of no recurrence.

Unless such apology and assurances are forthwith received, and this should be the minimum of our action as well stated in the editorial "that we will withdraw our entire diplomatic delegation."

With the recent experience of American soldiers held hostages in East Germany, and the outrageous attack on our Embassy in Moscow, the time for action on our part has arrived.

OUTRAGE IN MOSCOW

From time to time in our own country and the rest of the free world, there have been demonstrations against the Soviet Union. But they have not been things sponsored or encouraged or otherwise inspired by governments. Instead, as during the Kremlin's savage attack on Hungarian freedom in 1956, they have been spontaneous outburts reflecting the stirred-up feelings of earnest people acutely sensitive to both the decencies and the indecencies of international life. Further, taken as a whole, these displays of group emotions have been small in scale, and they have been policed effectively enough to minimize or eliminate the danger of serious violence.

The same cannot be said, however, of what has just occurred in Moscow as a sort of emphasis to the Kremlin's simultaneous warning to the West on the Middle East. Actually, all the signs indicate that this mob action—involving more than 100,000 Russians—would never have taken place had not the Khrushchev government itself been a party to it. Hours in advance of the event, thorough preparations had been made for it—openly, unabashedly, without the slightest effort to cover up the prior planning, including the setting up of loudspeakers and television equipment calculated to incite and display as much anti-Americanism as possible directly in front of the Embassy of the United States.

In due course, as planned, the hooligan elements (a favorite Soviet phrase) of this immense crowd went to work. They shattered at least 275 of the Embassy's windows. They splattered the building's walls with blue and green ink. They screamed. They threatened. They screeched out vile libels against our country and its decision to answer the Lebanese Government's urgent appeal for help. And all the while, with studied aloofness, the Communist police did nothing to restrain the demonstration. They did nothing until the worst part of it, the most disgusting and most violent part of it, had been carried out. Not until then, acting quite efficiently after a great deal of deliberate inefficiency, did they put an end to it.

How are we to respond to this outrage? Should all of us in town march into 16th Street and put on a similar show in front of the Soviet Embassy? Of course not. But we ought certainly to make clear that we have neither stomach nor tolerance for the kind of thing that has taken place in Moscow. And we ought to make clear, too, in very strong and unmistakable terms, that we will withdraw our entire diplomatic delegation—which would be tantamount to a complete break in relations—unless the Kremlin puts an end to outrages of this sort.

The Future of Gold Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, recent articles appearing in several of the leading publications of the Nation indicate there is more than normal interest in

gold, the problem of domestic gold production, the establishment of a price for gold commensurate with cost of production, a free market for gold, plus the very important problem of stabilizing our American currency through a return to the gold standard.

Although there has been some change in conditions since the paper was prepared, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address of Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin, chairman of the gold producers committee of the American Mining Congress and president of the Homestake Mining Co., presented at the American Mining Congress in February 1958.

The paper, entitled "Gold in 1957," is as follows:

Gold mining is supposed to be prosperous in times when the economy slows down and traditionally to suffer in times of booming activity. Consequently, in a rather wry way, the miners who are still surviving in this long depressed business may take a little comfort from the growing signs of trouble in other fields and may even derive some satisfaction from the stability of their meager incomes as compared with the change from riches to poverty experienced recently by the producers of copper, lead, zinc, and most other metals. Whether or not the turn of events at the end of the year will be of much significance to them, however, is still uncertain. If we are about to enter a depression adequate to atone for the sins of inflation at their present stage, the immediate prospects for better profits from gold mining are bright; if on the other hand the feverish boom is revived by more of the same stimulants that have been used since the war, further inflation will be likely and the pinch on earnings from gold mining will be more and more painful.

Under the latter circumstances the depression may be postponed, but it will be more severe when it eventually arrives. The gold miners would have a few more lean years to sweat out until the mounting pressures created by further inflation finally bring about a truly disastrous break. If ore reserves last long enough, gold miners might stand to gain from the delay and from the more drastic devaluation resulting in a higher price for gold in smaller dollars that these conditions will bring about. But surely they would be glad to give up these hopes for distant riches and settle for a milder recession at this time with much smaller benefits to them, if it would lead to sounder monetary policies related to gold.

From these comments, some unkind critics might charge the writer with being a cheerful sort of Cassandra, actually taking satisfaction in the dire consequents predicted for others. They might even go so far as to imagine he thinks that what is bad for the country is good for the gold miner. That really isn't true, for the worst program for our country would be to continue present monetary policies and to drift further into the soft habits of an inflationary prosperity maintained by excessive spending. This has already been nearly fatal to the gold mining industry.

GOLD: A STRONG WEAPON TO FIGHT INFLATION

If the commitments of the Federal Government and the special guaranties and obligations such as social-security, pensions, housing subsidies and the like, are added to the formal debt of $275 billion, the figures that we expect coming generations to meet become truly astronimical. The social-security liability alone, partially funded only by other promises to pay, is estimated by some to be as great as $350 billion. Truly it would be in the national interest to check this freedom with the money of future citizens and to restrain the growing practice (national and personal) of living more and more on credit. If this is not done, the end will be a drastic reduction if not complete repudiation of these excessive obligations through a truly disastrous inflation.

A strong weapon in the fight against these dangers and in progress toward financial integrity is gold, and the sooner conditions develop that reveal its power and that persuade our leaders in government and finance to use it, the better the country will fare.

Consequently, it is reasonable to think that even a recession at this stage—harsh medicine though it might be—is needed to prevent greater ills in the future. Whatever improvements might come to gold miners from such an event would be small in comparison with the long-range benefits gained by the country as a whole. It is truly a satisfaction to feel that the special interests of the gold miners actually are identical with the best interests of the country, which, of course, puts us in a position that can be strongly defended morally as well as on the grounds of enlightened self-interest.

The change in business conditions toward the end of the year, however, merely suggested the possibility that the economic climate might become more favorable for gold miners in the not-too-distant future. No improvement in profits from gold mining actually occurred in 1957, though the more abundant labor supply and the more intensive competition among sales agents that were apparent in the last quarter might soon begin to have an influence on costs, if such trends continued. For the year as a whole, however, we can only record that the same discouarging increase in costs and decline of profits continued.

In spite of this, the production of gold for the free world as a whole will be greater than in 1957. This rather contrary result was due entirely to the growing output of South Arica as the new mines on the deep reefs in the Orange Free State came into full production and as the returns from uranium offset losses and postponed the closing of a number of mines on the older Rand. These extraordinary conditions will probably lift the record of gold production to a new high for these immense deposits and will more than offset the continued decline in gold production elsewhere outside of Russia. South African production for 1957 is likely to be close to a million ounces higher than in 1956. which will probably result in an increase of 300,000 to 400,000 ounces in the total output of the free world, bringing it somewhat over a billion dollars in value.

GOLD PRODUCTION DOWN IN UNITED STATES, CANADA

In Canada, the United States, and elsewhere, no new gold fields or even gold mines of any significance were found and developed to offset the growing restrictions resulting from higher wages and cost of materials. Unfortunately none of the gold ores on this continent contain uranium, though a few gold mining companies on this continent have had some success in the development of uranium properties acquired in other areas. Canada is still in a strong second place among the gold producers, even with a production that will be 100,000 oz. less than in 1956.

In the United States, the Homestake mine has held its own fairly well, with a production of around $19,300,000, very close to that for 1956. Returns from other regions fell off, however, to an extent that will probably make the final figure for national gold production well below last year's. Curtailment of production from certain of the porphyry coppers that contribute a substantial percentage of the Nation's gold will also reduce the totals somewhat.

The United States may show a decline of as much as 200,000 oz. when final figures are in. In Canada the normal troubles of the times for gold miners were aggravated by the relative weakness of the United States dollar that reduced the gross value received for their gold in the currency that had to be used to meet payrolls and expenses. Gold has declined from its proud place at the head of the list of Canada's metallic products to fifth place, and the growing output of uranium will soon put it in sixth place.

The immense output of gold from south Africa, in the last few years, has undoubtedly been a decidedly beneficial factor in the world's economy, for it has kept the discrepancy between obligations expressed in paper currencies and the available stock of monetary gold from becoming too extreme. As these basic factors now stand in relations to each other, new ratios could be set and new monetary units still could be defined in gold at figures that could be supported and that would not require an increase in price of gold too great to be easily entertained.

In spite of their inconsistencies, the present policies concerning gold are still supported and defended, by the monetary authorities in the United States. The dollar is still defined in terms of gold, for it alone has basic authority as money; but the definition loses its meaning by the restrictions imposed on convertibility that make inflationary financial practices difficult to restrain, particularly on the domestic level where the protection of gold is completely denied to the citizens. The money managers are in the strange position of trying to present a respectable front to the world by maintaining convertibility of the dollar into gold at $35 per ounce through foreign central banks, while retaining full freedom to monetize debt and depreciate the dollar domestically. Until recently, the productive strength of America in contrast with the postwar weakness of the European countries and Japan has made it possible to maintain this position, though it could not have been done without the help of immense grants of various sorts.

FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY BECOMING COMPETITIVE

Furthermore, thanks to domestic inflation and to increases in wages forced by unions at a rate faster than the dollar depreciates, the United States has become an extremely high-cost country in spite of our advanced technology, particularly in mass production Faced with the mounting and increasingly skillful competition of Europe (Germany in particular), Japan, and before long of Russia, there is clearly danger that exports will decline with possibly rather serious effect on an economy that must maintain its output and sales at high levels to attain competitive costs. Tariffs or trade restriction, now so loudly demanded by those who are already feeling the painful impact of foreign competition, are not apt to help the overall situation.

The money managers apparently want it both ways. At home, the power of gold is not denied. Abroad, it is recognized by a rate of convertibility that makes the dollar an overvalued monetary unit. Sale of American goods abroad under these conditions has been possible only by the artificial device of offsetting dollar and gold balances payable to us by grants and aid on a vast scale.

Our international trade could be sustained without grants or other support if the gold standard were restored, on the proper basis. Foreign aid could be reduced and eventually terminated, with gradual transformation to the normal procedures of a free economy in which goods are exchanged internationally under conditions beneficial to each participating trader.

Most students of the problem recognize that the effects on trade brought about by foreign aid could be accomplished as effectively but in an impartial way by an increase in the price of gold. The principal

arguments against the latter procedure are (1) that it would then not be possible to direct our aid to selected friends, for an increase in price of gold would necessarily apply to all, and (2) that such an increase would be particularly beneficial to Soviet Russia.

MONETARY STANDARD NEEDED IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Even if it were assumed that our program of selected beneficiaries had achieved the desired objectives—a rather extreme assumption, as a survey of the current scene will indicate—it surely is inadvisable to continue it until financial aid from us becomes regarded as an obligation on our part that can't be dropped without dire consequences. Indeed, in places it appears to have attained this standing already, when aid is continued more on account of threats of reprisal than for mutual benefits.

"Trade not aid" is a slogan which if put into practice will win more friends in the long run than gifts. Convertibility of currencies in terms of gold, however, is necessary to give it practical meaning. Interchange of goods and normal business could then be conducted with assurance and with the mutual respect that is clearly lacking when favors are offered and accepted either with suspicion as to motives or with more or less concealed contempt for the simplicity of the benefactors.

Without entering into the debate over results to date, the time is surely near for a change from aid to trade—and that can be best accomplished through establishment of currencies convertible into gold.

RUSSIA'S GOLD POSITION GROWING STRONGER

The argument that restoration of the gold standard with an increase in price of gold would be of special aid to Russia is of very doubtful validity. Russia undoubtedly has accumulated a substantial gold reserve, probably considerably less than the actual quantity of gold we hold, but possibly greater than our net balance after short-term claims against our assets are taken into account. The Russians are using it only sparingly in payment of occasional imports, presumably because other means of exchange are limited. If trade with Russia is to expand—and what better way is there to promote mutual understanding and respect?—stable currencies convertible freely into gold that would be accepted by all participating countries are essential. The devaluations of the ruble have in all probability put a valuation on gold in Russia that is in reasonable relation to domestic prices for major industrial commodities. Adjustment of the already depreciated currencies in the rest of the world to gold will have to be made before relative values suitable for mutually beneficial trade can be established.

The building up of gold reserves of the magnitude now held by Russia—or of gold mining activities on a large scale—have undoubtedly required a major effort, involving engineering and geologic talent, the use of large amounts of machinery and materials, and the employment of labor in substantial quantities. Such expenditures surely were not undertaken lightly in an economy that must have had to meet many other severe demands. Russia has undoubtedly paid a big price for its present gold position, however one may measure prices in the Soviet economy. It would be most unwise on our part to think that this was done without intent to use the power that gold alone provides in worldwide exchange of goods. A sudden announcement of a ruble convertible into gold at a fixed rate for use in international trade could bring Russia as much new prestige as their success in sending up the first satellite. This will probably be done just as soon as the Russian economy has reached a stage where exportable surpluses are available in significant quantities. Before long, the Russian competitive position in foreign markets will undoubtedly be much stronger. With the added assurance that a ruble convertible into gold would give them, the rest of the world would be in a most disadvantageous position if earlier steps had not been taken to put the dollar and European monetary systems in better order. With the free world still in possession of the largest gold reserves as well as the greatest producing gold fields, the initiative in wise employment of the basic monetary power of gold surely should not be lost.

A higher price for gold—or, more accurately, an adjustment of the already depreciated currencies to the stable value of gold—would certainly not be to the disadvantage of the West, whose combined strength in gold is far greater than the Russians'. Such a move would be to the advantage of both sides of the divided world by stabilizing currencies in terms of a generally accepted unit. The assurance of dependable and impartial settlements that this would give would surely be of immense help to multilateral trade and could well do more to promote peace and mutual respect between nations than any other means.

The complexities of specific steps to achieve these ends are formidable, but not beyond our powers if the objectives can be agreed upon. Unfortunately, little or no recognition of the seriousness of the problem is discernible on the part of those in high places in our Government or seen in banking or business circles. (American bankers, strangely enough, are rarely if ever interested in basic monetary problems.) Time unfortunately is becoming short, and it is most worrisome to think that we are probably in danger of another defeat in the international position through failure to make wise and timely use of the immense power we possess through gold.

For several years the American Mining Congress has recommended that "Congress fix the ratio at which the dollar and gold are to be made fully convertible and determine other technical procedures involved in the restoration of the gold standard, after receiving the recommendations of a Commission of its creation, to which men skilled in appraisal of the world's potential gold supplies as well as men of competence in domestic and international finance and trade should be appointed by designated Government authorities."

The urgency of the situation calls for more direct action, but without agreement on principles and procedures this cannot be expected unless forced by harsh circumstances. But perhaps it is not too much to expect that a careful study by a competent commission would bring forth a program that could be approved and adopted in time to be effective, as a means of controlling inflation, of lessening the severity of the depression that we must eventually expect, and of strengthening our position in world trade.

The Fine Headquarters That Will Soon Be Constructed for the National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the current July 15 issue of the National Wildlife Federation's Conservation News a statement to the effect that there will soon be completed the fine new headquarters building for the federation.

The completion of this building will mark the fulfillment of a splendid dream—if one can call it that—of conservation pioneers. Long ago, they envisioned a national center which would radiate sound information on American resource preservation and management.

The American people are indebted to those conservation leaders who sensed the necessity of having a strong, effective national organization which would serve the needs of American resources.

The current issue of Conservation News contains a wide variety of news reports demonstrating how this wise dream is being carried out. I refer to news reports on preservation of timber, of wildlife, of waters, of scenic attractions.

There is news, as well, of the award by the Federation of some 30 grants to individuals in the 1958–59 academic year for undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate studies in conservation affairs. All this is to the good.

If the 173 millions of Americans today, and the tens of millions more who are to come in the years ahead, are to be able to enjoy the outdoor resources which are our heritage, then it is essential that this Federation continue to prosper, as I am sure it will.

The federation's sale of attractive wildlife stamps represents one of the vital means of its splendid educational and self-financing work.

This particular July 15 statement, to which I have referred, regarding the federation's new building, was written by the able executive director of the federation, Mr. Ernest F. Swift.

It is no accident that Mr. Swift is a past conservation director of the State of Wisconsin, for the Badger State has graduated, so to speak, many of our greatest conservationists who have long been in the forefront of conservation of America's outdoor heritage.

Mr. Louis S. Clapper is editor and Mr. Charles H. Callison is conservation director.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Conservation News statement be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSERVATION DREAM THAT BECAME A REALITY

(By Ernest Swift)

All the great moral and social values of our civilization which merit true recognition became realities because someone had a dream.

Invariably, selfless dreamers are ridiculed by a jealous and avaricious world which cannot comprehend that some men can rise above self-interest and personal profit to crusade for a cause.

While ordinary men hide their dreams, fearing to be different, the truly great will boldly follow their vision and fight to see its fulfillment.

Too often the dreamer never sees his promised land, but his dreams inspire others to carry on.

This Nation has been fortunate to have had a few men with sufficient imagination

and crusading spirit to rouse people to the need of resource preservation and sound management practices.

Such men as Fernow, Roth, Pinchot, Teddy Roosevelt, Pierson, Greeley, and "Ding" Darling qualify, to risk naming a few.

In 1936 Darling foresaw the need for a National Federation of Conservationists. He envisioned an organization that would encompass all conservation precepts. Most of all, he wanted to turn the tide of mediocre thinking that destruction of resources was inevitable; that good and evil in resource management was a matter of human determination.

An organization was created through his efforts, the National Wildlife Federation, which is now in its 22d year. Darling painted the first wildlife stamps to help finance this venture. The Federation did not develop exactly in the image that Darling conceived, but nevertheless its membership has grown and its potency for good conservation principles has been felt in every State and Territory.

One ideal which the Federation has clung to through years of growing up is the need for education in the field of conservation. Various efforts have been made along this line. One of these is the fellowship grants for worthy students and another is project grants for group training and teaching. Still another effort is culminated in the millions of pieces of literature distributed to the schools and the general public.

After long years of a struggle to survive, another milestone will soon be reached. The Federation is erecting its own building in Washington, D. C., as a more effective working tool and a base of operation for an enlarged and more comprehensive seat of conservation education.

Over and above office space for normal Federation business, here will be an auditorium, a conference room, and a library. The auditorium will seat 250 people; the smaller conference room, 60. Both visiting and local students, youth groups, teachers, and conservation organizations will be invited to use the facilities. There will be a full-time educational supervisor with assistants to cooperate by way of lectures, obtaining speakers or movies, or arranging business meetings.

The Federal seat of government at Washington, D. C., will at long last have a place where conservationists can convene and conduct their business.

The library will be built up as a depository of authentic reference for any and all who are looking for source material. It will be considered a place of study. Already, interested members have offered contributions to it.

Reference to an educational supervisor does not imply that he would spend all his time in Washington, as the Federation desires to make its influence felt in the field of conservation throughout the entire Nation.

The Federation will have an anchor point for this important work and the only one of its kind in the country. Although at considerable cost, the decision was justified.

The National Wildlife Federation wishes to express its appreciation to the thousands of people who have contributed toward making this conservation center a reality.

The McClellan Committee Hearings and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article entitled "The McClellan Committee Hearings and Labor" by Joseph Loftus, Washington correspondent of the New York Times. This article appeared in the July 1958 issue of the Michigan Business Review which is published by the School of Business Administration of the University of Michigan.

THE MCCLELLAN COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND LABOR

(By Joseph Loftus)

Organized labor, as you have observed, is going through a crisis. This is a big subject, so perhaps it's best if I give you in advance a rough outline of what I am going to talk about.

1. The labor movement and how it got that way.
2. The McClellan committee and what it is.
3. Can labor cure itself?
4. The prospects for legislation.

It is becoming increasingly hazardous to generalize about the labor movement. In fact, one might question whether there is such a thing as "a movement" any more. At least, one has to define the "movement."

The main body, of course, is the AFL–CIO. The group of unions outside the main body has been growing. They include the Coal Miners, the Longshoremen, the Teamsters, a couple of railroad unions, and some of lesser consequence like the Bakers, and the Laundry Workers, plus the groups that have always been unaffiliated.

Numerically, these are no rival of the AFL–CIO, but they have a strategic importance in our commerce and our society, and their behavior is a public-relations factor of critical consequence to all organized labor. The public tends to identify all labor with the headline characters. That happens in other segments of our society.

So, with these and other hazards in the back of my mind, I'll go ahead and talk about the labor movement without qualifying my statements every step of the way.

EVOLUTION OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

In retrospect, one could say that what has happened to labor was inevitable. Labor has grown up in the image of business, so it has been making the same mistakes that business made. It's just a generation or two behind.

In business, we had the accumulation of wealth and power, conspicuous consumption, corruption, abuses of rights and privileges, and a public-be-damned attitude. Regulation followed.

Now why has labor grown up in the image of business? The short answer is that labor—the mass of employees—accepted the business of private enterprise as a way of life.

This is a theory of history that can be explained in 2 minutes. I assume that everybody concedes that the creation of labor unions was a response to a need. The only question then was what direction would the unions take.

The Knights of Labor, which flourished for a while, was not a union, as we have come to know unions. It was an idealistic, cooperative movement that would have altered the course of our economic system had it gone on.

So the AFL displaced the Knights of Labor. Then within the AFL a Socialist movement flourished for a while. It withered and died. Most of those old Socialist labor leaders who still survive are avid advocates of the free-enterprise system today.

In the early days of the CIO, the Communists had a threatening foothold. They were expelled. They have no influence in labor any more.

In other words, the labor movement has evolved out of a clash of ideas into what we know today as business unionism. The old ideological spirit and missionary zeal are far in the background, if not lost.

So business should not scream too loud. It didn't want the cooperative society proposed by the Knights of Labor; it didn't want socialism or communism, so it got business unionism. Sometimes it is big business. The union leaders tend to identify with business leaders, so you get good ones and bad ones.

THE IMPACT OF SUCCESS

In a sense you could say that labor is a victim of its environment; but that carries the mechanical explanation so far that it absolves the bad labor leaders. On the other hand, perhaps it is asking too much to say that the labor leaders should have studied their history and learned from their counterparts in business that excesses bring penalties.

In a narrower perspective, the labor leaders are in trouble because they did not know how to handle success. They forgot that the public had given them special privilege because they were underprivileged. In 1935, the public gave the labor leaders a one-sided law, the Wagner Act. The public blinked at sitdown strikes and violence.

Labor got strong and sassy during the war and the rehabilitation. The Taft-Hartley law in 1947 should have taught the labor leaders a lesson. It didn't. I think the labor leaders are still misreading the public's temperature.

Growing with the general prosperity, most of the unions got fat and rich. Many of the labor leaders behaved arrogantly and consumed too conspicuously. They came to be trustees for great sums of money—a job they had never been trained to handle. The temptation to dip into the till became too great. Some became greedy. The racketeers moved in and have been making a good thing of it for themselves.

Now I see nothing inherently bad in a labor leader getting $50,000 a year, a liberal expense account, and a 12-cylinder car, assuming that the members have aproved these in one way or another. That is not the trouble. The trouble is that the labor leaders forgot that when they achieved these privileges they graduated from the underprivileged class and have to accept the responsibilities of their new level in society.

THE M'CLELLAN COMMITTEE

So we come to the McClellan committee. Or rather we came to it about a year and a half ago.

The McClellan committee, as you know, is the short form for a name as long as your arm. Its correct name is the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. Even the Congressional Directory got the name wrong.

My week-day editor doesn't recognize the name McClellan committee; insists on the full name, presumably on the theory that while MCCLELLAN's time here is limited the committee may go on forever.

Anyhow, you may remember that when the old McClellan committee—the Government Operations Committee—summoned the teamsters to a hearing in December 1956 the teamsters challenged the committee's jurisdiction.

This was an astute tactical maneuver by MCCLELLAN, who promptly appealed to the dignity of the Senate. The Senate, without a murmur of dissent, created a new, special committee, with all the jurisdiction MCCLELLAN could possibly use.

The Senate has given him over a half-million dollars, also without dissent, and there's more where that came from.

The committee has eight members; but—unlike the regular standing committees—it does not reflect the numerical party distribution in Congress. It's evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

On balance, however, it's conservative—McCLELLAN saw to that—although there came a time, when the Kohler strike investigation came up, that he wished he had a majority of Democrats—any kind of Democrats.

THE KOHLER CASE CRISIS

It was the even party balance of the committee that very nearly became the undoing of the committee in the Kohler case. Three of the four Republicans insisted on the Kohler hearings—right down to the order of witnesses—and the fourth went along out of party loyalty.

McCLELLAN resisted, but finally had to yield to the Republicans or see his committee wrecked. As a matter of fact, the crisis occurred over the order of witnesses. The Republicans said the first shall be last—meaning Reuther.

If McCLELLAN had not gone along, the Republicans either would have walked off the committee or despoiled it by accusations or insinuations that he was covering up for Reuther.

Now, however, the committee is back on the track, or seems to be; and, as I mentioned a moment ago, it has a conservative majority. That majority is made up of McCLELLAN, of Arkansas; ERVIN, of North Carolina; GOLDWATER, of Arizona; CURTIS of Nebraska, and MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, has just replaced PAT MCNAMARA as the member closest to the union leaders. IVES, of New York, a Republican, and KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, are friendly to the labor leaders, without being in their pocket, although the labor leaders don't always return the compliment.

INVESTIGATION AND EXPOSURE

There is no need to rehash the hearings of a year and a half. It is generally agreed, I believe, that the committee has done a spectacular job of investigation and exposure.

It has forced the AFL–CIO to expel some of its unions; or, it might be fairer to say, the committee helped the federation to expel some of its unions.

The federation has not put roadblocks in the committee's way, except for a couple of sharp statements.

And, of course, we have the codes of ethical practices now. What they are worth remains to be seen.

Whether labor can cleanse itself reasonably well is quite a question. I think the top leaders are more willing to do it than they are able to do it, although some are not willing to go as far as some of us would like.

On the other hand, one of these top leaders suggests privately that there ought to be such an investigation about every 4 years. I asked him why not a permanent Senate investigating committee on labor.

"No," he said, "after a while you could get to the staff."

This same man favors the administration bill that would let a Government man walk into a union office at any time, check the books, and prosecute the officers for false entries.

George Meany, in his own way, has been saying that the McClellan investigation was useful to labor, although now and then he has had to let off a blast to reassure some of his boys, as well as himself, that he was not going soft.

Meany concedes that the AFL–CIO alone could not have rooted out the evil found by McCLELLAN, because Meany and company has no power of subpena or penalties for perjury at its command.

MEANY'S POSITION

Meany is a man torn within by the pull and haul of opposing forces. On the one hand he is the honest, upstanding citizen who wants a decent world and a decent community. He led in the expulsion of the Longshoremen, the Teamsters, the Bakers, the Laundry Workers, the suspension of the AFL Auto Workers, and others. The wisecrack of the day was that if Meany wasn't careful he'd be president of the CIO. The editorial writers showered plaudits on Meany, the statesman.

On the other hand, there is the Meany with an overriding sense of loyalty to the labor movement, come hell or McCLELLAN; a Meany suspicious by experience of all editorial writers. He had fought off attackers for so many years it had become a reflex action, whenever labor was criticized, to throw a haymaker.

This fighting nature, which sometimes takes gross forms, is reinforced by pressure from many of his unions. Some of the building trades unions, for example, feeling the heat, were circulating secession threats and gossip of a slanderous nature about Meany because they thought he was too passive about the McClellan committee.

Not all this pressure on Meany has come from the old-line corrupt, or semicorrupt unions. When the McClellan committee issued its year-end report, it was Reuther who insisted on a denunciatory statement by Meany.

Reuther was then in the midst of the Kohler hearings and feeling pretty bitter. Reuther, however, as I understand it, had nothing to do with the content of the Meany statement that finally came out. Many of labor's friends found it more intemperate than the McClellan report warranted.

LABOR, ALONE, CANNOT CLEANSE ITSELF

My point was, though, that the ethical practices committee, and the federation, has trailed the McClellan committee; has never been ahead of it, although it has had more than one opportunity to move ahead.

It knew, for example, about the corruption in the United Textile Workers, but waited for the McClellan committee to bring it out in the open.

It knows of other corruption, although perhaps is not in a position to prove it.

It is easy to criticize the ethical practices committee, but it is an ugly assignment. Jury duty soon loses its novelty, especially when the man in the dock is a friend, or an amiable acquaintance, of long standing.

On the other hand, it is rather transparent for a member of the committee, or any labor leader, to argue against legislative reform on grounds that the McClellan committee has found corruption in only X number of places.

The easy answer is that the McClellan committee is still young. Give it time and it will find considerably more corruption.

So I'd have to conclude that labor, working alone, cannot cleanse itself; that investigation and legislation are necessary.

How far the legislation should go is another matter. For that matter, how far should the investigation go?

I remember when the committee's investigation of the Operating Engineers was drawing to a close, or seemed to be, I said to young Bob Kennedy, the committee's chief counsel: "How about so-and-so?"—mentioning a certain labor leader.

"What about him?" asked Kennedy.

"He's suppposed to be a millionaire," I said.

"Well, I can't be against that," said Kennedy.

OUTLOOK FOR LEGISLATION

The prospects for legislative reform are not good for this year. I wouldn't say impossible, but I'd wager odds against it.

It's an election year and many Members of Congress are skittish about a big fight with a major pressure group at this late date. They want to get away and campaign.

Oddly, it's the House that is the laggard. It used to be the other way around.

Major legislation takes a long time, and a good thing, too. If the Senate had adopted some of the undigested stuff proposed on the floor a couple of weeks ago as amendments to the welfare and pension fund bill, we would have a rather sloppy mess that should alarm even some businessmen.

The two big areas of legislative agitation in this field are financial responsibility and democratic procedures.

On this matter of democratic procedures, the spokesmen for business in Congress might be well advised to slow down. Senator KNOWLAND and Senator MCCLELLAN, for example, propose so much democracy that a tiny, dissident minority could keep a union in constant turmoil.

It's been my observation that when an employer has to do business with a union, his first concerns are stability and reasonableness. As a bargainer, he has little concern with the union's democracy, so long as the union and its agent have the other two qualities.

The coal industry is one example of that. The mine workers have no democracy, but the operators dread the day when John L. Lewis cashes in.

Union leaders must be responsive to their members, but democratic procedures can be legislated to impractical extremes, and if you think that's cockeyed, try running Detroit by the town meeting system.

I would say that next year would bring a labor reform law for sure, except that I want to see the election returns first. The political experts tell me it's a sure-fire Democratic year. If we get a big Democratic majority in Congress, the labor bill is likely to be quite moderate. And I'm not sure that's such a bad thing.

It's funny, you know, but it's the most conservative people who are demanding the most revolutionary things for the labor movement.

They ought to remember that labor is business now. Labor is going to have to submit eventually to the rules and responsibilities of business that are logically and realistically applicable to unions. For this, it might be wise to use the conservative, business approach.

How the Soviets View Intercontinental Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the July 1958, issue of the magazine Air Force, published by the Air Force Association, a series of exceedingly helpful and informative articles on man's venturing into outer space.

Among the articles was "United States Air Force Planning for the Space Age," by Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever; still another, by Brig. Gen. Don Flickinger, entitled "Preparing Man for Spaceflight"; plus "Probing the Northern Radar Shield," by M. Sgt. James R. Doherty; "Scientists, Not Cultists Will Conquer Space," by Editor John F. Loosbrock; and "Man Is Here To Stay," by Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt.

Each of these is worthy of the most serious consideration.

I believe, however, that other information also contained in that same issue is similarly important.

I refer to one article, in particular, "Missiles in Soviet Strategy." It was written by Dr. Raymond L. Garthoff, and actually is an excerpt from his book, "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age," just published by Praeger.

This excerpt, drawing upon well-documented Soviet sources, gives a revealing glimpse into Soviet thinking on rocket strategy. I may say, Mr. President, that some of our military thinking on Soviet planning seems based exclusively on America's own concepts of warfare, rather than going to Soviet sources, themselves, and seeing with our own eyes exactly how the Soviets conceive the nature of future warfare may be. Fortunately, Dr. Garthoff has his eyes open to what the Soviets themselves are doing and thinking, and so we fortunately are in a better position to prepare ourselves.

I send to the desk now the text of the article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILES IN SOVIET STRATEGY

(By Dr. Raymond L. Garthoff)

(The Soviet announcement in August 1957 of their successful tests of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) called the world's attention to the Soviet missile program. The launching of the first artificial satellite of the earth in October 1957 dramatically underscored the earlier Soviet announcement on the rocket. Both were but the latest and most publicized of many indications of the extensive and advanced character of Soviet rocket and missile development. What is the role of missiles—in particular, of long-range ballistic missiles, the IRBM and ICBM—in Soviet military strategy?)

Long-range ballistic rockets are, as the Soviets recognize, "intended for firing against strategic targets disposed in the deep rear of the enemy. . . ."

More specifically, enemy air bases and missile-launching bases are indicated to be in the category of strategic targets considered particularly appropriate for rocket attack. The strategic role of missiles is, thus, to an extent merely assignment of an additional capability to implement the strategic concept of achieving military victory by destroying the enemy's military forces located at distant and intercontinental ranges. But there is also a peculiar role of long-range missiles extending beyond that of other weapon systems. It is this distinctive mission which makes it useful to consider the role of missiles in Soviet strategy separately from land, air, and seapower (each of which employs appropriate guided missiles and rockets in defensive and offensive forms as a part of their now "conventional" armament).

Deterrence is the mission to which the Soviet leaders have "assigned" long-range ballistic rockets (and also, apparently, part of the submarine missile-launching capability). Soviet commentaries on their ICBM, including remarks of Khrushchev, have reflected clearly this Soviet concern for a "deterrent" against the United States, and their reliance on ballistic rockets as such a deterrent. There are of course, no hard and fast separations of missions, and in a very real sense all the Soviet armed forces serve in part as a deterrent.

Likewise, the military forces in general, but the long-range ballistic missiles in particular, serve as the basis for actions to deter and to pressure others, that is, for blackmail. This offensive political use of the new missile capability thus complements the defensive value of the weapons for deterrence. But the reasons behind the special role for long range ballistic rockets in these nonhostilities "cold war" missions lie in the peculiar advantages—and limitations—of the weapons system. Both for this reason, and to delimit more clearly the role of long-range missiles from that of long-range aviation, it is desirable to note the Soviet views on the relative advantages of each.

In a number of public statements in the fall of 1957, most notably those of Khrushchev and Marshal of Aviation Vershinin, the Soviets claimed that ballistic rockets make bombers "obsolete." Khrushchev used the term "obsolete," and declared that: "The present period is something of a turning point. Military specialists believe that airplanes, bombers, and fighters are in their decline. Bombers have such speeds and altitudes that they are vulnerable to attack by contemporary rockets." He also declared: "Fighter and bomber airplanes can now be put into museums."

Marshal of Aviation Vershinin more soberly presented the military evaluation which Khrushchev characteristically exaggerated. Vershinin, after noting the abilities of the ICBM to strike any point on the globe, declared: "Under contemporary conditions, of course, bombers also are being built. The United States of America especially is basing itself on that form of weapon. But rocket weapons now impugn the expediency of development of bomber aviation, since rocket weapons are more reliable and more certain." In particular, Vershinin points out, "For rockets it is almost excluded that they would not get to their targets. Contemporary means of air defense are ineffective in combating these rockets."

The theme that bombers are vulnerable to air defenses, while ballistic rockets are not, runs through the various military and political commentaries which have followed the Soviet ICBM development and announcement. In part, of course, this view is disseminated because of the advantage to Soviet propaganda of claiming superiority in a weapon which, it is said, makes obsolete the weapon in which the United States is admittedly stronger. In fact, it is probable that the actual evaluation of the Soviet military leadership is less extreme. For there has been a definite recognition by competent Soviet military technicians and specialists of the continuing importance for some time of manned and unmanned bombers as well as ballistic missiles.

Beyond the statements stressing deterrence, the Soviets have revealed their evaluation of the specific military advantages—and limitations—of ballistic missiles. Thus, for example, Lieutenant Colonel Tiurnin noted (in early 1957) four particular advantages of guided and ballistic missiles over bomber aviation: (1) the possibility of using mobile launchers, (2) the all-weather capability of guided missiles, (3) the opportunity for the use of missiles even under conditions of hostile general air superiority, and (4) the possibility of launching surprise blows from concealed launching points.

In the general Soviet view, at least as expressed prior to the definite Soviet acquisition of the ICBM (and hence as uncolored by the present propaganda emphasis on the rockets), the role of bombers will decline for certain missions but remain for others. The ICBM and IRBM will assume the burden of attacks on stationary strategic targets such as cities and industrial complexes, and operational targets such as known enemy airbases. Thus major general of the Engineering Technical Services G. I. Pokrovsky, an authoritative military technologist, as early as March 1955, wrote in the semiclassified general staff organ Military Thought that "the destruction of targets the coordinates of which are known in advance will more and more be accomplished by pilotless weapons armed with atomic and thermonuclear warheads."

Again, in the fall of 1956, General Pokrovsky spoke of this new important role for ballistic rockets in particular. But he also noted that for some important missions the ballistic missiles were not suitable, and that guided missiles and conventional bombers would continue to be necessary for these roles. In his words: "Long-range rockets can only destroy targets the coordinates of which are known in advance. They cannot destroy mobile targets. For this, self-seeking guided missiles or piloted weapons are needed, since a man can pilot or guide by remote control, observing combat targets beyond the battlefield with the aid of television." General Pokrovsky has subsequently (in 1957) reiterated that the future employment of ballistic missiles will be against "targets previously known and precisely located on the map."

Bomber aviation, and guided missiles or pilotless bombers, will in the Soviet view thus continue to have important roles. Again, Major General Pokrovsky has stressed this is a commentary made after the Soviet ICBM. The main role of bombers will probably be to find and attack targets not previously identified or precisely located: the traditional mission of armed reconnaissance. And probably still considered valid, in manned bomber systems: "Aviation guided missiles (air-to-surface missiles) can be employed for operations against strategically important targets having strong air defenses."

On the whole, however, the role of long-range bombers will probably be what it has been in the past; to serve as the far-reaching military arm to be employed, in conjunction with all other arms of the military forces, against the armed forces of the enemy.

In discussing the current Soviet evaluation of the relative roles of the ICBM and bomber aviation, it may be useful to note that the apparently continuing Soviet evaluation was first made in the immediate postwar period, prior to the virtual ban on discussion of missiles which prevailed from 1947 until late 1953. Major General of Aviation Tatarchenko was the first to raise the question, in an article in the official air forces' journal, in 1946. He posed the issue flatly: "Can long-range rockets replace bomber aviation?" And he answered:

"An underestimation of this new mighty means of missile warfare would be a fatal mistake. To even a moderately educated person it must be clear that this new weapon in 1944–45 appeared in an extremely primitive early form. One can hardly doubt that it will in the future develop significantly further. But does that mean that long-range bombs will completely replace the bomber in the air? Of course not. As the battleship did not replace the cruiser, nor the minelayer, nor the cutter, nor even the rowboat, similarly even the most grandiose development of rockets will not eliminate the necessity for any class of aircraft, least of all high-speed giant aircraft, bomber and transport.

"High-speed giant aircraft are the foundation of strategic aviation. Missions of this form of aviation are extremely varied and cannot be accomplished with rocket bombs alone. Rocket missiles are a means for destroying stationary targets which occupy considerable area. The realm of use of rocket missiles is fairly specific. Strategic aviation resolves many times more universal missions."

While these may have been Tatarchenko's own ideas, there are indications that these views in general probably represented the attitude of the Soviet Long-Range Air Force

staff at that time. Marshal of Aviation Skripko, then Deputy Commander of the Long-Range Air Force, stated in Red Star later in 1946: "It is entirely obvious that with the contemporary level of technology the operation of formations of long-range aircraft with well-trained crews will without doubt be more effective than the dispatch of blind missiles alone. Strategic aviation will develop along with the appearance of new weapons." In part, of course, the Soviets may not have foreseen the potentialities of rockets in 1946 (though Tatarchenko was one of the very few who at least attempted to.) Even as late as the fall of 1954, Engineer Lieutenant Colonel Safonov noted in the Air Forces' journal, without giving any sign of disagreement, that foreign sources had said that "even in 1960" ballistic missiles "will have a range not exceeding 500–600 kilometers," and cruise-type guided missiles "not over 1,000 kilometer" range.

The fact that this statement was so obviously a gross understatement is curious and interesting, especially in view of its appearance in late 1954. Colonel Safonov then concluded with a statement which would appear to be at variance with Western calculations of the implications of high-yield weapons for requirements of accuracy, unless gross errors indeed are expected: "An atomic missile, as a big expensive weapon, must be delivered accurately on the target."

But still more curious was the appearance as late as January 1957 of a repetition of the idea that "nuclear, and especially hydrogen, weapons" are so expensive that they must be accurately delivered. Nonetheless, Soviet advances both in rocketry and in nuclear weapons design had evidently led them by late 1957 to conclude that for stationary, known targets ballistic missiles are sufficiently accurate to be the most expedient weapon. Bomber aviation will continue, even after ballistic rockets are available in sufficient operational quantities, to play an important role in attacking untriangulated, mobile, and fleeting targets, particularly the enemy's military forces.

How the Middle East Mess Developed in Last 4 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the extremely competent and brilliant analysis by the Milwaukee Journal of the Middle East threat to peace and how it developed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD as follows:

HOW THE MIDDLE EAST MESS DEVELOPED IN LAST 4 YEARS

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is preparing to study our middle eastern policy and ask: Where do we go from here? It can't avoid asking how we got into our present mess. A review of our Middle East policies, especially as they affect Egypt, is vital. It is not a reassuring story.

The United States had no imperialist record in the Middle East. It benefited from a reservoir of good will. Some of that good will was lost among the Arabs when we backed the creation of Israel in an area the Arabs considered Arab. But the great fall in our stock in Arab lands has come in the last 4 years.

The President says of Lebanon that it is our duty to help preserve a legally constituted government. We felt no such compulsion when King Farouk of Egypt asked our help in putting down a revolution in 1952. We refused.

When Mohammed Naguib and Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser kicked out Farouk, our Government gave them every reason to feel we were sympathetic. The Naguib-Nasser government started out immediately on welcome and much needed reforms. We sent experts to help. Secretary Dulles visited Cairo and gave Naguib a silver-plated pistol—a fine symbol of peace and tranquillity—to show our esteem.

The Egyptians asked financial help. Our Government showed interest. But—as Nasser said with bitterness (and some exaggeration) to a Journal staff correspondent in 1954—nothing was forthcoming except "a few sick chickens." Without sufficient aid, the reforms slowed almost to a halt.

In 1954 Nasser, who had ousted Naguib, sought American arms. These were promised on condition that agreement was reached on evacuation of British troops in the Suez Canal zone. Arms were not furnished, although agreement was reached on British troops. Nasser sought arms again after Israel attacked the Gaza strip in 1955. Our Government offered two propositions—arms for dollars that Nasser did not have or arms accompanied by a military mission. Nasser felt politically unable to accept a Western military mission. He turned to Russia and got Communist bloc arms for cotton.

Our reaction was a new arms offer. It failed, but it showed to Nasser's satisfaction that he could play us off against Russia. He has ever since.

The Egyptians claimed, probably falsely, that Russia had promised to help build the Aswan Dam. The claim worked. We rushed in with the British to offer to do the job. We soon believed Russia had made no such offer. And Dulles rejected the dam plan abruptly in a manner that Nasser took as a personal insult. Our Government went out of its way to say that Nasser couldn't afford the dam because he spent too much for arms.

Nasser's reaction was immediate. He seized the Suez Canal. Our Government said navigation would be endangered by control of the waterway by one nation. "How about Panama?" the Arabs asked. We said Egypt couldn't run the canal. It has, successfully.

In 1956 America regained much prestige by forcing Israel, France, and Britain to withdraw after invading Egypt. But much of the gain was lost when this country froze $40 million in Egyptian funds. We rejected Nasser's urgent request to buy $14,000 worth of medicines for refugees, at a time we were pulling all stops to help Hungarian refugees. We refused wheat needed by hungry Egyptians, in spite of our huge surpluses. We stopped the CARE program that was feeding 3 million Egyptian children. The Arabs were bitter—and again turned to Russia for help.

The Eisenhower doctrine, promising intervention in case of Middle East invasion by Communist forces, far from being welcomed by the Arabs, was looked upon as imperialism and unwarranted interference.

When Syria got Soviet arms in 1957 an American emissary rushed to the Middle East to confer with all but Syrians and Egyptians. Arms were rushed to Jordan. Dulles told the U. N. that Turkey was threatened by Soviet arms in the hands of the tiny and inept Syrian Army. Turkish troops, with Americans present, stood on Syria's borders.

Through these years Nasser made repeated efforts to deal with the United States. He was rebuffed.

Now we are in Lebanon, where U. N. officials and even many prowestern Lebanese say we are not needed. Again we insist on status quo in an area where change and unity are considered the only hope by Arabs.

We have failed in the Middle East because our Government has ignored a basic fact: Foreign policy must take into account the aspirations and opinions of the people in the area if it is to work.

The Senate committee should have no trouble finding out how the mess we are in developed in the Middle East.

How to solve it now is another—and far more complex—matter.

An Oregon Editor Discusses Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 12, 1958, issue of the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier, a daily newspaper published in my district. Editor Kenneth Hicks offers some pertinent observations on the present Social Security Act, as amended, and some changes which have been proposed and others which are being considered.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY

"Show me one person receiving the top social security benefit of $108.50, and I will show you a thousand receiving only the average of $67.50 or less. There seems to be only one way for the common people to get legislation through Congress to increase benefits, and that's by combined organization of the people until there are enough voters behind such a movement to force the issue."

The above quotation is from a letter published recently in the Eugene Register Guard by a member of the Social Security Clubs of America, Grover S. Slayter. He discloses that the goal of his organization is a schedule of social security payments providing $150 for men at the age of 60, and the same amount for women at the age of 55.

Obviously such payments would be impossible, without imposing a schedule of taxes that would be prohibitive both to the employer and the employee. At present 2¼ percent of every worker's paycheck is taken out, up to a maximum of $4,200 a year, for social security. The employer must match this payment. In 1960 the rate will go up to 2¾ percent; in 1965 to 3¼ percent; in 1970 to 3¾ percent and in 1975 and thereafter—unless there is a change in the meantime—the rate will be 4¼ percent.

These figures may not mean much to persons at or approaching the retirement age, but to young people just starting out in life they are formidable. Many of them will have to pay these taxes for 40 or 45 years before they are eligible for benefits—if the system indeed still is functioning at that time.

Already the fund is paying out more than it is receiving, although the deficit is offset by interest from sinking-fund investments in Government securities. Pile heavy addi-

tional payments onto the fund, without compensating tax increases, and its actuarial solvency will be menaced.

The present Congress is considering a bill that would increase social security payments, probably by a flat 10 percent across the board. This will be financed, if the bill passes, by increasing to $4,800 the amount on which social security taxes will be assessed, judging from present reports.

This type of increase is sound, and undoubtedly needed in view of the inroads made by inflation. Actually, to be equitable, the increase probably should be higher in the lower brackets, and only nominal in the case of persons receiving the social security maximum. This probably would be politically unpalatable, however.

Many persons are losing sight of the fact that social security never was intended to be adequate for complete maintenance of people in their declining years. It was designed to supplement savings and possibly augment pensions paid by private industry.

The whole setup will be thrown into jeopardy if organized oldsters attempt to change it into another Townsend plan.

Resolutions Adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was adopted by the 45th convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I had the honor and pleasure of again serving as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, made many constructive suggestions, proposed numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached agreement thereon.

The convention was attended by registered delegates from 45 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, in addition to several hundred who failed to register, guests, visitors, representatives of the press, and so forth. Texas sent the largest delegation, 37; Louisiana was next with 24; while Michigan was third with 17.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 45TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 16, 1958

FOREWORD

For 56 years the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has played an important role in the development of our water resources. We intend to continue to devote our efforts toward the further development of such resources. Our quasi-official status and our membership of Federal, State, and local officials gives us the impetus and firsthand knowledge of the problems involved and their solution. In the years to come our dedicated purpose will be to bring about results that will reflect in the safety of our people and in the economic well-being of our Nation.

STUDY BACKLOG

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress notes that there is a substantial backlog of studies in the program of the United States Army Corps of Engineers and that new studies are constantly being authorized by Congress. A reduction of this backlog is dependent upon adequate appropriations and retention of highly qualified manpower. In order to build up an adequate staff of engineers and assistants to conduct these studies efficiently and to improve the quality of water resource studies, it is necessary for the corps to anticipate a consistent and higher level of appropriations. It is urged that these appropriations be gradually increased for 2 or 3 years and then not permit fluctuations to adversely affect the program.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

We reaffirm our long standing opposition to the imposition of tolls on inland waterways. Except in the case of international waterways, the imposition of tolls is contrary to and incompatible with the historic development and use of our waterways for the Nation's commerce. Tolls would be ruinous to many operators on existing waterways, thus rendering the Federal Government's investment in these waterways a waste. Further, the imposition of tolls on waterways would be inimical to the future development of waterways, an activity that is essential and vital to the continued development of the economy of this country. The investment of the Federal Government in the development of waterways is already amply repaid under the existing system through the returns to the Treasury from a vigorous commerce and economy that is made possible by waterway development.

RECREATION

The benefits from recreation at public works projects throughout the Nation are definitely on the increase. The attendance records show this and the national and local treasuries and local economies are benefited from such attendance. A word of caution is appropriate. The basic facilities are not adequate to serve a public accustomed to better than primitive ones. Funds to provide what is required are not excessive in amount and should be made available to the agencies now, in order that the situation may not become worse. The fact that attendance totaled 84 million visitor-days at Corps of Engineers installations in 1957 alone indicates the magnitude of the recreational resource and emphasizes the need for immediate action.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

This Congress for many years has made known its belief in the great economic value of the American merchant marine and its importance as a defense arm. The fleet that has made us a leader in the trade of the free world must be strongly supported to offset low-cost foreign competition. The survival of our fleet depends on subsidies and our national survival could depend on sea transportation for food and material in the absence of land transportation destroyed or damaged by nuclear attack. We favor continuation of these subsidies in order to provide an efficient fleet.

MAINTENANCE OF PROJECTS

This National Rivers and Harbors Congress recognizes and commends the attitude that Congress has adopted respecting waterway and flood-control maintenance by increasing appropriations therefor. This attitude is consistent with the contention of this body that if there is justification for building a waterway or a structure for flood control there is certainly justification for proper maintenance to permit their use to the fullest extent.

A large backlog of deferred maintenance has accumulated in many of the harbors and waterways of the Nation. Until this is overcome, the full potential of such projects cannot be realized.

We urge Congress to reassert its policy of providing adequate maintenance funds for current maintenance and additional funds for the elimination of the backlog of deferred maintenance.

ARMY ENGINEERS

Over a period of many years the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has been trained in public works for flood control and rivers and harbors development. On the whole, the engineers have done a magnificent job, and the country properly applauds their effort and their successes in taming the turbulent streams and making the water which they channel subservient and useful to the pursuits of mankind.

It is the sense of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in annual convention assembled, that the Army engineers have done and are doing a magnificent job for flood control and for the development of our inland waterways and rivers and harbors.

This organization petitions the United States Congress to support the engineers in the continuation of their natural and normal work as the peacetime governmental agency to develop civil works along our waterways.

INCREASING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

The rivers and harbors public works projects under construction throughout the Nation are recognized as an important asset in combating adverse economic tendencies.

There exists a sizable number of such projects now under construction which, if given funds in addition to those presently budgeted, could be completed and implemented at an earlier date than presently scheduled and would strengthen the economy of the Nation.

The Congress of the United States is urged to make additional appropriations above those budgeted on all projects under construction where such additional funds can be reasonably used for accelerated construction, land acquisition, and other such purposes.

EXPENDITURE CEILINGS

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been deeply concerned by the fact that the Bureau of the Budget had imposed a ceiling on the current river and harbor and flood control appropriations.

Although this ceiling was subsequently removed, the imposition of such ceilings was clearly in violation of congressional prerogative and of doubtful legal validity.

We therefore urge the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to preserve its control of appropriations.

VETO OF OMNIBUS BILL (S. 497)

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is greatly disturbed over the recent veto of

Senate bill 497 which would authorize river and harbor and flood control projects affecting the large segment of the American people who have expressed a desire for such projects.

The stalemate between the Congress and the President is a deterrent to the orderly development of our water resources at a time when favorable action would be of major importance to the national economy and welfare.

Important projects approved by both the President and Congress are being held up. The situation is not a healthy one, and we urge the Congress to override the veto.

NO NEW STARTS ON PUBLIC WORKS

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress considers that construction should be started each year on a substantial number of authorized rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. Such a program will strengthen the economy of the Nation and add to the general welfare of its people and, in addition, will keep the development of the natural resources of our country abreast of the other nations of the world.

Therefore the National Rivers and Harbors Congress disapproves of any administrative directive which restricts the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, from budgeting funds for the beginning of construction of new public-works projects. We further assert that any administrative directive which prohibits beginning of construction of new projects after funds for such purpose have been appropriated by the Congress is an unwarranted invasion of the legislative powers of Congress and should be restrained by appropriate action of the Congress.

We respectfully urge the administration to refrain from such a policy.

CONSERVATION STORAGE IN FEDERAL RESERVOIRS

Sites for dams and reservoirs are among our most valuable natural resources. In planning and authorizing the construction of dams and reservoirs on the Nation's rivers consideration should be given to the full development of the sites, particularly as to the provision for adequate conservation storage.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress approves in principle section 205 of S. 497 (the omnibus rivers and harbors bill recently vetoed), which provided that the Corps of Engineers were authorized to include conservation storage in reservoir projects constructed or to be constructed by them. Such conservation storage to be for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial or other beneficial use; and the reasonable value thereof may be taken into account in estimating the economic value of the entire project, and that when contract is made for use of such storage it shall be on the basis that will provide reimbursement to the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

We therefore respectfully petition the Congress to reenact similar legislation to the above at the earliest possible date.

New Peach Orchards Laid Out To Conserve Soil and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenville News, Greenville, S. C., of July 18, 1958, by Mr. W. D. Workman, Jr., one of the ablest newspapermen in this country today. This story is the story of South Carolina in connection with the famous South Carolina peaches in particular, the contribution made by Mr. Lewis Caggiano, who operates Sunny Slope Farms, near Gaffney, S. C., in my district. The article is as follows:

NEW PEACH ORCHARDS LAID OUT TO CONSERVE SOIL AND WATER

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

GAFFNEY.—South Carolina peaches mean profit for producers (at least in good years) and good eating for consumers, but they also bring problems to soil conservationists.

Fortunately, the picture is changing rapidly for the better as new orchards are laid out, but in years past peach orchards have contributed more than their share to the silting of streams, the eroding of hillsides, and the washing away of good topsoil. For one thing, peach orchards are semipermanent in nature, and mistakes made in planning and planting are perpetuated for periods as long as 20 to 25 years. They are not like row crops, which can be replowed in better fashion for next year's crop.

Consequently, the peachgrowing regions of the upcountry, particularly Spartanburg and Cherokee Counties, have been less adaptable to rapid change then other sections where farming practices improved with the spread of knowledge on land and water use. A peach orchard represents a major investment of time and money, and its return is spread over a long period of years. Not until an orchard approaches the end of its usefulness do many producers feel justified in completely revising the pattern of the peach trees.

Changes for the better are more and more noticeable, however, as new orchards come into existence, either through the replacement of old ones or the entry of new producers into the peach field as they divert acreage from cotton and other crops. Cherokee County in many respects is coming to be a showplace of proper peach practices, and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service have their hands full in meeting the demand for assistance and advice.

One example, among many, is the sizable cluster of peach orchards operated by the Caggiano family as Sunny Slope Farms. Each of these orchards, like those of neighboring Lawrence B. Clary and other peach producers, was laid off only after detailed study of aerial photographs, stream lines, ridge lines, and soil maps.

The peach trees are planted along contour lines, with only enough slope to let the water drain evenly and slowly from the rows of trees. The orchards are interspersed with meadow strips which serve the dual function of providing a covered runoff for draining water and a turnaround for the mechanized equipment used in spraying, cultivating, and harvesting peaches. Similar strips border the orchards.

Many of the meadow strips themselves drain into farm ponds, which are in turn used as sources of water for the irrigation of peaches. Thus, best results are being obtained by controlling the water which falls naturally on the orchards and by artificially applying water (by spray irrigation) when natural rainfall is deficient. Peach irrigation has come to be the general order of business in Cherokee, Spartanburg, and Edgefield Counties, with producers in several other areas likewise banking heavily on the same practice.

Lawrence Clary sums up the feeling of many producers when he says flatly that the peachgrower who doesn't irrigate is "on his way out." Peaches get both their color and size from adequate water at critical growing periods and when Mother Nature doesn't provide the moisture, irrigation can.

Soil conservationists contribute technical knowledge and assistance in devising proper irrigation practices, which benefit both producer and consumer. Their greatest contribution to the public good, however, lies in the work they do toward stabilizing the soil and keeping it in place, safe from the ravages of uncontrolled water action. Success in that undertaking pays dividends all the way from the hills of the Piedmont to the coasts of the low country.

Clear waters simplify the expensive task of providing cities with drinking water, they enhance the State's attractiveness to industry, they help conserve and propagate wildlife in field and stream, and they ease the task of harbor dredging at the State's ports.

Progress is being made toward the goal of clear streams, but even a passing glance at the muddy waters of the Pacolet, Tyger, Enoree, and other tributaries of the Broad River show that there is a long road ahead for soil-conservation practices. Peachgrowers, however, are doing their part in ever-increasing measure.

Senator Richard L. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 1958, the Vice President named 4 Members of the United States Senate to be members of the 15-man National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission. The work before the Commission and its 25-man advisory council is monumental.

On December 31, 1959, it will recommend what outdoor recreation needs the United States will have by 1976 and the year 2000 and will recommend how these needs should best be met.

Senators from Utah, ARTHUR WATKINS; New Mexico, CLINTON ANDERSON; Wyoming, FRANK BARRETT; and Oregon, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, were appointed.

It is a privilege for me today to enumerate a few of the particular qualifications my colleague in the other body, the junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER, has for this work.

He is a leading writer and scholar in the field of conservation and outdoor living. An ardent hiker and camper, DICK NEUBERGER has traveled through most of the wilderness areas in the West, from California through Oregon and Washington and into Canada and Alaska. He is a member of the Portland chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America.

His appointment to the Commission has not gone unnoticed in Oregon. I should like to include in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the July 14, 1958, issue of the Eugene, (Oreg.) Register-Guard which says, in part:

Vice President RICHARD NIXON, acting for President Eisenhower, showed exceedingly good judgment in appointing Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER to the 15-member National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission.

I also include an article from Magazine Index—April 24, 1958—telling of Senator NEUBERGER'S outstanding success as a writer:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard of July 14, 1958]

GOOD CHOICE

Vice President RICHARD NIXON, acting for President Eisenhower, showed exceedingly good judgment in appointing Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER to the 15-man member National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission. The Senator, who has been deeply interested in conservation for many years, will be a trenchant spokesman for those who fear the day that the recreational potential of America's great outdoors is exhausted.

Interestingly enough, the board of directors of the Eugene obsidians the middle of last week went on record favoring appointment of the Senator as one of the members of this 15-man commission. It was felt he would be an outstanding representative both from the Senate and from this corner of the Nation. Still to be appointed are 4 members of the House of Representatives and 7 citizens who are not Congressmen. Other Senators who will serve with Mr. NEUBERGER are WATKINS, of Utah; BARRETT, of Wyoming; and ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

The commission's job is large and important. It will report, three years hence, on the expected outdoor recreational needs of the country in 1976 and 2000, and will recommend how those needs should be met. The report could be as significant a milestone as creation of the national park system and the forest preserves. Senator NEUBERGER, who has written widely about these developments, now has an opportunity to make history of the type he has so often written about.

[From Magazine Index of April 24, 1958]

SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER: A MAGAZINE INDEX PERSONALITY

"My faith in democracy doubled the day DICK NEUBERGER was elected Senator," said a longtime Oregon friend.

"That a man who had dedicated his life to helping his neighbors through writing about them should so earn their respect and gratitude shows our American system at its best."

It shows, too, the role of the magazines of America in educating our citizens, and the thought-molding power which a gifted writer can exert.

For RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, although his name meant little to the casual reader until his senatorial election in 1954 has been more successful than any other American writer in bringing his State, his section, and his political ideas to the continuous attention of our entire magazine-reading community.

We may have overlooked his byline, but no one can have avoided the impact of his nearly 300 magazine articles (most on the great Northwest) which have been in the top magazines since 1933. In 1942 18 Neuberger articles appeared on such subjects as Alaska, Justice William O. Douglas, Hells Canyon, Grand Coulee, the American Indian in such magazines as Colliers, Saturday Evening Post, Harpers, Nation, Reader's Digest, the New York Times Magazine, and Survey.

Six years later, after an army enlistment slow-down, 28 Neubergers were published in 12 months—meaning that there was scarcely a week in 1948 that the American people were not absorbing some of DICK NEUBERGER's thoughts about Oregon, or the Northwest, or Western liberalism. And this heavy program continued right up to his election campaign.

RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER was born in 1912. He took his first journalistic job—as copy boy on the Portland Oregonian—in 1928, and was editor of the University of Oregon Emerald in his sophomore year.

A trip to Nazi Germany provided the material for the first Neuberger articles: The New Germany, the Nation, October 4, 1933, and German Under the Choke Bit, the New Republic, November 15, 1933. Since then he has stuck reasonably close to home. His three 1934 titles: Hooverism in the Funnies, The Northwest Goes Leftish, and The President Comes to Our Town show the course which he as to follow in his writing and his political life.

In 1945 DICK married Maurine Brown whose own successful political career in Oregon has been a part of the Neuberger combination. He likes golfing, hiking, camping, and all that goes with the good life in the West.

NEUBERGER now devotes himself to his big job in Washington. He is reached what most writers would consider the peak of fame: the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature lists almost as many articles about him as by him. Yet his typewriter never stays covered for long. His latest article Power Struggle Along the Canadian Border was in the December Harper's. The words change, his purpose of helping the Northwest by informing the world about it remains.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my statement at the annual outing of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, at Salem Willows, Mass., on Sunday, July 20, 1958:

When people are tired, they must relax, as we are doing on this Sunday afternoon.

Nature not only requires these periodic days of rest during our working years, but insists that we take it easy after we pass a certain age, when the wear and tear of life catches up with us.

Relaxation means far more than doing nothing. To sit in a chair for most of the day, or to sleep a few hours longer than we did in our youth, may be necessary to conserve our physical energy.

But what about our peace of mind?

How can we relax when we reach the age of retirement and still have to worry about paying the landlord, the grocer, and the doctor?

In the unstable world of today there is a great longing for security.

It was only in the last century that insurance companies were organized on the principle of sharing the cost and spreading the risk. Disaster can happen to any of us. However, it only strikes a few at any one time. If a small amount could be collected from the many who are subject to the risk, a fund could be built for payment of benefits to the few whom misfortune or disaster has struck.

By paying premiums on a voluntary basis, people acquired protection against loss of life, against accidents, sickness, fires, theft, and other hazards. But there was no protection against unemployment, or cessation of earnings in old age.

The Social Security Act came into being as a result of the painful lessons we learned during the severe depression of the 1930's. For generations the United States had evaded this problem. But when 10 million workers became unemployed, and some 18 million people were dependent for subsistence on relief, the emergency forced us to develop bold, new programs to save our Nation and its people from economic collapse.

President Roosevelt set up a Committee on Economic Security to study the problem of destitution and to make recommendations.

At last we were facing up to the central problem.

The Committee found that, whenever earnings are cut off, destitution is near. The Committee searched for an answer to this question: How to spread earnings over a lifetime, over periods when the breadwinner is working and periods when he is not, how to provide an income throughout the whole cycle of life—in childhood, youth, middle, and old age.

They discovered that few people, as individuals, can save enough out of their income to take care of emergency needs. They were too busy trying to pay for their day-to-day obligations to set aside enough for a rainy day.

The only protection that people had was life insurance, which eased the burden for their survivors, but this was of no help to the insured themselves during the declining years of their lives. It provided no income for retirement.

The only possible answer to this problem was through savings on a social or group basis, called social insurance.

Of course, it is not possible to establish social security on the basis of social insurance alone. These programs apply only to workers and their families. Many persons can't work. There are those who were too young, and those who were physically handicapped, and those who were already old when the program of social insurance began. Although they had not contributed to the system, or bad not contributed enough, they must be assured the basic needs of life. For this reason the Committee recommended also a program of noncontributory payments to needy persons.

It is this last factor that your organization is concentrating on.

We cannot have a genuine social security program of varying benefits, and depending exclusively on a person's contributions to the fund, matched by that of his employer.

If one person is getting $78.50 a month as old-age retirement and his next-door neighbor is getting $108.50, it seems to me that there is too much of a gap between the two.

Of course the person who worked longer and paid more in social security taxes is entitled to larger benefits, but not by such a margin.

There must be a higher minimum for all.

I never heard a person complain because he has paid into Blue Cross-Blue Shield, or any other form of contributory insurance for years without getting his money back, as it were; while some other person had his hospital and surgical bills amounting to hundreds of dollars paid for even though he has paid in only a fraction of that sum in premiums.

As this is a group effort, we must share the responsibilities and not quibble over the benefits paid to those who are more unfortunate than ourselves.

Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935 and has amended it in 1939, 1950, 1952, 1954, and 1956.

Gradually we are broadening the coverage and increasing the benefits.

To pay for this program it is necessary to increase the social-security taxes as well, until, by 1975, they will rise to 4¼ percent for employer and employee alike.

This schedule is designed to meet the future obligations of the program and to keep it on a self-supporting basis.

There has been much criticism that the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System has not kept up with the times. Whether a person is getting old-age insurance or old-age assistance, the benefits he receives fail to

pay for the creeping inflation in the cost of living.

Your representatives in Congress are aware of your need.

At the moment it is hard to predict for sure to what degree they will be able to improve the social-security system before Congress adjourns.

Last Tuesday the House Democratic leaders decided to try for an 8- to 10-percent across-the-board increase in social-security benefits.

It is likely that the House will pass this measure. If it manages to get through the Senate, and it is not vetoed by the White House, it would benefit more than 11 million people.

There would be a minimum boost of $5 per month, with an increase of $10.85 for those who are now getting $108.50 each month.

Although I shall vote for these increases because I believe in them, I cannot guarantee what the Congress as a whole will do. It is well to bear in mind, however, that Congress has liberalized social-security benefits in every election year since 1948.

For some time now I have been convinced that it would be better to provide a direct national pension of at least $150 per month to all Americans who reach the qualifying age to be financed through Federal taxes.

It would provide equal benefits, and it would eliminate redtape and overhead expenses in the administration of such a program.

We in the United States got a late start on social legislation.

There is much more work to be done before we achieve a complete social-security program that will be worthy of the name.

In addition to monthly cash benefits to cover rent, food, clothing, and incidentals, we should make provision for the health care of the aged.

As the American Public Welfare Association, in its 1957 Federal legislative objectives, stated, and I quote: "Study should be given to ways of meeting the medical and hospital care costs of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries, through the insurance program."

Most of the younger people are covered by this type of group insurance, but we have neglected to provide similar protection for the aged.

Either we credit retired people with paid-up hospital, nursing-home, and surgical-service benefits or we must legislate a national pension of at least $150 per month so that they can afford such care.

In any event, our present program for the aged cannot stand still.

Most of our older people have contributed more to the progress of the United States than we can ever repay.

It is the duty of the Nation to build a social-security program that will honor the aged in the harvest time of their lives by providing for their physical needs and contributing to their happiness and peace of mind.

The senior citizens and associates of America deserve this and more from a grateful Nation.

Clean-Politics Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to note that our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. BALDWIN] had introduced a bill providing that legislators and public officials fully disclose their personal financial affairs each year including a statement of gifts. I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] for his comprehensive approach toward reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot go home and honestly report to my constituents that the code of ethics which recently was passed by the Congress is anything more than a well-worded exposition of fine principles without any effective means of controlling conflicts of interest or improper practices.

It is very much to be hoped that bills such as Mr. BALDWIN's and my own bill, H. R. 10631, will be given a full and serious hearing in the next Congress, and in this connection, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial of July 10, 1958, from the Seattle Times which suggests an urgent need in new regulations covering campaign expenses:

TO CURB HIGH CAMPAIGN COSTS

The Adams-Goldfine affair touches on issues affecting the basic workability of our democratic processes. These are issues which should be kept alive long after the furor over one man's imprudence has subsided.

We refer of course to the whole complicated and disturbing question of gifts to men in public life.

Certainly, cases of outright bribery, of the direct purchase of specific favors, are rare in American political life.

And yet informed observers agree that the elected public official who is not under some sort of obligation to private and fund-or-favor givers (individuals, businesses, labor unions or other organizations) also is a rarity. Many nonelected public officials are under similar pressures.

There have been several unsuccessful attempts in recent years to solve this problem by legislation.

In the wake of the Adams-Goldfine disclosures, a California Republican Congressman, JOHN F. BALDWIN, this week introduced a new clean-politics bill.

The Baldwin measure would require Congressmen and top Government and White House officials to disclose yearly all financial transactions, including receipt of gifts valued at more than $10. An annual statement of assets also would be required.

Top Presidential appointees requiring Senate confirmation are given a very stiff going-over, at least by members of the opposition political party, regarding their financial holdings and possible conflicts of interest because of their private assets.

Washington observers long have maintained that Senators and Representatives should be subject to the same conditions, as regards their private finances, which they impose on Cabinet officers.

The Baldwin bill appears to a well-intentioned effort at needed reform, but the area—insofar as Congressmen are concerned—where new ground rules are most urgently needed is that of campaign expenses.

Legislation in this area presently on the books—the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—is widely circumvented by both major political parties. The act's limits on campaign contributions are, for all practical purposes, meaningless, and the measure has served only to introduce an element of hypocrisy into high levels of national politics.

The fantastic cost of campaigning for major political office can be expected to continue to soar—forcing candidates to ever greater dependence upon large contributors—until realistic, enforceable, workable legislation to curb them is enacted.

One attempt to at least take much of the hypocrisy out of present campaign-fund practices got surprisingly far in the last session of Congress.

This bill would have raised the authorized limits on spending by national party committees and by candidates for Congress, but also would have closed some of the loopholes through which existing laws are circumvented.

Many leading figures in both parties are, of course, reluctant to tamper with the established practices through which they have achieved office.

Continued public demand is needed to bring about the reforms necessary to the health of our democratic system.

Marines Fear Abolition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Los Angeles Examiner:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of July 15, 1958]

MARINES FEAR ABOLITION UNDER TERMS OF PLAN

(First in a series of two articles)

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Congress has been hearing from the Marine Corps on the proposed reorganization of the Pentagon.

There are two reasons for the Marine Corps' legislative offensive. First, the Marine Corps is not against a Pentagon reform, but it opposes when it seems to be dangerous errors in the official plan. Second, the Marine Corps does not want to be organized out of existence; and the official plan, according to some analysts, would permit that to happen. Consequently, for the third time in recent years the Marine Corps, or rather its veterans of overseas service, are fighting to avert its abolition.

The Marines have no quarrel with the main objectives of the reorganization proposal.

The vast and victorious campaigns of World War II, in the Mediterranean, in Europe and in the wide Pacific, dramatized the necessity for unified commands in combat.

Controversies among the Armed Forces, particularly in aviation and atomic weaponry, have proved the importance and value of closer unification than has been attained under the Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

But, Marine observers contend, no exigency can require that one service absorb another, while under any system, each service must have its own staff structure to direct its personnel and accomplish its missions.

The basic ideas justifying President Eisenhower's recommendations for a new reorganization of the Defense Department were set forth in his message to Congress on April 3.

Accompanying the message was the administration draft of a bill—prepared in the Pentagon, mainly by the Army—to carry out the President's policy.

This bill—as dissected by Marine Corps specialists and others—contains a number of provisions that are severely questioned, but that can be removed or modified by

amendment without detriment to the great work itself.

According to these analyses presented to the congressional committees, the official bill as it emerged from the Pentagon would tend to destroy the principle of civil control of the Military Establishment by—

1. Substituting a general staff system for the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

2. Authorizing arbitrary mergers or extinguishment of branches of the Armed Services created by Congress; and

3. Transferring to the executive duties and powers relating to national defense which, under the Constitution, belong exclusively to Congress.

The House Armed Services committee under the chairmanship of Representative VINSON, Georgia, wrote into the reorganization bill various provisions and prohibitions to preserve the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and protect the statutory integrity of the separated Armed Forces.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of July 16, 1958]

CHANGES URGED TO SAVE MARINES

(Last of a series of two articles)

(By E. F. Tompkins)

As presented to Congress, the administration bill for reorganization of the Pentagon would have bestowed upon the Secretary of Defense unlimited power "to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate" any function of the Armed Forces, including "combat functions."

Precedent was sought in the recommendations of the Hoover Commissions. Hoover reforms authorized the President to streamline or abolish civil bureaus, with the assent of Congress. The Pentagon bill would have given the Secretary of Defense dictatorial authority over the military branch, and enabled the President to veto corrective action by Congress.

Thus the Secretary could abolish the Marine Corps or alter the National Guard, belonging actually to the States.

SPECIFIC

The Vinson committee's report on its amended version of the bill deals with this proposal. It notes especially that the proposal would permit the Secretary to contravene existing statutes, which only Congress may repeal.

Congress, the committee observes, has by law itself "prescribed the broad rules and missions of the four major services"—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. And, the committee comments, "the language with a respect to the Marine Corps is more specific" than with respect to the others.

The committee recalls the special qualifications of the marines as an amphibious combat element, and the history of their long experience in little wars. It refers to an attempt in 1947 to abolish naval aviation and to reduce the Marine Corps to a ceremonial organization. Hence—

"Congress wisely inserted provisions in the National Security Act to insure the continuation of naval aviation and the continued existence of the Marine Corps as a meaningful force in readiness."

DREAD RECOGNIZED

Reassertion of the principle recognizes the continuous need for a defense system prepared to meet any type of aggression, not merely one type.

The committee began its revisionary work with the firm conviction that changes in the organization of the Department of Defense were necessary.

Accordingly, it yields to the Pentagon wide authorizations to make changes which do not impair combat functions, and which Congress may cancel by concurrent resolution, not subject to executive veto.

And, in war emergencies, the President, as Commander in Chief, would have temporarily absolute power, without restrictions, to assign and direct the Armed Forces.

IN ACCORD

On one point the President and the House committee were in full accord—establishment in the Pentagon of a Director of Defense Research and Engineering to prevent unwise service competition and make the best use of our scientific and technological resources.

In his congressional message, also, the President said:

"We must continue the three military departments (Army, Navy, Air Force) as agencies * * * to administer a wide range of functions."

With that, the House committee agrees completely.

Representative Hoffman's Record as Fearless Scrapper in Congress Cited in Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our colleague and dean of the Michigan Republican delegation in the House [Mr. HOFFMAN] has recently received well-earned recognition in the press for his fearless and untiring devotion to his duties. Not only did the Chicago Tribune recently devote much space to his activities but the News-Palladium, published in Benton Harbor, Mich., in the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called attention of its readers to the compliments being paid our colleague.

That article, entitled "HOFFMAN Is Envy of His Colleagues" follows:

"You lucky dog. Here it is election year and you have had no chance to campaign, and you are the subject of a fine article by a big metropolitan newspaper that covers your district."

That's about the way comment is running among Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN's fellow Members of the House, Republican and Democrat.

What Mr. HOFFMAN's friends are referring to is the recent Chicago Tribune story that highlighted this particular Michigan solon's long career in the House as a fearless scrapper and a dyed-in-the-wool Republican partisan.

HOFFMAN is getting some fine compliments, too, from the high command of the Republican National Committee.

ALCORN IS ELATED

National Chairman Meade Alcorn, chairman of the GOP National Committee, has just written him:

"Congratulations for the splendid job you have done on the floor of the House in focusing the Nation's attention on some of the abuses which have emerged from the Harris committee hearings. We need more forthright and hard-hitting statements such as yours. You have rendered a real service to the country and to the party."

Director of Public Relations, W. C. Strand, of the national committee, wrote HOFFMAN:

"This note gives me an opportunity to tell you that I have been following with pleasure your recent speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the Harris committee. I have never read finer expressions in the field of civil liberties with particular reference to the rights of citizens in their relations with their elected representatives."

CAN'T CAMPAIGN

HOFFMAN said today that it was impossible for him to make any extended primary campaign before now and the primary election which is only 2½ weeks away, August 6.

Even though he will be opposed by two candidates, Luther I. Daines of Van Buren County, and Dale Douthett, of Berrien, he says it's impossible to get away in these final weeks before adjournment.

This weekend he has promised to make a hurried trip home for an appearance at Kalamazoo, on Monday, before a meeting of supervisors of the Third and Fourth Congressional Districts. He may also fill a date in Berrien.

"Congress is hoping to wind up its session in August," said HOFFMAN today. "But the Middle East crisis is serious. Who knows what is going to develop with our Marines now in Lebanon? Adjournment may be postponed in view of the situation. The voters of the Fourth District have sent me here to do a job. If they don't know where I stand by this time, they never will know. I've said over and over, I'm nothing but a hired man for my district. They've paid me to be on the job. And here's where I'm going to stick while there's a job to do, primary or no primary."

Michigan's Labor Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following report dated June 1958 issued by the Michigan Employment Security Commission in connection with Michigan's labor market:

It has become increasingly likely since May 15 that the relatively small increase in unemployment during the preceding 30 days may have been the beginning of a change in the trend.

If it were not for the coming automobile model changeover period, there would be several reasons to hope that we have reached a peak in unemployment. Most important of these is the fact that the volume of claims activity in our branch offices had declined. In mid-April, claims of all types totaled 358,653. By the week of May 22, the claims load had dropped to 307,265 and by June 12, claims of all types were down to 302,209. Although the number of persons exhausting their right to benefits has increased sharply during the same time, it has not been great enough to make up for the difference in the claims total. Another reason for optimism is the fact that daily placement activity in the branch offices of the commission increased 17 percent during the past month. All of the increase was seasonal, and in the non-manufacturing industries, reflecting the efforts of the commission's intensive hire-now campaign. However, the fact that there was any gain at all is encouraging. Placements in manufacturing industries were unchanged and that was a definite improvement compared with the sharp downtrend of recent months. More satisfaction may also

be found in the recent settlement of labor disputes which had delayed the normal seasonal upturn in two industries.

Although the employment downtrend may have leveled off, we know that there will be temporary cutbacks this summer. Seasonal uptrends will undoubtedly continue during the summer months. But manufacturing employment is likely to decline because of the impending model changeover in the automobile industry. When the changeover occurs, more workers will be laid off and the uptrend in unemployment will be resumed. Employment will rise after the 1959 models go into production.

Michigan's labor market during the current period was characterized by small changes, with industrial unemployment edging upward. Improvement in employment was held back by a lack of seasonal jobs for vacationing students. Automobile production remained low. Unemployment was 15.8 percent of the total labor force on May 15.

Nonfarm employment, May 15, 1958	2,296,000
Net change from 1 month ago	−21,000
Net change from 1 year ago	−283,000
Manufacturing employment, May 15, 1958	819,000
Net change from 1 month ago	−22,000
Net change from 1 year ago	−239,000
Unemployment, May 15, 1958	462,000
Net change from 1 month ago	+2,000
Net change from 1 year ago	+275,000

The Midwesterner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as a middle westerner, I was particularly interested in an article written by Hal Boyle concerning the people who live in that great part of our country. I thought it might be interesting also to others and, under leave, include it herewith:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 17, 1958]

(By Hal Boyle)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—What makes the midwesterner different?

There is no doubt he is.

Coming from the East to the Midwest you are aware of a difference in the people who dwell in the great heartland of America. But it takes you some time to puzzle out what that difference is.

Here are a few things you may observe:

The midwesterner seems to get as much done as anybody else, but he never seems to be in a great hurry about it. He feels that every day is long enough for the work that has to be done in it.

The midwesterner loves to talk, but he prefers small talk to big talk. He seems to have an innate understanding of the fact that time has a way of punishing braggarts.

The midwesterner doesn't believe much in hysteria. The periodic panics and alarms that sweep people in coastal areas rarely touch him. He still retains a kind of wonderful 19th century feeling of security in both himself and his section of the country.

WRY SENSE OF HUMOR

The midwesterner has a wry sense of humor based on a sound set of normal values. To him nothing is funnier than anyone or anything that lets itself get out of perspective, or, as he puts it, "too big for its britches."

The midwesterner is self-confident in peace and makes a good soldier in wartime because he learns early to adjust to life, not as he might want it, but life as it is. He knows each winter probably will be long and cold, and each summer long and hot.

The midwesterner, like the southerner, is instinctively polite—although perhaps in a more informal way. He prefers to take the other fellow at his own estimate as long as possible.

The midwesterner is automatically friendly to everyone he meets. He enjoys doing small favors. But he can also be a long hater if he feels his friendship is imposed upon.

The midwesterner is endlessly curious. He likes to hear about how other people live, but he is slow to change his own ways—and won't be stampeded into doing so.

Weather rules his existence from birth, and is always there ready to ruin or enrich him. To a midwesterner probably the most important things in life are the weather and his home. He's a great weather watcher and a great homebody. No other American takes a deeper pride in his home—or works harder at keeping it up.

To the average midwesterner a steak sizzling in the barbecue pit in his backyard holds a finer music than any sonata by Beethoven; tomorrow's weather forecast is more meaningful to him than anything Khrushchev may have said yesterday about the international political climate.

Come up sunshine or a storm, there is one thing the midwesterner can't quite understand: Why anyone would possibly want to live anywhere else in the wide world except where he does.

A Queen Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, celebrated the 150th anniversary of its founding. It was my great privilege to join with Governor O'Neill, Senator Bricker, and Senator Lausche in paying tribute to this thriving community, one that serves adjacent farms and towns and contributes so much to the economy of our Nation through its many industries.

Founded in 1808, Mansfield, with its excellent location, rich soil, and fine climate was potentially strong. But the growth of a community depends upon the intelligent foresight and planning of its citizens and leaders. It has only been through the combined efforts of citizens from all walks of life, past and present, that this tremendous growth has been realized. With the historic strides made thus far, Mansfield can surely look to the future with confidence.

Among the honored guests at this year's sesquicentennial celebration was the wonderful lady who 50 years ago reigned as queen of the city's 100th anniversary celebration. It was a rare privilege and pleasure for me to spend a few short minutes with this queen of yesteryear, and it gives me equal pleasure to include in today RECORD an article by Ken Woodman, editor of the Mansfield News-Journal about this lovely lady—his mother-in-law:

A QUEEN RETURNS

(By Ken Woodman, editor, Mansfield News-Journal)

Not often does a queen who has reigned at a city's centennial celebration return to duplicate her sovereign honor when the city has reached its 150th milestone. But that is exactly what has happened in Mansfield, Ohio.

Fifty years ago, in 1908, Miss Nellie Lawrence, then 18, was chosen as the Goddess of Ceres for the city's 100th anniversary. She rode through the streets enthroned on a wagon drawn by four white horses.

Saturday, June 12, 1958, she returned to Mansfield to participate in the city's week-long sesquicentennial. She is now Mrs. Nellie Gerkan of Cincinnati.

After participating in the opening ceremonies she lunched with Congressman J. HARRY MCGREGOR (17th Ohio District), Ohio Gov. C. William O'Neill, and Edward Sutter, managing director of the sesquicentennial.

At 4 p. m. she was given a seat of honor in an old-time carriage drawn by four white horses and, following a cavalcade of notables, she led the main section of the parade down Park Avenue West, a distance of more than a mile, to open a review of bands and decorated floats that moved past the reviewing stand for more than 2 hours.

An estimated 120,000 persons watched the parade.

In the evening, Mrs. Gerkan was introduced to a crowd of 5,000 spectators who went to Arlin Field to witness the first of six evening performances of the pageant, Stockades to Satellites, commemorating the city's growth over 150 years.

For the celebration a part of Mansfield's Central Park was transformed into a replica of old Market Street with buildings copied from 19th century structures.

Visitors from all over the United States came back to Mansfield Monday, for bus tours and a homecoming dinner. The tours included visits to Malabar Farm, home of the late Louis Bromfield, and Kingwood Center, the multi-million-dollar cultural and horticultural center established for Mansfield by the late C. K. King.

Tuesday was Children's Day, featuring a youth parade. On Wednesday women white collar workers picnicked in the center of the city. Thursday brought a public shaving of beards to climax a beard-growing contest. Friday was devoted to looking toward Mansfield's future growth and Saturday was Agriculture Day.

As part of the celebration the Mansfield News-Journal issued a 208-page historical sesquicentennial edition. The total press run of 40,000 copies was completely sold out within 6 hours.

Arabs and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article recently published in the Cincinnati En-

quirer of Cincinnati, Ohio. This article deals with the basic nationalism of the Arab people and their fundamental desire to remain aloof from communistic influences. The Arab doctor who expressed the opinions contained in the article is evidently a very intelligent man and being an Arab himself he should know whereof he speaks. The article mentioned is as follows:

ARABS COULD BE BULWARK AGAINST REDS, SAYS IRANIAN DOCTOR, HERE 5 YEARS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The views expressed here by Dr. Niroomand are those of partisan Arab nationalism. The Enquirer presents them as points which deserve expression though in opposition to present United States policy.)

(By George Amick)

An earnest young Iranian doctor declared here yesterday that Americans should be encouraging the Arab nationalists instead of sending marines against them.

And if the American Government "practiced what it preached," he said, the marines now in Lebanon would call free elections "to see just what kind of government the people there really want."

Dr. Iraj Niroomand, 28-year-old Tehranian interning at Children's Hospital, said he has found Americans to be "the best people in the world" during his 5 years of study in this country.

But he doesn't think American policy toward the Arab countries reflects the real wishes of the taxpayers who pay for it.

"The American Government has sent a lot of money to these countries. But it's not used as it's meant to be," he said feelingly.

"Most of it goes to the heads of government. It buys Cadillacs for Ibn Saud and Swiss chalets as wedding presents for premiers. It doesn't have any effect on the poverty of the people."

In his own Iran, people live in a sad situation not imaginable to Americans, Dr. Niroomand declared.

"In Tehran there are 2 million, and 500,000 of them live in holes and hovels," he said.

"Is it fair for countries to be oil-rich like ours are—and the people be so poor?"

Dr. Niroomand said Americans make a "big noise here because Mr. Goldfine paid some hotel bills.

"We Arabs hate corruption, too, but we can't do anything about it because we don't have freedom," he said. "Now we have a little chance, because of a nationalistic movement, to get some freedom.

"The American people should support this movement. Americans stand for the very things these men are fighting for."

Nasser is looked on as a savior by the Arab people, Dr. Niroomand explained, because he is almost the only leader who has spoken out against the British.

"You must realize that Arabs have been under British influence for more than two centuries. They have never had freedom. Now, they want it," he said.

Dr. Niroomand denied emphatically that Nasser or the Arab rebels were Communists.

"It isn't their fault that there is a cold war, and that when they act against the West they appear to be cooperating with the Russians.

"Why, in Egypt, the Communist Party is outlawed. But in Britain it isn't.

"When Nasser visits Yugoslavia or Moscow he just wants to bluff you and use this situation to Arab benefit. Arabs try this bluff because they feel they have no other way to turn. I know the Arabs, and, believe me, they are never going to turn Communist. Their religious beliefs are to strong."

Now that America has landed marines in Lebanon—"whether this is right or wrong, the troops are there"—they should be used to conduct a free election, Dr. Niroomand said.

"If the United States showed she was really for freedom and democramy, as she says, she would win the love of the Arabs.

"You work hard to make a United Europe. Why not help make a United Arab Republic? And if you really help these people and show you are sincerely their friends, they will be a much stronger ally to you than the Baghdad Pact nations.

"They will make a chain from India to north Africa—a whole belt around the world against communism. The Arab people would love you—they would give their lives for you."

Dr. Niroomand came to the United States in 1949. He attended University of California at Los Angeles, Concordia College in Minnesota, and the University of Minnesota before going abroad to Heidelberg, Germany, for his medical degree.

He wants to return to Iran as a general practitioner. He has no interest in specialization.

"We don't need specialists in Iran," he said wryly. "There are few enough general doctors."

The Necessity for Maintaining and Implementing the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Middle East have pointed up the necessity for maintaining and implementing the Marine Corps both in personnel and equipment.

Despite the warnings of many of my informed colleagues and myself on this vital matter, the Defense Department has heretofore disregarded this obvious fact.

Within the past several months I have spoken of this and had intended to address the House once more. I have just read an article by Walter Winchell, one of America's great journalists, which is most eloquent on this subject.

The article appears in the New York Daily Mirror of July 18, 1958, and under unanimous consent I make it a part of the RECORD.

(By Walter Winchell)

Mr. and Mrs. United States, as the clouds of war gather from Cairo and the Euphrates and from Suez to Yemen, it is obvious that additional heavy burdens are being placed upon the Marines. Our international responsibilities have increased by thousands of miles—while the Department of Defense has cut down the Marines by thousands of men.—From this column March 20, 1958.

The Congress is in an uproar because, they say, Central Intelligence was caught flatfooted in Iraq. This is, of course, pure bunk. The CIA warned again and again that our whole diplomatic arch in the Middle East was falling—but the business-as-usual bunch teamed up with the Pollyannas and a good time was had by all until the house of cards collapsed. Since, by policy, Central Intelligence can neither affirm nor deny, Allen Dulles makes the ideal political scapegoat. It's as simple as fighting a man whose hands are tied behind his back. Unfortunately, this won't solve the problem abroad, though it does offer a plausible political explanation for the folks back home.

For 10 years, in the 1930's, this reporter attempted to warn the American people of the gathering Nazi warclouds. For the last 15, he has tried to point out the coming Communist cyclone, for which he has been variously called an hysterical warmonger and a member of the lunatic fringe. Unfortunately, I was far too right. All you have to do is look at the map. Not only the Middle East, but North Africa also, is a seething volcano. It not only fits together like a jigsaw puzzle; once the pieces are in place our jig is going to be up.

Asia is gone, the Middle East and Suez are breached, and North Africa is going. The Nazis knew what ancient Rome learned the hard way—who controls North Africa controls Europe. For repeatedly stating this, Allen Dulles was regarded as a Cassandra, at best, and a political nuisance, at worst. Having drunk the heady wine of phony security, the lads who wouldn't listen are now trying to blame Dulles for their hangovers. Just to get right to the bottom: London was caught far more flatfooted than Washington, which is neither here nor there. What's here is this: The world is closer to World War III than even the crisis of the Berlin blockade or of Korea.

Again, ironically, if war is prevented it is because the Marines have landed. But thanks to the myopic eyesight along the Potomac, the Marines have been cut to such a point that Commandant Randolph Pate testified only a month ago that they were in perilous shape. If this be true, Secretary McElroy owes an apology—and a resignation—to the Nation. The Congress appropriated the money for the Marines, and the Defense Department simply appropriated the money for themselves. Senator RUSSELL has thundered against this unconstitutional procedure, but the Pentagon is a law unto itself, apparently. The real irony for Commandant Pate is that just 40 years ago today—the 5th Marines broke the Kaiser's own regiment and the Hindenburg Line.

The United States Marines are on more than the shores of Lebanon. They are on the conscience of every American capable of writing to the White House. Instead of 4 divisions and 4 wings, they have 3 skeletonized wings and 3 lean divisions. They may lack strength on Capitol Hill, but we can thank the 49 stars they have it in the Mediterranean.

In this writer's considered opinion, unless the United States Marines are brought up to a minimum of 5 divisions and 5 wings, the Mediterranean is in for its most hectic days since Hannibal. Even as Allen Dulles warned of the hurricane, the wiseacres were cutting down our ability to do something about it. There is only one thing in American history more stupid than sending scrap iron to Japan. That is cutting the only ready force we have—the Marines—to the danger point. Unless this is remedied, even the men who made this tragic mistake won't have to answer for it—because we will have lost a war without even being able to fight it. You don't answer to the Reds: They tell you. In the meantime, all politicos will kick Allen Dulles in the shins because it doesn't cost anything. He's not running for anything and he can't answer back.

There has been a great deal of talk about a summit conference. The reason is that a large number of people believe it could bring peace. But an analysis of the facts indicates the exact opposite. The Geneva Conference was in session when the Reds barged into the Near East. The Berlin blockade was used as a cover for the attack on Korea. The Peace Conference on Korea was used as a cover for the seizure of Indo-China. Every conference to date has been a front for a new basic attack. Suppose the conference reached an agreement. By actual count, Moscow has broken 72 to date. This means it is 72 to 1 that they would break the next one. That's a long shot to take when the country's life is at stake.

It is an axiom that words repeated enough lose their meaning, but facts do not. The 20th century is punch drunk on war headlines—but that doesn't lessen the enemy's wallop. There was a time when the placing of all Armed Forces on Alert No. 1 would have aroused the country to its danger. But even the notice that the Marines have landed, that the Atlantic Battle Force is rushing reinforcements to the 6th American Fleet and that heavy units of Her Majesty's Home Fleet have been moved up in reserve—has failed to awaken the Pollyannas from their dream world. The Commander in Chief has told the Nation we will accept our responsibilities come what may. If that isn't plain American language, what is?

In March of this year, this reporter wrote that the Near and Middle East was reaching the explosion point. If I knew, you can bet Allen Dulles knew and if Allen Dulles knew, so did the High Command. This writer remembers President Roosevelt, under similar attack, exhibiting a letter to him. It was from one of F. D. R's sons, who wrote from the battlefield that he hoped he'd fall in action—so they would stop criticizing his father. Well, Allen Dulles' son is only now recovering from his severe Korean wounds as a result of magnificent courage on the battlefield. What FDR's son offered, Allen Dulles' son paid. That alone should stop the cowardly attacks on the CIA Director. But if that isn't enough, at great risk to his own life, Allen Dulles caused the early surrender of the Nazi armies in Italy—thus saving tens of thousands of American lives.

In any event, it is too late for blame, even if there were any place to put it. The crisis is far beyond an examination of its cause. What we should worry about is its effect. The first lines of defense for this country are Central Intelligence and the United States Marines. Unless they are backed to our hilt, the enemy's hilt will be in our back. It is time the country awakened and armed—really armed. The choice is simple. For America—it's reveille—or taps.

Congress and the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial, Congress and the Stars, relating to the new outer-space bill that recently passed the Congress, appearing in the Washington Star of July 18, 1958.

Also an editorial, Up We Go, appearing in the Boston Traveler of July 18, 1958:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 18, 1958]

CONGRESS AND THE STARS

Now that Congress has unanimously approved the necessary legislation, our country soon will have in operation the kind of organization it needs to carry out, on a high-priority basis, what President Eisenhower has described as "an imaginative and well-conceived space program."

This program will have the following objectives, among others: (1) Increasing human knowledge of the phenomena in the heavens above us; (2) improving the safety, design, and efficiency of aircraft; (3) developing vehicles, manned as well as unmanned, for spatial exploration aimed at promoting the peaceful, scientific progress of mankind; (4) maintaining our country's role as a leader in all such ventures; and (5) cooperating with other nations engaged in the same sort of activities.

As set forth in the new legislation, which contains the substance of Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations, the Federal body in charge of all this will be called the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. It will absorb the existing National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and it will continue—and greatly expand upon—the committee's current projects. It will do so under a single Administrator, who is expected to be Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the NACA's present Director. Working closely with it, in addition to a Pentagon liaison group, will be a nine-man advisory council, including the President, whose decision will be final in any civilian-military dispute as regards the direction and supervision of certain types of spatial undertakings.

Moreover, although the organizational setup of the new agency will have the effect of establishing firm civilian control over such undertakings as a whole, the law specifically provides that the Defense Department will be the boss of all activities peculiar to or primarily associated with development of weapons systems, military operations, or defense of the United States. As far as some projects are concerned, this leaves room for possible controversy between the Pentagon and the projected NASA, but the President's overriding power as arbiter safeguards against disputes of a kind that could seriously impede progress.

Everything considered, therefore, Congress seems to have done an excellent job in legislating to create the new agency and lay the groundwork for far-reaching activity in this all-important field. If the agency itself acts with vision and vigor, our country should be able to hold its own in space as a power second to none.

[From the Boston Traveler of July 18, 1958]

UP WE GO

Congress has cleared the way for United States leadership in the space age this week by creating a new civilian space agency.

It will be known as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It will have a nine-man advisory council headed by the President. And its immediate objective will be to propel this country ahead of Soviet Russia in the race for the conquest of outer space.

This was badly needed. Without such an agency, there would be overlapping and conflict between military and civilian space projects, attended by costly duplication of effort.

Now we can move ahead with a minimum of confusion.

House and Senate alike deserve a word of commendation for swift and intelligent action on this.

Arkansas Good Place for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the work of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission in a growing and expanding State is justly famous throughout the Nation. Arkansas citizens, working from a program expertly devised and operated by dedicated and devoted officials, have joined together to utilize the resources of the wonder State in strengthening the economy of the South by bringing industry into areas originally dependent on agriculture.

The success of this program is indicated by ceremonies recently held in Helena and West Helena to retire some $755,362.70 in bonds provided by the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission in assisting the Mohawk Rubber Co. to establish a plant in the twin cities.

This is but one instance of the work of AIDC. In the first half of 1958 over 32 industrial plants, representing 1 investment of $10 million, have been located in Arkansas.

It is a pleasure to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the estimate of Arkansas as a site for an industrial plant as stated by Mr. Henry W. Fawcett, president of the Mohawk Rubber Co. Says Mr. Fawcett:

Arkansas is the best State in the Nation for producing consumer goods.

The full story of this impressive ceremony and the rise of industry in Arkansas is well written in the July 16 issue of the Helena World. It is a pleasure to call to the attention of Members the article written by Mr. Jack M. Young, editor of the World. These citizens are building a better State and deserve our commendations.

ARKANSAS GOOD PLACE FOR INDUSTRY, PRESIDENT OF MOHAWK RUBBER SAYS

(By Jack M. Young)

"Arkansas is the best State in the Nation for producing consumer goods," Henry W. Fawcett, president of the Mohawk Rubber Co., told a luncheon meeting at the Helena Country Club yesterday afternoon.

Purpose of the meeting was to hand over a check for $755,362.70 to Withrop Rockefeller to retire a bond issue which helped the company establish its West Helena plant back in 1956.

"I think the members of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and those of the Helena-West Helena Industrial Development Corporation are the most dedicated and unselfish men I have ever met," Mr. Fawcett stated.

"When they came to see us in Akron about putting a plant in Arkansas we were greatly impressed and I want to say that the Helena plant has worked out wonderfully for our company.

"We hope to become better citizens of the community and State in the months to come. As of June sales from the local plants totaled over $1,200,000," he added.

Mr. Fawcett then announced that $500,000 worth of new equipment has already been ordered for the West Helena plant and that another million dollars' worth would be installed early in 1959. That would bring the plant to peak production with existing facilities and any future growth would call for additional buildings.

We are calling in the bonds today not because we have refinanced them at a lower rate of interest, but because of our Mohawk wants to make a small contribution to help further Arkansas industry.

Mr. Rockefeller said Mohawk's early payment of its bonds would make the money available for assisting other industries in locating plants in Arkansas.

The check included $368,000 plus interest in bonds purchased by the State board of finance. A $2 million fund established by the legislature for industrial development

loans was all but depleted before Mohawk's payment was made.

In accepting the check, Mr. Rockefeller pointed out that the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission is a continuing cooperative program. "Unfortunately, a lot of towns haven't realized, as you have, that the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission is a cooperative venture. A lot of towns are sitting back and waiting for us to bring them an industry.

"The people of Helena and West Helena saw the problem and did something about it," he continued.

Rockefeller also said he thought the State's population was stabilizing because people like you are providing jobs for young people.

"In talks before university, college, and high-school groups, I tell them that it is worth taking a gamble to stay in Arkansas because we have a great State and the potential is tremendous," he continued.

While praising the work of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and of the Helena-West Helena Industrial Development Commission, Mr. Rockefeller said that Jack Taylor, of the Missouri Pacific office in St. Louis is the one who deserves most of the credit for starting the ball rolling on the Mohawk plant. Mr. Taylor was a guest at the luncheon.

Gov. Orval Faubus made a brief talk to open the meeting and pointed out that this area has benefited appreciably from the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission program.

He was high in his praise of State Senator James P. "Doc" Baker, Jr., master of ceremonies, for his work in establishing the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission.

The governor said that as a member of a subcommittee of the Southern Governor's Conference on industrial expansion, he had found out that the Arkansas program was the envy of all the other Southern States.

"The Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and such groups as yours are doing a great job. Some folks say I want to take over all the commissions in the State, but I don't know how I can take over the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission since I appointed all its members," he said in an aside in a political reference to the current governor's campaign.

Governor Faubus then presented Arkansas Traveler Certificates to Mr. Fawcett, Edwin J. Howe and William F. Irvin, all of the Akron office of Mohawk.

Other distinguished guests present included Lawrence W. Angst, plant manager; W. P. Rock, executive secretary, and Charles Shapiro of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission; Mayor C. Sheffield of Helena and Mayor Walter Shannon of West Helena, local chamber of commerce officials and representatives of press, radio, and TV.

In introducing the guests, Mr. Baker called attention to the work done by Harry J. McCarty, who handled the negotiations with Mohawk, and added that what every Arkansas city needed "is Harry McCarty." Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Fawcett jointly added an "Amen."

Vain Hopes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Richmond News Leader, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, on Tuesday, July 15, 1958, wrote a very cogent and revealing editorial regarding the present crisis facing the Virginia schools this September. Mr. Kilpatrick is an outstanding editorial writer and has done much to arouse our people to a realization of what is happening to them through Government usurpation of power, including particularly the judicial arm thereof.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the editorial which was published in the Richmond News Leader on Tuesday, July 15, 1958:

VAIN HOPES?

In today's Forum, a Negro attorney, in tones of mixed contempt and satisfaction, tells the South to abandon all hope that the Supreme Court's opinion in the school segregation cases ever will be reversed. He charges us with distortion in falling recently to mention a fact so well known that we had not imagined it needed reiteration, that *Brown* v. *Board of Education* was decided by a unanimous court. In the light of that fact, the hope of ultimate reversal, he says, is mere whistling in the dark.

It may be so. But in more optimistic moments (and we have an occasional optimistic moment, despite some dyspeptic opinion to the contrary), we draw hope from example and precept. There is the example of the 18th amendment.

This misguided social experiment was submitted to the States on December 17, 1917. Mississippi became the first State to ratify on January 8, 1918. Within little more than a year, on January 16, 1919, the requisite 36 States had approved the amendment, and it became in actual fact a part of the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land. Subsequently 10 other States accepted the amendment. An industrious statistician, adding up the votes State by State, discovered that in State senates, the vote for the 18th amendment was 1,310 for, 237 against; and in the various lower chambers, it was 3,782 for, 1,035 against—a preponderance of 78.5 percent dry.

The last State to ratify was New Jersey in March of 1922, 4 years after Mississippi had been the first. And we remember once coming across a despairing tract written about this time by an antiprohibitionist, a judge who loved his toddy, who lamented the deplorable truth that now only Rhode Island and Connecticut remained as small islands of hope for the wet. His essay began something like this: "It is absolute folly to imagine that the 18th amendment ever will be repealed. It is supported by overwhelming public sentiment, evidenced by the ratification of no fewer than 46 of the 48 States. Churches, schools, political parties, newspapers, and magazines are universally aligned in its support. This tide of opinion is not to be reversed."

Of course, it was reversed. Over the next 10 years, the people discovered that prohibition would not work; public sentiment shifted completely, and when the Congress submitted a repeal amendment in 1933, the States took only 10 months to wipe the 18th amendment off the books. The count among the States had been 46 to 2 in favor of prohibition in 1922; today the States stand 46 to 2 against it. So when Mr. Martin, 4 years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, asserts that it is folly ever to imagine this opinion will be reversed, we say maybe so, and maybe not.

And as for precept, the foes of compulsory integration can seek no brighter example than the precept established by their enemies themselves, the advocates of integration. In 1899, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous opinion by the former Mr. Justice Harlan, approved the concept of separate but equal schools. Did the proponents of integration give up? Not they. They kept hammering away. But in 1927, in another unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court of the United States bounced them down again. Did they give up? Not they. They felt the court was unanimously wrong, and they kept probing, testing, challenging, litigating; and little by little, in Gaines, in Sipuel, in the McLaurin case in Oklahoma, in the Sweatt case in Texas, their siege tactics proved effective. On May 17, 1954, they claimed a unanimous court for their side.

The NAACP saw no reason to give up after *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* in 1927; they kept up their hopes in a discouraging hour. Well, we see no greater reason for the South to abandon hope after *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in 1954. The South is right in this great struggle, right constitutionally, right morally, right ethnically. In time this right will prevail.

Abandon hope? Give up the battle? Not yet, Brother Martain, not yet. Why, the South has been fighting this opinion for just barely 4 years. It isn't even breakfast time yet. After a while, when the sun gets up, we'll settle down to some real massive resistance.

Determining Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 16, 1958:

DETERMINING CONTEMPT

It is not surprising that the Harris subcommittee rejected Bernard Goldfine's suggestion yesterday that it suspend its hearings until a United States district court decides whether he is required under the law to answer certain questions of the subcommittee which he deems irrelevant. Seeking an advisory opinion of this sort is not the practice among congressional investigating bodies; and a proposal put forward a couple of years ago by Representative KEATING to make it a regular practice was not adopted by either House of Congress. Nevertheless, we do not by any means share Chairman HARRIS' view that the Goldfine suggestion is not reasonable or that it would amount to abrogating the responsibilities of his subcommittee.

In most situations of this sort—in an administrative proceeding or in a grand jury interrogation or in connection with most State legislative investigations—the question whether a witness is required to answer is submitted to a court for adjudication. In point of fact it seems altogether unreasonable to force a man to run the risk of a term in jail for contempt when his refusal to answer is based on an honest conviction that the questions put to him are improper. Mr. Goldfine cannot yield to the Harris subcommittee without waiving his indubitable right to refuse an answer to irrelevant questions; and he cannot resist the subcommittee without placing himself in very serious jeopardy. He ought, we think, to have a definitive determination of the law as it applies to his situation so that he can know what to do.

Since Congress never adopted the Keating bill for advisory court decisions on issues of this kind, it is very doubtful indeed that

the Harris subcommittee could accede to Mr. Goldfine's request even if it wanted to. We do not know how it could submit the question to a Federal court. But the situation simply underscores more clearly than ever, it seems to us, the need for legislation along the lines of Mr. KEATING's proposal. Only a court can make the decision; and only a court is qualified to do so.

The Political and Governmental Situation in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years Michael Chinigo, a top reporter on international affairs, has been analyzing the political and governmental situation in Italy. No one I know of is better fitted to write on such a subject. He has spent a good portion of his life in Italy and areas adjacent thereto. His analysis of the present situation in Italy is excellent. His acquaintance with Amintore Fanfani gives him an inside picture of not only the personality of this man, but also his psychological approach to the entire question of communism. I felt the House would be interested in having these views of an expert in this field in view of the fact that we are constantly faced with problems with Italy. I append herewith the article in full from the July 13, 1958, issue of the Champaign-Urbana News-Gazette:

FRONT ROW
(By Michael Chinigo)

ROME.—Italy has just tiptoed into phase 3 of her postwar existence.

It could be a momentous phase if successful.

The goal: compression of communism within Italy's borders.

The responsibility, one way or another, rests on the shoulders of Amintore Fanfani, a man big in brains and of even bigger heart. He heads Italy's 19th postwar government.

Fanfani has for years fought alongside such men as Alcide De Gasperi, Mario Scelba, Giuseppe Pella, and Antonio Segni—all Prime Ministers before him—to contain communism.

In the postwar period he so excelled in the diverse ministerial posts that Alcide De Gasperi often pointed to him as the logical successor.

And, when Fanfani was denied parliamentary approval in his first try at the premiership 4 years ago, it was De Gasperi who turned over to him the direction of the Christian Democratic Party which had just emerged from the 1953 general elections defeated and divided.

In the role of general secretary he showered the initiative and energy all Italians recognize to be his in reorganizing the party, building it up into a formidable political instrument and preparing for the general elections of this year in which he won a resounding and unexpected victory.

HAD DESPAIRED OF VICTORY

On the eve of the elections, the fiery Christian Democratic leader, who had visited Adenauer to learn how the German sister party had spun its success, despaired in a victory. Most Italians concurred that a decade and more in power had whittled the popularity of the Italian Christian Democrats and that a slight recession should be expected.

The dramatic turn of events in France produced an amazing shift in the thinking of the impressionable Italian people and a consequent victory for the Christian Democrats in Italy.

Fanfani's campaign platform rested solidly on the slogan: "Progress without adventure."

Translated into simple language that meant that the nationalization of Italian industry would not be undertaken at the expense of private enterprise but only as a complement and catalyst of private enterprise.

The election victory, while surprising, fell short of what it would have taken to give the Christian Democrats absolute majorities in both Houses of Parliament.

Therefore, Fanfani who, as the political strategist of his party's victory, was chosen by the President of the Italian Republic to form the 19th government and had to find allies for a "coalition."

He found his partner in Giuseppe Saragat, leader of the Italian Democratic Socialist party, who has resisted against pressure from many sides to keep his party solidly democratic and supporting the development of democratic processes in Italy.

Though ideologically a Marxist, Saragat has been a frontline fighter of communism and of parties allied to the Red terror.

HOPES TO REALIZE DREAM

Compression of communism has been Fanfani's dream for years.

Now, as premier of Italy, he may be expected to attempt to realize this dream.

That he intends to act in this direction is evident both by his partner in government and the basic lines of his government program which involves further land reforms, huge public works and cheap housing programs, low-cost education to eliminate illiteracy, and other social reforms to give dignity to every Italian.

It appears clear that Fanfani will fight communism not by legal suppression but on the economic front, in which he is a recognized expert.

The reason why his government is labeled as going into phase 3 is because the Italian picture, to date, has been popularly divided into phase 1—that of reconstruction in the immediate postwar years—and phase 2 which involved the disintegration of the conservative parties, climaxed by defeat at the polls last month.

Almost immediate repercussions on the huge Italian labor front have been registered by the naming of anti-Communist Italian labor syndicate's top man Giulio Pastore to the post of minister for the south of Italy and other depressed areas.

It is the first time in Italy's history that a labor union leader has been given government responsibility.

It is obvious that the anti-Communist war will find action on the labor front where communism has its mammoth strength.

Parallel with action on the labor front will be moves to cause the Italian Socialist Party to break completely away from the Italian Communist Party and unequivocally declare itself for democratic processes of government.

This Italian Socialist Party, headed by Pietro Nenni, has been a sore-making thorn on the growth and stability of Italian democracy since the end of World War II.

RETURNED STALIN PEACE PRIZE

Nenni has flirted with the idea of breaking with communism several times. At one point, after the Hungarian bloodbath, he returned the Stalin Peace Prize which had been given him shortly before Stalin died. But when the chips were down, Nenni always seemed to fear the reaction of what he calls "the masses of labor" and he always returned to the fold of pacts and fellow-traveling collaboration with the Italian Communists.

If the action on the labor front by Minister Pastore is successful, Nenni's residual hesitancy may fall and he may break with local Reds and consequently strengthen the anti-Communist democratic forces.

The public-works, low-housing and other programs scheduled by the Fanfani government are going to cost money. The conservative Liberty Party is already saying that Fanfani will have to float a national loan, seek a foreign loan * * * or both.

The Eisenhower administration and the United States Congress is offered an opportunity to support the efforts of Amintore Fanfani and his coalition government.

Fanfani has elected to retain for himself the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

This, first of all, is intended to assure the Western powers that Italy will continue its full solidarity with the West.

It is meant to serve notice, however, that Italy will expect a more important role in international councils.

CHOOSE SEGNI AS AID

Fanfani has chosen to have as his closest collaborator former Premier Antonio Segni who has the Defense Ministry as well as the title of Vice Premier.

This will enable Fanfani to dedicate a good deal of his time and energy to international affairs and make visits to the principal western capitals.

Washington should lose no time in inviting Fanfani to visit the United States officially.

He was invited by both the Republican and Democratic Parties and attended their conventions before the last American elections.

To his closest friends Fanfani admits he "learned much" about political party organization and political moves in his United States stay. Lessons he put to good use in his own party and in the Italian political arena resulted in his recent electoral success.

Proud Italian, Fanfani will not be a beggar. But he will appreciate moral and financial support.

Outspoken champion for a United Europe, he may be expected to speed the rusty gears of nationalism with the oil of intelligence and enthusiasm and help build up the European defense against communism.

Establishing Rules of Interpretation for Federal Courts Involving the Doctrine of Federal Preemption

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again today what I said on yesterday, that it is perhaps presumptuous for a layman to enter into a legal contro-

versy such as the one we are hearing on bill H. R. 3. However, I suspect there are a lot of laymen in this country who have an intense interest in the measure and who are very much concerned over many things of a judicial nature which have transpired in the recent past.

There has been and is an increasing and massive concern throughout this country relative to some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. I agree that the Supreme Court, as an institution, is deserving of the respect and the reverence of the American people. However, I do not agree that everything done by the Supreme Court is per se perfect. One need not stand in wondrous awe at every decision that is handed down by that esteemed body to reflect respect for the institution. Recent decisions of the Court have, in the opinion of many, struck at the very fundamentals of State government.

I propose to discuss briefly two instances, without respect to whatever constitutional issues may have been involved because, in my opinion, this entire matter must be taken in context of the whole rather than in its separate parts.

I certainly agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] that we cannot take a piecemeal approach to a problem which is not piecemeal in its essential nature. I, too, am interested in Pennsylvania. I am interested in New York, New Hampshire, and in the several other States which have been made the subject of some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. But I am, however, primarily and fundamentally interested in California. I want to discuss two cases very briefly and you will forgive me if I do not do so in the proper legal terms. I shall not quote precedents. I shall not quote many of the things a lawyer would quote. But, I think in discussing these cases, I will quote only the concern which has been evidenced to me by many hundreds of the people I represent.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I was interested in the gentleman's observation to the effect that he was interested in all these States, but that he was particularly interested in the State of California. I do not think it is a secret that an attempt will be made under the 5-minute rule to limit this bill to take care of just 1 case in 1 State. I am sure, in view of the gentleman's statement, that he agrees with me that the bill should be left intact so that it would cover all of these situations; and that will dispose of the broad question in one bill rather than having to take a half dozen bites at this problem.

Mr. JACKSON. I am in complete agreement with the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi. I will most reluctantly oppose the amendment, which I understand is to be offered in due course. I say again—this is not a piecemeal problem, and we must seek an answer which will deal with the problems of tomorrow. The answer must meet situations which have not yet developed and decisions which have not yet been handed down. I am in complete accord with the premise contained in the amendment which I understand is to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. I think the Congress should do something with respect to the Steve Nelson case. However, I do not believe that the proper place for that action is in the legislation presently under consideration.

A few months ago in the State of California, an applicant appeared before a committee of the bar examiners of the State of California; a group delegated by statute the authority to inquire into the moral character of applicants for the California bar. The man's name was Raphael Konigsberg. Mr. Konigsberg first came to the attention of the House Committee on Un-American Activities when he was identified under oath by two witnesses—one in open hearings and one in executive session—as a past member of the Communist Party. He refused to answer any questions as to his alleged membership and availed himself of the provisions of the Fifth Amendment. Mr. Konigsberg subsequently made application for admission to the California bar and after the most careful and searching inquiry by the committee of bar examiners, it was held that he had not established the proper moral character for admission to the bar in light of his declination to answer any questions put to him by the bar examiners relative to his alleged membership in the Communist Party.

In a very excellent dissent to the majority of opinion of the Supreme Court the point was made by Mr. Justice Harlan, who was joined by Mr. Justice Clark, that the action of the majority, struck down the right of a State to establish certain criteria for admission to the bar.

Perhaps this is only on the fringe of preemption, but certainly there is an element of preemption when the Federal Government or when a Federal court restricts in that manner the capacity of a State agency operating under the laws of the State to establish the criteria for membership in the bar association.

Obviously, this doctrine if carried further, and it could logically be carried further, would make it impossible for a private employer to refuse to employ a man who declined to tell him whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party. Here, I think, is inherent the proposition that the State as a community must have the right to protect itself, to protect its institutions, and to protect those things which have traditionally fallen within the area of State jurisdiction.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am not a lawyer, but I would like to know whether in the gentleman's opinion that decision would be affected by H. R. 3, which we are now considering?

Mr. JACKSON. I would say to the gentleman that perhaps it does not go directly to it, but I think it is on the fringe. Certainly there is a preemptive process when longstanding custom and usage have been struck down.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The reason I raise that point is that it seems to me the case the gentleman cited bears upon a constitutional right which is not inherent in H. R. 3. I would appreciate it if one of the lawyers here would enlighten me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On that I would like to say to the gentlemen from California, whose districts adjoin, and who may from time to time differ in their ideologies, but who, I understand, hold each other in high regard, as I do both of those gentlemen, that this bill would in no way affect the decision which the gentleman from California is now talking about.

Mr. JACKSON. I suggested the possibility that it was on the fringe.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman said it was only on the fringe. I would suggest the outer fringe of this legislation.

Mr. JACKSON. Outer or inner fringe, the fringes are also of concern to the people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like to say to the gentleman from California that I have had communications from citizens of California who are very much disturbed, who are interested in the passage of this bill as is, to care of their water rights, because they are disturbed about what is going to happen unless such legislation is passed with respect to their water rights in the State of California.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that aspect of the entire matter is a very important one indeed, not only to the people of California but also to the people of all the western States who are confronted, and have been confronted, with these tremendous problems with regard to water.

The second case, and I will preface this for the benefit of my colleagues, may also not be precisely to the point of the legislation under consideration; but again it demonstrates what I, for one, consider to be a dangerous doctrine, the doctrine that the civil rights of an individual who is or has been close to the Communist conspiracy, that his civil liberties and his civil rights are more important that the collective security of the American people. I submit that is a dangerous concept.

The second case recently decided in the Supreme Court—reversed—grew from an act of the California legislature requiring a loyalty oath, requiring organizations and individuals who were to obtain certain tax exemptions to submit an affirmative statement that the organizations were not dominated or controlled by the Communist Party; and wrote the same obligations substantially on an individual. Several organizations including, I regret to say, the First Unitarian Church of the city of Los Angeles, refused to sign the loyalty oath and the matter entered into litigation.

Before I go further with this case, I should like also to point out that the minister of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 12, 1951, and refused to answer any questions having to do with his alleged participation in the Communist conspiracy.

In answer to a question by Mr. Wheeler, staff investigator:

Are you a member of the Communist Party, Reverend Fritchman?

Reverend Fritchman answered:

I decline to answer on the ground that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me and violate my privilege under the Constitution, and especially under the fifth amendment. I have answered this question previously.

Mr. Chairman, this church was one of those refusing to sign the oath. It went through several courts and in due course reached the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, in reversing the lower court, stated that it was not proper for the State of California to grant these tax privileges to certain groups and to refuse to grant them to others only because certain questions of this kind were not answered. I contend this very definitely is an infringement on the right of the State and the State legislature to set up certain standards in granting a privilege, the privilege of a tax exemption.

These 2 cases are only 2 of a great many which have recently served to cause consternation, concern, and alarm from one end of the country to the other.

H. R. 3 was started on its way through the legislative processes. I said on yesterday that the progress has been a reluctant one as the bill has inched its way forward from the time of its introduction to the present time. It is not a popular bill, it is not a bill which can be hailed with great enthusiasm; it is a bill which many of us regret, that finds itself before us today. But the stern realities of a world in turmoil and dissension, the continued aggression of the Communist conspiracy on all fronts, have dictated again to us the responsibility to meet realities with appropriate action as necessity dictates. This slow progress of H. R. 3 has been given the needed emphasis and impetus by criticisms from the American Bar Association and other legal advisers.

National 4–H Group Has Served 2 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, in insert in the RECORD an article on the National Committee on Boys and Girls Club Work, which appeared in a recent issue of the Aroostook Republican, a weekly newspaper in my congressional district.

This article is important to me because 4–H Club work in the State of Maine is truly a dynamic function, as is borne out by the following details on 4–H performance in my State for 1957. As a former 4–H Club leader, I am indeed proud of Maine's record:

Participating 4–H Club members produced over $500,000 worth of goods in various operating projects, with a Nation-leading project completion rating of 97.7 percent.

During the State of Maine dairy show, 445 4–H cattle were exhibited, and this program continues to expand each year.

Under the 4–H poultry program, 7,250 broilers were raised, an increase of 1,150 over the previous year.

There were 5,442 4–H Club meetings held in the State, with 70,296 persons in attendance.

Public demonstrations were given by 2,399 4–H teams.

A total of 10,074 exhibits was given at fairs, and fair associations awarded $19,795.85 to 4–H boys and girls.

Four of Maine's 4–H Club members won national 4–H scholarships of $400 each.

The article initially referred to follows:

[From the Aroostook Republican]

NATIONAL 4–H GROUP HAS SERVED 2 MILLION

The only organization of its kind in the Nation has completed 36 years of service to 2 million boys and girls enrolled in more than 90,000 4–H clubs throughout the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, according to the annual report.

This unique nonprofit agency is the National Committee on Boys and Girls Club Work with headquarters in Chicago. President Dwight D. Eisenhower is honorary chairman. Up until May 1 of this year, the committee had been headed by Guy L. Noble, one of the founders who is now retired. His successor is Norman C. Mindrum, former director of the National 4–H Club Foundation. Kenneth H. Anderson is associate director.

The committee's principal function is to assist in furthering 4–H Club work through cooperation with State and Federal extension services of the USDA. Over the years it has obtained financial support of business and philanthropic interests that has provided funds for 4–H awards and expenses involved in program operations.

During the last fiscal year an all-time high of $900,000 was dispersed by the committee, the report announces. A total of $123,782 was used for training 15,851 adult 4–H leaders. College fellowships and scholarships totaling around $93,000, plus more than 1,000 expense-paid trips to the annual 4–H Club Congress in Chicago, were awarded to State and national champions.

The report also points out that the committee produced and supplied free of charge to State 4–H Club offices nearly 4 million copies of printed educational material pertaining to 52 national and regional 4–H award programs.

In addition, the committee publishes a monthly 4–H Club magazine, and maintains an information department which handles 4–H publicity on a nationwise basis. Through the mail-order supply service, the committee sells 800 different 4–H items to club members.

A 12-member board of directors backed by 19 official members of the committee are responsible for the corporate affairs. These are public-spirited citizens who volunteer their time and talents. Besides the director and associate director, the committee has on its staff 14 professional men and women assigned to specific jobs. Total employees number around 50.

Freedom of the Press and Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include, for the information of my colleagues, an article by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, on the recent legislative battle to amend our trade policy.

The article has to do with the part the press of the Nation played in their biased judgment of the need for facts not propaganda in presenting the purpose of this legislation which would revise our trade policies.

Mr. Strackbein's article follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND RECIPROCAL TRADE

(Statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

Freedom of the press, a principle that nurtures the very heart of democracy and is the hope of free people, has been sullied and subverted ignominiously by the great metropolitan press of this country in the congressional battle over the reciprocal trade program.

Never was this fact made more obvious and obtrusive than during the current legislative battle that began nearly 6 months ago. It has been a shameful thing to behold, a cynical negation of the very principle that gives the press any reason for being other than moneymaking and shallow entertainment, on the level of a noisy merry-go-round.

Freedom of the press is presumed to offer a medium for the spreading of truth rather than its suppression, for balanced presentation of public issues that divide the people rather than biased and distorted versions of what is said or written.

Freedom of the press becomes nothing better and indeed something much more dangerous than sordid commercialism in politics if it is debased and used as an instrument of out-and-out propaganda or a medium for blinding the public rather than enlightening it.

The predominant press of this country has been guilty of exactly this sundering sin in presentation to the Nation of the issues involved in the extension of the reciprocal trade program.

It has—

(1) succeeded in withholding almost completely from the public the facts and the reasoning that support the opposition to the particular bill proposed by the executive branch of the Government;

(2) accepted and disseminated uncritically exaggerated estimates and highly dubious declarations from public figures, Cabinet members, subcabinet officials, and other spokesmen who favor the program's extension, perilously close as these exponents of the program have come in point of integrity and dignity to the level of carnival barkers and racetrack touts;

(3) given currency to speeches, handouts, and opinions that support the Government's position, after the manner of a subservient press in a dictatorship, while failing to report what has been said or written by the opposition, except in fragmentary form, with sentences often set out of context to give them absurdity or a color of extremism, with

the undoubtable purpose of discrediting the sources;

(4) displayed on front pages and in slanted headlines the proclamations and arguments and interpretations of supporters of the trade program, or highlighted favorable events and buried others, engaging for the purpose of promoting the trade program the highest talents of cartoonists and virtue-breathing editors, while perverting news columns into veritable replicas of the cartoons and caricatures;

(5) dissolved the faith of many who had regarded the press with respect and pride and replaced it with shame and the deepest reget;

(6) and perhaps worst of all has used its concealed position as a party in interest as a base from which to launch its poison-gas attack.

The importation free of duty of the many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of newsprint and woodpulp used by the newspapers in this country is something that the newspapers owe, for its preservation, to a duty-free binding agreed to in two trade agreements; and the gratitude shown by the press for this favor engineered by the State Department 20 years ago is a wondrous tribute to the power that government can gain over the souls of men, purportedly free and honorable, when it knows the chemistry and biology of gratitude.

It is obviously a matter of the bleakest indifference to the great metropolitan newspapers, beneficiaries of the favor, that neither the President nor the State Department can properly bind any item on the free list, since determination of the free list is a function of Congress. To agree with a foreign country that no duty will be levied henceforth is to place Congress in a position of international outlawry if it nevertheless legislates its will and breaks the agreement.

That this conflict between the Congress and the Executive is at the very heart of the present battle over the trade-agreements program has in no understandable way been given to the public by the press—not that the facts have not been given directly to the press or before congressional committees where the press was present in profusion.

Not at all. The selectivity of the press in deciding what is news is the greatest loophole for escape from principle and impartiality yet invented by a self-serving and self-justifying estate. Through that loophole, anything can crawl, and when pressed usually does.

It is evident that the great metropolitan press cares for the Constitution only (1) when its invocation is expected to help or promote or defend the press; (2) when it can use the Constitution in behalf of an editorial position or against someone in opposition.

It quickly forgets that document and reacts with annoyed silence when its invocation would be inconvenient or would aid and abet the position of any group or cause regarded as contrary to the aspirations of the editor and/or publisher.

In the matter of the trade-agreements extension bill currently before Congress, the great metropolitan press has shrieked, not only editorially and through caricatures, but newswise, against sensible and moderate alterations of the program honestly designed to bring its administration back within the channels of the Constitution. It has embiazoned the intemperate words of those who purport to be appalled by the action of the Senate Finance Committee and virtually smothers all that has been said in good reason for the committee's amendments. It has thus presented to the American people a profoundly false image, a distortion and blurring of reality so gross that only dismay and shame can respond to the degradation of the noble principle to which the great metropolitan press professes so cynically to adhere.

The blame does not fall upon the newswriters. They owe their employment and, therefore, their livelihood to carrying out assignments and orders. What they write is not always printed or printed as written.

The sin, profound and inexcusable, except on the theory of almost complete ego blindness, lies predominantly elsewhere. For the good of the country, a diffuse goal so often and, oh, so feelingly invoked by the great editors, this sin should be rooted out. It is unbecoming of any newspaper that lays claim to the least effort to be worthy of the freedom that is so fundamental to the yet broader freedom of all,

Landing of Marines Holds No Cure for Mid-East Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very fine editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean under date of July 16, 1958, concerning the Middle East situation and the necessity for President Eisenhower to fall back on the United States Marines.

On July 18 I placed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in this same newspaper with regard to the Iraq coup and the grave decision which faced our President. The following editorial, concerning the President's decision to call on the Marines, points out very clearly the need for a new outlook of our Middle East policy.

The editorial follows:

LANDING OF MARINES HOLDS NO CURE FOR MIDEAST ILLS

Faced with the collapse of his self-defeating Middle Eastern policy, President Eisenhower has fallen back on the United States Marines.

Five thousand of these fighting men have been landed on the shore of Lebanon as a result of the Iraq nationalist coup, for the avowed purpose of safeguarding that country and protecting American lives. In addition to this the great Atlantic Fleet is in a state of alert.

Marine diplomacy is all that is left when statesmanship fails, but there is a realization in Congress and throughout the Nation that it is only a stopgap and not the answer to the surging tide of Arab nationalism which the Eisenhower administration has misjudged and mishandled.

In the light of the situation which now confronts him, the President has chosen to bolster up a friendly Arab Government whose people could be expected to follow Iraq's example, thereby precipitating a rush by other nations to join the movement.

The marines, it is said, will hold on until the United Nations takes over, which recalls the opening phase of the Korean war, but there will naturally be strong opposition, by Russia and others, to United Nations participation in this crisis. In any event, the future is uncertain, and the President will be fortunate if he is able to withdraw these forces within a reasonable time and before more damage is done.

Before any progress can be made, negotiations with President Nasser will be necessary. And they will hardly be successful unless the Eisenhower administration, whose mistakes catapulted Nasser into his present position of power, alters its present divisive stand as related to the Arab world.

Assuredly, we in the United States do not want to see the Middle East move fully into the Soviet Russian orbit, but signs point to the fact that this Moslem population has not yet done so. To push it in that direction would be a terrible blunder.

There is abundant proof that Arab nationalism and Arab aspirations are very real, and it is a matter of regret that the United States did not take this into consideration before the curt withdrawal of aid for the Aswan Dam in Egypt. At that time, the State Department, influenced by Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., who was then Under Secretary of State, decided to teach Mr. Nasser a lesson by repudiating the promise of aid for construction of the dam.

So brutal was the manner in which this was done that the Egyptian leader defied the West and seized the Suez Canal, thereby becoming the Arab world's hero. And ever since, in defiance of its own Middle East experts, the State Department has confounded its folly.

No wonder, then, that the cry arises anew from sober leaders in Congress for new policies which will embrace the understanding that the tide of Arab nationalism cannot be dealt with in a negative way, and that the original program of dealing with it in an understanding manner must be restored.

As a matter of fact we cannot hope to make Arab nations stand up and be counted on our side, and we cannot afford to be put in a position of justifying the term "imperialists" in many quarters.

Nationalism is an idea which is not going to be suppressed by armies or fleets or airships.

We cannot control events in the Middle East by force or dollars, but we may influence them by wise policies which have been so noticeable by their absence in late years.

In this crisis the Baghdad Pact, of which we are not a member although Mr. Dulles was a leading figure in its organization, has not been invoked because the pact is as dead as a doornail. Nor has the famous Eisenhower doctrine played any part, for it is not applicable.

So we call on the able marines as we face the need of a fresh outlook, as it is termed by Chairman FRANCIS GREEN, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Other thoughtful Senators of both parties see this immediate need, and are willing to help.

The Eisenhower administration, as it gropes for a way out of the dismal fog which has enveloped its handling of the changing Middle East, should welcome such assistance and enlightenment.

Enemy Assets Seizure During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to act in the matter of enemy assets seized during World War II. The administration has

proposed action by Congress giving primary attention to the small assets. There are many German nationals who are living on relief because this Nation has failed to act—in 13 years since the end of World War II—on this basic question.

It is time for this Nation to set the record straight and let the world know that we do not condone seizure of foreign assets by this Nation or any other nation. We are joined now in our efforts to contain communism by the people of Western Germany yet we continue to hold the assets of many of these people who desperately need what income they might get from these holdings.

We can note that it has been a year since West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer had discussions at the White House on this and other subjects. Following that conference, the White House issued a statement expressing deep concern over this problem of disposal of enemy assets seized during World War II. The statement pointed to the historic American policy of maintaining the sanctity of private property even in wartime.

There are many proposals before Congress for the return of these seized assets. This matter is a strain on our relations with the people of West Germany, who stand with us now in fighting communism and in opposing those nations who espouse seizure of private property.

Indicative of the feeling of the people of West Germany toward this problem is the following resolution, which was passed by the Bundestag on an appropriate day—July 4, 1958.

This resolution urges the Federal—Adenauer—Government as follows:

First. In the settlement of the problem of restoration of German private property confiscated in the United States of America, to continue emphatically to aim at the preservation of the principles of the White House declaration of July 31, 1957, according to which private property should be inviolable even in time of war.

Second. Bearing this point in mind, to turn its special attention to the bill announced on July 3, 1958, under which the confiscated German assets should be used only to satisfy American claims for war damages. The passage of such a bill by the American Congress would constitute a complete breach of the promise made on July 31, 1957, of a just and fair compensation of German property owners.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, why should the Army convert heating plants at Fort Eustis, Va., for use of oil in preference to coal at a cost of $800,000 or more when available coal is abundant at reasonable cost, when American miners and transportation employees are losing their jobs, and when a great part of the fuel oil has to be imported from abroad?

The unfortunate impact of imported residual fuel oil in the amount of 93,822,000 barrels during the first half of 1958 has displaced the equivalent of 22,514,900 tons of American coal.

Without coal, World Wars I and II would have been lost. Without markets to keep mines in condition to produce America's fuel supply in case of national emergency, the country will suffer.

Federal agencies and the Defense Department, by converting coal burners to oil, are encouraging the risk of fuel shortages that may result at any time from unpredicted developments abroad. The Nation's security dictates that coal mines be kept in condition to meet emergencies.

The Federal Government should cease to tolerate excessive imports of fuel oil to compete dangerously with coal. When the coal industry is hanging by a thread, it is obvious that further inroads on coal's markets should be avoided. Conversion of defense plants to fuel oil is not only unjustified but untimely.

On a High Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the June 20 issue of the Lorain Journal, an outstanding daily newspaper located in the 13th Congressional District of Ohio. As a preface to this editorial, I desire to make a few personal observations.

First, I feel that the subject is timely in light of the labor legislation presently under consideration in Congress. Secondly, it appears that many people are all too eager, as a result of recent disclosures of elements of corruption in certain national unions, to label any form of unionism and union activity as corrupt.

Labor unions since their beginning have played a vital and ever increasing role in our American economy, and like any other similar organization, government or industry whose existence is based on human endeavors, they are subject to the same elements of human frailties. I firmly believe, and have indicated on many occasions, that wherever corrupt and illegal procedures are uncovered in union operations, they should immediately and effectively be stamped out. However, when we witness a sterling example of efficient and democratic union activity, I feel it is no more than proper that it should receive equal recognition.

Another message of corresponding importance conveyed by the editorial is the example of active participation on the part of this union's membership. Operating under the same democratic election principles that are employed throughout our country, the majority of the union's members turned out to support the candidate of their choice. A similar percentage of expressed convictions on the part of our Nation's electorate in local, State, and National elections would be gratifying indeed.

The editorial from the Journal follows:

ON A HIGH PLANE

To members of United Steel Workers, local 1104, the change in the union's leadership brought about by the voting on Tuesday rates as the outstanding feature of the election.

To others, who have no connection with the union, the most impressive feature was the orderly, democratic manner in which the election was conducted.

Campaigning by three slates of candidates was spirited, rivalry was intense and at times tempers ran high.

Yet in spite of the keen competition in a voting contest that was almost as large as some city elections, there was never at any time before or during the balloting the slightest hint of intimidation or misconduct. Union members went to the polls confident that their vote would be counted as cast.

Out of 9,700 eligible, 5,035 union members voted. This compares with a total vote of 5,702 on an important public issue, the 6-mill school levy, in the recent primary election.

Lest the supposition might be raised by this comment that the orderliness of the union balloting this week was unusual, it should be pointed out that fair, democratic elections by local 1104 are the rule, not the exception.

Comparison Between State and Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer an address on taxes delivered by Jack S. Roesch, of Massillon, Ohio, over radio station WTIG in that city. He offers an interesting comparison between State and Federal taxes and a very reasonable conclusion.

Today, I am going to talk about an unpleasant subject.

I believe most of you will agree it is unpleasant.

The subject is taxes.

Every one of us has to pay taxes, and no matter how patriotic we may be—no matter how civic minded we may be—we are never exactly overjoyed at the prospect of paying them.

I don't intend to complain about taxes.

I'm not even going to say they are too high.

But I am going to make some comparisons between the taxes we pay to the Federal Government and the taxes we pay to our State and local governments.

I think we all know that it is impossible to make exact comparisons.

This is because there are so many so-called hidden taxes.

Taxes that are concealed in the price of almost everything we buy.

I think we can leave these hidden taxes out of our comparison—partly because we are not conscious of paying them and partly because they probably tend to cancel each other out—since some are State and some are Federal.

We have to start somewhere with our comparison, so I am going to assume that the man we are talking about has a wife and two children and that this family's income is $6,000 a year.

This family will pay Federal income tax of $600 per year under present rates.

Now, let us try to figure out what this same man pays in State and local taxes.

This is not quite so easy to figure.

Maybe we can arrive at it this way.

There is an old rule which says that a man should not buy a house which costs more than 2½ times his annual income.

Our imaginary man makes $6,000 a year and 2½ times this amount is $15,000. So let's say his home cost $15,000. This means—at least in Stark County—that his home would have a valuation for tax purposes of about $7,000.

But let's make it high so nobody can say we have deliberately made the local taxes seem low.

Let's say his home has a tax value of $10,000.

The real-estate-tax rate this year in Massillon is $25 per $1,000 of valuation, so this man's real-estate taxes would be $250.

But he also pays other State and local taxes.

The most important of these is the sales tax. This amounts to 3 percent.

If we assume that this man spends half his income—or $3,000—for things subject to sales tax, he would be paying $90 sales tax each year.

Actually, this figure is probably high because the Internal Revenue Service figures that a man spends only an average of one-third of his income on merchandise subject to sales tax instead of the one-half we have estimated.

So let's add $90 to the $250 we already have for real-estate taxes—making a total of $340—and we are still being generous.

Now just to be on the safe side let's add another $60 to take care of miscellaneous State and local taxes like gas tax, cigarette tax, auto license tax, and so forth. By doing this we are being more than fair because the Federal Government gets more taxes from cigarettes than the State and it also taxes gasoline, cosmetics, jewelry, liquor and a host of other things a great many of us buy and use—and at a rate usually better than three times as much as our Ohio sales tax of 3 percent.

So let's add $60 more to the local and State tax bill and this gives us a grand total of $400.

Four hundred dollars for State and local taxes compared to $600 for Federal income tax alone.

As I said before, this is only a rough comparison. A man with a lower income or more dependents would pay less Federal income tax, of course, but his local and State taxes would also decrease.

As a man's income increases, however, his Federal taxes will increase, but this increase in most cases will be much greater in proportion to his increases in local taxes.

A man in business, of course, would have a different comparison, but I don't think we can be accused of being unfair if we say that on an average most people, like our imaginary man, pay about $3 in Federal taxes to every $2 they pay in State and local taxes.

I can almost hear some of you asking, so what?

So I'll ask the question myself, so what?

So what if we do pay half again as much for Federal taxes as we do for State and local taxes.

I don't say that I can give you a completely satisfactory answer to the question, but I believe I can give you a few things to think about.

Let's start out by considering what we get for our tax dollars in each case.

In the case of Federal taxes our dollars are being spent for national defense—over half goes for this purpose or things related to it.

They are being for foreign aid.

They are being spent for surplus farm commodities.

They are being spent for interest on the national debt.

They are being spent for flood control and reclamation projects.

I could spend a half hour going into detail about what we get for our Federal tax dollars.

Now what do we get for our State and local taxes?

First of all we get schools—and we get good schools. I shall spend some time telling you how good they are in a later broadcast. They many need some changes, but in spite of all we've been hearing I still think we're doing a better job of education than the Russians.

We also get police and fire protection, streets and roads, health protection, traffic control, sewers, parks, playgrounds, and many other things which are important to us in our daily lives.

Now I don't want to give you the wrong impression.

I'm not trying to tell you that the things we get for our Federal taxes are less necessary than what we get for our local taxes.

Many of the things we get for our Federal taxes are absolutely necessary.

But so are the things we get for our local taxes, and these things affect us more in our everyday lives.

The peculiar thing about it is that even though we probably spend $3 in Federal taxes to every $2 we spend for local taxes—we do much less—as individuals—to try to lower our Federal taxes than we do to try to lower our local taxes.

How many of us ever complain to our Congressmen or Senators about Federal spending. Oh, yes, we grumble in a general way, but how many of us wrote to Congressman FRANK BOW to congratulate him for helping to save millions of dollars in foreign aid expenditures recently. Yet in the same week I saw an editorial congratulating our city council for saving $300 by not sending the fire chief to a convention. As a matter of fact the fire chief might learn quite a bit about new methods of saving lives and property at that convention.

Many of us scream to high heaven at the mention of a city income tax, which in no case could cost our imaginary average taxpayer more than $60 a year on a $6,000 income and more often than not we vote against tax levies and bond issues for schools and for necessary city expenditures.

A couple of years ago we almost defeated a renewal of a recreation levy which costs our imaginary average taxpayer about $2 a year, but we scarcely give a second thought to a proposal to increase Federal expenditures by a billion dollars, and a billion dollars means more than $6 for every man, woman, and child in the whole United States.

I wonder if it isn't about time for us to get our thinking straightened out.

Even if we can't get those obnoxious taxes reduced, I'm willing to bet that if we could shift things around to where we were paying $3 for local taxes to every $2 we spend for Federal taxes we'd be getting a great deal more for our money and we'd have a whole lot more say-so about how those tax dollars are being spent.

Congress Should Establish Ground Rules for Admission of Alaska Into Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the President and Congress to establish some ground rules for admission of Alaska into the Union; the design of the new American flag is of utmost importance.

The President, both political party platforms and many of the congressional bodies have expressed themselves in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

With this in mind, we can ill afford millions of dollars in new flags with 49 stars if there is a reasonable assurance that within the next few years—2-year period—we will have to add another star.

In my humble opinion, we should add a star to the present constellation in our flag as a temporary yet authentic recognition of our newest and potentially one of our brightest stars.

I would simply provide for the sale and distribution of a single star to be added to the top red bar next to the field of blue. It could be sewn or ironed on every flag in America in the matter of minutes.

This could be official and remain so for a period of a few years, giving the next Congress and the next President time for a decision on Hawaii.

As a further thought I would suggest an immediate program of construction and repair to the Alaskan Highway and Government-sponsored ship and airline excursions for the period between now and the day of the official admission ceremonies.

The entrance of Alaska as a sister State into the Union is no small matter. It is a matter of great importance to this Nation, and the whole world; militarily, economically, and geographically it spells a milestone in world history. This Nation, the United States, has for the first time become a united yet detached Nation. The future alone can tell how far this will carry us in our search for peace, prosperity, and the welfare of not alone our northern country, but in fact, the nations of all the world.

With all of the empire nations of the world contracting and troubled with demands for colonial freedom and independence, this Nation finds itself beseeched and petitioned by our protectorates and Territories by demands and prayers for admission to the mother family politic.

In this age of materialistic greed and atomic pitfalls this represents a modern phenomena.

Why? I have not the full answer and maybe my answer is no answer at all, but I believe that it is because here in the United States, we have found a way of life in which all of the peoples, the creeds, the religions, the colors and nationalities can live together, sharing our

prosperity and recessions, our joys and sorrows, our smiles and tears.

I know the propaganda of our communistic counterparts in government. They point to our problem of integration and segregation.

Can anyone observing as an impartial observer fail to realize that in this country in spite of some regional differences in method and approach the American Negro has achieved through efforts greater franchise, greater recognition of their demand for personal liberty, and true equality, more than even the highest-born Communist in Russia or any of its satellites?

Could a Russian Communist condemn, criticize publicly his elected officials, his government? Could he make demands for better working conditions, better schools, better housing and equality in the polling place?

We admit to many imperfections and yet can anyone doubt that the American Negro has not competitively proven his equality in less than 100 years since the days of his bondage, since the day when he was a commodity, sold body and soul as a chattel in the market place; he has in fivescore years perfected in human values far beyond his development in the centuries of his domicile in the lands from whence he came as an illiterate, underprivileged, pagan believing mortal with the highest moral standards and the finest of mortal humanism.

Given equal opportunity under our form of government, the future can only hold greater accomplishments for the American Negro but by contrast what opportunities for individual advancement are there for the people of communistic countries.

To an American, the admission of Alaska means more than a new pioneer's challenge or the launching of sputnik. In the days to come the real significance of this action is a great epoch in this decision by the American people will stand out long after the last beep has been heard from outer space. The beep the world will hear from now on into eternity will be the heart beat our free people here, in Alaska and wherever else destiny places our flag of brotherhood and statehood.

Compare if you will Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Isles to Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the rest of the so-called Communist-influenced States. Any comparison can be only odious.

And so I call upon the President, the Congress and the American people to make this celebration one that will put the sputnik even beyond outer space in the hearts, the minds and desires of men and women everywhere in the world.

Peace comes from the hearts of people not from the mouths of guns or the explosion of bombs.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of pride as an American, I offer the following resolution:

Whereas this Congress, this administration, and the citizens of America have joined with the peoples of Alaska in an eternal compact of equality under the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of all the peoples of the earth to have a proper and fitting expression and celebration of this momentous event: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States, in conjunction and agreement with the government of the newly created State of Alaska, establish a joint committee to set aside a period and a day of celebration, to make necessary plans for the proper observances, to order a commemorative stamp, to promote and sponsor any and all activities that will properly and everlastingly mark the day of admission of Alaska as a free and equal member of the sisterhood of the United States of America.

Farley's Road to Senate Packed With Well-Wishers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, there are a few people on the political scene who are not aware of the great participation in public life of Jim Farley, of New York, frequently referred to as "Mr. Democrat."

The following article, which appeared in the Dayton Sunday News on June 8, 1958, is a fitting tribute to Mr. James Farley:

FARLEY'S ROAD TO SENATE PACKED WITH WELL-WISHERS

(By Dick Cull, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 7.—As a popular personality, gentleman Jim Farley will get a rousing reception in this political-minded capital if New York voters elect him to the United States Senate in November.

Hardly an unkind word has been heard about the 70-year-old Farley, the one-time mastermind of Democratic national politics, since he announced on Tuesday he will be a candidate. It will be Farley's first real bid for elective office in 45 years.

"He is a great guy, I hope he wins," an Ohio Republican who has known genial Jim for years said when he heard the news.

As usual, it was the small things that Farley always remembers that prompted the Ohioan to speak. "Every time he came to my hometown he called me," he said. "I always appreciated that."

Long-time friends and the reference books always emphasize Farley's friendliness. "I like people," says the man who is a genius for remembering first names. Ten years ago he said he had 100,000 friends.

The story here at the National Press Club and in the corridors of Congress is that Farley liked Washington but his wife, now dead, didn't.

If she didn't, she had a lot of company. This reporter remembers other wives of prominent men in political life who said frankly they thought many of the social trappings here were phony.

In 1946 Farley wrote a book, Jim Farley's Story, telling about the Roosevelt years, and dedicated to his mother and to his wife. In writing the book, Farley leaned heavily on his close friend, Walter Trohan, correspondent here for the Chicago Tribune.

In his book, Farley recalls his first meeting with Franklin D. Roosevelt, the fellow New Yorker he helped to elect to two terms in the White House before breaking with him in 1940 over the third-term issue.

That meeting brought a wry comment about politicians from wife, Bess.

As Farley tells it, it was 1920, the first summer of his marriage and he was invited to attend a reception in New York for the late former Gov. James Cox of Dayton, the presidential candidate that year, and FDR, his vice presidential running mate.

Then Farley, who was then a county chairman, goes on:

"Although I should like to be able to say that some psychic understanding passed between the tall, vigorous vice presidential candidate and myself, I can only report that the meeting was nothing more than a handshake and a 'How d' you do.'

"The only memorable remark came from Bess at the end of the long, tiring day, when she said, 'If I had ever realized that politicians spent their time going through such nonsensical performances, I would never have married you.' "

The prescription for success in politics, Farley once said, is a delicate one. These were his words:

"In politics, you can speak too often or not often enough; you can speak too loud or too soft; you can start too soon or too late; you can be too polite or not polite enough; and again you can be too friendly or not friendly enough.

"Any of these extremes at any given time may be fatal."

Although 70, the campaign trail should not prove too difficult for Farley. He is in good health and good spirits, friends say, and itching for the battle.

If elected, the I-like-Jim-Farley line will stretch a long way outside the Senate Chamber on the day he takes his oath.

Spiraling Inflation and Social Security's Inadequacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, immediate prospects for a turn in the inflationary trend are not apparent.

Labor demands for wage increases, Government's consent for more and higher paid employees, manufacturers' and producers' propensity to adjust prices in terms of production costs seem to have become accepted practice.

Individuals, business enterprises, and fiscal agencies at all levels tend to disregard ledged deficits. Increased national debt, requiring increasingly greater cuts in the dollar's purchasing power, provides the stimulus to resort to a greater profit motive as the only means to get ahead.

As this cycle of fiscal malignancy infiltrates the body politic, society automatically separates into two distinct classes: First, those who are in positions to demand periodic adjustments by seeking wage and salary raises and producers free to pass increased costs onto the taxpayer; and, second, those who lack organized power to compel wage and salary standards in keeping with living costs, plus that large group made up of retirees, pensioners, relief, and social security recipients.

The basic social-security legislation adopted when the dollar would buy its par value in goods and services has by no means kept pace with the dollar's decline in value. Citizens who purchased their social security with 100 percent dollars now face the impossible problem of making a 50-cent dollar meet their needs.

As organized groups are legally empowered to seek adjustments through collective bargaining, the problems arising out of inflation are promptly overcome by negotiation. To them inflation has little or no bearing on standards of living.

Now that governmental agencies have approved salary increases for both civil and military personnel, they, too, at least for the time being, are in a favorable position to battle inflation. While the financial status of industrial retirees varies considerably and railroad retirees feel the pinch, Federal employees are in position to look for a modicum of relief.

But the social-security retiree, especially those with no savings, are at this writing quite unable to live comfortably even when their payments are supplemented by public assistance.

The social-security legislation should be revised. Recipients on social-security rolls who have no other source of income should receive monthly payments in amount to meet the present-day cost of living. This might be possible with little or no increase in rates by setting an arbitrary limit on assured incomes of those who retire at 65, if instead of going on the social-security rolls they were given the right to withdraw the totals of their contributions with accrued interest at that age. Universal social security is not solving the problems of a sizable number of the aging population. If inflation is not curbed, the Nation will be confronted with an ever-increasing number of unfortunate citizens.

Educational Improvement Through Local Action and Lay Participation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School was Dr. David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois. At the National Conference on the Rural Development Program, held in mid-June, Dr. Henry delivered an address on Education Improvement Through Local Action and Lay Participation.

I desire to bring to the special attention of my colleagues in Congress certain portions of that address by one of the Nation's most able educational leaders, Dr. Henry.

The concern for more and better education is widespread and engaging the attention of Congress. The educational problem is most acute in low-income farm and rural areas.

A major sector of the Nation's rural development program is emphasis on more and better education. It will give the boys and girls of poor families the opportunities in life that should be theirs. It will strengthen America.

State and local leaders already have moved into action to get more boys and girls to go beyond high school with their education. This is being done through the education committees of the rural development programs.

The conference on the rural development program, where Dr. Henry delivered his address, placed major emphasis on the need for an aggressive action program for education beyond the high school in areas where incomes are low. As he stressed:

National security, economic growth, and effective democratic living are intertwined with what happens educationally to youth * * *. The number of able students who withdraw prior to high school graduation is an alarming waste of human resources * * * only 1 out of 3 of the upper one-fourth graduating from high school goes to college.

Excerpts from Dr. Henry's address follow:

EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH LOCAL ACTION AND LAY PARTICIPATION

(Address given at Rural Development Conference by David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois, Vice Chairman, President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, June 16, 1958, Memphis, Tenn.)

It was nearly a year ago that the Committee on Education Beyond the High School presented its main report to President Eisenhower and to the American people. In the intervening period, the substance of the report has been widely debated and its subject has had unprecedented public attention.

In considering how comprehensive public understanding and appreciation might be brought to bear upon education problems in the United States, two theses of the Report on Education Beyond the High School are stressed repeatedly. They are directly related to the work of the Rural Development Conference. One is that readiness and improvement in education service will come chiefly from local action. The other is that the layman has a vital role in the attainment of the Nation's education goals.

A grassroots understanding of the problems and a widespread public participation in planning for the future are basic to orderly progress. Schools are not apart from American life, and the solution to school problems will depend upon intelligent lay involvement. The specific form lay participation will take will vary from community to community, from institution to institution. But the idea must have friendly support from the profession and from citizen leaders if it is to be meaningful.

HELPING THE INDIVIDUAL AND HELPING THE SCHOOLS

There are two aspects to citizen action in school improvement, and they both apply to a consideration of education beyond the high school. One has to do with assistance to the individual; the other has to do with help to the school as an organization.

A specific point of action for any community is to persuade able students to remain in high school through graduation. You have been told in advance materials for this conference that one out of five students in the upper one-fourth of their class scholastically drop out of high school before graduation.

The number of able students who withdraw prior to high school graduation is an alarming waste of human resources.

Improved counseling in the secondary school—both in numbers of counsellors and in method—is an acknowledged point of attention in all studies of the subject. Counseling of parents and of families is a part of the need.

A community which organizes a program of "On to College" for its youth will do much to encourage students to remain in high school as well as to stimulate motivation for advanced work. On the latter point, only one out of three of the upper one-fourth graduating from high school goes to college.

Many students need financial help to remain in school or to go on to school. I believe, however, that at the present time improved motivation of students is a more influential factor than is financial aid. In most States, the majority of students are within commuting distance of an institution with at least 2 years of college work.

Among those who undertake the costs of going to school away from home, many are on their own. Fifty percent of the single undergraduate men and 30 percent of the women students at the University of Illinois receive no family support. They manage with summer employment, part-time employment and sometimes savings. Some qualify for scholarships and loan funds. It should be noted, too, the working or self-help students make the better grades.

The individual young person looking ahead to his own education can have assurance on two points.

First, the world has need of his talents whatever they may be and in whatever direction he may apply them.

And, second, motivation is a controlling factor in success.

Each community is interested in recruiting youth for its own on-going life. Rural communities quite properly want to retain as high a proportion as possible of their youth for rural life; and the education program of a community should take this goal into account.

Beyond this purpose, however, is the larger concern for individual opportunity, the obligation to give every boy and girl a chance to develop his talents, wherever he may have been born and under whatever circumstances. This goal is the great American dream and it has come nearer to fulfilment in this country than anywhere else in the world. But we still have the task of making the ideal apply to increasing numbers, with increasing effectiveness.

National security, economic growth and effective democratic living are intertwined with what happens educationally to youth. This idea is not new. It has been a part of the public philosophy in every age of American history. Each age, however, must bring it up to date and make it work in its own time. Citizen support for school improvement in general is the key to educational progress.

Individual freedom is meaningful only if we make sure that every youth has a chance to develop according to his talents and his intellectual and emotional horizons. Without that opportunity we would lose our sense of adventure, our aspiration for an improved society, our faith in individual freedom itself. We would go down the road of cynicism, content ourselves with the conservation of what we have with security as our watchword and mediocrity our standard.

EDUCATION AND AGRICULTURE

Boys and girls from rural areas should be encouraged to learn the career opportunities

in agriculture today and the education required for them.

Trained brainpower and the development of new ideas have accounted for the past success of agriculture, a success which for the moment has upset the balance of supply and demand.

Instead of being discouraged about the future of agriculture because it has been too successful, cannot we assume that the same basic ingredients of past success will mark the future? "New knowledge and its application has become the single most important factor shaping the affairs of agriculture," says Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago. "Fertile brains are as important as fertile fields," another has said.

The manpower requirements of agriculture are not commonly understood. In numbers of people, our needs are still very great; and the methods of agriculture today require more than ever that those numbers be adequately trained. With an increasing population predicted for the Nation, there can be no letdown in our educational effort to produce an efficient and effective farm operator and manager.

In Illinois, for example, 4,500 people are needed to enter farming each year, just to meet the turn-over requirements. The number of college graduates in this annual roll call is at present far too small to fulfill the expectations for maximum leadership and development.

The developments of new business for agriculture may take three forms: the building of new markets, economically through new consumption or geographically; the discovery of new uses for present products; the discovery of new products. The history of American agriculture is replete with examples of all three forms of growth.

Thus we are reminded that agriculture is not alone a vacation or profession, and not alone a business; it is also a science. Highly trained technicians are needed, and this message should be conveyed to the young people who have a narrow view of farming. Agronomists, geneticists, animal breeders, plant breeders, cereal chemists, entomologists and botanists are very much needed. "There is," says Dean A. D. Weber of Kansas State College, "a bull market for such men."

Any discussion of the future of agriculture or any aspect of it, brings us back to the need for trained personnel for management and leadership, for teaching and for research, and education beyond the high schools takes on greater and greater importance in all phases of a successful agriculture.

CONCLUSION

In the history of our country the establishment of universal educational opportunity, the growth in support for the free public elementary and secondary schools, the establishment and development of our State universities and land-grant colleges, the founding of many non-public institutions in the public service have all come only after terrific struggle for support and great public debates.

But in each generation the issues must be defined anew and the battles fought again. There are those today, as in other years, who say the student should pay the full cost of his education, that enrollments should be restricted for the intellectual elite, that we cannot afford an expanding system of higher education.

If 1957 is recorded as the year of sputnik, 1958 should be the year when America recognizes more fully than ever before that her chief resources are her human resources, and that education is the most important business of the Nation.

As long as we harvest the talent of the Nation from a broad base, encourage its freedom of choice, and provide for adequate educational opportunity, our national achievement will be adequate in the economic, scientific, and military competition of the world.

Whatever may be the appraisal of the work of the President's Committee, or of other groups working on education problems today, the American people have at last started thinking about plans for the future of higher education and education service for post-high-school youth. With confidence in the process of democratic appraisal, it may be hoped the school and civic leadership together may build a responsiveness among the people which will be a source of strength and inspiration for the challenging questions of our time.

For an appropriate peroration on the meaning of our work and its importance in our time we may well repeat the main burden of the report of the President's Committee, as thus phrased:

"What confronts us all is an enormous and unprecedented opportunity to develop the human resources of this Nation to a broader and fuller degree than even our most optimistic forebears ever dreamed of. The challenge presented by this opportunity points up, rather than supplants, the cardinal role of education.

"That role is to develop human beings of high character, of courageous heart and independent mind, who can transmit and enrich our society's intellectual, cultural and spiritual heritage, who can advance mankind's eternal quest for truth and beauty, and who can leave the world a better place than they found it.

"Only by pursuing these paramount goals of education can we insure a free society and a sane and peaceful world in which all individuals may live in greater dignity and achieve greater fulfillment."

Mr. Nixon—"Gran Señor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the July 5, 1958, issue of America:

A LOOK BACK AT CARACAS

Even Venezuelans were surprised at the violence of the demonstrations against Vice President NIXON during his recent visit to Caracas. Angry accusations were tossed about—at students, disgruntled nationalists, and Communists. Who was responsible?

A month has passed and Caraquenos have had time to reflect. The Jesuit monthly sic, of Caracas (Apartado 628) concludes in its June issue that a Communist group masterminded the riots of June 13. What is worse, Sic charges, someone is today preventing exposure of the facts.

Why has there been no investigation of the Molotov cocktails and the Communist leaflets found in a house in the parish of San José"? Who organized the painting of "Down with Nixon" posters and worked out the riot plan "in a high school that everyone knows"? Finally, how is it that phone calls from the Ministry of the Interior came to the newspapers, forbidding them to mention these disclosures—and that now the Ministry denies any knowledge of the calls?

"We conclude with apprehension," writes Sic, "that the Communist Party is so strong here that it silences the press and paralyzes the police and the courts."

There had been feelings of resentment against the United States, the editorial admits, but after the outburst Venezuela was overwhelmed by a sense of national shame. The one who came off best was Mr. NIXON, whose calm and aplomb during the attack * * * and whose statements back in the United States reveal the 'hombre culto' and the 'gran señor'."

Goldfine-Adams Case Interpreted by Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I include here a summary of opinion as expressed by a representative group of young people in my district. This article was taken from the July 13 edition of the Omaha World-Herald, as follows:

GOLDFINE-ADAMS CASE INTERPRETED BY YOUTHS

The Goldfine-Adams case in Washington was interpreted this way last week by members of a summer class in American Government at Central High School:

Barbara Chandler, Benson: Bernard Goldfine was trying to buy influence. Sherman Adams should not be removed from office because he didn't realize Goldfine was trying to buy influence. It has not been proven that Adams really did anything wrong.

Rosan Carder, Benson: Washington should turn its attention to a violator of trade laws (Goldfine) and shouldn't persecute an easily persuaded underdog (Adams).

Gene Brown, Benson: This thing has caused more excitement than it is entitled to. It has turned from a violations investigation to a political issue.

Ronald Black, Central: Mr. Goldfine has a lot to explain about the Christmas checks to White House workers.

Shirley Baer, Benson: This is what Americans have to watch for.

Joan Pedersen: The Adams-Goldfine case is an example of how we are falling short.

Margaret Lessard, Benson: I can't see how Adams could influence the Federal Trade Commission. Adams shouldn't be the fall guy just because the Democrats are looking for an issue. But Adams should be removed if the Republicans are to gain control of Congress and get a President elected.

John Riekes, Central: The case has been overpublicized. Imagine the field day for papers like Pravda. No man is indispensable. Sherman Adams has lost prestige. This incident shows that President Eisenhower, in a sense, is weak. The case points to corruption and illegitimacy in both parties. Papers stolen, rooms wired, records gone—in Mr. Goldfine's words, these are Gestapo tactics.

Susan Hursh, Benson: Adams shouldn't be removed unless it can be proved he influenced the FTC in Goldfine's behalf.

John Otte, Benson: The case has been blown out of perspective. The United States has again lost face.

Georgia Heidkamp, Benson: The Government should get rid of Adams.

Terry Maides, Central: Both Adams and Goldfine should be punished.

Sally Nelson, Benson: Men (in government) are men, liable to make mistakes. The Government's readiness to do some-

thing about it renews America's faith in its Government.

Marilee Nelson, Benson: Adams has served his country long. He should be given the benefit of a doubt.

Joel Davis, Central: If Adams stays in office, Republicans definitely will be hurt.

Doug Platt, Central: Adams holds a big office and his loyalty should not be questionable.

Jamie Taras: Politics are not always clean. Adams should be removed. I don't see how this can put the Republican Party in a hot spot. This administration is cleaner than Truman's. Democrats ought to save their hot air for warming up Alaska.

Nancy Donaldson, Benson: I think it is wonderful for President Eisenhower to put so much faith in Adams and stand by him. It shows the President is a man of character.

Statement of Letters Favoring S. 2119

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD my statement to the Communications Subcommittee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, favoring S. 2119. Also, letters received by me in support of this legislation and written by Mr. Ralph Lowell, of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council, which operates educational television Channel 2, WGBH-TV, in Boston, and from Mr. Gilbert E. Mottla, of the University of Massachusetts, for the Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc., board of directors:

JULY 17, 1958.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Member of Congress, Acting Chairman, Communications Subcommittee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate this opportunity that members of the subcommittee have given me to express my views on S. 2119, the bill before you for consideration.

This legislation, which has passed the Senate, would expedite the utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs by granting funds to establish or improve television broadcasting facilities for educational purposes.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation. I feel the Federal Government should, and with considerable justification, give financial support to foster this very worthwhile use of television.

I am sure the members of this subcommittee are aware that the only noncommercial educational television broadcasting station on the eastern seaboard is located in Boston. It is WGBH-TV, Channel 2, operated by the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council. This station presents a wide variety of interesting and stimulating programs on a very modest budget, approximately $3 million a year, the cost of a 90-minute network color spectacular. As Mr. Jack Gould pointed out in the New York Times of January 5, 1957, Boston's Channel 2 presents low-cost brain waves and the WGBH-TV gets the top minds for its telecasts.

In his New York Times article of January 13, 1957, Mr. Gould wrote:

"But it is equally apparent that Madison Avenue has scratched only one side of the medium: Educational TV, despite its forbidding title, is one of the most hopeful remedies yet seen for what ails the electronic colossus. The lesson of WGBH-TV is that after a while a viewer can be entertained to death; there does come a time when it is refreshing to have the mind titillated with regularity and purpose."

While channel 2 is telecasting to an audience of hundreds of thousands of persons in the eastern Massachusetts area, the citizens and educational institutions in western Massachusetts, where my congressional district is located, have not had an opportunity to benefit from such programs because no educational station has gone on the air. The Federal Communications Commission has reserved channels 80 and 82 in the ultra-high frequency bands for educational purposes in western Massachusetts. But, due to the tremendous costs in establishing a UHF station, the Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc., has not been able to put these channels on the air.

This subcommittee will be interested to know that the Special Commission on Educational Television, in its second report to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, estimated the costs of establishing channels 80 and 82 at over $500,000. The directors of the Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc., are from the various colleges and school systems in the area, including: Horace Hewlett, Amherst College; Roger Holmes, Mount Holyoke College; Donald Sheehan, Smith College; Gilbert E. Mottla, University of Massachusetts, and Edmond P. Garvey, council representative for the Springfield School Committee. The council urges that this legislation be enacted by the 85th Congress so that channels 80 and 82 can be established and a tie-in made with the educational television network.

In conclusion, may I also ask members of this subcommittee to act favorably on S. 2119 so that the bill can go to the floor of the House soon for a vote.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

WGBH,
LOWELL INSTITUTE
COOPERATIVE BROADCASTING COUNCIL,
Cambridge, Mass., July 11, 1958.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am interested to learn that the Senate bill (S. 2119) for the purpose of expediting the use of television facilities in schools, colleges, and adult-training programs has passed the Senate and has been referred to the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As you know, while we have channel 3 here in Boston serving the educational needs of eastern Massachusetts, there are no educational facilities in the Connecticut Valley area, including Springfield, nor facilities to serve the Berkshires, including the Pittsfield area. WGBH is now programing not only a wide range of educational and cultural materials for adults, but is also presenting programs for in-school use at the elementary-grade level. (A copy of our school guide is enclosed.)

The New Hampshire Educational Broadcasting Council has just announced that it will activate the ETV channel in Durham, which will cover New Hampshire and southern Maine, and will carry a substantial amount of the WGBH program schedule over their station.

It is a great shame that the people who live in the Connecticut Valley and Berkshire areas cannot also benefit from this programing, and particularly that their children will not have an opportunity next fall to take advantage of the many excellent programs that the WGBH Educational Foundation will present to the public, private, and Catholic schools and colleges in the eastern part of the State. It would be so easy for educational stations in these 2 western areas to rebroadcast these programs that originate in Boston at WGBH-TV, as well as to present their own local programs. I think there is no question but that this bill supplying $1 million to each State would make it possible to establish a statewide educational television network, which would permit the entire State rather than just a portion of the eastern area to enjoy the benefits of this unique medium of communication.

In connection with this bill, I would have one suggestion, and that is that it include responsible agencies authorized to operate an education television station such as a nonprofit corporation similar to our own WGBH Educational Foundation. The bill as it comes from the Senate includes such authorization. In our case this would make it possible for public, Catholic, and private schools and colleges to engage in a joint undertaking with the aid of these funds to bring educational television to the western half of the Commonwealth.

It would be a tremendous step forward in education, not only for our own Massachusetts, but for the entire New England area, as it would undoubtedly become part of a larger network serving this region with educational benefits that are of tremendous importance in these days of rising educational costs and inadequate school staffs.

We are also sending a packet of materials about the WGBH operation that we hope will be of us to you.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH LOWELL.

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS
BROADCASTING COUNCIL, INC.,
Amherst, July 7, 1958.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: The Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc., is very much interested in the Magnuson-Udall bill (S. 2119), recently passed by the Senate and now before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where hearings are scheduled to begin on July 15. The act would grant funds to establish or improve television broadcasting facilities for educational purposes.

As you may know, while channel 2 is on the air in Boston serving eastern Massachusetts with educational television, some 600,000 citizens in western Massachusetts are deprived of the opportunity to view educational television. In 1953 the Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc. was instrumental in having the FCC reserve UHF channels 80 and 82 for educational purposes in western Massachusetts. The reason that these channels have not been utilized is due to the tremendous costs involved in establishing a UHF station. In its second report to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the special commission on educational television estimated the cost of establishing channels 80 and 82 as over $500,000.

This year some 54 school systems in eastern Massachusetts are cooperating in in-school television programing over channel 2 in Boston. Legislaiton has been passed to allow all Massachusetts school committees to vote money for in-school television. Unless facilities are established in western Massachusetts, primary and second school students in this area will not be able to share in the educational advancements now

available in the eastern part of Massachusetts.

The council urges that the Magnuson-Udall bill be granted a favorable committee report and subsequent passage by the House before its expected August adjournment.

Passage of the Magnuson-Udall bill would make a statewide educational television network a reality in Massachusetts and would assure our continuing leadership in the whole field of education.

Sincerely yours,

GILBERT E. MOTTLA,
University of Massachusetts Representative for the Western Massachusetts Broadcasting Council, Inc.

(Directors: Horace Hewlett, Amherst College; Roger Holmes, Mount Holyoke College; Donald Sheehan, Smith College; Gilbert E. Mottla, University of Massachusetts; Edmund P. Garvey, council representative for Springfield School Committee.)

Expulsion of Communist Correspondents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the 39th annual convention, Department of Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Inc., at Pittsburgh, Pa., on July 9, 1958, regarding denial of visas by Soviet Union to American correspondents and recommending expulsion of Communist correspondents:

"Whereas since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics without explanation, has denied Daniel Shorr, former Moscow correspondent of Columbia Broadcasting System, permission to return to his customary news beat at Moscow; and

"Whereas this arbitrary and unprecedented act of the Soviet Government is equivalent to dictating who may represent a privately owned American radio news service in Moscow; and

"Whereas Pravda and Izvestia, two Moscow newspapers, the former named Truth and the latter named News, of which Communists themselves say there is "no news in the Truth and no truth in the News;" and

"Whereas Tass Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., and Pravda and Izvestia combined have numerous allegedly bona fide correspondents in Washington and New York who enjoy equal privileges and courtesies extended other actually bona fide correspondents under our constitutionally-guaranteed freedom of the press, as compared with the extremely limited privileges of American correspondents in Moscow who report such facts as they can obtain, and who work under strictly enforced news censorship rules, and unbelievable hardships in news gathering purposely created by the Soviet Government; and

"Whereas the Communist correspondents at Washington and New York, despite the availability of hard news facts, notoriously slant American news to parallel the prevailing Moscow-line, which appears obvious from their filed reports rebroadcast worldwide from Moscow that are attributed to Tass correspondents who are thus aiding in intensifying the "cold war" between the Soviet Government and the United States Government by their false news that disparages our Government's purposes and policies and the attitudes of our people; and

"Whereas Pravda, Izvestia and Tass correspondents at Washington and New York, who are actually Soviet Government employees and work under orders of the Soviet Embassy at Washington and the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, and enjoy virtual immunity while simultaneously undermining the United States Government through their false news and through abuse of our freedom of the press system, which privileges accorded them in the circumstances of their work might be questioned; and

"Whereas two Russian correspondents are preparing to return to Moscow, ostensibly on vacation and probably for new instructions detrimental to the United States, have requested renewal of their reentry to United States visas and, despite their contemptible conduct, insist permission to return be granted before they leave the United States: therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That permission to return to the United States be denied the two Communist correspondents in reciprocation for the Soviet Government's decision in the case of Daniel Shorr, until Daniel Schorr is permitted to return to Moscow as an accredited correspondent, or satisfactory reason is given to the United States Department of State for Daniel Shorr's arbitrary exclusion from Moscow by the Soviet Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the policy of the United States Government should be to expel at once from Washington the Communist correspondents under provision of rule 3 of Rules Governing Press Galleries, approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, that limits membership in the press galleries (of the Senate and House of Representatives) to bona fide correspondents of repute in their profession, and also under rule 4, subsection (b) of the same rules, which subsection denies admission to the Senate and House of Representatives press gallery to any correspondent engaged in promotion work, which is their principal occupation, and also expel from the United States any other Communist correspondent at Washington or at the United Nations who deliberately distorts American news to serve the purposes of the Kremlin's propaganda policy that is hostile to the United States Government and injurious to the best interests of the American people; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States; the Secretary of State of the United States; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House; Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; Representative Omar Burleson, chairman, Committee on House Administration; Senator Theodore Francis Green, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate; Representative Thomas S. Gordon, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, the House; Representative Francis E. Walter, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, the House; Mr. Frank Eleazer, chairman, Standing Committee of Correspondents, Senate and House of Representatives press gallery, all at Washington, D. C., for appropriate consideration and action."

Approved by the council of administration, Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at a regular meeting at Pittsburgh, Pa., July 9, 1958.

WILLIAM J. TEPSIC,
Department Commander.

Attest:

ROBERT S. MUSSER,
Department Adjutant.

A Warning to Soft-Living Americans: Soviets Will Stomp Us If We Don't Settle Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the clarion calls we have heard over the years warning against a soft, complacent living and a disregard of the growing and dangerous power of communism have too often fallen on muted ears. Let no one underestimate the perilous times in which we live. Evidence of this is crystal clear and we need but look around, pause and give heed to the menace that would and desires to destroy the way of life we enjoy and hope that our children and their children will have in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the survival of democracy has been tested many times before and it has prevailed. But, never in its history has it come up against the power and machinations that threatens it in this day and age. For, today, we are dealing with an evil that knows no bounds, respects no word, glibly breaks its commitments and heaps abusive and distorted condemnations upon peoples who seek peace and freedom and the right to choose their own way of life.

We are now engaged in the struggle of how to meet this challenge. There is much that we have done but there is so much more that must be done. Mr. Speaker, every man, woman, and child in this land of ours is a party to this struggle. Without some kind of sacrifice on the part of all, we cannot hope to remain free.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members of the House and to the American public a very pointed article clipped from today's Washington (D. C.) Daily News and I quote the note that headed the report:

Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, has been traveling the past few weeks in Russia and the European satellite countries. He returns to home base in the midst of the Near East crisis. Here he writes of America's long-range struggle against Communism dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Stone's article with my remarks:

A WARNING TO SOFT-LIVING AMERICANS: SOVIETS WILL STOMP US IF WE DON'T BUCKLE DOWN

(By Walter Stone)

If we don't get off our big fat comforts, we are going to be stomped into the ground.

Events in Iraq and Lebanon illuminate the struggle in which the West has taken a stand to halt the spread of gansterism and world power gained by assassination and subversion.

Whatever happens in the Near East will not end the struggle. It will continue through the lifetime of all who read this—since Americans and others who have known freedom will not supinely yield to slavery.

To prepare ourselves for the great test of strength we cannot avoid, we must rid our-

selves of two myths now prevalent in America.

MYTH NO. 1

One is the myth of "peaceful coexistence." We must try, of course, to coexist with the Russians. They are a powerful nation of 200 million, occupying a sixth of the earth's habitable area.

But we have to get over the wishful thought that they are going to be easier to live with, no matter whether the top ruler is Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Khrushchev or whoever.

Peaceful coexistence, in the sense we understand it, implies a trust in which we might relax and pursue our pleasures. The Communist system, which pervades everything Russian, rules that out. For the primary aim of communism—at once a religion and a political and economic philosophy—is frankly world dominion and complete mastery over the lives and minds of men.

The other myth we must get rid of is that we can survive against this Soviet plot without toil and sacrifice. We'd better stop dreaming of an easy future with "the bees and the cigarette trees and the soda water fountains, and the lemonade springs where the bluebird sings, in the big rock candy mountains."

It is easy for an American newspaperman, after traveling in the Soviet Union, to stress the hard life and low living standards of the people. But that would give a dangerously false impression of their dynamic energy, their state of mind and their power to produce in competition against us.

Living standard comparisons never are printed in Russia and wouldn't be believed if they were.

TRUE BUT—

It is true that the American steelworker can buy a good pair of shoes on the wages of 4 hours' work, while the Russian steelworker must toil 60 hours to buy an inferior pair. But neither can wear more than one pair at a time and the Russian thinks he's doing all right when he doesn't have to go barefooted.

The average Russian's diet of bread and potato soup, borscht with cabbage, and an occasional chunk of meat would not satisfy an American accustomed to culinary variety and abundance. But what the Russian eats suits his taste and provides him with the calories he needs to maintain health and vigor. He never tasted a steak and doesn't know what he is missing.

In the city he may live in one room with his family, and share the kitchen and bath with other families. If he lives in the country he may have no indoor plumbing at all—probably never has seen such luxury.

Similar Spartan standards did not diminish the survival power of American pioneers. Only half a century ago, they lived in one-room, sod houses with dirt floors and ate what they could grub from barren plains.

These privations toughened our pioneers who had one advantage in common with the average Russian of today. They didn't know they were underprivileged.

OPTIMISTS

They worked hard and had faith in the future. Though the Russian is an automaton, he feels he is part of a collective society, and that next year, and the next, things will be better.

"Come back 3 years from now," he tells you, "and see how much we have done."

He does not compare his lot with American or other western standards of which he knows nothing. His comparison is with what he had under the czars or more likely, during the earlier days of the revolution.

FEWER PATCHES

A westerner coming into Moscow may be impressed by the absence of Brooks Bros. suits and modish dresses. He had better be impressed by the absence of patched clothes, so prevalent only a few years ago.

And he had better be impressed less by the continuing shabbiness of the people than by the hustle and purposefulness of their stride—a people on the make and on the go, a people hurrying to their date with destiny.

They are at the command of cynical, power-hungry conspirators who control their government and can channel their energies into guns instead of more food and better clothing.

If we don't go to work fast, we'll get tromped down.

For "the stairway of time ever echoes with the wooden shoe going up and the polished boot coming down."

Buren Presidential Disability Proposal Receives Editorial Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I presented a plan conceived by retired Attorney Frank Buren, of Long Beach, Calif., to solve the presidential disability riddle and remold the office of the vice presidency to fit modern needs and conditions. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 651 which seeks to adopt the proposal by an amendment to the Constitution. The plan has recently received editorial praise from both the Long Beach Independent and Press-Telegram newspapers.

The Independent editorial reads as follows:

DISABILITY PLAN REMOLDS VICE PRESIDENT ROLE

Frank Buren, retired Long Beach attorney, earned a full page in the finely printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this month with a new and unique plan to resolve the presidential disability riddle.

Buren's essay was introduced to the RECORD by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER who noted that the attorney's solution not only handles the disability problem, but recasts the office of the vice presidency into a more modern mold, better suited to the exigencies of our time.

His plan, in the form of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, provides for relieving the Vice President of his duty as President of the Senate and for making him an active Assistant President. As such he would have the power and duty to perform any of the official acts of the President when so authorized and directed by the President.

Under the Buren plan thousands of signings of bills, now the constitutional duty of the President, could be done by the Assistant President. Numerous other purely ministerial and routine duties would be performed by the Assistant President, thus giving the President more time to consider and act upon important matters of state.

Attorney Buren emphasizes that his amendment also expels all doubt as to what the Vice President should do in case of the inability of the President, by authorizing him to assume the duties of the office as Acting President until the President returns to duty.

A section of the Buren amendment also provides for Presidential appointment of a successor in the event of the death or removal from office of a Vice President.

Buren regards this replacement feature important because there have been as many Vice Presidents as Presidents who have died in office—seven of each.

The Buren plan has a long way to go. Congressional approval and States' ratification of constitutional amendments may take anywhere from 5 or 6 months to 2 or 3 years.

The author is to be commended, however, for a constructive piece of work which he is following step by step along the long road, and for one which already has received some congressional attention.

The Press-Telegram editorial stated the following:

THE BUREN PROPOSAL

Long Beach made the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Tuesday through the offices of Congressman CRAIG HOSMER and the words of retired Long Beach Attorney Frank Buren.

The entry, termed "interesting and unique" by HOSMER, was an outline of Buren's proposed constitutional amendment to provide a new scope of duty for the Vice President including his accession to the post of acting president in case of Presidential disability.

Buren's amendment would relieve the Vice President of Senate duties and make him an active Assistant President, "with the power and duty to perform any of the official acts of the President, when so authorized and directed by the President."

This would relieve the President of his current constitutional chore of signing personally all bills, resolutions, orders, and votes of the Congress.

A disabled President could "authorize and direct" his Vice President to take over. If the President lay unconscious, his Vice President could take over on his own without the currently-existing fear of being charged with power grabbing.

Then, with recovery, the President could resume his role as Chief Executive. A Vice President could not cross his President, Buren explains, because it would be political suicide. Since the Vice President's whole power lies in being authorized and directed by the President, the President could reduce an erring assistant to an officer in name only, with no official duties.

We'll be hearing much more about Buren's proposal, just touched upon here, for he plans to work toward presenting a formal resolution in Congress.

Then it will be up to experts to determine its value. Meanwhile, Attorney Buren deserves congratulations for his enterprise in advancing a constructive idea toward solution of a puzzle as old as our Government.

Another Attack at the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the following belated editorial in today's New York Times, entitled "Another Attack at the Court," reflects a sober afterthought on H. R. 3. The editorial properly attacks the vindictiveness of this legislation and its retroactive effect on settled existing law in many areas.

I personally believe it will strike down the Natural Gas Act and expose millions of American consumers to ruthless manipulations of natural gas pricing.

The editorial is as follows:

ANOTHER CRACK AT THE COURT

In trying to protect alleged States' rights from Supreme Court decisions based on the doctrine of Federal preemption, the House of Representatives has passed as weird a piece of legislation as could be imagined—and one that calls for unceremonious burial.

This measure would prevent Federal laws from superseding State laws on the same subject unless the Federal statute specifically said so, or unless there was an absolutely irreconcilable conflict between the two. While doubtless inspired by the Nelson case of 1956, in which the high court invalidated a Pennsylvania sedition statute under the preemption doctrine, the bill that went through the House with the usual combination of conservative Republican and southern Democratic support is so broadly worded that—if it means anything at all—it would go far beyond the Nelson case and throw the whole area of Federal-State relationships into indescribable confusion.

The "one certain effect of this legislation"—in the words of so moderate a Republican as Representative KENNETH B. KEATING of New York—"is that it will unsettle a large body of existing law in many vital areas, such as interstate commerce, immigration and naturalization, agriculture and labor relations." Retroactive as it is, it would bring untold chaos into railroad regulation and it could "resurrect long-dormant State statutes * * * enacted in the horse-and-buggy age" relating to a tremendous variety of human activity.

What the House was doing by passing this vindictive bill was to take a crack at the Supreme Court because the latter has handed down a number of decisions of which certain people disapprove, particularly in the field of civil liberties. The measure endorsed by the House is bad in purpose and worse in content, and is no credit to the 241 members who, astonishing as it may seem, voted for it.

Eliminating an Inequity in the Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to eliminate from the Civil Service Retirement Act the requirement that an unmarried employee or Member of Congress must be in good health in order to elect to provide a survivor annuity to persons with an insurable interest.

Under the present law, a married person is not required to pass a medical examination in order to name a survivor as the beneficiary of his civil-service annuity. But an unmarried person must be found by the Commission to be in good health in order to exercise that privilege. My proposal would eliminate the requirement of good health for unmarried civil servants, thus bringing it in line with the standards for married civil-service workers.

The inequity in the law was brought to my attention by a constituent who was a Post Office clerk with 44 years Government service. He complained that because of a heart attack and his unmarried status, he would be prevented from naming his sister as his annuitant. He asked for the correction of what he termed the great injustice of the present law.

Mr. Speaker, the present statute, requiring good health for unmarried civil servants and Members of Congress, but not for those married, in naming annuitants, is grossly unfair and discriminatory. There is no logical reason for withholding this privilege from anyone simply because, through the whims of fate, he happens not to have been married.

In a Nation founded on the principle of universal equality, we cannot allow one standard for marrieds and another for unmarrieds. It is high time we put an end to this discrimination against the honorable states of spinsterhood and bachelorhood. We can do that, simply and swiftly in this case, by eliminating the requirement of good health for unmarried civil-service workers and Members of Congress who wish to name an annuitant.

I am sure this measure will have the backing of all fairminded people, and most particularly and directly, those bachelors now serving in both bodies.

A Revolution of Small-Business Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Wallace R. Fingal, of the Washington editorial office of Printers' Ink, points out in Printers' Ink for July 11, 1958, that the small-business revolution against the administration may turn out to be more significant than the hint of scandal that has reached into the White House. Under a consent previously granted, I include Mr. Fingal's entire remarks:

The small-business revolution against the administration may turn out to be more significant than the hint of scandal that has reached into the White House. How many voters Sherman Adams' self-confessed imprudence will affect is by no means certain as yet, but small-business men are sure to be changing their minds at the ballot box this fall.

The administration has never been notably a friend in deed to small business, but this year, many feel, it has consistently and repeatedly betrayed them. A leading spokesman representing several national trade groups—and a lifelong Republican who is normally extremely cautious in expression—says: "In everything I have tried to do (in efforts to protect small business) I have been kicked in the face."

Another disillusioned trade-group counsel—also a lifelong Republican, who has served as aid to two Republican Senators—states that he will advise the membership of his 90 percent small-business national organization that if they vote for this administration in the coming elections they will be voting to commit business suicide.

Increased postal rates are the hardest blow the administration has dealt small business this year. In congressional rate hearings, many warnings were presented about the possible effects on small publishers and small retail advertisers. Not only were these warnings ignored by the administration, but Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield stated in an interview with a magazine that the rate-increase opponents were only a few large magazines.

The dire outlook for smaller magazines and mail advertisers is coming true, as the effective date of the rate increases approaches. At least one mail advertiser has begun preparations for closing down his business.

Not so well known is the administration's effort to scuttle a small-business tax-relief bill. The story has leaked out thus far only to a handful of observers. The tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee finally directed its staff to write the version of the bill that is to be reported. The committee was scheduled to meet again this week, with the expectation that the bill would be ready by then.

The tax-relief report is thus about 4 weeks late. The committee began work on the bill at the beginning of June, and planned to report it by June 12. The reason for the delay is that the committee was constantly interrupted by a variety of administration efforts to take the meat out of the measure, and even to kill it altogether. The specific undercutting method was an attempt to substitute one or all of the administration proposals which have been termed meaningless by small-business spokesmen.

The key proposal for small business will probably be watered down in the Ways and Means Committee bill. Small-business forces have been trying to put across a measure that would free part of any business' income from Federal taxes, in order to allow those earnings to be reinvested in the business.

Reinvestment must take the form of greater business expenditure, and must be made in the same year as the tax exemption. Proponents of the bill assert that the provision will give a dynamic lift to the economy.

Small Boat Safety

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11078) to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to the language of the committee amendment on line 15, which says "become effective until 60 days thereafter." I propose to add language which will say when the entire amendment is read: *"Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate when Congress is in session, and shall not become

effective if disapproved by a resolution adopted by either branch of Congress within 90 days thereafter."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the language of the committee amendment does not, in the first place, provide ample time for the Congress to express disapproval of regulations that may be submitted in connection with this bill.

In the next place, the type of action to be taken by the Congress to disapprove such rules and regulations is not spelled out. If my language is adopted, there will be a clear responsibility of the Congress if it does not favor the proposed rules and regulations to so show its disapproval by a resolution adopted for one branch or the other of the Congress within 90 days.

Obviously 60 days is insufficient time to insure adequate time for Congress to act. My amendment will give time enough to study whatever is submitted in proposed rules and regulations, to analyze and determine what the effect would be upon those who are under the jurisdiction of small-boat legislation.

Those in the coastal areas recall very well the distressing experiences we have had under Public Law 519. For months we battled regulations that were excessive and exacting in scope. The first regulations proposed by the Coast Guard would have made it virtually impossible for boat operators in the coastal areas to carry on normal operations. Those regulations literally increased their costs of operation to the point and placed such requirements on them that it would have been economic suicide for fishing and pleasure craft operators to try to stay in business. It took the Congress a long time and a great deal of effort to secure partial correction of the regulations that were issued under Public Law 519. Even though the worst regulations were modified or eliminated, there is widespread hardship as the result of this legislation.

If my language is adopted, the Congress will have an orderly way of insuring that unreasonable rules and regulations are not summarily imposed by the administrator of this act.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 19, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)
JULY 19, 1958.

A simple bill, H. R. 3, "To establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws," provoked one of the year's longest, most controversial debates. The bill's one single sentence is: "No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

This brief statement to many Members represents a rephrasing of the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This act is intended to prevent Federal preemption of legislative fields from the States wherein there is concurrent jurisdiction. Some fields are solely Federal—such as foreign affairs, war, coinage, postal, etc. In others, there is concurrent jurisdiction, both Federal and State, such as tax, transportation, health, sedition, and many others.

The Supreme Court in the Nelson case ruled that the Smith Act, a Federal law on sedition, preempted the field from State law, that of Pennsylvania, simply because the Federal Government had a law in this field. When the Smith Act was passed, Congress did not intend to preempt this field, as the Supreme Court ruled. In the hue and cry of debate, the opponents of the act proclaimed mainly their concern over: (1) the clash of Federal and State law that would be provoked; and (2) the "retroactive" nature, wherein earlier Federal laws would be upset in favor of State jurisdiction. To the first argument, proponents answered that the language of the bill by its nature prevented confusion and would force evaluation and expression of jurisdiction; and, to the second, that no retroactivity would follow, since this was a yardstick for the Court to use in the future.

In 3 days' debate I heard no arguments damaging the good sense of the bill's objectives. In fact, I felt that any retroactive effect of this bill would be most healthy. The arguments against, to me, were powerful arguments for. The AFL–CIO was opposed to this bill. The votes were quite significant. On the earlier rule to take up the bill for consideration, of the 114 against, 105 were Democrat, 9 Republican. On final passage (241 to 155) of the 155 Members voting against, 132 were Democrats and 23 Republicans.

Educational TV legislation with Federal grants to States, is before the Interstate Commerce Committee for public hearings. Testimony established the peculiar advantage of TV teaching, each student having the illusion the teacher is talking directly to him, possibly improving students' concentration. One unanswered question for me is this, Should we start new spending programs when we're running up a heavy Federal deficit?

The Mideast situation is recognized by all as in a most dangerous and precarious balance. The United States was obliged to make good the earlier Mideast resolution offering help to those seeking it ,when Lebanon appealed to us for help. Force and firmness are understood by Russia. This we know. Communist weapons of infiltration, subversion, and duplicity, are not United States weapons. True, we chance outright war with Russia. Unanswered questions, however, include: (1) Will Russia be deterred and delayed in Mideast advances through subversion by our action? (2) How dangerous is the quickened choosing of sides—the Nasser United Arab Republic backed by Russia, against Lebanon and Jordan backed by the United States and Britain? (3) How will the many neutrals line up? (4) Is Arab nationalism too strong a force to be contained in view of the artificial boundaries of many of the Mideast nations? (5) Will a U. N. majority support us?

This is sure. We need our best effort, our clearest thinking, our combined devout prayers for guidance. It's time the nations of the world recognize the terrible menace of worldwide communism masterminded by the Kremlin, as have we. If the United States fails in the role of leadership for peace and freedom, through economic collapse or conquest, the world's people would all become Communist slaves.

Testimonial Dinner Honoring Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire, June 16, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 I had the pleasure of participating in a testimonial banquet given for our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW. It was a standing-room-only affair and one of the most heartening evenings I have spent in a long time. Some 500 people had come to express their appreciation of Mr. MERROW's wonderful service to them through the years, and to wish him well. May I say, as an aside, that they were not all Republicans. I had the privilege and pleasure of giving the group gathered there a glimpse of what we here in the Congress think of CHESTER MERROW, especially those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs which he has served faithfully since 1945.

Miss Christine Perry, chairman of the Merrow for Congress Committee, gave a beautiful address which expressed so well the sense of those present. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Miss Perry's statement and my own talk in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with excerpts from an article appearing in Foster's Daily Democrat for June 17, 1958:

REMARKS BY MISS CHRISTINE PERRY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING CHESTER E. MERROW, June 16, 1958

CHESTER E. MERROW, your life is the perfect denial of the old saying that a man cannot lift himself by his own bootstraps.

Born by the light of a kerosene lamp in your beloved town of Ossipee, by your own efforts you drove yourself through school and college.

Entering public life as a member of our New Hampshire general court, you quickly proved your ability in debate on the floor of the House and won wide respect and many friends.

When the time came for you to run for Congress, your lack of money and modest means were made up tenfold by a far more valuable asset—your sterling worth and your sincere desire to help your fellow citizens.

Although you have walked with kings you have never lost the common touch. You have never forgotten how much sweat there is in a $10 bill, nor what it means to walk the cold roads in threadbare clothing.

Today you strive, through travel, conference, and hearings to establish an international understanding and means of living together, so that the world we live in and all that we hold dear will not be wiped out overnight by the third and last world war.

You have been instrumental in deepening Portsmouth harbor, aided our towns and cities from the dangers of flood, speeded our mail communications and gone beyond the normal call of duty to make sure that our veterans received their hard bought benefits. You have always had a ready and attentive ear for every one of your constituents.

CHESTER MERROW, you are the living example of the American tradition that no matter what a man's origin, if he but prove himself worthy, his fellow citizens will recognize his strength and place him in position to aid in the counseling of our Nation's destiny.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING CHESTER E. MERROW, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, NEW HAMPSHIRE

(Talk by Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, Ohio, 22d District, Wentworth on the Sea, New Castle, N. H., June 16, 1958)

Friends, you cannot know what deep pleasure you have given me by your kind invitation to take part in this testimonial dinner tendered my colleague, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW. We have been together in the Congress for many years, and since the death of our greatly beloved comrade, Larry Smith, of Wisconsin, in January, we have sat side by side.

There is a curious bond between the men and women of the Congress—especially among those who are of the same party. We Republicans have many differences of opinion—too many once and again—but the bond is strongly felt by those who come back after some years in other fields. Warm welcome awaits them, and memories dance in the Chamber. Yes; it is a strangely friendly company, merciless in its criticism, seldom given to praise. One earns whatever reputation one builds.

This Representative of yours has built himself an enviable place in the greatest legislative body in the world. When he has spoken on the floor it has been to the point. Intelligently and simply he has presented us with his views. You can read his statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All of them redound to your credit, as well as to his.

I could read you his record—I have it here—and I assure you it is an enviable one. Portsmouth Harbor — Farmington — your shipyards, your industries, are but a few places which are better for his service. All these, while he was giving himself also to special missions to Australia, Pakistan, India, Thailand and Indochina—to Europe, to Central America, and, not least, a fine contribution as 1 of the 2 United States congressional delegates to the 10th General Assembly of the U. N. I know what this last means, for I was a delegate to the 8th Assembly in 1953.

So I say to you with great earnestness, that the value of this man who has served his district, his State and his country, increases with each year you send him back.

Yes; it is good that you take this evening to let him know how truly you recognize his value and honor him. I congratulate you all for your understanding and your wisdom.

My colleague suggested to me that you might be interested if I gave you a few thoughts on that great continent of Africa to which I went 3 years ago. But before I do, I want to give you another picture—about matters nearer home, matters that have to do with your security and mine, and the security of free men and women the world over—for in that picture your Representative in the Congress, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, plays a unique and far-reaching role.

We on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, pride ourselvees that we are first of all Americans, without party. Yes; we Republicans sit on one side of the committee table and the Democrats sit on the other, but in all the 17 years I have sat on that committee, I could count the partisan votes on my fingers.

This year we have had a demonstration of truly American action unlike—and to my mind beyond—any so far known. One of the two members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs participating in this unpartisan action is your Representative; his companion—A. S. J. CARNAHAN, a Democrat from Missouri. The most important bill before our committee this year was the mutual security bill. Probably no bill has ever suffered more from misrepresentation, from half truths, from exaggerations. Certainly no bill was ever in greater need of an honest presentation to the people. Such a presentation these two men made—indeed they are still making it—when invitations reach them.

Only those who have presented serious matters to audiences can have any conception of the amount of preparation that has to be done before a word is spoken. With their charts set up between them they told their audiences the reasons for and the results from this program entered into by our Government. They showed it to be the most far-reaching and effective method of protecting the free world in this all too little understood war that is being waged between those of us who believe in God, who consider the individual of first importance because He is part of the very essense of the infinite, and those who deny His very existence.

No two men ever assumed a more selfless service—not easy—not simple, but infinitely worthwhile. I am glad of this opportunity to say once again: Thank you, CHESTER MERROW, for the fine contribution you have made and are making.

[From the Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N. H., June 17, 1958]

FRIENDS HONOR CONGRESSMAN MERROW WITH TESTIMONIAL BANQUET—MRS. BOLTON, OHIO REPRESENTATIVE, PRAISES WORK OF MERROW IN CONGRESS—ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESSMAN REVIEWED IN TALK BY MISS CHRISTINE PERRY

WENTWORTH-BY-THE-SEA.— Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, said here last night that Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW and S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, succeeded in getting the facts of the mutual-security program to the people in their recent tour of the United States.

The woman Congressman who serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee with Merrow, said the program is "one of the most misunderstood" in the country. It provides 600,000 jobs in the United States, she explained.

Eighty percent of the money in the mutual-security program is spent here at home, she said.

Mrs. BOLTON, who has served in Congress since 1940, spoke to a capacity audience at an appreciation dinner for MERROW at this resort hotel. The affair was sponsored by Strafford and Rockingham County friends of Congressman MERROW. She commended MERROW and CARNAHAN for their recent cross-country tour in bringing the facts of the program to the country.

She described the mutual-security program as a death flight, with godless communism in aiding underprivileged sections of the world. Mrs. BOLTON said Americans must cease being "an arrogant lot" and come to understand other people.

"Our schools must teach languages—including Russian," she said. "The State Department is struggling to put languages back into our public schools."

Mrs. BOLTON spoke of her recent tour of Africa, the continent that God has held in reserve. We need the confidence and friendship of its peoples, said the Congresswoman, and you can't buy that. She spoke of the continent's bauxite, industrial diamonds, and iron which our industry and our economy must have.

"Africa has everything we need," she concluded.

TRIBUTE TO MERROW

Hugo Lindahl, of Manchester, presented Congressman MERROW with a citation for his work in behalf of the country and the First Congressional District. He described MERROW as the living example of American tradition.

Others paying tribute to MERROW included James Smith, toastmaster of the evening; Andrew Christie, an old friend and longtime MERROW supporter; Andrew Jarvis, the mayor of Portsmouth; Christine Perry, of Somersworth, whose enumeration of MERROW's accomplishments on behalf of the First Congressional District appear in an adjoining column; Samuel B. Blair, chairman of the dinner committee; Mrs. Norma Studley Currier, Rochester, national committeewoman; and State Senator Paul Karkavelas, who as acting mayor of Dover, brought the good wishes of our great, beautiful, and industrial city.

MERROW told the gathering that he was deeply moved by the confidence expressed here tonight and expressed great satisfaction with being able to carry on his work.

He said that he and CARNAHAN are convinced that the American people are being missold on the intent of the mutual security program. He added that they will speak in Concord July 7, and probably in other New Hampshire communities.

The Congressman said, "I will dedicate my efforts to trying to see if we can build a peace, for another war—a nuclear war—would be devastating."

Seated at the head table were: Mr. and Mrs. Samuel B. Blair, of Dover; Rev. and Mrs. Robert Dunn, of Portsmouth; Rev. David, of the Franciscan Order at Rye; Mayor and Mrs. Andrew Jarvis, of Portsmouth; Mr. and Mrs. James Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Hugo Lindahl, of Manchester; National Committeewoman Mrs. Norma Studley Currier, of Rochester; State Chairman William Treat, of Hampton; Congressman and Mrs. Merrow, Father Thomas Duffy, Portsmouth, and Miss Christine Perry.

Among those attending the dinner were several prominent labor leaders in the local area.

Speaking for the committee that sponsored the testimonial to Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW last evening, Miss Christine Perry, of Somersworth, reviewed some of the accomplishments of the New Hampshire Congressman. In particular she stressed some of his work for Strafford and Rockingham Counties during the past several years.

She spoke as follows:

CHESTER E. MERROW, your life is the perfect denial of the old saying that a man cannot lift himself by his own bootstraps.

Born by the light of a kerosene lamp in your beloved town of Ossipee, by your own efforts you drove yourself through school and college.

Entering public life as a member of our New Hampshire general court you quickly proved your ability in debate on the floor of the house and won wide respect and many friends.

When the time came for you to run for Congress, your lack of money and modest means were made up 10 fold by a far more valuable asset, your sterling worth and your sincere desire to help your fellow citizens.

Although you have walked with kings you have never lost the common touch. You have never forgotten how much sweat there is in a $10 bill, nor what it means to walk the cold roads in threadbare clothing.

World Peace Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the present crisis in the Middle East gives renewed and grave emphasis to the need for an effective method of settling international disputes. We know that this method will not come quickly or easily. There is no gimmick, no magic formula. World peace will only be attained through world law. We will only attain world law by wanting to attain it.

Now is the time for more attention to be paid to the recently published book World Peace Through World Law, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. Under permission previously granted, I include hereafter an editorial from the Washington Post for July 9, 1958, entitled "Bid for a World Order":

BID FOR A WORLD ORDER

Amid the fulminations of international politics, it is refreshing to find two eminent lawyers solemnly publishing a detailed plan for reorganization of the United Nations and establishment of legislative, judicial, and military organs that would substitute world law for nuclear force. Statesmen and citizens alike will perhaps look upon the plan as a wishful dream. One reads it with a sense of remoteness from the current scene. Yet the President commented on it at his news conference the other day, and indeed its reminder of the world's headlong rush toward mass suicide affords a tie to realities most basic than any maneuver in the cold war.

The book entitled "World Peace Through World Law" is the work of Grenville Clark, an eminent New York lawyer and student of international organization, and Louis B. Sohn, who teaches United Nations law and problems in the development of world order at Harvard University. What they contemplate is a strengthened U. N., with a more representative General Assembly in which the largest nations would have 30 representatives and the smallest nations 1. This Assembly would retain its broad powers to make nonbinding recommendations on any subject and in addition would be given legislative powers "strictly limited to matters directly related to the maintenance of peace."

The Assembly would elect an Executive Council of 17 members to take the place of the present Security Council. The 4 largest powers—the United States, India, China, and the U. S. S. R., would have a representative on the new council at all times, 4 other seats would rotate among 8 medium-sized powers, and the others would go to smaller nations. The council would be the executive arm of the revised U. N. in carrying out total disarmament and enforcing peace. It would be responsible for its actions to the Assembly.

Elaborate plans have also been worked out for a world police force, for a judicial and conciliation system and a World Development Authority. Total disarmament would be achieved in stages with worldwide inspection to make certain that all countries were complying. A bill of rights would reserve to existing nations all powers not granted to the U. N. and guarantee basic individual rights againts encroachment by the U. N. The entire U. N. Charter would be enforceabel through the judicial system to be created for that purpose. The proposed new Charter would come into effect when ratified by five-sixths of the world's nations, including every country with more than 40 million people.

We have not observed any rush to the Clark-Sohn standard. But many pressures are driving mankind toward a keener realization that some form of international control to keep the peace is imperative. If nuclear war should break out, the clamor for world law and a world policeman are likely to be irresistible. The efforts of two thoughtful lawyers to pilot this movement deserve far more attention than they have received to date.

Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered before the Americans for Democratic Action Educational Conference recently, in Cleveland, Ohio, by Alfred J. Holtz, professor of political science at Western Reserve University. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the RECORD because, while it is not necessarily an accurate reflection of either my views or those of ADA, it does represent an important independent judgment on disarmament.

The address follows:

DISARMAMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Alfred J. Hotz, department of political Science, Western Reserve University)

The vital issue of disarmament has, frequently, been discussed as a problem apart from, rather than as a part of, the crucial political and military issues that deeply separate the Soviet Empire and the Western World. It will be my hopeful purpose to place these political and military problems into proper perspective, or at least in sharper focus.

The fundamental political question that divides East and West arises from two diametrically opposite concepts of political world order—the Soviet concept of a monistic, highly centralized, coercive Soviet Empire versus the western concept of a pluralistic, decentralized, cooperative union of sovereign states. Since major political objectives are never achieved merely by political means, even when augmented by economic, psychological, and ideological means, the vital element of military power is invariably applied, either directly or indirectly. Briefly stated, military power is the ultimate arbiter in the achievement of national objectives, and thereby has a positive connotation.

The vital military problem, that divides the Soviet Empire from the American coalition, revolves about the existing, and future, military balance of power, both global and local. Parenthetically, the military balance is never a perfect equilibrium as between the two main protagonists because of variant geographic positions, changing military technology, and vacillating, or determined, political will. In general, however, each side attempts to establish a military balance that is generously in its favor, if not superior to that of the other side.

Therefore, in oversimplified form, American military objectives have been twofold: (1) a positive purpose to support our modest political objectives in the international arena; (2) a negative purpose to deny the Soviet Union a military superiority to threaten the military security not only of the United States proper, but as well the national security of other vital strategic areas that constitute the overall global balance of power.

Soviet military objectives are likewise twofold: (1) the negative purpose, to reduce American military power, thereby to protect Soviet military security; and (2) the positive purpose to support what appears, at least in western minds, to be the expansion of the Soviet monistic, highly centralized, coercive Empire. While the Kremlin, whether under Stalin or Khrushchev, would probably prefer to achieve their political objectives by less than open military means, it is clear that Soviet leadership is irrevocably committed to the application of military pressure, whether open or veiled, against the West. Soviet leadership knows and understands the vital component of military power—after all, the Kremlin uses it constantly against its own Russian people.

What compounds the American military posture are two major weaknesses: (1) our distant geographic position from the major strategic areas of the world, as contrasted to Soviet geographic propinquity to those selfsame regions; and (2) the military weakness and political paralysis, or at least lack of political will, of some of the West European powers that formerly had preserved, in some degree, at least, the prewar balance of power.

Thus, the military requirements of the two major antagonists, whether necessary defensively to protect national security or offensively to protect national political objectives, very considerably. Indeed, due to a wide divergence in political will the past and present military balance of power has changed, if not fluctuated, considerably. Therefore, disarmament proposals and negotiations have, heretofore, in general been one-sided, and, thereby, unsuccessful.

No serious, and reasonable, disarmament programs can be divorced from the existing military-and-political balance of power. At the risk of oversimplification, may I illustrate this thesis by dividing the post-War II period into three main periods, with the fourth military balance presently emerging, and by evaluating the American disarmament proposals and Soviet counterproposals within the changing context of the prevailing balance of power.

Period I encompassed the years 1945–50 (the Korean war). In theory, the military balance appeared to be a tolerable equilibrium between the Soviet conventional forces and the western (American) demobilized conventional forces, buttressed by the American monopoly of the A-bomb, a supposed massive deterrent. Parenthetically, Secretary Dulles may have coined the phrase "massive retaliation," but, in reality, the massive nuclear deterrent has been American military policy vis-a-vis Soviet possible aggression since 1945.

However, any military policy, whether maximal or minimal, depends primarily on whether or not it is "credible." In brief, it depends upon whether the nation-state having such a military component is politically prepared to use it as an instrument of national policy. But more important still, its effectiveness depends on whether or not the enemy believes it to be "credible"; that is, fears the employment of that military weapon, or weapons system, and, therefore, hesitates to risk its own military power to test, or to break, the prevailing military balance.

Thus, period I ended when the Soviets tested in Korea not merely the American military posture, but as well our political

will to employ military power in defense of our national interests. But the American atomic deterrent was found wanting at the time of the Korean war. Incidentally, I approved the devision of a limited war with limited objectives to redress the local North Pacific balance of power. Parenthetically, it should be clear that our major objective in defending South Korea was to defend Japan as a bastion of the western defense system.

Period II, which ran approximately from the Korean war to the summit conference in Geneva (1955) established a different military balance than the earlier period. The American military posture was strengthened by the accumulated increase in conventional troops and arms, occasioned by the Korean conflict. Furthermore, it was augmented by the development of more destructive nuclear weapons, including the H-bomb, with concomitant strengthening of our delivery system, both through development of the Strategic Air Command and the envelopment of the Soviet Empire by a wide-flung series of airbases.

Meantime, the Soviet Empire increased its military striking power both within the Soviet Union and through the acquisition of Communist China's conventional forces. Major emphasis, during period II, was given to the increase in weight and destructiveness of Soviet firepower—nuclear weapons. Soviet atomic and hydrogen bomb capability served as a counterweight to the American ever-expanding nuclear component.

Thus, while the United States still held, during this period, a relatively overall superior military advantage, we were restrained from employing same except as a defensive warning agaisnt Communist encroachments.

The military stalemate was, as yet, not a "balance of terror," as Winston Churchill described it, primarily because the United States bastion itself was relatively safe from direct Soviet military assault. Therefore, the Soviet Union, during period III, covering roughly from the Geneva Conference (1955) to the present time, was determined to place the United States proper under direct military threat.

Consequently, major attention was directed to the development of a new, faster, and more flexible delivery system—the IRBM and the ICBM—in brief, missiles. The Soviet Union, primarily, as the result of greater political will, has temporarily gained an advantage, but how decisive, in military terms, is questionable, or at least debatable. Therefore, I would be prompted to state that while the military balance of power is no longer favorable, in purely military terms, as it was in the previous periods, it is certainly not unfavorable, as yet to the United States, nor the West. In brief, there is a more tolerable military balance for the Soviet Union, as we enter the fourth postwar period, than at any time heretofore.

This new military balance, presently emerging, will in all likelihood be the most precarious ever in history largely for three reasons. First, the newest race in weapons technology—missiles—with all the complex concomitants, including electronic guidance systems and dispersal of launching platforms, or bases, will take some years to effectuate, and then possibly stabilize. Second, the unknown factor of outer space for military purposes, both offensive and defensive, will add a new and incalculable dimension to the future military balance of power. Third, the flexibility and unpredictability of the post-Stalin leadership of the Kremlin provides a new test of American prudence, coupled with imagination.

Now, side-by-side with this constant armaments race, there has evolved a series of disarmament proposals by both sides. Stripped of all verbal paraphernalia, the military objective of the various American disarmament proposals was designed to weaken Soviet striking power, whether conventional or nuclear. The political objective that undergirded our proposals was to establish an "open society" within the Soviet closed-totalitarian state, thereby, in turn, achieving two specific objectives: (1) to grant the West sufficient warning against "surprise attack"—a sort of "clear and present danger signal"; and (2) to create, if possible, a more rational Soviet political order less given to a pathological hatred of the West.

The Baruch plan, the various inspection programs presented before the U. N. Disarmament Commission, including President Eisenhower's "open skies" plan, all had the above objectives, laudable from our standpoint, but quite, obviously, unacceptable to the Soviet Union. For had the Kremlin accepted any one of the above proposals, the prevailing military balance would have shifted perceptibly even more in our favor.

Equally, and more obviously, all of the Soviet counterproposals for disarmament were designed to militarily disarm primarily the West, and particularly the United States. Thus, their demands to ban the A-bomb was calculated to remove the major military counterweight to Soviet overwhelming preponderance in conventional forces. Soviet constant demand for American withdrawal from our forward bases in the NATO countries, including West Germany, has the selfsame military objective.

Meantime, Soviet outcries against the horrors of nuclear war had a political objective of rising importance—i. e., an appeal to Western pacifism and neutralism. Thus, even American public opinion, or at least certain sectors thereof, oscillate between apathy, on the one hand, and agony, on the other, when it comes to dissecting and debating the rough-tough military questions in this nuclear age. Parenthetically, on this question, I share the opinion expressed by Walter Lippmann (1915): "We shall end war by dealing effectively with our problems, not by reiterating that war is horrible."

We shall not deal effectively with our military dilemma, nor with reasonable disarmament proposals, until we face squarely the various types of wars, or military pressure, that the United States, its allies, and other regions of the non-Soviet world may be subjected to. Without attempting to delineate the different types of military conflicts, allow me to, at least, list them in separate categories: (1) all-out nuclear war; (2) limited conventional war, supported by tactical weapons (both of these contingencies involving directly the two great powers); (3) "proxy" wars engaged in by satellites to alter a local balance of power situation; (4) international civil war within a nation-state, with one side supported militarily by the Soviet Union, the other by the United States; (5) local wars erupting from the military Nassers, supported directly or indirectly by the Communist bloc with view to subtracting from the Western defense system.

The key problem is the maintenance of both the global and the local balance of power, at best favorable, but at least tolerable, to the defense of American vital interests. Therefore, any present or future disarmament programs must take this military balance into serious consideration. All the problems of cessation of testing, cutoff of production, geographic placement of aerial bases or missile-launching platforms, reductions in armed manpower, redeployment of conventional forces, require careful calculation by both sides, and the establishment of a new military balance that is rational and acceptable to both.

Therefore, I suggest that no substantial disarmament is possible or probable until the following conditions are met:

1. Weapons technology will have to be frozen, or at least stabilized by mutual agreement. Incidentally, our present nuclear tests were necessary, first to test a nuclear antimissile missile, thereby to counter the Soviet IRBM and ICBM; and, second, to test new systems of light, rugged, mobile weapons to fight limited wars and local wars with a minimum of radioactive fallout. Actually, both the Soviets and the United States have sufficiently tested nuclear weapons of optimum destruction. However, it should be recalled that a democracy requires a more sophisticated and flexible weapons system than does a totalitarian aggressor.

2. Delivery systems will have to be balanced to meet variant geographic-military requirements for both sides. With the uncertainty of outer space and its military potential, I do not foresee much immediate progress on this issue. Significantly enough, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States have seen fit, as yet, to bring into negotiations another delivery system—navies.

3. Manpower requirements for both military blocs will undoubtedly require a different formula than presently being discussed within the U. N. Disarmament Commission. Meantime, the deployment of conventional troops by both sides will also demand more careful consideration to achieve a tolerable military balance.

4. Finally, military disarmament cannot be completely divorced from the larger political questions that have, thus far, defied successful agreement, such as Germany. Moreover, until Red China is brought into the disarmament negotiations, and thereby part of a reciprocal agreement, we would be unrealistic to expect genuine and effective disarmament.

In conclusion, may I merely add that disarmament is not a panacea, but merely a possible program for making war more rational, and more calculable. Our major task remains: To achieve, and to maintain a tolerable military balance of power that clearly forewarns the Soviet empire that it cannot achieve its objectives by the employment of military force. Continued negotiations with the Soviet Union are, therefore, necessary in order to airify and clarify this basic political issue.

Albert Einstein, when asked why man's intelligence and ingenuity was capable of inventing the atom, but not of establishing peace, is reported to have answered: "Politics is far more difficult than physics."

H. R. 9521

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I speak about H. R. 9521, the bill which would relieve produce of the soil, that is, fruits and vegetables, from the necessity of bearing a label declaration of added chemical preservative, and I would like to speak primarily of the fact that enactment of this bill would seriously curtail the public health protection that is presently available to the American public.

The Food and Drug Administration and its counterparts in the States have the obligation of determining that food is pure and wholesome. When a chemical preservative is used, it is important

for them to know that it is permitted on food and that it is present in a safe quantity. If these officials know that a preservative is present, then they are able to proceed expeditiously to a determination of the quantity present without wasting valuable time examining stocks of fruits and vegetables that have never been treated with preservatives.

The need for conserving the time of our public health officials is acute. A few years ago a committee of outstanding citizens, representing various walks of life, studied the activities of the Food and Drug Administration and found that it needed a 3- to 4-fold increase in staff in order to perform an adequate job. The situation in most of our States is even more critical. We do not have sufficient manpower working on this important field of public health to allow 1 hour of time to be squandered. Yet this is a bill that would require the squandering of untold hours of time of those who must protect our public health.

Why is it so important to check fruits and vegetables for preservatives? Simply because growers and shippers are beginning to use more and more frequently the extremely toxic chemicals to reduce the losses in transit. The effects of some of the preservatives now permitted will curl your hair. While these substances have been shown to be safe when present only in approved concentration, they can be extremely unsafe if a little too much is used.

Captan is one of the preservatives permitted on a number of crops at this time. Too much Captan depresses growth, causes enlarged livers and kidneys, and actually brings about changes in the testicle of the male.

Another preservative, 2,4–D, which we think of primarily as a preparation to kill weeds in the front lawn, is used widely on citrus and excessive amounts damage the liver.

Another preservative for citrus, diphenyl, damages the kidney if too much is present.

Two preservatives coming into rather widespread use today on melon crops are Maneb and Zineb. They injure the thyroid gland and the liver when present in too large an amount. Other preservatives are nerve poisons and one developed just recently, which goes under the tongue-twisting name of tetraiodoethylene, has been shown to interfere with reproduction of test animals. The latter, I am glad to say, is permitted only on cantaloups and I have full confidence that the food and drug officials assured themselves either that it does not penetrate the skin into the edible portion of the melon or, if it does, that the quantity that reaches the edible portion is insignificant.

These examples illustrate the significance of the problem raised by this bill. I know you have been told that there is no public health problem involved. But that is not so. There is no public health problem so long as these preservatives are used exactly as they are supposed to be used. But people make mistakes and it is an easy thing to put a little too much chemical into a soaking tank at some shipping point, particularly during the rush season when fruits and vegetables are moving through there by the carload. Have you ever been to a vegetable packing shed at the peak of the season when they are operating around the clock to try to keep up with the incoming produce? Why, it is like a nightmare. There is utter confusion all over the place. How can anybody honestly expect that the application of these extreme poisons to our fruits and vegetables will be made under these confused conditions so that they are always applied in the proper manner. It is not reasonable to expect that. So we have got to leave with our food and drug officials all of the tools they need to permit adequate checking of fruits and vegetables bearing poisonous chemical residues.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed bill would be bad legislation, would be a backward step in public health protection, and should not be enacted.

The Timid School Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article entitled "The Timid School Board," by David G. Salten, which appeared in the Nation, July 19, 1958:

THE TIMID SCHOOL BOARD
(By David G. Salten)

LITTLE ROCK.—Judge Harry Lemley's decision on June 20, delaying integration in Little Rock for 2½ years, has placed a roadblock in the continuing progress of our American public schools toward equality of educational opportunity. If this decision is not reversed in the higher courts, an obscure Federal judge who once declared the South "is almost a religion with me," will have accomplished something that neither Orval Faubus and his troops nor mob violence could achieve—the removal of eight Negro students from Central High School.

Both sides in the 3-day hearings which preceded Judge Lemley's decision agreed that the eight Negros had been guiltless of wrongdoing. The fault admittedly was on the side of a small group of white supremacists who displayed their contempt for law and order. Yet it is the Negroes who are being sent away. Apparently we delude ourselves when we consider scapegoat justice a phenomenon of the past. In Little Rock, the sin of a community has been ceremonially attached to a group of eight Negroes—themselves the victims—who will now be driven out to dispel the evil.

The hearings, held June 3–5 on a petition of the school board to delay school integration for two and a half years, resulted in somewhat less than 500 full pages of testimony. As a school superintendent called in as an expert witness on behalf of the NAACP, my chief concern and field of special competence was the practical problem of administration of Central High School. In any American community, however, and especially in Little Rock today, school administration is intimately related to the prevailing political climate of a community and the broad educational policy of its school board. To get a clear picture of the internal situation and school-board planning, it is necessary to view the collapse of its discipline against the background of failure in the disparate but related areas of political action and school-board planning.

The 1957–58 school year was due to commence on September 3. The Little Rock Board of Education had arranged to enroll nine Negro students in the formerly all-white Central High School. On September 2, Governor Faubus announced that "in the interest of preserving the public peace and tranquility," he had called out units of the Arkansas National Guard and had directed that the white schools be placed "off limits" to Negro students and that the Negro school be placed "off limits" to white students.

Subsequent events indicated clearly that Governor Faubus' method of "preserving the public peace and tranquility" was about as inept an example of governmental administration as can be found in recent American history. One is compelled to accept either the fact of Faubus' amazingly poor judgment, or the theory advanced by some local political sages that his action was designed to make him a symbol of resistance to the Supreme Court decision and assure him a rare prize in Arkansas—a third term as Governor.

Only the most naive of Americans can view the Little Rock controversy as a local rather than a national issue. Traditionally, long-term planning for the solution of national problems is a responsibility of the executive branch of the Federal Government. President Eisenhower took firm action on September 24 when he ordered troops of the 101st Airborne Division onto the grounds of Central High. Since then, the President has maintained the position that the responsibility for implementing the decision of the Supreme Court belongs to the courts, and that the Justice Department and the executive branch generally will not intervene unless their help is actively sought by local authorities. Thus, the rate of compliance with the Supreme Court's decision will be determined, in effect, by litigation in district Federal courts. In the present state of affairs, Little Rock School Superintendent Virgil Blossom's plea for Federal legislative assistance is disingenuous because of the attitude of the southern bloc in Congress.

In Little Rock, not one but a whole series of errors has been made—at Federal level, at State level and within the school district. My experience and training qualify me to speak on problems of school administration, not on Government; and it is therefore to the field of my special competence that this article is addressed.

The 3-day hearings before Judge Lemley yielded numerous indications that the Little Rock Board of Education planned poorly for desegregating Central High School, and that some trouble might have been expected even without Governor Faubus' colossal blunder. Either through ignorance or design, the board failed to take into account what has been learned elsewhere about desegregation. Wherever desegregation has taken place smoothly, it has been the result of vigorous school-board leadership on three fronts: (1) Genuine and intense support of democratic ideals, (2) involvement of the moderate and responsible elements of the community, and (3) refusal to be intimidated. The Little Rock school board struck out dismally on all three. From the outset, it adopted a philosophy of despair and defeat. This was dramatically expressed in the board's pretrial petition to Judge Lemley, wherein it was plaintively argued that segregationist were continually implanting in the minds of the citizens that a Federal cour order is a nullity and that nowhere in the South has a plan of inte-

gration been put into effect except where the school officials have supinely acquiesced to the orders of the court.

What few steps the board and the school administration did take to prepare the community for gradual desegregation showed little evidence of a commitment to the democratic ideal of equal educational opportunity. Superintendent Virgil Blossom spoke to some 200 groups of Little Rock citizens. But his plan treated integration as an unavoidable evil which could be minimized by skillful management. The community was assured that school-building plans and zoning regulations would be arranged so as to continue, in fact, a segregated school system which would no longer be maintained in law. There was no attempt to make clear the basic reasoning of the Supreme Court, i. e., that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional because racially separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

In effect, the school authorities told the community that its plan was designed to avoid integration as much as possible. Before Judge Lemley, Superintendent Blossom testified that there had been room for 400 Negro students at Central High, but that he had screened this number down to approximately 60, and then down to 17—of whom all but 9 withdrew. On cross-examination, Mr. Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP's chief counsel, asked, "Wouldn't you agree, Mr. Blossom, that you deliberately kept it as low a figure as you could?" "I've admitted that a dozen times," Mr. Blossom responded.

With an air of scholarship and conservatism characteristic of school superintendents, Mr. Blossom defended his view of what the Supreme Court meant by deliberate speed. During cross-examination, he stated: "Now we're speaking about something that the Negro race cannot help. * * * The history that I recited to you does not reveal the centuries of opportunity, of culture, and all of those opportunities that are wrapped up in that phrase 'socio-economic background.' This generation of Negro children is not responsible for that, but it is a factor in maintaining the educational program and standards."

The board assumed that the Little Rock situation was unique and that little was to be learned from other districts in the South where school integration had taken place smoothly. In his testimony, Wayne Upton, president of the board, seemed unaware that widely divergent reactions to school integration had taken place in Southern communities which were relatively close together Clinton and Oak Ridge, Tenn., are both Southern—in fact, they are only 6 miles apart. Yet the Oak Ridge schools were integrated with relatively little difficulty, while the Clinton schools were scarred by strife and turmoil. The school board of Louisville, Ky., developed a plan of desegregation which worked smoothly, while in the Kentucky towns of Clay and Sturgis, desegregation created violent opposition. Mr. Upton knew little of how integration had been effected in Hoxie, Ark.

Superintendent Blossom stressed, in the course of his testimony, that curriculum planning, which had been previously emphasized at Central High, had been seriously impeded by the admission of the Negro students. Indeed, the single point made most frequently and emphatically by him was that the quality of education had been substantially impaired by the presence of 8 Negroes (1 of the original 9, Minnijean Brown, having been expelled.)

Admittedly, the responsibility for developing and maintaining a program of high educational quality should be the chief concern of any board of education. But it is meaningless to discuss quality in education unless there is a preliminary agreement as to what constitutes a good curriculum. The policy-making responsibilities of a local school board require that the purposes of the curriculum be made explicit so that the board, acting for the people of the community, may have some set of standards against which to evaluate the effectiveness of the school program. There is almost universal acceptance among the thousands of school boards in the Nation that preparation for good citizenship is at, or close to, the top of the imperative needs of youth. It was the duty of the Little Rock Board of Education to establish the goals of Central High School in terms of the knowledge and skills, and more important, the behavior and overt actions, which are essential for good citizenship in a democracy. Only in the light of these goals can educational quality be measured.

One does not have to be a professional educator to recognize that students learn more in school than is to be found in their textbooks. The most valuable addition the school board could have made to the Central High curriculum was to give white and Negro students an opportunity to learn they could go to school together harmoniously. Conversely, the reluctance or inability of the Little Rock Board of Education to carry out the supreme law of the land in the operation of Central High taught the students disrespect for law and order by demonstrating that a hard core of student troublemakers could repeatedly break the law with impunity. This was a disastrously immoral lesson to teach—and one which will take much unlearning.

The truth is that the board simply refused to accept the findings of fact on which the Supreme Court decision of 1954 was based, namely, that racially segregated schools are inherently unequal. White students as well as Negro students need to have the experience of studying together in an integrated cultural environment. The Little Rock board's measure of quality in the up-to-date Horace Mann High School for Negroes included physical facilities, teacher preparation, and instructional supplies. But the essence of a good curriculum is the total school experience to which a student is exposed, including measures of student behavior which will indicate whether desirable changes in attitude and conduct have taken place.

Much of the testimony presented to Judge Lemley dealt with the collapse of discipline at the school. The first witness was Mrs. Elizabeth Huckaby, vice principal in charge of girls, who has been at Central High since 1930. She testified that all through the year she had been apprehensive, not sleeping well, and that her social life had dwindled to nothing. "On weekends," she testified, "I would usually go to the country with my husband and just sit for about a day and usually by noon Sunday I would begin to revive enough to face the next week." On cross-examination by Mr. Marshall, Mrs. Huckaby admitted that she had not had any professional training in discipline. "I am afraid," she said, "my limit has been a workshop course in the summer."

J. O. Powell, vice principal in charge of boys, characterized the discipline as chaotic, but ascribed the turmoil to a lack of prompt, firm, and effective action. Although he was the school board's own witness, Mr. Powell, on cross-examination by Wiley Branton, counsel for the NAACP, gave evidence that was extremely damaging to the board's position. He testified that no disruption had taken place inside the classrooms and continued: "I wish that we, as administrators, had followed the teachers' example in being able to control and maintain order as admirably as those teachers have in the classrooms." He asserted that he had received no specific instructions for coping with the special problems which might confront him as a result of the integration controversy with the exception of a board policy statement on discipline which did not appear until the second semester had already started.

The high point of this witness' testimony was the disclosure that he had recommended suspension of a small group of habitual offenders involved in incidents with Negro students or in acts of vandalism. These recommendations were not adopted by the principal. Mr. Powell expressed his personal conviction that if the group of some 20 to 25 ringleaders and "repeaters" had been removed by juvenile authorities, or by some appropriate police action, the entire disciplinary situation would not have deteriorated.

The school board's next witness, A. F. Lake, Jr. director of the band, testified that Negroes had never been in the band, but that their presence in the future would create a serious problem. "Do you think it would hurt to put Negros in the band in 1961?" Mr. Marshall asked. "That is rather speculative; I don't know," responded Mr. Lake.

The school board called upon O. W. Romine, director of school plant services, as one of its star witnesses. Mr. Romine spent considerable time on the stand describing the conditions which Judge Lemley later found intolerable. Mr. Romine had organized 43 bomb searches during the course of the year. These were very costly because some children persisted, in violation of school regulations, in using locks with unregistered combinations for their lockers. When these unauthorized locks were cut off by the bomb searchers, the students were reimbursed. Pressing home the enormity of this expenditure, board counsel Butler asked, "Do you know how much these locks cost individually?" "They cost us a $1.25 per each," Mr. Romine responded. "So that every time you would have to saw a lock off and replace it, it would cost the school district $1.25?" Butler continued. "That is right," Romine answered. Later, Judge Lemley in the memorandum accompanying his decision, noted that Mr. Romine "saw a bushel basket full of locks and that it cost the board $1.25 apiece to replace them."

Mr. Butler asked Mr. Romine why radiators had been removed from restrooms.

Answer: "These were floor radiators and the fact that students urinated on those radiators when they were hot caused fumes to go through the entire building."

Question: "Did that create quite a stench?"

Answer: "It did."

Question: "Was there any way you could remove that stench effectively?"

Answer: "By leaving the radiators cold it could not happen."

Question: "What did you finally resort to doing?"

Answer: "We removed them."

Question: "Did that leave the restrooms cold?"

Answer: "It left the restroom areas without heat."

On cross-examination, Mr. Branton asked, "You have testified at length about the obliteration, mutilation of public property at Central H. S. and destruction of physical facilities attached to the building. Is there anything as a result of your investigation that would lead you to believe that any of these acts were committed by Negro students enrolled at Central High School?" Mr. Romine responded, "It would be very difficult to tell, but my personal opinion would be that they were not."

W. P. Ivy, a teacher of mathematics for 34 years, testified that he didn't even know about some of the "things that went on up there until I got home and read it in the paper or saw it on television." Mr. Ivy had 1 Negro in each of 2 classes and 2 classes which were all white. He testified that the grades in the 2 mixed classes were not as good as those in the 3 all-white classes. But, of course, he himself had given those grades.

Presumably, too, a teacher of mathematics would know enough about sampling theory and statistical inference to realize that these data, even if achieved on objective tests, proved nothing.

The board's next witness, Miss Shirley Stancil, "guidance counselor for A through C of the 10th graders, and H through P of the 11th graders," testified that this past past year she was "more exhausted at the end of the day," and that standardized achievement tests in science had not been given because the teachers felt that the classes had not covered enough material in science. On cross-examination, Mr. Marshall asked how tests results in other subjects compared with past years. "About the same," Miss Stancil said, "the results were good."

Lawrence Mobley, basketball coach and teacher of physical education, testified that the presence of 1 Negro in a class of 150 students created problems. To avoid trouble, he had eliminated exercises and contests involving bodily contact between students.

The NAACP called two expert witnesses to the stand, Dr. Virgil Rogers, dean of the School of Education of Syracuse University, and the writer. Reduced to essentials, the testimony of the two administrators pointed up the demoralizing effects of permitting a small group of habitual troublemakers to remain in school and continue to flaunt the law with impunity. During a critical and abnormal situation, the customary discipline measures for misconduct should have been carried out more promptly and severely, rather than the reverse. The statements made by several of the board's witnesses suggesting that the staff didn't know how to handle an unusual situation because there simply had not been any discipline problems in Central High prior to the admission of the nine Negroes are, of course, untenable.

The techniques of good discipline need not be detailed here. Obviously, children will continue to use unapproved locks if their disobedience is rewarded by cash payments. Bomb scares in most schools have been brought under control quickly by adding to the length of the schoolday the time lost in searching lockers. Most high school students are occasionally mischievous; some are rebellious; a relative few are vicious. No teacher ought to become a high school principal before he can recognize these various types of misconduct and deal with them appropriately. School regulations are not a substitute for the State penal code. A person who commits a crime in high school should be summoned before the proper court.

Judge Lemley ruled that he was unwilling to substitute his judgment for that of the school administration in deciding what disciplinary steps should have been taken. Yet, since the principal of Central High School was not called to the stand to testify (a most significant fact, in itself), the judge should have given great weight to the testimony of the vice principal in charge of boys. It is most significant that Mr. Powell's recommendations for stricter discipline coincided with the findings of the two expert witnesses called by the NAACP. But Judge Lemley discounted the testimony of all 3, claiming that the 2 northerners were too far from the situation in Little Rock—and that Mr. Powell had been too near.

In his decision, Judge Lemley admitted that under the Supreme Court decision the eight Negroes in Central High have a constitutional right not to be excluded from any of the public schools on account of race. But the learned judge reasoned "that the time for the enjoyment of that right has not yet come." His agreement with the school board that any Negro in Little Rock could get a good high-school education by attending a colored school is a denial of the role of the free public school in making a reality of our American dream.

Milestone in Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, the people of Washington County, Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent here will mark the 100th anniversary of the foundation of their county children's home. This fine institution is notable as the first such home supported by local taxpayers in the Nation. Its contribution to society and to countless children over the past century is an achievement of which any community might be proud. Through the molding of useful citizens, the cost to Washington County has been returned many times over.

The Washington County Children's Home was established 100 years ago by individuals who met a local need with dedicated and determined action—action which proved to be a model for other counties in the Nation. I wish to call the attention of the Congress to an account of the establishment of the home which appeared in the July 19 edition of the Marietta Daily Times of Marietta, Ohio. The article is as follows:

AMERICA'S FIRST TAX-SUPPORTED CHILDREN'S HOME WILL CELEBRATE ITS 100TH BIRTHDAY ON JULY 27

(By James Abrams)

Washington County Children's Home, the first tax-supported children's home in the United States, is 100 years old this year.

Centennial ceremonies will be held Sunday, July 27, at the home on Muskingum Drive. The Reverend Charles Harrison, assistant superintendent and chaplain of the Boys Industrial School at Lancaster, will be principal speaker. The Marietta High School summer band, directed by Grover Buxton, will present a concert.

Today the children's home includes a group of modern brick buildings dedicated in 1950 that surround the older administration building.

Founder of the children's home was Miss Catherine Fay who had been a schoolteacher and missionary among the Choctaw Indians. She married A. S. D. Ewing in 1866.

Returning to her parents' farm on Moses Run in 1857, she visited the Washington County Infirmary. Here she found what was common in every such institution in the country then—dependent children of all ages living with aged and infirm adults.

She felt that this was not the right place for children, who through no fault of their own, had been left homeless and destitute. Miss Fay requested and got permission to move the 26 children to her home.

"Aunt Katie Fay," as she was called by the children, was able to buy her family's 15-acre farm at Moss Run and to enlarge the house. On April 1, 1858, what was to become the Washington County Children's Home, was opened at its first site by Miss Fay for these children. Mariettans helped with gifts of food for the children, all of whom were under 10 years old.

Under Miss Fay's and other Mariettans' urgings, the State legislature authorized in 1866 the legal support of the Washington County Children's Home and other children's homes by direct taxation by the counties.

The original home was too remote and not large enough and the home was moved to its present location and opened there with 33 children on April 3, 1867.

Today approximately 75 children between the ages of 3 and 18 are cared for during school months. In the past 5 years the number has fluctuated between 84 and 34 children.

W. P. Rolleyson, superintendent of the county children's home explained that all but one of the children there are from broken homes. All are wards of the county, placed in the home by the courts.

He said that "children aren't placed here until we've explored all possible means of keeping them in their own home." "There isn't any better place to raise a child than in his own home," Rollyson emphasized.

The home is to a great extent a stopping-off place until homes can be found with relatives for children made wards of the county.

Many children are placed in free foster homes in the county. The county does not pay for children's upkeep in these foster homes. Interested people contact the county welfare board of their own accord to have children placed in their care.

Members of the Washington County Child Welfare Board that governs the county home are Ray Goddard of Cutler, Charles Ingram of Marietta Rural Route, Helen Evans of Lowell, Judge Xilpha R. Metcalf, and Attorney E. E. Erb, both of Marietta. Rollyson is executive secretary.

The 100-acre farm's own produce pays for about 35 percent of the home's costs. Its modern farm has a dairy herd, cans close to 1,000 half-gallon jars of vegetables, and raises around 7 to 800 pounds of sweet corn, 200 bushels of potatoes and its own pork.

The home operates its own school for grades 4, 5, and 6, in a 2-story brick building built in 1938. The other children attend Putnam School and Marietta High School.

The four modern brick additions dedicated in 1950 include a large well-equipped gymnasium with folding bleachers. Connecting on either side of it are the two single-story boys' dormitories. Connected to the administration building is the two-story girls' dormitory.

Rollyson and his wife, who is matron, have been at the home for nearly 6 years. Other staff members include 4 housemothers, a farmer in charge of the agricultural work, a utility man, a cook, a dining room supervisor, 2 laundresses, and a caseworker.

Resolutions Adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, 38th annual conference, June 25, 1958:

RESOLUTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO COORDINATION ACT

Whereas the conservation and perpetuation of fish and wildlife are becoming critical because of the increasing utilization of lands and waters to meet the needs of our expanding human population; and

Whereas large sums of public money are being spent by State, Federal, and private

agencies for the development of water resources; and

Whereas construction agencies, both private and governmental, have been reluctant or legally unauthorized to consider ways and means to maintain or mitigate losses to fish and wildlife resources; and

Whereas many water development projects can be planned and coordinated to benefit all the users of the resources; and

Whereas the amendments to the Coordination Act of 1946 (commonly called Public Law 732) as proposed by the Department of the Interior and endorsed by the 48 States, and agreed to by all interested Federal agencies, will provide planning and procedures for enhancement of fish and wildlife as well as mitigation of losses in all construction projects; and

Whereas weakening and controversial amendments have been proposed to this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That the Senate be urged to pass S. 3725 (Watkins) as reported from committee, and that the House expedite favorable action on S. 3725 or an identical bill.

RESOLUTION 2. SUPPORT OF $3 DUCK STAMP LEGISLATION

Whereas there is a great need to acquire wet lands throughout the United States for waterfowl conservation purposes; and

Whereas the cost of such acquisition has risen materially over the past years; and

Whereas the availability of such lands continues to decrease with agricultural and urban expansion; and

Whereas there is need for wiser management on said proposed waterfowl area acquisitions in order to harvest surplus waterfowl properly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby endorse the provisions of H. R. 12072 (DINGELL, of Michigan) and similar legislation which would increase the cost of the duck stamp from $2 to $3, earmark all net receipts for the acquisition of waterfowl areas, and permit the Secretary of the Interior to open up to 40 percent of the acquired lands for migratory bird hunting, and which would further provide for the leasing of small acreages of wet lands and potholes as waterfowl production areas; and be it further

Resolved, That the bill contain no restrictions on the hunting of resident game species.

RESOLUTION 3. WATER RIGHTS ON PUBLIC LANDS

Whereas the recreational uses of the national forests and public domain lands are bound to increase in both social and economic importance with the growth of population, urbanization, and improved travel facilities, and the interest of the general public in the multiple-use management of the public lands is a very real interest that must be protected; and

Whereas the use of water for fish and wildlife purposes, largely a nonconsumptive use, is essential to and inseparable from the balanced multiple-use management of the public lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners urges the Federal administration of the national forest and public domain to exercise all necessary diligence under existing legal authority to forestall and deny the appropriation of water, or the development of water resources, when such appropriation or development would be inconsistent with the proper multiple-use management of such lands in the public interest; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if existing authority is inadequate to protect the public interest, the Western Association recommends the initiation of legislation to correct the deficiency.

RESOLUTION 4. PACIFIC SALMON

This resolution, condensed here to save space, expressed concern because of the continued downward trend of Pacific salmon due to a variety of factors, and offered the following recommendations:

"*Now, therefore, be it resolved,* That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby endorse a more positive action on the part of all agencies concerned to maintain and improve the Pacific salmon resources; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Western Association officials appoint a committee composed of one member of each affected State, province, and Alaska to survey and investigate Pacific coast and Alaska salmon management programs and that of the international salmon fisheries and make a comprehensive report, along with recommendations, to the respective management agencies and their governments on their findings on or before the first day of January 1959; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the three States' Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission be requested to undertake the task of compiling this report."

RESOLUTION 5. PUBLIC ACCESS FOR RECREATIONAL USE ON AND AROUND RESERVOIR IMPOUNDMENTS

Whereas Federal laws now provide that under certain conditions Federal agencies administering our public lands are permitted to issue special use permits to private individuals for the construction of dams for the purpose of impounding waters; and

Whereas it is recognized that said special use permits allow development of our agricultural lands and provide for the highest use of said lands; and

Whereas public access for recreational purposes does not interfere with the primary purpose for which the special use permit was granted; and

Whereas said lands belong to all the public rather than a few individuals: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners,* That the Bureau of Land Management and other Federal agencies authorized to issue said permits be requested to include, at the time of granting, a provision stipulating the right of public access for wildlife and recreational purposes.

RESOLUTION 6. PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RESERVOIR SITES AND SURROUNDING LANDS

Whereas the policy of taking flowage easements rather than outright title to reservoir sites and surrounding shorelands, adopted in August 1953 by the Corps of Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, has resulted in an almost complete loss to the general public of highly valuable and irreplaceable recreational areas; and

Whereas under the policy followed prior to August 1953 such shorelands and access areas to these lands were often licensed to the various State game departments, resulting in a high and permanent public use of these areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does strongly urge that the present flowage easement policy be terminated in the general public interest, and that there be substituted for it the former policy of taking absolute legal title to reservoir sites and surrounding shorelands in order that their use may be permanently assured to the general public.

RESOLUTION 7. REVISION AND AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RANGE CODE

Whereas some livestock interests are still making it difficult for the Bureau of Land Management to improve range conditions; and

Whereas the Federal Range Code of the Bureau only recognizes "reasonable numbers" of big game in its operations; and

Whereas the stockmen appeal-clause procedure under the Code is unsatisfactory and too time consuming; and

Whereas there is still lack of full appreciation and acceptance of the multiple use concept by various users of our Federal rangelands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby urge the Secretary of the Interior to rectify these shortcomings in the Federal Range Code and to take immediate action to integrate multiple use throughout the code.

RESOLUTION 8. CONSERVATION OFFICER COURSES IN WILDLIFE SCHOOLS

In this resolution, abbreviated here to save space, the association recommended that administrators of educational institutions offering wildlife management degrees include in their curriculum courses in law enforcement, public relations, journalism, public speaking, report writing, general psychology and fisheries management as prerequisites to a bachelor's degree in wildlife management. The association further suggested that only wildlife students evidencing a special aptitude for research be encouraged to pursue true wildlife research and that they be encouraged to continue their academic training with graduate work.

RESOLUTION 9. OPERATION OUTDOORS

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture, through the United States Forest Service, has developed a long-needed program identified as Operation Outdoors; and

Whereas part I of this program, concerning national forests recreation aimed at solving the mounting problem of increased family outdoor activity, has been published and is ready for implementation by increased appropriations; and

Whereas part II will deal with improvement and management of wildlife habitat on the national forests in cooperation with the fish and game departments, and

Whereas both phases of these activities have long been needed and have been programed in a most thorough and systematic manner: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners commends most highly the United States Department of Agriculture for preparing the analyses and resulting plans dealing with the extremely important recreational and wildlife values of the national forests, and urges Congress to implement the program through appropriate financing.

RESOLUTION 10. COMMENDATION FOR THE TULE-KLAMATH SETTLEMENT

Whereas on April 1, 1958, Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, issued a decree to the effect that the lands in controversy in the Lower Klamath-Tule Lake region of California and Oregon, which are so vital to the Pacific Flyway, must be used in a manner that will fully protect the valuable waterfowl resources of the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby commend Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton and Assistant Secretaries of the Interior Ross L. Leffler and Fred Aandahl for their courage and foresight in recommending a positive settlement, favorable to conservation interests, of this long-standing controversial issue; and be it further

Resolved, That the Western Association urges Secretary Seaton to submit to Congress at an early date such legislation as may be

deemed necessary to implement the Secretary's action, and that the member States inform their respective delegations in Congress accordingly.

RESOLUTION 11. SOLICITOR'S OPINION ON STATUS OF WILDLIFE WITHDRAWALS

Whereas in the past decade there has been a widespread program among the 11 western States to withdraw tracts of public land for wildlife use in order that the general public could be assured of continued hunting and fishing access to these lands; and

Whereas the several State game and fish departments have spent considerable amounts of money and manpower in this program in the interests of the western hunting and fishing public; and

Whereas a member of the solicitor's staff of the Department of the Interior has recently submitted opinion M-36442 questioning the legality of withdrawing these public lands for wildlife use and transferring the administration of said lands to the State game and fish departments; and

Whereas it appears to the Western Association that this interpretation is incorrect and unreasonable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby request that the Solicitor of the Interior Department review opinion M-36442 in order that the several States may be assured of their exact position with respect to past, present, and future withdrawal requests; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event the Solicitor of the United States renders a decision unfavorable to the State game and fish departments in their proposed administration of such lands that the Western Association sponsor Federal legislation which would assure the States of the right to administer these public lands for wildlife management purposes in the interest of the general public.

RESOLUTION 12. RETENTION OF HUNTING AND FISHING RIGHTS ON STATE AND FEDERAL LANDS PROPOSED FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE

Whereas parcels of federally owned and State owned land are being sold or exchanged to private interests in increasing numbers; and

Whereas it has been established by Federal law for many years and by most State laws that mining, mineral, oil and gas rights on any Federal or State land sold or exchanged shall remain in the name of the Federal Government or the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby request the legislative committee of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners to prepare a bill for introduction during the 86th Congress which will provide for the retention, in the name of the public, of hunting and fishing rights on any Federal land sold or exchanged; and be it further

Resolved, That following the action of the legislative committee of the international association, that the individual Western States prepare similar legislation for introduction into their State legislatures.

RESOLUTION 13. RETENTION OF WILDLIFE COVER IN RANGE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Whereas a number of private and Government agencies are conducting, or contemplate conducting certain large-scale programs for the eradication of sagebrush, juniper, and other chaparral, shrub, and tree growth by use of public funds in the Western States as a means of increasing the grass production on the lands in question; and

Whereas this procedure in limited areas appears to be beneficial to big game species in that it provides a beneficial edge, but the complete eradication of all shrub and tree growth over large expanses of terrain is detrimental to big game species with the possible exception of antelope because it eliminates necessary food and cover; and

Whereas reduction of the winter feed supply for big game will result in greater property damage to the landowners who advocate the eradication programs and/or a reduction in the carrying capacity for big game on the ranges concerned; and

Whereas big game has great economic and recreational value to the Western States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That Federal and State agencies approve such eradication programs on land under their jurisdiction only when fingers, blocks, or strips of the original growth are left standing for game cover and food, and when it has been determined in each instance that to do so would not be detrimental to the best public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federal and State land management agencies, when contemplating such range improvement programs, confer in advance with State game departments as to the effect on big game resources and modify their plans to the end that damage to wildlife habitat will be held at a minimum.

RESOLUTION 14. OPPOSING CHANGES IN FEDERAL AID ACTS

Whereas the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, more commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, has since its enactment in 1939 been a tremendous asset to the wildlife conservation programs of the States; and

Whereas the formula for the apportionment of these Federal-aid funds to the States had the unqualified endorsement of all 48 States; and

Whereas this basis for apportionment has been successfully accomplished these past 19 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners goes on record as being unalterably opposed to any change in the present apportionment formula; and be it further

Resolved, That the western association goes on record as being opposed to spending any of the sportsmen's funds for determining the number of duplicate licenses sold and being in favor of continuing the present method of certifying license sales.

RESOLUTION 15. COMMENDATION FOR THE OIL AND GAS LEASING POLICY ON WILDLIFE REFUGES

Whereas for the past several years there have been threats to the integrity of the original purpose of the national wildlife refuges through ill-advised proposals for leasing oil and gas rights on these refuges and game ranges; and

Whereas recent regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior would give effective protection to these refuges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses these regulations concerning oil and gas leasing and development on the national wildlife refuges and game ranges, and hereby commends Secretary Fred A. Seaton for his diligence in protecting the primary wildlife values in dedicated wildlife lands, and further urges him to stand firm on his established policy.

RESOLUTION 16. RESEARCH ON CHEMICAL HERBICIDES

Whereas there is an increased interest in chemical herbicides, insecticides, and pesticides for use in application on Federal, State, and private lands; and

Whereas some of these agricultural chemicals have been proven to have an immediate and/or accumulative effect on fish and wildlife species as a result of direct contact, and an accumulative effect as a result of changes upon the habitat of fish and wildlife; and

Whereas our knowledge of the effects of most of the chemicals so employed is deficient or entirely lacking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That Congress enact Senate bill 2447 as it now stands to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of various chemical herbicides, insecticides, and pesticides on fish and wildlife resources so that they may be used with minimm loss of fish and wildlife; and be it further

Resolved, That the supplemental appropriations bill include $300,000 for the use of the Department of the Interior in the immediate activation of the provision of S. 2447.

In a final resolution the association expressed its appreciation of Idaho hospitality.

Postmaster General Needs Greater Authority To Control Obscene Literature Disseminated Through Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a resolution passed by the Ohio Rural Letter Carriers' Association at the organization's annual State convention in Columbus, July 13–16. This resolution, pertaining to the need for providing the Postmaster General with greater authority to control the dissemination through the mails of obscene literature, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Ohio Rural Letter Carriers' Association strongly support the valiant efforts of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield to prevent the distribution of obscene matter through the United States mails; and

Whereas we, by the very nature of our duties, realize the demoralizing effect of such material has had on the morals of the people of this country, and particularly the young people who will be the leaders of tomorrow: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will prohibit the distribution of such matter through the United States mails, and which will penalize violators of this prohibition with fine or imprisonment, or both; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to both United States Senators from this State and to all Members of the Congress from this State with the strongest possible recommendation that they support the fight against the dissemination of filth through the United States mails.

CHARLES FISHER,
Chairman.
LOWELL LEPP.
HOMER DEWEY.
DEWEY GIBBS.
GEORGE M. SHELLY.

Residents of southeastern Ohio have furnished me with shocking examples of

the filth that is being sent to unsuspecting families, often addressed to schoolchildren. I have been impressed with the speed and earnestness of the Post Office Department in acting against the purveyors of such trash.

The House of Representatives took an important step in the right direction recently when it passed H. R. 6239 to strengthen the hand of the Postmaster General in matters of this kind. This legislation, allowing for criminal prosecution of offenders either at the point of mailing or at the point where the mail is received should eliminate much of the frustration the Department has experienced in the past. I am pleased that this bill is on the Senate Calendar and it is my hope that consideration and passage will be forthcoming soon.

Middle East Question: Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal is in a particularly sound position to comment on the situation in the Middle East because two of the members of its editorial staff have spent considerable time in that troubled area in the last few years—one of them in the last few weeks.

In its editorials of Thursday, July 17, Saturday, July 19, and Sunday, July 20, 1958, the Milwaukee Journal has raised a number of important questions about our future steps in the Middle East. I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 17, 1958]

SOME LOGICAL QUESTIONS ABOUT INTERVENTION IN MIDDLE EAST

The fact that the United States Marines are in Lebanon makes it rather futile to discuss whether we should have intervened. We have intervened.

President Eisenhower says that he decided upon intervention "only after the most serious consideration." And surely there was much to consider, and much that might have recommended some other course of action.

The main fact of intervention now is that we have, in the minds of much of the world, been proved the "imperialists" that Russia and many of the so-called neutral nations call us.

By attempting to draw parallels between the situation in Lebanon and the cases of Greece, Korea, and Vietnam, as the President did, the implication is that we have moved in opposition to communism. Indeed, the President cited the Communist aggression in each of these alleged parallels.

But communism is a very minor issue in Lebanon. The issue, if any single one can be cited, is Arab nationalism, as a Milwaukee Journal staff correspondent reported from the Middle East a few weeks ago. Whatever one may call Nasser one cannot call him a Communist. In Egypt, Communists are in jail.

Very properly the President has taken the case to the United Nations. But here again there is a serious hitch. He acted after United Nations officials had declared that there was no massive outside intervention in Lebanon calling for U. N. action. Now Secretary General Hammarskjold reiterates that no international military force is necessary.

Our Government can argue—and rightly in the Journal's opinion—that the U. N. officials are mistaken. Syrian agents have undoubtedly played a big part in the Lebanese crisis. So has the Cairo radio. Syrian arms have been furnished the rebels.

In a country as small as Lebanon—a nation of 1,500,000 persons in an area smaller than Connecticut—even a few thousand rifles, a few hundred machineguns, a handful of mortars, and a few hundred volunteers can amount to massive intervention. But against this is the fact that a well-armed Lebanese army has made no serious attempt to put down Lebanon's revolution.

How do we convince the U. N. to send international forces to Lebanon when its officials have already said that the presence of U. N. observation teams is all that is required? Probably a Russian veto will stop any Security Council action. Can we get enough votes in the Assembly to back our demands for U. N. intervention? It is at least doubtful.

Then we will be left occupying a country that the U. N. says does not need help or occupation. It seems that the time to have gone into Lebanon, if there ever was a time, was a month ago—not after the U. N. had in effect taken a stand in opposition to our Government's view. Even our good friend Sweden now accuses us of violating the U. N. Charter.

The Lebanese intervention is aimed, of course, at broader problems—those of Iraq and Jordan,. Is it, then, our national policy to become self-appointed policemen to restore ousted regimes that had little mass support, or to put our troops behind shaky ones?

Obviously one great worry is Middle East oil, vital to our allies in Europe far more than directly to us. But is it to be our policy to protect resources over the world by force?

Have we any real proof that Middle Eastern oil would not be sold to the West whatever regimes, short of Communists, take over Middle Eastern countries? The only hope that the Middle East has to realize its aspirations for development requires sale of oil. The West lost control of the Suez Canal, but is not denied its use.

Barring Russian intervention with force—which is not to be ruled out for a moment—we and our allies could police the Middle East indefinitely. But where does that get us? How long do we sit as policemen? How long can we oppose the aspirations—many legitimate aspirations—of Arabs to control their own destinies? How can we expect world peace if we engender hatred of us and our allies in widespread areas of the world—alienating not only the people of the Arab world but many in India, southeast Asia, and Africa?

These are legitimate questions.

We are in Lebanon. It is too late to gain much by debating the reasons for our being there. But it is not too late to ask: Where do we go from here?

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 19, 1958]

WHEN CHAMOUN STEPS OUT, WHAT HAPPENS IN LEBANON?

The claim that Camille N. Chamoun wanted to change the constitution so he could succeed himself to a 6-year term as President was the excuse for starting the Lebanese revolt.

But that was not the basic cause for revolt. The real cause lay in the determination of the Moslems to aline Lebanon with the Arab States and their opposition to Chamoun's stanch prowestern policies.

Chamoun did not help matters by refusing to commit himself on his plans to succeed himself. He was cagey. He kept saying that he had never said he planned to change the constitution. But he refused to say that he had no such plans.

His refusal rested on several considerations. One was that for a time he did want to succeed himself. He thought that the elections of a year ago had brought to the Chamber of Deputies enough supporters to guarantee him the two-thirds majority necessary to change the constitution. And the chamber elects the President. He was confident, too, because in 1952 he won the Presidency by an overwhelming 74-to-3 vote in the chamber. He also had the qualification of being a Maronite Christian. By gentlemen's agreement Lebanon has always had a Christian President and a Moslem Prime Minister.

Now Chamoun's hopes have died. Prime Minister Sami Solh says his Government will not allow the constitution to be changed. Chamoun has denied any desire for reelection, but it comes weeks too late.

One irony is that Chamoun took power after President el-Khoury, who had changed the constitution to reelect himself, was forced out of office. One of Chamoun's first acts in 1952 was to rewrite the bar to reelection into the constitution.

Under Lebanese law Chamoun's term ends September 23. Law provides that the speaker of the chamber of deputies can call a session to elect a President 30 to 60 days before the end of a term. If no session is called, one is automatically held 10 days before the end of a term. The speaker has called the session for next Thursday, July 24. The question now is whether enough deputies will attend the session to provide a quorum. Even if a quorum is present, will enough of the chamber's 66 deputies attend to provide the two-thirds majority of membership necessary to elect a president? The Moslem rebels may boycott the session.

What would happen then is anyone's guess. At all events, Chamoun is through in about 60 days. America's problem is what happens to our invited intervention if an antiwestern president is elected or there is no president at all.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 20, 1958]

HOW THE MIDDLE EAST MESS DEVELOPED IN LAST 4 YEARS

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is preparing to study our Middle Eastern policy and ask: Where do we go from here? It can't avoid asking how we got into our present mess. A review of our Middle East policies, especially as they affect Egypt, is vital. It is not a reassuring story.

The United States had no imperialist record in the Middle East. It benefited from a reservoir of good will. Some of that good will was lost among the Arabs when we backed the creation of Israel in an area the Arabs considered Arab. But the great fall in our stock in Arab lands has come in the last 4 years.

The President says of Lebanon that it is our duty to help preserve a legally constituted government. We felt no such compulsion when King Farouk of Egypt asked our help in putting down a revolution in 1952. We refused.

When Mohammed Naguib and Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser kicked out Farouk, our Government gave them every reason to feel we were sympathetic. The Naguib-Nasser government started out immediately on welcome and much needed reforms. We sent

experts to help. Secretary Dulles visited Cairo and gave Naguib a silver-plated pistol—a fine symbol of peace and tranquility—to show our esteem.

The Egyptians asked financial help. Our Government showed interest. But—as Nasser said with bitterness (and some exaggeration) to a Journal staff correspondent in 1954—nothing was forthcoming except "a few sick chickens." Without sufficient aid, the reforms slowed almost to a halt.

In 1954 Nasser, who has ousted Naguib, sought American arms. These were promised on condition that agreement was reached on evacuation of British troops in the Suez Canal zone. Arms were not furnished, although agreement was reached on British troops. Nasser sought arms again after Israel attacked the Gaza strip in 1955. Our government offered two propositions—arms for dollars that Nasser did not have or arms accompanied by a military mission. Nasser felt politically unable to accept a western military mission. He turned to Russia and got Communist bloc arms for cotton.

Our reaction was a new arms offer. It failed, but it showed to Nasser's satisfaction that he could play us off against Russia. He has ever since.

The Egyptians claimed, probably falsely, that Russia had promised to help build the Aswan dam. The claim worked. We rushed in with the British to offer to do the job. We soon believed Russia had made no such offer. And Dulles rejected the dam plan abruptly in a manner that Nasser took as a personal insult. Our government went out of its way to say that Nasser couldn't afford the dam because he spent too much for arms.

Nasser's reaction was immediate. He seized the Suez Canal. Our government said navigation would be endangered by control of the waterway by one nation. "How about Panama?" the Arabs asked. We said Egypt could not run the canal. It has, successfully.

In 1956 America regained much prestige by forcing Israel, France and Britain to withdraw after invading Egypt. But much of the gain was lost when this country froze $40 million in Egyptian funds. We rejected Nasser's urgent request to buy $14,000 worth of medicines for refugees, at a time we were pulling all stops to help Hungarian refugees. We refused wheat needed by hungry Egyptians, in spite of our huge surpluses. We stopped the CARE program that was feeding 3 million Egyptian children. The Arabs were bitter—and again turned to Russia for help.

The Eisenhower doctrine, promising intervention in case of Middle East invasion by Communist forces, far from being welcomed by the Arabs, was looked upon as imperialism and unwarranted interference.

When Syria got Soviet arms in 1957 an American emissary rushed to the Middle East to confer with all but Syrians and Egyptians. Arms were rushed to Jordan. Dulles told the U. N. that Turkey was threatened by Soviet arms in the hands of the tiny and inept Syrian Army. Turkish troops, with Americans present, stood on Syria's borders.

Through these years Nasser made repeated efforts to deal with the United States. He was rebuffed.

Now we are in Lebanon, where U. N. officials and even many prowestern Lebanese say we are not needed. Again we insist on status quo in an area where change and unity are considered the only hope by Arabs.

We have failed in the Middle East because our Government has ignored a basic fact: Foreign policy must take into account the aspirations and opinions of the people in the area if it is to work.

The Senate committee should have no trouble finding out how the mess we are in developed in the Middle East.

How to solve it now is another—and far more complex—matter.

Democracy in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under a consent previously granted, I include remarks I made on Radio Caracas TV, in Caracas, Venezuela, on July 6, 1958:

Friends, my wife and I have greatly enjoyed celebrating with you our independence day and your independence day. I apologize for not knowing your language. Our tongues are different but our hearts are the same.

I congratulate you on having overthrown the tyrant Perez Jimenez. You are on the road to greatly improved economic and social conditions on a democratic basis.

Your junta has pledged free elections soon. I commend Admiral Larrazabal and his colleagues on the junta. They deserve much credit.

Will you succeed in establishing democracy in Venezuela? Hope and enthusiasm are high, both here and elsewhere in the hemisphere.

Of course hope and enthusiasm are not enough. Brains and patience are needed also.

Your great national parties have great leaders. I have had the honor to meet them all. Along with you I like and respect them. They would be great leaders wherever they lived—Betancourt, Caldera, and Villalba.

AD, COPEI, URD, honorable and dedicated parties, determined to improve the economic conditions of Venezuela, determined to guarantee equal justice under law.

AD, COPEI, URD, all dedicated to government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Infinitely preferable to the tyranny of Perez Jimenez or to the rule of the Communists who are the tools of a tyranny.

Perez Jimenez is overthrown. Trujillo is tottering, Batista's days are numbered. Stroessner and Somoza will soon be engulfed by the strong tide of liberty and justice.

Tyranny is tyranny, be it allegedly anti-Communist, Communist, or neither. Tito, Ibn Saud, Khrushchev, Mao, Chiang Kai-shek, or Franco—chiefs of vile police states, just like Trujillo, Batista, Stroessner, and Somoza.

All are enemies of the free man, of justice, of God.

My country's Government is not perfect. Nor is yours. We have made mistakes. We will make more mistakes. So will you. But we are committed to freedom under law and against tyranny of whatever name. We are not Yankee imperialists.

Our own mistakes of policy have been of technique, not of intent; of the head, not of the heart.

Certainly our mutual love of freedom and hatred of tyranny binds us close. I fully endorse my Government's declared policies toward Venezuela.

These policies are:

1. Nurture friendship between our governments and our peoples.

2. Encourage the development of democratic institutions and constitutional government.

Ask yourselves, my friends, do the Communists want democratic institutions and constitutional governments? No Communist country today has these features, so the answer is no, of course not.

I have been shocked to have it alleged to me that a number of educated Venezuelans, even including journalists, are sympathetic to communism.

Or they proclaim their neutrality and profess to be disgusted with both the United States and the Soviet Union.

As for me, I agree with Betancourt, Caldera, and Villalba that Venezuela needs parties that put Venezuela first, not the Soviet Union, not the United States.

Our mutual love of democracy will bring Venezuela and the United States together, in spite of disagreements between us.

There are quarrels in the happiest families.

Misery and fear are formidable foes. We need all our strength to win over them.

We need political parties, more than one, to translate the will of the people into the laws of the land.

We need armed forces who know that their duty is to keep order and to defend their country, not to try to govern it.

We need labor unions to insure better working conditions and fair wages.

We need a press that will tell the truth fearlessly.

We need the church, businessmen, lawyers, doctors, farmers, everyone to work together.

Only in a democracy can this be done to mobilize most powerfully against misery and fear. The fancy facade of the tyrant hides much misery and much fear, whether this tyrant be in this hemisphere or the other hemisphere.

Friends, now you have a great opportunity, great leaders, great national parties. We in the United States admire your courage. We sympathize with your suffering.

We pray for your success in your struggle for democracy.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued consideration of trade agreements bill and passed 19 sundry bills.

House passed 38 miscellaneous bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 13061–13075

Bills Introduced: 10 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4157–4166; and S. Con. Res. 108–109. **Pages 13062–13063**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 7734, to exempt teachers in the Panama Canal Zone from application of the dual employment statute (S. Rept. 1863);

H. R. 3513, relating to entitlement to reenlistment of certain former officers (S. Rept. 1864);

H. R. 7140, to authorize a registrar at the U. S. Military Academy, with amendments (S. Rept. 1865); and

H. R. 8002, to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, with individual views (S. Rept. 1866). **Page 13062**

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. **Page 13075**

Onion Futures: Senate insisted on its amendments to H. R. 376, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges, agreed to hold conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Ellender, Johnston (South Carolina), Eastland, Aiken, and Young. **Page 13065**

Coal Development: Senate disagreed to House amendments to S. 2069, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain, asked for conference thereon, and appointed as conferees Senators O'Mahoney, Carroll, and Barrett. **Page 13080**

Sundry Bills Passed: By unanimous consent the Senate set aside its unfinished business and passed 19 sundry bills as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

Hospital construction loans: H. R. 12694, to authorize loans for the construction of hospitals and other facilities under the PHS Act (motion to reconsider passage tabled);

Amphibious vessels: H. R. 11518, authorizing the construction of not to exceed 20,000 tons of amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft;

VA refunds: H. R. 9369, to authorize the VA Administrator to make certain refunds;

Land exchange: H. R. 10321, authorizing exchange of certain lands in Estes Park, Roosevelt National Forest, Colo.;

Land exchange: H. R. 11253, authorizing exchange of certain U. S. land with the city of Redding, Calif.;

Forest townsites: H. R. 12161, to provide for the establishment of townsites in national forests;

Transportation allowances: H. R. 7902, to authorize travel and transportation allowances in the case of certain members of the uniformed services;

Firearms permits: H. R. 11700, authorizing certain civilian personnel of the Department of Defense to carry firearms;

Naval and Marine Corps transfers: H. R. 11504, to permit enlisted members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve to transfer to the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve on the same basis as members of the Regular components; and

Naval aviation cadets: H. R. 11626, to increase the period of active service for naval aviation cadets.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Hospital construction: H. R. 12628, to extend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (motion to reconsider passage tabled); and

Navy—shore duty: H. R. 11636, to remove the requirement that the Secretary of the Navy certify that the assignment of naval officers to shore duty is in the public interest.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Unita National Forest: S. 3248, authorizing exchange of certain lands in the Uinta National Forest, Utah; and

Vessels—day signals: S. 3951, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe day signals for certain vessels.

Appendix

Food in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Food Industry in a Changing World," delivered by Bernard L. Oser, Ph. D., of the Food and Drug Research Laboratories, Inc., Maspeth, Long Island, in my city, on the occasion of his receiving the Babcock-Hart award.

The article calls our attention to the tremendously vital question of the capability of our earth to support the increase in population. It points out that the answer to the problem is the increased application of technology to food production and processing.

We in New York are proud of the award made to Dr. Oser and of the distinguished contribution which he has made to this science.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD INDUSTRY IN A CHANGING WORLD

It is a distinct honor to have one's name associated, however remotely, with Babcock and Hart and the distinguished list of past recipients of the award bearing their names. I am truly appreciative of the honor which has been bestowed upon me.

The other day, when I was contemplating some of Babcock's accomplishments, I was impressed by the parallel which exists between what he did and the challenge which faces all of us as food scientists today. His development of a simplified scientific method to determine the fat content of milk was cited as "emancipating the dairy farmer from the rule of thumb." Today, food science may hold the key to another, and even more far-reaching emancipation: We have the opportunity to free mankind from the burden of two great fears—the fear of starvation and the fear of the scourge of war.

That's a bold statement. However, I am convinced of its fundamental truth. If we, as food scientists, appraise the situation which confronts mankind we will have to acknowledge that whether man's tenancy of the world continues depends upon how well our science progresses. If we are farsighted and diligent, mankind's future is assured; if we are shortsighted or laggard, the prospect of man's surviving for many centuries is dismal.

Consider where we stand today. This is the most crucial time in the history of the world. Within our own lifetimes man has propelled himself at speeds beyond that of sound; he has created new moons to explore the atmosphere above the earth; he has peered into the very depths of the atom; he has produced new forms of matter and is tapping new sources of energy; he has conquered the most devastating diseases; and he has discovered exquisite ways of destroying himself.

Our attention has been focused upon these remarkable achievements—and in terms of science they must be regarded as achievements. But we have paid but little heed to two matters which are vital to man's future existence. These are the explosive growth in the population of our planet and the clear inadequacy of present and immediately prospective resources to feed burgeoning mankind. I'm impelled to modify a Biblical reference somewhat and say, "What availeth a man to attain the moon and lose the world."

Let's consider for a few minutes the food problems which the world's fast-growing population thrusts upon us. Then, a little later, we can appraise how this is related to the prospect of war or peace.

World population at about the time of Christ was somewhat under 300 million. By 1650 this had about doubled. This relatively modest increase was characterized by many ups and downs due to famine, war, and especially the ravages of disease. (For example, cholera killed a full quarter of the people in Europe in the 14th century.) During no half century before 1650 was the population gradient greater than 10 percent. But from an estimated 518 million people in 1650, humankind has now multiplied more than fivefold to 2.7 billion. What is more important, century by century the rate of rise has accelerated to 14 times the rate before 1650. If it continues we may anticipate a world population of between 7 and 9 billion a hundred years hence. One hundred years is a short time—my birth to the time my grandchildren reach my present age.

We should be aware, of course, that the United States has played no minor role in the rate of population increase. In only the past quarter-century our population has grown from 125 million to over 170 million. This represents an increase of nearly 40 percent, which is greater than India's, for instance, and even greater than that of the world as a whole. Estimates of what our population will be in 1975 range from 207 to 229 million—or 20 percent to 33 percent over the present level. (In the 4 minutes since I began this talk 30 little Americans were born.)

The food situation in this country is, of course, unique. And being so it tends to condition our perspective as far as the rest of the world is concerned. We are blessed in the United States with an overabundance of food and with excellent storage, transportation and processing facilities. In the past 20 years we have accomplished miracles in increasing production of grains, milk and eggs per acre or per unit weight of animal or feed. Our principal nutritional affliction is obesity. But that is far from being so in many other parts of the world. More than half of the world's population now struggles to receive fewer than 2,200 calories per capita per day. Shortly before World War II there was sufficient food to provide a world average of 2,300 calories per person. Now, despite a 9 percent increase in food output, the average available today is down to 2,260 calories. We are indeed walking a nutritional tightrope.

Moreover, as I have intimated, whether we have war or peace may well depend on the adequacy of our food resources. It is not weapons that create wars. Rather it is disturbances—regional disturbances—of a social or economic nature which spawn wars. And they have at their roots the pressing needs for existence. The fight for freedom and independence may inflame nations to wage wars but smouldering beneath these aims is the struggle for a decent standard of living.

Look back over history and that truth becomes evident. We pride ourselves on being a peace-loving people. And we are. But we have had a rich continent to plunder. Suppose it had been otherwise; suppose our country had been barren and we had been hungry. Suppose we knew about—or saw—the fertile wheat fields of Canada to our north. Might not our necessity and our covetousness have overwhelmed us?

Greater worldwide production of foodstuffs is essential if we are to minimize the danger of war—a war of human extermination. As a corollary, I might suggest that any dictator or political leader finds it almost impossible to arouse warlike sentiments in the minds of comfortably fed people.

Let us take the optimistic view that neither nucear warfare, famine, nor disease will seriously affect the predicted expansion in world population and then consider our available and potential food resources. We may assume that the physiological energy requirement of man may diminish somewhat with advances in mechanization, automation, and transportation. Nonetheless, it will probably never fall much below present levels of about 2,800 calories per day. Where are the vast—and they are vast—quantities of food we will require for sustenance going to come from?

Much of the earth's 36 billion land acres is not arable. In fact, less than one-tenth is under cultivation and, it has been estimated, present agricultural technology would permit at most a doubling of current world food production. Compare this with the anticipated trebling or quadrupling of population and it becomes obvious that some control of human multiplication must be exercised. This, however, is a subject fraught with emotional and sectarian implications and is outside the sphere of food scientists. Perhaps we may assume, however, that birth-control measures will counterbalance population increases deriving from the conquest of disease. Some sort of population control, in any case will be inevitable since, as it has been so aptly put, "this battle between production and reproduction will never be won by production alone."

Nevertheless, every means will have to be taken to expand and conserve food supplies. Arable acreage must be wrested from the erosive forces of wind and water; hydroelectric, solar, and nuclear energy must be harnessed to irrigate desert areas; water must be drawn from subterranean sources or reclaimed from the sea at low cost. We may look hopefully toward control of rainfall, toward greater utilization of genetic selection of plant and animal varieties capable of resisting adverse climatic and soil conditions, and toward the extension and improvement of mechanization on the farm. It is advances such as these that have doubled production per farm worker in the United States in the past two decades.

We shall have to find or make new foods. These foods may little resemble the foods we now prefer or enjoy but they will furnish the energy, the amino acids, the vitamins, and the minerals for survival and reproduc-

tion. And, under the pressure of necessity, I warrant that man's palate will become adapted to accept them.

They may come from some of the thousands of known plant varieties never before consumed by humans, from artificially cultivated algae or yeasts, or from the sea. For instance, the krill or animal plankton which whales consume at a ton-a-day rate, abounds in the surface waters of the Antarctic. It is rich in protein but has not been exploited as food or feed for land animals. (In passing, I might mention that Dr. Babcock once proposed that whales be domesticated, brought to ocean slips, and milked.)

But in addition to tapping the natural sources and biological factories, future mankind will have to look to the chemical laboratory—or the chemical factory—for supplemental amino acids and calories as we do today for vitamins. Commercial synthesis of the essential amino acids, of which only a few grams per day would suffice to round out an otherwise protein-deficient human diet, is now foreseeable. Synthetic fats and carbohydrates will also be made available by the time the demand becomes sufficiently great, thanks to the progress being made in organic chemistry, photosynthesis, and other types of enzymic synthesis.

The science of chemistry is our greatest potential ally. Through the study of soils, the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, the development and improvement of fertilizers, the chemist has already rendered vital contributions to the agricultural revolution of our age. In recent years, too, significant strides have been taken in the effective use of chemicals to destroy plant and animal pests—including insects and rodents, pathogenic, microorganisms and viruses and weeds. Chemicals have also been synthesized which prevent fruit from dropping to the ground prematurely and rotting, which prevent germination during storage (of potatoes, for instance), which induce defoliation, increase yields and produce seedless varieties of fruit.

It is impossible to calculate precisely the value of agricultural produce saved by pesticides alone. Some estimates, and they seem reasonable, place it at 20 percent of our entire United States production. It is ironical, however, that shortly after the introduction of DDT to Ceylon the death rate from malaria decreased while the birth rate and food production remained unchanged. This created an acute food shortage in that lush country. On the one hand, science invents new compounds to fight off the Grim Reaper. On the other hand, it creates the problem of feeding those whose lives have been saved.

I have mentioned various methods whereby world food production can and must be expanded and the increasingly important role that chemical science must play. Passing mention must also be made of the use of chemicals to protect foods from contamination, dehydration, and spoilage after leaving the farm or factory; to retain or impart nutritive value; to maintain color or clarity; to improve flavor, texture or attractiveness; to facilitate preparation in the kitchen; and to effect economies in production and in distribution to consumers.

These functional uses of chemicals have contributed greately to expanding the variety and wholesomeness of our foods. Parenthetically, this has also been important in coping with the problem of the shortage of domestic household help. Today there are more than 20 million workingwomen in the United States, so the advantages of foods that keep well, and hence requires less frequent shopping, and which contain built-in convenience and speed of preparation are obvious. The food additive which all housewives and many husbands appreciate most is, in fact, antidrudgerine.

In spite of the established virtue of food additives there is a growing tendency to look at them askance as though they debase foods. The rigid structure of our laws has cast most of these substances as poisons. True they cannot themselves be eaten as ordinary foods. Even when the amounts contained in foods are so trivial as to present no hazard to human health, the law forbids the presence of additives, regardless of how useful they may be, unless they are actually essential to production. The fact that an exception is made in the case of certain pesticides, which are unquestionably poisonous, seems paradoxical.

It can hardly be denied that caution must be exercised in effecting basic changes in the principles governing our food supply. However,—out of sheer necessity—people generally and health officials particularly will have to abandon the attitude of suspicion toward all change. We will have to gear our thinking, legislative and otherwise, to technological and agricultural progress if we are to satisfy human needs in the days to come. The scientist must be encouraged to pursue his research with the realization that he will not have his progress thwarted by overzealous enforcement agencies which feel themselves bound by stagnant or archaic laws.

Consider for a moment what science, and particularly chemistry, has accomplished for mankind in other areas. A few decades ago we were following the same practices in clothing ourselves as did primitive man. We sheared sheep, tediously unravelled the cocoon of the silk worm, or waited a full season for a bit of fluff to ripen on a cotton plant. Now we can make textile fibers, by the ton, from plentiful chemical raw materials. To produce rubber we had to tramp through steaming jungles, draw the sap from trees, coagulate it over a smoky fire and ship the gum half way round the world.

To provide medicinals we had to seek out exotic botanicals, harvest, ship, and laboriously extract some of their ingredients. Chemical progress has changed all that—and for the better. Yet I venture that little of that progress, and those benefits, would have come to be ours if scientists in those fields had been as restricted by status quo regulations as we food scientists. Such regulations do not, of course, develop of themselves.

Much of the popular writing on the subject of chemicals in foods is buncombe. It is fabricated from speculations, half-truths, and obsolete information. Nevertheless the doubts, the fears, and the confusion engendered by these sensational outpourings are not offset by the more sober but less exciting facts which seldom reach the public. Consequently emotional pressure is brought to bear on legislative representatives and administrative agencies who are forced to hearken to the will of the people, however ill-informed they may be.

The responsibility for this situation must be placed not only on blood-thirsty journalists or crackpots but also on some quite competent scientists with a strong sense of personal greatness. They fancy themselves as being persecuted when colleagues reject their unproved postulations and prejudices. With all the sincerity, and all the zeal of crusaders, they vent their spleens in the form of ill-considered, ill-tempered, or peevish statements to feature writers.

It would be in the common interest if views on controversial scientific questions were either resolved or explained by groups of competent scientists in responsible agencies such as the National Academy of Sciences rather than leaving complex scientific questions to the judgment of the general public which, for lack of specialized training is incapable of separating the wheat from the chaff.

Let it be remembered that science is but one constituent of progress. To reap its fruits we must have boldness and courage, as well. Primitive man had to use the process of trial and error to select and prepare food. He was his own guinea pig and often to his great distress. We owe to him our knowledge of poisonous berries, mushrooms, roots, nuts, legumes, and so on ad infinitum. Today, however, we have remarkable research tools and refined biological methods to insure the safety and wholesomeness of new foods and food ingredients. We do not have to tarry for years or generations for acute or subtle dangers to manifest themselves. Present-day risks are minor risks and we can afford to take them to win the greater benefits that await us and our descendants.

In our concern lest a few parts per million of a useful food additive violate the letter of the law, let us bear in mind that if we are to produce and protect food for future billions, the advances of chemistry must be capitalized upon. Additives are important today and always will be. But the "food chemicals" of tomorrow will be eaten by the pound and by the ton. They will be the synthetic proteins, fats, and carbohydrates that will augment the cruder products of nature.

A negative or shortsighted attitude toward chemicals will only delay—but not prevent—the day when creative chemistry will come to the rescue of a world population threatened by mass starvation or the strife of mass extermination. We, as food scientists, and our colleagues in the days head, have a responsibility to all mankind—to the future of the world.

Housing for Middle-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Gerald S. Gidwitz, chairman of the board, Continental Materials Corp., to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Gidwitz has developed materials and methods which it is believed will lower the cost of good housing and bring it more closely into conformity with the means of the lower- and middle-income groups. He has made some very interesting suggestions, which he himself, as a successful industrialist, is carrying out. I commend a reading of the statement to all persons interested in the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GERALD S. GIDWITZ, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CONTINENTAL MATERIALS CORP. TO HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A major stumbling block to the continued health and prosperity of our Nation requires the immediate attention of Government and industry.

Simply stated, it is that we are failing to build the type of homes necessary to accommodate the huge home market and to make updated living facilities available to the great majority of our citizens.

The result is that the home building industry is not measuring up to its capabilities nor is it carrying its full share in insuring the stability of the economy.

Other than in cost, the materials, design, and construction of our homes has not kept pace with the rapid and startling advances made in other fields.

It costs 2½ times more to build a house today than in 1941. The $8,000 prewar house now costs $20,000. But the resisting home buyer is not being offered much that is new or better to reconcile his objections to construction costs which will continue to move upward some 3 percent a year.

The well being of our entire economy, as well as the fortunes of many other large and important industries, are closely related to the performance of the housing industry. It is up to housing to lead the way to greater economic growth.

Last year fewer houses were started than in any of the preceding 10 years. Yet our population is greater and national income has been rising to new high levels each year. This makes the housing industry as culpable for the recession as any other industry.

For 1958, however, home builders are predicting a 10-percent increase to about 1,100,000 starts on the basis of easier buying terms under Government-backed mortgage plans and a planned increase in the construction of lower-priced homes.

This still is far short of what could be achieved were the huge market potential effectively tapped. But it is first necessary for the many elements making up the complex $20 billion home building field to shake off their mantle of conservatism and conventional thinking and give the buyer something really new and better.

The American home building industry has within its hands the means of mass-producing budget-priced dream homes this year with which to open up a new era of economic prosperity and of family living. New materials and construction technology hold the promise of transforming the face of all America into a veritable panorama of utilitarian beauty and variety in which all our people can share.

Unfortunately, this great promise is far short of realization at this time—not for any lack of technological achievement but rather because of traditional thinking which has fallen far behind our technical progress.

The home-building industry is composed of many individualistic elements—building materials suppliers, architects, contractors and engineers, governmental agencies, lending institutions, skilled craftsmen and common laborers, and unions. It has yet to achieve a really central force of direction, initiation, planning, and financing.

As a result, new materials, new construction techniques, and new concepts in home design are extremely slow in gaining acceptance and adaptation in this field.

In the past decade, new products have found ready acceptance in, and paced the growth of, most other industries in both unit and dollar sales. Yet the resistance to—or fear of—change in the home-building industry has kept it from making full capital of its own technological developments in this same period.

I should like to propose that the Government, preferably through the Federal Housing Administration, concern itself more closely and directly with this all-important socioeconomic matter. The Federal Housing Administration, which remains the bastion of home building for the bulk of our great middle-income population—accounting for as much as 25 percent of all homes built per year—must take the lead in translating the home-building industry's enormous potential into positive action.

I urge that the Federal Housing Administration actively encourage the use of new materials and techniques—those that meet the necessary specifications of performance and quality—to pave the way for continuing economic and social improvement for all our people. I am not implying that the FHA is not aware of, and sympathetic to, new developments, but I am asking for a dynamic further development of FHA's interest in better housing at lower prices.

A coordinated program of action is needed, and I therefore propose:

The establishment under Federal Housing Administration auspices of a special agency composed of all elements of the housing industry to work together in giving the American home buyer a home product that he wants, that is better, less costly to buy, and more economical to maintain.

This agency or board, which would have an advisory and initiatory function, would be named by the Federal Housing Administration and be composed of representatives of Government, leading architects, engineers, building contractors, materials manufacturers, building trades unions, and building code officials.

This board would concern itself with all matters relative to improving home construction techniques and design, the adaptability of new building materials toward furthering this end, and maintain an ever-watchful eye toward effective cost-cutting practices.

This agency could be of immeasurable help by pursuing the following programs:

1. Sponsorship of the construction of strikingly new and superior model homes in a minimum of 100 key market areas. These homes would incorporate new features, new materials, and new designs—and be erected via improved techniques. They would serve as an example of what can be done, not only for the consumer-home buyer, but to recalcitrant builders and building-trades people generally. Each home would be staffed with an expert to explain its erection, cost factors, the materials used, advantages, etc.

2. Promote the modernization of antiquated community building codes throughout the country. In many areas these codes were written early this century, many before World War II, and fail to recognize or take into consideration the great advances made in materials and construction techniques since then. The drafting of a realistic standard building code and its presentation at a national conference of local building department officials would be a logical first step. This should, of course, be followed by a concerted effort to sell the suggested building code at the local level.

3. Sponsorship of traveling seminars to major metropolitan areas for educational and instruction purposes. A major drawback toward the adoption of revolutionary new materials and techniques is lack of coordination, explanation and cooperation between building materials suppliers, architects, builders and laborers. Such seminars would serve to point up the value and use of new materials, as well as instruct construction personnel and builders in how to work with them.

4. This board would invite materials manufacturers and builders to submit their new products and/or construction techniques for inspection to the FHA's own testing section, and then more widespread adaptation, by passing upon them with an open mind toward the demands of the home market.

5. Sponsorship of an effective educational effort to the journeymen and contractors to emphatically point out that the use of these new concepts makes for better and less expensive homes, and will widen the housing market. Greater, and not fewer, job opportunities will obviously result because the expanded market for new homes will insure a rising and continued demand for home construction workers far in excess of the best year we have had to date. The building trades worker, contractors and unions, understandably fearful that such automated advances are a threat to their job security, must be brought up to date for their own well being and that of the industry and the whole economy.

6. The board would also work with banks and other lending institutions to overcome the traditional conservatism of such organizations against financially supporting revolutionary concepts in home construction.

New families of building materials developed in recent years are in most instances superior to conventional materials found in nature. The industry, in its factories and using mass-production techniques and prefabrication, can make virtually anything necessary for building better and cheaper than by on-site handicraft methods.

Standardized, precision-made and mass-produced building material components can utilize to great advantage power assembly techniques on the job. This means mass production of homes as well as of the materials, resulting in quicker built, better built, and lower priced homes using imaginative new design concepts providing more space, new luxury features and facilities now not available to the average American family.

What are some of these revolutionary new materials and concepts?

1. Calsi-Crete, a multipurpose lightweight cellular concrete panel is one such material which may help revolutionize home construction. A home of Calsi-Crete can be erected in 40 percent less time and at 20 percent less cost—and be practically maintenance free. This product provides high strength and structural qualities, fire protection, intrinsic insulation, dimensional stability, economy of erection, good acoustical values, and pleasing appearance.

2. Stressed skin sandwich panels are now an economic and practical reality. The skins can be made of almost anything—metal, plastics, wood, composition materials, etc. The cores can be made of lightweight concrete, foamed plastics, honeycombs or grids (paper, aluminum, gypsum, etc.). These panels are structural, meaning that they are self- and roof-supporting. They offer a new kind of panelized house using maintenance-free materials that will cut assembly costs sharply. They provide for an entirely new home product made with precision factory conditions.

3. Partitions will be nonstructural, providing for walls that can be put up, taken down and moved anywhere throughout the house. Modular panels of materials such as lightweight cellular concrete, in standardized ceiling height lengths, mean quicker assembly on the job and reduced shipping and handling costs.

4. New powerful adhesives may result in homes assembled without nails or screws. They provide for stronger, better sealed joints as well as more rapid and less costly assembly, and a greater freedom to combine various dissimilar materials such as masonry, concrete, wood, metal, plastics, etc. New mechanical joints have been developed for connecting and holding lightweight concrete panels that enable a complete wall to be installed without support beams except at the corners.

5. Plastics—principally polyethylenes and polypropylenes—have great adaptability. In piping, hardware, exterior and interior finishes they provide for lower cost, longer life, better weather-resistance, and lowered maintenance. Plastic foams also hold promise as spray-on carpeting, acoustical ceilings, sandwich panel cores, etc., providing a big weight saving in shipping and assembly costs.

6. Prefabricated, plastic molded, modular bathrooms can cut assembly costs, standardize bathrooms for rapid installation, cut costs and lower maintenance.

7. Oversized brick or prefabricated brick sections also hold the promise of quicker installation on-site, less maintenance and reduced costs.

All these developments, plus many, many more, presage not only better and less ex-

pensive homes to appeal to practically all our people, but homes that will also look different in shape and design, homes that truly will exemplify the American culture and the growing American philosophy of outdoor-living, indoors.

With these new materials and construction techniques it may be possible to build new and better homes at prices in the $12,000 to $15,000 category that are comparable to, and in many ways superior, to those homes of today made with conventional materials and costing $20,000 and more.

The American public is not only ready for something new and better in their homes, but they are demanding it.

Today they can only get this in luxury housing which most can ill afford. The Federal Housing Administration, as the Government agency concerned with housing, must work with the industry in taking advantage of the dazzling opportunities offered by the technological developments in housing of the past few years.

Home building directly accounts for some 5 percent of our gross national product, but indirectly probably sustains well above 25 percent of our total production and economic health, even with the fact building starts have been hovering around the million mark each year.

By astutely studying and then building for its real market, the industry would see a home-building boom that would shove the recession into oblivion and set the whole economy into a rising orbit.

I urge the industry, and the Federal Housing Administration, not to delay. The need is great, the solution is at hand.

States Rights Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, popular demand for the enactment of H. R. 3, the so-called States rights bill, appears to be on the increase. I believe that this reflects the growing public awareness of the necessity for such a law to prevent the Supreme Court from invalidating useful State laws.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., for June 20, entitled "States Rights Victory." The editorial points out that the desire to protect the rights and powers of the States is not, as is sometimes supposed, a peculiarly southern phenomenon, but, on the contrary, is national in character.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES RIGHTS VICTORY

The whopping 86-vote margin by which the House of Representatives passed a bill Thursday designed to prevent the Supreme Court from knocking out State laws not in direct conflict with Federal laws indicates rising national opposition to the Warren court.

The bill introduced by Representative SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, says that no Federal law shall be interpreted as superseding State laws on the same subject unless the State act is in direct and positive conflict with the Federal law and the conflict cannot be reconciled.

If enacted, the bill would restore State antisubversion laws. The Supreme Court knocked these out last year when it ruled that Federal law covered the entire field of subversion control.

The President has threatened to veto the law. The Senate, which faces a heavy load of work before it adjourns this summer, may not be able to vote on the bill this session. But a precedent has been set for action next year. The 241 to 155 vote makes clear that judge rule over States is being vigorously opposed in Congress by representatives from States outside the South.

The Popularity of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial, which is timely at this particular moment because of our approaching action with respect to appropriations for mutual security. The editorial is entitled "Is Foreign Aid Unpopular?" and was published in the New York Times. The editorial sets forth important and revealing economic facts which should be reassurring to every American. For example, the total per capita yearly cost of the entire foreign aid program since the end of World War II has been $35.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS FOREIGN AID UNPOPULAR?

Democratic leaders in the House, as Allen Drury reported to this newspaper last week, are convinced that the foreign-aid bill is "generally unpopular with the country this year, and that by upholding cuts in the program they would be taking the politically profitable course." About 7 out of 10 House Democrats acted accordingly. They sliced some 20 percent out of what the President had called "the smallest amount we can wisely invest in mutual security during the coming year."

The President and his principal spokesmen have been making similar appeals during the past 6 years, as did President Truman and his staff before them. Foreign aid, beginning with the Marshall plan for the economic revival of western Europe and coming down to today's global mixture of military aid, military support, economic aid, and technical assistance, has cost us about $60 billion since the end of the Second World War. This is a considerable investment, soberly if not always eagerly made. Are we growing tired of the experiment?

Sixty billion dollars is about $350 per capita. Spread over 10 years it is $35 per capita yearly. The House has been trying to reduce Mr. Eisenhower's request for $22.60 per capita to about $17.60 per capita for the coming year. The billions are not quite so alarming when they are translated into the extra tax bills each one of us must pay.

The reluctant voter to whom the Democrats and many Republicans seem to be appealing might be wise to do the indicated long division. If he can afford a motorcar, a television set, a summer vacation—if he can afford these comforts, then foreign aid, or, as it may better be called, mutual assistance, is not beyond his means. It would be beyond his means only if it didn't buy anything.

It does buy something. In western Europe it bought a return of prosperity that kept communism from taking over France and Italy. It is buying not merely military strength but greater well-being and an enlarged freedom in the Far East. It is buying health, food, independence, and self-respect in the underdeveloped lands.

Is foreign aid unpopular? If it is so, the reason is lack of information, lack of straight thinking, lack of imagination. We willingly spend for instruments of war to use in our defense. Shall we grudge the pennies or even the few dollars a year that may avert war?

This newspaper doesn't believe we do. It doesn't believe that the Democrats or Republicans in Congress who support a false and dangerous economy in foreign aid will earn votes by it.

Ready Forces Prove Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 17, 1958:

READY FORCES PROVE VALUE

When the showdown came in the Middle East it was rifle-carrying marines who went ashore backed by the guns of warships and the air power of Navy carriers.

The significance of this should not be lost on the American people. Here was no threat of atomic annihilation, with all or nothing the stake in a vast area of the world.

The United States put ashore, from a swift-moving, highly-mobile task force; what amounts to an international police force—a force to make the peace and keep the peace. Its aim was not a military surrender, but the restoration of order in countries helpless before a subversion fed by international communism and military adventurers.

This didn't create a battlefield, but it did isolate an area of possible war by the very action of peaceful intervention at the scene of spreading trouble. This police power, however, is backed by the knowledge of America's atomic power, of the capability of massive retaliation—if ever necessary.

But that is the key—if ever necessary. As long as this country, or the United Nations, is able to isolate scenes of trouble, and limit military action to prevent full-scale war, the danger of an atomic holocaust is small.

The action in the Middle East demonstrates the absolute need for ready ground, naval and air action, equipped with the conventional weapons proved in World War II and in Korea and continually being improved for just such emergencies.

Would the United States have taken the step it did in Lebanon if it had only the choice of an atomic action or nothing? Would the limited objective have been worth the cost of an atomic war?

The speedy action by the Navy and Marine Corps indicates that the present concept of our military organizations, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a sound one.

The Navy and Marine Corps, along with the Army and the Air Force, fully understand their roles and missions. While the Navy

and marines were making the landings in Lebanon, the Air Force moved into readiness with its power of massive retaliation if made necessary by a sudden Russian explosion, and other naval units moved to protect America's shores and to block off any accompanying actions in other parts of the world.

It was a remarkable demonstration of military coordination and again proved how right were the opponents of the single-chief-of-staff system which would scrap our present defense organization for an omnipotent military conception.

The Middle East situation is proving that this Nation cannot forsake the so-called conventional weapons. Its nuclear armaments and ballistic missile power must be made second to none, and fast, but this country should never be left with no military alternative but all-out war.

Two Virginia Plans—A Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House passed H. R. 3, the so-called States rights bill which has as its purpose prohibiting the Supreme Court of the United States from annulling State laws simply because there are acts of Congress on the statute books dealing with the same subject unless Congress intended by its act to set aside State laws or unless the State laws are in direct conflict with Federal laws. The bill also specifically restores validity to all State sedition laws set aside by the Supreme Court in the infamous case of the notorious Communist, Steve Nelson.

On Monday, July 21, there appeared a very enlightening editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch entitled "Two Virginia Plans—A Contrast." Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the editorial in the hopes that it will bring enlightenment to the people of this country who need the know what the Supreme Court is doing to the rights of our people and the integrity and sovereignty of our States. The editorial is as follows:

TWO VIRGINIA PLANS—A CONTRAST

Thanks to a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, the House last Thursday passed the Smith bill, designed to prohibit the Supreme Court from invalidating State laws on its assumption that Congress tacitly agreed to preemption by Federal statutes.

The 241 to 155 vote rebuked the Court for equating what it imagines to have been the "intent of Congress" with the Court's own political philosophy. Repeatedly it has voided State legislation—not because of inconsistency with the Constitution but on grounds of do-it-yourself policy.

The author of this defensive measure was Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia.

Its passage by an overwhelming margin is a tribute to his prestige and parliamentary skill, and reveals a welcome awareness—that the threat to intrastate rights is not limited to the South.

Representative SMITH's Virginia plan to preserve those constitutional rights when not in conflict with congressional legislation points up its contrast with the original Virginia plan, offered at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and intended to give Congress "a negative on State laws."

At that convention the States' Rights Party was favored by the smaller States. They were partial to a loosely knit league of States, and desired a Constitution that would have been little more than a feeble enlargement of the Articles of Confederation.

Populationwise and politically, Virginia was then the giant of the family. Her fears of domination by the small fry was understandable.

The sixth clause of the Virginia plan in 1787, fortunately rejected, would have empowered Congress:

"* * * to negative all laws passed by the several States contravening in the opinion of the National Legislature in the Articles of Union."

Washington, Franklin, and Madison approved this centralization of legislative power.

"A negative on State laws," said Madison, "is the mildest expedient that can be devised for enforcing a national decree. Should no such precaution be engrafted, the only remedy would be coercion. This prerogative of the General Government is the great pervading principle that must control the centrifugal tendency of the States, which without it, will continually fly out of their proper orbits and destroy the order and harmony of the political system."

Because of the Nation's phenomenal growth the dangers of excessive State autonomy has disappeared.

In its infancy the Federation might have fallen apart, for lack of sufficient interstate authority.

Today the States are inseparably linked by the national economy, entities fully able to administer their own affairs.

The danger now is that a topheavy Central Government will become too big and too powerful, oblivious to regional diversities and hence as incompetent in the handling of multistate affairs as "the old woman who lived in a shoe."

High Court Curb Too Drastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "High Court Curb Too Drastic":

HIGH COURT CURB TOO DRASTIC

Disturbing as was the Supreme Court's decision overruling the trial and conviction of Communist Steve Nelson under a Pennsylvania antisubversion statute, the move generated in the House of Representatives to curb powers of the high tribunal in dealing with State laws is even more so.

The Inquirer decried the Steven Nelson finding because it nullified antisubversion laws in this and many other States on the ground that the Federal Smith Act preempted all authority to combat destructive communism and other forms of sedition.

Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, sought to overcome this by a simple measure to restore to the States the right to legislate against those undoubted evils.

But in the latest drastic move in the House, heavily prodded by southern States rights adherents, opponents pointed out that the bill as passed Thursday was a broad States rights measure that might put handcuffs on the Supreme Court in a wide variety of cases, including segregation.

It would be a grave mistake to enact legislation of that character. The bill has gone to the Senate where, it is intimated, its prospects are not good. It is to be hoped this is the fact and that the measure is defeated or at least modified to eliminate provisions that would make the Supreme Court a virtual cipher in dealing with many vital aspects of our Government.

Tribute to the Late B. E. Stallones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD today a notice of the death and funeral services for B. E. Stallones, of Tomball, Tex.

Mr. Stallones has been a friend of long standing, and I have worked with him personally in many of his endeavors. The farmers of Texas have lost one of their staunchest spokesmen and dearest friends in the sudden death of this outstanding Texas leader. Mr. Stallones has served as president and manager of the South Texas Producers Association of Houston, Tex., since its first operations in 1931.

He has become nationally known through his work with the farmers and producers of Texas. He has not only been a leader in his home State; he has achieved national prominence as a leader in his field of endeavor.

Mr. Stallones' interest in the cooperative approach in solving farm problems became known when he purchased and stocked a dairy farm near Tomball, Tex., in 1929. A year or so later, the South Texas Producers Association was formed, and Mr. Stallones devoted his talents and leadership unceasingly to this work. He became director of the National Milk Producers Federation in 1935, and has been on its executive committee since 1953.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item and the editorial carried in the Houston Post of Thursday, July 17, 1958, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news item and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

B. E. STALLONES RITES TODAY—FOUNDER OF MILK ASSOCIATION

Funeral services for B. E. Stallones, 65-year-old civic leader and founder-president of the South Texas Milk Producers Association, will be Thursday, at 2 p. m., in the First Baptist Church of Tomball.

A native of Arkansas and resident of Tomball and Houston since 1927, Stallones was

one of the outstanding agricultural leaders of Harris County. He died early Wednesday morning in the Tomball Hospital, of which he was a founder. Cause of death was attributed to a stroke.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. B. E. Stallones; one son, Troy; a daughter, Mrs. Dana Johnson; one grandson, Tod; four granddaughters, Dana Darlene Johnson, Gayle Johnson, Melissa Stallones, and Jennifer Stallones, all of Tomball.

Also surviving are eight brothers, W. R. Stallones, of Houston; L. E. Stallones, of Elgin; T. C. Stallones, Ike Stallones, Bill Stallones, and Hurley Stallones, all of Tomball; Kenneth Stallones, of Dallas; and Jake Stallones, of Spring; one sister, Mrs. Leota Coble, of Banning, Calif.; and a number of nieces and nephews.

The Rev. W. W. Baker, Jr., and Rev. B. P. McGowen will be in charge of the funeral services. Burial will be in the Willow Cemetery of Tomball.

B. E. STALLONES FOUGHT FOR TEXAS DAIRYMEN

B. E. Stallones, president of the South Texas Producers Association, was a controversial figure of a quarter century ago who later won the admiration and respect of his opponents.

During the depths of the depression Stallones, then operator of a small dairy farm near Tomball, organized his fellow dairymen of this area into the South Texas Producers Association. Under his leadership it grew into a giant cooperative which now has a membership of thousands of dairymen in Texas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

He fought hard and tirelessly to improve the lot of dairymen. He became a familiar figure in Washington where Secretaries of Agriculture and Members of Congress heard his views on dairy problems expressed in a booming voice that needed no microphone. His contributions to the betterment of dairying were outstanding. His death is a great loss to the industry.

Unionism and the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, representing a Chicago district and being a lifelong resident of Chicago, I have been following the activities of the Rackets Committee in the Senate closely.

Many of the restaurants mentioned recently are familiar to me and I have heard often the names of some of those from Chicago who were subpenaed by the committee to give testimony of activities by members of the restaurant unions and restaurant owners. I have a deep concern for the future of American unionism. The climate of public opinion which exists today toward unionism generally does not auger well for the days ahead.

The New World of July 18 published a splendid editorial on this subject. The views expressed in this piece are not brash but indicate calm, clear, and sound thinking, aimed, not at destroying respect for unionism but to preserve and rekindle it. At no other time has the need to do this been greater than now.

The editorial follows:

WHO'S GOING TO MAKE UP THE SCORE CARD?
(By William F. Graney)

The McClellan rackets committee has recently been focusing the powerful searchlight of TV on Chicago's restaurants and the so-called union for their employees. The quiz has revealed the tieup between this "union" and "the syndicate," or underworld mob.

The committee's hearings have revealed that this union has done nothing more than shake down restaurant owners for tribute, euphemistically called union initiation fees and dues. The owners were forced to pay or face the threat of a strike with pickets parading around their front door to keep the customers out and around the back door to keep the garbage in.

The extortion money was taken in without any benefits to employees in the form of better hours, wages, or working conditions. The employees did not even know they were "members." The only ones benefiting from the arrangement are the big boys who muscled in. Victimized were the employer, the employees, and the general public. The employees sometimes had to take salary cuts to pay "dues." If a legitimate union even got started, you can imagine the opposition.

The mobsters are not talking, but who really needs their self-incrimination now? Their refusals to answer the questions of the committee were enough to convince viewers of their connection with the shakedown. This conviction of the general public was no doubt the aim of the committee.

It is likely a hope of the committee to stir this conviction into a state of indignation. Public indignation can be a powerful force to support future legislation. It can press law enforcers to be more alert and better equipped. It can give the AFL–CIO the public support it needs to throw out the union, just as it threw out Jimmy Hoffa's teamsters, if the International Restaurant Union cannot guarantee an immediate clean up.

The public can be aroused, but first it has to be informed. You can't distinguish a legitimate union from a hoodlum union without a scorecard. Now who is supposed to make up the scorecard? Is it a Senate committee, police officers, or the AFL–CIO? I would think, for the sake of unionism, it should be the AFL–CIO. We can hope to see a swift descent on this muscle outfit, but what can we expect in the future? Are we going to have to wait for a Senate committee exposé before any action is taken by legitimate unionism against hoodlums in unions?

The case of Hoffa's union was admittedly a different story. The teamsters union was seeking and obtaining benefits for its members, and, strange to say, it still does even after its expulsion. It was, and still is a powerful union with 1½ million members. The Senate committee hearings which revealed the questionableness, if not the corruption of its leadership gave George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, the public support he needed for the strong action of expulsion.

Fortunately, for those who like to keep score, the restaurant union in Chicago made no effort to mask their muscle operation by giving any service to the "members" of the union. The list of members was not even kept accurately. That was a mistake which the AFL–CIO failed to capitalize on.

Senate committees have an admitted advantage over the AFL–CIO in the power to subpena witnesses. But would witnesses have to be subpenaed to learn that members were receiving no benefits from union dues? It seems a visit and conversation with listed "members" would have revealed this.

Could it be the AFL–CIO was asleep; or could it be that this hoodlum influence is so strong in unionism as to tie the hands of the AFL–CIO; or could it be that the AFL–CIO is so internally weak as not to maintain the minimum of standards for entrance to its organization? I suspect the answer lies in the third possibility. The AFL–CIO would have to and should explain. Whatever the ailment a remedy must be found quickly if people are to maintain respect for American unionism.

There is a danger arising from these hearings that people may lump all unions together. There are going to be people who will say, "See, I told you unions are run by gangsters, just like I've been saying all along." If this necessary distinction between good and bad unions is to be made by the public, help is needed. It should come from the AFL–CIO.

Opinion Poll Indicates Voters' Beliefs on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently conducted an opinion poll among my constituents of the Seventh District of Indiana. I believe the results of this sampling are of significance and of interest to my colleagues.

SUMMARY OF POLL RESULTS

Despite the soft approach of Communist diplomats, only 4 out of 10 replies indicate hope for a worthwhile summit conference. The response was divided about evenly until the political execution of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian leaders became known. Thereafter the daily tabulations showed as little as 25 percent hopeful about a summit meeting.

More than 60 percent of those responding favor stopping our testing of nuclear weapons after the current series is completed, if the Russians will do the same. The favorable answers usually were qualified with the admonition to be sure that the Russians do not resume testing without our learning of it.

Two out of three replies favored the postponement of general tax reduction until the Federal budget can be balanced and deficit financing avoided. Additional comments on this subject indicate that people recognize that defense is costly, but believe that overall Government spending can be reduced. Some express pessimism about balancing the budget, but fear tax reduction at this time would merely increase inflation.

Excise tax reduction was favored by about the same margin that general tax reduction was opposed. Many of the wartime taxes on transportation, communications, autos, and appliances are considered burdensome, and it is felt that reduction or elimination of the taxes on these services and products would stimulate sales and promote economic recovery.

Legislation to prohibit any of the forms of toll television was favored by 3 out of 4 respondents, for it is felt that

such charges would put an unnecessary burden on low-income families who rely on television for much of their entertainment and news. Several of those who oppose prohibitive legislation stated that they are opposed to pay TV, but do not believe a legislative ban is necessary to defeat it.

Almost 75 percent of the replies expressed the belief that foreign aid appropriations should be substantially reduced from the amount of the authorization bill which had passed the House before the questionnaire was released. Many noted in the margin that large-scale foreign aid should be discontinued altogether.

Strong support was expressed for greater traffic control over military aircraft to avoid repetitions of recent mid-air disasters, although there is reluctance to hinder the alert readiness of our air defense forces.

The replies, which came from non-farm as well as farm families, indicate 1 out of 5 prefer price supports at a fixed 90 percent of parity over the sliding scale of flexible supports. More than 1 in 10 declined to comment on this question, however, and several suggested the elimination of price support programs.

By a 3 to 2 margin, voters rejected proposals for a large-scale program of Federal grants and loans to help communities undertake public works projects, frequently expressing the fear that they would become make-work projects typical of some of the depression relief programs. Both yes and no answers frequently were qualified with suggestions as to what types of programs would be worthwhile.

The response was better than 4 to 1 against giving diplomatic recognition to Communist China. This is a clear indication of public dislike and distrust of the Peiping regime until it demonstrates a capacity to act as a responsible nation.

POLL PROVIDES VALUABLE INSIGHT

We all recognize our duty to know the thoughts and beliefs of our constituents and to be the spokesmen of these views in the House of Representatives. It is not an easy task to keep well-acquainted with voter sentiments in districts that cover large areas and contain populations of 300,000 or more. In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams and telephone calls I receive, I greatly appreciate the many personal contacts I have with seventh district people, including my customary tour of all of the post offices in each of the 11 counties. I believe this poll is another worthwhile tool for keeping closely in touch with the legislative wishes of the people, and consequently being better able to represent them. Each of those who replied helped to form this cross-section of public opinion, and demonstrated the willing participation and interest in public affairs which has been the hallmark of American citizenship.

I commend this insight into the thinking of my constituents to all of my colleagues for I know these people to be truly representative of the finest traits and characteristics of this Nation.

Final summary of opinion poll conducted by Congressman William G. Bray, Seventh District Indiana

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe a so-called summit conference between leaders of the free world and Soviet Russia would help to relieve world unrest?	42	53	5
2. At the conclusion of our 1958 test series, should we then stop testing nuclear weapons if the Russians will do the same?	62	35	3
3. Should personal and corporation income tax reduction be postponed until the budget is balanced and deficit financing avoided?	67	26	7
4. Should excise taxes (transportation, communications, autos, appliances, etc.) be reduced to promote business and expand employment?	68	29	3
5. Do you favor legislation outlawing pay television?	73	22	5
6. The House has authorized $2,900,000,000 in foreign aid for 1959. Do you believe the appropriation, to be voted on soon, should be substantially less than the authorization?	74	21	5
7. Should military aircraft be placed under civil air safety control to reduce the chance of midair collisions?	74	19	7
8. Do you favor fixed (as opposed to flexible) price supports for farm commodities?	22	65	13
9. Should the Government begin a large program of grants and loans to communities for public works to stimulate economic activity?	38	57	5
10. Do you believe the United States should give diplomatic recognition to the government of Communist China?	16	80	4

NATO Parliamentarians' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 7, 1958, which refers to a resolution which is on the Senate Calendar. The resolution relates to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. We have for consideration a concurrent resolution, sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, approved by the full committee. The resolution proposes to carry out some of the recommendations which were agreed to by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference last September.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LINKS FOR NATO

The Senate has a chance to help foster, if even in a modest way, a more meaningful sense of community among the 15 nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Last September, the annual conference of NATO Parliamentarians conceived the idea of giving private citizens a chance to confer together on ways of enhancing the Atlantic Alliance. Unanimously, the Parliamentarians—all legislators from NATO countries—called upon their governments to appoint officially outstanding private citizens as delegates to such a conference. This would fill a void which now exists by giving private citizens a role in NATO. Conceivably, the citizens could propose useful suggestions for giving greater unity of purpose to NATO and emphasizing the nonmilitary aspects of the alliance. No citizens, of course, could commit his government, and all proposals would be advisory.

The next step in this country is before the Senate. All the Senators present at the NATO meeting have joined with Senator GREEN in sponsoring a concurrent resolution which would request the President to take appropriate action. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, without dissent, approved the resolution; favorable action in the House seems assured if and when the Senate as a whole votes its approval. Therein lies the rub. Faced with the adjournment confusion, this noncontroversial resolution could be relegated to limbo. That would be a pity. There is much cogency in Senator GREEN's comment that "all wisdom does not lie in governments." Surely the Senate will give the businessmen, scholars, labor leaders and scientists a chance to throw new light on this problem of so much concern to the free world.

San Jose Building Boom Paces Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following editorial which appeared in the San Jose News under date of July 10, 1958:

SAN JOSE BUILDING BOOM PACES NATION

City Building Inspector R. V. Lotz reports that new building permits for the first 6 months of the year are running almost $2 million over the same period of last year. Our jubilation knows no bounds since we have repeatedly said construction is the most substantial evidence of a soaring economy and lays the basis for prosperity in every other single field.

Single family homes lead the parade with permits at $18.7 million. During the year previous, the score stood at $14.5 million, a fantastic increase. In addition, Hayward builder A. L. Branden will this forthcoming Sunday dedicate his Tropicana Village which will be a $150 million community of 10,000 homes, the largest such project ever planned in the West, with the site at Bayshore Freeway and Story Road.

What is happening in this area reflects the very same pattern, if to a lesser degree, developing across the Nation. The F. W. Dodge Corp., construction news and marketing analysts, report that construction contracts made in May were at the very highest level for any month in any year in the history of the Nation.

The Dodge company also says that the awards, which total for May more than $3.4 billion, exceed May of 1957 by nine one-hundredths of 1 percent. In addition, the third highest month in history, June of 1957, was 5 percent below last month's record. These figures, incidentally, run parallel with the San Jose reports for they are, by and large, mostly concerned with home rather than commercial building.

Since there is absolutely no question but that construction is the most reliable indicator of economic trends, it is possible to be complacent about a sneer at the United States hurled the other day by Nikita Khrushchev who took time out in East Berlin to taunt losing capitalism. The Russian pointed out with obvious relish at the American recession and said smugly there was no need for the Soviet Union to destroy the United States by force of arms, implying that we are doing a good job of economic suicide all by ourselves.

Thus San Jose is still booming along and the rest of the Nation is lifting itself out of the slump in the most constructive and lasting of ways. And the most recent employment index verifies this.

Every Third Family Hit by Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and illuminating document on the effects of the recession has recently come to my attention. This is Elmo Roper's Public Pulse of July 19.

Mr. Roper titles his release "Every Third Family Hit By Recession," and goes on to substantiate this claim on the basis of questions which were asked of a cross-section of the population, nationwide.

To me one of the most enlightening comments on the impact which the recession has made on the individual stems from the correlation which is made between economic status and unemployment. These statistics show that unemployment is significantly higher—21 percent—among families that are already in the low income group, while in the high or upper middle income group that is only 3 percent.

Even worse is the substantiation which Mr. Roper seems to make for the thesis that unemployment is felt first and worst by Negroes. Twenty-four percent of Negro families have an unemployed member, as opposed to only 9 percent of white families.

I highly recommend this short article to my colleagues as a new perspective of the recession, and under leave to extend my remarks, include it in the RECORD:

One third of the Nation has felt the impact of the current recession. This means that close to 60 million people have been affected in some degree—either by loss of employment or loss in income—by the economic malaise that has crept across the Nation in the past year. A nationwide cross section was asked this question:

I'd like to know a little about how the recession has affected you personally. Which of these statements applies to you?

	Percent
I or someone in my immediate family is out of work	10
While no one in my family is out of work, our family income is less than it was a year ago	22
Our family income is the same as it was a year ago	52
Our family income is higher than it was a year ago	14
Express no opinion	2

What job statistics do not show is the millions of people who while still at their jobs, have suffered cuts in pay or in overtime. The official figures do not record how many salesmen are facing unaccustomed sales resistance, to the extent that their families face unaccustomed budget restrictions. Nor do they reveal the number of factory workers who have dropped from a 5-day week plus overtime to a 4 or 3-day week. Yet such people represent a group more than twice as large as those actually unemployed.

High though these figures are, they still leave the majority of the public untouched by the 1957–58 downturn. They also reveal a substantial segment who are actually better off than they were a year ago. This last group is of course a mixture of people on their first jobs, people who benefit from automatic pay increases, as well as those working in businesses or industries that are actually doing better this year than last.

Inevitably, the economic blight is spread unevenly over the economic scale. Among people whose normal standard of living is above average, the better off and the worse off balance each other out. But among those already on the economic margin, half the families have suffered a setback in their standard of living:

[In percent]

	High or upper middle income	Middle income	Low income
Out of work	3	7	21
Income lower	18	21	26
Income same	56	57	43
Income higher	20	14	8
Express no opinion	3	1	2

In addition, the old belief that Negroes are last hired, first fired gains substantial backing from today's results. Only 9 percent of white families have an unemployed member at the present time, but 24 percent of Negro families report this sad statistic.

RURAL RECESSION WORST

Although cities like Detroit have been hard hit, in general people in large cities have weathered this year's rugged economic climate better than people in small towns and country areas. While in cities of 100,000 or more, 28 percent either have a family member out of work or reduced family income, the corresponding figure for people from towns of 2,500 or less and those living in rural areas is 37 percent.

Since farm income is up somewhat, the rural recession appears to reflect a loss of job opportunities off, rather than on, the farms. While agriculture demanding less and less manpower, country and smalltown people have been turning more and more to forms of industrial employment within commuting range of their homes. Apparently this kind of employment has dropped sharply.

Regionally, midwesterners and southerners are most affected. The lowest out-of-work figure is reported for families in the Northeast. The Far West, whose unemployment figures are as high as those of any other part of the country, also shows the greatest number of people better off.

[In percent]

	East	Midwest	South	Far West
Out of work	6	11	12	12
Income lower	23	23	22	18
Income same	58	50	51	46
Income higher	12	14	11	21
Express no opinion	1	2	4	3

What do these figures mean? They make it clear that the blight of unemployment spreads quickly beyond those who actually lose their jobs. A dip that has not earned the name depression has nonetheless reduced the economic well-being of a full third of the Nation's families.

Senators Thank Sun-Times for Telecast of Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Chicago Sun Times is fully aware of the appreciation on the part of Congress and the public, including the working men and women as well as businessmen for telecasting the Senate rackets-committee hearings held in Chicago recently.

This endeavor was indeed an act of public service and I want to thank the Chicago Sun Times, too.

It is my belief that better solutions and sounder legislation will result because the eyes of the people are on some of the unscrupulous labor leaders as well as on Congress. The public is informed and the people want action to remedy and not destroy, to strengthen, not weaken our laws in the labor field. Justice to all concerned will not be wrought with prejudicial thinking and discriminatory legislation.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of July 19, 1958]

SENATORS THANK SUN-TIMES FOR TELECAST OF HEARINGS

(By Jack McPhaul)

With the thanks of the government, a 2-week public service telecast of the Senate rackets committee probe ended Friday.

The camera report to Chicagoans on gangster activties in their city initiated by the Sun-Times and station WBKB (channel 7) ended with the reading of statements by senators as they concluded the Chicago phase of the hearings.

The Sun-Times and WBKB presentation began with the start of hearings July 8 and the cameras were on the job at every session thereafter.

WIDE INTEREST SHOWN

Surveys have shown that the telecasts attached wide interest and attention throughout the Chicago area. Letters received by this newspaper reflected the anxiety and indignation of citizens over the disclosures

of hoodlum forays against working people and businessmen.

This alerting of the public to gangland violence, intimidation and extortion was one of the chief goals of the hearings, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (Democrat of Arkansas), committee chairman, said Friday.

"This committee is very grateful to The Sun-Times and Station WBKB for televising the hearings," said Senator MCCLELLAN. "It was a genuine public service. The program was not sponsored. It was presented by The Sun-Times and WBKB at their own expense."

MCCLELLAN said he wished that similar public service programs could be presented in other communities during exposures of local conditions.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT (Republican of South Dakota) and Senator FRANK CHURCH (Democrat of Idaho), other committee members, joined with the chairman in praising the telecast.

"PUBLIC'S BUSINESS"

"This is the public's business," said CHURCH. "It is appropriate that the hearings be televised and publicized in the press."

In addition to supporting the telecast, The Sun-Times assigned staff reporters to the hearing for full newspage coverage of the testimony, background information and interpretation.

Televiewers in homes and public places watched and listened as MCCLELLAN stated that the next move was up to Chicago public officials. He said:

"Other than legislation, the final good, the maximum good can only come if local enforcement officers will meet their responsibilities and pursue the clues we have developed here to the end that those who have committed criminal acts are brought to the bar of justice."

Again, the Coin Clippers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, inflation continues to rob the financially prudent and thrifty citizen. It oppresses the elderly and the disabled, existing on modest fixed compensation, pension or savings.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a thought-provoking statement on the effects of this vicious and unbridled economic robber contained in a letter I have received from Mr. Maury A. Hubbard, executive secretary of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation.

The pertinent portion of his letter follows:

Every responsible citizen is interested in security and a large part of our total energies are expended toward the attainment of this objective. This is done through systematic savings which are generally invested in life insurance policies, pensions, annuities, stocks, bonds or real estate and personal property. Such savings and investments not only provide security for those who prudently provide for their own future—they also provide the capital which must be available to supply the machines and tools needed by job holders in an ever expanding economy. Up until now, this has been one of the factors responsible for our fantastic growth and development.

But people will not save for the future without some assurance that their savings will be protected.

It is here that government has a very solemn moral obligation and responsibility. It is not the responsibility of government to undertake the impossible task of providing security for each of its citizens—this is something that they and they alone can do. People support government—government cannot support people.

Instead of attempting the impossible, the Congress should make it a first order of business to discharge its responsibility in preventing any further deterioration and erosion in the value of savings already accumulated or which will be accumulated in the future.

There are numerous examples of why this is necessary and desirable.

We shudder at the thought of the coin clipping indulged in by the Roman emperors in order to finance false and fraudulent schemes designed to mislead people into thinking that government could or would provide for their security. Dishonest practices of this sort led to the collapse of the mighty Roman Empire.

The wild inflation in Germany following World War I brought on the collapse of government that produced Hitler.

The political shenanigans of Argentina's Peron, who professed to love the poor people, the shirtless ones, caused a deterioration in the value of money amounting to 73 percent over a 9-year period. Mr. Peron destroyed 73 percent of the security of the provident people in Argentina under the guise of providing for their security. Thrifty people, the backbone of every country, lost their earned security and the shirtless ones, the poor people, lost job opportunities for the lack of capital to provide the machines and tools needed to supply jobs. Result: no one has security—not even Mr. Peron.

France is now on the verge of collapse—politically, economically, and militarily—in spite of millions which we have poured down the rathole trying to bolster up and support her socialistic economy. The job is completely hopeless and will continue so until the people of France recognize the utter futility of government attempts to do for people what the people should and must do for themselves. In its failure to protect the people's savings, however, government has made it impossible for even the wise and the provident to take care of their own future needs.

Consider the plight of the farsighted Frenchman who at the age of 21 in the year 1914 started a program of systematic savings which would have given him a comfortable retirement income of 1,000 francs per month beginning in 1958. For his provident sacrifice over the years, at retirement, his reward was 1,000 francs per month—worth the price of 1 meal every 30 days. Such is the end product of government-guaranteed security.

Well, that can't happen here—some will say. But it is happening here. The dollar of 1939 is now worth 48 cents. It has lost 15 percent of its purchasing power in the last 9 years. Each month, in spite of the recession, prices move up, the papers say. It would be more accurate to say that each month the value of money shrinks. Security based on a dollar that becomes increasingly insecure is a cruel political fraud. It is a crime against the very people whose provident foresight and self-sacrifice have entitled them to a secure old age and whose savings have provided the machines, tools, and other resources necessary for our unprecedented progress.

The total tax take, Federal, State, and local, now amounts to around 32 percent of the total earnings of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Pushing this rate any higher would generate irresistible demands for increased salaries and wages plus further demands for the Government to provide services which the exorbitant tax rate makes it increasingly difficult for families to provide for themselves. Hence the only sensible course is to reduce expenditures to balance our tax income. Yet in spite of indications that the Federal budget may be as much as $10 billion out of balance on the red side, we are witnessing the disgusting spectacle of some Congressmen falling over themselves in their attempts to force through legislation calling for vast new and additional Federal outlays.

As coin clippers, such Representatives put the ancient rulers to shame, and as pilferers of the public's savings, these men make of John Dillinger a 10th rater.

I Have Served My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include "A Mother's Letter to Theodore Roosevelt," dated February 3, 1916, and his reply:

"I HAVE SERVED MY COUNTRY"—A MOTHER'S LETTER TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND HIS REPLY

THE LETTER TO COLONEL ROOSEVELT

DEAR SIR: When you were talking of "race suicide" I was rearing a large family on almost no income. I often thought of writing to you of some of my hardships and now when "preparedness" may take some of my boys I feel I must. I have 11 of my own and brought up 3 stepchildren, and yet in the 30 years of my married life I have never had a new cloak or winter hat. I have sent seven children to school at one time. I had a family of 10 for 18 years with no money to hire a washerwoman though bearing a child every 2 years. Nine—several through or nearly—of my children have got into high school and two into State Normal School and one into the University of Michigan. I haven't eaten a paid-for meal in 20 years or paid for a night's lodging in 30. Not 1 of the 5 boys—the youngest is 15—use tobacco or liquor. I have worn men's discarded shoes much of the time. I have had little time for reading.

I think I have served my country, my husband has been an invalid for 6 years—leaving me the care and much work on our little sandy farm. I have bothered you enough. To me race suicide has perhaps a different meaning when I think my boys may have to face the cannon.

Respectfully,

Mrs. ——— ———.

COLONEL ROOSEVELT'S REPLY

FEBRUARY 9, 1916.

MY DEAR MRS. ———: Your letter interests me very much. It interests me both because of what you tell me about yourself, and because of what may be the attitude of mind of other women and men, whom I heartily respect and admire, and who do not understand quite what it is that I am trying to say to our people.

You say that when I was talking of race suicide you were rearing a large family on almost no income; that you often thought of writing to me of some of your hardships; and that now that my "preparedness" may take some of your boys, you feel you must write to me. You state you have 11 children of your own and have brought up 3 step-

children, and that yet, in the 30 years of your married life, you have "never had a new cloak or winter hat" and that you had sent 7 of the children to school at one time and had a family of 10 for 18 years, with no money to hire a washerwoman, although you were bearing a child every 2 years; and you say that, of your children, 9 have gotten into high school and 2 into the State normal school and 1 into the University of Michigan; that you "haven't eaten a paid-for meal in 20 years or paid for a night's lodging in 30," and that you have had most of the time to wear men's discarded shoes and have had little time for reading; and you say that you feel that you have served your country. (And so you have.) You add that your husband has been an invalid for 6 years, so that you have had to do most of the work on your little sandy farm. You end by saying that race suicide has perhaps a different meaning to you now, when you think your boys "may have to face the cannon."

Now, my dear Mrs. ———, you have described a career of service which makes me feel more like taking off my hat to you and saluting you as a citizen deserving of the highest honor, than I would feel as regards any colonel of a crack regiment. But you seem to think, if I understand your letter aright, that "preparedness" is in some way designed to make your boys food for cannon. Now, as a matter of fact, the surest way to prevent your boys from being food for cannon is to have them, and all the other young men of the country—my boys, for instance, and the boys of all other fathers and mothers throughout the country—so trained, so prepared, that it will not be safe for any foreign foe to attack us. Preparedness no more invites war than fire insurance invites a fire. I shall come back to this matter again in a moment. But I will speak to you first a word as to what you say about race suicide. I have never preached the imposition of an excessive maternity on any woman. I have always said that every man worth calling such will feel a peculiar sense of chivalric tenderness toward his wife, the mother of his children. He must be unselfish and considerate with her. But, exactly as he must do his duty, so she must do her duty. I have said that it is self-evident that unless the average woman, capable of having children, has four, the race will not go forward; for this is necessary in order to offset the women who for proper reasons do not marry, or who, from no fault of their own, have no children, or only 1 or 2, or whose children die before they grow up. I do not want to see us Americans forced to import our babies from abroad. I do not want to see the stock of people like yourself and like my family die out—and you do not either; and it will inevitably die out if the average man and the average woman are so selfish and so cold that they wish either no children, or just 1 or 2 children. We have had six children in this family. We wish we had more. Now the grandchildren are coming along; and I am sure you agree with me that no other success in life, not being President, or being wealthy, or going to college, or anything else, comes up to the success of the man and woman who can feel that they have done their duty and that their children and grandchildren rise up to call them blessed.

You have had to work very hard, but, Mrs. ———, I am sure you are the type of woman who takes pride in what you have accomplished. Surely, you feel you are entitled to respect, not sympathy or pity. Certainly this is the way I feel about you. I feel that you are the kind of American of whom all good Americans should be proud. I think that what you have done puts you in the first rank of those men and women of this generation who have served their country.

Now, for what you say about preparedness. I am enclosing you a slip of paper containing an account of the destruction that has been wrought in Belgium by the German Army. Over 18,000 houses have been destroyed. You will see that in one town 127 out of 130 houses were burned to the ground, and in another 1,263 out of 1,375. A population twice the size of that of Michigan is now living under conditions where, if the women of a family are maltreated, the father and sons dare not stand up for them against any soldier of the invading army, because they would be shot if they did so. In some towns, the officers treat the women and children well. In other towns they permit frightful misconduct toward them. Would you wish your sons to see you and their sisters frightfully maltreated and be afraid in any way even to show resentment against the brutal men guilty of the misconduct? This is exactly what has happened to the population of Belgium—7 million souls—because they had not prepared their strength in advance. Beligum gave no cause of offense to any nation. She was much freer from giving offense than the United States has been. She had not committed a wrong of any kind or sort; but she was rich; she was badly prepared; only a small proportion of her people had been trained to war; and so she was invaded. For 18 months her people have been living in misery such as you and I can hardly picture to ourselves. The shame, the humiliation and suffering have been well-nigh intolerable. Many hundreds of Belgian women and children, many thousands of men, have ben killed. Multitudes of innocent noncombatants have been killed, or their houses burned, and their little all taken from them. Many hundreds of thousands are in the direst want. All are suffering greatly. And this is because her people had not prepared and because a big, powerful neutral nation like the United States did not dare to stand up for them.

Mrs. Roosevelt and I have four sons and they are as dear to us as your sons are to you. If we now had war, these four boys would all go. We think it entirely right that they should go if their country needs them. But I do not think it fair that they should be sent to defend the boys who are too soft or too timid to face the cannon, or the other boys who wish to stay at home to make money while somebody else protects them. If throughout this country all young men like your sons and like mine are trained so that they can defend this country in time of trouble, I do not believe that the trouble with ever come. Preparedness will probably prevent these boys from having to face the cannon; but if other nations become convinced that the mothers of this country have raised their boys to be afraid to face the cannon, then you can be absolutely certain that, sooner or later, these other nations will come over and treat us just as the military powers of the old world have treated the Chinese. The Chinese were too proud to fight; and so they have been kicked. Those of our people who are too proud to fight ought to wear pigtails.

You say you have had little time for reading; but your letter interests me so that I am sending you a copy of my autobiography. You won't care to read it all; but I wish you would read about our family life and about what I say of war and social justice. I think, on the whole, you will agree with what is therein said.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

A Dream Come True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 years that I have served in Congress, I have sponsored the annual Mack educational tour to Washington, D. C., for schoolchildren of the 21st Congressional District of Illinois. It has been my policy to ask the children, after returning to Illinois, to submit an essay giving their impressions of their trip. Each year the American flag which was flying over the Capitol when the students visited there is awarded to the writer of the best essay.

This year the winner of the flag was Paul James Walstad, of Morrisonville, Ill. I would like to include his winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY IMPRESSIONS OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

(By Paul James Walstad)

During my study of American history in junior high school, I dreamed of the time I would be able to visit our Nation's Capital. This dream was first implanted in me by my mother who lived and worked in Washington, D. C., for 3 years before I was born. My dream came true, due to the generosity of Congressman PETER F. MACK, Jr., during the period June 9 through June 13, 1958.

I learned that our Capital City is laid out in a wheel design, with the stately Capitol Building forming the hub, and the beautiful avenues, along which are constructed the many Government buildings, the spokes. As I began the tour I was first impressed by the beauty of the city and its beautiful marble buildings. However, as the tour progressed I became increasingly aware of the historic background which formed the city and laid the foundation for our present form of government. Once in the Capitol Building I was impressed with its structure, the statues of our forefathers, and the beautiful paintings on the walls. As the tour of the Capitol Building progressed I felt, along with the others, that it truly is the living symbol of freedom.

The tour covered such places as the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where we shook hands with J. Edgar Hoover and saw various new criminal detection devices, the home of our first President at Mount Vernon, the National Cemetery in Arlington, the Supreme Court Building, the White House, and many other points of interest. We also, during the tour, visited Jefferson's Memorial, Washington's Monument and last, but not least, Lincoln's Memorial where I was impressed by the large statue of Lincoln.

As I went from one point of interest to another, I was impressed by how closely related each was with the other. In Washington, D. C., lies the beginning of our government and from it comes the hopes and promises that our Nation shall remain free.

This feeling was most apparent during my visit to a session of the House of Representatives and to the Senate. There I became aware that we are living in the days of vital history making. As I watched our Representatives and Senators at work, I was espe-

cially grateful for our democratic form of government.

As I said goodby to our Capital and started on the trip home, I promised myself that I would, somehow, do some small task in helping to keep our Nation free and always be faithful to her.

Right To Come, Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1958, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which pointed up the matter of the President's proposal to Congress to enact legislation to restore to the Government the right to deny passports to Communists and their sympathizers.

Since that date, another newspaper item in the form of a letter to the editor of the Baltimore Evening Sun by George Washington Williams, of Baltimore, Md., which addresses itself to this same important problem, has come to my attention. These two newspaper articles herein referred to come from widely separate sections of our country and, by reason of their separation, point to two significant facts: First, that the American people are alarmed by the continuous, unbroken string of Communist-coddling decisions of the Supreme Court; and, second, that this alarm is not sectional. To the contrary, this feeling of alarm, disgust and grave suspicion of a Court which has subordinated law, national security and commonsense to what they glibly and sanctimoniously refer to as individual rights, is a general one shared by the people throughout the country.

Travel abroad for purposes which might be inimical to the national interests of the American Government is not one of the inherent rights of citizenship. Instead, it is a high privilege and one which should be restricted to those loyal Americans who have demonstrated their loyalty to the United States—the country upon which they may call for protection while traveling in foreign lands.

Under unanimous consent I insert this item herewith:

RIGHT TO COME, GO

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN.

SIR: The matter of the refusal of passports has been given a fair amount of attention by the Sunpapers and the President is now pressing for legislation to provide him with discriminatory power. As we not infrequently refer to the Magna Carta in connection with what may be called primordial rights reference therein to this problem may be appropriately made at this time. Section 41 of the original Carta provided for all merchants to come and go, except in time of war. The following section provided that "It shall be lawful, for the time to come, for anyone to go out of our kingdom, and return safely and securely * * * unless in time of war, by some short space, for the common benefit of the realm." The other reservations are not important to the moment, except "according to the law of the land."

Now, there were a number of changes in the Carta, but the one in common use will show that section 42 has been eliminated, which is found only in the original Carta. It appears that the King had the right to control his subjects' movements by the use of the writ "ne exeat regno," and particularly in the interest of war necessities. In any circumstance, the right to go and come was dependent upon circumstances and was finally eliminated from the Carta, thus making the matter of coming and going dependent upon the needs of the kingdom as provided for by law. It will be noted that this coming and going, as the right appeared in the original Carta, was for the common benefit of the realm, and not for the convenience of the subject. So we find that the right to come and go is not completely rooted in that basic document to the point where the interference with it runs afoul of due process or the law-of-the-land limitation on government action.

GEO. WASHINGTON WILLIAMS.
BALTIMORE, *July 9.*

Letter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, the following is a letter which I am sending to some of my constituents in Louisiana:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am enclosing a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I will appreciate your reading. This will give you an idea of a few of the accomplishments which I have worked hard to bring about as your Congressman. Since January of 1943, I have had the great honor and privilege of serving you as your Representative in Congress. During my term of office, which counting this year will make 16, I have done my very best to give you the kind of representation that you wanted and deserve here in Washington.

I have tried to help each and every one in the district that called upon me for assistance during this period, and have done everything possible to give each and every person my sympathetic and complete cooperation in their problems with a feeling of understanding and friendship. As you no doubt realize, since 1942 we have been through, and are still going through, perilous times. I think you will agree with me that my seniority and experience in Congress for the past 16 years certainly enables me to work in your best interests, and for the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Since Congress is still in session, and may or may not adjourn before election day, I will be deprived of an opportunity to get around the district to personally see and shake hands with you, and for that reason, I am writing this letter to sincerely ask you for your vote and support on Saturday, August 23, which is election day.

I am extremely grateful for your kind and sincere support in all my previous elections, and I again will be most appreciative for your vote and support on Saturday, August 23. I know many times it is most inconvenient to go to the polls on election day, but I again urge you to do everything possible to go to the polls and be sure to vote, Saturday, August 23. You may rest assured that I shall continue to do everything within my power to help and assist you in any trouble that may beset you at this time and in the future. You may, therefore, rest assured that I shall continue to put forth my best efforts in your behalf.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JIMMY MORRISON,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—As I have said in the past, I want you to feel that at any time I can serve you in my capacity as your Congressman, please do not hesitate to call on me. Best regards.

J. H. M.

H. R. 469, a Bill To Require Fiber Content Labeling of All Textile Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, most of the opposition to H. R. 469, my bill to require fiber content labeling of all textile products, has come from various segments of the garment industry. I think it is worth noting that one of that industry's well respected and longtime columnists, Dorothy L. Wallis, who has been writing for the Women's Wear Daily for many years, has spoken up strongly in favor of fiber content labeling. Under unanimous consent, I include her column of May 27, 1958:

WHAT'S IN IT?

(By Dorothy L. Wallis)

May a consumer have an opinion? Amid current hullabaloo on the subject of compulsory fabric fiber labeling, has it not occurred to some of the disputants that in many cases the consumer wants to know?

The pros and the cons battle, scourging each other with "selfish interests," "high-powered promotion," "protection of the customer," and other robust terms. "The textile industry is not misrepresenting its products," insists a spokesman in a lately published letter to the New York Times. Hardship, high costs, hitting an industry when it's down are all bandied about freely. "We tell the consumer what she needs to know," insists one faction. "She's more interested in durability, shrinkage, colorfastness, and service."

Well, here's one consumer who wants to know all that, and still wants to know what fibers go into the materials she buys. I'm no textile technician, but I'd like respect for the small knowledge I have, when it comes to materials with which I've had, or am going to have, experience.

I'm able to learn what specific fur I'm buying. And incidentally, from what country in the world it comes, another controversial aspect of the textile labeling bill, as it's being juggled about in House and Senate. Perhaps the bill is, as argued by some antagonists, a propaganda effort on the part of cotton growers. Certainly parts of the fur industry fought their bill before it finally became law. Presumably, nobody's yet gone out of the fur business simply by reason of having to identify his goods. The

same situation may well continue in the textile fields. And here's one consumer who will be happier and more satisfied—if anybody in textiles cares.

Soviet Schedule Kept in Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of July 17, 1958, is most interesting. It reveals in retrospect what I said more than 2 years ago was in prospect.

I told it to all who would listen, including all of the people I could get to in the White House, in the State Department, as well as to our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It should have been in their files then. There can be no excuse for it not having been verified by them long before the happening of any of the events recounted.

The article by Drew Pearson, based on his own travels through the area, follows:

SOVIET SCHEDULE KEPT IN NEAR EAST

(By Drew Pearson)

The Kremlin timetable for the Near East is running right on schedule. Last October, after talks with Arab leaders, this writer reported Nasser's plan to unite Syria and Egypt, and Moscow's plan to work with Nasser in gradually taking over all the Arab States through subversion and revolution.

The Kremlin timetable, as then reported, was 3 months to take over the desert kingdom of Jordan; 6 months to take Saudi Arabia; 9 months to take Lebanon; and 12 months to take Iraq.

The timetable is late in one respect, early in another. Jordan did not fall in 3 months. Tough little King Hussein, backed by American arms and the British-trained Bedouins of the Arab Legion, resisted all attempts to undermine his regime.

Instead, the timetable was speeded up for Iraq. This country, supposed stronghold of the West, was scheduled to become Nasserized in 12 months. Instead it fell in 9 months.

It was to block the Kremlin timetable that the Eisenhower doctrine was proclaimed. Here is how both timetable and the doctrine are working:

Saudi Arabia: King Saud's glamor visit to the United States seems to have been for naught. The old King is sick, a virtual prisoner in his own palace, surrounded by wives, children, and medical prescriptions. His brother, Prince Faisal, a friend of Nasser, has been running the country.

Saud has sent a hurry-up call to the State Department to send an American doctor to his desert capital. After the doctor's arrival it's expected Saud will go to Switzerland for medical treatment and remain there indefinately. This will be the cue for Prince Faisal to become King. There is already unrest in Saudi Arabia and a definite tie-up with Egypt is expected shortly after Faisal assumes the throne.

Lebanon: Handsome, pro-West President Chamoun, a Catholic surrounded by Moslems, is bitter against the United States. For weeks he has been pressing Secretary Dulles informally for aid under the Eisenhower doctrine; and for an equal number of weeks Dulles has been working through the United States Ambassador to head off any formal request for aid. Only this week did the desperate Chamoun lay it on the line. Up until then, Dulles had pointed out that the United Nations found no evidence of foreign intervention.

However, U. N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjold has now admitted privately to American diplomats that he deliberately whitewashed Syrian-Egyptian intervention in Lebanon in order not to embarrass Nasser. When Hammarskjold went to Cairo, Nasser promised to cooperate with the U. N., if the U. N. did not embarrass him. On the other hand, if the United States and England intervened, Nasser warned, he would be forced to resist. So Hammarskjold pulled a "Munich" and declared there was little evidence of Egyptian-Syrian intervention in Lebanon.

President Chamoun, who will step down after the July elections, is expected to throw his weight to the Lebanese chief of staff, Gen. Fuad Shehab, his successor. However, he has warned that Shehab is deceitful, will probably play ball with Nasser. General Shehab has been sunning himself on the beaches outside Beirut instead of fighting to defend his country.

Iraq: Instead of cooperating with Dag Hammarskjold as promised, Nasser's agents in Baghdad dealt the West one of the most deadly blows so far received in the Near East. The United States had not the slightest inkling that revolt was coming.

We were so confident of the Iraqi Army that we were planning to use them, along with Turkish troops, to intervene in Lebanon. American transport planes had been flown to southern Turkey near the Iraqi border from Wiesbaden to be ready to ferry Iraqui troops to Lebanon.

Israel: When I reported the Kremlin timetable to Premier Gen-Gurion last fall, he kept repeating, "This is a problem for President Eisenhower." What he meant was that the plan to solidify the Arab States in a Nasserized anti-West confederation was too big for Israel. He was right.

Loyalty Oath Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of Tuesday, July 8, 1958:

LOYALTY OATH RULING

The United States Supreme Court caused another shock when it decided that the California non-Communist oath required of religious groups and veterans seeking State tax exemptions is unconstitutional.

Thus was toppled another barrier set up by those who felt they were trying to stem the progress of domestic communism in this country.

Justice Brennan stated that it was not proper that the individual or organization applying for the tax exemption bear the burden of proof that he is not a person or organization advocating the overthrow of the Government.

But Justice Clark in opposition said:

"I cannot agree that due process requires California to bear the burden of proof under the circumstances of this case. This is not a criminal proceeding. Neither fine nor imprisonment is involved.

"Appellants are free to speak as they wish, to advocate what they will. If they advocate the violent and forceful overthrow of the California government, California will take no action against them under the tax provisions here in question.

"But it will refuse to take any action for them, in the sense of extending to them the legislative largesse that is inherent in the granting of any tax exemption or deduction."

And Los Angeles County Counsel Harold W. Kennedy declared:

"As a public law officer, I firmly believe it is the purpose of the Constitution to preserve the government and not to serve as a protective shield for those who, while claiming privileges under the Constitution, would seek to destroy it."

More and more, it would seem to us, the way is being paved toward that day when it will be just nobody's business who and how many people are American Communists, no matter how harmful or threatening their activities.

States Rights Victories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal:

STATES RIGHTS VICTORY

The last of the 10 original amendments to the United States Constitution says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The House of Representatives, by an overwhelming 241 to 155 vote, has reaffirmed that guiding American principle in a measure referred to as a States rights bill. It is a signal victory for State government.

In essence, the bill was designed to put a restraining hand on Supreme Court tendencies to indulge in judicial legislation.

The House measure states:

"No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

To Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, must go much of the credit for this important legislation. He was a coauthor of the bill, and he fought long and energetically for its passage.

In this he had strong support from the American Bar Association, the American Farm Bureau, the Conference of Governors, the Association of State Attorneys General, and the American Medical Association.

Opposition came mostly from the AFL–CIO, the NAACP, railroad brotherhoods, and the Departments of Justice and Labor.

As we read it, the bill holds the Constitution supreme, and where there is any question about States versus Federal control, Congress stands as the arbiter. It will affect antisubversive laws, narcotics statutes, water rights—many fields in which State laws have been preempted.

Mr. COLMER put it to his House colleagues plainly. The bill restates, he said, the Jeffersonian doctrine "of keeping the government on a local level as close to the people as possible, as against concentration in an all-powerful Federal Government."

Bang-Jensen: Another Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., of July 16, 1958; which cites an article from the Indianapolis Star, also included:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of July 16, 1958]

BANG-JENSEN: ANOTHER MARTYR

The dismissal of the senior political affairs officer Povl Bang-Jensen by the United Nations Secretariat, for refusing to hand over to that body the names of 81 Hungarian witnesses who testified during the U. N. investigation of the brutal Hungarian massacre, ranks as one of the most cowardly and unprincipled betrayals of trust in the history of this country. Moreover, it is an act for which the American Government cannot shirk its responsibility, for Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has washed his hands of the whole affair, calling Bang-Jensen's ouster an internal personnel matter, and Judge Robert Morris, former counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, says he has definite proof that two top Americans at the U. N. actually had a hand in the conspiracy against Bang-Jensen.

The naivete of Ambassador Lodge, who says he thinks the names would have been kept out of the wrong hands if the Secretariat had access to them, is too good to be true. We don't believe it is naivete. Lodge knows full well that the scores of Communist employees of the Secretariat would have stolen the list of names and the Reds would then have murdered hundreds of innocent Hungarians, just as they did former Premier Imre Nagy and Gen. Pal Maleter only a few short weeks ago. Bang-Jensen realized this too, but being made of sterner stuff than our U. N. representatives, he not only refused to hand over the names of these Hungarians, who agreed to tell their stories under the pledge that their identity would be protected, but he also fought until he secured permission to burn the names in the presence of U. N. officials.

Why have the Communists centered their fire on Bang-Jensen? Unless your memory is very short, you will recall that it was he who put the teeth in the U. N. report condemning Soviet Russia for the brutal rape of Hungary. While the Communists go unpunished for the atrocities they commit, Bang-Jensen is fired for doing his duty. It was Bang-Jensen whom the U. N. had personally entrusted with the safekeeping of these names.

This whole sordid affair does have one brighter aspect. It has given the American people an opportunity to see the great power wielded by Russia within the United Nations. It has given them an opportunity to see the cowardice of the Eisenhower administration, which stood idly by and permitted Bang-Jensen to be fired without ever having had an opportunity to testify in his own behalf, an administration which had acquiesced when the U. N.'s highest tribunal ruled that American employees at the U. N. could not be fired for suspected Communist sympathies. Bang-Jensen was fired, but they were reinstated with back pay.

We urge our readers to protest the cowardly betrayal of Bang-Jensen to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Department of State, 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, Washington, D. C., and, by way of encouragement for a job well done, to send copies of their letters to Mr. Bang-Jensen, 18 Old Farm Road, Lake Success, Long Island.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star]

A COFFIN NAIL FOR FREEDOM

We have been sent a copy of a letter from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge to State Supreme Court Justice M. T. Philips, of Arizona. It concerns the fate of Paul Bang-Jensen. He is the Danish diplomat who refused to surrender the names of scores of Hungarian freedom fighters to the U. N. Secretariat, first because he promised the Hungarians not to, and second, because he knows that U. N. employees from Communist countries would be certain to steal or copy these names and give them to Soviet delegates.

Lodge washes his hands of the whole affair. First he says, he was always convinced that the names would have been kept out of the "wrong hands" if the Secretariat had got them. That is nonsense. Anybody who knows anything about communism ought to know that all the Soviet Union has to do is order one of its employees to steal those names and it will be done. There are scores of employees in the Secretariat from Communist countries.

Second, says Lodge, the names have been destroyed anyway. That is right, but it is no credit to Lodge. They were burned because Bang-Jensen refused to surrender them, and due to public protest in the United States. If Lodge had had his way, Bang-Jensen would have surrendered the names, and no doubt the list would be in Soviet hands now.

Finally Lodge says, "I have no authority in this aspect of the matter." This is only an "internal personnel matter" from which "member states are specifically precluded from interfering." Again nonsense. This is not a simple "personnel matter." For Bang-Jensen it is a matter of his whole future which he is risking to protect Hungarian patriots. For the United States it is a matter both of human justice and foreign policy. For if a U. N. employee can be persecuted by the U. N. Secretary General, and his deputy, at the behest of the Communist states, for doing his duty well and for protecting the lives of the sufferers of Soviet aggression in Hungary, then the same thing can happen to future U. N. employees who dare to expose aggression, subversion and terror anywhere by the Soviet Union.

For the United Nations itself the Bang-Jensen case is of vital importance. For with Bang-Jensen fired for doing what he did, what does it prove? It proves that the Soviet Union dominates the U. N. Secretariat. It proves that if the Soviets want a man punished who works through U. N. machinery against Soviet interests, he will be punished regardless of the truth. It proves, in other words, the very thing Bang-Jensen has claimed—that Communist representatives in the U. N. Secretariat control the Secretariat. And Hammarskjold and Cordier are just front men for Khrushchev.

More than this. If Lodge is right, that he can do nothing in this case, then we have here in the United States a powerful instrument falling under control of the Soviet Union, which we are powerless to control, powerless to investigate, powerless to prevent from carrying on activities aimed at destroying the United States. Is this what the U. N. was supposed to be? Has the United States no say over what conspiracies and plots are concocted against us in our own land?

What is amazing to us is the fact that only from Denmark has there been official protest against the blatant Communist persecution of Bang-Jensen. In the United Nations everyone looks the other way and washes their hands of the affair. Why? Are they so cowed by the Soviet Union that they dare not take a stand for the rights of this man, for his right to due process, his right to be heard, his right to know what charges are made against him so he can properly answer them?

America was once the "land of the free and the home of the brave." Henry Cabot Lodge makes us appear like the land of the cowed and the home of the cowardly. Let the true voice of America speak for Bang-Jensen, the voice of our people. For as Bang-Jensen goes, one more nail in the coffin of liberty is nailed over the corpse of the United Nations.

What Recession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic, July 21, 1958, issue, is most timely and I commend its reading to the attention of our colleagues:

WHAT RECESSION?

Whatever happened to the recession? Lots of people have no jobs, steel mills operate languidly, and Detroit makes so few cars that nobody seems to care whether a new contract between the companies and the UAW is signed or not. But our newspapers have decided that the recession makes stale (or is it unpatriotic?) copy. The new news is that of economic improvements. Thus, on July 9, the New York Times, in a front-page headline, pointed to the new job upturn shown for June. A more discreet subhead read: "But the total of unemployed reached a 17-year high." On June 29, a solemn editorial assured us that the rise in the cost of living was the smallest since December. The July 6 Times headlined the news that the recession was ending, and, lower and littler, that "most experts expect slow recovery." Good news demands block letters. Bad news is fit to print in small type.

Have the Times and a large part of the rest of the press wished the country into prosperity? Unfortunately not, but the press has done something else instead. It has reinterpreted the recession in something like the following manner: True, we have close to 5.5 million persons unemployed, but many prophets expected 6 million out of work. Prices don't stop rising, but note how slowly they ascend. Maybe the recession isn't getting better, but it's wonderful that it grows no worse.

How soon can the economy absorb its idle men and idle plants? The 1959 automobiles, the hope of the optimist, promise to be less salable than their 1958 predecessors. Capital expenditures show few signs of reviving. Unemployment compensation has run out for hundreds of thousands, and supplementary unemployment compensation covered only a small fraction of manufacturing employees. In short, the fact that the press doesn't scream, doesn't prove that its readers aren't bleeding.

H. R. 10637

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I have been receiving a large amount of mail for the past few weeks from savings and loan associations all over the country urging favorable consideration of H. R. 10637, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Some of the banking institutions in my district and the surrounding area oppose this legislation. In this connection, I forwarded information sent to me by the United States Savings and Loan League to Mr. J. E. Brucklacher, president of the Cumberland County National Bank & Trust Co., Camp Hill, Pa., for his comments. The following letter from Mr. Brucklacher gives his reactions, and I thought his letter would be of interest to other Members of the House.

The letter follows:

CUMBERLAND COUNTY
NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO.,
New Cumberland, Pa., July 18, 1958.

H. R. 10637, Home Loan Guarantee Corporation.

Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Material sent with your letter of July 15, 1958, is returned herewith. I found the details most interesting and it permitted me to consolidate my reactions more firmly.

The proposal is not unpalatable or beyond my imagination, but I cannot condone legislation that permits privileges to one unit of the lending industry. There are 4 major sources for real estate credit in our Nation and much of the earlier progress of our Nation can be attributed to the advances made by 3 of the types prior to recent ascendancy of the savings and loan associations. The May issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin reports residential and nonfarm mortgage holdings at the end of 1957 by the 4 major lending groups as follows:

Commercial banks	$17,147,000,000
Mutual savings banks	19,010,000,000
Life insurance companies	32,640,000,000
Savings and loan associations	40,119,000,000
Total	108,916,000,000

The first 3 sources have a total of $68,797,000,000 representing 63 percent of the outstanding real-estate credit at the end of 1957. The aggregate is a fair contribution to our national growth and I believe it justifies consideration when one group is seeking maximum relief from limitations and not making the same privileges available to the other lending groups.

A further review of figures reflected in the Federal Reserve bulletin gives some interesting facts on conventional residential and nonfarm mortgage holdings at the end of 1957 distributed among the four groups of lenders as follows:

Commercial banks	$8,735,000,000
Mutual savings banks	6,551,000,000
Life insurance companies	18,124,000,000
Savings and loan associations	31,463,000,000
Total	64,873,000,000

By deducting holdings of the savings and loan associations, the three remaining lending groups held $33,410,000,000 equivalent to 51 percent of the total. It becomes quite evident that commercial banks, mutual savings banks and life insurance companies do not rely entirely on FHA or VA loans for their investments, but participate quite broadly in the conventional financing along with the savings and loan associations.

Our bank enjoys an enviable reputation in the FHA as well as VA originations ranking at the top among lending institutions in central Pennsylvania, but the volume of conventional loans represented 64 percent in 1956 and 77 percent in 1957 of all originations. We know we undertake a volume much greater than the average bank, but we maintain a ratio in conventional loans quite comparable to the average banking institution. Despite intense efforts to keep our volume at a peak, we have suffered in recent years from privileges extended to the savings and loan associations and the proposal to increase their facilities creates much concern in our organization.

In the statement made by Henry A. Bubb, chairman, legislative committee, United States Savings and Loan League, I find a recount of problems encountered with technicalities in the FHA program by small savings and loan associations, but reference to the same problems for smaller banks is overlooked. Our banking system has the same ratio of small institutions that exist in the savings and loan field and it seems quite unfair to seek freedom from details for small lenders in one field while the other must continue to suffer with the problems.

I would like to believe the proposed program would not interfere or harm the FHA, but the act does not define or control appraisal procedures sufficiently to prevent abuse and possible 100 percent financing. Savings and loan associations held $1,643 million in FHA loans at the end of 1957 and elimination of that type of loan origination will not harm the future of FHA. Maximum financing in amount almost equivalent to FHA provisions obtained quite informally without too much cost or redtape will influence borrowers and creates the real problem. In my opinion, few borrowers will care to undertake FHA financing when they can obtain the equivalent under the Home mortgage guaranty proposal with lower costs, quick settlements and freedom from detail.

Mr. Bubb used three pages in his comments to cite advantages of the proposed program, but I doubt if they justify the inequities that will be created for other lenders by passage of the act for reasons as follows:

1. As we review success obtained in the past by the HOLC, observe current earnings in the FNMA and realize FHA is quite self-supporting, it seems useless to initiate a new program to protect the Federal Government when there is no problem now or foreseeable in the immediate future.

2. As far as advantage to our economy is concerned, I am not sure we need a shot in the arm when most of us believe we should stabilize and not accelerate our economy to inflationary proportions.

3. Financing for the home buyer in rural areas, may be a problem in isolated communities, but local banks as well as individuals have served well over the years and with the expanded FHA provisions now available it seems unnecessary to provide specific legislation for a limited segment for our population.

4. I am certain we do not need additional legislation for the elimination of second mortgages as long as current legislation is ample and the actual deed is self-policing by the lenders.

5. I doubt the need for new provisions to finance existing homes or trade-in properties when I learn 61 percent of all FHA applications in June 1958 were of that type and I find 90 percent or more of my current originations are on older structures.

6. All lenders crave patterns that will be useful to them to assist in their relations with borrowers but all of us object to legislation that limits the usefulness to one type of lender, namely the savings and loan associations.

I appreciate the privilege you extended to me and hope the comments I have made will assist you as you continue study of the subject bill.

Sincerely,
J. E. BRUCKLACHER, *President.*

Comments by Rank-and-File Union Members on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending labor legislation, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the comments I have received from those who replied to my questionnaire. In the next few days, I intend to insert all the comments which I have received from union members. Most of the comments are in favor of strong union legislation, however no attempt will be made to select those in favor of a strong bill. I believe the membership of the House will find these letters to be of considerable interest, since they give a good indication of the individual union members' views as distinguished from those of many union leaders and officers.

I am a UAW member since the union first started but I think the union has gotten out of control of the individual union members—in other words—too big for rank and file control, which is the fault of the members for not attending meetings and leaving the control of the union in the hands of the president and executive board and delegates elected by a small minority of members—often by a show of hands vote and not an election of all members. As an example, Walter Reuther was elected at the last convention by the delegates and not by a popular vote of union members. That is why I marked all five questions on the other side of this sheet. In the last convention in Detroit, the delegates voted a special $5 a month special assessment for 3 months for a strike fund without an election of rank and file to approve it. Who gains on a strike—nobody. (Auto lathe operator.)

I feel each union member should have a vote for union office holder from president to committeeman and do away with delegates who I feel vote any way after they once get there. (Factory worker.)

I am a member of the UAW. Our local cannot make contract agreements that do not follow the pattern set in Detroit. We are but a rubberstamp. The company I work for cannot stand all the demands made on them much longer. There has been no profit for 5 years. It is a small firm, 300 or less workers. (Factory worker.)

In regard to labor unions, I have belonged to a labor union since 1936 when I first went to work and have been a good member ever since. I have been president, vice president, member of the bargaining board, secretary, and other appointive offices in several locals throughout Michigan which I have traveled as a tool and diemaker.

I sincerely believe, as thousands of other members, there should be a closer contact held by your States and National Government over the unions as far as there being a corporation and held by antimonopoly laws and books audited so the members know where the money goes. Also, no money should be spent for any political party.

I am a Republican and under present conditions my dues money goes to support the Democratic Party without my O. K. This I don't like and if something isn't done about it you'll lose your job and I will be working under a labor dictatorship. (Tool and die-maker.)

Is there any antimonopoly legislation for corporations? The company whom I work for just bought a plant from the Government whereby they can now produce better than 90 percent of the country's magnesium metal.

It is the duty of all union laborers to attend their meetings. They know then what goes on. The meetings of our local are very democratic. (Repairman.)

Careful consideration should be given to any labor legislation before passage. Unions are just like a barrel of apples—there is always a bad one, but it doesn't spoil the whole barrel.

I am a member of the United Steelworkers of America and I believe our code of ethical practices cover every point you have brought up.

(a) Our pension plans are administered jointly by the company and union. The company deducts so much each pay and is responsible for all money received and amounts disbursed. The union has a trustee working with the company. These funds have to be audited yearly and results posted.

(b) If it is proven the union is creating a monopoly, it should be dealt with the same as a corporation.

(c) We always use secret ballots for election of officers—both national and local. Strike votes are generally always secret. Any member may ask for and receive a strike vote taken by secret ballot.

(d) The right to work law is a misnamed gimmick. It guarantees no one the right to a job or right to earn a decent living. All it does is allow a free rider to work and enjoy the benefits won by the union at the bargaining table and pay no dues for this privilege. Yet, if he has trouble with the company he can pay 1 month's dues and the union has to handle his grievance and he can withdraw from the union as soon as his grievance is settled. Do you think this law would be fair?

(e) Corporations can spend money for political purposes, why should not the union have the same privilege? The union doesn't tell you whom to vote for, but tries to let everyone know something about the issue or delegate to be voted for. It also tries to present both sides of an issue. (Steelworker.)

There has to be some kind of a law to regulate these labor unions. I am a member of the UAW—I have been for 20 years. I believe in labor unions, but at the present time they are run by the union officers, not the rank and file. About all the rank and file does is pay dues. Before we can have a union run by the rank and file, there must be some kind of a law to outlaw the union shop, also the closed shop. You can call it anything you wish: right to work, unrestricted employment, or democratic labor market. It all adds up to the same thing. Mr. Reuther, Mr. Meany, and John L. Lewis are not labor leaders by choice. They have their political machines and the rank and file can't do anything about it.

I believe the labor unions should be run like our own United States. I believe in voting for the president directly. This idea of voting for delegates to represent me at the conventions is no good. Too many of the delegates go to the convention with the idea of voting for the man that furnishes the best and most liquor. I know, I have talked to several men that were delegates. A man can resign from the union, sure, but he loses his job, too. That's the union shop. I hope Congress puts through some kind of a law or laws to regulate these union officers. (Factory worker.)

Resolutions of Nebraska Stock Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some resolutions as passed by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association when they held their 69th annual meeting on July 12–14 at McCook, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, the cattlemen of the country have been wise in resisting Government controls of any kind. They are able to handle their own problems without Government interference. A few years ago we had the OPA regulations with red stamps for meat and the rationing of many products that simply did not work in America. The cattlemen believe in the free enterprise system.

They are in the business of producing meat for the human diet. As a physician I know the importance of meat in the human diet, and the importance of protein and animo acid because they make up every cell and tissue of the body. Proteins and animo acids of meat are needed to make blood, supply glands, repair tissue, and produce energy.

Mr. Speaker, nature has endowed no other food with so many essential vitamins and minerals as it has meat. Meat is a masterpiece of nature's laboratories. Meat is good for us. It can be produced under the free enterprise system, recognized and encouraged by fine organizations like the Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

I recommend to my colleagues the reading and consideration of the following resolutions as passed by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

Whereas under existing procedures there are no effective controls over expenditures by Congress or the executive branch of the Government: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association endorse and recommend passage of legislation which would provide that governmental appropriation be in terms of estimated annual accrued expenditures, namely charges for the cost of goods and services estimated to be received; be it further

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association endorse all efforts to encourage more interest in governmental affairs with special emphasis on economy; be it further

Resolved, That recommendations made by the Hoover Commission which would save approximately $7½ billion be given further consideration by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association favors the repeal of the excise tax.

CHECKOFF

Whereas there is a bill pending in Congress to permit a checkoff from proceeds of livestock sales at posted markets for the purpose of meat research and promotion: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association endorse its passage and a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Senators and Congressmen.

Whereas this tax on freight charges is levied at every stage of marketing or manufacture, resulting in pyramiding the tax and is an unfair burden on the livestock industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association favors the repeal of the excise tax.

LABOR UNIONS

Be it resolved, That although we are not opposed to honest labor unions, we express our belief that no man should be denied employment solely because of membership or non-membership in an organization; and

That we deplore the ruthless and unjustified actions of some labor leaders; and

That we ask that labor unions be subjected to the same controls and regulations as are now in force for corporations and industry.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

We endorse the general principles of the Cooley-Hill bill (H. R. 9020), which transfers supervision of retailing practices from the United States Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission, but retains supervision of wholesaling and packing company procedures under the United States Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of this association is instructed to send copies of this resolution to all members of the Nebraska congressional delegation.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Whereas legislation is pending before the Congress to authorize a program of Federal grants for school construction; and

Whereas Federal aid for school construction would be only the first step toward Federal aid for school operation; and

Whereas the White House Conference on Education reported that no State has demonstrated a financial incapacity to build its own schools; and

Whereas any form of Federal subsidy brings with it the implied threat or self-evident need for Federal supervision or regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is firmly opposed to the passage of any proposal to extend or provide new Federal grants for any school purpose.

OUR CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS

Be it resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association express appreciation to our Representatives and Congressmen and our Nebraska Senators in Washington, and commend them for their work in Congress for the best interest of Nebraska and the cattle business, its principal industry, and hereby instruct the Secretary of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association to write letters of appreciation.

IMPORTS OF CATTLE AND BEEF

Whereas cattle and dressed, canned, and processed beef from foreign countries are attracted to our markets whenever domestic

prices reach a level at which we can operate without loss; and

Whereas the present import duties are inadequate to protect our markets against importations of more cheaply produced cattle and beef from foreign countries; and

Whereas our present protective tariff was written several decades ago and is now inadequate under present conditions of greatly increased costs of production in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress and the Tariff Commission to revise these old import duty rates and import quotas to a more realistic basis which will preserve the American market for American producers.

United States Has It, Soviets Do Not, at Brussels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have read and heard much on the subject of the United States Pavilion at the Brussels World Fair, both pro and con, and for that reason I request that the news story written by George Harris, of the Boston Globe, be inserted in the RECORD. Mr. Harris has made an on the scene observation of our exhibits at the pavilion and I for one am satisfied that his reflections are fair, unbiased, serious, and most truthful, and I for one am highly pleased that our exhibit is a credit to the people of the United States.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe of July 20, 1958]

GLOBE MAN REPORTS: UNITED STATES HAS IT, SOVIETS DON'T AT BRUSSELS

(By John Harris)

Even the White House sent ex-President Hoover over to the Brussels World Fair to get answers on the hottest questions posed about the mammoth United States pavilion:

How does it rate with the exhibits of other nations?

How does it stack up against the Soviet display?

Ever since I returned from the fair, I've been asked these two questions. After all, the biggest attractions at the fair are the United States and Soviet showplaces.

Which has made the bigger hit?

My answer:

"The United States pavilion by a mile."

Take the yardstick of attendance.

The rival pavilions attract about the same number of visitors. This is only natural because of all the conflicting publicity and, even more so, because they are located in the same international area of the city-size modernistic wonderland.

Throngs of men, women and children pour in and out the entrances of both main exhibit halls—the gigantic, rectangular Soviet structure and the large circular United States superbuilding. They stream along the corridors, up and down the stairways and escalators; collect in mobs around the Russian white-nosed sputniks; swarm around the lagoon and galleries to watch the United States fashion show.

The main point, though, is how do they react to the shows.

After strolling each of the exhibits for hours I can report that in the Soviet main building there is only one real audience reaction. This is not on the main floor, but rather on the basement level where one can find visitors laughing, applauding, enjoying themselves before a semicircle of TV sets.

There a gloomy-faced Russian is aiming a TV camera at the gathering of visitors, and the visitors—to their delight—find themselves flashed back on the semicircle of TV sets, in black and white. Who does not enjoying seeing himself on TV? The kids, making faces to add to the fun, love it.

The Globe's Otto Zausmer, by the way, tells me he saw the same stunt staged in a London department store back in 1939 and Victor O. Jones saw himself the same way at the New York's World Fair.

By the way of contrast, in the United States pavilion there seems to be no end of enthusiastic audience reaction.

The fashion show, with beautiful young women walking down a ramp from the gallery and parading on a float on the central lagoon, has been the most publicized. Some critics have assailed it as not being particularly American. But there's no denying the crowds find it thrilling.

They find plenty else that stirs applause. There is always a jam to watch the broadcast of color TV. Long lines wait to get into the circular theater and see the thrilling circarama, a quickie sight-seeing trip across the United States with rollercoaster sensations of going up and down San Francisco's hills and the Rockies, and the lifelike sea-rocking of entering New York's harbor and seeing the Statute of Liberty.

Dorothy Thompson once doubted that serving hamburgs and hot dogs at the United States restaurant would make a hit with Europeans, accustomed as they are to tasty sausage concoctions of all types and flavors.

Well, each time I went to the restaurant I found long lines of sightseers waiting to get in. A tour around the counters inside would convince Miss Thompson that Europeans do like to try our hot dogs and hamburgs.

"We sell 'em by the ton," a restaurant official told me.

Another big hit is the layout of trees and fountains in front of the United States pavilion. At night the trees—which are apple trees and beauties when they were in flower—are flooded with lights. The Russians have no comparable outdoor attraction. It is so popular there are signs placing part of it out of bounds for picnics.

Even the Sears Roebuck and Montgomery Ward catalogs, on display upstairs as part of American life, are so popular they are badly dog eared. Visitors gasp at seeing the things that can be bought direct from these catalogs. The companies would do well to keep a flock of replacements on hand.

Possibly the biggest crowd reaction comes from 6 voting machines on the ground level near the inner lagoon.

"These," said Mrs. Katherine Howard of Boston, top official at our pavilion, "were suggested by President Eisenhower. When I visited him and asked him what he thought we should have at the fair he told me. Get some voting machines so that people abroad can get an idea on how we run our elections.'"

Young United States men and women, part of the corps explaining the United States exhibits to visitors, answer questions about the machines. Said one of these young women:

"The crowds are delighted with them. Some," she chuckled, "mistake them for photograph booths, some for love-making, some for toilets. That's because of the curtains. But they all get quite a thrill when they enter and have them explained. They go in two's and three's and talk excitedly about them."

These guides have two stories about Russians and these machines. Two Russians came by and one thought of entering. The other warned: "Stay away. They're more dangerous than A-bombs. If you're seen going in there you might get shot." The other tale is about a Russian who nearly took one of the machines apart to find, as he put it, "the trick that makes it work."

There is actual voting. It applies, however, to a set of general questions. From this tabulation when I was there it appears that New York is the visitor's favorite city, Ben Franklin America's greatest statesman, Ernest Hemingway our greatest writer, Harvard the favorite college and Hawaii the favorite vacation spot.

There is also big crowd reaction to three, small, odd-looking buildings just outside the pavilion. These represent what is called America's unfinished business. In these are photographs, charts and newspaper clippings (blown up) on the subjects of slum clearance, soil erosion and racial relations.

The Russians have nothing like these. They admit to nothing wrong or worrisome in their workers' paradise.

Some United States critics have assailed our having these three little structures—built sort of awry to show the problems involved are still nettlesome. But if you listen to visitors as they go through these little buildings, you will quickly join them in admiring a big nation that is big enough to admit its shortcomings.

The usual reaction of visitors is::

"You have done a courageous thing here in showing these problems."

There are a couple of other highly admirable things about the United States exhibit. The corps of young men and women, each speaking at least two languages fluently, makes a visit to the United States sector highly instructive and entertaining. They eagerly try to help each and every visitor.

The Russians have nothing like this service. In their buildings there are Russians around, but they make no attempt to help enlighten visitors.

Another big advantage is that the United States pavilion stays open at night. The Russians, like most of the countries at the fair, close their pavilions—but not their restaurants—around 6 p. m. when thousands of visitors are still touring the fairgrounds. The United States pavilion remains open until about 11 p. m.

"Maybe the Russians have labor trouble," suggested one disappointed visitor when he found himself shut out, and turned happily into the United States pavilion.

After looking over both exhibits critically, I went away with the strong feeling the United States officials—despite some penny-pinching by Congress—have done an exceptional job. What they have to show beats the Soviets in every department (even in showing atomic medicine versus sputniks.

And loads of this credit goes to a Bay Stater, a tireless worker for United States good will abroad, Mrs. Katherine Howard.

To Serve You Better in More Than 250 Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, to better serve you, Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI will be available so that you can see and talk to him personally right in your hometown. If you have any

Federal matter or Federal problem to take up with him, feel free to visit and talk it over with him in person at place and time listed on back of this card or published in your local newspaper.

All expenses of making his services available in your hometown each year are paid by the Congressman himself—with no cost to the taxpayer. Each year Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI brings the congressional office to you—right in your hometown, no matter how big or how small. He is most anxious to help you in every way humanly possible.

Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that Congress act before this session ends to give the State Department authority to restrict and limit the issuance of passports.

The Los Angeles Examiner and other Hearst newspapers have repeatedly warned of the dangers inherent to our Nation as long as this authority is denied the State Department.

Prompt, positive congressional action is demanded now because of the dangers facing the United States. The following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of July 11, 1958, forcefully tells why:

President Eisenhower's special message to the Congress, calling for prompt approval of pending legislation in the vital field of passport controls, expressed grave concern for the dangers involved in delay—and his feeling of alarm is fully warranted.

As the President suggested, the recent decision of the Supreme Court stripping the State Department of traditional controls over foreign travel by American citizens precipitated critical problems.

It left the country powerless against disloyal and traitorous persons guilty of association with foreign conspirators against the peace and security of the United States.

Speedy correction of this perilous situation is strongly and urgently indicated, as the President recommends. As the Hearst newspapers have pointed out before, the Supreme Court was far from being of one mind about the supposed lack of State Department authority in this matter, and in fact divided 5 to 4 on the issue.

But whether there is distortion of fact or not, the country is left in an untenable situation. Since the Court says Congress has not previously delegated the necessary powers, it is mandatory that it be done at once. It is indisputably essential, as Mr. Eisenhower says, "that the Government today have powers to deny passports where their possession would seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States or would be inimical to the security of the United States."

The prospect of the American Government being defenseless against those whose travels abroad are detrimental to the safety of the American people is a frightening one, and not to be endured.

Corrective legislation was first introduced June 17 by Representative PAT HILLINGS, Republican, of California. The administration now has introduced its own bill, generally following the Hillings proposal, which is sponsored by Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, Rhode Island Democrat, and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; and by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee.

It should have immediate attention and overwhelming approval.

One Hundred and Sixty Acres in Alaska: Yours for the Asking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting and timely article by Leonard Lerner, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, on July 20, 1958:

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY ACRES IN ALASKA: YOURS FOR THE ASKING (BUT YOU MUST CLEAR IT AND LIVE THERE)

(By Leonard Lerner)

If you're not afraid of real, hard work, you can get a free homestead in the 49th State.

Alaska, with a total population of 215,000 in its vast 586,000 square miles, needs people.

It needs people to encourage industry to build up its economy and to build its roads, and the new State is giving away land to prospective settlers.

If you are 21 years of age and an American citizen you are eligible. If you're under 21 but the head of a household and a citizen, you are still eligible.

Up to 160 acres of land are available and this acreage may be raised to 300 if some of the Alaskan officials get their way.

Once you get your land you must live on it at least part of the time.

Some of it must be put under cultivation and some of it must be cleared of undergrowth and trees cut down. It's not easy.

You've also got to build some kind of a house on your land. Not just the kind that will barely keep out the cold, but one that's livable.

In other words, you've got to show that you're really interested in homesteading, not just getting free land for speculative purposes. If you are a pioneer and want to make a life for yourself in the 49th State, the land is there.

The Federal Government still owns about three quarters of the land in Alaska and will place much of this on the line for future homesteading. With the coming of statehood, this program will continue.

In addition, when Alaska does officially become a State, new rules will probably be set up statewise to make land available, in addition to the Federal program.

The new State, under the Statehood Act, will be allowed to take almost 103 million acres of land. Quite a bit of this State land will be offered.

It will be done by outright sales, which will not call for the same regulations as Federal homesteading. It will probably be offered in part for lease, which would be to the benefit of those who want to speculate in Alaskan land.

And, the new State will probably offer outright homesteads, under its own regulations.

Actually, no money would be involved in obtaining a Federal homestead.

But, the Department of the Interior points out that even though you get your free 160 acres, you'll still need ready cash.

It costs money, in addition to labor, to clear your land, to comply with the rules of the Homestead Act.

Anywhere from $85 to almost $250 is estimated as the cost of cutting down the trees and getting the land level.

It's possible to live on your land, work it, and in order to pay for the costs of making it into a home and a farm, get a job in town. This is hard work, but many individuals are doing it—working a long, long day.

If you decide that homesteading is for you, it might be a good idea to look for land near Fairbanks in the Tanana Valley; on the Kenai Peninsula, or near Anchorage in the already-pioneered Matanuska Valley.

Statehood is going to bring an influx of settlers to Alaska.

Some will make it and some will become discouraged and go home.

But, now's the time to apply for your 160 acres if you think you can make it.

Just write to the United States District Land Office, Department of the Interior, either at Fairbanks, or Anchorage, Alaska, United States.

Brassie, Putter, Nine Iron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the July 21, 1958, issue of the New Republic:

BRASSIE, PUTTER, NINE IRON

When the Canadian Premier, Mr. John Diefenbaker, answered a parliamentarian—who inquired if the Secret Service man who accompanied President Eisenhower had entered the House armed—by saying that he thought the President came armed only with a brassie and a putter, he summarized one part of the recent exchange of views in Ottawa. Announcement of the new, Cabinet-level committee to direct Canadian-United States defense policies for North America was clearly a brassie shot, long-range, and straight for the flag. And most of the rest could have been done with a putter.

What is not known at this writing is the extent to which the President and Mr. Diefenbaker may have consulted about each other's recessions. If such talk did take place, Mr. Diefenbaker may well have had something to say about the uses of a nine iron when the economy lodges in a sand trap. The Canadians have used a much heavier club than we in an effort to lift their economy back onto the fairway. Canada's decline in production started earlier, but it has not gone nearly as deep as that of the United States: its drop, from the high of February 1957, to the low of last December was a 7-percent falloff, compared with a United States contraction of 13 percent from August, 1957, to April of this year.

Canadian programs have included a price floor for farmers, direct public investment expenditures, aid to provinces and municipalities for public works. On the consumer side, social security payments have been increased as have direct loans for housing which have produced a record number of starts.

The Message of the Flag—Address by the Honorable Ernest Gruening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest historical discussions of the background and development of the flag of the United States was delivered in Philadelphia recently by a man who has had a remarkable role himself in the placing of what will be the 49th star in our flag. I refer to the Honorable Ernest Gruening, former Governor of Alaska, who appeared before the Flag Day Committee of Philadelphia on June 9, and outlined the order and the circumstances of the admission of each of the States in a manner I am sure every Member of Congress will find worth reading.

Governor Gruening was introduced at the meeting by one of our outstanding Philadelphia patriots, the Honorable Michael Francis Doyle.

The text of Governor Gruening's Flag Day address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ERNEST GRUENING BEFORE FLAG DAY COMMITTEE, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 9, 1958

Our flag received its design 181 years ago from the Continental Congress.

The 13 alternating red and white stripes represented the 13 Colonies which unitedly secured their independence and were to become the first 13 States. The 13 stars also represented the 13 States that formed the Union. Each State admitted thereafter would be represented in the canton or union of the flag by a new star.

There was a temporary digression from this formula when Vermont and Kentucky were given statehood. For a brief period there were 15 stars and 15 stripes in our flag. But before long the Congress realized that a star in the blue firmament was adequate recognition for a new State; that adding also a stripe for each State would be needless duplication; would in time diminish the beauty of design by overburdening the flag with stripes; and that it would forfeit and destroy the great historic symbolism inherent in perpetuating the memory and fact of the 13 Colonies and the original 13 States. So 140 years ago the Congress returned to its original formula which has persisted to this day—13 stripes forevermore and an additional star for each new State:

Thirty-five stars have been added to the original 13. But that does not mean that our flagmakers had to make 35 different flags and 35 times scrap those on hand. A sufficient number of States came in at one time so that changes had to be made only about 25 times instead of 35. No historical museum could collect more than 25 different American flags because they do not exist.

In the nearly 3 quarters of a century between the formation of the Union and the Civil War, not a few States came in in pairs. The dates of their admission did not coincide exactly, but their joint entry into statehood was prearranged, and by design.

Each star that has been added to our flag represents a stirring chapter in our history. Each new star signalized a step in the progress of mankind. Each star incarnates a portion of the hopes, the struggles, the trials and errors, the quest for goals, and the achievements that together constitute the American epic.

It is, I believe, the greatest epic of all time. It is the greatest epic because it stories the untrammelled efforts of free men—freer than any of their predecessors in the pageant of history—to work out their own destiny.

So we must not think of our flag only as an emblem. We must not think of it merely as a symbol, though of course it is very much a symbol, a symbol of everything that our American faith embodies. But we should think of it also as a symposium of great adventures—adventures of mind and heart and body—a recording of past performance, proudly raised on high for each coming generation to look up to, ever a summons to present obligation and a guide to future conduct.

We cannot identify any one of the 13 stripes with any one of the original 13 States. We might have done so—or might do so—if someone wished arbitrarily to relate each stripe from the top of the flag down to each State in the chronological order of its adherence to the Union. That would assign to Delaware, our oldest State, the topmost stripe. It would award to Pennsylvania the second stripe from the top. Rhode Island's would be the stripe at the lower edge of the flag since it was the 13th State to sign up.

It was wholly appropriate that Delaware, the first State to enter the Union, should adopt as its motto, "Liberty and independence." Perhaps this is the time and place to advert to the fact that Pennsylvania, which decided to enter the Union 5 days after Delaware, amplified Delaware's ringing words "Liberty and independence" by preceding them with the word "virtue," so that as you all know, the Keystone State's motto is "Virtue, liberty, and independence." Possibly the 5-day interval between Delaware's signing of the Constitution on December 7, 1787, and Pennsylvania's adherence on December 12, led Benjamin Franklin and his colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation to reflect that they already had liberty and independence and needed to prescribe virtue additionally to safeguard and amplify the blessings of their new-found freedom. It might be worth mentioning that the motto of the third State to ratify, 6 days after Pennsylvania, New Jersey, was "Liberty and prosperity." Thus was perhaps illustrated the rapidity of progress in our national infancy—all in the course of 11 days—from the newly achieved "Liberty and independence" hailed by Delaware, to the addition of "Virtue" by Pennsylvania, and the substitution by New Jersey for Pennsylvania's somewhat austere prescription of "virtue," the less arduous and perhaps more alluring goal of "prosperity."

Incidentally those three first States—Delaware, your own State of Pennsylvania, and New Jersey—all contiguous to each other, were the only States to join the Union in 1787. Not until after the New Year, 1788, had begun, did the others follow. Here in the very heart of the new-born Republic, midway between New Hampshire to the north and Georgia to the south, were the pioneer States, the first three to pledge their allegiance to the Constitution and flag of the United States.

I wonder that no one has thought to form an inner club, an exclusive order within some of the Sons and Daughters of Yesteryear, entitling it "The Joiners of 1787." Something analogous to it occurred a century later in Alaska. There, in what Alaskans fondly call the last frontier, "pioneering," a beloved word, dates from the days of '98 romantically eternalized in the verse of Robert D. Service and the short stories of Jack London. Ninety-eight was the year of the great gold rush that followed the discovery of gold in the Klondike. No candidate for public office in Alaska fails to claim—if he can truthfully do so—that he was a '98 pioneer. But several years ago, a charming lady, a candidate for Alaska's Territorial House of Representatives, proclaimed in her political advertisements that she was an '87 pioneer. She had been carried across the Chilkoot Pass in that year as a babe in arms, 11 years before the Klondike. She did not want to be mistaken for any of the Johnny-come-latelys of '98. She was elected.

It would perhaps be painting the lily to pursue further the theme of the rapid progressiveness of the sentiments in the subsequently enrolling States mottos, but it may be worth noting that Georgia, the fourth State, which came in on January 2, 1788, apparently considered "Liberty and independence," now achieved, no longer timely, and instead looked to the future with the motto, "Wisdom, justice, moderation." May "the Empire State of the South" achieve them. They are desirable goals for any State.

If it is not customary to associate any one of the 13 stripes in our flag with any of the original 13 States, it is even more impossible to attach any one of the 48 stars to a given State. Yet we might well view the addition of each star to our flag as much more than a minor and automatic change on a piece of bunting. Rather should we think of what lay behind that star, what preceded the admission of the new State that star represents, hail it as we would a great new star in the heavens and reflect on the cosmic forces that brought it into being.

Who can relive the story of Vermont's gallant struggle for self-determination which culminated in its entering the Union as the 14th State—the first additional star in the flag—without sensing that the Green Mountain Boys were reenacting on the home ground our own epoch-making Revolution? From the outbreak of the War of Independence Vermont was master of its destiny and determined to remain so. In those 4 years, between 1787 and 1791 Vermont had not had territorial status. It had steadfastly maintained its independence against the claims of adjacent New Hampshire and of powerful New York, which Vermonters were prepared to resist, if need be, by arms. Likewise Vermont rejected the tendered blandishment of union with Canada. It would join our Union, but only as an equal, as a sovereign State.

And now, early in our history, we come to the first of those interesting arrangements in which sectional balancing played a great part. For while Vermont was resisting the claims of two already established States, pioneers settled across the Appalachians in land belonging to Virginia, were trying similarly to free themselves from the grasp of Old Dominion, then by far the most populous—and by that token the most powerful—of all the 13 States. There had been not fewer than 10 conventions of representatives from Virginia and from the embryonic State of Kentucky in a vain effort to reach a solution. Finally in 1791 under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, a provision which satisfied conflicting claims and regional rivalry was achieved for the admission of both States, Vermont and Kentucky. This solution was reflected in a bit of doggerel which originated in a Pennsylvania newspaper and was widely reprinted in the press of that period:

"Kentucky to the Union given,
Vermont will make the balance even;
Still Pennsylvania holds the scales
And neither South nor North prevails."

Thus, those first two new stars in the flag—the 14th and 15th—marked not only the advent of two States but, with the admission of Kentucky, the beginning of the westward march that has so profoundly shaped the American character and contributed such unique quality to our American life.

The next three States—Tennessee in 1796, Ohio in 1803, and Louisiana in 1812—were

admitted separately, but widely varying and unprecedented conditions accompanied the admission of each. The frontiersmen occupying the region south of Kentucky, and belonging to North Carolina, impatient at the delay in granting them admission to the Union, first set up a State of their own and called it Franklin, honoring your greatest Pennsylvanian. But receiving no invitation to join the Union from the first three Congresses, they assumed the initiative, drafted a constitution for the future State of Tennessee, elected two Senators, and sent them to the National Capital—then Philadelphia—to knock at the door of Congress for admission. They were successful. In a few months, in 1796, Tennessee became the third new State. And that example of Tennessee in, so to speak, jumping the gun was subsequently followed seven times by other areas seeking statehood. Tennessee's was the 16th star in our flag.

With Ohio, represented by the 17th star, the frontier advanced across the Alleghenies north as well as south, ushering in the birth of that great American region known—perhaps not too exactly—as the Middle West. In Ohio, also, Virginia acquired a rival Mother of Presidents.

Before the next State, Louisiana, added the 18th star to our flag, President Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase had doubled the extent of American territory, and extended its western border to the Rockies.

Now there was a return to sectional balancing into which the issue of free versus slave States had crept, with the admission in 1816 of Indiana and in 1817 of Mississippi, represented by the 19th and 20th stars.

The same pattern was followed shortly thereafter by the admission of Illinois in 1818 and Alabama in 1819, our 21st and 22d stars.

By now the slavery issue in relation to the admission of new States had become more acute and led to the Missouri Compromise—an important milestone in our history, dealing with problems happily no longer existing. By it Maine was admitted as a free State in 1820, our 23d star, and Missouri, our 24th star in 1821 as a slave State but with certain limitations, while thereafter all future States west of the Mississippi River and north of 36° 30' were pledged to freedom. There is perhaps a little significance in the fact that that compromise was arrived at as our Nation was midway in its creation of States, with 24 stars in the flag.

Thereafter the free versus slave State issue would for a time dominate every new State's admission. Arkansas, a slave State, came in in 1836, Michigan, its offset, a free State, in 1837—our 25th and 26th stars—and following the same pattern, Florida in 1845 and Iowa in 1846, our 27th and 29th stars. For in between, Texas, in 1845, under unprecedented and dramatic circumstances, following its victorious war of independence had come into the Union bringing its own lone star with it, and, surprisingly, not insisting that when added to our flag that star should be bigger than all the rest, but reserving the right to divide itself into five States. Texas was the 28th star.

By this time the irrepressible conflict was looming larger and the balancing in the admission of northern and southern States ceased. Texas was the last slave State admitted. Wisconsin placed the 30th star in the flag in 1848.

California, having loosened its bonds from Mexico set up its own republic, was briefly under United States military rule, and scorning even a temporary condition of territorialism, was admitted to the Union in 1850. Its star—the 31st—marked the extension of American dominion to the Pacific. It also marked the admission of the first State not contiguous with any other State; a thousand miles separated California from Texas, and 1,500 miles from Iowa, the 2 nearest States.

Minnesota came next in 1858, followed by Oregon in 1859 and Kansas in 1861, respectively the 32d, 33d, and 34th stars in the flag.

The next two States were "war babies." They were the direct consequences of the Civil War. When Virginia seceded in 1861, the State's 40 western counties voted to remain loyal to the Union, rejected the action taken at Richmond, and set up an independent State with the capital at Wheeling, W. Va., as these secessionists from secession called it, which was admitted to the Union in 1863.

Nevada was brought into the Union in 1864 by President Lincoln to help him secure ratification of the 13th amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery. Perhaps we might with poetic license call these two—the 35th and 36th stars—"shooting stars." They came into the Union mid the booming of cannon on far-flung battlefields, and as a direct consequence of that bloody family quarrel.

Nebraska followed in 1867, and Colorado in 1876. Dakota Territory was divided into two States in 1889, and in the same year Montana and Washington came into the Union. Idaho and Wyoming followed the next year, 1890. Six States in two years. Utah was added in 1896, Oklahoma in 1907, and the last 2 States, New Mexico and Arizona, in 1912, brought the field of blue to its present galaxy of 48 stars.

There is a great story behind the placement of each new star in our flag. Each star is a condensation of that story. Each, while different, is a saga of aspiration and effort, of sacrifice and struggle—all primarily for one basic purpose, the application of that most fundamental of American principles, the principle of government by consent of the governed. It was proclaimed as an unalienable right in the Declaration of Independence. It guided our forefathers in the founding of the Republic. It has guided all of us to national greatness.

In one respect our flag is unique. While it is one of the oldest national emblems on earth—older than any other in the New World, and outaged by very few in the Old—it is the only flag which while unaltered in basic design, yet changes progressively. It is the only flag which is not static. It records the birth of our Nation; it codifies the Nation's growth from infancy to maturity.

It is now 46 years since the last State was admitted. The longest previous interval between the admission of States was 13 years, between the entry of Colorado in 1876 and of the great northern tier of States in 1889—the Dakotas, Montana, Washington.

Does this long pause mean that our flag, for so long a dynamic and inspiring compendium of what America signifies, is becoming static? And our country with it? I hope not. I think not. A 49th star is twinkling on the northwestern horizon. Its inclusion in the galaxy should—perish the thought—which some latter-day Jeremiahs have expressed, that our Nation, no longer young, its ardor cooled, its momentum lost, has completed its life cycle and is about to follow other civilizations that after rising to great heights have begun a melancholy decline toward decay and ultimate extinction.

Those vanished civilizations perished largely because they abandoned the principles through which they arose; were content to stand still when they should have moved forward. If and when our beloved country falls into that danger, its citizenry need but read the message of the flag and act accordingly.

West Will Need Iron Nerves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very timely, also most interesting and highly illuminating, article written by that able and capable writer, James H. Powers, that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on July 20, 1958. I offer this well-written news statement for the attention of all Members of the Congress due to the present world situation:

WEST WILL NEED IRON NERVES—SITUATION IN MIDDLE EAST MOST SERIOUS SINCE WORLD WAR II—CONTROL OF AREA WOULD GIVE SOVIET DOMINANCE OF EARTH'S RAW MATERIALS

(By James H. Powers)

The Middle East was once described by a historian as "the cradle and grave of empires and civilizations." It still is.

During nearly 6,000 years that vast region, stretching from the Nile to the southern reaches of central Asia, has witnessed the rise and demise of the power and glories of ancient Egypt, of the fabulous Sumerians, of the Mesopotamian, Assyrian, and Persian conquerors. Alexander hammered together there the gigantic patchwork empire that immortalized his name. There he died—and his handiwork with him.

The Romans, the Saracen hordes, and the Seljuk Turks trod successively in one another's footsteps in the Middle East. Napoleon sought there to consolidate his growing imperium at the dawn of the 19th century—and failed, at the battle of the Nile.

His successors from France and Britain did better throughout the remainder of that century, only to find themselves compelled to retreat in the mid-20th before forces generated by the awakening of native peoples under stimulus of two devastating world wars.

PRECARIOUS BALANCE UPSET

Twice within the past 30 months, the dangers of a major collision among the powers have loomed in that endlessly uneasy region; twice they have been curbed. But the timid equivocal statesmanship of these evasions has as yet found no solution to the basic problems of the area.

That failure is attributable in part to the lack of a unified, coherent Western policy, in part to the determination of the Soviet Union to expand its reach and influence on the Eurasian-African land mass, in part to the formidable, and at times self-destructive, forces of an Arab nationalism astir from south Asia to the Atlantic.

Today, only 10 months after the flamboyant build-up of a crisis in the Middle East by Nikita Khrushchev, centering upon claims that Turkey threatened Syria, and almost exactly 2 years after the Suez crisis, the region is in turmoil once more.

The orgy of political subversion, military revolt, and murder which has overthrown the Hashimite dynasty in Iraq and instituted a republic adhering to the imperial pan-Arab program of Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt has created a situation more serious than any preceding it since World War II.

For this bodeful event has upset the precarious balance of power in the world's notorious storm center. Bearing all the

familiar marks of collusion from outside Iraq's borders, the Iraqi coup has knocked out Nasser's strongest opponent in the Arab world, adding another satellite to his United Arab State.

It has dealt a series of grave reverses to the West. Yanking Iraq from the Baghdad Alliance, it has weakened that pro-Western defensive setup along the southern borders of the Soviet Union. This has been a Russian objective for years. Simultaneously, the coup has generated a new upsurge of Arab nationalist pressures against all the remaining pro-Western nations in the region, and especially Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Israel.

CENTURIES-OLD PRECEDENTS

These obvious threats raise new hazards to the flow of Middle Eastern oil to Western Europe, upon whose industrial complex the strength of the West's defensive system, NATO, reposes. Because of the alliance between Nasser of Egypt and the Soviet Union, the current crisis has finally compelled the West to make a decision:

Either it must take steps to halt the debacle of free, independent states friendly to the West, and to contain the Iraqi upheaval, or it must expect speedy erasure of these states, eventually including Turkey, and a new amalgamation of Russian-dominated power spread to the gates of Africa.

Thus the present turn of events is but a new chapter in the old story of the Middle East's strategic position in a troubled world. Only a few of the leading characters have changed. The facts of strategy and survival remain. Even in his espousal of a new Arab nationalist dream, Nasser is copying, with modern trimmings, the precedent of the Arab ascendancy of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries of our era, when the writ of the prophet ran all the way to the Atlantic.

SOVIET POLICIES NOT NEW

Nor is there anything new about the middle eastern policies of the Soviet Union. Only the tactics have altered, with appropriate Communist twists.

Russia's successive efforts to penetrate the area date back to the 18th century. In the early decades of the 19th, "The Eastern Question" revolved precisely around that issue. Palmerston, in 1845, turned back the czars at Constantinople by alliance diplomacy. The Crimean War in 1855 sprang from new efforts of czarist Russia to move across the Black Sea and the straits into Turkey.

The Congress of Berlin, in 1879, had as its main task still another containment of Russia's southward pressure. In 1900, Russian claims were advanced once more and repelled. In 1946, immediately after World War II, the Communist successors of the czars tried again at the straits—and encountered the Truman doctrine.

Why is the Middle East considered so important to Russia and the rest of the world?

The answers etch the contemporary world's dilemma. Control of the area, initially in alliance with a gullible Arab nationalism and eventually through an infiltrated takeover, would provide the Soviet empire with warm-water ports on the Persian Gulf. It would flank India from the west, open the land bridge from central Asia to the awaken-African continent, give Moscow control of air, water, and land communications between Europe and Asia, unhinge NATO, and place an openly hostile power at the controls of the raw materials supplies of two-thirds of the habitable globe.

TORTUOUS, LAMENTABLE TALE

The real tragedy of the present imbroglio in the Middle East is that the aspirations of an entirely legitimate Arab nationalism for independence from outside control, and its hopes for development of a resurgent Arabian culture and economy, have become entangled in Russian ambitions through failure of western leadership to present a consistent, dependable alternative.

Piecemeal policies, hesitant measures, grotesque failure to apportion a more realistic share of economic assistance to the middle eastern nations and to Africa from 1947 to 1955, reluctance of western governments to revise oil contracts until forced to, bland inattention to the activities of the Soviet Union in the area until the Russian breakthrough in the fall of 1955 startled Washington, and the tieup of Cairo and Moscow became a fact through the Soviet's arms and aid deal; the inability or unwillingness of the United States, at the peak of the Suez crisis, to grasp the opportunity offered for concerting a genuine settlement in the Middle East—the story is long, tortuous, and lamentable.

Its consequences were well-nigh inevitable. To contain and resolve this grim and sprawling diplomatic muddle will require more than the military precautions now forced upon the West. It will demand something more specific than recourse to the United Nations, important though that agency can be and useful as it is proving.

It calls for hard realism, constructive statesmanship, iron nerves, a just policy, and recognition of the political facts of life in Asia and Africa, not as we would like them to be, but as they are.

Danger in the Skies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us are acutely aware of the danger that continues to lurk in our airways as long as Congress delays action on legislation to establish a single Federal aviation agency with complete authority and control over the use of our diminishing airspace.

I am convinced that this agency must be established and operative before our commercial airlines put the new, speedier jet transports into service on transcontinental routes. The day of this service is rapidly approaching.

I respectfully urge the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to approve without delay and without further modification the Senate-approved bill to create this agency, which would have complete control over all military, commercial, and private planes operating in the airspace over the continental United States.

The dangers of more disastrous midair collisions with their terrible toll of lives and property are with us daily under our present system of divided air controls.

The establishment of a single Federal Aviation Agency unfettered by any domination of the military, commercial or private interests will be the first major step forward in better utilizing our shrinking air space and promoting greater air safety. At least under such an agency, all aircraft operating in our airways would be in contact with one another, thus reducing the possibility of midair collision.

After the establishment of this agency, the second major step must be to make funds available for the many technical improvements required for the modernization of airway operations and control.

These improvements will be costly but measured against the prospect of greater air safety they actually would be cheap in the lives and equipment saved in this day of advanced aviation.

I again urge Congress to consider my proposal for the creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate on aviation and air safety to work hand in hand with the proposed new Federal Aviation Agency in promoting greater air safety in the United States.

A Fireman's Lot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to insert a very interesting and thought-provoking poem about volunteer firemen which appeared in the Bucks County Gazette, New Hope, Pa., on July 17:

A FIREMAN'S LOT

Now that the Eagle fire company has launched its annual fund drive, we'd like to give you a fireman's view of his job. The poem, unfortunately, doesn't tell of the satisfaction firemen feel after they've done a good job—and it doesn't tell how much they need your help to make a good job possible.

"FIREMEN DON'T HAVE A CHANCE"

When the firetrucks are delayed 40 seconds in traffic people say:
"It took them 20 minutes to get here."
When the truck races at 40 miles per hour it's
"Look at those reckless fools."
When 4 men struggle with an 8-man ladder:
"They don't even know how to raise a ladder."
When firemen open windows for ventilation to reduce the heat in fighting a fire:
"Looking at the wrecking crew."
When they open the floor to get at the blaze:
"There goes the ax squad."
If the chief stands back where he can see and direct his men, people say:
"He's afraid to go where he sends his men."
If they lose a building:
"It's a lousy department."
If they made a good "stop" folks say:
"The fire didn't amount to much."
If lots of water is necessary:
"They are doing more damage with water than the flames."
If a fireman gets hurt:
"It's a crazy department."
If a fireman inspects a citizen's property:
"He's meddling in somebody's business."
If he wants a fire hazard corrected:
"I'll see the mayor."
If he gets killed and leaves a family destitute:
"That's the chance he took when he joined the fire department."

Soviet Has Convenient Lapses of Memory Especially Where Hungary Is Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in these days of crisis, when the Kremlin is endeavoring to exploit the Middle East situation for propaganda purposes, it is well to consult the record. Actually, and despite all the protestations of Khrushchev, the present difficulty in the Middle East is the result of Soviet intrigue and indirect aggression.

There was a timely reminder of the Soviets' double-dealing tactics by the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail in a recent editorial entitled "Soviet Has Convenient Lapses of Memory Especially Where Hungary Is Concerned." Revealing the hypocrisy of the Kremlin in its present posture so far as the Middle East is concerned, the editorial aptly refers back to the Soviet aggression in Hungary when Mongolian troops and tanks were used to crush Hungarian patriots and keep proud Hungary in brutal servitude.

The Charleston Daily Mail has rendered an important national service in refreshing our memories and in illuminating the record on Soviet aggressions. I wish to call the editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It is as follows:

SOVIET HAS CONVENIENT LAPSES OF MEMORY ESPECIALLY WHERE HUNGARY IS CONCERNED

It becomes more and more apparent, as the world moves from one crisis into another, that the Soviet Union has a convenient lapse of memory when it chooses.

We have particular reference to the most frightening situation of recent months—the crises in Lebanon and Iraq which threaten to explode the entire Middle East and possibly engulf the world in conflagration.

Russia and her puppets have taken advantage of the sending of American troops to Lebanon and Turkey and British troops to Jordan to accuse the West of "imperialistic aggression" and "intervention"—among other things.

Allies of the Soviets declare that it is the right of the country concerned to act as it sees fit. If this means killing off the government officials and all who stand in the way, fine. If, by chance, the officials killed had been pro-West, so much the better. Russia and her satellites have hailed the Iraqui coup as a move toward "freedom."

It's ironic, we think, that a little over a year ago the Hungarian people made a bid for freedom, but this movement was not hailed by the Soviets. Quite the opposite, the Russians would have none of it.

Armed Russian troops were sent into Hungary to convince Hungarians they had freedom whether they realized it or not. Some Hungarians didn't realize it. They found themselves—equipped only with crude weapons such as pitchforks, clubs, other homemade weapons, and a few modern arms—battling the crack Soviet Army with its up-to-the-minute means of warfare.

Needless to say, the Hungarian freedom fighters didn't stand a chance. They had lost before they began. But the brief encounter served as a source of freedom in at least one respect. It provided an opportunity for thousands of Hungarians to escape across the border to the West. They apparently didn't think they had freedom in Hungary either.

But the Hungarian affair has been closed so far as the Russians are concerned. As a matter of fact, it wouldn't be the least bit surprising that if the Soviets were reminded of the Hungarian incident, they would counter with the remark that it never happened.

Emma Lazarus: 1849-87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written for the East Side News on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, much loved and much honored and probably best known for the fact that she wrote the words inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor:

EMMA LAZARUS: 1849–1887

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"THE NEW COLOSSUS

"Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
with conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon hand
Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
'Keep, ancient lands, your storied poump!' cries she
With silent lips. 'Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door'."

Tuesday we commemorate the 109th anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, the beloved American poetess. Children of liberty will clasp her hand in loving memory.

Emma Lazarus is the author of the inspiring sonnett, The New Colossus. Her message to the world, all the world may read. It is engraved on the Statue of Liberty. It is standing in the gateway of democracy.

The noble soul and human heart of Emma Lazarus are symbolized in the Goddess of Liberty. It was given to a child of oppressed generations. To understand the true meaning of this liberty-loving nation; to pen the immortal lines with such prophetic pathos; to express the spirit of democracy with such eloquence; to welcome the persecuted of the Old World, to the glorious promise of the New World.

And through the years we can hear the echo of Miss Liberty's voice speaking to these pilgrims to our blessed land. As you breathe the free air of our shore homeless wanderer, reaching home, become one with us in freedom's cause, take the riches of our liberties and repay the gift of becoming one with us—an American.

The Goddess of Liberty and Emma Lazarus have become synonymous. No poet of any nation has ever received such world-wide distinction. The "lady with the torch" was presented by the people of France to the American people to commemorate the first centennial of American independence.

Emma Lazarus was born on July 22, 1849, in New York City. She was the daughter of an old Jewish family. The story of her literary evolution is the story of the fulfillment of the evolution of a soul. Many women of every race, many men of every race, have evinced literary ability.

But it is rarely given to man or woman to so combine the powerful poetic expression with the clear insight and courage, with the conviction and devotion, as it was in Emma Lazarus. Her poems had power. Her poems had fire.

Since Miriam sang of deliverance and the triumph of the Red Sea, the Jewish race has had no braver singer. Her songs of divine unity repeated on the lips of her own people, in all zones and continents, have been heard round the civilized world.

Her poem, The Crowing of the Red Cock, written when the Russian sky was red with blazing hatred, is a powerful lyric worthy of the Maccabean age. Her poem, Banner of the Jew, has the ring of Israel's war trumpet. It sounded the clarion call to all Jews to unite for human rights, for new achievements and for new glories as in the days of the Maccabees.

She was one of the pioneers of Zionism. She was one of the outstanding advocates of a Jewish homeland. It was in that cause that her character had its fullest flowering.

It is heartening to see that the same poetess who was the first to give expression for the national renaissance of her people has become the symbol of humanity and democracy. She died on November 19, 1887. She was in her 38th year.

On that tragic day no better appreciation of Emma Lazarus was expressed than that of the famous American poet John Greenleaf Whittier, who wrote: "Her people will mourn the death of this woman. But they will not be alone. At her grave the tears of the daughters of Jerusalem will mingle with those of the Christians."

As long as liberty shall live in the human heart, as long as the Statute of Liberty shall remain our symbol of freedom the name of Emma Lazarus will forever be a part of the fame of that symbol as the champion of liberty.

O, take Miss Liberty, O, take thy radiance 'round, when dimmed, revive; when lost, return; till not a shrine through earth be, on which they glories shall not burn.

Grave Hazard Faces Sheepmen if Wool Act Is Not Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Representative LEE METCALF, and I have been in continuous communication with the sheepmen of Montana concerning the crisis now facing their industry if the Wool Act is not extended. There is a definite and desperate urgency in their appeals for legislation to be enacted at this session of Congress, and their reasons are expressively stated in the tele-

grams we have been receiving. We are urging the Members of Congress to read these representative views of a large corporate sheepgrower, a Production Credit Association official, the national president of the Sheep Shearers Union, a private sheepgrower, and a county political group. All portray this grave danger now confronting the wool industry.

Their messages follow:

ANACONDA, MONT.

Congressman LEROY ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The wool market is approximately 35 percent below wool prices of last year. There is virtually no activity in contract buying of lambs or breeding sheep for fall delivery in this area. At this time of year normally there is a great deal of fall contract activity. These facts are presented to you as indications of the general unsteady feeling growers and woolmen have that chaos in the wool and sheep industries is likely to occur if the National Wool Act is not renewed during the current session of Congress. It is apparently quite possible that this measure might not be renewed without great effort on the part of you and other Senators and Congressmen who are friendly to the sheepmen. Current lack of activity in the industry indicates lack of confidence in the future due to an inability of the grower to plan his future breeding programs on an unstable future market. It is my personal feeling and the feeling of all persons connected with the wool and sheep industries that without the renewal of the National Wool Act the sheep and wool industries which are an important part of the basic national agricultural economy cannot survive but will collapse and thus severely adversely affect the economic status of thousands of farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation. Without the National Wool Act as a support program the sheep and wool industries cannot survive in the face of foreign competition and the growing pressure of synthetic fabrics. Without a support program the flocks of sheep in this Nation will unquestionably be dissolved or materially reduced and thus our domestic supply of woolen fiber which has proved to be essential commodity in every war will be lost as the result of sheep flock depletion.

Following this flock depletion if the United States were to find themselves entangled in another global conflict and our domestic source of wool was unavailable due to the reduction of flocks resulting from uneconomical operations due to low prices of products sold and high cost of production it would be impossible to reestablish the flocks for many years, probably not soon enough to meet the needs of a critical emergency. Thus another basic reason why the National Wool Act is needed to bolster the already depleted sheep flocks of the United States. I sincerely hope that with these facts before you in addition to the other facts with which you are cognizant you will expend every possible effort to have the National Wool Act renewed before the termination of this session of Congress. It would be appreciated if you would read this telegram into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help acquaint other Senators and Congressmen of our problem. Many thanks in advance for your efforts and assistance.

Best personal regards.

DR. H. E. FERGESON,
Operating as Mt. Haggin Livestock Co.,
Anaconda, Mont.

HELENA, MONT.

Hon. LEROY ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The lack of action by Congress in renewing the Wool Act is in a large measure responsible for a 30-percent reduction in wool prices this year compared with a year ago. Sheep and wool prices in Montana are well under other livestock values. The incentive payment on wool and lambs was the difference between profit and loss to most Montana sheepmen in the year 1955 and 1956. We finance over 100,000 sheep and whether or not the Wool Act is renewed will have a definite bearing on our extension of credit to sheep operators in the future. We urge your continued support of this legislation which we think is vital to Montana's continued growth and economy.

S. H. KEMP,
Montana Livestock PCA.

BUTTE, MONT.

Congressman LEROY ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The sheep shearers union in convention at Butte, Mont., unanimously endorses immediate action to renew the National Wool Act this session.

LAVOR TAYLOR, *President.*
PAUL C. JOHNSON, *Secretary Treasurer.*

HELENA, MONT.

The Honorable LEROY ANDERSON,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative that the Wool Act be renewed this session. The breeding of sheep is a long-range enterprise. Planning must be made now and breeding program instituted for future production. Any change in breeding activity this year can influence sheep numbers and wool production for many years to come. The failure to renew the Wool Act this session will drastically reduce present breeding plans. This will reduce the production of wool, lambs, and limit the base of breeding stock upon which future expansions must build. The entire intent of the Wool Act and the good that it has done to date would be nullified. The effect on the sheep industry would be disastrous.

HENRY S. HIBBARD,
Sieben Livestock Co.

CHINOOK, MONT.

Hon. LEROY ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Note that there appears to be some indications that Congress may adjourn without renewing the Wool Act. Feeling among local sheep ranchers and bankers is that the industry cannot survive in the face of foreign competition, synthetics, etc., high labor costs, and increasing taxation without a support program and that failure to renew the Wool Act would be disastrous. We thank you for your past support and now urge that you do everything possible to see that the Wool Act is renewed at this session of Congress. It is our thinking that a renewal of the act at the next session will be too late.

WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN,
Democratic State Committeeman.
JOE J. MATULKA,
Democratic County Chairman.
CHARLES L. O'DONNELL,
Secretary, County Committee.
D. J. SIAS.
WILLIAM S. HARBOLT.

Soviet Is a Giant Sweatshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to follow up my comments of yesterday by including the second in a series of articles by Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, which appears in the Washington Daily News today. Mr. Stone has just returned from a tour of the Soviet Union and the European satellite countries. In the following article he reports on labor conditions in the Soviet Empire.

MARXIAN SLOGAN LONG ABANDONED—SOVIET IS A GIANT SWEATSHOP

(By Walter Stone)

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not patterned on the old Marxian worker's paradise formula of "from each according to his ability, and to each according to his need."

That was abandoned more than a generation ago.

There are no rewards for need.

Rewards are keyed to productivity. And penalties are assessed for lack of productivity.

The incentive motive, once considered a copyright of the capitalist system, is applied in elaborate detail in every phase of Soviet agricultural, industrial, and scientific endeavor. And it is backed up by the grim goad of poverty which forces even the laggard to produce or else.

SWEATSHOPS

In Western capitalist countries, under pressure of free trade unions, humanitarian thought, and social legislation, the sweatshop and the speedup largely have been abandoned. But those institutions thrive in the Soviet Union.

The standard workweek in the U. S. S. R. is 46 hours (Saturday is the short workday—6 hours). But the workers are not paid by the hour, nor by the week. When they work overtime, they don't get overtime rates. Extra pay is earned by producing in excess of allotted work quotas. Penalties are levied against their pay when they don't make their productive norms.

THE NORMS

These quotas or norms are based, not on averages, but on what fast workers can turn out. The norm wage for the average worker is fixed at about what he must earn to feed, clothe, and house himself—but seldom enough to support his family.

So his wife is propelled into the Soviet working force and goes out to earn her norm, in a factory, an office or perhaps sweeping the streets with a twig broom. They have to hustle to provide simple necessities, and work even harder if they are to obtain such luxuries as a radio or an extra pair of shoes.

Where pay is on piecework, the coffee break, and bull sessions around the water cooler are unknown. Especially not where consumer goods are made deliberately scarce and expensive, and people are driven to work even harder by the impetus of poverty.

In such capitalist countries as the United States and Britain, the main source of gov-

ernmental revenue is from income taxation, graduated according to ability to pay. That's not so in the Soviet Union, where the income tax produces only a small fraction of the revenue.

In the United States, the individual income tax rate starts at 20 percent and goes up to 91 percent. In the U. S. S. R., the lowest rate is 5 percent, the highest 13 percent.

Thus the big-money makers in the Soviet Union—the industry managers and top scientists—not only are not penalized for their success; they don't even bear their fair share of the cost of government.

The great bulk of Soviet revenue comes from the regressive turnover tax on goods produced and traded—and in the wide margin between what the government pays industrial and farm workers for what they produce and what the government charges for these same goods and commodities.

GIANT SALES TAX

This has the same effect as a gigantic sales tax on everything, including food. The margin of profit, or tax, on that scarce item, shoes, for instance, must run as much as 300 to 400 percent.

A Soviet trade union is not a bargaining agent for the workers, but an arm of the Government, the great employer of all labor. A Soviet trade union cannot call a strike for higher pay or fringe benefits. The job of the trade-union officials is to make sure that the workers produce what the Kremlin planners have determined they must produce.

EVERYONE WORKS

There is no unemployment in the Soviet Union. The system will not permit unemployment. You work at something—or else.

An American worker temporarily on unemployment relief in this recession period is better off than the average Russian worker earning his norm wage.

That is possible for us, of course, only because America's capital investment and enterprise are directed primarily to the production of goods consumers want to buy, whereas the Soviet economy is geared to scientific development and to the upbuilding of heavy industry and armaments that provide the greater world military and political power the Soviet rulers want.

The sweatshop, the speedup, exorbitant taxes on the food of the poor are relics of a dark age in the free world. But the Soviet rulers are making them work in Russia—with an expert mixture of fear and hope.

They are making this system produce military might, and that is what Americans must understand. Unless we voluntarily go to work, unless we sacrifice some creature comforts and luxuries, unless we return to fundamental values and build a stronger America and more purposeful society, we could very easily end up working for them

Blueprint for Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I read a very interesting and timely article in this morning's New York Times which seems to me to effectively attack the situation in the troubled Middle East. I believe that serious thought, given to the situation, would prove salutary.

BLUEPRINT FOR MIDEAST—RESPONSIBILITY FOR PEACE SHOULD REST WITH U. N., IT IS SAID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The United States and Britain have responded to the coup d'etat in Iraq by stationing troops in Lebanon and Jordan. In the absence of effective United Nations action two terrible alternatives threaten in the Middle East.

On the one hand, the United States and Britain may intervene in Iraq; such action seems certain to lead to the disaster of limited war, and may provoke war with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the United States and Britain may in time withdraw their troops from Lebanon and Jordan, in the belief that the present crisis has passed; such action seems certain to lead to the eventual surrender of the entire Arab world to opportunist Nasserism.

A third, constructive alternative remains:

The United States should continue to press for the assumption of full responsibility for the stability of the Middle East by the U. N. as the only guaranty of peace. At the emergency session of the General Assembly, which the United States has already requested—and in which the Soviet veto will not operate—the United States should insist on the creation of a large U. N. Middle East police force, supplemented by a sizable observer corps. The primary mission of these U. N. units should be to guarantee the integrity of all legal governments in the area; to guarantee all national frontiers; to guarantee the submission of all international disputes in the area to U. N. arbitration, and to enforce an absolute embargo on all further arms shipments to the area.

THREAT TO SECURITY

The United States and Britain should announce unequivocally to the world that they regard the policies of Nasser's United Arab Republic as a direct threat to their own national security. The United States and Britain are not opposed to Arab nationalism per se, nor to legitimate aspirations for greater self-determination on the part of any national population in the Middle East. The United States and Britain are opposed to illegal and violent seizure of property—as in the case of the Suez Canal—and the illegal and violent abrogation of contractual agreements—as in the case of Syrian sabotage of the oil pipeline in 1956.

The policies of the United Arab Republic have been illegal and violent. The United States and Britain should openly acknowledge their need for the natural resources of the Middle East. And therefore the United States and Britain should declare that their opposition to Nasser's policies is not only based on principle, but prompted by the most vital reasons of national self-interest.

The United States and Britain should negotiate immediate mutual security treaties with Lebanon and Jordan which will allow United States and British troops to remain permanently in these countries until relieved by a U. N. police force.

TREATY WITH ISRAEL

The United States and Britain should proclaim that the national security of Israel is indispensable to their own national security and negotiate an immediate mutual security treaty with Israel which will allow American and British troops to be stationed in the country permanently until relieved by a U. N. police force.

The United States and Britain should announce unequivocally to the world that they will regard the sudden, violent, and illegal abrogation of oil supplies from any present source in the Middle East as an act of naked aggression directed at them. Unilateral and arbitrary interference with contractual arrangements for oil in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran or anywhere else must and ought to be regarded as hostile action by the United States and Britain, and world opinion ought bluntly to be so informed. Alteration of any existing commitments for oil should in future be negotiated exclusively under the jurisdiction of a special U. N. body to be created for this purpose.

At this terrible hour these five steps may yet preserve both peace and the national security of this country.

STEVEN MULLER,
Assistant Professor of Political Science, Haverford College.
HAVERFORD, PA., *July 18, 1958.*

The United States Army Reserve: Its Importance and Future Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 2 million Army reservists in the United States, with around 300,000 of these in a drill-pay status and other thousands in an active but unpaid status. They are vitally interested in the Army Reserve program and its future.

The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, in an address before the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in annual convention at Atlantic City, N. J., had most significant views on this matter.

Secretary Brucker said:

It is a great pleasure to accept your invitation to come to Atlantic City and meet with this distinguished group during your annual convention. The representatives of your patriotic and dedicated organization gathered here today may well be proud of the progress being made in strengthening the United States Army Reserve as a vital element of our national defense strength. Our strength is the bulwark of freedom and the hope of all free men.

While all of you are dedicated to the noble purposes which we espouse, not all of you are primarily involved in the current subject of the reorganization of the Reserve components. Yet, I know that this is not only a subject of intense interest to you, but it is the real objective which we all seek. While many of the things I shall say are matters of common knowledge to some of you, nevertheless this assembly of the members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, from all parts of the country, presents an excellent opportunity to acquaint the entire membership of this dedicated group with the objectives we seek and the plans we have devised to attain these goals.

As you know, on March 28, 1958, I announced my decision to go forward with the development of a new troop structure for the Reserve components within the framework of a plan which had been developed by the Army staff and which had been recommended to me by the Chief of Staff.

In the development of this reorganization plan, as well as all other plans and programs for the Army, we have adhered to the concept established by law, that the Army of the United States is an entity consisting of the active Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the United States Army Reserve. A basic premise of all Army

plans and programs stems from the concept that the active Army, the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve are a composite entity. We are not three separate segments which become a whole only when joined together by some emergency. We are one Army. We must plan as one. We must organize as one, and if we must fight a war, then we will fight as one.

The law requires that the Army (including all three elements) be organized, trained, and equipped for prompt and sustained combat, and that it support and maintain national policies and objectives.

During the course of our review of the Reserve components program, it became clear that the Reserve components must be modernized in accordance with the pentomic concept upon which the active Army is now organized. The timetable of modern war makes it impossible to rely on the time consuming methods of mobilization in the event of an emergency which have proved reasonably adequate in the past. The lightning speed with which the powerful opening blows of any future conflict might strike compels us, during peacetime, to take those steps which will produce on M-day a force which can absorb these opening blows yet still retain a capability of immediate retaliation against the aggressor.

The adoption of the streamlined pentomic organization in the Reserve component division will serve this imperative purpose. It will produce Reserve units which can quickly and effectively mesh with the units of the active Army in an integrated combat force. Four primary requirements are met by the new organization:

1. The division commander will have atomic weapons within the organic structure of his division;

2. The division will be so organized that it can disperse readily in case of atomic attack into semi-independent battle groups replacing the present infantry regiments;

3. The division will be organized to take full advantage of the progress in signal communications which permit a division commander to direct and control more subordinate units than formerly, and

4. Organic divisional equipment will be reduced to that which is habitually needed in any theater of operations, and special equipment will be attached only when required to accomplish a specific mission.

The reorganized divisions will be considerably smaller than those of World War II. For example, the infantry division will be reduced in strength from 17,500 to 13,700. The number of company size units will go from 114 to 77. However, whereas there are 37 fewer companies in the pentomic division, in the case of the infantry rifle companies, their strength has increased from 196 to 243. In short, the trend, particularly in infantry, has been to fewer but stronger company size units.

The application of the pentomic concept to the Reserve components has been deliberately held back pending the completion of the reorganization of the active Army. Now that the pentomic readjustments within the active Army have been completed, the experience we have gained in developing solutions will assist in the adoption of the new structure within the Reserve components. I believe this dedicated group wholeheartedly supports our objectives in this area.

The overall review of our Reserve components program also highlighted the necessity to aline the reserve structure to the requirements of approved war plans. Within the guidelines of national policy under which this review was conducted, this would mean that the structure should contain only those units for which a requirement had been established by approved war plans and which could not be created from untrained sources in sufficient time to meet a predetermined mobilization schedule. By retaining only those units which fall into this category, we can obtain maximum return from our materiel resources and training support in achieving a higher degree of combat readiness during peacetime than we have ever been able to do in the past.

The guidance under which the size and composition of the Reserve component forces was developed can best be illustrated by citing an excerpt from a letter from the Secretary of Defense to the President of the United States dated February 20, 1958. He said: "The basic question is one of how large the Reserve components of the Army should be in order to augment the active forces and to insure a maximum of mobilization readiness. The troop basis now being developed by the Department of the Army is specifically designed to provide the Reserve forces required to support joint plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and reached in accordance with basic national security policy. Units planned for inclusion in the Army Reserve troop basis, together with the active forces in being, are those required to meet current mobilization objectives. Units excess to requirements need to be eliminated from the Reserve forces troop basis if maximum support is to be given those units actually required in the early phases of mobilization."

President Eisenhower concurred with the views expressed by the Secretary of Defense.

After careful study, the Chief of Staff recommended a Reserve forces structure developed within the limits which I have just discussed. In turn, I have considered recommendations of the Chief of Staff and, after a detailed review, have given my approval. This structure was to contain 27 combat divisions—21 for the National Guard and 6 for the Army Reserve. In addition, there would have been 17 USAR divisions designated as training commands specifically designed to train individuals. This reorganization would have resulted in a reduction in the number of company-size units in the Reserve components. However, we would have assured the retention of only those units required to meet existing national policy and joint plans. To make certain that the Army met its mobilization schedule, we established a priority system in the Reserve forces. This system assures that the units needed first are ready first, by giving them preferential treatment in the assignment of personnel and equipment as well as authorizing a higher strength and equipment level.

I am certain you are familiar with the comments of the Army Chief of Staff before the Governors' Conference at Miami, wherein he stated that a relaxation by the Department of Defense of the original guidance upon which Army plans had been based enabled the Army to take another look at the problem. In brief, the Army has been authorized to develop a plan looking toward the retention of all the present 37 divisions in the Reserve forces structure—that is, 27 National Guard divisions and 10 USAR divisions—provided that this troop structure is maintained with no increase of cost or personnel beyond currently programed levels, and that priorities as between organizations contained in the troop structure be established to meet the essentials of approved war plans. I have, therefore, requested the Chief of Staff to restudy our previous plans in the light of this new guidance, with a view toward furnishing a tentative plan to the respective States, Territories, and ZI Armies at an early date.

Although this new review of our previous plans may retard the initiation of the reorganization of our Reserve components, I have not, as yet, changed the end of calendar year 1960 as the target date for completion of the reorganization.

At this point I would like to digress for a moment and discuss a collateral matter which has arisen by coincidence at the same time. Considerable confusion has come about as a result of the simultaneous consideration of two separate and distinct problems, (a) the modernized troop structure, and (b) the paid drill strength authorized the Reserve components.

I am sure that all who are assembled here are familiar with the fact that the fiscal year 1959 budget proposes to establish the new paid drill strength of the Reserve components at 630,000, of which 270,000 will be allocated to the Army Reserve. Gentlemen, I know that all of you are aware of my feelings toward the necessity of a strong and virile Reserve. You also, of course, are aware of the methods by which the budget is developed. The budget for fiscal year 1959 will support a paid drill strength for the Army Reserve of 270,000 spaces. Therefore, that is the figure included in the Army planning.

I cannot, however, emphasize one point too strongly—and that is that whatever figure may finally be approved by the Congress, the necessity to reorganize the Reserve components is still as valid as ever. The reorganizational changes are generated by military requirements and must come about irrespective of the drill pay strength finally authorized by the Congress. A higher drill pay strength than that currently programed in the President's budget would establish higher manning levels in those units required early in mobilization, thus hastening the attainment of the desired degree of combat readiness within these units.

I am sure that you share with me a sense of urgency in bringing our Army to the highest degree of combat readiness that time and resources will permit. We know that Soviet Russia has the capability of launching a limited or all-out war without resorting to nuclear warfare, and that they of course have a capability for an all-out atomic attack upon the free world. Another course which the Soviets may adopt to attain their aggressive aims is to sponsor attack by their satellites, supported by Russian materiel and so-called Russian "volunteers." No matter what course they might choose, the Army must be prepared to play its indispensable role in countering their moves and deterring their aggressive action.

To the degree that we rededicate ourselves to the problems lying ahead, to the degree that we recognize no unsurmountable obstacle, and to the degree that we march confidently ahead in the attainment of our common goal, will our power for peace be felt. I am confident that this patriotic group will, as you have so often done in the past, assume the lead in a vast reawakening of our people to the perils we face today, and to the pioneer spirit which cradled the birth of individual liberty and personal dignity within our beloved country.

On Memorial Day, I had the honor and privilege of escorting our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower, to his position of honor at the Arlington National Cemetery on the occasion of the interment of the unknown dead of World War II and Korea. As you so well know, I am a veteran of World War I and, at the end of that terrible conflict someone penned a poem which captured the spirit of Flanders Field. They threw to us a torch of liberty and they admonished us to hold it ever high.

Gentlemen of the Reserve Officers Association, holding that torch high today involves much more than it has ever required in the past—it means constant and eternal vigilance. And I say to you in the spirit of our Commander in Chief that we might all very well adopt as our personal creed the motto selected by General Eisenhower to symbolize the spirit of SHAPE—"Vigilia pretium libertatis" or "Vigilance is the price of liberty."

Chances for Living to a Ripe Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade Members of Congress have been made increasingly aware of the problems of our aging citizens and geriatrics, that subdivision of medicine which is concerned with old age and its diseases. Modern science has made great progress in the treatment of diseases that afflict older persons so that they may enjoy a longer life in comfort.

One of the Nation's top medical writers, Miss Mary Clayton, of the Boston Advertiser, has written a most interesting article on the subject entitled "Chances for Living to a Ripe Old Age." Miss Clayton, who has made a thorough study of the problems of the aging and the promise of geriatrics, attended Trinity College here in Washington, D. C., graduated from Mount Holyoke College, and took a master's degree in journalism at Northwestern University. She has worked on the editorial staffs of the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, the Holyoke, Mass., Transscript-Telegram, and is now a writer for the Boston Advertiser.

With permission to extend my remarks, I commend to Members of the House for perusal Miss Clayton's article which appeared in the New York Journal-American on July 17:

CHANCES FOR LIVING TO A RIPE OLD AGE
(By Mary Clayton)

What are your chances of living to ripe old age?

What do you think your prospects are for good health at 65?

No one has a medical crystal ball for authentic predictions, but it's possible to speculate on the basis of knowledge we have so far.

Dr. Robert B. Hickler, specialist in geriatrics and director of Pearl Memorial Clinic at Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston, suggests a possible formula for determining what you will be like when you are old.

Consider these factors:

The body which you've inherited—its defects and assets.

The general health and longevity of your parents and grandparents.

Your health habits over the years.

The physical and mental stresses you've experienced in your lifetime.

If young people have been fortunate enough to come from a family whose members commonly live to old age, this factor is good health insurance for their later years.

Of course, this doesn't mean that people can abuse themselves just because they have heredity on their side.

Our health prospects in old age are also the sum total of our whole pattern of living: eating, sleeping, exercise, and mental health habits.

Scientists are beginning to cope with the problem of chronic illnesses usually associated with age—hardening of the arteries, common types of heart diseases, cancer, arthritis. They don't have the answers yet, but they are striving to determine whether these illnesses are the result of the normal aging process of our bodies or whether they are the result of other unknown factors.

In the past, scientists were more likely to take the aging process for granted. As a result there was a lack of thinking and effort in this important area, says Dr. Hickler whose specialty, geriatrics, deals with the medical aspects of old age.

We know that the average lifetime of Americans has been extended to 70 years of age and may be even longer in the future. But by the time most of us reach 65, we have some chronic disease or physical impairment.

People who formerly would have died of diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid fever or pneumonia are saved through medical advances and live on to acquire the chronic illnesses.

"Medical science has an obligation to the elderly," emphasizes Dr. Hickler.

"Since science has permitted people to live so much longer and to develop chronic diseases we are confronted with the problem of preventing and managing these disabilities."

Dr. Hickler—and others in his profession—will tell you that the challenge is not just to keep patients alive, but to keep them usefully and comfortably alive as well. Their challenge is not only to keep younger people as healthy as possible but to extend the active life of the aging.

"Long life without health is a personal tragedy for the individual involved."

If the average lifetime of an American is 70 years, this means that there are people living into their 70's and 80's and 90's. As they live longer they are subject to more of the chronic degenerative diseases.

There are 14 million Americans today over 65. There will be 21 million in 1975. If you are 48 years old now, then odds are in your favor that you will be in that group in 17 years.

Protect yourself into the future and you'll be better able to understand the problems facing our senior citizens today.

Dr. Hickler believes that most of us neglect to consider what our old age will be like because of an almost unconscious resentment toward prospects of losing youth. This includes our attitudes toward gray hair, wrinkles, stiff joints and defective hearing.

Emphasis on youth in this country may be in part due to the fact that we are a young country. But we ought to keep in mind the compensations which older years bring: joy in past accomplishments, successful rearing of a family, an opportunity to take part in activities which have been shelved because of a previously busy life, the doctor feels.

Dr. Hickler's clinic treats ambulatory patients from 60 years and over—men and women who need more specialized treatment than usual medical channels have to offer. The clinic has as many patients as it can handle.

Pearl Clinic's program approaches its older patients in terms of the total person: attitudes toward life, social and economic problems, emotional and physical needs.

Dr. Hickler has found there are too many erroneous generalities about people who are elderly—a tendency to lump them into one group.

Many young adults think of all older persons as irritable and rigid. But men and women don't suddenly develop into grouches because of age, he says.

Old age doesn't make people rigid and unbending in personality. These characteristics date back into early years when personality traits were formed.

Older people want to be treated as individuals, recognized for their differences one from another, their contributions, their potentialities. People differ individually at any age.

Our attitude toward senior citizens affects their whole outlook on life, cautions Dr. Hickler.

Medical care of the elderly is not the only challenge. Recreational opportunities after retirement and economic problems are others.

Most of our senior citizens are retired and living on limited incomes. Fifteen percent need institutional or hospital care. Many need long-term care in nursing homes or in their own homes.

The best way to reach solutions to these problems is first to examine our own attitudes toward the elderly, Dr. Hickler suggests. Also the attitudes of the elderly toward young people and toward themselves.

Before undertaking "grand schemes" to aid our senior citizens, it's necessary to ask:

For the younger adult: "How do I think of my role at 65 or over? How would I like to be treated?"

For the older person: "How can I be old, accept the fact and make the best of it?"

When these questions are answered, Dr. Hickler believes, we will be making headway in coping not only with the medical needs of the aged but their other needs as well.

The Welfare of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested in Italy and its people. No Representative from New York City could be otherwise. A great number of my constituents have always been Italian immigrants or their descendants. New York City owes a great deal of its prosperity to its citizens of Italian heritage. Its arts and sciences have been quickened by them. Its industry would wither without their brain and brawn. The highly important dress trade and manufactory of New York could not exist without its Italian seamstresses, stitchers, cutters, tailors, designers, and workmen. Its food and restaurant industry is linked ineluctably with them. One of New York's greatest mayors was Fiorello La Guardia, son of an Italian musician immigrant.

I cannot conceive of the Metropolitan Opera without Del Monaco, Albanese, Siepi, Tagliavini. Then there were the unforgettable Caruso and Pinza. Small wonder, then, that during the opera season you can find me and my dear wife and daughter in our accustomed seats each Saturday night listening intently to La Boheme or Otello, Andrea Chernier or Aida. I often sing myself to sleep with the heavenly arias from La Tosca or Butterfly or the Barber of Seville.

All of which brings me to Italy and its desperately desired prosperity under its new premier Fanfani, who is soon to come to the United States. We shall offer him sincere welcome. As our friend and ally in NATO we must aid Italy to the utmost. Our people, too, should do their share. They can and should invest in Italy's future. She offers great inducements for safe and profitable investments. Her domestic economy is expanding at a rapid rate. Hea seaports, open year round in the sunny Mediterranean, afford wonderful shipping facilities. She plies the ocean

trade with the fourth largest merchant marine fleet in the world. Nearby lie the rapidly developing markets of Africa and the Middle East; to the north, the prosperous NATO community affords a ready outlet for all kinds of manufacture and produce.

Italy was formerly known primarily for her agricultural commodities. Who, for example, has not partaken of delicious Italian wine? But in recent years, the complexion of the nation has changed completely. Today, Italy is predominantly an industrial nation engaged in a wide variety of manufacturing. Her steel production has risen to almost 7 million tons per year and total industrial output since the end of World War II has doubled.

Foreign capital has already participated to a considerable extent in the development of the Italian economy. Substantial foreign investments have been made in Italy's textile industry, her growing chemical and pharmaceutical industry, and in her electrical industry. In Sicily, the island lying off Italy's southwestern coast, large expenditures have, with foresight, been made for exploring and developing her petroleum resources. Present instability in the Middle East would dictate that more Western capital be employed to make maximum utilization of the Sicilian oil fields.

I can assure you that, unlike many other areas of the world, capital investment from the United States is most welcome in Italy and much has been done to provide the economic climate necessary to attract dollars from abroad. Under Italy's new Foreign Investment Law, foreign investors are provided with the same rights and privileges of domestic concerns. There exist no limitations on the amount of money that may be invested in newly established companies in Italy nor on the number of nonnationals who direct or manage such ventures.

Truly, Italy provides a golden opportunity for American investment. By assisting in her economic development, not only will we in the United States be profitably employing our own capital resources, but we will be providing vital assistance to an important ally in this unsettled world. We cannot forget that it was an Italian who discovered America. It is now time for Americans to rediscover Italy.

Farmers' Net Income Jump Greatest in Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the 22-percent jump in farmers' realized net income from the first half of last year to the first half of this year was the greatest in a decade. It was not much short of the 26-percent increase that took place between 1946 and 1947 as a result of the ending of wartime price controls.

The exceptionally large gain this year is mainly the result of improved market prices. Prices received by farmers averaged 8 percent higher in January to June this year, than a year earlier. The volume of marketings was also up 3 percent.

Production expenses increased less than 4 percent—not nearly enough to cancel out the increase in gross income.

The increase in realized net income in terms of dollars, reflects an annual rate for the first half of 1958 that is close to $2½ billion above the first half of 1957. That means increased buying power in the hands of farmers all over the Nation, and the effects will be felt throughout the communities in which they live.

Farmers' realized net income was running at an annual rate of $13.3 billion the first half of this year, as against only $10,850,000,000 the first half of last year.

Mr. Speaker, these figures dramatically point up that Secretary Benson has been right in his insistence upon a free farm economy and a lessening of government regulation.

An Area Rich in Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from one of the leading weekly newspapers in the 21st Congressional District of Illinois, the Gillespie News.

This editorial shows a spirit of enthusiasm and public-mindedness which is so essential to the progress of the small communities in that area which have been hurt by the decline of coal production and the closing of coal mines which were the livelihood for so many of their citizens:

[From the Gillespie (Ill.) News of July 9, 1958]

AN AREA RICH IN COAL MINES

Once upon a time there was an area rich in coal mines, a prosperous area. Men working, providing well for their families, most of them owning their own homes, and educating their children.

The entire area profited by the mines, business flourished. This all showed in the people, the home, and business houses.

Then came a different day, the mines began to work less hours, still times were not too bad, and most considered it only a temporary setback. This proved to be wishful thinking. One by one the mines began to close, until all the coal mines which had been gold mines were closed. For the first time a depression hit, gloom spread. Everyone in the community felt the tightening of money. Many of the men went elsewhere for employment.

As is always the case following calamity or disaster, life went on, business continued on a smaller scale.

Time went on, people learned to live without the mines, but naturally would prefer to live with them.

Since then there has been more or less drifting along—dreaming of the past, hoping that a sudden demand for coal would bring about the reopening of the mines. This cannot be counted on, therefore we need to look for other gold mines.

In the midst of this area, as you have probably guessed, is our own Gillespie. We still bear scars. We did come back in a manner—but, where are we going from here? Forward? There is no such thing as standing still, we go either forward or backward.

There is an appearance of drifting, a lack of leadership, organization, a general public apathy.

Attempts have been made to attract industry, a few working to this end and bearing the burden. Too many stand on the sidelines saying: "It can't be done." Those words and feeling spread, it takes away the vim and vigor.

Public meetings flop by lack of attendance and interest.

Civic organizations are in a rut. A business organization meets when necessary, but it's seldom necessary.

Cities smaller than Gillespie have both a chamber of commerce and a junior chamber. Each have their projects—and, carry them out. Sure, it takes work, it also brings results.

What makes the Canna anna's click? Projects. They are continuously working on some civic project. This working together brings action, which keeps them together, making Gillespie a better place in which to live—keeping Gillespie on the map. Even the men are proud of them, willing to assist, but seem content in letting the Canna annas do it.

If we had a strong men's organization, not to compete, but to work with, what a Gillespie we would have.

However, if we are not going to have action from the men, let's give the girls full power—a Canna anna mayor and a Canna anna council, then there will be only one way we can go—forward—and once more Gillespie will be a progressive, up-to-date city.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, during the 8 consecutive terms or the 16 years that I have had the distinguished and great honor to serve the people of the Sixth District of Louisiana, I have done my utmost to give to them the representation they truly deserve.

During these 16 years the schools and colleges of the Sixth District have received in Federal grants and surplus properties an amount of over a million dollars.

To mention a few of the benefits that I have worked on during the past session, I list the following:

First. Necessary funds for flood control and navigation in Louisiana.

Second. Improved social-security benefits.

Third. Increase in Federal retirement.

Fourth. Increase in pay for all Federal workers, including classified and postal workers.

Fifth. Better care for our aged.

Sixth. Increased veterans benefits.

Seventh. Assistance to the farmers.

Eighth. Development of interstate highway program.

In the past 7 years as your Congressman, I did everything possible to secure Federal expenditures for the construction and maintenance of flood control and navigation projects for the State of Louisiana, which totaled $224,509,000.

The Pearl River navigation project was completed in 1956, at a total cost of about $10 million.

In this session of Congress, $6,500,000 was appropriated for the continued construction and development of the Baton Rouge-Port Allen-Indian Village cut-off of the Intercoastal Waterway. This makes a total, to date, of $16,237,000 in Federal funds for this project. Included in this project is the port of Baton Rouge and Port Allen which means so much to the sixth district, as well as Louisiana and the rest of the Nation. For the Amite River and its tributaries, the Federal Government, including this year's appropriation, has given for flood relief of the parishes of Ascension, Iberville, Livingston, and East Baton Rouge, the amount of $750,000 in Federal funds which will greatly help in relieving the drainage problems that exist in these parishes.

Approximately $29,767,200 for the old river control structure, north of Morganza, to keep the Mississippi River within its levees, has been provided in Federal funds. Of this, $8,550,000 is included in this year's appropriation.

All of the above did not just happen by accident. On the other hand, it took an enormous amount of time, planning, and effort, and quite naturally, I am proud of the part that I have played in helping to secure these much-needed projects.

Today my congressional office, or I really should say your office, in the Nation's Capital, has the reputation of being one of the most efficient on Capitol Hill. It has taken years of hard work and experience to achieve this.

Not only have I endeavored to represent you people of the Sixth District as you wish me to, and to vote for all constructive legislation; but I have also endeavored to help and assist each and every person in the Sixth District regardless of their walk in life or whether their problems were large or small, regardless of their political faith, to the best of my ability.

With this in mind, I pledge with the best of my ability to continue to help each and every one of you with your troubles that beset you and to work to improve your working and living conditions in every way possible.

During the years I have served you in Congress, I have voted for and supported all legislation that would help the farmers and I have voted for and supported all legislation that would be beneficial to all the veterans. I have been and will continue to be a strong advocate of free enterprise. I have been a perpetual supporter of all flood-control projects and all flood-control legislation.

During the time I have been in Congress, I have worked for, and helped secure $6,562,471 Federal funds for hospitals in Bogalusa, Mandeville, Hammand-Ponchatoula, Plaquemine, Covington, and Slidell, La.

From the above, I am sure you will understand how I have worked to help bring about many of the projects that mean so much to everyone in Louisiana.

Waterway Development Important to Mobile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Waterway Development Important to Mobile," which was published a few days ago in the Mobile Register, of Mobile, Ala.

Although the editorial deals primarily with the importance of waterway development to that particular port, what the editorial has to say with reference to the connection between the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers has a great deal of importance to all the inland parts of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT IMPORTANT TO MOBILE

Government reports show a decline of about 15 percent in farm exports for the fiscal year which ended June 30.

"Major declines * * * were in cotton, wheat, rice, edible vegetable oils, meat and dairy products," the Associated Press notes in pointing out that "Department of Agriculture officials cited the export downturn in new appeals to Congress to extend the trade act."

Also making headlines this week, however, is the Midwest grain traffic on the Mississippi River.

"A flood of grain is pouring into St. Louis and from there flowing down the Mississippi headed for export markets," the New York Times relates.

"It represents the largest wheat crop in 11 years and the second largest ever. Harvesting in Illinois and Missouri is at its peak; millions of bushels are moving off the farms every day. * * *

"This year the wheat harvest is expected to exceed 1,311,000,000 bushels. Only the 1947 crop of 1,359,000,000 bushels was larger."

Grain flowing down the Mississippi River for export means, manifestly, that it will not move through the port of Mobile.

And here once again is reason, in the form of specific example, for Mobile to be keenly interested in seeing the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway become a reality.

This project, which contemplates the linking of the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers by navigable canal, would place Mobile in stronger position to compete for Midwest trade, including export grain.

With navigation established between these two rivers, an uninterrupted inland waterway route for barges would be available between this important gulf port and the middle United States.

The lack of such a route today, while Ol' Man River—the Mississippi—carries a huge annual volume of exports and imports through the New Orleans gateway, is an obvious handicap for Mobile in Midwest competition.

Not Mobile alone, but a whole vast region of the country would benefit from the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway development, of course. But the importance of this project to this port is currently emphasized by a flood of grain * * * flowing down the Mississippi headed for export markets.

It clearly is to the interest of Mobile as Alabama's industrial seaport to do all it can in behalf of high priority listing for the Tennessee-Tombigbee project every step of the way from here on in waterway improvements until it becomes possible for barges to operate without interruption between this seaport and the middle inland region of the country.

Donations of Free Food to Needy Abroad Nearly Four Times the Volume of Surplus Food Given to Needy in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in my efforts in these past 4 years to enact a food-stamp plan for distribution of surplus food to all of the millions of very needy persons in our country, I have noted Mr. Benson's many glowing reports about the volume of surplus food now being given out to the unemployed in many areas of the country.

But Mr. Benson's own figures show that we have distributed nearly four times as much of this surplus food by volume to the needy of the rest of the world as we have given to our own needy. In fact, in any one year under Public Law 480, we give nearly twice as much surplus food away abroad—I am speaking now of straight-out donations to the needy, not to so-called sales for counterpart funds—we give to the needy abroad nearly twice as much as Mr. Benson has used for all domestic purposes here, including the school-lunch program, donations to public institutions, and so on as well as distribution to the needy.

I have repeatedly said I am not against our charity programs for the needy abroad—to have food in great abundance and not help to feed starving people would be a terrible sin. But while charity does not have to begin and end at home, there is nothing in ethics or morals which says we cannot be charitable to our own desperately poor in a manner at least equivalent to what we are doing overseas.

TABLES SHOW GREAT DISPARITY IN FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC FOOD GIFTS

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including as part of these

remarks several tabulations covering this point of foreign donations of food to the needy overseas under title III of Public Law 480 as compared to the much reduced program of food distribution to help our own needy.

I hope the Members will have an opportunity to look over these tables before voting Wednesday on passage of S. 3420 under suspension of the rules. I hope they will also note the detailed breakdown on the needy in their own States which I placed in the RECORD yesterday at page 13188. These various tabulations should prove beyond all doubt that a food-stamp plan for needy Americans belongs as part of Public Law 480, and that the bill to extend Public Law 480 should not pass under suspension of the rules but should be brought before us instead under the regular order so that it is subject to amendment to include a food-stamp plan.

The following tabulation lists the 85 countries which have been receiving free surplus food at United States Government expense so that they could help feed their poor. It shows the poundage sent to each country in each of 3 fiscal years, and the dollar cost to the United States Government of this phase of Public Law 480. This, I repeat, has nothing to do with the operations under title I of Public Law 480 under which we have transferred about a billion dollars worth of food a year to foreign governments in return for their own currency which is then usually lent back to them for their own currency which is then usually lent back to them for their own development.

The tabulation immediately below covers operations under title III under which we make outright gifts of this food, usually through church and charitable organizations, and help pay the ocean transportation costs as well. Note particularly the totals for the 1957 fiscal year and then compare those with figures for the same year covering domestic use of surpluses which I am also going to place in the RECORD further down in this insertion.

First, the report on foreign donations of food under title III, as follows:

Title III, Public Law 480—Sec. 416, foreign donations, fiscal years 1955–57

[Thousand pounds—thousand dollars]

Country	1955		1956		1957	
	Pounds	Cost	Pounds	Cost	Pounds	Cost
Aden					36	$7
Afghanistan			229	$42	250	51
Africa, French Equatorial						
Africa, West French			110	20	1,070	219
Algeria			124	31	7,737	850
Antigua	500	$92	415	76		
Austria	7,564	3,360	23,521	10,667	11,856	3,203
Bahama Islands			255	107	247	78
Belgian Congo						
Belgium	85	35	195	89	250	59
Bolivia	3,994	1,412	9,062	2,723	6,453	1,175
Brazil	12,282	2,542	25,912	5,369	11,117	1,942
Burma	498	91	1,639	302	1,816	356
Cambodia					126	26
Canary Islands			480	18		
Ceylon	449	82	477	88	40,267	5,306
Chile	1,065	195	1,122	238	8,481	1,082
China						
Colombia	4,381	946	13,982	3,164	16,860	2,872
Costa Rica			132	52	1,086	359
Czechoslovakia						
Dominica			866	159		
Ecuador	874	160	688	176	1,437	242
Egypt	57,758	23,544	35,960	17,514	2,694	274
England	90	49	149	56	54	18
Ethiopia			144	26	36	7
Finland	1,000	737	2,200	1,423		
Formosa	9,720	2,603	48,636	9,612	91,064	10,529
France	6,124	2,840	12,182	6,413	2,773	568
Gambia			263	48	351	72
Gaza					882	181
Germany	44,611	18,530	85,915	33,108	72,373	15,407
Goa	499	314	400	207	350	62
Gold Coast	54	10	875	371	215	79
Greece	29,526	12,787	62,033	22,084	98,682	14,902
Grenada			338	62	338	69
Guadaloupe					135	39
Guatemala	1,385	254			1,594	327
Guiana, British			667	171	72	15
Guiana, French			241	44	241	49
Haiti	2,460	463	1,792	595	2,008	240
Holland			4	(1)		
Honduras	1,482	543	470	86	3,340	738
Honduras, British			650	120	325	67
Hong Kong	2,689	631	21,060	3,460	52,868	6,625
India	60,041	27,890	76,898	29,318	86,902	17,841
Indonesia	999	202	3,924	691	6,334	1,260
Iran	2,739	949	2,643	927	5,584	983
Iraq			3,575	658	1,925	395
Ireland, North						
Israel	902	378	4,237	1,646	13,308	2,291
Italy	85,843	35,649	290,668	44,442	307,161	27,098
Jamaica			4,420	1,215	3,625	835
Japan	6,281	1,623	24,797	4,460	31,386	4,809
Java	60	11				
Jordan	3,646	$1,573	1,792	$598	5,567	$929
Kenya			510	130	520	107
Korea	50,041	10,597	91,209	16,790	226,331	27,269
Laos					208	29
Lebanon	537	139			1,150	230
Liberia	99	18	100	18	36	7
Libya	537	99	1,384	255	3,359	1,116
Macao					1,267	130
Malay States	971	337	1,850	473	1,706	358
Malta	396	160	3,015	1,609	3,086	563
Martinque			200	37	200	41
Mexico			1,474	357	3,163	625
Montserrat	108	20			142	29
Morocco, French	511	149	1,092	327	12,475	2,362
New Guinea, Netherlands			132	24		
Nigeria	50	9	437	80	85	17
North Borneo	40	7	140	26	120	25
Norway						
Nyasaland			36	7	36	7
Okinawa	360	66	3,433	406		
Pakistan	13,317	4,796	29,874	11,448	60,531	9,679
Palestine						
Panama	1,252	386	3,732	1,218	5,350	1,035
Paraguay	1,095	201	593	109	1,121	230
Peru	4,719	927	5,690	978	6,075	1,122
Philippine Islands	3,437	659	6,030	1,083	14,282	2,653
Portugal			17,543	4,825	24,309	4,415
Ryukyu Islands	1,250	252	1,880	416	4,960	730
St. Kitts			514	94	514	105
St. Helena					110	23
St. Lucia	250	46				
St. Vincent			386	71	386	79
San Salvador			1,119	206	2,475	668
Sarawak	305	56	1,225	225	900	185
Scotland						
Sierra Leone			36	7	36	7
Singapore	80	15	276	51		
Spain	56,938	19,181	129,089	33,814	74,453	17,845
Sudan			36	7		
Surinam			681	125	681	140
Syria			655	120	1,020	209
Thailand			200	37	371	67
Trieste	1,805	677	2,255	848	7,900	1,449
Tripoli						
Trinidad and Tobago			680	125	301	62
Tunisia	379	125	394	104	2,561	528
Turkey	664	218	1,250	297	3,509	718
Wales						
Virgin Islands, British			91	17	85	17
Vietnam	5,43	1,947	96,124	14,323	178,517	22,730
Yugoslavia	37,804	16,063	29,141	8,724	182,191	31,309
Total	531,985	197,195	1,200,678	302,488	1,727,877	265,739
Number of countries	57		94		85	

[1] Less than $500.

SEVEN MILLION AMERICANS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE NEED A FOOD-STAMP PLAN

Mr. Speaker, I have not inserted the tabulation above for the purpose of protesting or decrying these gifts of food to the needy abroad. Far from it. I think we can all be proud of how much good has been done with that food in the countries whose people benefited from our charity and thoughtfulness.

But, Mr. Speaker, cannot we be charitable at least in kind to the nearly 7 million Americans on various forms of public assistance, plus the millions more today suffering extreme hardship because of the recession?

The tabulation below, also from official sources, lists the actual poundage of food distributed by Mr. Benson in the 1957 fiscal year to the school-lunch program, to public institutions, and to needy persons. I call attention to the totals in the needy person category, since that is the only one which would be affected if we were to enact a food-stamp plan. That shows only 489,800,000 pounds of surplus food—mostly flour, cornmeal, cheese, dry skim milk, dry beans, and rice—as having been given to our needy that year, compared to 1,727,877,000 pounds of food donated abroad under the Public Law 480 provisions which constitute a food-stamp plan for the needy of other countries.

I might say that the partial figures for fiscal 1958 on foreign as against domestic

donations of food show the same ratio of nearly 4 to 1 in pounds of food donated and in dollar costs to the United States Government:

Quantities of surplus foods donated for domestic use, fiscal year 1957, and estimated, July to March, fiscal year 1958

[In million pounds]

Commodity	Domestic, fiscal year 1957			
	Schools	Institutions	Needy persons	Total
Beans, dry	28.3	9.2	42.9	80.4
Butter	46.3	9.4	12.5	68.2
Butter oil				
Cheese	31.7	15.6	71.6	118.9
Cornmeal	17.7	9.5	89.9	117.1
Corn	.5	.4		.9
Cottonseed oil				
Eggs, shell	30.0	7.2		37.2
Egg solids, dried				
Flour	46.1	56.8	140.8	243.7
Grapefruit, canned				
Ground beef—frozen	71.3			71.3
Lard	16.5	6.0	1.6	24.1
Milk, nonfat, dry	23.6	15.5	82.7	121.8
Peanut butter				
Pork, corned and frozen	52.1		[2]	52.3
Rice	21.9	10.8	47.6	80.3
Turkeys, frozen	22.6	2.6		25.2
Wheat	1.9	6.4	(3)	8.3
Other [4]	7.1	5.1		12.2
Total	417.6	154.5	489.8	1,061.9

[1] Special distribution for hurricane disaster relief in Puerto Rico.
[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.
[4] Includes commodities distributed domestically in limited amounts during fiscal year 1957: Cabbage, fresh plums, sweetpotatoes, and cottonseed oil.

Student Loan Guaranty Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Student Loan Guaranty Funds," published in the American Banker of July 22, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT LOAN GUARANTY FUNDS—WIDE ADOPTION OF NEW PLAN SEEMS LIKELY

Once the idea of students going into debt to finance their college education was pretty generally frowned upon in academic circles as a postgraduation handicap better avoided than incurred. Many argued that it was not wise to saddle the graduate with a debt load during the first struggling years of his business or professional career when income would be low and marriage a complicating factor. This sentiment was probably more widely entertained, however, before there were so many thousands of applicants hammering at the college gates. At any rate, there seemed to be an abundance of scholarship funds available to the exceptional or superior students as grants, rather than as loans, although loan assistance would be found in almost every college catalog. These scholarship grants are predicated, for the most part, on the assumption of a combination of scholarly attainment and financial need.

The loan assistance idea, however, is gaining increased recognition. That would seem to be the implication of the student loan plans being set up in some of the States under which bank loans to college students are being underwritten by some sort of instrumentality such as Massachusetts' Higher Education Assistance Fund.

The loans authorized under such plans are hardly enough to fall into the category of a load around the student's neck. A maximum of $500 a year for each of 3 years, or an aggregate of $1,500, is not a staggering sum these days. In one State, New York, the total is higher. There it could run to $3,000.

NOT BURDEN WHEN BUDGETED

Also in the past generation we have had reassuring experience on installment repayment loans in general. Going into debt is not frowned upon as a "burden" where repayments can be budgeted and the purpose is constructive. Moreover, certain private corporations, such as C. I. T., and certain banks, have launched their own plans for higher education loans. All in all, it looks as though the idea has shed its chrysallis and is ready to take flight and breed its kind nationally.

The new student loan idea is not directed as much at the top flight student as are most of the scholarship funds, but at the student qualified for college, unable to attend, or unable to continue if he is already in college, without some financial help. Much is being made in New York State, at least, of the fact that a substantial number of the upper half of their high school graduating classes do not go to college.

That there is a real need to be met seems indicated by the record of the Massachusetts Assistance Fund, where the idea was pioneered. In operation since the fall of 1956, this Massachusetts fund has guaranteed 2,000 bank loans to students, aggregating $900,000.

Perhaps it ought to be explained here that so far as we can learn, these loan programs are in operation in three States, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York.

NEW YORK PLAN MOST LIBERAL

The New York plan is more liberal than the other two, possibly because the New York Higher Education Assistance Corporation was created by the legislature with an appropriation of $425,000 for the guaranty fund and $75,000 for administrative expense. It will give a 100 percent guaranty to a bank loan for a student who has been accepted by a college. It will guarantee loans for each of the 4 years of college, up to $500 in the first year, up to $750 in the second year and in the third year and up to $1,000 in the fourth year. The interest rate is 4 percent. The student is allowed to spread his repayments over 6 years, beginning 5 months after graduation.

The Massachusetts and Maine Higher Education Assistance Funds were raised through private subscriptions by corporations and individuals. They guarantee loans only for the 2d, 3d, and 4th years in college. To be eligible a student must have demonstrated his success and intention to continue by completing his freshman year.

The Massachusetts fund's guaranty limit is 80 percent of a loan. A student may borrow $500 for each of his last 3 years in college. Repayment must begin by 6 months after graduation and be completed in 3½ years. The fund has currently fixed 4½ percent as the maximum that may be charged on these loans. The bank gets 4 percent, and one-half percent is remitted to the fund as a service charge.

In New York State, the interest rate ceiling is 4 percent. In Massachusetts the rate is one-half percent over the prime rate, but not more than 5 percent or less than 3 percent. The Maine fund sets a maximum rate of 4½ percent, with 1 percent being remitted to the fund for service. However, a lending bank may charge any rate below these figures.

On July 8, the New York State Higher Education Assistance Corporation, which has been in operation only this year, announced that it has guaranteed 71 outstanding loans, totaling $37,000. On June 30, the Massachusetts Higher Education Foundation announced that it has guaranteed 2,000 loans, totaling $900,000, and on July 15 the Maine Higher Education Assistance Foundation, which has been in operation only since April of this year, announced that it had guaranteed 16 loans, totaling $7,067. A pickup in applications is expected between now and college opening time.

Students under the borrowing rules may attend any recognized college or university. In New York State he obtains a loan application blank from the college registrar and submits it to the appropriate college official for certification, after which he submits it to the fund through the bank of his choice for guarantee.

In the two New England States, where the guaranty funds were raised privately, no legislation was required except laws to permit minors to sign notes for this purpose and be responsible for them. As pointed out, in New York, the fund is a public corporation created by legislative enactment.

It is understood that enabling legislation, in whatever form may be required, is under consideration in several other States, including Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Indiana and Pennsylvania.

Service of Senator Neuberger to Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is always gratifying when we can read a very favorable, commendatory editorial about one of our colleagues in the Senate. Such an editorial was brought to my attention by means of a letter from a friend of mine in the great State of Oregon. With the letter there was enclosed an editorial which was published in the World, of Coos Bay, Oreg., on July 12, 1958. This splendid editorial is a very effective and enlightening one about the work done by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] as a Member of this body and, indeed, about the attitudes and philosophy of our friend and distinguished colleague. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. NEUBERGER AND BANK CASH

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, in his fourth year in the United States Senate, is paying the people of his State some handsome dividends for his election to that post.

Latest was last week's success—undoubtedly with help from his colleague—of securing an appropriation for a start on the Gold Beach harbor project and Green Peter dam.

Neither was recommended by the Budget Bureau. In such cases, securing the appropriation in committee is extremely difficult.

To be sure, the fact that the cash was put in the bill in committee does not assure a start for the projects. They may be lost on the floor of the Senate or in conference committee with the House.

But their inclusion is indicative of how well Mr. NEUBERGER has learned his job among a difficult and talented group of men, although he began with a head start through his legislative experience in Salem.

Along with these practical legislative matters, there is another dividend. Mr. NEUBERGER is becoming known as a nonhair shirt conscience of the Senate with his questioning of his own, and other Senators', propriety in accepting campaign contributions dhile at the same time criticizing the morals of the gift-accepting members of the executive branch.

One thing Oregon has in the Senate besides talent: she has national recognition. There is probably not a normally well-read citizen in the Nation who could not tell you the names of Oregon's two United States Senators.

Can you recall the names of the two Senators from, say, Florida?

WAYNE MORSE is of course a national institution after 13 hectic years in the Senate. NEUBERGER chose to make himself well known at the start with some bits about bedroom caucuses and squirrels. His sallies seemed insane at the time, but they achieved his purpose: DICK NEUBURGER became immediately well known from coast to coast.

Once over that hurdle, which takes most Senators about three terms of seniority-building, he was in a more formidable position to achieve things like cash for a start on the Gold Beach harbor, and he had a readymade audience for his more philosophical utterances, such as the nature of the Senator's conscience.

It has been widely reported that Senator NEUBURGER will be a one-termer, by choice.

He appears honest in saying that he finds Washington, D. C., a sticky and disagreeable atmosphere for a Northwesterner who likes nothing better than hiking, camping, and writing colorful history about his home country.

"I get no time to write," lamented one of America's best writers (and once its best paid writer) in a conversation about a year ago. "Sometimes I think I hate this job. But the courtesies a Senator gets would be hard to give up," he admitted, still leaving the impression that Teddy Roosevelt's vigorous life holds greater attractions.

Those NEUBURGER thoughts are prior to the certain pressure which will be brought on him by Oregon Democrats to run again, should he in 1960 indicate his thoughts are running the same way. A political party doesn't willingly give up an asset like DICK NEUBURGER, who is votes in the bank on any election day.

Neither, we are sure, will a State like Oregon give up a Senator like Mr. NEUBURGER without some pressure.

He is cash in the Oregon bank every day he's in the Senate—dividends of legislative know-how like that which produced the Gold Beach appropriation, and dividends of Oregon presige by the fact that he is well known and widely respected.

Supplemental Appropriation Needed for Veterans' Administration Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on veterans' housing held March 12, 1958, the committee asked the Veterans' Administration whether the agency had taken into account an increase in loan guaranty activities in compiling their budget request for fiscal 1959. The VA stated that the budget requested contemplated a steady decline in loan guaranty activities and that VA had just finished their hearings before the Appropriations Committee and had not asked for additional funds for any laws which had not been passed. The VA was asked to insert in the record estimates of additional funds and personnel that would be needed for increases in loans from 300,000 to 450,000 over and above their 1959 estimate.

Estimated increased costs, loan guaranty program, based upon stated number of loans closed

	Number of loans	Employment	Personal services	Other costs	Total costs	Increase			
						Employment	Personal services	Other costs	Total
1959 budget	55,500	1,750	$9,081,486	$1,952,156	$11,033,642				
Estimates	300,000	2,515	13,051,341	2,805,483	15,856,824	765	$3,969,855	$853,327	$4,823,182
	350,000	2,686	13,938,728	2,996,233	16,934,961	936	4,857,242	1,044,077	5,901,319
	400,000	2,853	14,805,358	3,182,521	17,987,879	1,103	5,723,872	1,230,365	6,954,237
	450,000	3,021	15,677,177	3,369,925	19,047,102	1,271	6,595,691	1,417,769	8,013,460

NOTE.—There is no allowance in the above figures for increased costs due to an increase or extension of the direct loan program.

On April 2, 1958, the committee wrote the Administrator calling attention to the VA's testimony and asking what steps, if any, were contemplated by VA for supplemental money in view of the new Housing Act that had been approved the previous day by the President:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1958.

Mr. SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITTIER: During the recent hearings held by the Committee on Veterans' Housing, officials representing the Veterans' Administration were requested to furnish for the record figures on personnel that would be required if the veterans' housing program was reactivated. These officials furnished figures indicating the additional personnel that would be required and the dollar amount that would be needed in addition to the 1959 budget if 300,000 or 400,000 loans were to be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration during the next year.

Mr. T. J. Sweeney, former Director, Loan Guaranty Service, advised committee staff members that there is sufficient money for the remainder of fiscal year 1958 to employ additional personnel to handle any increase in housing activities.

Now that the President has signed the housing bill, I would appreciate being advised if there is sufficient money available for the remainder of fiscal year 1958 and what steps will be taken to request a supplemental appropriation for the 1959 budget in order to staff the regional offices so that the loan guaranty operations will not be hampered due to lack of personnel.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

On April 15 the Administrator replied that he had discussed the matter of securing additional funds for loan guaranty with the Bureau of the Budget and had decided to delay his request for a few months so that he would have some experience under the new law and would be able to more accurately reflect their needs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1958.

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: You are correct in that the Veterans' Administration has on hand sufficient funds to cover necessary expansion of the loan guaranty program in fiscal year 1958, as a result of the new housing bill as stated in your letter of April 2, 1958.

I have discussed the matter of securing additional funds for fiscal year 1959 with the Bureau of the Budget. Based on this discussion, it is my intention to submit a supplemental request to the Congress in sufficient time to permit action by the Congress prior to adjournment. By delaying this request for a few months we will have the opportunity to gain some experience under the new housing bill and will be able to more accurately reflect our needs for fiscal year 1959.

Thank you for your continued interest and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
Administrator.

The House Appropriations Committee cut the overall VA budget by $2,088,000. Just what amount would be charged to loan guaranty operations is unknown at this time. The Senate, in considering the regular appropriations bill, restored the cut; however, in conference the amount was cut back to the House figure.

When it became apparent that the new housing bill adjusting the interest rate tnd providing increased direct loan funds was going to pass the Congress, it also became obvious that VA would need additional funds for loan guaranty personnel. The budget which had been pre-

sented contemplated a cut of 75 percent in loan guaranty personnel during fiscal year 1959. The committee urged the VA to seek additional funds in the regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1959, and we are confident that if the VA had made a request the funds would have been provided. Nevertheless, the administrator made the decision to seek additional loan guaranty funds in a supplemental bill and I understand that bill is now being processed by the House. The VA workload has increased sharply and processing delays are being encountered in various parts of the country.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee is considering at the present time a bill which will increase the workload of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program. I regret very much that the bill which is being approved here today does not carry increased loan guaranty funds, but I do hope that additional funds can be made available soon through a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in connection with the inpatient care item which is included in the bill pending before us under the Veterans' Administration. This item of inpatient care, as Members of course know, represents the amount of money which is actually spent for care of VA patients in VA hospitals and in contract hospitals where such care is authorized. The Veterans' Administration received from its operating agencies for the current fiscal year of 1959 a request for slightly less than $734 million for this item. To be exact, it was $733,966,000. The Veterans' Administration, on its own initiative, reduced this figure to $724,500,000, and the Bureau of the Budget, in submitting the 1959 budget, reduced this item further to $707,100,000. After hearing representative of the Veterans' Administration the Appropriations Committee recommended a sizable increase of $8 million in this one item, to make the total $715,465,000. The House passed it in this form and this was predicated by having an average daily patient load of 140,800. The other body, in its consideration approved the figure of $717,267,000, and the conference agreement provided for the return to the House figure—$715,465,000 with an average daily patient load of 140,490. I cite these figures, Mr. Speaker, to make the record abundantly clear that the Veterans' Administration was prohibited by the Bureau of the Budget from even asking the Congress for the amount of money which it felt it needed. While the final version is considerably more than the budget submitted by the President, it is still inadequate and, in that connection, I will also include as part of my remarks in the RECORD a letter from Dr. J. Gordon Spendlove, manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Portland, Oreg., and a resolution of the western managers adopted at the conference on March 19–21, 1958, in Oakland, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be clear to Members that the funds provided for fiscal year 1959 contemplate a reduction of 1,125 tuberculosis patients, this due to improved techniques in the treating of this disease. The 1,125 figure will not be entirely lost, however. Three hundred and twenty-seven of this 1,125 figure will be devoted to neuropsychiatric patients, and an additional 300 for general medical and surgical care. There will be a net reduction, however, of 498 in the average daily patient load, which means, of course, that there will be a corresponding reduction of approximately 500 operating beds.

Newspaper stories have been published indicating that all Government agencies are under instructions not in effect to submit for the 1960 budget any item in excess of their spending for 1959. This would mean, this case, that we can expect a further reduction in this field in the next budget which will be submitted to the Congress in January 1959. Originally, the Administrator had contemplated the closing of seven hospitals but after the restoration of funds in the House those plans were canceled.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Portland, Oreg., March 26, 1958.

The Honorable OLIN D. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I believe that it is my duty to apprise you of the feeling of the managers and assistant managers of the 23 Veterans' Administration hospitals, centers, and Domiciliaries located in the 7 most Western States. This group met in Oakland, Calif., March 19, 20, and 21. Enclosed is a copy of a resolution which we are asking our central office to forward to the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget.

We believe that current appropriations do not and have not supported presently legislated benefits for veterans nor the accepted concept of medical care either in 1958 or in the past several years. You will note in our statement that economies have been necessary to the extent that essential care to patients is deteriorating and further, that the Government's investment in equipment and physical plants has not been protected. We believe that Congress should either provide the money to implement the law or that it is guilty of breaking the law. The alternatives, of course, are that sufficient money be appropriated, or that the veterans' benefits be redefined on a level afforded by the appropriations.

Since you are the most powerful person in regard to the legislation affecting veterans' affairs, I have felt compelled to direct this correspondence to you.

Sincerely,
J. GORDON SPENDLOVE, M. D.,
Manager.

RESOLUTION OF MANAGERS CONFERENCE
MARCH 19–21, 1598

The managers of the 23 Veterans' Administration hospitals, centers, and domiciliaries located in 7 Western States have met to consider our hospital program for the next 2 years. Our deliberations have revealed a simple stark reality. Current appropriations will not support presently legislated benefits and accepted concept of veterans medical care.

The inexorable flood tide of price increases on all fronts is recognized throughout the hospital field. Voluntary hospitals, State hospitals, and university hospitals have experienced the effect of rising costs. With the possible exception of a few State hospitals, the costs are reflected in large rate increases and in substantial appropriations each year. In the nongovernmental hospitals these costs are passed on directly to the patient.

Our Veterans' Administration hospitals have not received funds over the past several years sufficient to keep abreast of these ascending costs. We are endeavoring to maintain a medical program equal to that offered in the community on preinflation appropriation levels. Neither have managers had funds adequate to discharge their specific responsibility in protecting the Government's investment in the physical plant and in equipment.

We have economized to the extent that essential care to our patients is inevitably deteriorating. Our 23 hospitals must have a substantial increase in fiscal year 1959 and a specific increase of $10 million for 1960 over and above the appropriation for 1958 in order to retain an acceptable level of medical care and to maintain our physical plants. These sums do not include whatever might come in a general pay raise for Federal employees, or the automatic wage boosts for blue collar workers.

Unless these sizable sums are made available, Congress must face these alternatives:

1. Lower quality of medical care and further deterioration of the physical plants; or
2. Reduce beds with a concomitant reduction in patient load: (a) close selected hospitals throughout the country; (b) close whole sections of beds in many hospitals.

We therefore unanimously resolve that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of the United States be apprised of this basic issue and be requested to take clear cut remedial action.

President Carlos P. Garcia, of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 last, we heard His Excellency Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines, address us in this Hall. He spoke to us as the leader of 23 million Filipinos, our loyal friends and allies. It was an impressive speech. We gave him one of the most cordial and heartwarming receptions ever given by Congress to a visiting head of state.

The speech was impressive because of its frankness, its sincerity, its forthright expression of loyalty to the ideals of democracy and freedom. He gave us an Asian interpretation of the meaning of Philippine-American relationship, how the success or failure of Philippine democracy would be taken by the uncommitted peoples of the world. Without circumlocution he told us the problems that confront his country and his administration and he appealed to the "soft spot" that he knows the American heart has for the Philippines. He said he did not want charity, he wanted a development loan "on a strictly business basis." It was a dignified plea and it struck a responsive chord in every American heart.

His plea was heeded. Our Government gave him the development loan that he needs for the first year of his 3-year economic program. Because the executive cannot commit our Government beyond 1 year in view of the need

for yearly congressional budgetary approval, President Garcia was given only the amount which it is believed his program needs for its initial requirements. This was mentioned in the joint communique signed by the two Presidents and I may say that the communique is remarkable in that as far as I can remember it was the first time that a specific amount of a loan or that the subject of a loan was ever mentioned in a joint comunique signed in the White House as a result of the visit of a head of state. This may be considered a feather in President Garcia's cap. Furthermore, I have no doubt but that such further assistance as his Government may believe necessary to complete his 3-year projects will be forthcoming when the funds are needed after the first year and the original credit line has been wisely invested.

President Garcia's trip to the United States was a tremendous success not so much for the development loan that he obtained or the prospect of other loans, but principally for the favorable impact that his visit had on Phillippine-American relations. His address before the National Press Club, his extemporaneous replies to the question-and-answer period, his speeches in Nork York, his unrehearsed televsion appearance in Meet the Press, his press statements, his addresses in Chicago, Phoenix, Los Angeles, and San Francisco were well received and favorably editorialized by the leading organs of American public opinion, and they all served to cement the friendship that exists between our two nations. Wherever he went the American people welcomed him with a warmth that proved to him how right he was in referring to the soft spot that the Philippines occupies in our hearts.

In order that the American people may know how the Filipino people gratefully acknowledged the cordial welcome that was accorded their leader, under unanimous consent of the House I include in my remarks a few of the many editorials written in the Manila press about President Garcia's visit, the clippings of which I received by airmail from the Philippines the other day:

[Editorial from the Manila Times of July 3, 1958]

WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT

One of the most successful top-level missions to the United States runs full circle today when President Garcia and his entourage return to Manila. The success of the good will part of the Garcia mission has been both clearly evident and unanimously accepted, both here and in the United States.

The good will aspect of the mission has been so successful there is no quarrel between the majority and the opposition over its practical value. With dignity and intelligence, the President represented the Philippines in Washington and before select and influential groups in the United States. His presence, the readiness with which he answered questions, and his frankness served to dispel prejudices to which even American observers are not immune and to create a fresh and clear impression of the type of leadership we have in the Philippines. Such a result has to be classified as an imponderable which can't be valued in terms of dollars.

A grateful people will meet the President at the airport today. We add our own word of welcome as he steps off the plane to rejoin his people.

[Editorial from the Philippines Herald, Manila, June 22, 1958]

IT'S UP TO US NOW

The United States has demonstrated once more to the world that it will not fail a friend in need. In hurried negotiations that reflected a marked departure from the usual stringent business deals, the United States Government wrote down a promise of up to $125 million loans to boost the shaky Philippine economy and a verbal assurance that there would be more help coming if the funds to be utilized in the next 12 months were used as intended.

It undoubtedly is to the distinct credit of the American Government and people that this happy situation has come about. Realizing the dangers posed by a collapse in the Philippine economy, not only in the point of common defense against communism but also from the standpoint of regional prestige, the United States Government strained its efforts in accommodating Philippine requests for loans that could arrest the slowdown in the country's economic development and afford a continuation of its program of industrialization. It can be said in all candor that the American Nation, in entrusting their faith in the economc blueprints submitted to them during the negotiations, not only has reaffirmed its maternal concern for the welfare of 23 million Filipinos but also has shown to 1 billion Asians that friendship with America, not on the basis of political blackmail but one on a plane of good will and genuine concern for each other's welfare, pays off handsomely.

For President Garcia, the gesture of the American Government and people will go a long way toward realizing his administration's economic goals. To the majority, his loan-seeking venture, earlier considered "dim" by a good number of people, including Americans, has come as a surprise and a spectacular triumph for which the Chief Executive can be proud of. It cannot be doubted now that the President took a calculated risk and a gamble in seeking the loans. And it is to his credit and to that of the entire Philippine Nation that he won.

But the loan alone, which can give prosperity to the entire country, is not all that the President has secured for his people. With his conferences with President Eisenhower, the Chief Executive was able to secure an unqualified assurance that the United States would instantly run to the defense of the Philippines if attacked, more aid and assistance for the armed forces, and, most important of all these assurances, that the military-bases question, which has long plagued the harmonious relationship of the two allies, would be resolved to the satisfaction of the two countries "having regard to the principle of sovereign equality and the vital requirements of an effective common defense." Indeed, President Garcia has secured much from his mission that he will return to his country a "victor."

In the face of all these triumphs, we should not lose sight, however, of the fact that the $125 million loans represent just the first step in building the nation economically. It should be remembered and constantly borne in mind by our leaders, both in the economic and political fields, that more economy-boosting loans will come our way if the administration spends wisely and fruitfully the initial amount during the next 12 months. For it is on this basis that the American Government and people will judge us on future approaches for aid. And for our own sake and America's prestige in this region, we should not fail.

[Editorial from the Manila Evening News of June 23, 1958]

THE JOINT PHILIPPINE ISLAND-UNITED STATES STATEMENT

The eyes of underdeveloped countries in the last few days were doubtless trained on the Philippine President and his mission as they went through their paces in Washington. The central target of the mission, as the world knew, was the procurement of an economic self-help loan for long-range developmental projects. At the end of President Garcia's 3-day visit to Washington, the results of his efforts were briefly summarized in a joint statement issued by the heads of state.

Firstly, there was a reaffirmation of the special ties between the Philippines and America, a friendship that now belongs to tradition. In the process, the Philippines and the United States pledged anew their cooperation against aggression, their adherence to the principles and aims of the United Nations, and the unity of strength and purpose in achieving peace with justice, based on the dignity of the individual.

As to the economic aid sought from the United States, none can deny that the President had received more than just sympathy. Necessarily, because of the long-range projects outlined, the United States could not immediately ascertain just how much financial aid it could extend. But instant action was taken in meeting the Philippine Island's immediate requirements—in the form of a $75 million credit line and a maximum of $50 million development loan. The immediate effects of these grants may be felt in the continuation of existing projects, as well as the launching of new ones deemed needed at this time, besides maintaining and certainly improving the employment level, the living standard, and the volume of production. Equally important is that these grants would serve to stimulate economically idle areas.

Finally, the joint statement assures us of continuing United States military aid in the buildup of our defenses against aggression, instant United States action in repelling aggression, and an equitable solution of problems affecting United States bases in the Philippines, with all due regard to the "principle of sovereign equality and the vital requirements of an effective common defense."

In fine, the joint statement answers fully the questions formed in the minds of those who watch from the sidelines, quizzically or skeptically, or perhaps hopefully, about the validity of this friendship between two countries, one big and the other small, whose main common ground is mutual faith in freedom and democracy, and whose relations rest squarely on mutual affection, respect and a reverence for justice.

Hundreds of editorials were written in the American press eulogizing President Garcia. I have only chosen a few excerpts at random representative of the spontaneous and sincere admiration that he earned because of the splendid manner in which he comported himself while in America and the excellent way in which his trip was arranged. Under unanimous consent I include them in my remarks:

New York Times (June 18): "It is a pleasure to welcome Philippine President Carlos P. Garcia who arrives this morning in Washington.

"We have occupied a unique position in that the Filipinos were in a sense, our wards for a long time. They have become our stanch allies, our firm friends, our coworkers for democracy and freedom. We have built up a new framework of government in Asia and we fought together for it.

The Filipinos have a right to assume that we will not fail them now."

New York Daily Mirror: "Speaking an English which Americans recognize as their own language, President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines has made a brilliant impression upon those who saw and heard him in New York at the various affairs arranged for his reception."

New York Herald Tribune: "He has won the admiration and friendship of the public * * * has shown that he can handle diplomatic problems with cool self-possession."

New York World Telegram and Sun: "Americans, no less than Filipinos can be grateful that a man of Mr. Garcia's stature and principles was available as successor to the late, great Ramon Magsaysay. The United States and the free world as a whole remain assured of a faithful ally and dedicated fighter against communism in a vital corner of the globe."

New York Times: "Philippine President Carlos P. Garcia is now in New York for a few days. His visit here is not technical. * * * His official duties have been discharged in Washington. Here he is merely among friends.

"It is at this point that President Garcia's visit, here and elsewhere, becomes far more than an economic mission. It is rather a symbol of the good things that Filipinos and Americans have been able to do in the past by their joint effort and a promise for even better things in the future."

Time: "The speaker before a joint session of Congress was the Philippines' cheerful, articulate President Carlos Garcia, and as he moved through Washington last week on an official state visit he soon found that United States officials had for him a soft spot."

Chicago Tribune: "A new type of Asian leader."

Arizona Republic: "President Garcia, like most Filipinos, is uncompromisingly anti-communistic. His government has not established relations with Soviet Russia nor does it recognize Red China. * * * The Philippines today is a bastion of American military strength in the Far East. Our bases on Luzon, both air and navy, are strong links in the defense of the free world. We can keep these bases because the Filipinos are on our side."

President Garcia unquestionably sold himself to the American people because of his winning personality and his apt and eloquent utterances. He has succeeded in establishing personal relationships that will be of great value to his administration and to his people. He showed no histronics in his demeanor and he did not play to the gallery. There was a dignified restraint in his behavior and there was unstudied honesty in his remarks. In his address before Congress he did not appear as one with hat in hand. Although he had something to ask for, he did it subtly and very appropriately—and may I add effectively—almost at the end of his speech and with such dignity and sobriety that won for him the standing ovation his splendid and masterly address so richly deserved.

Having said all these in tribute to a great leader and statesman who left behind him in this country, especially in Washington, an excellent impression that will no doubt be an asset to his people in the years ahead, I am sure it will not in any way detract from his personal success to mention also in this connection the Ambassador of the Philippines, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo who, as his country's representative in Washington, was the one who we all know laid the groundwork for the Presidential visit. I have personal knowledge of the meticulous care with which General Romulo made the preparatory arrangements because he called on me several times, wrote to me, and telephoned me regarding his President's trip. A Presidential visit is a difficult thing to manage and only by a careful handling of the smallest and multitudinous details in connection with it can every phase of the visit, official, diplomatic, social, and publicity-wise be a total success, and the Philippine Ambassador, with his usual ability and efficiency and using the innumerable valuable contacts that he has cultivated in and outside the United States Government, saw to it that nothing was overlooked.

It was also a good instance of effective public relations job and in this field General Romulo has rendered his nation service of incalculable value. He has visited every State of the Union and spoken in every important city in the United States publicizing the Philippines, has written books about the Philippines, and is respected and liked by the American press. He has helped make us more Philippine conscious. General Romulo is so highly regarded by the American people he has enhanced Philippine prestige immeasurably and has built here such a reservoir of good will for his country it is with justifiable pride that as his former colleague in this House, I also pay tribute to him today. An evidence of the esteem and affection in which he is held was the unprecedented ovation given him by the Senators and Representatives when he entered the session hall of the House the day President Garcia addressed the joint meeting of Congress. As is the usual practice when a head of state addresses Congress, his ambassador enters the session hall behind the United States President's Cabinet, accompanied by the State Department's Chief of Protocol.

As we face critical days ahead of us because of explosive international developments in the Middle East, as our motives are questioned when as a nation we have proved to the world, time and again, that our one and only aim as a people is to preserve peace and freedom not only for ourselves but for all, it is gratifying and inspiring to be able to dwell on a subject such as Philippine-American friendship, the keynote of which is identity of ideals and purposes, equality, mutual respect and good will between two nations of two different races. A state visit is paid to us by the Philippine President and he leaves behind him for us to cherish the lasting impressing of the tested friendship his people have for us. We hope he carried with him also the memory of the more than cordial welcome we accorded him and which we reserve only for those who, like the Filipinos, have earned a soft spot in our hearts.

This is the way to permanent peace and world brotherhood, and the Philippine-American pattern should be held up for all the nations to profit by.

Rising Costs and Foreign Competition Threaten Aluminum Industry's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Nunzy Chipoletti, enclosing excerpts from a speech entitled "Rising Costs and Foreign Competition Threaten Industry's Future," made by Mr. Donovan Wilmot, vice president in charge of product sales for Alcoa. I respectfully submit for insertion in the RECORD both the letter and the speech, as I believe they contain messages of great importance.

JULY 21, 1958.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is some reading material that might interest you. It came out of our monthly magazine we get here at our New Kensington Aluminum Co. plant.

We, here at the Arnold and New Kensington plant have been walking the street with seniority as high as 22 years for the past 10 months.

What they have called back is just a handful. Things have been at a standstill.

Sure, we get unemployment checks but that won't last forever. Unless something is done to our import laws, we will be out one long time, and at our age nobody will hire us for what few remaining jobs there are to get.

I have put 4 years in the Army infantry. Twenty-four months fighting through the jungles of Guam, Philippines, and Okinawa. I'm not looking for sympathy or handouts. Just a chance to work, so I will have some security for my wife and kids.

You have done a wonderful job in what short time you have been there and if you can lick this situation it will be magnificent.

Respectfully yours,

NUNZY CHIPOLETTI.

RISING COSTS AND FOREIGN COMPETITION THREATEN INDUSTRY'S FUTURE

(Speech of Donovan Wilmot, vice president in charge of products sales for Alcoa)

I am a little tired of the economic platitudes which have been handed out so freely over the past several months. I don't propose to discuss here whether business conditions have bottomed out, are going sideways, will edge up or fall off further or what. I think we would all be better off if less were written and more direct and positive action taken.

In November 1955, there was a shortage of aluminum. Alcoa's plans to substantially increase capacity to produce primary aluminum were well along when business went into a decline. This is the irony of fate. It has happened to us many times in the past. We recognize the current situation as one of those periods which inevitably occur from time to time. It is painful while it lasts but we get over it.

We want to sell every one of the products we produce at prices calculated to return a fair profit. This is highly necessary if a fair return is to be realized on the heavy capital expenditures we have made for expanded facilities and older facilities for the production of aluminum and aluminum products. Unjustifiable price concessions, only defeat the aims described.

PRICE POLICY HAS ENCOURAGED GROWTH

One factor which has given the aluminum industry an advantage over competing industries has been its pricing policy. This policy has been an important item in aluminum's rapid progress over the years. It has been designed to realize a modest return on investment rather than to take all the traffic would bear. This policy has encouraged consumption of the metal and enabled every segment of the industry to increase its size and strength.

It has been impossible to absorb the increases in wages and benefits and the consequent increasing material costs which have occurred with monotonous regularity year after year. The next increase in the aluminum industry under the last leg of the 3-year contract between the producers and labor is due August 1. If this goes through, our costs will, of course, be increased substantially and we shall have to decide what to do about prices. We don't like price increases any more than you do, but we want to compensate our employees properly and earn a fair return for our stockholders.

INDUSTRY COSTING SELF OUT OF BUSINESS

We, as an industry, and the American economy as a whole, face a number of more than usually difficult problems resulting from increased costs. I share the opinion of many others that if some well-considered action is not taken soon, American industry will cost itself out of business. For a long while the American people were apparently indifferent to price increases. That situation no longer exists, as you realize. The President mentioned this especially in his speech before the American Management Association in New York on Tuesday, May 20. Somewhere along the route we are going to reach a point of reckoning. In fact, we may have already passed it.

Every one realizes that this country is an excellent market for aluminum and aluminum products—the best in the world. This fact is not lost to the producers and manufacturers in foreign countries.

During World War II there was considerable agitation for the United States Government to enter into long-term contracts with a foreign source for its aluminum supply. This proposal was rejected by our military authorities who insisted that this country should provide its own facilities and therefore not be at the mercy of a foreign source. The primary industry must remain strong and will find it increasly difficult to do so unless the Government provides adequate protection for it against the competition of subsidized or state-owned foreign producers. Wage rates in these foreign operations are only a fraction of the rates paid in this country. I think you will find the following comparison interesting:

The present wage rate of the average factory worker in this country is $2.07 per hour. Average hourly earnings, excluding fringes, in the aluminum industry in the United States today are in a range of from $2.50 to $2.65. In certain competing industrial countries the following wage rates are paid:

	Cents
Japan	24.3
Italy	33.1
Netherlands	35.5
France	39
West Berlin	48.3

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS QUESTIONED

The matter of reciprocal trade agreements has been much in the news of late. I think it would be appropriate for me to take time out at this juncture in order to make a comparison for you of the tariff on imports into the United States versus those now effective for imports into certain European countries.

The United States tariff on aluminum pig and ingot today is 1.3 cents per pound. On July 1 of this year it will be reduced to 1.25 cents per pound.

France has a duty of 20 percent ad valorem on primary pig and ingot. On top of this, aluminum items are subject to 25 percent sales tax.

Italy has a tariff on crude aluminum of 25 percent ad valorem. On most semifabricated products its tariffs vary between 25 percent and 31 percent. The tariffs against Americans shipping into these countries are something like 6 to 10 cents per pound as compared to the 1.25 cents United States import duty which will become effective on July 1. Where, may I ask, is the reciprocity in this set of conditions for American-made aluminum?

While on the subject, I'd like to ask this question. "What do you want the Government to do regarding the import duty on extruded shapes, tubing and rod, which you can make on your extrusion presses?" And—"What about the tariff on fabricated items such as window frames, etc.?" You may be aware of the fact that many fabricated products of aluminum are now being imported into this country at 8 to 15 cents per pound under the established domestic market price.

Going far beyond the sphere merely of aluminum, I firmly believe that if the United States is to maintain its industrial strength and leadership, if our workers in many industries are going to continue to have jobs and the populace generally to enjoy our high standard of living, then something has to be done about our economic relationship with the competing industrialized foreign nations. American industry must not be put at a disadvantage with its foreign competitors. I would be willing to play golf for sizable stakes with a Sam Snead or Ben Hogan if the match were properly handicapped. I am certainly not, however, foolish enough to play against a Snead or Hogan with no allowance for the difference in our skills. They don't even run horseraces on that kind of a basis.

I would hope that Americans would give these complex problems the most serious consideration and then arrive at a policy which would safeguard our interests while dealing as fairly as possible with whatever friends we may have made among the foreign nations.

Returning to our own immediate domestic situation, I would again urge all to exert the maximum effort to create more uses for aluminum products and thereby provide orders for the greatly expanded domestic capacities which now exist.

Seven days each year Alcoans forsake their mills and typewriters to take a holiday with pay. In 1957, each one of these holidays cost Alcoa close to half a million dollars in holiday pay.

By the time the year's 7 paid holidays had rolled by in 1957, employees had received about $3,250,000 in holiday pay for those days of relaxation. For employees who had to be on the job on official holidays there was an additional $700,000 in premium pay.

Paid holidays are only one part of the Alcoa benefits program which makes up a hidden paycheck that last year averaged $880 per employee. The benefits which make up the hidden paycheck are life insurance, sickness and accident insurance, hospital and surgical benefits, workmen's compensation, State unemployment compensation, supplemental unemployment benefits, social security, retirement plan, jury pay, paid vacations, and paid holidays.

I would like to add just a few words of observation.

As a legislator of many years, I helped by legislative action to build up these hidden payrolls. They are part of the American way of life. They contribute to the American worker's standard of living.

The problem that I face is whether I can justly ask our American employer to compete with foreign employers who are not carrying the legislated extras placed upon his production costs.

The employee must face this reality sooner or later. If he demands cheap foreign products for his own use he destroys the market for his own handiwork and eventually creates the impossible economic situation that closes down plants all over the country.

No sane person is against reciprocal trades, but to be reciprocal they must be beneficial to both countries making the agreement. There is room for living and letting live. There is room for all of us to work, produce, and prosper. However, in this area of possibility the realistic and practical viewpoint must prevail.

Unemployed workers and closed plants reduce the revenues of our country. With reduced revenues how long can we continue the foreign-aid program?

To be honest to others, we must be honest to ourselves. The American consumer market can sustain foreign products only so long as the market is healthy economically.

When we have recessions of long duration the foreign producers will find themselves in a far worse dilemma than before their entrance in our domestic market.

I sincerely believe we must make a complete survey of reciprocal trades. We must ask two questions, Where have we been and where are we going?

In these answers can be found the solutions.

Why Not a Conservative Tack on States Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union:

WHY NOT A CONSERVATIVE TACK ON STATES RIGHTS?

One of the most important pieces of legislation to come up in this session of Congress goes to the Senate now that the House has approved it.

The Upper Chamber will be a more formidable obstacle for passage of the bill. Lateness of the session—Congress is due to adjourn in August, barring a worsening of the Mideastern crisis—will also prove a stumbling block to Senate approval.

The measure is simply styled, "H. R. 3," meaning House Resolution No. 3, but it deals with the important subject of States rights. It seeks to avoid invalidating State laws on subjects on which there are also Federal statutes, as long as the two are not in conflict and unless Congress specifies that other laws on the matter are voided by its enactment.

While duplication of legislation has its disadvantages, there is danger in action—judicial or legislative—that might clip the wings of States rights and duties. One of the unhealthy trends—and it is a product of

our tremendous national growth—in government today is the centralization of authority in Washington. Anything to counteract that tendency should be encouraged, as well as moves that prod States into discharging their local responsibilities.

Why shouldn't States have laws on same subjects as the Federal Government? Don't their lines of operation overlap? A look around us—in the fight against crime, for instance—confirms that the National Government could use help in its work.

Accounting for a considerable bit of the opposition to the bill is the sweeping nature of the legislation. It is claimed by opponents of the measure that it leaves open the possibility of States virtually nullifying Federal statutes on a vast range of subjects.

Why not a more conservative approach to States rights? The only amendment to H. R. 3 so far sets the pattern. It declares that Federal laws on sedition and subversion do not supersede State laws in the matter. It was the Supreme Court's ruling overturning Pennsylvania's laws on this score that sparked the present action.

From that point the problem could be tackled in other particular instances. Step by step the principle of States rights could be strengthened, and its effect could be most far reaching.

Master of Oregon State Grange Favorable to Purposes of Columbia River Regional Power Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Grange is the largest farm organization in the State of Oregon, and its annual sessions are attended by delegates from all sections of my home State. The sessions of the annual Grange convention are devoted to discussion of a wide variety of political and social questions of concern to members, not only on the basis of an interest in agricultural matters, but also because of desires to discharge responsibilities on broader issues of public policy.

One of the highlights of the annual grange sessions, which I have attended personally many times as a member of the grange and as a participant in its program, is the annual address of the State master. The Oregon Grange has been long and ably served by Mr. Elmer McClure, of Clackamas County. He has a deep interest in efforts to gain social justice and to insure maximum development and use of natural resources. This year, in his annual address, Mr. McClure covered a number of subjects. After his presentation, the Oregon State Grange adopted several sections of Mr. McClure's address as the official position of the organization on these important problems.

Because this action reflects public opinion among a large segment of Oregon's population, I ask consent to include a portion of Mr. McClure's address in the Appendix of the RECORD, so the Congress may be apprised of the viewpoint of the majority of Oregon Grange members. I particularly desire to stress and emphasize the endorsement by Mr. Elmer McClure of the general purposes and aims of a Columbia River Regional Power Corporation, such as we have advocated here in the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following sections of the master's address were adopted by the delegates to the annual session of the Oregon State Grange, assembled in Eugene, Oreg., June 9–13, 1958:

"REGIONAL CORPORATION

"I believe that the time is at hand when the Oregon State Grange should establish a specific policy concerning the Columbia River Regional Corporation program. The purpose of the Regional Corporation is to establish a single agency, a Federal corporation, to develop the water resources of the entire Columbia Basin. This corporation would have the authority to plan, to build, and to administer the development of the entire basin. It would be self-financing. It would absorb the Bonneville Power Administration.

"It is generally agreed that this is a financially feasible approach to the problem of regional development. We have as an example what has happened in financing the Bonneville grid system. A report from the Office of the Comptroller General shows that Pacific Northwest Federal power projects were $78,806,820 ahead of schedule in repayments to the Federal Treasury at the end of the 1957 fiscal year. The Federal loan payout schedule until that time had called for $148,017,884 in payments on principal, but the projects had earned sufficient additional revenue to repay $226,824,704, thus exceeding requirements by more than 50 percent. In addition, the dams have returned $161,718,044 in interest payments. They have also paid $123,933,335 for all operation and maintenance expenses of the projects.

"It is a matter of record that expansion of the Bonneville grid system has come to a halt. No new major projects have been authorized for Federal construction since 1953. The effect of this is that, where we had an expanding economy in the Pacific Northwest States during the 12-year period ending in 1952, we now have had no new major industries in Oregon for the last 5 years. That the steady expansion of the preceding 12 years was based on the abundance of low-cost power from the Bonneville Power Administration is aptly summed up in a report from the Stanford Research Institute made in 1951. This report stated 'Any detailed examination of the region's manufacturing growth during the past 12 years must conclude that a large part of it has been due to the region's ample supply of low-cost power, either directly or indirectly.'"

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I made at the annual convention of the Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association on June 24, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE LEAF TOBACCO EXPORTERS ASSOCIATION, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., JUNE 24, 1958, SPEAKING WITH SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, CHIEFLY ON EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

I am very happy to be with you, and to speak at the annual convention of the Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association and the Tobacco Association of the United States. I want you to know how much I appreciate the cordial invitation extended to me by your organization.

One of my principal interests in the Congress has been to work with tobacco growers and organizations like yours, to promote the welfare of the tobacco industry—an industry vital to the people of my State as well as to Kentucky's sister States throughout the South, and to the Nation.

Many of your number are my fellow Kentuckians, and in my various stays in the Congress I have come to know and enjoy the friendship of Mr. Lanier, and many others among you.

Today, I intend to talk about tobacco and foreign trade. And in doing so, I know that I am talking to a group with export knowledge in this field.

You and your predecessors have been marketing United States tobacco in the far corners of the world since the first cargo of a few hundred pounds of leaf moved from Jamestown to England some 350 years ago.

You know the importance of the tobacco industry—both in its domestic and foreign trade aspects—to the people of the country. More than 800,000 rural families in the United States depend on tobacco as their principal source of cash farm income. Countless dealers, warehousemen, traders, factory operators, wholesalers, and retailers depend for their livelihood on the tobacco trade. Additional thousands of sheet metal workers, coopers, paper and foil factory workers make their living indirectly, but in part, from tobacco. And in this day of high budgets, we do not forget that Federal and State governments receive more than $2¼ billion annually in revenues from tobacco.

The level of foreign trade is of vital importance to all of those engaged in the tobacco industry. About 30 percent of a normal United States tobacco crop moves overseas each year, either in the form of leaf or tobacco products. Exports for the past 3 years—including leaf used in the manufacture of export tobacco products—averaged 600 million pounds of tobacco annually, worth over $400 million. This 3-year record of exports is an alltime high in value, and in volume was exceeded only by postwar restocking.

Nevertheless, even with these record exports, the United States is not sharing proportionately in the growth of world tobacco trade. Tobacco production abroad has increased remarkably since World War II, and our competitors have steadily enlarged their share of world trade. At no time in history has the United States export tobacco trade faced such intense competition in world markets as it does today.

A number of adverse factors have prevented our exports from reaching even higher levels. You gentlemen are well aware of that. But I would like to mention them briefly here.

I assume that one of the first to come to mind is that of competitive prices. It is not easy to appraise the ability of the United States tobacco growers to compete with respect to price in the international movement of tobacco. World market prices, such as those for cotton and wheat, based on uniformly recognized grades and quali-

ties, do not exist for tobacco. Our prices for the better grades of cigarette leaf are no higher, and generally lower, than competitive growths produced in such countries as Rhodesia-Nyasaland and Canada. On the other hand, lower quality grades produced abroad usually bring prices well below those for similar grades of United States leaf. So it is wrong to assume categorically, using average export prices from a given country as a criterion, that we are not competitive in world markets for cigarette leaf.

Of course, we are definitely not competitive in price, with respect to dark tobaccos. Yet our exports of these kinds of leaf, due to their suitability for manufacture abroad, have not declined drastically in recent years. But consumption of products made from these tobaccos, in foreign countries as well as in the United States, is definitely declining.

From the above discussion—it may be said that prices of United States tobacco, in general, appear to have had less adverse effect upon exports than other factors in world trade.

Basically, the dollar problem—the necessity to acquire and consume dollars for total trade—has been the justification used for the continuance of barriers to tobacco trade. Most foreign governments have been unable to earn sufficient dollar exchange to purchase from us all the tobacco and other commodities they desired. Our tobacco had to compete, not only with leaf grown abroad, but also with other United States commodities which these countries desire to buy—must buy—especially capital goods and other industrial products considered essential to economic development. Consequently, the major problems confronting us arise from actions taken by other countries.

Balance-of-payments difficulties have induced foreign governments to encourage self-sufficiency in tobacco, to resort to bilateral trading arrangements covering tobacco purchases from areas which are natural trading partners, and to use licensing and exchange controls which limit tobacco purchases here. But even with these barriers to our export trade, countries whose consumers insist on good-quality tobacco products, must continue to import substantial quantities of United States leaf tobacco to maintain satisfactory standards. For our export tobaccos—particularly those kinds used in cigarettes—flue cured, burley, Maryland, and others—are the hallmarks of quality the world over.

Within the Commonwealth market, producers in Rhodesia, India, and Canada are favored by guaranteed purchase arrangements and preferential tariffs. Even so, our tobacco accounts for about 50 percent of consumption in the United Kingdom—for there the superior quality of our tobacco overrides the price factor—and Commonwealth countries buy 40 percent of our tobacco sold abroad.

A second group of markets, outside the British Commonwealth, accounts for another 20 percent of United States exports. These markets also place greater emphasis on quality than on price and include such important customers as Sweden, Norway, Ireland, Thailand, and Mexico. We continue to hold the major portion of the import trade in these markets.

A third group of countries can be called price markets and for this group the price factor is of greater importance than the quality of imports. In countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Portugal, and Austria, manufacturers have low profit margins and may pay close attention to leaf costs. But even in these countries, manufacturers are meeting consumer resistance against inclusion in their products of larger quantities of substitute tobacco. For example, Portugal announced recently that it would step up its purchases of United States burley this year, because of consumer preference for cigarettes containing good Kentucky tobacco.

These facts strengthen my conviction that price supports at a level lower than the present 90 percent of parity would not solve our export problems. And I do say that the thousands of tobacco growers who produce tobacco as their principal source of cash income must have some assurance that the crop they grow will repay them adequately for the long and arduous toil devoted to it. Growers have worked together over the years to keep their program sound, and have joined in a cooperative effort to comply with the law of supply and demand.

During the postwar period of foreign dollar shortages and domestic surpluses, various United States Government programs have been undertaken to bolster exports of farm commodities. The most important one in operation at present is Public Law 480 which, as you know, provides for the movement of tobacco and other farm products into friendly foreign markets, with payment made in local currency. The program is designed to sell to these countries additional products over and above what we might sell them for dollars.

Since 1954, some 200 million pounds of tobacco, valued at $135 million, has been programed under the Public Law 480 program. The Senate recently voted extension and expansion of this program, as I am sure the House will do. It is a valuable program and one of the best instruments of foreign policy that we have.

Primarily, however, you gentlemen are interested, and you are to be commended for pushing aggressively, the regular commercial sales of tobacco. For more than 90 percent of United States export sales last year were for dollars.

Our basic export objective is still to sell tobacco, with payment in dollars. This means that in the long run, foreign customers must have the dollars to pay for tobacco they desire to purchase in the United States.

Our best hope for improvement in the tobacco export situation, therefore, lies in the general upswing in world economic activity. Increased tobacco consumption abroad, which necessarily benefits our export trade, can only come from a substantial easing of international trade barriers.

You have been in the forefront of those advocating the reciprocal trade agreements program as the best means of achieving this objective. I believe your industry is right in looking to this program to foster and develop export markets for its products.

The original trade agreements legislation has been extended 10 times by the Congress since its enactment in 1934.

In the early days of the program the United States negotiated on a country-by-country basis, and between 1934 and 1937 concluded bilateral agreements with 29 countries. They embodied the most-favored-nation principle, and were therefore bilateral only in the sense that they were negotiated between two countries, and not in the sense that they established exclusive or preferential advantages. In each of these agreements we reduced or agreed not to increase duties on selected imports, and our friends made similar commitments on United States exports products, including, in numerous cases, leaf tobacco, and tobacco products.

In 1947 we decided that better progress in lowering world trade barriers would be made by negotiating on a multilateral basis, and since then we have negotiated under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT. This multilateral approach has the effect of assuring to the United States many concessions resulting from the extension to us of agreements between other countries. Within this framework the United States has concluded agreements with 39 counties.

But the present authority to negotiate trade agreements will end on June 30 of this year. The President has urged Congress to again extend the authority—this time for a period of 5 years.

The basic purpose of the legislation is to enable the President to continue this program, to expand free world markets, and to expand markets for United States products. It is to strengthen our economy and the economies of our overseas friends. It is to strengthen our security by making more difficult the international economic penetration of the Soviet Union.

The President would be authorized to reduce duties in effect on July 1, 1958, by 25 percent in not more than 5 annual stages, with no decrease to exceed 10 percent in any one year. In order to deal with low duties, he would have the alternative authority to lower rates by 2 percentage points. High duties could be reduced to 50 percent ad valorem.

At the same time it provides safeguards to domestic producers. The peril-point and escape-clause safeguards would be strengthened. The peril-point investigation period would be lengthened from 4 to 6 months, permitting a more careful advance study of possible concessions. The escape-clause investigations would have to be completed in 6 months, instead of 9 months, as under present law. This change is designed to permit greater speed in bringing relief to injured or threatened industries.

There is a new provisions for review of escape-clause cases. When the President disapproves recommendations of the Tariff Commission in whole or in part, both Houses of Congress could within a 60-day period take action to approve the Tariff Commission's recommendations by a concurrent resolution, under privileged status, to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each House.

There are other important modifications, but I believe I have covered some of the principal points. On July 11, thanks to bipartisan support, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12591 by a strong vote of 317 to 98. The Senate Finance Committee is now holding public hearings, and shortly, the Senate must come to its decisive vote.

The importance—yes, the necessity, for a 5-year renewal of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements is intimately related to the recent creation of the European Economic Community—the so-called European Common Market. Here six European countries, with a combined population almost equal to ours, and a combined national product about one-third of our own, are in the process of forming a new economic grouping.

During the next 12 to 15 years, the European Economic Community will gradually eliminate all duties on its internal trade, and will gradually adopt a common tariff to the outside world, including the United States. With this economic unification should come faster economic growth, and, consequently, enlarged opportunities in the European market for our traders and investors. The extent to which we can benefit from these enlarged opportunities will, however, depend upon the tariff rates ultimately adopted by the European Economic Community, and our ability to negotiate with the European Community during the critical years when it is fixing its policies. If we cannot negotiate through the mechanism of a Trade Agreements Act, we may lose rather than gain markets.

It is true that in certain lines our exports have been encountering unfortunate but unavoidable obstacles. I know you have experience with exchange controls, quantitative import restrictions, licensing systems, and other nontariff trade barriers which developed in many countries after the war. Un-

der the terms of GATT the member countries imposing these restrictions are obligated to eliminate them as rapidly as their exchange position improves, and the United States is constantly pressing such countries to relax their restrictions on American export products.

Most people are not aware of the extent to which these quantitative restrictions have been eased in recent years, particularly in Western Europe. Today, for example, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany—three of our principal trading partners—impose virtually no restrictions on imports of dollar goods. In fact, practically all of the countries of Western Europe have taken some steps to remove quotas on dollar imports. This development undoubtedly has played a part in the extremely favorable development of our European trade in recent years—our exports to this area having increased from $2.9 billion in 1953 to $6 billion in 1957.

There can be no doubt that some of our domestic industries have been hurt by competitive goods originating abroad. Nor can anyone deny that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has, since 1934, made this competition easier for foreign products. What is really at issue, however, is whether or not this country gains more than it loses under reciprocal trade. Is there a positive balance of benefit accruing to the United States from the operation of the Trade Agreements Act?

The answer lies in two areas, domestic and foreign. On the domestic side there must be counted some American industries hurt by competition from abroad. I think it is only honest to say that low wage scales, combined with increasingly efficient production techniques, have put some American industries at a dangerous disadvantage.

Ranged on the other side, however, is a massive array of facts, figures, and opinion to the effect that although some industries are depressed, at least in part, because of foreign imports, the Nation's business as a whole is benefiting enormously from international trade.

Last year we imported $13 billion worth of goods. That is no small figure. But our exports in that same period totaled some $19.5.

To emphasize the importance of this trade to our economy, I would like to quote Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. Testifying last Friday before the Senate Finance Committee, Secretary Weeks pointed out:

"Our exports of goods and services currently represent about 6 percent of the Nation's output. The value of United States goods marketed abroad in 1957 exceeded the value of: all consumer purchases of automobiles, parts, and accessories; or all residential construction; or all consumer purchases of furniture and household equipment.

"Or, to take examples from the field of agriculture: all cash receipts of farmers from crop marketing; or all cash receipts of farmers from marketing of livestock and livestock products.

"We exported around 10 percent of our entire output of movable goods in 1957, including: 13 percent of our machine tools; 20 percent of our production of trucks; 29 percent of our construction and mining equipment.

"And in agriculture, on an average over the last 5 crop years: 25 percent of our cotton; 28 percent of our tobacco; and 32 percent of our wheat.

"Figures of these dimensions forcefully demonstrate the importance of world markets to every area of the United States, and every major segment of business and agriculture in our country."

It is easy to talk in terms of figures. They are cold, impersonal. This whole issue involves human beings as well. Testimony has been given in the current hearings that some 4.5 million men and women are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon international trade for their livelihood. They constitute 7 percent of our labor force. On the other hand, it is estimated that less than one-half million people would lose their jobs if all tariffs were abolished completely, a step no one suggests.

The trade agreements program has introduced a strong measure of stability into our international trade, and this we need to preserve.

Through the trade agreements program, moreover, we have a considerable degree of protection against the arbitrary and capricious setting up of trade barriers against our products. Any member country wishing to limit imports of American products must go through the formal processes set forth by the agreement. These same processes also serve in reverse to help us get foreign trade barriers removed.

And finally, I would like to say that the extension of the Trade Agreements Act is important to our national security, as well as to our economic well-being.

Our immediate crisis is one of physical security. It is different from any that we have known before, for Russia has developed rockets and missiles which can strike this country. Today, it can be said that we have adequate retaliatory power, and it would seem unreasonable that Russia would risk its own destruction by launching an attack upon the United States.

But for our own safety, we cannot assume that nuclear deterrence is absolute. There is always the danger of an act of desperation, an act of fear, or of a mistake. But until we secure disarmament, or settlements, our ability to maintain superiority, or at minimum, a balance of strength, is absolutely essential to our security.

Our national security is challenged also by the economic and political side of the new Soviet policies.

For some time now, Russia has been saying to other countries of the world that they, too, can develop economically, and quickly, by following the Soviet pattern, and by associating closely with the Soviet bloc. And, despite the needs of her own people, Russia has been offering, and delivering, substantial economic aid through trade agreements with other countries.

If we withdraw or withold assistance, and most important, if we close the channels of trade with friends throughout the world, so that they come to rely permanently on Soviet aid and trade, and their economies are tied into the Soviet bloc, then we will face eventual isolation in the world.

It is an isolation which would cut off vital materials, supplies that we buy throughout the world. It would dry up our world markets. Worst of all, it would make of the United States a military garrison, and we would see our standards of living steadily go down.

Recently, we have been shaken by the outbursts of anti-Americanism in South America, the Middle East, and even in Europe. I think it is likely that these outbursts and resentments against our country will continue. For millions of people throughout the world are in the act of revolution. As the richest and most industrialized country in the world, one that can give or withhold aid—restrict or open the avenues of trade—invest or not invest—insist on true disarmament and settlements, or adopt the illusory proposals of the Soviets—our policies will be a source of constant attention and criticism.

I am, like most of my fellow Americans, optimistic by nature. Yet I feel today, more than I believe I have ever felt, that our country and its institutions are in danger. During the past year and a half, the threats of war in Egypt and the Middle East—the cruel oppression of the Soviet Union in Hungary and Poland—war in Algeria, and now in Lebanon—the seeming return of Soviet Russia to Stalinism—all reflect the danger and instability of our time.

The question for us is whether we will make the continuing effort and sacrifice that our time requires.

And a further question is whether we will give the President the flexibility he needs, through the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, to meet the economic offensive of Soviet Russia. For in the next 10 years it is the economic competition between democratic countries, above all of the United States, with the Soviet Union that may determine the future of freedom.

The United States has for years been regarded as the leader in the move to lower trade barriers, eliminate trade discrimination and encourage the healthy flow of commerce between countries. I believe that our friends all over the world are watching developments in Washington, and will regard the outcome of current congressional deliberation on the trade agreements legislation as a guide to our future international economic policy.

Extension of the Trade Agreements Act will reflect the awareness of the American people and the Congress that economic growth—and the stability that can be enhanced by the development of wider world trade—is an important part of our effort toward world security and peace.

I believe that the Congress will extend the trade agreements legislation for another 5 years, with adequate authority for the President to conduct a trade program to the benefit of our economy and security, and that of our friends overseas and to the discomfiture of Mr. Khrushchev and his fellows.

Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in these very trying days for humanity when the specter of war casts deep shadows over the entire world, the great figure of Pope Pius XII emerges as a source of hope and an inspiration for continued efforts in the interests of peace. People of all faiths are with him in his prayers for peace, for in them he expresses the wishes and the yearning of all mankind.

A very timely and inspiring article on Pope Pius XII, Beloved Spiritual Leader appears in a special issue of Wisdom, a magazine published in California. I commend it highly to my colleagues:

POPE PIUS XII, BELOVED SPIRITUAL LEADER

(By Alden Hatch and Seamus Walshe)

From the moment a child notices anything at all his character begins to be formed. In this his mother plays an almost solo role as she leads her baby out of the confusion that surrounds it.

Virginia Pacelli was not only a devoted mother, but deeply religious. She truly believed that the only reason we are born into this world is to serve God. So little Eugenio Pacelli was conscious of God almost as soon as he was conscious of hunger; and certainly in that household prayer was more important than food. As soon as he could speak, his mother taught him to say his baby pray-

ers at her knee. And his father's example was equally devout.

By the time Eugenio was 5 years old and ready to start school, the Pacellis had moved to Number 19 Via della Vetrina, the Street of the Window. This was deep in the crowded area that surrounded the Palazzo Taverna.

The pious Pacellis would not dream of allowing their son to attend a kindergarten or grade school supported by the state. Anti-clericalism and new ideas on philosophy, they feared, had penetrated even to that level. So they found a school they were sure was run in the old familiar way. It was conducted by the Sisters of Divine Providence, and situated conveniently close to the Via della Vetrina. In this gentle atmosphere the sisters extended the peace and contentment of spirit that Eugenio found at home.

Little Pacelli was already showing a marked leaning toward a religious life. In Rome it is the usual thing to see small shrines in houses, on the street corners, even in offices, dedicated to the Madonna or some favorite saint. The Pacelli home was no exception, but Eugenio wanted his own special shrine. He made it himself, with an altar on which he put a fine white damask, pieces of lace, and silver vases that he joyfully wheedled out of his mother and adoring older sister. He kept the vases filled with flowers, and when he played at religious ceremonies, candles burned in silver candlesticks on his altar.

Apparently Genio's one secular passion, then and all his life, was music. He learned to play the violin at a very early age, while his younger sister, Elizabetta, was equally precocious on the piano. Apparently the only arguments the devoted brother and sister ever had concerned the interpretation of a favorite composition. On such points Eugenio had strong views.

When Eugenio was 10, he had learned all the Sisters of Divine Providence could teach him. Just about this time Giuseppe Marchi, who had a fine reputation as a teacher, started a private school in his house in the Piazza di Santa Lucia Ginnasi on the far side of the Chiesa Nuova. The school seemed made to order for Eugenio.

Indeed, the moment he came under the intelligent guidance of Professor Marchi, Pacelli's mind opened its doors. Marchi grounded him well in the classics, and he delighted in the works of the ancient Greeks and in the history of his own great city. But his special ability was in languages. He picked them up seemingly without effort and could soon converse fluently in French and German, and had some English. To these he added many others in the course of his life.

Eugenio first assisted at the sacrifice of the mass in his own church, the Chiesa Nuova, where he became an altar boy for his cousin, Don Vincenzo Cirilli. He had a perfect record of attendance, for he considered it a great honor and joy to be allowed to wear the cassock and surplice and to assist the priest.

When Eugenio was 15, his father decided that it was time for him to think of choosing a profession. Eugenio had no definite ideas on the subject, but Filippo Pacelli had very definite ones. He wanted his son to be a lawyer like himself.

So Eugenio was entered in the Liceo Quirini Visconti. In 1891, this liceo, or high school, had a fine reputation for scholarship; but it was a very different sort from the pious education to which young Pacelli was accustomed. It was state-controlled and staffed by professors whose ideas on politics and religion were extremely modern—which then meant 19th-century materialism.

It must have been like the shock of an icy plunge to young Pacelli after being sheltered in a sort of intellectual incubator. However, Eugenio neither fell for this specious thinking, nor did he reject it blindly. Rather he examined these new ideas and found them wanting. In his thinking he was helped by Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, Rerum Novarum, Of New Things, which was published the year he entered the lyceum.

The encyclical sharply drew the difference between theories which were based on class struggle, and the principle of Christianity, which led to democracy. Eugenio read it and understood. He could see how the basic concept of communism must lead to self-destruction.

The antagonistic atmosphere of the lyceum was a good thing for him. It honed the edge of his mind to brilliance and rid him of soft thinking. It also offered him the advantages of genuine scholarship that opened the way to the higher levels of learning and taught him how to pursue them. He was much too sensible to disregard materialistic philosophy just because he thought it wrong. Instead he studied it carefully in order to combat it. But unlike many of his fellow students, who thought themselves more tolerant, he also read the Rerum Novarum and the Confessions of St. Augustine.

However, it was all very exhausting. At the end of his second year at the lyceum, Pacelli was more gaunt than ever and though his spirit was as ardent as ever, every nerve and muscle and organ of his body cried for rest.

The Pacelli family still owned the little farm at Onano, and Eugenio's mother proposed that he go there to build himself up for another strenuous winter. Eugenio was delighted. On "the lovely earth," which his grandfather had left to come to Rome, he would renew himself. And there he would make the decision that he had refused to face until now.

Although he was studying to be a lawyer, he had not definitely decided on a career. Now that he was 18, he knew he could put it off no longer. Young Pacelli was very much attracted by the legal profession. On the other hand, Eugenio felt a strong compulsion toward the church. Spiritual and moral rewards were much more important to him than money or fame.

Pacelli did not actually reach a decision at Onano. When he came back to Rome, his family was delighted at how tanned and rested he looked. They did not press him as to his future plans.

The young man felt the necesity for contemplation before finally deciding. He applied to the Canons Regular in the Via Nomentana for permission to enter their house for a short time. He wanted to make a retreat; to retire from the world and live in complete silence for 4 days.

The room he occupied was as bare as a room could be—a cell in fact. Here he passed the greater part of his self-imposed imprisonment. The days were spent in religious exercises. He rose very early and attended mass in the chapel. Except for evening devotion, the rest of the time was passed in solitary prayer and meditation. After those 4 days he had no doubts as to what was right. He decided to become a priest.

Now that Pacelli's career was chosen, there were all sorts of technical details to be arranged. First a seminary must be selected and permission to enter it obtained. Eugenio's parish priest gave him a strong recommendation as a young man likely to persevere in his vocation and to be a worthy addition to the ranks of the church.

The next thing was to be accepted by the bishop of the diocese. A young man cannot just decide to be a priest, enter a college and be ordained. He has to be "adopted" by his bishop; that is, the bishop takes him as a candidate for work in that diocese. There is no such thing as a free-lance priest.

With his fine record and recommendations, the bishop was, of course, happy to accept Pacelli. The young man duly entered the Capranica as a clerical student.

The regimen at the college was very strict. Just outside of Pacelli's door was a big bronze bell, like a ship's bell. At 6 o'clock every morning its clangor blasted him out of bed and echoed through the corridors. At 6:30 there were communal prayers and meditation in the chapel, which was on the same floor as his room. It was very small and awkwardly arranged. The backless wooden benches ran at right angles to the altar, which was set out from the wall and lighted from the back by a large window, whose tinted panes of glass let in only weak light even in summer.

At 7 o'clock the students went to mass; and at 7:30 they had breakfast. As is usual in Europe, this was merely a hot cup of milk mildly flavored with coffee or chocolate.

For the next 4½ hours there were lectures to attend. These were held at other colleges in Rome, as there were no classes in the Capranica. At 12:30 the students got their first real meal for the day. The food was good enough, but it was both monotonous and rather meager.

After dinner was the time of relaxation, for in Italy the siesta prevails even in the cloister. Pacelli and his fellows could rest or study in their rooms if they liked, or they could leave the college precincts and walk through the town, but only in groups. Probably so their minds would not be distracted from their mission, they were not allowed to visit their homes without special permission. Though this was seldom refused, the students were not expected to ask unless there was a real need.

After this recess there was another 2 to 4 hours of lectures before supper. Then came a further period of recreation, which consisted of meeting in the common room and talking shop; that is, about their studies or theology.

Nine-thirty was bedtime, but the students were allowed to study by the light of oil lamps in their rooms. Before and after each meal, and again before retiring, they all met in the tiny chapel for prayers and devotions.

After about a year at the Capranica, the strain proved too great for Pacelli's frail body. He caught a dreadful cold, which evolved into a deep cought that wracked him day and night, shattering even the quiet of his hours of prayer and meditation. When at last he consulted his family doctor, Eugenio received a verdict that was even more disheartening then than it is now—he was threatened with tuberculosis. Nothing would save him but rest and fresh air. Even then one could not tell.

Feeling completely crushed, he went back to the farm at Onano. As it had before, the pure air and serenity of Onano worked its natural miracle. Eugenio's body filled out and became firm again; his skin tanned, and he no longer felt the horrid, skin-pricking rise of fever in the afternoons. His cough quieted to an occasional short bark. When he felt his vitality rising higher than it had for many years, he went back to Rome.

This time the doctor was much more encouraging. The disease was arrested, perhaps even conquered, though the victory was still not complete. Under no circumstances would he consent to his patient going back to the ascetic life of the Capranica. It was the bitterest of blows to Pacelli. How then could he ever hope to become a priest?

While he pondered unhappily at home, word of his situation was carried by friends to the Holy Father. Pope Leo XIII already knew something of his story and was aware of the young seminarian's deep piety and brilliant scholastic record. He determined that such a youth should not be lost to the church because of a technicality. For the only time in the whole long history of the Capranica, the Pope granted a student the extraordinary dispensation to resume his

studies for the priesthood as a day student, without being subject to the rigid discipline of community life.

After he left the Capranica, Pacelli went on to the famous Pontifical University of the Roman Seminary. Stronger now than ever before, with the flame of his spirit adequately supported by his rejuvenated body, he made so brilliant a record at the university that on the day of his graduation, Pope Leo sent for him to come to his apartment in the Vatican.

Through the splendid corridors, past the elaborately accoutered guards, Pacelli walked, all trembling with excitement and awe, his vellum diploma clutched in his hand. At the end of all that magnificence was the Pope's simple apartment, and a little old man in white extending his hand. Almost overcome with emotion, Eugenio knelt to kiss the Fisherman's Ring and receive the congratulations of Pope Leo XIII.

Eugenio Pacelli was ordained a priest on Easter Sunday, April 2, 1899, in the church of St. Mary Major. It is impossible to describe, or even imagine, the waves of exultation and humility that swept his soul during the long ritual by which he was accepted and consecrated to the service of God. When it was over, though he would not himself have thought it, he was as pure and dedicated as St. Augustine himself.

On the following day, in the Borghese Chapel of the same church, Father Eugenio first offered the sacrifice of the Mass.

After his ordination, Father Pacelli went back to Onano. Though he was impatient to begin his ministry, the mental and physical ordeal he had been through had taken a lot out of him. He had to rest or collapse again.

As soon as he felt strong enough to return to Rome, he threw himself into the life of the parish. His post was that of curate at the Chiesa Nuova, where he had first served Mass and first realized the greatness of the priestly vocation. He went about his duties with quiet zeal. Though he had already taken his doctorate of theology, no work was beneath his dignity, no teaching so simple that he would not give his best. In fact, his greatest joy was to gather the children of the parish around him and, talking on their level, explain the meaning of the catechism, teach them simple prayers and listen sympathetically to the confused woes of childhood. He also spent long hours in the little confessionals listening to the sins and sorrows of that overcrowded neighborhood. Frequently at night he would be aroused by a sick call and stumble sleepily through the dark alleys to bring comfort to the sufferer, often to someone who had known him as a boy, and who lay sick, perhaps dying and very frightened.

On Sundays, Don Eugenio sometimes preached at the Chiesa Nuova. Some who remember those days picture him mounting the pulpit with rapid, nervous steps, but speaking with the firm assurance of a Roman to the Romans he knew so well, expounding doctrine to his people, admonishing or exhorting them with an inspired certainty that clothed his youth with authority.

Eugenio loved his work, and when he thought of his future he imagined himself in charge of some similar parish, working thus and striving for his people with contentment.

But though his ambition was so simple, his mind was too fine an instrument to be neglected—no good Christian may hide his talent. In the little spare time he had, Eugenio went to the College of Apollinaris where he won his doctorate of canon and civil laws, summa cum laude. He had previously taken his doctor's degree in philosophy. Thus he ended the preferred simplicity of his life.

Now the church as an organization was as keenly aware of its need of fine instruments to serve its high purpose as any corporation. From Pope Leo XIII on down, its chief dignitaries had their eyes on young Pacelli. Particularly his friend and patron Vincenzo Cardinal Vannutelli brought him to the attention of the Vatican, without Pacelli's knowledge. The young priest had shown himself to be unusually intelligent, and, unlike many intellectuals, he was painstaking and conscientious in his work. He had a thorough knowledge of three important languages, French, English, and German; and was a doctor of theology, philosophy, and canon law. Finally, they took into account that he came from an aristocratic country family who had faithfully served the church for generations. The latter consideration was not snobbery, but simply the realistic estimate that such a background made the young priest even more valuable. It was no great surprise to anyone—not even to Pacelli—when Monsignor Gasparri paid him a visit.

The monsignor was secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, which is the Vatican foreign office. There is also a home office called the Congregation of Ordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, which, in 1901, was headed by Msgr. Giacomo della Chiesa. The overall head of both departments was Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, secretary of state.

After receiving his instructions from Cardinal Rampolla, Monsignor Gasparri paid his portentous visit to Pacelli. Though he was not surprised, the young priest was very doubtful when Gasparri offered him a position in the Vatican foreign office. "This is not what I became a priest to do," he said. "When I made my decision I had no thought of the church needing the sort of work you describe. My desire was and is to work among the people of my parish, this one or another. I have no other ambition."

The monsignor smiled into the earnest black eyes behind the young man's spectacles. "They also serve Him, who work in the administration of His church," he said. "'In my Father's house there are many mansions.' We feel that you will be more valuable because of your special qualifications in our department than at your present work. Also, you will have a little spare time for the parish. We do not want our officials to lose touch with the people. But we want you. Will you accept?"

"What else can I do, Father?" said Eugenio. "Yes, I will come and serve to the best of my ability, but I am disappointed. It is not by my wish."

From that moment Don Pacelli's life changed radically. No longer did his neighbors see the young priest walking every morning toward the Piazza Navona and his college. Instead he headed briskly in the opposite direction toward the Castle St. Angelo.

Pacelli's first position was that of a minor clerk, an epprendista it was called, which might be loosely translated as apprentice. His work was mainly to write unimportant letters—the Vatican was not yet equipped with typewriters—and to copy reports from nuncios all over the world. It could not have been better training; for Pacelli's retentive mind stored up a vast knowledge of the complex problems faced by the representatives of a truly global church. Soon he could smile at his naivete of a few months before. Here indeed was work to be done that was vital, not only to the church, but to all mankind.

Soon after he entered the Secretariate of State in 1901, Pope Leo appointed Pacelli as his envoy to carry his personal condolences to King Edward VII of England on the death of Queen Victoria.

It is surely a very unusual apprentice who learns his trade in such exalted circumtances. At the Court of St. James, Pacelli, who was 25, was most likely the youngest of all the diplomats who hurried to carry the sympathy of the nations of the world to the court of courts on the death of a sovereign who had become a symbol of the stability and grandeur of the British Empire and had given her name to an era in history. He moved at ease among the famous figures of the Victorian age, modest but dignified. Word came back to the Vatican of the fine impression he had made with his quick smile and friendly warmth.

Pope Leo XIII died in 1903. He was sincerely mourned by everyone, for his inspired leadership had done much to rejuvenate the church. Father Pacelli was especially sorrowful, for Pope Leo had been his protector and friend, the first truly great man he had known.

In the first year after the election of a new pope, Pius X, Don Pacelli served out his apprenticeship. In 1904, he was promoted to the rank of minutante, which is a sort of confidential secretary. In that position he attended high-level conferences, prepared secret reports and drafted important state papers. In short, he was taken completely into the confidence of his superiors.

In that same year Pacelli was appointed a papal chamberlain and made a monsignor. This title is not conferred by any special religious ceremony; but is granted by the Pope as a mark of distinction. The award is made known by a "letter patent," which advises the recipient that he is entitled "to all the privileges of place and rank that may accrue."

There are precious few privileges except that, if the new monsignor is in the personal service of the Holy Father, he may work even harder than before.

However, Monsignor Pacelli now doffed the plain cassock of a simple priest. His cassock was still black, but it was made of finer material with all the edges and cuffs piped with red and a long line of red buttons extending from chin to feet. A small shoulder cape was attached to the cassock, and the stock beneath its collar was changed from black to red. When in Rome he wore silver buckled shoes.

In 1905, Pacelli was further honored by being made a domestic prelate, a title of honor and distinction conferred by the Pope for services rendered to the Vatican.

Gasparri, now a cardinal, was still head of the Vatican foreign office and these two worked even more closely together. But all of Monsignor Pacelli's time was not occupied by high-level diplomacy. He continued his work at the Chiesa Nuova, where he still taught catechism, heard confessions and occasionally preached. He also continued studying, and became a part-time lecturer in canon law at his old alma mater, the Apollinare.

The decade from 1904 to 1914 was tranquil on the surface, though underneath the pressures of national ambition and the armament race between England and France and the German Empire were building up to the explosion of World War I. During these last years of serenity, Eugenio Pacelli played a great part in a tremendous task which Cardinal Gasparri had undertaken at the direction of Pius X. It was no less than the codification of the canon law, a labor beside which the projects of Hercules seem simple. For church law had been built up during a thousand years of edicts, papal bulls, instructions, decrees, regulations and precedents, each probably applicable to its era, but often contradictory and by now in such a state of confusion that many ecclesiastical authorities considered codification absolutely impossible.

Cardinal Gasparri had chosen the right man for his assistant. Monsignor Pacelli organized the work, and soon an army of priests all over the world were busily searching through their archives. Their findings were sent to Rome where they were sifted,

indexed, and ultimately codified by Gasparri and Pacelli. The work was finally finished and the first draft sent out to the bishops just after the death of Pius X in 1914. It gave Pacelli a legal knowledge equal to that of any man's who ascended the papal throne.

Even these labors did not keep Pacelli tied to a desk. Twice again he went to England, the first time as assistant and advisor to Cardinal Merry del Val at the International Eucharistic Congress of 1908. Pacelli's third visit to England was in 1911, as a member of the papal delegation to the coronation of George V.

In that same year the Catholic University of America in Washington, having heard of his vast labors in the jungle of church law, offered him the chair of Roman law. He wanted very much to go, for he had a far-sighted understanding of the growing power and importance of America, and realized, as many Americans of those days did not, that the United States would soon be a great factor in international affairs.

Pope Pius, himself, and Cardinal Merry del Val told him they could not spare him. Disappointedly he refused the offer. Soon afterward, in 1912, Monsignor Pacelli was made acting secretary of the Vatican foreign office.

The summer of 1914 was very hot, and apparently serene. But the tensions of the armament race were becoming acute. Advised by Merry del Val and Pacelli, Pope Pius X was anxiously awake to danger. Again and again he warned Europe of the peril of sudden fearful wars that might spring from the diplomatic chess game the great powers were playing, with battleships and armies as the capital pieces and the lives of their subjects as the pawns. Typically, no one heeded the saintly old man in the Vatican.

The pistol shot that killed the Archduke Francis-Ferdinand at Sarajevo was the flash that fired the European powder barrel. Helplessly the Pope, helplessly Merry del Val and Pacelli watched the drift toward war, slow at first, and then, as the days of July ran out, with terribly quickening pace. Now, the very men who had played with the fire, the statesmen of Austria, Russia, Germany, and France tried to halt the spreading flames. But the momentum of mobilizing armies and unbridled speech was too great. Kings and Emperors, the royal cousins of Europe, sent pathetically affectionate, desperate telegrams to each other begging for peace; but family ties were too frail to stem the onrush. On July 28, 1914, the declarations of war went out, and on the frontiers of Europe little flickering flashes of rifle fire from border guards grew as the reserves poured out, and the crash of cannon punctuated the rattle of machineguns in the spreading holocaust.

Three weeks later, on August 20, 1914, Pope Pius X died.

As men by the tens of thousands died in an ever-widening arc of fire from the Marne on the west to the Pripet Marshes on the east, Giacomo Cardinal della Chiesa, archbishop of Bologna, was very quickly elected Pope and named himself Benedict XV.

Benedict's first move showed his appreciation of the necessity for the most expert assistance. He appointed Cardinal Gasparri secretary of state, and Monsignor Pacelli moved up to Secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. Thus Benedict acquired a proven team to advise him on the delicate relations of the Holy See with the passion-blinded statesmen of the warring powers. Certainly the name of the department that Pacelli headed was now justified—never in history had the Vatican been involved in such extraordinary ecclesiastical affairs.

Benedict was much too astute a diplomat not to realize that his hands were bound by the prejudices of the leaders of the fighting nations. He knew that there was virtually nothing he could do to stop the holocaust, though that did not keep him from trying. But if he could not arrest the course of the war, there were many things he could do to alleviate its consequences. He placed most of the business of relief in the hands of Monsignor Pacelli.

Pacelli was especially fitted for the job. He knew personally many of the diplomats on both sides with whom he must deal in order to get permission for acts of mercy; he knew how to instruct his representatives as to the best way of approaching them. He also knew the needs of the people themselves, not just the overall pattern of hunger and sickness and destruction, which were universal, but the special local requirements of all those sharply individualistic nations.

The worst situation was that of the prisoners of war. Conscription had produced armies of millions of men, far larger than ever before in history. In the rapid German advance through Belgium and France, the prisoner bag was tremendous. The German General Staff had not foreseen this. They simply did not know what to do with hundreds of thousands of captives; so they just herded them into barbed wire stockades where they began to die like fish stranded on a beach.

On the eastern front the situation was even worse. The Russians had taken many thousands of German prisoners in their advance into East Prussia, and the notoriously inefficient Czarist Army was hopelessly baffled by the problem. In addition, they were, if anything, less humane than the Germans. So the plight of their prisoners was incredibly miserable.

Pacelli determined to use the entire hierarchy of the church to cope with these conditions. Orders went out from the Vatican to the bishops of all dioceses in which there were prisoner-of-war camps to see to it that priests who spoke the language of the captives were enabled to contact each of them personally and to establish communication between them and their families. Furthermore, the bishops were instructed that no distinctions were to be made between race, nationality, and religion. All were to be taken care of as well as was humanly possible.

As soon as the priests got to work, reports began to come back to Pacelli of the many wounded among the prisoners who were dying from lack of care and the despondency of their condition. He promptly opened negotiations with all the belligerents for the exchange of wounded prisoners and interned civilians. Since these unfortunates were a source of embarrassment and a drain on their captors, and no military good to their own countries, the various governments were willing to listen to reason. As a result of Pacelli's efforts nearly 65,000 people were returned to their homes.

In all this Pacelli worked closely with the International Red Cross and the Swiss Government. Neutral Switzerland opened her sanatoriums to wounded and tubercular soldiers of all nationalities.

For 3 years Monsignor Pacelli directed this great network of relief activities. He thought of it as a job to be done once in a lifetime. Had he realized that he was only learning how to handle even heavier responsibilities in a yet more terrible war, the load might have been more than he could bear.

By January 1917, after nearly 3 years of mass slaughter with no decisive results, everybody but the generals was sick of war, and there were signs that even the military were looking for a way out. Pope Benedict XV felt that now there might be a chance for direct action for peace to succeed.

In December 1916 President Wilson had queried the belligerents as to the terms on which they would consider making peace. With Gasparri and Pacelli, the Pope carefully studied their replies and came to the conclusion that there was sufficient common ground to offer a faint hope of peace. Working closely with Pacelli for several months, he drew up his own peace plan.

At this time the question arose as to how best to present it to the nations at war. The Pope did not want to launch it at all if there were no chance of its having at least a hearing. He needed to sound out the various governments ahead of time. This would have been simple enough if he had had diplomatic representatives in all their capitals; but he did not. The nearest thing to an official contact with Kaiser Wilhelm II's government was the Papal Nuncio to King Ludwig III of Bavaria. In February 1917 the Nuncio, Archbishop Guiseppe Aversa, died. The Pope decided to replace him with a man whom he hoped would be able to get to the Kaiser himself and lay the groundwork for peace. Pacelli was the obvious choice. His appointment was announced in April 1917. Pope Benedict decided to consecrate the new Nuncio Archbishop of Sardes. He arrived in Munich on May 25 and went directly to the Nuncio's official residence, a neoclassic palace on the Briennerstrasse opposite the Brown House, which later became the cradle of nazism.

The very next day, Pacelli, who was not the man to waste a moment in the pursuit of peace, secured an audience with King Ludwig III of Bavaria. He lost no time in making the object of his mission clear. In his opening address he told the tottery, white-bearded king of the Pope's desire to act as intermediary in peace negotiations and added, "The task of collaboration in this work of peace has been entrusted to my weak hands in a period that has no parallel in history."

He urged that, with Ludwig's support, it might be possible to achieve the peace so much desired by the Holy Father, a peace founded on the Christian principles of love and justice. King Ludwig agreed to use what influence he had with his imperial master to arrange that Pacelli be received by the German government.

As a result, the Nuncio was invited to Berlin to confer with the Imperial Chancellor, Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, on June 26, 1917. Pacelli firmly stated the conditions under which Pope Benedict hoped that peace might be made. The Chancellor was worried, almost distraught, for he realized how desperate Germany's situation was and knew his imperial master's uncompromising nature. He is said to have moaned aloud when Pacelli spoke of the possible restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France. But he was greatly impressed by the earnest, logical words of the Nuncio.

The fact that von Bethmann-Hollweg was too reasonable a man to suit the megalomaniacal mood of Kaiser Wilhelm's final period. Indeed, the Chancellor was on his way out. But he had just enough influence left to arrange an audience for Pacelli with the Emperor. It took place on June 29.

The German Emperor stood behind the desk, with his withered left arm resting on the hilt of his cavalry saber and the Iron Cross (first class) dangling from the collar of his field-gray tunic. He greeted the archbishop with the minimum of respect due to his office and forthwith began to talk in rapid, explosive French, interlarded with German words.

When the Nuncio finally got in a few words about the Pope's peace plan, the Emperor with a slight sneer suggested that he might have more success if he presented it to a Catholic power.

Despite his discouraging reception at the imperial court, Pacelli's hopes rose again when he went to Berlin to see the new Chancellor, George Michaelis, who on July 14

replaced von Bethmann-Hollweg. Michaelis declared that the German Government was ready to talk peace on the basis of the Pope's proposals.

Days of anxiety, exhaustion and frustration followed for the archbishop. Interview piled on wearisome interview. Diplomatic promises were offered and quickly withdrawn. Pacelli passed through the gamut of emotions from high hopes to blank despair. In the end there was only despair.

By October, Pacelli came to the bitter conclusion that Michaelis had been simply playing cat-and-mouse with him. With no hope left of immediate action, Pacelli returned to Rome to report his failure to the Holy Father.

After a very short stay in Rome, Archbishop Pacelli went back to his post in Munich. Even though there was nothing to be done for peace, there was a tremendous job to do in alleviating misery. He virtually spent the next year on the road traveling around Germany, which was sinking further each week into the gray misery of war and the stupor of imminent defeat.

There was hardly a prisoner-of-war camp or hospital that he did not visit, bringing not only material gifts of foods and medicine from the Holy See, but, since he could talk with all but the Russians in their own language, bringing also comfort and hope.

During the final months of war the allied blockade had reduced the German people to a point just above mass starvation, and many unfortunates fell below that level. Though Pacelli had small use for the militarists, the plight of the civil population moved him deeply.

To help them and the unhappy German poor, who, normally living at a subsistence level, were ground down by the pressures of defeat to actual starvation, he organized a great relief campaign. The work of mercy that Pacelli performed is still remembered in Germany today.

The end came for Germany in November 1918. The Kaiser and his bemedaled court fled to Holland in a special train, while the humble citizens, who now headed the hastily organized republic, undertook the thankless task of surrendering Germany to the victorious Allies. Though the guns fell silent on the western front, there was no peace in Germany.

The Communist revolution came to Munich on February 21, 1919, and after 6 weeks of sporadic street fighting the Communist mob seized the Bavarian government and declared it a separate Communist state. At this point all the diplomats in Munich packed their belongings into automobiles and trucks and scampered across the frontier to the comparative safety of Berlin. Only Nuncio Pacelli announced that he was staying at his post.

During the months since the armistice, Pacelli had increased his efforts toward relief. No sooner had the Communists seized the Bavarian government than they started a campaign of hate against the Papal Nuncio. Returning one day from a visit to a poor quarter of the city, Pacelli saw that the ground floor windows of the nunciature were shattered and its facade pock-marked by machine-gun bullets.

That very afternoon he heard a crash below stairs and raucous voices. Hurrying from his office, he saw that the hall was seething with an angry mob armed with everything from butcher knives to Luger automatics. Pacelli walked straight toward them. There was a sudden silence as they saw his tall, thin figure in black, with a violet sash around his waist and the gleaming cross on his breast.

"You must leave here," he said calmly. "This house does not belong to the Bavarian government but to the Holy See. It is inviolable under international law."

There was a muttering rumble from the crowd and one of the leaders shouted, "What do we care for the Holy See? We'll leave if you show us your secret store of money and food."

"I have neither money nor food," said Pacelli simply. "For, as you know, I have given all I had to the poor of the city."

"That's a lie!" shouted the Communist.

"No; it's true," other voices cried. "Let us go."

Seeing that he was losing control of his band, the leader glared venomously and hurled his heavy automatic at the archbishop. It struck him fair on the chest, denting the jeweled cross. Pacelli put his hand to his breast, but continued to stand looking into the angry faces with eyes full of sorrow and pity.

Even the leader seemed shocked by what he had done. In an embarrassed silence the whole crowd shuffled out of the door.

Pacelli never knew the name of the man who had attacked him, nor why he threw the pistol instead of firing it. Perhaps it was out of ammunition, or perhaps some remnant of grace held him back from murdering a man who wore the livery of Christ. The archbishop kept the badly bent cross and years later gave it to Francis Cardinal Spellman as a mark of his great affection.

The forces of the Republican German Government under the command of General von Epp regained control of Munich in May 1919. His police immediately began hunting down the Reds. One of the first things they did was to call at the Nunciature to get information from Pacelli. But the Nuncio had no desire for revenge and would take no part in betraying his enemies. In June 1919, the new Bavarian assembly met and elected a democratic government.

Archbishop Pacelli began at once the work of negotiating concordats with the German states. Pope Benedict would have liked to make a single agreement with all Germany, but this was impracticable under the Weimar Constitution, which made the German states semiautonomous in such matters. The first step then was an agreement with predominantly Catholic Bavaria. The work of negotiation was interrupted on January 22, 1922, by the death of Benedict XV. Pacelli's personal grief at the loss of a friend was reinforced by his anxiety as to whether his successor would pursue the same policies. This worry vanished when on February 6, 1922, Achille Ratti was elected Pope and took the name of Pius XI.

It took 4 years of hard work and delicate maneuvers to negotiate the much-desired concordat. The solemn agreement, which was finally signed on June 24, 1929, allowed the Catholic Church to function where church and state had been recently separated.

It was an amazing diplomatic achievement for Pacelli in the face of the rising tide of nazism in a country where the kulturkampf was becoming epitomized by atheism and, especially, by anti-Catholicism.

In November 1929, Archbishop Pacelli went to Switzerland for a highly necessary rest. In the healing quiet of a narrow snow-filled valley below the sheer white peaks, he could at last enjoy complete solitude for prayer and meditation of which he had for so long been deprived. There the telegram from the Holy Father found him, announcing that he was to be elected a cardinal at the next consistory and ordering him back to Rome.

Once the official reception was over, while he was waiting for the College of Cardinals to meet and elect him a member, custom enjoined that Pacelli must wait elsewhere for the message to be brought to him. He chose the Palace of the Propaganda, in the Piazza di Spagna, for the few days at his disposal. He could not be present at the meeting of the Sacred College, which was held on December 16, 1929, for the cardinals gathered together as it were in secret, but in the evening a letter was brought to him at the Propaganda Palace. Beginning with his then title of "Excellency," it informed him that His Holiness had been pleased to receive him into the College of Cardinals, and the letter ended with his new title of "Eminence." That was all; a simple letter conferred on him the honor of belonging to the elite group of princes of the church. He murmured his thanks but inwardly prayed that he might successfully carry out the extra duties of his new position.

Three days later, December 19, was the day fixed for conferring the outward sign of the cardinalate—the red hat. The ceremony was brief and not attended by any unnecessary pomp. The cardinals gathered in the Sistine Chapel, and Pacelli, flanked by two attendants, walked with hesitant steps to the foot of the altar and knelt before Pius XI. The folds of his silk mantle fell in a red circle around him and he held his head erect as Pope Pius XI received the hat from one of the servers and let it rest on his brow, pronouncing as he did so, "To the glory of Almighty God, receive this red hat, a sign of the cardinal's dignity. It signifies that you should be ready to shed your blood, if necessary, in the defense of the holy faith and for the preservation of peace among Christians. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Pacelli rose from his knees and took his place among the cardinals. When the ceremony was over, the doors of the chapel were closed and another consistory or meeting was immediately held. This was not to discuss matters of moment, but to confer on the new cardinal the right of being able to speak and pronounce judgments in the future meetings of the sacred college.

Again Pacelli knelt before Pius, and the Pope opened the mouth of the new cardinal and then closed it, signifying the right to speak. Pacelli then offered his right hand to the Pope and his holiness placed on the fourth finger a gold ring set with a large sapphire, the symbol of his office and of his authority.

As soon as a cardinal receives the red hat, he is appointed titular head of a church in Rome, whether he is Italian, British, American, or any other nationality. Cardinal Pacelli was appointed to the Church of Saints John and Paul, one of the oldest in the city.

The new cardinal was not given much time in which to resume his duties as a priest. Pope Pius XI had brought him back from Berlin for a definite purpose. On February 11, Pietro Cardinal Gasparri, who had been reappointed secretary of state by Pius XI, asked permission to retire. He was just over 80 years old, and now that the great works of his life, the Lateran Pact, and the codification of canon law were an accomplished fact, he thought that he should hand over his vast responsibilities to a younger man.

When Pius XI had first heard of his intentions, he realized that Pacelli was Gasparri's logical successor. The Pope knew Pacelli well, both as a friend and a diplomat. Both had faced the Communist terror that attacked central Europe after World War I, Achille Ratti in Poland, and Pacelli in Munich. They had worked together ever since with the same high purpose and like-minded methods. Pacelli's brilliant successes in his missions to Bavaria and Prussia, his wide knowledge of foreign affairs, and his record as a peacemaker, which some years later led Father Robert I. Gannon of Fordham University in New York to call him "the cardinal of peace," were controlling considerations. In the letter of appoint-

ment which Pacelli received on February 10, 1930, the Pope wrote, "We make this appointment because of your spirit of piety and prayer, and also because of the great talents which God has given you."

Pacelli knew that he would have to grapple with problems presented by scientific advances and political retrogressions. The most ominous shadow on the picture was the rising popularity of totalitarianism—Facist, Nazi, and Communist. He was prepared to combat all three.

Not all of Pacelli's days as secretary of state were toilsome and harassed. There were happy occasions, and moments of great triumph. Such was his trip to Argentina as papal legate to the Eucharistic Congress held in Buenos Aires in 1934, when the faithful of all the world gathered to honor Christ the King in the sacrament of the Eucharist. These congresses are held in a different world capital each time. It was many years since Pacelli had attended the one in London in a minor capacity.

Ever since his invitation to become a professor at the Catholic University in Washington, Eugenio Pacelli had wanted to go to America. In this he was like most Europeans whose dearest wish was to go to that—in Europe—fabled land. In 1936 Pacelli's chance came. He recognized that the aggressions of totalitarians, of the right and left alike, were part of a worldwide attack on the Catholic Church. And he proposed not to choose between either of these monsters but to rely on strengthening the solidarity of Catholics throughout the world. In line with this policy and to make contacts in the United States, which had no diplomatic ties with the Vatican, he asked the Holy Father's permission to make the trip. The aging Pope replied, "Va figiolo, staccati un instante da me. Viaggia!"—"Go, little son, leave me for a short time. Travel!" This was the first time in history that a papal secretary of state had visited the United States.

Pacelli had been well briefed on the ways of American journalists, and on the way over he had typed out a "handout" himself, which he now distributed to the reporters. In it he emphasized that his visit was purely personal—to see for himself the country where people know how to unite so nobly a sense of discipline with a well-ordered liberty.

The crowding, pushing reporters, the colloquial questioning, and the lightning storm of flashbulbs did not bother him at all. Smiling happily, he walked down the gangway determined to see America like an American.

So he did all of the things a tourist is supposed to do. He shot up to the top of the Empire State Building, and properly admired the skyline of New York. In Philadelphia, he saw the Liberty Bell, and in Washington drove out to Mount Vernon. He thought that ride behind the screaming motorcycles of his escorts was great fun, for he always loved speed.

In Washington he gave an address at the Catholic University, where he spoke a little wistfully of its offer of a professorship saying, "Only the fatherly prohibition of Pius X kept me from accepting such an agreeable invitation, and so it does not seem to be entirely strange that I am here."

During his stay in the Capital he made his only political speech—if you could call it that—to 500 newspapermen at a luncheon in his honor at the National Press Club. Speaking his slow, precise English, he told them of their responsibilities for molding public opinion toward peace, and added, "Glory belongs not only to those who triumph on the battlefield, but to those who safeguard tranquillity and peace."

Then the cardinal chartered an airplane and roared away on a whirlwind tour of the United States: Cleveland, Chicago, Notre Dame—where he received an honorary degree—St. Paul, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Hollywood—where he enjoyed a visit to a movie studio—Boulder Dam, Kansas City, and back to Chicago. Though he visited many Catholic institutions, he did not confine his interests to them, but endeavored to make contact with every aspect of American life.

As he boarded the ship for his return voyage, Pacelli said with real sincerity, "I am leaving America with sorrow, and yet with gratitude in my heart to all with whom I have come in contact, and with the prayer that Almighty God may continue to bless this great Nation, that its citizens may be happy, and that the influence of the United States may continue to be exercised for the promotion of peace among peoples."

The Cardinal's arrival in Rome was an unhappy return to cold realities. Pope Pius XI was very ill. Pacelli had been appointed Camerlengo of the Church in 1935, which meant that if the Holy Father died he must make all executive decisions until a conclave met and a new Pope was elected. Thus, in addition to anxiety for his beloved Pope, was added mounting cares of state.

February 11, 1939, was the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Lateran Pact and coincided with the aging Pope's 60th year as a priest. A celebration was planned; and Pius and Pacelli began drafting an address which they hoped might yet stem mankind's downward drift. Sick as he was, the Pope refused to conserve his energy. Pacelli, worried by the amount of work the Pontiff was putting in on the speech, begged him to take more rest. To this Pius flashed the reply, "The church is better off with a dead Pope than with a Pope who cannot work."

The inevitable happened. On the evening of February 9, the Holy Father suffered another heart attack. Doctors were called, who pronounced it slight, and when Pius was made comfortable for the night, Pacelli allowed himself to be persuaded to go to bed.

But he could not sleep. At 5 o'clock in the morning of February 10, Pacelli was already dressed and working in his room when he heard confused murmurs outside his door, and a gentle knock. Not even pausing to ask a question, since he knew in his heart the answer, he went swiftly to the Pope's apartment.

He was only just in time to kneel beside the bed of the man who had offered his life for the peace of the world. With his hand clasped in that of his friend and adviser, Achille Ratti died.

Wearily Pacelli rose from his knees, and gently folded the dead Pope's arms across his breast. Then he stooped down and lightly kissed his friend's serene forehead.

Then Eugenio Pacelli rose again from his knees and walked slowly from the room.

In the long corridors of the Vatican Cardinal Pacelli's pace unconsciously quickened—there was so much that he must do. In his office he became, temporarily, an efficient executive issuing the orders that started the vastly complicated arrangements which must be made. First he signed the death certificate, then dispatched messages keyed to the urgency of the moment to 62 cardinals in 15 different nations, officially informing them of the death of their Pope and summoning them to Rome to participate in the election of his successor. The messages went by private courier, by telephone and cable, whichever was quicker. The princes of the church were allowed only 18 days to reach the eternal city; for in February 1939, the world was teetering on the edge of the abyss of war, and the church, which was the best hope of peace, must not be left for long without a ruler.

Then arrangements must be made for the burial of Pius XI, with all the mournful pomp that tradition and his high place demanded. Innumerable details had to be worked out and the elaborate ceremonies planned and timed so that no unseemly confusion should mar their solemnity.

It must have been with pity in his heart that Eugenio Pacelli watched the preparations, for he knew that the new Pope would face a worldwide turmoil and such difficult decisions as, perhaps, no man who wore the Fisherman's Ring had ever known before. Thinking of the awful responsibilities which he knew might well be laid on him, he watched the carpenters and workmen carrying heavy timbers and planks across the marble floors and building wooden partitions in the great galleries of St. Damascus. They divided them into 62 enclosures, each of which was in turn partitioned into three rooms, thus forming small apartments. In these the cardinals, each with two attendants called conclavists, would live until a Pope was chosen. In addition, a small hospital was set up. Kitchens were installed as well as accommodations for the governor of the conclave, the guards, doctors, apothecaries and servants in attendance. Everything was ready for the opening ceremony by March 1.

As he moved through the entrance of the Sistine Chapel, Eugenio Pacelli found that emotion heightened its ancient beauty for him. Sixty-two low thrones were ranged along the walls of the chapel within the sanctuary. Over each throne was stretched a canopy of purple velvet, heavily fringed; and before each was a small writing desk on which were a candle, matches, paper, pen and sealing wax.

The procession of cardinals, moving over the mosaic floor of the chapel with the faint swish of feet, approached the altar, marvelously inlaid with mother-of-pearl, the altar at which the Pope alone may officiate. Before it Eugenio Pacelli sank to his knees and slowly repeated the sacred oath that he would choose freely and deliberately, uninfluenced by political advantage or any worldly consideration.

One by one the other members of the College of Cardinals repeated the solemn oath. After that the cardinals' assistants, the governor of the conclave, the marshal, and all the attendants and servants swore to observe the rules governing the conclave.

Cardinal Pacelli had one more duty to perform before retiring. He personally inspected the hall of the conclavists and the reserved area, making sure that no intruder was present, and that it was sealed off from the world. As he walked through the spacious corridors he could hear bells ringing and the ushers crying, "Extra omnes." The conclave had opened; no unauthorized person remained. The next day, March 2, 1939, was Pacelli's 63d birthday.

When the cardinals were all seated on their shrouded thrones, the senior cardinal drew the names of the three scrutators—the tellers—from a velvet purse. Then, in silence so complete that the faint scratching of pens sounded clearly, the cardinals prepared to register their choice. Each had received a ballot on which was printed in Latin, "I choose as Sovereign Pontiff The Most Reverend Lord Cardinal ———."

When they had finished, the scrutators took the chalice and shuffled and counted the folded ballots. They announced that the number was correct—62 votes had been cast. Seated at the long baize-covered table, they unfolded the slips of paper and read aloud the name written in the center of each.

As the names rang out, Eugenio Pacelli heard his most frequently of all. Before the counting was done the scrutators had called "Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli" 35 times. He had received more than half the votes on the first ballot, but not the two-thirds necessary to elect.

The pens were scratching again; the cardinals moving softly toward the altar to slip

the sealed and folded papers into the chalice for another vote. This time it is known that Pacelli voted for Cardinal Dalla Costa of Florence.

Again the scrutators opened the ballots and read them, and this time they called Pacelli's name more than 40 times.

So Pacelli was elected on the second ballot, for the count was a bare two-thirds of 62. There was a rustle behind the draped thrones of the cardinals. The master of ceremonies moved to proceed with the formal announcement. But those who were there say that Pacelli, greatly agitated, stepped from behind his purple curtains, and humbly begged his colleagues to search their hearts and vote once again. They accorded him his wish.

In the tense silence of the chapel, the pens whispered as the voting began again. The slips of paper were piled on the green table, and this time, with a single exception, the scrutators had but one name to say. The vote was unanimous for Pacelli, save for his own ballot, which this time he cast for Granito, Cardinal di Belmonte, dean of the Sacred College. As the scrutators called his name for the last time, those present say the Pacelli's face was filled with anguish.

When the count of ballots had been verfied, the cardinal-deacon rang a bell and opened the chapel door. The secretary of the conclave accompanied by the master of ceremonies and the sacristan of the Vatican entered. With the senior cardinal, they approached Pacelli's throne. In firm tones the cardinal asked, "Accipisne electionem?"

For a tremendous moment no answer came. Then in an awed whisper the new Pope answered, "Accipio."

Now each cardinal swept back the baldachines; all the thrones were uncovered except Pacelli's which still bore the sign of sovereignty.

Again the senior cardinal spoke: "What name do you wish to bear?"

In a firmer voice came the answer, "Pius."

Then the Pope rose to his feet and walked with grave dignity to the sacristy. There he took off his cardinal's robe and was robed in the Papal cassock of pure white, a color he would never leave off, even in death. He returned to the chapel, and now the cardinals who had been his equals a few moments before knelt in turn before him and kissed his hand and his narrow foot as a sign of their submission to his authority. All the time his lips were moving, and the kneeling cardinals heard him repeating over and over the words, "Miserere mei"—"Have pity on me."

The Pope is officially Supreme Pontiff from the moment of his election, but his coronation has always been looked upon as the symbolic expression of his assumption of that high office. Eugenio Pacelli was elected on March 2, 1939. He named March 12 as the day of his coronation. In order that the spiritual impact of the ceremony should be as effective as possible, he decided that the coronation should be held in full view of the people of Rome.

This would be the first time since before the fall of Rome in 1870 that a Pope had been crowned in public, and the news raced like a flash fire through the city, filling every home with eagerness. The excitement was especially intense in his own quarter, the Monte Giordano, where everyone joyfully anticipated seeing one of their own people assume the triple crown.

Eugenio Pacelli, now 63 years old, was up very early the day of the ceremony. He spent a long hour in silent prayer and meditation, strengthening himself for the ordeal. At about 7:15 he started for the sacristy accompanied by the papal chamberlains and attendant monsignori. There they helped him to vest for the processional entry into the cathedral.

The robing took more than an hour, as the many ceremonial garments were 1 by 1 placed upon him. The Pope's tall, ascetic figure seemed to bow under the enormous weight of his vestments, and when he moved there were deep imprints of his narrow feet in the thick carpet on which he stood. But Pius' face was unmoved except for a moment when he raised his luminous black eyes to the cross above the cupboards and asked help from One who also bore a heavy burden.

The procession had already formed near the courtyard of St. Damaso, and the pontiff now took his place at its end. Down the broad marble steps of the Scala Regia, the royal stairs, it wound into the columned portico of St. Peter's. It halted before the holy door, which is opened but once every quarter century in the holy year. Pius slowly walked toward the door, and seated himself on a small throne that had been placed in front of it. The canons of St. Peter's, forming a double file, came forward and offered their homage to Pius XII.

The Pope accepted it and thanked them for their welcome to the church. Already the taunt skin of his face showed the emotional and physical strain under which he labored, but his voice was strong and clear.

Now the sedia gestatoria, the huge white and gilt sedan chair of ceremony, was brought forward. The Pope stepped into it, and was raised to the shoulders of the stalwart guards who followed the procession into the church.

By 6 o'clock that morning, St. Peter's had been filled by a congregation of more than 70,000 people. All the bells of Rome had been pealing thunderous joy since early morning. At 8:15 they all stopped at once, and the sudden silence seemed a physical thing. Then the soft vibrancy of music was felt rather than heard as the procession entered the basilica. At its head walked the habited superiors of the religious orders. They were followed by the papal valets in red-flowered damask. Then came the monsignori in their red cassocks, befurred with white, the glowing purple of the bishops, the vibrant scarlet of the cardinals. The vested prelates carried white silk cushions on which rested their miters. On one cushion, larger than the rest gleamed the triple crown. Last came the Pope himself carried high above all heads between the gently stirring plumes of white ostrich feather fans, a frail figure in the enshrouding folds of his vestments of white, gold-laced silk. His fine features were rigid, his eyes enraptured, seeming lost in the immensity of the Almighty.

But from the high, gently swaying sedia gestatoria, Eugenio Pacelli could see in the shadowy vastness of the church an infinity of faces all turned toward him, and occasionally his features relaxed and his eyes smiled as he raised his hand to impart the papal blessing to his right and to his left.

At the altar of St. Gregory the ceremonial chair was gently lowered to the floor and Pius stepped out. He assumed the vestments of the celebrant of the mass. But before Pius moved again toward the high altar, a server, holding a silver salver on which were three balls of flax, moved before him. The server set one of the flaxen balls on fire, and, as it flared fiercely and died, he said in loud tones, "Sic transit gloria mundi."

Three times he performed this rite, and each time Pius gravely acknowledged the reminder of the evanescence of earthly glory.

Around the Pope's shoulders now was placed the pallium, a long strip of white wool in which are woven black crosses, the symbol of jurisdiction. As the mass began with all the solemnity accumulated through 19 centuries, he took his place on the throne underneath the chair of St. Peter. The rite proceeded through its stately course. The Epistle and the Gospel were sung in Latin and Greek. At the consecration, Pius came forward and elevated the host to the four corners of the earth. A blare of silver trumpets rang out from high up in the dome, accompanied by a metallic clash as the guards presented arms.

After the last Gospel, His Holiness turned from the altar and facing the multitude, like a white flame in his jeweled chasuble, imparted his threefold blessing.

When the mass was over, the provost presented the holy father with a purse in which were 25 golden coins—the mass stipend. In accepting it Pius knew that he was acknowledging his office as a priest. He gravely thanked the provost, and passed the heavy purse to his trainbearer. The procession now re-formed and moved back up the aisle.

The crowd waiting in St. Peter's Square was so great no man could guess its numbers. The people had climbed on parapets and window ledges and perched precariously on top of the chimneys. Into that vast assemblage the congregation, 70,000 strong, issuing from St. Peter's, slowly forced its way. This took a long time, and it was after midday when the papal standard bearer appeared on the balcony facing the square and set the banner of the church beside the throne on the platform. He retired, and soon a cascade of miter-crested cardinals and bishops in scarlet and purple poured in and arranged themselves to the right and left of the standard. A little moment passed, and the Pope in gleaming white appeared at the entrance, hesitated for an instant in the face of the heaven-splitting crash of cheers, and then walked forward to seat himself on the throne.

The coronation itself was surprisingly brief. A cardinal-deacon stepped toward the throne and removed the miter from the Holy Father's head. As he backed away, the senior cardinal-deacon came forward holding the triple crown in his outstretched hands. There was a flurry of scarlet silk as he made his obeisance. Holding the tiara over the pontiff, he said in slow clear tones, "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that you are the father of princes and kings, the pastor of the universe, and the vicar on earth of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom belongs honor and glory, now and forever, world without end."

Then he slowly lowered the crown onto the dark head before him.

That was all, but as the weight of the great tiara pressed down on Pius' brow, the full import of the ancient formula exalted his mind. He was ruler, father, vicar, and he was no longer afraid.

Still crowned with the tiara, Pius raised himself, and descending the podium, walked to the balustrade. Slight though he was, the majesty of the church seemed to enlarge him as he stretched out his arms to all that throng and all the world. His voice rang clear and sonorous as he said, "May the blessing of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, descend upon you and remain with you forever."

Republican Hopes To Obtain Control of House of Representatives Following the November 1958 Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an edi-

torial entitled "No Law Against It," which was published a few days ago in the Mobile Register.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO LAW AGAINST IT

This week's news from Washington has included an AP dispatch reporting:

"Republican House Members heard a pep talk from their leaders Thursday with predictions that they can win control of the House from the Democrats this fall."

House Republican leaders knew, of course, that up to now Congress has passed no law against daydreaming.

Besides, it's an old political custom to make fantastic claims of victory before the votes are cast.

The only chance the Republicans have of winning control of either the House or the Senate in the November election is for the Democrats to fumble themselves out of control.

In the apparent present state of the people's thinking politically as between the Republicans and the Democrats, that would take quite a lot of fumbling.

Still, if daydreaming makes the Republicans feel any better in the improbability that the congressional driver's seat will be fumbled into their hands by the Democrats this fall, why discourage them, when already the world is long-faced enough?

Excerpts From Commencement Address by Prof. Charles McKinley, of Reed College, Oregon

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on June 15, 1958, Prof. Charles McKinley, of Reed College, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class of that famous liberal arts college in Portland, Oreg. The title of Professor McKinley's address was "Guidelines for Citizenship."

Charles McKinley is well qualified to speak on that subject to the coming generation of young American citizens. In his career he has successfully combined his work of teaching about government with direct participation in important public affairs in his city, State, and region. Professor McKinley is particularly known for his thorough knowledge and understanding of the role of the different levels of government, in our Federal system, with respect to the wisest development and use of the rich and diverse natural resources of the Far West.

In his commencement address to the Reed College seniors, Professor McKinley referred to this, as well as to other important issues of public policy, which his young audience must continue to face in the future. Unfortunately, it is not possible to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire text; but I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the eloquent excerpts from Prof. Charles McKinley's address on "Guidelines for Citizenship."

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDELINES FOR CITIZENSHIP

(Address by Charles McKinley, professor of political science, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.)

I want to talk to the seniors about citizenship—commonplace as may be the images which this word evokes. I do this because I question the adequacy of your preparation at Reed, or at any college, for that matter, for playing effectively the constructive civic roles with which you will be confronted. I take advantage of your final hour of captivity to "speak my piece" to you. * * *

Of all the western nations the need for enlightened and active citizen understanding and participation is greatest in the United States. It is most urgent here because of the preponderance of economic, military, and political power and influence which, whether we desire it or not, we exercise within the society of western states. Our behavior in international and military affairs and our answers to many domestic questions may carry either great benefit or great woe not only to ourselves but to the rest of mankind. We did not deliberately seek this tremendous responsibility. But it is now ours, and we must do the best we can to meet it. Who turns away in fear or indifference or in blind unwillingness to face these facts and to shoulder as best he can his personal civic responsibility weights the scales against its constructive fulfillment. In a democratic polity one cannot resign, but he can become a political parasite. This he does if he seeks to escape through absorption in art, religion, professional or purely personal interest or whatever sort, and leaves his civic choices to others.

But on you and other college graduates there are special moral claims that your 4 years of advance preparation shall be used not merely for personal ends. You have had 4 years free of the burdens of the work-a-day world, and a large extra community investment in your training in order that you may better equip yourselves for the lives you wish to lead.

* * * * *

The significance of the egalitarian principle which has accompanied the slow growth of democratic systems is found in many aspects of domestic public affairs. It is one of the most essential ingredients of the concept of justice as that is felt not only in western society generally but in the fermenting emotions that deeply stir the so-called backward peoples. Two-thirds of the human race literally hungers for an equalization in the material means of existence. But just as important is their aspiration for the removal of social and political barriers to their acceptance and to many other opportunities. Whoever gives his allegiance to foreign policies that neglect these intangible ethical realities throws his weight against world adjustments by peaceful means. It will be difficult enough, with all the good will and intelligence that can be mustered to work our way through the lowering clouds of war. But the chances of success will be infinitely reduced if these simple ethical goals are not firmly embraced, intelligently implemented, and persistently adhered to.

Another worry of our times is the fact of what is called big government. That term is chiefly used to describe the regulatory and public service functions that have multiplied since the end of the 19th century.

What is often called the "public service state" developed in this country earliest and most rapidly at the municipal level, for there the concentration of large numbers of people in crowded space created urgent need of services essential to health, safety, and enjoyment for even the poorest citizen. Thus we have public schools, the municipalization of the water supplies, the provision of public sewers and other sanitary services, the paid fire departments, parks and playgrounds and many other special urban services.

The National Government's great expansion started with Woodrow Wilson's time but did not fully arrive until the great depression. We should remember, however, that our Nation began as a great landlord and that it ultimately possessed the richest landed estate of any modern nation. Today we take for granted public ownership and management of the national forests and parks. We of the West esteem them so highly for their services as the collecting reservoirs that feed our life-giving streams, for their universally enjoyed recreational values, and their supplies of timber products and forage which support our industries of factory and farm. In our own Pacific Northwest the mountain ranges from the sea to the Continental Divide are blanketed with these verdant and spectacular symbols of the public service state. Yet we are not alarmed. We know that these vast public enterprises can be and are managed not to enslave us but to release our energies and our spirits while preserving the material foundations for much of our regional private economy. We know also that public management of timber resources can be desirably harmonized, much of the time, with private timber ownership and operations—a conclusion well documented by over 30 years of successful collaboration between national, State, and private timber owners in fire prevention and suppression, and by the recent growing juncture of effort to stop the devastating timber insects and tree diseases.

These are but a few examples of the coexistence of public and private enterprise with its freedom from any vestige of enslavement or of the diminution of democratic processes.

* * * * *

The regulatory aspect of big government is likely to grow in importance and, it may be, in difficulty in the years ahead. Two recent essays by Adolph Berle, our foremost student of the business corporation, suggest this prospect. In his Arden-house lecture, 4 years ago, Berle called attention to what he called a new kind of federalism in the United States—an economic federalism in which a few great corporate groups were closely intermingled with the Government as its agents in defense development and production, or as its partners in national and international raw materials procurement and planning (as is the oil industry), or function as the operators of such essential services as transportation, or have become the determiners of nationwide prices through the price leadership system for commodities essential to the whole Nation. The powers and influence wielded by these private corporate groups, said Berle, are far greater than the power possessed by most of the 48 States. In a more recent essay Berle has continued his analysis by noting that not over 600 corporations today control two-thirds of the nonagricultural industrial wealth of the Nation and that less than a third of the 600 control most of this two-thirds. Whether Justice Brandeis was right or wrong in his belief that giantism is incompatible with economic efficiency, it is bigness that, despite all legal efforts to control, has won the day. This is a situation with which only big government has the resources and legal powers to grapple.

Despite all the difficulties involved—and they are many—it seems to me that the time is overdue to boldly recognize that we have an economic system of very mixed private and public enterprise and that this system,

with many changes of the mixture, will continue for the indefinite future. To expect otherwise in an epoch of cold global war which, along with a sudden great increase in population, presses with increased weight upon our natural resources, is to seriously misread history and to indulge in great naivete about the demands of politics in any democratic system. We should spend our civic intelligence and energies in insisting that the essential facts in each changing situation be clearly revealed and that whatever regulation or public ownership is proposed be carefully calculated in terms of probable social consequences.

Another continuing problem of citizenship which will remain acute so long as international tensions and military preparation remain at their present pitch is that of civil rights. I shall touch lightly on this, not because it is not of great importance but because I know that it has received much attention both in and out of the classroom during your stay at Reed. I would make three observations: first, that the panic fear over security which has motivated much of the recent interference with civil liberties stands revealed as self-defeating; second, that despite the decline of McCarthyism it is not dead and the difficulties of reconciling security with civil liberties will be with us so long as the menace of war survives; and third, that the special place at the head of the hierarchy of civil rights which the United States Supreme Court has often recently accorded to the first amendment, though not consistently applied nor always with the most careful discrimination, furnishes as good a guide for civic acceptance as we are likely to obtain.

* * * * *

We, like the French, have many such obstacles to community decision embedded in our political systems. In most of the States we have shackled the urban population, now well over 60 percent of our people, and rapidly mounting, by distortions of legislative representation frozen into State constitutions or by the unpunishable refusal of legislatures to obey their State constitutions. We make our governors take oaths that they will enforce the State laws and administer the State's services and then we withhold from them the power to direct the chief law-enforcing officials and the State administrative agencies through whom these tasks must be exercised. It is no wonder that the recent commission on intergovernmental relations pointed out that before the cry for States' rights can posses reality the States must reform their own power structures.

An illustration of our occasional bedeviling paralysis of national will is afforded by the current story of racial integration in the schools. The Congress and the President for years avoided this issue while the Supreme Court, case by case, slowly moved toward the inevitable requirements of justice. And when it took the last step, it got no help in implementing its conciliatory procedures from the Congress and, until Little Rock, small aid from the Executive department. This vacuum was filled by extremists in the South determined to use force and chicane to nullify the court's decision. Why did not Congress assist? It could not, because it was bound hand and foot by its own internal institutions of veto. A single Senator may talk until all breath is gone before the Senate can vote. The anachronistic cloture rule is now more difficult to alter than it was 10 years ago. It was made that way so that minorities of either Republican or Democratic Senators could block any action with which they disagreed. And in the House the Rules Committee stands at a sturdy wicket which ordinarily only it can open, ready to kill any legislation which its seniority-endowed committee members dislike. Men get congressional committee places not because they represent the community of America through a party duly returned to power, but because they have a local or special interest which is important to their reelection. They attain control of committee gates to legislation by political longevity. And the longest lived Congressmen, who chair its committees, come chiefly from the one-party districts and States.

* * * * *

We must recognize the need for continuous self-reeducation in public affairs. There is no handy aid for this like that available to the practicing physician to whom a tape-recording service can bring daily tested knowledge of new discoveries in medicine and the treatment of illness. It is unfortunately true that with a few distinguished exceptions our newspapers and other mediums of mass circulation do not afford the kind of help most needed. For example, the growth of the great newspaper chains and the consolidations of recent decades signalize the fact that the press today is big business, with the special attitudes associated with such organizations, ever pressing for bigger circulations upon which big advertising and big profits depend. Every presidential election of the past 25 years has been from 70 to 87 percent of the readers of the press served by papers that supported the same party candidate for the Presidency. An equally important fact is the changed character of the news portion of the variety-store mixture served up in the daily press. Max Lerner expresses the news readers' situation as follows:

"Each news event adds another stimulus, batting him this way and that. He finally becomes only a receptacle into which the floods pour and from which they flow out in energy—a receiving and transmitting agent but not a valuing agent. He sees small and large items given the same sensational importance in the daily disaster diet—murders and wars and massacres, sex cases and strikes, personal incidents and revolutions. The result is a debauchery of the meaning and relation of events."

For making social meaning out of this turbulent melange you will have to rely on the journals seriously devoted to public affairs—and they are not too numerous—but chiefly upon books that treat public affairs in depth. Fortunately, the stream of such books flows freely and, through the paperbacks, can often be tapped cheaply. To these sources you can turn. It is within your power to spare for their reading a fraction of your daily time from the pursuit of income or the quest for occasions to buy and be happy.

We can never finish our tests of citizenship or expect ever to be fully educated to pass them perfectly. But if we actively enlist our intelligence in this essential lifetime function which a democratic society demands of us, and if we guide it by the motive power of human sympathy and a keen sense of justice we shall build the only rational foundation for hope that the processes of self-government may yet win through to master the difficult unfolding public problems or seize successfully upon the great opportunities that their mastery would make possible.

Low Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 22, 1958:

LOW DOWN

It has been the habit to point to the Soviet Union's slave camps in Siberia, to its prisoner pits in Poland, and to the Nazis' incinerators and gas chambers for humans as samples of how far the world has sunk into barbarism.

The casualness with which King Feisal and Crown Prince Abdul Iliah were gunned down the other day is further proof (as if it was needed) that humanity and decency have little meaning to many politicians these days in the Middle East as well.

But for completely cold-eyed, perverted criminal intent in high places, we give you yesterday's UPI story of the current official radio campaign, conducted by radio stations of Egypt and its satellites, Syria and Iraq, calling for the assassination of King Hussein of Jordan.

Here we have governments which pretend to be civilized; which want to be called civilized; which want to be accepted as responsible instruments of their peoples, deliberately engaging in cowardly incitation to murder. Not picking up the gun to do the deed themselves but, instead, pimping for assassins.

Mind you, this incitation to crime does not come over some peanut-powered clandestine transmitter run by cranks; it comes over the powerful government radio stations which carry only the official words of the established governments in Cairo, Damascus and Baghdad.

And these governments—Nasser's, that is—blatantly, overtly, call for assassination.

It seems to us that this is proof positive that the Western World cannot now, nor for a long time to come, treat in the usual civilized way such governments, but that is beside the immediate point.

The immediate point is this: Are they or are they not meddling with the Government of Jordan by broadcasting international appeals for the assassination of Jordan's King?

We ask Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations:

Does this constitute interference?

Does this constitute infiltration?

Certainly Mr. Hammarskjold, who was raised in a society built on decency, honor, truth, and trust, can recognize it for what it is: official and deliberate behavior on the part of Nasser's government which is even below the standards of animals.

Address by Fred Blair Townsend Before Rally of Churches of Christ and Christian Churches in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a speech made to the rally of Churches of Christ and Christian Churches in Arizona, by a close friend of mine, Fred Blair Townsend, attorney at law of Phoenix, Ariz. Mr. Townsend, in his speech, displays a unique understanding of the Communist doctrine as enunciated by Marx and Engels and such latter-day Communists as Lenin and Stalin.

Mr. Townsend's speech created much interest in the State of Arizona and I think that the country at large could benefit from a perusal of Mr. Townsend's message.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS ON COMMUNISM SUBSTANTIALLY AS DELIVERED TO THE RALLY OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN ARIZONA BY FRED BLAIR TOWNSEND ON FEBRUARY 26, 1958

When my good, dear and oldtime friend Dr. Peyton H. Canary, Jr., president of the Southwestern Christian Seminary, called me up one day and * * * asked me if I would make an address to today's session of this distinguished body on the subject of communism, I accepted the invitation right now. I hold Peyton in such esteem and I admire him so much that I imagine that if he had asked me to board a spaceship for the moon I would have as readily consented. * * * However, when I awakened in the middle of the following night and realized that he had asked me to talk on communism, probably the most controversial subject in the world today, I became panic stricken. No 10 people together could cover this subject in a series of speeches of interminable length, so who was I to have such self-conceit that I would think I could cover the subject in a half hour's talk. As I later understood his subject, he asked me to delineate for you the harsh outlines and cruel essence of the Communist system which challenges the ingenuity and resources of free men everywhere.

* * * * *

Forty years ago the people of Russia had revolted against the despotism of the Czar and they chose a constituent assembly, the only freely elected parliament in their history. It was crushed by the Communists after just 1 day's session, January 18–19, 1918. The other day, to remind the world of this grim event "Radio Liberation," an organization of private citizens from free countries of the world, broadcast over powerful transmitters in Russian and 17 other Soviet languages some pointed messages. These were from leaders in the Congress of the United States, also from authors, playwrights, editors, etc. To briefly mention 1 or 2, we have these: Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, said: "The dissolution of the all-Russian Constituent Assembly was a crushing blow which ended the hopes of the Russian people for democratic Government but the dream of freedom is one that can never be completely crushed, and men of good will everywhere join in the hope that Russia will some day be free."

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, minority leader of the Senate said: "In the only free election the people of Russia have enjoyed, we remember that the Communist Party received an overwhelming defeat. All of the people of the free world look hopefully to the future, that the people of Russia will again have the opportunity to select freely their own government and official representatives." My friend, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, who visited me a short while back in Phoenix, said: "I join my fellow Americans in extending to the Russian people our fervent wish which we hold for all peoples of the earth that you may be permitted and that the peoples of all other nations be permitted to establish, as we have, a government of our own choosing."

The communism threat is much more than a question of the relative sizes and comparative orbits of the Russian and the American satellites, although that aspect should not be ignored. We have tried to laugh off Russian advances in science. Just the other day I heard of the two Russians who appeared at the Pearly Gates. Being avowed atheists, their appearance created quite a furor, and when they learned that there was a dispute about admitting them, one of them hastened to explain: "Oh, no, sir, we don't want to get in. We just want our ball back."

Our Government proposes to spend more than $45 billion in just a single year to defend ourselves against Soviet communism. For this economic reason alone it is tremendously important that every American citizen understand exactly what communism is, how it operates, how it controls and contaminates people. It is staggering to imagine a peril so great that in just 100 years it has come to control the lives of more human beings than are today influenced by the great doctrines of Christianity, although we have had the Christian religion for almost 20 centuries. In one-twentieth of that time, communism has come to influence as many people as the Christian and Jewish faiths combined, and it is gaining day by day.

What is communism? It is not the thing that Karl Marx and Engels wrote about 100 years ago. It is not an economic creed. It is not built on the concept that Communists should take from people according to their ability and give to people according to their need. There is nothing particularly inflammable about that, even if it is patent nonsense. There is nothing in such a creed, even though the Communists actually did practice it—which they don't—which would require appropriating $45 billion a year to defeat it or stop it.

* * * * *

The Lenins and the Stalins and the Malenkovs and the Khrushchevs may come and go, but the Communist program of world conquest remains exactly what it was from the very beginning. The goal was described in "The Program of the Communist International", adopted at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow in 1928. The objective is clearly spelled out: to bring about the world dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to usher in the Communist society—world communism—the paradise on earth for the human animal. At that time, remember, the Communists controlled one-sixth of the world—today they control one-third. So we see that there is a certain amount of basis for their brazen boast of world mastery in the not too far distant future.

In order to understand the magnitude of the threat that Soviet communism poses for our Christian society, it is important to understand what communism is. The word itself came into being in the middle of the 18th century, and as used by the secret revolutionary societies in Paris, referred to the use of property in common. It was at that time no more than a symbol of protest against social injustices. represented the old religious and utopian idea of a social system free from economic inequality. A synonymous term, socialism, was employed early in the 19th century to express the beliefs of the idealistic social reformers, such as Robert Owens, Francois Fourier, Claude Saint-Simon, and Eugene V. Debs.

What is there in the communistic doctrine that made it possible for its adherents to sweep into such great power in so short a time? The first apostle of communism was Karl Marx, exiled from his native Germany at the age of 31 because of his political activity against the German government. He found refuge in England, where he lived in poverty and largely on handouts from his wealthy friend Friedrich Engels. Engels, who had known Marx in Germany, had inherited a factory in England, and was thus one of the capitalists Marx claimed caused all the world's troubles. Marx and Engels wrote out their theories not only in the Communist Manifesto but also in a large and ponderous book entitled Das Kapital. When Marx died in 1883, Engels finished writing Das Kaiptal and published it. He died at the end of the 19th century.

Communism, or Marxism, as it began to be called, passed into more energetic and less idealistic hands. Lenin, the first Communist dictator, was a professional revolutionist driven by one unrelenting passion—to drive the czarist government out of Russia. As a young man, he read a Russian translation of the Communist Manifesto, and for him Marx's theories were the answer to all his problems. He plunged into the work of organizing a secret revolutionary party. In order to give the Communist doctrine the militance he felt it lacked, he published additional ideas of his own on the technique of revolution. Boiled down, the Lenin idea is something like this: In taking over the power of a government, the end justifies any means. It doesn't matter how power is obtained, nor how it is maintained after it is obtained. The important thing is to get and to keep the power.

As a theory, Marxism embodied three principal doctrines. These are (1) historic materialism, (2) surplus value, and (3) the class struggle. The materialistic concept of history claims that all political and social institutions are the inexorable result of the operation of economic forces, and that each of the historic social systems—slavery, feudalism, and capitalism—is based on a particular method of exploitation of the worker, dividing society into classes consisting of the exploited and the exploiters, the rulers and the ruled. The term dialectic materialism was borrowed by Marx from the German philosopher, Hegel, to explain how social processes evolve. According to this theory, every force in social life produces an opposite and resisting force. The collision of these two forces results in the creation of a new force which combines the features of the first two. In this way, Marx explained that capitalism produced the seeds of its own destruction—that is, it provoked a counterforce, or revolution, among the working class—and that from this struggle would arise, sooner or later, a new force which would be the communistic society.

The second doctrine embodied in Marxism is that of surplus value. The reasoning is something like this: The worker is the only creator of value or wealth; the wages he receives represent less than the total value that he creates; the value created by the worker in excess of his wages—that is, the surplus value—is appropriated by the capitalist who exploits the worker. Here, according to Marx, is the root of the inequities and evils of the capitalist society.

In his Communist Manifesto, Marx declared that "The history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class struggle." Class struggle, he asserted, is inevitable. The oppressed fights the oppressor, the exploited fights the exploiter. The class struggle produces either revolutionary changes in the social structure or the ruin of the contending classes. Marx's view was that the capitalistic society would suffer this fate, that it would end in the revolution of the proletariat, a worldwide revolution of violent nature. He further declared that force and violence constituted the only means of defeating the capitalist system. The working class would be obliged to assume power through revolution, destroying capitalism and organizing in its place a communistic society.

So much for the theory. Let us now take a look at what it has achieved in actual practice. Russian communism is something that not even Marx would recognize. The economic picture in Russia may be summed up by stating that the state—which Marx considered unnecessary—controls all industry, agriculture, trade, and banking. Minerals, metals, forests, fisheries, and all the other wealth of natural resources belong to the state. Practically all the farms have been collectivized, often against the wishes of the farmers and peasants who formerly owned them. The majority of all farm products belong to the government.

The factory worker works for the government and usually lives in a government-owned apartment, shared as a rule by two or more families. If the worker is a loyal party member he may get to be a boss and rent an apartment alone on wages which may be as high as 10 times those of the average worker. As far as most of the population is concerned, such foods as meat, butter, and eggs are great luxuries. A pound of meat costs about 10 percent of the average worker's weekly salary, and about 20 percent is needed for a pound of butter. Consequently most factory workers live almost entirely on bread, potatoes, and cabbage soup.

A court system as we know it does not exist. The Peoples Court is the nearest form to our system of trial by jury, and it is made up of a presiding judge and two citizens, who are empowered to decide questions of both law and fact. There are no private lawyers, and the accused must accept an attorney appointed by the collegium of state defense attorneys. When the government is the accuser, a lawyer usually does no more than try to find excuses for the purported crime and ask for leniency.

It may be, however, that the most important feature of the Communist system is its attitude toward religion. Communism views men as a general views his soldiers in the midst of a desperate battle. It regards men as dehumanized. Dynamic, militant atheism is the root of the Communist system, and that the spread of its atheistic ideas by force is one of its chief features can be proved by endless quotations from the writings and words of the Communists themselves. John Fischer, in an analogy of communism and religion, pointed out the Communist position with cogent eloquence so listen: "The Russian party member," he wrote, "is a dedicated zealot whose body and mind belong to the Kremlin. Lenin is god. Stalin is the son. Marx is the holy ghost. The 13 in the Politbureau are the apostles."

The antireligious attitude of modern communism cannot be ascribed to the corruption of the former Russian state church. Modern Communists, in their militantly antireligious attitude, simply follow the principles and teachings of Marx. He intended and planned communism to be what it is today—the greatest menace to religion, the most determined and the most deadly foe of Christianity. Communism and religion are absolutely incompatible, for communism, in theory as well as in practice, is atheistic.

Listen to these words written by the Commissar of Education of the Soviet Union just a few years ago: "We hate Christians. Even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love to one's neighbor, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is a hindrance to the development of the revolution. Down with love for one's neighbor. What we want is hatred. We must know how to hate, for only at this price can we conquer the universe. We have done with kings of the earth; let us now deal with kings of the skies. All religions are poison. They intoxicate and deaden the mind, the will, and the conscience. A fight to the death must be declared upon religion. Our task is to destroy all kinds of religion and all kinds of morality."

Just as there can be no compromise between Christianity and communism, there can be none between democracy and communism. Perhaps some of you recall the story that circulated in Europe. According to the story, a man went hunting. He tramped through the woods for a while and encountered a huge black bear. "What are you doing here in the woods?" asked the bear. "I am hunting a new fur coat," replied the man. "What are you doing?" "I'm looking for my breakfast," replied the bear. "What do you say we drop into my cave and have a talk, and perhaps we can reach some kind of a compromise." The hunter agreed, and they entered the cave together. A short time later the bear came out alone. They had reached a compromise. The bear had his breakfast, and the hunter had his new fur coat.

And we might ask the Marxists just when the state—the dictatorship of the proletariat—is going to wither away, as Marx and Engels said it would and must. Why has the state become omnivorous and omnipotent in Soviet Russia, while in our own decadent capitalistic United States the only thing that has withered away has been the classes. And where, may we ask, are the fierce class struggles that Marx described? Here, our poor, exploited American workers own homes or their own farms. Seventy million Americans have money in savings accounts; more than 115 million own life insurance. Twenty-seven thousand companies and many unions have private pension funds. Over 7 million men and women own stocks in American companies. Probably as many as two-thirds of all working Americans receive at the same time an income from labor and an income from capital. Can it be that the working class is its own exploiter? If this is capitalism, it is not the capitalism that the Communists talk about. It is not the kind of capitalistic society that Marx predicted. Indeed, it may be said to be the precise opposite of what he saw, for to him capitalism generated deeper cleavages among classes and inevitable conflicts among them.

So we see that communism, both as a theory and as a system, is nothing but a colossal fraud, based on a clever concocting of philosophical and economic lies. If it were not for the fact that the Soviet Union is today in such a commanding military position in the world, the whole Communist doctrine could be brushed aside as an absurdity which would collapse under the ponderousness of its own errors. But the lies and the errors of communism are defended by the greatest military force that history has known.

That is what makes communism such a powerful threat to Christianity and to the democratic freedom we enjoy in America. It is up to us to rededicate ourselves to a more faithful understanding of these influences which seek to undermine our spiritual concepts which have permitted this country to become so great, and which are so necessary in this hour of world anxiety. The communistic doctrine, and the force that upholds it, threaten to plunge civilization into moral and social darkness. For the house that it would build for the new humanity is not a palace but a prison, since it has no windows. Let us work for the coming of that "dayspring from on high" which may "give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." For the Christian, that light must always be Christ and not Karl Marx or Nicholas Lenin.

Here is Christianity's greatest challenge. Can we meet it? The answer: Not only we can, but we must and with the help of a gracious and kindly Heavenly Father we will.

The United States Meets the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the July 15, 1958, issue of Near East Report. I feel that this editorial is most timely and informative in view of recent world developments.

THE UNITED STATES MEETS THE CHALLENGE

The decision to intervene in Lebanon was inevitable. The administration had no honorable alternative but to fulfill its commitments. It was dictated by moral imperative and national security.

The military coup in Iraq is a staggering blow for the West. It precipitated Lebanon's appeal to Washington and our reply. The bloody attack on Iraq's leaders was jubilantly hailed by Pravda.

For the Kremlin, it is the successful conclusion of a process that began when President Nasser completed the Soviet arms deal.

The forcible overthrow of the Feisal-Nuri as-Said regime may lead to these results:

1. Nasser gains control of Europe's oil. With his seizure of the Suez in 1956 and the annexation of Syria in 1958, he won domination over the oil arteries—the pipelines and the canal. Now he has an oil-producing state and he may tighten his grip on the oil Europe—and NATO—needs so vitally. British economy suffers a critical blow.

2. The Baghdad Pact, which was originally conceived in Washington as a major western defense arrangement, loses its only Arab member. And modern arms, jets, and tanks sent by Washington and London now pass into Nasser's hands.

3. The Iraq-Jordan union, established to block Nasser's advance, ceases to exist. The balance has been upset. Jordan cannot stand alone and may be torn apart by its large pro-Nasser population.

4. Under pressure from Iraq and Jordan on one frontier and Nasser-controlled Yemen on the other, Saudi Arabia may veer away from the west, prejudicing United States oil interests and the Dhahran base.

5. With Iraq out of the alliance, both Turkey and Iran may be under greater pressure from the Kremlin, and oil-producing Iran may be weakened. (The Nasser radio has been inciting a Kurdish revolt.)

6. The Lebanese rebels have been braced. They have been whitewashed by Hammarskjold's observers and encouraged by the Baghdad coup. They will make it harder for Chamoun to arrange an orderly election to pick his successor. Their target: the Eisenhower doctrine.

7. If Lebanon and Jordan go the way of Iraq, Israel will be encircled—as she was when she moved into Sinai in 1956.

Like Lebanon, Iraq is a victim of subversion. Is the U. N. powerless to combat warfare which relies on propaganda, intrigue, and corruption? Yet the concept of collective security ceases to have meaning if Lebanon and Iraq are allowed to fall. Few Middle East countries would confide their future in the West. There would be a compulsion to accommodate themselves to the Cairo-Moscow axis.

Until July 14 there were still some in official Washington who believed that it might be possible to get along with Nasser, to accept his protestations as valid and constructive. But behind these facades of neutralism and nationalism the truth was told with bursting bombs in Beirut, the scream of the street mob in Baghdad, the harangue of Cairo radio blatantly calling for violence everywhere.

Nasser wants to dominate a vast totalitarian Arab empire, swaying Asia and Africa. He calls it neutralism, but it is in fact anti-westernism. Khrushchev told him in Moscow that the Russians wanted solidarity with the Arab people under Nasser leadership and promised "all the help you need from us."

Nasser will give his neighbors no rest and no peace unless they purge every official who wants to remain a friend of the West, unless

they dismantle every western defense interest and unless they sunder every western tie. This is the challenge that faces Washington.

Unless that challenge is met we shall witness the spread of an aggressive military fascism in Asia and Africa, serving the Kremlin, and undermining the capacity of the West to defend individual liberty and the free democratic society.

The Sending of American Troops to Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Anguished Choice," which was published on July 19 in the Florence Times, of Florence, Ala.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANGUISHED CHOICE

The President's decision to put American troops in Lebanon clearly was an anguished choice.

He concedes that serious consequences could flow from the move.

What Russia may do after the talk and the resolutions are disposed of is uncertain. That rabid Arab nationalists throughout the Middle East will be enraged is widely taken for granted.

The Marines who landed on the Lebanese coast are presumably under specific injunction not to seek combat but to serve insofar as they can as a strictly stabilizing and protective force. Obviously we hope to avoid another Korea.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge told the United Nations we did not regard our move as ideal and would withdraw our forces at the earliest possible moment.

That we made this plunge in spite of the risks reflects our realization of the immense peril following upon the sudden overturn of Iraq's pro-Western Government by forces allied with Egypt's Nasser.

Our intelligence evidently had warned us of pro-Nasser plots in Iraq, Jordan and one other Arab land.

When the Iraq coup came off, we feared it would spark a chain reaction that would engulf the whole Arab world, including Lebanon, already torn by 2 months of rebellion.

From this could come the almost total disintegration of America's and the West's position in the Middle East.

Secondly, we felt it vital to reassure such stanch United States friends as Turkey and Iran that our pledges of support have genuine meaning. To stand aloof in the face of the direct appeal from the friendly Lebanese government would be to suggest to other friends that dependence upon us is not only futile but dangerous.

Our U. N. resolution urging establishment of a police force, indeed, our whole supporting argument for the troop landings, makes it plain we believe the U. N. really is the proper agency to step into the crisis.

We were disappointed that the U. N. observers' report on Lebanon, in minimizing evidence of intervention by Nasser, did not sustain earlier hopes of a police force. We were not persuaded that the report was accurate.

In fact we believe the events in Lebanon represent a new kind of sneak aggression contrasting sharply with the gross assault upon South Korea. And we fear that if successful outside intervention masked as internal rebellion—or capitalizing upon it—may set an ominous pattern for the future.

For a time we consoled ourselves in the thoughts the U. N. observers by their presence had reduced Nasser's interference and possibly improved the outlook for a solution not entirely unacceptable to the West. But the Iraq revolt ruined that prospect.

Now we have acted, and a train of events has been set in motion whose outcome cannot be foreseen. This could herald the decisive showdown in the long middle eastern struggle.

Leo A. Hoegh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the United States Civil Defense Council publishes a monthly bulletin entitled "United States Civil Defense Council Bulletin." Hon. Elliott R. Jackson, of Atlanta, Ga., a constitutent of mine, is secretary to this council. In its July 1958 issue of this bulletin, there appeared an editorial entitled "Leo A. Hoegh." This editorial is a fitting welcome to Governor Hoegh who has been appointed recently as director of the agency soon to be known as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilitzation. This new agency in the Federal Civil Defense program will result from the merger of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of all defense-minded people at this time, particularly in view of the critical situation now developing in the Middle East.

Pursuant to unanimous consent, I insert this editorial herewith and commend it to the attention of the Members of the House:

LEO A. HOEGH

The United States Civil Defense Council is delighted with the appointment of Gov. Leo A. Hoegh as Director of the merged agency—Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization—and soon to be known as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. He understands and appreciates the problems of the city and county director and is willing to talk with you about them. This is something new in the higher echelons of Federal civil defense.

Leo Hoegh has already proved that he is a man who gets things done. In less than a year he has started a program aimed at providing a million radiological instruments within a 12 months period, promulgated a national shelter policy and has drawn up a national civil defense plan to be announced if and when Congress provides the prerequisites.

Sometimes referred to as a hawk with a butch haircut, he has lived up to the reputation in his hawk-like habit of heading straight for the target. Actually Hoegh's name (pronounced "Hoyg") means hawk in Danish. His adversaries will tell you the name fits. He likes a good scrap, whether it's a winning or losing cause. This trait has endeared him to his friends. He gives and receives loyalties with singular intensity.

Hoegh's energy is built-in. As a boy he shined shoes in the Danish community of Elkhorn, Iowa, where he was born—"a nickel for oxfords, a dime for high shoes with mud on them." When he went to Iowa U. to study law he couldn't swim but he quickly learned and became captain of the water polo team.

He and his attractive wife, Mary Louise, and their 2 daughters, Kristin, 14, and Janis, 9, live in a new colonial 4-bedroom house in Bethesda, Md.

This is the man whom President Eisenhower has appointed to head one of the most important departments of our Government. The department is in good hands and we know. We have talked with him man to man and we understand each other.

World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in these times of anxiety as to what is going to happen in the Middle East—viz is this but the beginning of a definite scheme to explode world war III, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a sound scholarly and factually historical article which appeared in the July 10, 1958 issue of the Ridgewood Times, written by Dr. Charles A. Tonsor, whom I have known for many years. As a matter of fact, he was assistant principal of Boys' High School in the days when I was a student. I believe it contains real food for thought.

The article follows:

THROUGH THE YEARS—WORLD WAR III
(By Dr. Charles A. Tonsor, retired principal, Grover Cleveland High School)

World war III has been going on for nearly a decade. Deluded as we have been that wars must be fought by special weapons forged for the purpose, we have failed to recognize that the use of weapons is but the last stage. Long before the resort to weapons in 1775, the battle of ideas had been going on. It was so in France. It was so in the Civil War, it was so in the Spanish American War, it was so in World Wars I and II. It is so in world war III.

Because I knew the situation in the Far East, I told a class at the American Institute of Banking, that the next world war would break out in two decades from 1919. That statement was made in 1921. And it did. At that time Pan-Asia and Pan-Islam were the ideas spreading across the field of history. Both contained serious threats for the nations of the West, and wars seem to take two decades to hatch out. We are approaching the second decade since the outbreak of World War II, which by the way, was proceeded by a considerable period of educational incubation summarized by Mein Kampf of Hitler, which the world gleefully ignored. Allow two decades from the end of World War II and the situation is still too hot for comfort.

The period of education for world war III has been going on for some time. The anti-American feeling all over the world has been the result; also the wavering of our allies. But one part of this education has been as gleefully ignored as was Hitler's Mein Kampf—Nasser's The Philosophy of the Revolution. I urge every reader who wants to know and understand to get a copy and read it. He will then see that it was no accident that copies of Mein Kampf in Arabic were found on Egyptian officers during the recent Suez action.

Some 4 years ago I told my last class in Vergil's Aeneid, that the next war would break out in the region about which they were reading—Troy. All great wars revolved about that crossing from Europe to Asia, Xerxes, and the Persians invaded Greece about 450 B. C. The Gauls overran Asia about 300 B. C. The Turks invaded Europe about 1470 B. C. World War I grew out of the "Drang noch osten" and this was not forgotten in World War II. Today, Russia has replaced Germany in the "pressure to the east."

World war III will start in the Middle East. Dictator Nasser, aping Hitler, has begun his campaign against the Jews. Russia is aiding and abetting him. Agents provocateurs have already begun their work in Lebanon. Soon Nasser will march in to "defend" Syria and Russia will say "hands off" to everyone else. Then war will be declared against Israel. That will bring in the United States, for if we don't go in, we shall show ourselves before the eyes of the world as unmitigated cowards. If we do go in, Russia has us more completely surrounded than we have her.

Here's the sequence: Nationalist China will be neutralized at once. Japan will be offered revenge—and will take it. Indonesia will be set against the Philippines; India against Pakistan. Russia will come into the Near East and India via Iran, Turkey, a land route, while we have to rely on water and air. Egypt will close the canal. Algeria, Tunisia, Libya will keep France occupied.

A dream? Watch the way events are going. They are being prepared for the war as an expert player prepares for the end of a chess game—far in advance of the actual checkmate, but every move planned to that end. Our moves are checked at every point. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, central Germany, Austria. Tito could control Greece, but he is not playing ball. Therefore, his country will be invaded—the buildup for this has already started.

I hope the dream does not come true. But I am too well aware of our inept foreign policy (and this from a Republican) and our spineless education that is ashamed to "indoctrinate" for democracy, to refuse to face the facts.

The Crisis in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the longer we ignore the crisis in education in this country the more difficult it will be later for us to solve this problem. There is no doubt that Federal leadership is required because this is a problem of national proportions, not a local matter.

The New York Times of July 11, 1958, published an interesting letter on the subject which points up the problem. It is written by three leaders of the Public Education Association of New York and reads as follows:

TO MEET EDUCATION CRISIS—FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TO AROUSE PUBLIC IS DEEMED ESSENTIAL

To the EDITOR of the NEW YORK TIMES:

We read with great interest the incisive letter of Hon. Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, in your issue of June 27 with reference to the recent Rockefeller Fund study committee on educational needs in the United States. We wholeheartedly concur with his conclusion that we can have only as good an education for our children as we are willing to pay for.

The New York Times also published the equally excellent report by United States Commissioner of Education L. G. Derthick, on the competence and quality of the Russian school system. This report, too, in the words of Mr. Silver, should be required reading for every citizen.

Both the Rockefeller and Derthick reports point up the necessity of awakening the American people to the role of the school in our society. It is essential to the accomplishment of this that the administration and the Congress stop sweeping our need for schools under the rug.

The thought that the Federal Government would spend up to $2 billion a year for the next 5 years for school construction would not be a shocking one to the American public, but would be one which they would accept as readily as the fact that we spend over $40 billion a year for our national defense.

MATCHING OF FUNDS

The Nation needs dramatic leadership in the field of education. New school buildings erected with a real assist from Federal funds should spur local school districts to do their part toward matching these funds to meet local needs. More than this, once the school buildings are built it would be an incentive to the States and local districts to fill these buildings with skilled teachers at necessarily increased salaries.

A climate of opinion from the activity of the Federal Government would be created so that education would be given proper consideration by so-called opinion molders. Communities then would more readily vote for local taxes to support education, thus reversing the present trend. Only through Federal leadership with its ability to affect the entire Nation will we be able to meet the present crisis in education.

It must be met now. This, too, is national defense.

WILLIAM B. NICHOLS,
President.
BETHUEL WEBSTER,
Chairman, the Board of Trustees.
FRANK E. KARELSEN,
Chairman, Executive Committee of Public Education Association.
NEW YORK, *July 7, 1958.*

Why Nasser Needs Iraq's Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing an analysis of "Why Nasser Needs Iraq's Oil":

WHY NASSER NEEDS IRAQ'S OIL

Economic need—as much as the thirst for political power—has heightened Nasser's determination to control Iraq oil. For a long time it has been obvious that the clash between Egypt and Iraq is a conflict between a poverty-stricken "have-not" nation and a weak "have." This situation has been sharpened within recent months as a result of the continuing decline of the UAR ecohomy.

AFTERMATH OF SUEZ

The Suez crisis of 1956 and its aftermath have caused Egypt to adopt commercial and financial policies which may undermine her international and domestic economic position. This impression is conveyed clearly, if cautiously, by the United Nations' most recent report on economic developments in the Middle East. Describing events over 1956–57, the period prior to formation of the United Arab Republic, the report documents a disruption of Egypt's foreign trade, a moderate but distinct inflation, and an increase of government spending and debt.

Egypt's sterling and dollar reserves were blocked by Britain and the United States in response to Nasser's nationalization of the Suez. As a result, Egypt could no longer draw upon her accumulated balances to pay for imports as she had since World War II. Cairo at once imposed harsh restrictions on imports, tried to expand exports, and sought credits from the U. S. S. R. and other countries. The import restrictions had little overall effect because Egypt's wheat stocks had fallen to a dangerous low during 1955 and imports of foodstuffs had to be maintained. The attempts to increase exports met with less success. Egypt's total exports fell slightly in 1956 despite a remarkable rise in the world price of cotton, her principal product. But Cairo was able to persuade certain of her trading partners to accept payment for their exports in Egyptian currency. The U. S. S. R. and her satellites were among the nations which came to Egypt's assistance in this fashion.

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST BLOC

During the first half of 1957, countries within the Soviet orbit and Yugoslavia supplied 26 percent of Egypt's total imports, as compared with 16 percent during the second half of 1956, 12 percent during the first half of 1956, and only 6 percent during 1955. The Soviet bloc also took up a substantial portion of Egypt's exports: 39 percent in the first half of 1957, as compared with 28 percent during 1956, and 17 percent during 1955.

The long-term agreements which generated this expansion of trade between the Communist countries and Egypt disrupted Egypt's traditional commercial and financial connections in Western Europe, thereby threatening to perpetuate Cairo's dependence upon the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Communist countries have apparently dumped a portion of the cotton obtained from Egypt in European markets to the detriment of Egypt's own cotton exports.

Cairo's attempts to balance her international accounts after the Suez crisis had other injurious consequences. The payments arrangements negotiated by the Nasser government to secure goods in exchange for Egyptian currency increased Cairo's indebtedness to other countries and caused a marked depreciation of the Egyptian pound on world markets. During 1956, Egypt's short-term debt to foreign countries increased by some $70 million.

The import controls employed to little effect in 1956 had considerable success in 1957. During the first half of that year, imports were about 10 percent below the level they had reached during the first half of 1956. But this improvement in Egypt's balance of payments position was secured at the cost of additional inflationary pressure. When imports are curtailed by quotas and

tariffs, expenditure is diverted to domestic goods, driving up prices at home. Between 1955 and 1956, wholesale prices in Egypt rose by some 10 percent. Over the first half of 1957, they rose another 8 percent.

This rise in prices reflected, in part, an increase in world cotton prices; the prices of consumer goods and food rose by less than wholesale prices. To some extent, however, it reflects the pressure of domestic demand generated by import controls and by Government spending. During 1956 Government expenditure rose 14 percent because both military and development spending were increased. The Government ran a large deficit which it financed in the most inflationary fashion possible. About two-thirds of the deficit was covered, by selling bonds to Egypt's central bank; much of the rest was covered by sales of bonds to the commercial banks. Both of these methods of finance add to the money supply and make for additional inflationary pressure.

NASSER GOVERNMENT GAMBLES

In 1957, Cairo managed to reduce the Government deficit. It did so, however, largely at the expense of economic development. Only E£28.3 million was budgeted for development in 1957, as compared with E£45.9 million in 1956. Other forms of Government spending, including military spending, were scheduled to rise in 1957. Here, as in its foreign economic policies, the Nasser government appears willing to gamble with Egypt's economic future. As private investment in Egypt has been declining steadily since 1950 and now Government spending on development projects reduced, Egypt's capacity to provide for her rapidly growing population is bound to diminish.

Because Cairo has reached agreement with the Suez Canal Co. concerning compensation for the canal, Egypt has again secured access to her sterling and dollar balances. She can, therefore, finance a temporary increase of imports. These foreign currency reserves, however, are small, compared to the balance of payments deficits which Egypt has run in recent years, and they must be rapidly depleted if import spending returns to pre-Suez levels.

The U. N. report concludes, however, that Egypt's immediate position is not as grim as is sometimes presumed. Dues from Suez, it believes, will more than replace the declining sterling and dollar balances as the means of financing excess purchases abroad. It remains to be seen, of course, whether these revenues and the proceeds of the loan from Moscow will be used to accelerate Egypt's development program or will be dissipated in armaments expenditures. The increase of Government spending planned for 1957 and the reduction of planned development spending to offset this increase and to balance the budget are not encouraging.

CONTRAST WITH IRAQ

Little wonder that Egypt has become increasingly eager to swallow up her rich rival. The plans and performance of Iraq's Development Board contrast strikingly with those of the Nasser regime. Since 1951, Iraq has allocated 70 percent of her oil royalties to economic development. For some years, actual expenditure under this development plan lagged far behind scheduled expenditure. Recently, however, spending has caught up with authorizations and revenue. During the fiscal year 1956–57, Iraq spent 50 million dinars, compared with 39 million in 1955–56 and 21 million in 1954–55. Revenue in 1956–57 totaled 51 million dinars, a reduction from 1955–56 of 10 million caused by the Suez crisis and the decrease of oil sales that accompanied the closing of the canal.

Roughly 40 percent of the development funds have been used for irrigation and agriculture, the country's most urgent need. There is indirect evidence, moreover, of an increase of private investment, probably attributable to the activities of the Iraq Petroleum Co. This trend in private capital formation is also discernible in Lebanon and in Israel, but not in Egypt and Syria. Private investment in Egypt declined by some 30 percent from 1955 to 1956. In Syria, it fell by 9 percent.

Iraq is also distinguished by her comfortable foreign exchange position. Over the years 1953 to 1957, Iraq's foreign currency holdings have risen by 579.7 million dinars. These holdings are surplus oil receipts deposited in London and New York. Naturally, the acceleration of Iraq's development program will reduce the rate at which reserves accumulate. The U. N. economists point out, however, that "oil consumption in western Europe, the main outlet for Iraqi oil, is increasing at a compounded rate of over 10 percent a year; and Iraqi oil production and royalties are likely to grow along with it, provided that larger pipelines and more loading facilities are made available."

Iraq could easily subsidize Jordan, her partner in the Arab Union, without diminishing by much the rate of increase of her own hard currency reserves. Jordan relies heavily upon such subsidies for balance of payments and fiscal solvency; in 1957, Jordan anticipated tax receipts equal to but one-third of her planned public expenditure. In this respect, the Arab Union is a more viable and beneficial alliance than the UAR, for neither Syria nor Egypt enjoys a satisfactory payments position. But its promising prospects now may be dismally dispersed by the bloody coup which may turn Baghdad into a satellite of Cairo.

Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for their work in behalf of small business and to aline myself solidly behind H. R. 13382. The problems of small business are becoming increasingly magnified as big business becomes more and more monopolistic. The measure before us today is not an all-inclusive one. It lacks a great deal of providing a cure-all. Nevertheless, it is helpful in meeting some of the problems which confront small business today.

House Report No. 2198 which accompanies H. R. 13382 provides a very good explanation of the provisions of the bill and I suggest its careful reading by the Members of the House.

H. R. 13382, among other things, provides for ordinary loss treatment where the original holder of small business stocks sells it at a loss, extends the 2-year net operating loss carryback to a 3-year carryback; thus, businesses will have a 3-year carryback and a 5-year carryforward for losses. Permits businesses to write off 20 percent of the cost of their depreciable, tangible personal property. Increases from $60,000 to $100,000 the minimum accumulated earnings credit representing amounts which a business can accumulate over a period of years without the possibility of the imposition of any accumulated earnings tax. Provides that where the estate of a decedent consists largely of an interest in a closely held business, the estate is to have up to 10 years for payment of the Federal estate tax.

In the great State of Florida, which I have the pleasure of representing, I have been profoundly disturbed by the number of small businesses, once a thriving part of the communities' economy, which have closed their doors because it has become impossible for them to operate at a profit. It is a serious thing indeed when more and more firms which are representative of small business are forced to the wall, and we see that taking place every day. As a result, the small family business, once the very foundation of community economic stability, is fast fading from the scene. Replacing these small firms everywhere are the huge corporations, the chainstores, the mammoth combines, which prosper at the expense of small business. I feel that we must take positive action in the Congress to provide some measure of relief to try to insure that small business will not be wiped out in our time.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that these provisions are necessary to provide a "shot in the arm" for small business. These provisions will help to eliminate the fears that have strangled so many small business ventures in the past.

Once again, I want to commend the distinguished members of the House Committee on Ways and Means for their efforts to correct the serious plight facing our small businesses. And, I also urge each of my colleagues to remember that America was founded on the great principle of opportunity for the individual; therefore, I sincerely urge that in the interest of maintaining our economic system of fair competition that they vote in favor of H. R. 13382.

America's Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, while much has been written on our national farm problem over the past few years, I honestly believe that the article recently written by my good friend, Ned Chase, is the sanest discussion of the fundamentals of the farm policy problem that has been written in the magazine field in a long while.

AMERICA'S FARM PROBLEM

(By Edward T. Chase)

The threat of social and economic dislocation from automation is a very modish topic among feature writers and social scientists, especially the prospect of the automatic factory. Curiously, however, the notion is seldom applied to our largest single industry, farming, which has the most workers, the largest capital investment, the largest gross

value for its output and for nearly a century, ever since the post-Civil War period, has been our biggest single economic headache. Yet dislocation from technological progress is the heart of the farm problem.

The farm problem is really a maze of problems, not the least of which is gross confusion about its nature, and the congressional farm bloc bears a notorious responsibility for this. Its overriding concern has always been short-range relief of symptoms and escape from the displeasure of constituents by means of whipping boys, such as middlemen, the corporate farm, and now Ezra Taft Benson.

Let there be no mistake about it, the problem is a grave one, despite the current evidence of a temporary upturn in farm income (an 8-percent rise in farm prices and income for the first third of 1958 compared with the same period in 1957, cause strictly by Midwest drought and Florida freeze). Statistics alone cannot illuminate what is a complex and poignant human situation, but a handful are quite pertinent. Nearly a third of all nonmilitary Federal expenditures goes to supporting agriculture, the largest single "civil" item. Besides the tax burden this represents, there is also the matter of high food costs, which the technological revolution in farming might have cut in half long ago had it been directed to operate on behalf of the consumer. Meantime, the income-cost plight of millions of farmers has been harsh and their families have suffered from chronic poverty. They have seen their net income drop 41 percent from 1948 to 1957, down from $17 billion to $10 billion, while all their costs have risen. The per capita decline was only 6 percent, from $958 to $902, because of the dwindling farm population, comparing dismally, nevertheless, with an overall United States per capita increase of 33 percent in the same period, from $1,279 to $1,708. And let it be remarked that today's farmer, unfortunately, lives on practically the same cash basis as the rest of us; even buys his eggs in the grocery store. What is especially galling about all this is that we have spent about $45 billion in the last quarter century directly or indirectly aimed at resolving the problem. And we have managed for the most part only to compound it.

This has been a sad and inexcusable failure, when one considers how much man knows about both the historic tribulations of agriculture and the processes of technological displacement. The enclosure movement in English agriculture, for instance, is an instructive analogue for us as we face a mass exodus from the farm (1,800,000 left in 1957, a record migration) and a trend toward urbanism that is now irreversible. This English precedent lacks the cruel complication of our surplus problem, however. This is the further predicament the American has imposed on himself through his science: excess production accomplished through the frenzied race for ever higher yields, creating undistributable commodity surpluses in a world where starvation is endemic. The surpluses, costing us about $1 million daily for storage, relentlessly depress the prices the farmer receives for his industry. This spurs him to create still larger surpluses, a treadmill-like exercise that must be stopped without at the same time destroying its victim, the farmer. This is the general setting of our farm problem.

The displaced English farmer and agricultural laborer suffered severely from enclosure. So did the farmer doomed to a subhuman existence by too small or poor holdings. Nothing much was done about it. On the other hand, however, man responded with belated horror to the uncontrolled barbarism perpetrated in the early phases of the industrial revolution. He fashioned great systems of legislation to ameliorate the machine's impact.

Certainly it is more than high time we quit deploring the maladjustments in American agriculture and applied similar wit and energy to easing the effects of this revolution. Consider the astonishing fact that the American farmer's man-hour output has actually risen more rapidly in the last 20 years than the rest of the economy, and this in a period of unmatched productive expansion. His production has doubled since 1940, he feeds 20 others besides himself, as against 3 others in the 19th century.

To adjust agricultural resources to this productive boom. Mr. Benson has made us fear his real aim is a cataclysmic reversal of farming from a controlled to a completely free status. His current plea for authority for a wider price-support range—between 60 and 90 percent of parity (it is now 75 and 90)—suggested this to many. But Mr. Benson himself has recognized that a sudden change is manifestly undesirable, as well as being a political impossibility. Sudden return to a free market would see the wholesale bankruptcy of much of American farming. Millions of farmers, a substantial percentage of whom undoubtedly lack proper land and other resources to justify their staying in farming, would be thrown upon the untender mercies of urban industry—this during a time of considerable unemployment.

The classic palliatives of recent times are rigid high price supports of certain major crops tied in with acreage allotments; Government storage; and escalator laws that automatically force guaranteed price levels upward as surpluses decline—thereby encouraging new surpluses of the same. What we have is a perpetuation into peacetime of the agricultural production incentives of World War II, an endlessly self-defeating system. It is a palpably absurd system from the viewpoint of economic logic or any other logic, as has been demonstrated clearly by responsible students of the problem. Not to mention the fact that the support system, while originally an incentive system, was later rationalized as a price stabilizing system, but has in fact been used strictly as an income subsidy for the farmer. Even more bewildering is the fact that while this subsidy results in a stimulus to the farmer, the Government at the same time, with the other hand, pays him to stop production by placing his land in a soil bank.

Yet this price-support system, in a bumbling, and increasingly ineffectual way, has transcended logic, so to speak. It has acted as a giant philanthropy financed by all of us to sustain a certain minimal vitality in farm income until we could come up with a real solution to the problem. While the farm bloc has been selfishly shortsighted, the high price-support advocates are to be sympathized with. They have the humanity to appreciate that a brutal readjustment brought about by throwing agriculture on the free market would have a devastating repercussion on something over half our farm families. Nevertheless, this fact has tended to paralyze us, has disarmed us from asking for real solutions from the major political parties, and thus in the long run has served neither the farmer nor society in general.

Our politicians and our farm specialists have not been short of answers. Yet until recently few if any of the answers have been good ones. Dismissing Secretary Benson, for example, just won't do. (The 8 percent farm income rise, plus the tacit acceptance of congressional leaders that votes could not be mustered to override President Eisenhower's recent veto of the bill to freeze price supports at 1957 levels have silenced the Benson-must-go talk.) Surplus disposal abroad helps, but it does not make an appreciably enough contribution to reducing price-deflation excesses, so great are they, and, regrettably enough, it has proved disruptive to friendly trade relations with our allies and friends. Meantime, support programs, acreage allotments and quotas have failed, especially so far as providing any foreseeable termination of the farm problem is concerned.

But one who closely observes the scene can detect a vitally important change occurring in farm thinking—among the experts in Congress, in the Government, among farm leaders, and among economists and farm journalists. It is in essence a realization that the only truly responsible approach to the farmer's problem today is to help him to adjust to the radically altered agricultural scene created by science, not to perpetuate his difficulties by demonstrably hopeless expedients and irrational disinclination to face up to the facts of a changing rural economy.

We see the National Farmers Union at their annual convention this spring, while properly holding to their ideal of the family farm's virtues, not only recognizing that vast changes are rapidly taking place in agriculture but also that industry must be established in rural areas to provide a better balanced economy for agricultural communities. At the same time we see the most important of all the farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, strongly supporting the presidential veto of the bill to freeze price supports as in the farmers' best interests. Here is powerful evidence the farmers themselves have gone ahead of the farm bloc in their thinking and at last have begun to see the perils of tight governmental controls and the rigid high price-support system.

Meanwhile, in the farm State agricultural colleges there is a new preoccupation with the farmer's adjustment problem in the light of perhaps deplorable but nonetheless unchangeable trends, toward greater farm production; specialization; ever larger but fewer farm units; harder pressed small, inefficient farmers; more part-time farmers; and the implacable evolution to urbanism. (This year, for the first time, Iowa—and Italy—have passed from predominantly rural-farm to urban-industrial States.) We see the establishment at Iowa State College of a new institution called the Center for Agricultural Adjustment, concerned with the farmer's sociological and cultural problems in this era of great dislocation in rural living patterns. Implicit in its establishment is a remarkable change of attitude in the farm country, away from emphasis on ever-greater production to the realization that the farm problem encompasses such once-heretical considerations as training excess farm labor for better economic opportunities in urban industry.

Several developments affecting national farm policy have occurred in recent months that both express and in part account for these fundamental changes in attitude.

In informed circles in Washington there is now the admission, grudgingly given in some quarters to be sure, that Congress can be expected slowly to accede to the realities of the technological revolution and provide new legislation calling for lower price-supports and other recommendations of the administration's farm program.

There is talk of the possibility that much of the administration's farm program may yet go through, though this appears unlikely to this observer. The other day Secretary Benson said that if the agriculture committees would allow Congress an opportunity to pass upon this program, "it would have a good chance. After the evidence the members picked up at home during the spring recess of a grassroots hostility to the old high support and tight controls approach, few would dispute this statement.

The fact is that the virulent power of the farm bloc is becoming a thing of the past as the diminution in farm constituents accelerates. And not only is the drop of farm population to 12 percent of our population (from nearly 30 percent 25 years ago) decisive, but today the farmer shares most of

the consumer interests of the rest of us. Add to this the divisive conflicts of interest within the old bloc, between South and West, and it becomes clear that it will not be able to perpetuate the short-range, rigid, high price-support remedies it has insisted upon in the past.

A remarkable experiment was carried out by the Government recently to determine a direct way in which to bring about constructive (i. e., preservation of the land, not destruction) retirement of farm lands on a purely voluntary basis, with the hope of making a real dent in the surplus acreage problem. In four trial States farmers were invited to submit bids indicating what price rent they would accept per acre in return for taking their entire farms out of production for 5- or 10-year periods. The number of farmers wishing to participate exceeded all expectations (over 50,000), though in fact none of the bids was accepted because the Agriculture Department eventually decided it could not furnish the funds to meet the average high-bid level asked by the farmers. But it was a valuable experiment for the information it produced, and now the Department is weighing new methods and a higher rental level to make the device more practical.

What this farm retirement scheme represents is the most effective way to carry out the objectives of the Soil Bank, in particular the conservation reserve program, which is a vital part of the administration's proposals and is now universally respected. This calls for payment to those who elect to withdraw their cropland from production and put it into a cover of trees or soil-conserving grass. It can be a boon to the terribly hard-pressed low-income farmer, hitherto immobilized by poverty, who is anxious for a chance at a more secure livelihood. At the same time it directly attacks the production problem.

One of the influences behind these plans and the shift in general attitude that has allowed them to come into being is the farm report of the Committee for Economic Development, the private research group of university and business leaders now embarked on a major exploration of America's monetary policies. The distinction of the Committee for Economic Development report and what differentiates it from the series of prior serious proposals we have had (the McNary-Haugen plan, the triple A's program, the Brannan plan, marketing quotas, allotments, supports, etc.) is that it is constructed so as to end the problem, not simply ameliorate symptoms. It is a program with many interlocking, phased steps, but the most important point it makes is that to ease farming into the new era means that a gradual transition must be begun to retire whole farms on a voluntary basis, the problem farms at first, paying the farmers via rentals or outright purchase for putting the land into cover crops. (To correct the resources imbalance, of course, larger farms too must eventually be retired.) A paramount phase of the program is adequate preparation of the farmer and laborer by means of training and by the provision of community employment opportunities to make sure that the lot of the farmer and the agricultural worker actually improves rather than deteriorates.

This will take, initially, funds nearly as large as we are presently spending on the farm problem, but they will taper off as the farm production crisis is brought nearer to control. Our people are going to have to learn that such dislocations as these—and especially those that will be posed in many communities by automation in the years ahead—have to be faced on broad, community-wide bases. This is the great lesson of the farm problem. The Committee for Economic Development's recommendations have powerfully influenced the administration's proposed 1958–59 plans and account for whatever distinction they have.

For those like myself who feel that the historic quality of American life is understandable only in terms of the catalytic effect of the frontier and the vision of family life we have realized for generations on our farms—for all of us, indeed—it is disturbing to see farm life moving so rapidly and so irrevocably into a new era. We must, nevertheless, have the resiliency and wit to cope with this in a way that least damages our national well-being.

In any case, we may take cheer. While it is true that the large corporation farm has become important in certain specialized farming operations, the family farm, thanks to the marvels of technology which allows one family to manage more acres, is at least holding its own in proportion to all those engaged in agriculture. Family labor accounted for 76.5 percent of farm employment a year ago, compared with 75.6 percent just before the last war. Many experts believe this proportion can hold, as we move from the present situation of 12 percent of our people in farming to what will probably be 5 or 10 percent by about 1975–80. That is something. Remember, too, that as the changes we have been discussing make it increasingly impossible for the small farmer with slim resources to lead the good life, the community must see to it that it comes to his rescue in a realistic way and does not turn its back with euphemisms about a kind of family farm that can no longer make its way.

We should realize also that it is silly and worse for us to deplore the fact that the farmer is getting a smaller share of the food dollar when it is we ourselves who are demanding more and more semiprepared foods. This is the explanation for the rise of the middleman, not some arcane conspiracy to do in the American farmer. Like it or not, a new era has come in American farming. It calls for a new era in policy and in public understanding.

Arizona: America at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Glendale Herald of July 11, entitled "Arizona: America at Its Best." In this editorial the scenic wonders of Arizona are outlined in a most interesting manner.

ARIZONA: AMERICA AT ITS BEST

Arizona is that geographic rarity—a State which, in the heart of winter, can honestly boast it is one of the Nation's sunniest playgrounds, then 6 months later claim with equal vigor and verity to be an ideal summer vacationland.

Few States have been so bountifully blessed by Mother Nature. Yet the story of Arizona's remarkable double-barreled appeal has never really got around. Most vacationers, particularly from the East and mid-West, think of it as a winter resort, period. When Arizona comes to mind they conjure up visions of one vast, cactus-studded desert, balmy and sun-splashed in winter time, but hotter than a cow-camp dutch oven from June to September.

This popular concept bears little resemblance to the facts. Actually, less than 35 percent of the Grand Canyon State's 114,000 square miles is true desert—the kind that makes warm winters and hot summers. The remainder is a tremendous montage of high, wind-swept plateaus, pine-crested mountains and lush green valleys.

There are a few exceptions, but generally speaking this contrasting panorama of scenic beauty spreads over all the east-central and northern half of the State. For the most part the whole northland, as it is known locally, offers the vacationer dry, pleasant days and crisp, invigorating nights. In some mountain areas the weather even tends to be downright nippy. Often during the summer months places like McNary, Alpine and even Flagstaff pop up on weather charts as the coolest spots in the Nation.

The fact that 80 percent of Arizona's population is concentrated in the desert region gives the northland a built-in vacation market. For example, in a matter of 2 or 3 hours over good highways, Phoenix and Tucson families can trade the 100-plus temperatures of the desert for some cool, pine-scented retreat beside a babbling mountain stream. This no doubt explains why the northland has continued to boom in spite of the rampant misconceptions by out-of-State vacationers.

To generalize, Arizona's most popular summer playground areas probably are Prescott, the Flagstaff-Oak Creek Canyon area, the Tonto Basin and the White Mountain area.

Prescott, the onetime territorial capital of Arizona, is a colorful Old West city located 100 miles north of Phoenix on the mile-high slopes of the Prieta Loma Mountains. Cool pine forests bracket it on three sides and green rolling hills spread out northward into the fertile Chino Valley. One of the town's big tourist attractions is the old mud and log territorial capital, which is now preserved as a museum. Its most famous midsummer attraction is the impressive Smoki Ceremonial, August 9, during which a unique organization known as the Smoki People recreate dances and rituals of the Western Indian tribes.

Fifty miles northwest of Prescott on U. S. Highway 89–A lies Sedona and the awe-inspiring Oak Creek Canyon. Next to the fabulous Grand Canyon itself, Oak Creek probably rates as Arizona's most scenic attraction. Flaming red buttes and cliffs wall an emerald ribbon of oak, sycamore and cottonwood trees for more than 12 miles along boulder-strewn Oak Creek. Sedona itself is a picturesque little village, made up mostly of artists, writers and summer colonists. Because of its spectacular beauty, Oak Creek has long been a favorite spot for Hollywood movie companies. Rustic lodges (rates from $50 to $70 per week), trailer courts and public camping areas are spotted every few miles along the shaded floor of the canyon.

Only a half-hour from the dizzying climb out of Oak Creek Canyon is Flagstaff, the cultural and commercial center of northern Arizona. A booming, bustling city of 15,000 Flagstaff is the seat of Arizona State College and the railroad for the colossal Glen Canyon Dam project. On top of that it is a favorite base of operations for tourists who want to make side trips to the myriad attractions of the northland.

Immediately surrounding the city is the world's largest ponderosa pine forest; on its outskirts is the fascinating Museum of Northern Arizona, and towering over it to the north are the snowcapped San Francisco Peaks, which rear skyward more than 12,000 feet. Thirty-two miles east along United States Highway No. 66 is the pleasant little tourist town of Williams, gateway to the Grand Canyon, and 52 miles further north is the spectacular canyon itself. Within an

hour's drive of Flagstaff are such diversified attractions as Wupatki National Monument, Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon and Meteor Crater. By driving a little longer eastward on United States Highway No. 66 you can take in such wonders as the Petrified Forest, the Painted Desert, and that vast stretch of desolate multicolored buttes and dunes known simply as the Indian country.

The Indian country is a fascinating land in itself. Actually it is the reservation home of America's largest Indian tribe, the Navahos, and their strange, custom-bound neighbors, the Hopi. The two reservations, empty and treeless, form an awesome tableau of primitive beauty stretching 22,000 square miles over the entire northeast corner of Arizona.

Within its boundaries are such breathtaking wilderness areas as Canyon de Chelly (pronounced de-shay) and Monument Valley. Prehistoric cliff dwellings dot the whole land, and in the Hopi Villages, off Reservation Route 3, travelers can see life and customs which have remained changeless over hundreds of years. Only one really adequate road—Route 3 from Window Rock to Tuba City—slices through the Navaho-Hopi country. The remaining roads vary from fair down to impassable, and local inquiry should be made before venturing too deep into this strange country.

One summer area of Arizona that has scarcely been touched by out-of-State vacationers is the cool, verdant Tonto Basin, 2 hours out of Phoenix over the new Beeline Highway. Tucked between the Salt River lakes and the towering Mogollon Rim, the Tonto Basin country has been long held back by the absence of an arterial highway. Aside from camp, picnic and summer cabin areas, the only real settlements are the rustic little cow town of Payson and the crossroad community of Young, focal point of the bloody Pleasant Valley cattle war during the 1880's.

However, it is the same beautiful and historically-fascinating country which inspired many of Zane Grey's popular Western novels.

Perhaps the fastest-growing summer playground in the whole State is the White Mountain section of eastern Arizona. This area is traversed by two principal highways—U. S. 60 east and west and U. S. 666 north and south.

The towering forestland ranges from 6,000 to 9,000 feet above sealevel, and is speckled with shimmering lakes and gurgling trout streams. Progressive, tourist-minded towns like Springerville, Show Low, McNary, Alpine and Pinetop offer just about anything vacationers need in the way of motels, lodges, and trailer facilities.

Even the million-and-a-half acre Fort Apache Indian Reservation is being developed as a summer vacation mecca. From their tribal headquarters in sleepy little Whiteriver, the once fierce White River Apaches have launched a multi-million-dollar tourist development program to supplement their ranching and lumber enterprises.

Already they have built a $250,000 motel and trailer park just west of McNary, and more than 650 campsites are either completed or near completion.

The whole White Mountain area is a trout fisherman's dream. Hundreds and hundreds of miles of trout-filled brooks and rivers swirl through the network of spectacular canyons and gorges. Nonresident anglers pay only $10 for a year-round trout license, or they can get a 5-day combination trout warm water permit for $5. In addition, if you fish in Apache waters, you'll need a special tribal permit costing 60 cents a day.

So whether it's fishing, camping or just plain relaxing in some breeze-swept motel, chances are you can find it in the sprawling northland of Arizona.

House Should Vote Down S. 3420 and Pass Simple Extension of Public Law 480

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau Federation was the original sponsor of the proposal to sell our surplus agricultural commodities abroad for foreign currencies, the program that became Public Law 480.

On the whole, the program has worked well. But this year the Committee on Agriculture, instead of bringing out a bill to extend a good program for another year, presented us yesterday with a bill that makes far-reaching changes in the program, including mandatory barter and broad new purposes for which the foreign currencies acquired may be used. These changes are so undesirable that the American Farm Bureau Federation has had to come out publicly in opposition to the mutilations of its own brainchild.

The Farm Bureau, like all the rest of us, wants a continuation of Public Law 480, substantially as is. Why tinker with it? Especially when the changes are opposed by those who have been closest to it from the beginning and by those who will have to administer it?

Tomorrow, the vote will come on this bill. Why not vote it down—and have the committee bring back here within 48 hours, as it easily can, a simple bill to extend Public Law 480 so that we can go ahead with what is fundamentally sound in the program and not get it all mixed up with new proposals whose ultimate results no one can foresee, but which at the very least will be confusion and uncertainty, and at the worst, bad both for the program itself and for our relations with other countries. No harm will be done by voting this bill down, and a lot of trouble avoided.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a letter received today from the American Farm Bureau Federation opposing the new barter provisions and the authorizations for entirely new and, in some instances, unwise uses of the foreign currencies such as putting the United States Government into practically unlimited operation of all types of educational institutions in foreign countries:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1958.

Hon. WALTER JUDD,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development Act, was passed by Congress and signed by the President in July 1954. It was designed as a 3-year program and $700 million was authorized for sales for foreign currency.

The three main objectives of the Public Law 480 program were: (1) to reduce surpluses by making possible sales of farm products in addition to the normal dollar sales; (2) to establish private trade channels for sales of farm products which could be continued with dollar sales after the termination of the program; and (3) to use part of the currency received from such sales to develop new markets or expand old markets for farm products. In our opinion these objectives are still sound.

In 1955 and 1956, authorization was increased from $700 million for foreign currency sales to $3 billion. In 1957, Congress extended the act for 1 year and authorized $1 billion for fiscal year 1958.

Public Law 480 has been successful in moving substantial quantities of agriculture products into export markets. However, when Public Law 480 was passed on July 10, 1954, CCC had title or held loans on $6 billion worth of agriculture surpluses. Today our surpluses amount to approximately $7.3 billion. We have not been successful in making substantial reductions in the amount of our surpluses, but we have been able to halt the rapid accumulation which would have taken place had it not been for this effective export program. These facts, together with the prospects of large production this year—especially of wheat—make it necessary to again extend this program. It is unfortunate that we have delayed the extension in the manner that we have. The Senate passed a bill extending the act last March. It is now July and the program expired on June 30. This delay has caused a serious breakdown in negotiations of title I, foreign currency sales. As of March 30, 1958, approximately $840 million of the $1 billion Public Law 480 authorization was obligated. Since March 30 the program has been operating on a small reserve. This has made it impossible to begin negotiations on a number of large programs. It is important that negotiations be concluded on these large programs in time to allow orderly shipping. These exports should be scheduled over the entire year, rather than attempting to move them in a 3- to 4-month period.

If the fiscal year 1959 authorization had been known by the Department of Agriculture it would have been possible to have concluded the agreement early in the year and perhaps we could have prevented heavy accumulations of surpluses in the fall. It should be borne in mind that extension of Public Law 480 also was delayed last year for over 4 months. Very few important agreements were signed between June and October of 1957 due partially to the delay in enacting such an extension.

The sharp decline in foreign exports during this period had a drastic effect upon American shipping and was very disruptive to the normal commercial trading facilities. As long as this program operates, it is essential that it operate with proper continuity and careful programming, rather than extreme peaks of activity for a short period and then a virtual cessation of operation. Valuable time has already been lost due to the delay in enacting an extension bill. If we are to have proper administration of this program, it is important that we take prompt action.

We do not mean to indicate that we should change the nature of the Public Law 480 program. It is a temporary program. Throughout its legislative history it has been emphasized that these sales for foreign currency are an emergency measure and not a permanent part of our agriculture exports. For example, the report from the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 432, dated May 9, 1957) stated, "This committee would remind those in charge of administering this law that it is not intended as a permanent part of either our agricultural or our foreign-trade program. It is an emergency law designed for the sole purpose of making the best of a bad situation by providing for the disposal

of agricultural surpluses in a manner which will return some benefit—if possible, a permanent benefit—to the United States."

A program of sales for foreign currency can benefit American agriculture only a limited length of time before markets start orienting to this way of doing business. The trade becomes acclimated, as it were, to such sales. In short, customer nations start to consider unconsciously or consciously, the Public Law 480 operations as a normal part of commercial trade. There are indications that just this already has happened in some instances. We view with serious concern evidence that some countries are adjusting their dollar exchange so that very little of it is used for the purchase of American farm products. They are taking for granted that they will be able to purchase a substantial portion of their food and fiber needs from the United States with local currency. This places United States farm products in a very vulnerable position and jeopardizes future dollar markets.

S. 3420 has been amended by substituting the language of H. R. 12954. Section 101 of H. R. 12954 extends authorization for foreign currency sales for 1 year and provides a $1.5 billion authorization. This is an improvement over the Senate bill which provided an open-ended authorization. This type of authorization for Public Law 480 would tend to destroy the temporary nature of the program.

Sections 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108 of H. R. 12954 expands authorized uses for foreign currency generated under Public Law 480. This multiplicity of possible uses could greatly complicate the proper administration of the program. We must not forget that Public Law 480 is a trade development act and foreign currency should be used efficiently and effectively to accomplish this primary purpose.

We are opposed to section 102 of H. R. 12954 and feel that this section should be deleted. It represents an effort to tie the Secretary of Agriculture's hands in administering the barter program. We are for a barter program vigorously implemented; however, it must be conducted with proper safeguards. Section 102 of this bill amends section 303 of Public Law 480 and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to barter farm products for strategic and other materials up to $500 million annually. This section forbids the Secretary to restrict countries into which surplus-agriculture commodities may be sold under the program, except when the Secretary makes a specific finding as to a particular transaction, that such transaction will replace a cash sale for dollars. This places a burden of proof responsibility on the Secretary which, in our opinion, would make proper administration of the program impossible. Such a provision could cause an unrealistic barter program which could tend to displace substantial amounts of dollar sales. This would have the effect of channeling an even greater proportion of our agricultural exports into government programs.

We must recognize the danger signs. Over 40 percent of our agricultural exports moved under Government programs in fiscal year 1957. Farmers' position in normal commercial trade must not be jeopardized. We must work toward expanded sales for dollars through private commercial channels. A barter program which merely displaces sales for dollars achieves no benefits for American farmers. It does not expand exports; it simply diverts them from private trade to government programs.

However, a properly administered, properly implemented barter program can expand agricultural exports. The Secretary has this authority. We are assured that he will use it.

Section 303 adds no new authority, but merely makes proper administration more difficult, if not impossible. Section 102 of H. R. 12954 should be deleted in the long-run interest of the American farmers.

Respectfully,

GEORGE J. DIETZ.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Mathematics and Science Education in Indiana Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mathematics and Science Education in Indiana Schools," written by Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction in Indiana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION IN INDIANA SCHOOLS

(By Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction)

Russian advances in the field of satellites have been responsible for criticisms of our science and mathematics education by cirtics of our educational system. Because of the interest expressed by the school people and the citizens in the veracity of these criticisms, the State superintendent of public instruction appointed a 14-member committee with Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School and a member of the Commission on General Education of the Indiana State Board of Education, to investigate and appraise science and mathematics education in the schools of Indiana. This in part, was necessitated because the schools were being blamed for the failure of the United States to launch a satellite before Russia's Sputnik I, and in part because the school people and the citizens wanted to know the truth about Indiana's educational adequacy. The committee has scientifically studied the schools in Indiana to determine the actual facts in five areas of our educational program pertinent to the teaching and achievements in the mathematics and science courses. These areas are as follows: (1) Teacher qualifications; (2) high school offerings; (3) pupil participation; (4) achievement of pupils; and (5) the need for scholarships for talented pupils. To obtain pertinent data the committee used the records of the teacher training and licensing division, the statistical division, and the research division of the State Department of Public Instruction. In addition to this, questionnaires were mailed to all of the 707 Indiana high schools. The fact that 100 percent of the questionnaires were returned is indicative of the excellent cooperation and true interest shown by the school administrators in aiding with this quest for the truth. Investigation of the five areas listed above has been completed and a summary of the results is as follows:

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

The courses taken in colleges and/or universities by all the teachers of mathematics and science were studied by examining their credentials filed in the teacher training and licensing division of the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. These records show that all mathematics teachers in Indiana have a minimum of 24 semester hours of college credit in mathematics. Data from these files also reveal that approximately 80 percent of the biology, chemistry, and physics teachers have a teaching certificate in their specific area which, in fact, means that the biology teachers have a minimum of 24 semester hours of academic biology, and the chemistry and physics teachers have a minimum of 18 semester hours of academic chemistry and academic physics. All of the other teachers, with the exception of a very small percent, have had at least 15 hours of science. For only 2.2 percent of the biology teachers, 1 percent of the chemistry teachers, and 2.2 percent of the physics teachers were our records incomplete.

HIGH-SCHOOL OFFERINGS

The idea has been prevalent that our high schools no longer offer the challenging and solid courses in mathematics and science. The facts are that during the 1957–58 school year 85 percent of our high schools were offering physics; 83 percent were offering chemistry; 88 percent were offering second-year algebra; 72 percent were offering trigonometry, and 62 percent were offering solid geometry. All of these schools did not offer these subjects each year but offered the courses in alternate years.

PUPIL ENROLLMENT

During the school year 1957–58 the records showed that 100 percent of the graduating seniors had at least 1 year of mathematics; 34 percent had 2 years of mathematics; 15 percent had 3 years of mathematics, and 11 percent had 4 years of mathematics. Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and former United States High Commissioner to Germany, recently used in a nationwide telecast our data that 11 percent of Indiana graduates have 4 years of secondary mathematics, as an indication of the strength of the American comprehensive secondary school. Of this year's (1957–58) graduates, 100 percent had 1 year of science; 26 percent had 2 years of science; 15 percent had 3 years of science; 2 percent had 4 years of science. These figures indicate that about as many high-school pupils in Indiana today are enrolled in advance science and mathematics courses as could profit from the accelerated study of these subjects. This statement assumes that it is the most capable and talented students who are enrolled in these advanced courses.

ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS

The science and mathematics committee tested the ninth-grade pupils in mathematics and science. The California Test Bureau of Los Angeles, Calif., was selected to provide the tests in mathematics and science. Schools were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Of the approximately 63,000 pupils enrolled in the ninth grade, over 44,000 students took both the science and the mathematics tests.

The results of these tests have very definitely established the high caliber of our students both in past and present achievement and in the prognostication of their future scholastic ability and achievement.

The tests were validated on the national norms previously established and grade placements were also derived and ascertained from these national norms.

In the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th-grade students was at the 10th grade. Approximately 27 percent of the total number of 9th grade students taking the test showed a grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more, while approximately 58 percent showed grade equivalents at or above the 10th year grade level.

In the area of physical science, the median grade level for these 9th grade students was at the 9th grade level; however, 36 percent of the students taking the physical science exam showed a 10th grade equivalent or more.

In the area of biological science, the median grade level was the ninth grade, the same as in the area of physical science. Thirty-four percent of the 9th grade students taking this test placed at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

Results show that 61.6 percent were above the national norms in mathematical reasoning and mathematical fundamentals, and 50.7 percent were above the national norms in physical and biological sciences. More students were above the national norms in physical science than in biological science because many city schools offer biology to 10th grade students while the test was given to 9th grade students.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

"How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?"

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½-hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were sent to Yonkers, N. Y., where they were machine scored.

There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into 4 categories:

1. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile based on national norms in each of the four fields of mathematics, science, English, and social studies.

2. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the 4 areas tested.

3. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in the group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their

higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college. Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient funds to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid for amounts from $10 to $1,200. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from $25 to $750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 are needed and can be taken care of but the problem concerns provision for financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

The results of the study of these five areas have shown conclusively that the training and education directed to our students do not in any way preclude their ability to achieve and to meet the challenges of our changing world.

The facts do show that our schools are very adequately meeting the needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for unfavorable criticisms concerning Indiana's educational system. The aims, the objectives, and the philosophy of our schools sharpen and challenge the working tools of the pupils. Since progress is an important product, our youth will not mark time but will keep pace with all the developmental tasks that our culture expects of them.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FIVE AREAS

Teacher qualifications: The records of Indiana's mathematics and science teachers show that they are well qualified to teach in these subject areas.

High school offerings: Indiana's high schools are definitely offering adequate mathematics and science courses to meet the needs of our challenging students.

Pupil enrollment: The records show that Indiana's high school seniors for 1957–58 had a firm and substantial background in both mathematics and science.

Achievement of pupils: Results of a mathematics and science test showed that in the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th grade students was at the 10th grade. A large percentage of these students ranked at the grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more.

In the science area, the median grade level was the 9th grade, while a large percentage ranked at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

The need for scholarships for talented pupils: A 4½-hour comprehensive examination (essential high school content battery, form BM.) was taken by 703 qualified high school seniors.

One hundred and ninety-nine or 28.3 percent of these 703 seniors made a percentile ranking, based on national norms, above 90; however, the committee decided not to consider for scholarship, at this time, those students who had an average percentile ranking of 94 or below in the areas of mathematics and science, and an average percentile ranking of 90 or below in the areas of English and social studies. This eliminated 20 of the 199 students.

By process of further elimination according to pupil interest, course of study pursued, and a financial need formula; only 53 students, who were still qualified, remained.

A plan is being devised whereby those 53 students needing financial assistance may obtain this aid from private sources in Indiana. The committee is convinced that Federal assistance on this program is neither necessary nor desirable.

Alaska Statehood and District of Columbia Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, July 15, President Eisenhower sent United States marines into Lebanon, the U. N. Security Council began considering sending a police force to the Mideast, Great Britain prepared to send paratroopers into Jordan and the United States Senate was obligated to consider and pass bills permitting the District of Columbia Commissioners to alter overhead wiring regulation, expanding the charter of the St. Thomas Literary Society in Washington and permitting and permitting clerks of the District of Columbia Municipal Court of Appeals to administer oaths.

While these bills are innocuous in and of themselves and merited enactment, legislation such as this could best be considered by a locally elected body in the finest tradition of our governmental heritage rather than by the Congress of the United States which was elected by the people of the States to serve as our National Legislature rather than as a municipal city council.

Now that Alaska has been admitted into the Union, very serious and active consideration must be given to giving to the citizens of the District of Columbia their rights of citizenship and giving to them such modicum, at the very least, of self-government. There is legislation presently pending on the calendar of this body providing for home rule in the District of Columbia; I hope very much that such legislation will be enacted into law.

The Reporter Dispatch of White Plains, N. Y., on Tuesday, July 8, 1958, carried a ringing editorial urging that the people of the District of Columbia be divested of their second-class citizenship and restored to full citizenship.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR PLAY FOR HOME-GROWN AMERICANS, TOO

There's been almost unanimous approval—excepting perhaps some prideful Texans—on admission of Alaska as the 49th State of the Union. It's anticipated that Hawaii won't have to wait very long to become the 50th.

Yet, while we're welcoming Alaska, which we acquired in 1867, and preparing to lay down another red carpet for Hawaii, which joined us in 1898, we stubbornly hold back in the awkward status of less than second class citizenry the 800,000 residents of a mainland section which has been with us since the Revolution.

While we tie in Juneau, Alaskan capital as far distant from Washington as is London, we still push back from statehood, or even territorial status, the home of the National Capital itself.

Alaska and Hawaii to be States? But residents of the District of Columbia not to be given even territorial rights? Doesn't sound exactly like fair play, does it?

Population of the District is just a little bit more than that of Westchester. It's four times that of Alaska. Yet, while Alaskans are getting ready to elect State and congressional officers, folks in the District of Columbia can't vote for even a dogcatcher.

Oh, they're allowed to pay taxes, real estate taxes, personal income taxes, corporation taxes—but they don't have legal rights to even a whisper as to how those taxes shall be used. Instead, that function is given by present law to nonresidents, to Members of Congress who live and have personal interests many hundreds of miles away.

How would we feel here in our community if an authority reported that the salary level of our public school teachers was "not only a disgrace but fails to enable the board of education to recruit properly trained teachers"? And how much worse would we feel if we knew the statement to be absolutely true but were completely helpless to do the least little thing to correct it? Yet, that's the situation in the District of Columbia.

Why, even such a comparatively minor matter as whether the District, entirely urban, should have daylight saving time took up hours of debate in the Senate, hours which might have been far better given to discussion of weighty national and international issues. Senators from Western agricultural States whose constituents are congenitally opposed to daylight saving objected to giving the boon of an extra hour of summer daylight for relaxation of District residents.

Consider our own Senator JACOB K. JAVITS. He's on the Senate District Committee. In that role he has all the responsibilities and headaches of a Mount Vernon alderman or a Westchester supervisor. The time he should be able to give to global issues he must surrender instead to questions of sewage treatment and garbage disposal. Is that good?

Then, there's our other Senator, IRVING M. IVES, who has been named to a joint committee to iron out differences between Senate and House on the District's budget. He faces the unpleasant task of imposing taxes upon property owners who can't say a word about how big that budget can be, how it should be raised, or how it must be spent.

Who was it said away back in our early colonial days: "Taxation without representation is tyranny"? And if true then, why not now?

Is this what we sent our Senators and Representatives to Washington for? Is this local government a burden we must put upon them when they need all their time and energy and brains to meet pressing national problems?

Senator JAVITS, realizing the situation, has helped to introduce a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. Its passage will give fair, honest, American-type representation to residents of the National Capital. It will also relieve Senators and Representatives of petty annoying details of city-level administration, and thereby make that time available for the more important and more proper work of Congress.

Of course, there may have been away back there in 1790 some reason to exclude District of Columbia residents from local voting rights. There may have been some slight substance for fear of local control of the National Capital.

But that fanciful bugaboo evaporated from the dim mists of capricious imagination many decades ago. It's laughable now to advance the supposition that to give the vote to the District of Columbia would endanger the basic principles of the Nation.

So, while we're preparing to recognize the civic equality of Alaskans and of Hawaiians, how about giving a bit of fair play consideration to the rights of mainland Americans in our National Capital?

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under considering the bill H. R. 13450 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, or someone familiar with the matter, a question in reference to a statement in the committee report appearing on page 48 having to do with the reactor-development program. The committee has recommended, according to the report, the following:

The budgeted program includes $1,250,000 for development work on fast-reactor systems. In keeping with the position taken by conferees on the bill last year none of these funds are to be charged against the contract between the AEC and the Power Reactor Development Co.

It is my understanding that during fiscal year 1958 none of the funds made available for the fast-breeder reactor were specifically charged to the PRDC contract but that benefits from AEC research on the reactor-development program could be made available to the PRDC project. Do I gather from the words in the committee report that the same arrangement will be carried on in fiscal 1959?

Mr. RABAUT. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. FORD. That arrangement is satisfactory, as I understand, to the PRDC and the AEC. Therefore I am glad to hear that this bill for the fiscal year 1959 will carry out that arrangement in the future.

Mr. RABAUT. The Congress has never approved the contract between the AEC and PRDC but, as far as the gentleman's question is concerned, the answere is "Yes." The situation is the same.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He is as concerned about this matter as I am. I think the answer is very satisfactory.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment and ask a question of the committee, particularly with reference to the matter referred to on page 5 of the committee report. This has to do with emergency conservation measures. The Congress several years ago appropriated $24 million for disaster relief in areas that had been devastated by floods and other acts of nature. Now, as I understand, there is about $18 million or $19 million remaining of this fund. The question is this: Does this bill extend that public law, which I understand was Public Law 85 and Public Law 170?

Mr. TABER. I understand it does.

Mr. BEAMER. Well, the reason I asked that question, I represent a district and I think many others represent districts where there have been tremendous flood losses this year in various farm areas. Now, the other question that I would like to ask is this: Is this amount of money on a matching basis, or is it on a loan basis? Could that be answered?

Mr. TABER. I think I would have to yield to a member of the agricultural subcommittee to answer that question.

Mr. BEAMER. As to the language on page 2 of the bill, emergency conservation measures, is that money available on a matching basis or is it an outright grant?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an outright grant to repay money expended by local people to remedy the damage done in times of natural disaster. The law itself limits the area and conditions under which the funds are available. The State must determine the disaster, and the President must agree. We have, for a period of years, each year extended this disaster fund in line with the legislation. The budget request was that we extend it now for 6 months. In view of the restrictions and limitations in the law itself, which protects the funds, we felt it was better to continue the fund on an indefinite basis.

Mr. BEAMER. I discussed this with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi, and I think it is an excellent move, but I did want to get this question answered.

Mr. WHITTEN. Permit me to go further by saying that actually this is a reimbursement to the people in the area who do certain work incident to recovery from a disaster which the Federal Government and the State determined did exist.

Mr. BEAMER. And it must be declared a disaster area?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right; which comes from the Federal Government and the State Government, and that precedes the allocation of money from this fund.

Mr. BEAMER. I compliment the committee for including it and extending this particular legislation.

Nixon Pens Own Story of Latin Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Tribune of July 15, 1958:

NIXON PENS OWN STORY OF LATIN COMMUNISTS

(By RICHARD NIXON)

WASHINGTON.—I appreciate the opportunity Victor Riesel has afforded me to report through his column on an important aspect of my South American trip, which, because of the understandable interest in the violent demonstrations which occurred, has not been adequately covered in the press.

I have often been asked why I insisted that State Department officials arrange meetings with labor-union leaders in the countries I visited wherever my schedule would permit.

The answer is that a free trade-union movement is one of the strongest bulwarks against communism.

The proof of the truth of this conclusion is that the growing trade-union movement in Latin America is a major target of Communist infiltration.

TRADE UNIONS GROW FAST

In the United States we can be grateful for the fact that our trade-union leaders were among the first to recognize the insidious character of the international Communist movement and the threat it presented to all free institutions. Men like George Meany, for example, were never fooled by the popular-front tactics of the Communists and they have fought the Communists skillfully and effectively through the years.

The trade-union movement in Latin America is comparatively small but it is growing fast, and in countries where former governing classes are losing their influence the trade-union leaders, together with leaders in the universities and public-opinion media, form a powerful and sometimes decisive force in determining the makeup of governments and their policies.

The Communists recognize this. That is why they are concentrating their efforts primarily not on government and business officials who may be in power today, but on the union leaders, the university students, and the public-opinion molders who may be in power tomorrow.

TALKS VERY FRIENDLY

What progress have they made as far as unions are concerned? We would be deceiving ourselves if we were not to recognize that they have made and are now making serious inroads in the union movement in Latin America. The Red labor network, organized under the direction of Vincente Lombardo Toledano, is well-heeled, efficiently organized, and ruthlessly aggressive.

Even in those countries where the Communist Party is outlawed, Moscow-trained and directed labor leaders are working and planning for the day when they will come to power. In other countries they openly boast of their Communist affiliation and are waging unceasing warfare on those they realize are their most effective opponents—the free trade-union leaders.

But there is another side to this story—an encouraging one from the viewpoint of those who support the cause of freedom. I

saw this side first hand. In every country I visited, with the exception of Venezuela, I met with free trade-union leaders.

The meetings I attended and the discussions I had with these leaders were without exception always friendly. That does not mean that they agreed with me on all aspects of United States policy. But in each instance it was a friendly disagreement from which a better understanding of the true attitude of the people of the United States toward those of Latin America resulted.

Since I have returned to the United States, I have received scores of letters from these democratic labor leaders deploring the incidents that so grossly misrepresented the true sentiments of the people of South America toward the United States. To note a few among many, Augusto Malave Villalba, of Venezuela, wrote that the organized workers of his national emphatically repudiated the incidents that took place.

The Confederation of Labor of Peru rejected the demonstrations as "contrary to their ideals of democracy, freedom, and inter-American trade unionism." And it should also be pointed out that in the demonstrations that took place there was no participation whatever by free trade union members.

SPLENDID JOB RELATED

I found in my converastions with trade union leaders that they recognize the threat which communism presents to the true interests of the working people of South America. They say there is no place in the Americas for the kind of foreign controlled dictatorship which mowed down workers by the thousands in the streets of Budapest. They realize that a Communist government would mean the end of the right to strike and all the other powers that a free trade union must have if it is to survive and grow.

Much of the credit for the successful fight against Communist infiltration of the union movement in Latin America goes to the International Regional Labor Organization (ORIT) with which the free labor organizations are associated.

And I am happy to point out that the American trade union movement through the AFL–CIO is doing a splendid job in Latin America, as well as in other parts of the world in encouraging the development of free trade unions as opposed to Communist unions.

STRONGER PROGRAM NEEDED

I would not suggest that this battle for organized labor in the Americas is won. I believe we should step up our activities in this struggle in several respects. We should strengthen the labor attaché sections in the embassies in Latin America. We should increase in quality and quantity the labor union phase of our leader exchange program.

And probably most important of all, through our information program and every means possible we must get across to the great masses of people in Latin America that the policies of our Government and our enlightened 20th century private enterprise are dedicated to the ideal of producing there, as in the United States, not just a good life for the few but a better life for the mnay.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana, with regard to Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, July 21, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: A hypothesis is only a hypothesis until it is proven or disproven by facts. Following the launching of Sputnik I, we in Indiana began a thorough factfinding study of our education system, particularly regarding science and mathematics courses, enrollments, and pupil aptitudes. The entire project was conducted by a representative committee of citizens and educators, headed by Dr. Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

Every Indiana ninth grade student received an identical test, the results being evaluated by a professional laboratory. We also gave an extensive test to high-school seniors to determine exceptional individuals. Then we inquired of these exceptional seniors as to how many wished to enter college and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance.

The results of these tests and inquiries are detailed in the attached summary. Because there is now before the United States Congress proposed legislation for Federal scholarships, we feel that you might be particularly interested. We are convinced that Indiana does not need such Federal assistance, and that if similar factual inquiry were made in the other States the same conclusions would be tenable regarding them.

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions and institutions now independent or State supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

Living Theater, Music, and Ballet: A Wedding of Business and the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 2081, to establish the United States Arts Foundation, a measure which I introduced on May 15, 1957, to establish an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government to give assistance to the performing arts—living theater, music, and ballet. Stimulation of interest in culture and the arts has long been regarded as almost solely an academic prerogative; however, interest in the living arts is not so restricted but rather encompasses our whole national life. This is especially true in these days when we seek deeper content and motivation in our national spirit. Illustrative of this is an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1958, Aiding the Arts, detailing the activities of businessmen in the promotion of living theater, music and the ballet and the dividends, spiritual as well as material, which accrue.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING THE ARTS—MANY BUSINESSMEN JOIN CITIES' DRIVES TO SPUR MUSIC, DRAMA, DANCE—THEY PUSH BIG NEW CENTER IN NEW YORK, BACK FESTIVALS IN FORT WAYNE, BIRMINGHAM—A GOAL: REVIVING DOWNTOWN

(By Jerome J. Zukosky)

NEW YORK.—Around the green baize-covered board-room table in General Foods Corp.'s Park Avenue headquarters, 15 men and women sat down recently for an unusual conference.

Its subject: "How To Ask for a Million Dollars."

Around the table were the heads of some of the Nation's biggest banks, brokerage houses and industrial concerns. The lesson in fund solicitation, conducted by Clarence Francis, retired chairman of General Foods, was part of a meticulously plotted campaign to coax from corporate treasuries contributions to a relatively new venture in business philanthropy: Culture.

CULTURAL CLUSTER

The executives at this meeting and other volunteer solicitors are seeking $75 million for Lincoln Center, an 11-acre cluster of halls to be built near Manhattan's Columbus Circle. The center eventually may house opera, symphony, dance, drama and other performing troupes. Construction is scheduled to start later this year, with completion of the entire center due by 1964.

It will be the largest privately financed cultural project ever built in the United States. Some $7.5 million is expected to come from corporations, the rest will be solicited from private, noncorporate sources.

"It bothers some people to ask their friends or associates for a million dollars, especially when they know they are asking for more than their company or they themselves can give," comments John McNuty, a fund-raising counselor to the group. "We've tried to show them how."

The culture crusaders' embarrassment, however, isn't the only problem. "Lincoln Center is selling a new idea," says Edgar Young, associate of John D. Rockefeller III, active head and a promoter of the project. "Business support for the arts now is at the stage where corporate aid to education was 10 years ago and aid to medical and welfare work was 30 years ago. We want to set a spectacular example to establish support for the products of man's leisure and spirit as well as his health and vocational training."

OTHER CITIES WATCH

Other cities are watching Lincoln Center's development with keen interest. The decay of downtown areas has long been a major problem for most metropolises. Many experts in urban affairs believe that if downtown areas in cities around the country can reemerge as places where the best in entertainment and cultural activities is available, it may trigger an overall revival in commerce,

housing, and other fields. Thus cities as diverse as Seattle, Pittsburgh, and Winston-Salem are planning construction of new civic auditoriums for performing arts companies. Birmingham, Louisville, Boston, St. Paul, Cincinnati and Fort Wayne, among others, are stepping up promotion of arts festivals using existing facilities. In addition, a Fort Wayne group is trying to raise $3 million for a permanent music, drama, and dance center.

Behind the increasing zeal of the culture campaigners, too, is a growing respect for other practical benefits of ballet, opera, and theater.

"We want to attract top-notch technical people here," says a General Electric Co. official in Louisville, "but their wives badger them to settle in New York or some other city where the kids can enjoy the cultural advantages they think we don't have here. What has Louisville got other than horses and whisky, they ask?"

CONTINUING GROWTH

Adds Dr. John E. Bryan, director of Birmingham's Committee of 100, composed of leading local businessmen, "We want to continue our industrial growth and we have to attract the people to do it. The men our firms want always ask what the community has to offer. And they mean cultural activities as well as good schools and such."

Dr. Bryan, for 11 years superintendent of schools in Birmingham, says over 100,000 persons attended the 75 theater, ballet, opera, orchestral, and art programs during the just completed Festival of the Arts in Birmingham.

The Lincoln Center idea already has won widespread praise from New York businessmen. The reason is simple: Planners of the project figure it will attract some 2,500,000 additional persons annually to cultural events—an influx which naturally would be a boon to merchants.

Recently, New York City condemned the land on which Lincoln Center will stand and sold it for $4 million to the nonprofit corporation that will build and operate the enterprise. That was far less than the land cost the city; the Federal Government makes up two-thirds of the city's loss under the slum clearance program.

Lincoln Center's costs so far have been paid from some $15.5 million contributed by three philanthropic foundations. The first unit to be built is a 2,800-seat concert hall, to be ready late in 1960.

COMPANY CONTRIBUTIONS

According to David Church, director of the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, the $7.5 million being sought from business for Lincoln Center probably is more than all United States corporations have given directly to the performing arts in any 1 year. A survey made 2 years ago of contributions by 138 corporations showed only 2.5 cents of each gift dollar went for "civic and cultural" activities, "and probably only half that went to the arts," Mr. Church notes. American companies gave away some $520 million last year in all forms of philanthropy, the association figures.

There have been some notable cases of corporate financial aid to the arts, to be sure. One came a few years ago when the Detroit Symphony was resuscitated by a $260,000 grant from 26 corporations. The companies pledged to continue the aid for 2 years.

But many fund managers say business aid has been sporadic and unplanned, at best. Direct grants generally have come only after desperate, emergency appeals.

Many communities recently have unified their cultural fund raising on the lines of local community chest campaigns.

"It is now much easier to solicit gifts from company leaders who formerly were reluctant to give to one organization such as the Louisville Symphony only to be deluged with dozens of requests from other groups," asserts Richard H. Wangerin, director of the Louisville fund, now busily collecting $131,000 in its annual appeal. The money will help rub out deficits of the Kentucky Opera Association, the symphony, a junior art gallery, and several other organizations.

LAYING THE GROUNDWORK

Notes Leslie C. White, manager of Cincinnati's Institute of Fine Arts, another united fund: "We collected $250,000 in 1948, our first united drive, about $50,000 more than the total collected by all the individual cultural groups in town the year before." Now the drive garners $325,000 a year and has between 13,000 and 14,000 contributors. About $160,000 was donated last year by corporations and business firms.

Most united fund drives are handled by community arts council, which also administer certain office chores and business details of the cultural organizations that are to share in the collected funds. There are some 50 councils now, compared with 5 or 6 a few years ago, says Mrs. Helen Thompson, president of the American Symphony Orchestra League, which coordinates their activities.

The councils range from new and struggling groups, such as Fort Wayne's Fine Arts Foundation, which has not yet launched a united fund drive and whose director recently painted his own office, to well-oiled organizations such as Winston-Salem's Arts Council. A proud North Carolinian boasts the Winston-Salem group has a volunteer battery of three lawyers to iron out tax tangles and a punched-card machine that will, for example, come up with the names of likely contributors.

Unified funds may help spur culture contributions, but they don't solve all the problems facing the money raisers. Some company executives, for example, fret over possible stockholder opposition to corporate philanthropy. Lincoln Center's directors went so far as to have the New York law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley draw up a lengthy brief asserting the legality of such grants.

RECESSION TROUBLES

"The recession isn't exactly helping us," says Allen K. Holding, fund-raising counsel to the Lincoln Center campaigners. Mr. Holding observes, however, that none of the leading corporations approached by the Center has declined to consider the request.

"Art isn't a critical and tangible need," says ex-public relations man Richard Gibeau, who heads Ft. Wayne's effort to secure $3 million to endow a permanent group of buildings for the performance of music, drama and dance. He describes his work as "low pressure and long range."

The Ft. Wayne Fine Arts Foundation distributes a bulletin to about 2,600 families, sponsors a four-night-a-week program of serious music on local radio stations and presents lectures by visiting artists several times a month. Much of the annual budget of $17,000 comes from 14 local concerns such as the Rea Magnet Wire Co., Inc., whose president, Samuel A. Rea, is head of the foundation; Lincoln National Life Insurance Co.; Magnavox Co., and Fort Wayne Corrugated Paper Co. Sighs 37-year-old Mr. Gibeau: "It takes enthusiasm and a lot of faith."

BIBLE BELT STRATEGY

Sometimes enthusiasm stimulates unusual strategems. "We're in the so-called Bible Belt," drawls R. Philip Hanes of Winston-Salem. "So we had all our preachers one Sunday deliver sermons on the good of artistic endeavor. We put up religious pictures in the churches painted by art classes supported by the Arts Council, and had notes printed on church programs indicating what choir members took part in the choral societies in town."

The problem of how to finance the performing arts in America currently is under study by the Ford Foundation. W. McNeil Lowry, a Ford Foundation official, notes one plan under consideration by the Foundation is a setup similar to the National Merit Scholarship Corp., Inc., and the National Wilson Fellowship Program, Inc. Both are nonprofit corporations originally endowed by Ford and others to encourage corporate donations to education by providing central administration of funds.

Many business and cultural leaders hope that through centralized private administration of such funds this country can avoid direct Government intervention in the arts. Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany and Russia, among others, funnel government funds to state opera houses, ballet and theater companies and orchestras and send them abroad as national troupes.

"We hope our groups will fulfill a similar function—and it's fitting they will be privately financed," says Lincoln Center's Mr. Young. Planners hope the Center will serve as a home base for touring troupes.

The center also will have an educational role. Some $20 million of the $75 million to be raised will be used for scholarships and subsidies for untried productions. The Juilliard School of Music will cut its enrollment from about 1,400 now in its present quarters near Columbia University to about 400 when it moves into its new plant at Lincoln Center. The change will enable it to concentrate on only the most talented students and to advance instruction to the postgraduate level.

The remainder of the funds raised will be spent to build a new house for the Metropolitan Opera, a replacement for Carnegie Hall for the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, buildings for Juilliard, the first new dramatic theater in New York in two decades, a dance theater, library, museum, band shell and a landscaped plaza. Under the plaza will be an 800-car parking garage owned by the city.

The Metropolitan Opera, the Juilliard School and the other organizations will lease space from Lincoln Center. But rents are likely to be lower than the organizations might pay if they were to rent comparable facilities from a landlord intent on piling up profits. The nonprofit Center is chiefly interested only in collecting enough in rents to cover maintenance of its properties. Also helping to hold down rents will be the fact that all capital costs will have been covered by contributions.

Lincoln Center, like similar but smaller projects in Seattle and Pittsburgh, is part of a broader urban-renewal project. The New York venture consists of a 45-acre site being rebuilt under title I of the National Housing Act. Besides the arts facilities, there will be a midtown campus of Fordham University and several housing developments. All of the new buildings will replace tenements and rundown commercial buildings. Estimated cost: $200 million, of which $42 million consists of Federal and city grants for land acquisition.

As a result of these subsidies, Lincoln Center bought its land at about half the cost to New York City, with the Federal Government absorbing two-thirds of the city's loss.

The housing developments and Fordham University's buildings, like Lincoln Center, will be privately owned, and they, too, will benefit from Federal and city subsidies to cut the cost of their land.

The redevelopment project has not been without controversy. In fact, some tenants and owners of buildings now on the land have gone to court in an effort to block the entire project. Their contention: Land subsidies to Fordham University, a Catholic institution, violate constitutional provisions on separation of church and state.

The New York State Court of Appeals will hold hearings on the issue March 24, after

which the Federal district court in New York City also will hold hearings. Until final disposition is made, no tenants can be evicted from the site.

An attorney for Lincoln Center says the risk taken by the center in buying its land and planning the project is minimal, but that it is possible Fordham's plans may be affected by the court actions. "We wouldn't have sunk $4 million into the land if we didn't think the center would go through," the lawyer notes.

Mr. Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., Saturday, July 19, 1958:

MR. NASSER

A Nasser who begged for his life in 1956, today has become an arrogant egotist, bloated out of size by implied support of Russia in the Middle East crisis.

In less than 2 weeks the Egyptian Army Nasser claimed was unbeatable, was scattered all over the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula 2 years ago by armed Israel forces, and Nasser himself fled from Cairo, fearing capture.

He was restored to power by American intervention when this country persuaded Israel, Great Britain, and France to withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian soil without getting an iron-clad agreement from Nasser the Suez Canal would remain an international waterway. Another case of our bumbling foreign policy.

A couple of weeks after this country hinted Marshal Tito of Yuugoslavia would be welcomed back into the fold and thus become eligible for added American aid, the Yugoslav leader granted formal recognition to the rebels in Iraq who had killed their king, friendly to American interests.

There is hardly a spot in the world where American diplomacy has been worth a tinker's dam and this goes back to the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Mr. Nasser has a nuisance value to the Kremlin. He can trade on Arab nationalism, incite his followers to overthrow governments inimical to his personal interests, and grab off valuable oil-producing territory without raising the living standards of the Arabian people one iota.

Today he is a pawn of Russian imperialism and when he has served that country's purposes he will be liquidatd or sent into comparative oblivion like Molotov and Malenkov.

Nasser is this generation's symbol of Hitlerism ever on the march to increase his personal power without thoughts of the consequences.

There seems little doubt now but for American and British intervention, Lebanon and Jordan today would be under Nasser guidance and the Middle East would be entirely lost to the Western World.

A veto by Russia in the United Nations Security Council last night sidetracked passage of a resolution backing the American-British stand as votes in this body have to be unanimous.

An emergency meeting of the United Nations Assembly may be in the making for Monday or early next week as a showdown nears on whether further U. N. security forces are to be sent to the Middle East.

And while all this debate is going on the man on the street, unlearned in diplomacy, dumb in the art of doublecrossing, wonders why United States does not demand the ouster of Russia from the U. N., as she has contributed nothing but trouble since she became a charter member in 1945 with extra veto voting power granted no other nation.

Russia has been a thorn in the side of amicable relations with every country in the world that wants to see peace restored to this global hemisphere. She has been represented in the U. N. by men who consider moves toward peace signs of exterior weakness, inward cowardice.

With some exceptions President Eisenhower's decision to send marines into Lebanon has won almost universal approval. Even Truman who seldom has anything good to say about the man in the White House, okayed the move as one dictated by necessity.

It may be recalled he took similar moves when President in halting the Communist tide running toward Greece and Turkey and won instant American approval for that broad step.

It's a touchy situation that faces United States today following the marine and paratroop landing in a country far from the shores of America, but it is one time when unity should prevail among Americans, and let the pot shooting to Russia and members of the United Arab Repubic.

It was inevitable a showdown had to come sometime between the free and the communistic world—that time may be here now. At least the Kremlin now knows Uncle Sam is no longer bluffing.

Plea to President Eisenhower To Retain National Guard at Full Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, commendation is in order on the action of the House yesterday in passing House Concurrent Resolution 333, expressing the sense of the Congress that the National Guard strength should not be reduced below 400,000 nationally. In line with this action, under unanimous consent, I include letters sent to the President and to Secretary of Defense McElroy urging the President to reverse his proposed decision to reduce the National Guard strength:

JULY 18, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I respectfully, but strongly, protest the reductions in National Guard strength throughout the country, and urge, instead, an increase in the guard's unit strength and number of units. Minnesota is probably no harder hit by the proposal than other States, but the net effect of the proposed reduction in Minnesota is shattering.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter I have received from the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota. Governor Freeman ably evaluates the effect of the proposed cut for Minnesota. For all intents and purposes, the cut spread thinly throughout the country will destroy the effectiveness of the guard—and its usefulness in the national defense picture.

The greatest moral force in our country has always been the quiet patriotism and dependability of our people. In any kind of crisis, the people gather their spiritual strength to do "what has to be done." They accept their responsibilities as you accept yours. Our people willingly provide the civilian army which has made it possible for this country to win every war in which it has been engaged throughout its history. The National Guard is the exemplification of this sense of responsibility of the citizens of this country. It performs its duties in peace and in war. It is composed of people who serve and train voluntarily. It is a "grassroots" arm upon which the military must depend.

Today, we are faced with serious international troubles, different from the troubles of past years. Today the threat of terrible destruction from nuclear forces hangs heavy over every head and every heart. Despite this, the people of the country, according to news reports, have accepted your decision on the Middle East with reactions ranging from resignation to approval, whatever they may think are the reasons and causes of our present difficulties in that area. This is the way the American people perform.

Persistence with the decision to cut back the National Guard will be not only detrimental to the morale of the people, but it will also seem to them, unwise and shortsighted in the extreme. The times demand forthright action. If a mistake has been made in proposing the cutback, the administration should be willing, for the safety of the country and the morale of the people, to reverse the decision and withdraw the proposal at once.

Respectfully,
Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON.

[Copy to Secretary McElroy.]

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
St. Paul, July 14, 1958.

The Honorable COYA KNUTSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KNUTSON: The proposed reorganization of the Army National Guard to conform to the Army's concept of military requirements for modern warfare has given me, as I know it has given you, deep concern. While we have been in full agreement with and fully support reorganization and modernization of the Army, which, of course, includes the Army National Guard, our concern has been that in effecting the reorganization, the Pentagon planners would administratively do that which the Congress never has, or would legally do, authorize the emasculation and relegation of the National Guard to an inferior position in the Nation's scheme of defense. There is strong evidence that there is a desire among military planners in the Pentagon to do this, and the proposed plan for the reorganization of the reserve elements of the Army is indicative of this desire.

Yesterday my office received a tentative list of the proposed Army National Guard troop basis for the State of Minnesota, and I am attaching hereto a statement drawing a comparison between the present and proposed troop basis. It will be seen that we now have 107 company, battery, and detachment size units in Minnesota organized in 65 communities, and we are being asked to reorganize on the basis of 80 comparably sized units in the reorganization program. Spreading these units thinly over the 65 stations in which we now have armories and strong and active units organized, it may be possible to continue to carry on National Guard activities in these communities through the medium of splitting some unit

between 2 communities, a practice in which we have not heretofore engaged and one which does not contribute to an efficient and effective military unit. We have been given to understand that the troop basis is subject to negotiation, and we will make strong representation to increase the unit allotment beyond 80.

Our immediate concern is in connection with the maximum strength authorized under the proposed reorganizaton. Currently the Army National Guard of Minnesota has a strength of 8,792 officers and men available for service and we are 67 percent of authorized war strength. Under the proposed reorganization, all but a few of our units will be authorized to be organized on only a 52 percent of war strength basis, with a maximum of 7,150. This will result in a loss of over 1,600 officers and men and will be seriously felt in all of the 65 communities in Minnesota in which the Army National Guard is organized. It is evident that this proposed allotment of 7,150 officers and men is predicated on a national overall strength of the Army National Guard of 360,000 and not the 400,000 which Congress has heretofore authorized and is in the process of authorizing for the current year. I sincerely trust that you will strongly support the strength figure of 400,000 in the respective committees and on the floor of Congress for this is vital to reducing the seriousness of the impact of this reorganization throughout the State of Minnesota.

I wish to also add that it is apparent that once the 400,000 strength is authorized by the Congress, it will be necessary to vigorously follow up the authorization to see that administration officials proceed with the reorganization of the National Guard on a 400,000 strength basis in accordance with the will of Congress and the desires of the States.

It is quite evident it is the intent of the Department of Defense to ignore the Congress and the strong position in support of a nationwide strength of 400,000, which the governors of all the States and Territories took at their recent Miami conference, in the Army's announced action establishing the Army National Guard on the basis of 360,000. In the light of the international situation and our scores of global mutual-security agreements, reduction of the National Guard both as to units and officer and enlisted strength at this time would appear to be ill conceived if not dangerous. It is difficult to understand that the announcement of the Secretary of the Army concerning this reorganization of Reserve Forces should, on the one hand, contemplate the destruction of well trained units in being of the National Guard and the organization of 15 of the National Guard Divisions at less than full organizational strength, while directing the organization of new units of other elements of the Reserve and prescribing an organizational plan for Reserve divisions, which authorizes all organizations of the division to be organized. There exists a strong suspicion in the minds of many of our governors, which I am beginning to share, that there are many in authority in the Pentagon and perhaps elsewhere in Washington, who do not like the State-Federal status of the National Guard and would destroy it or render it impotent. I am sure that this is not the will of our people and that you and I and all others who may reflect their voices and actions in supporting a strong and virile National Guard, will be ever vigilant in seeing that this does not occur.

Yours very truly,

ORVILLE FREEMAN,
The Governor, State of Minnesota.

State of Minnesota Army National Guard—Allotment of troop units

PROPOSED ALLOTMENT OF UNITS

Type of organization or separate unit:	Number of units
1 State headquarters and headquarters detachment	1
1 field artillery battalion 155-millimeter howitzer tow	5
1 signal area operation battalion	5
1 transport truck battalion	4
1 Infantry division (less 2 battle groups)	65
Total number of units	80
Maximum authorized strength	7,150

CURRENT ALLOTMENT OF UNITS

1 State headquarters and headquarters detachment	1
1 infantry division (less 1 regular combat team)	87
1 transport truck battalion	4
1 antiaircraft artillery group	15
Total number of units	107
Present strength	8,792
Total proposed reduction in units	27
Total proposed reduction in strength	1,642

JULY 18, 1958.

Hon. NEIL M. MCELROY,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since you are the President's chief civilian adviser in the military and on military matters, I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you a copy of a letter I have just sent to him, urging reversal of the decision to cut back the National Guard strength.

May I respectfully ask that you use your influence with the President to secure withdrawal of the proposal to cut back which would do immeasurable damage to this portion of our citizen army. As a civilian, you will perhaps regard these matters a little differently from the President whose views naturally are colored by his long service in the military. Your understanding of the basically civilian-minded nature of the people of this country will perhaps be of assistance to the President in his review of the need and importance of the National Guard.

I wish to thank you in advance for your courtesy and coperation in this important matter. As time is pressing, may I ask an early reply to this request.

Respectfully yours,

Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON.

Public Law 480

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the Fifth District, Kansas, one of the largest wheat-producing districts in the United States, I am very concerned with the surpluses in our Nation today. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to make known my full support of Public Law 480 for the following reasons:

This law has helped to reduce the surplus of farm products in our country for both public and private interests. Storage space is at a premium in my area. We must dispose of a great portion of our present surplus to make room for this year's crops. This is the first good crop that my district has had in 6 years. Under Public Law 480 we are exchanging wheat and other surplus farm products to friendly countries. We are taking foreign currency and using it to improve the living standards of these countries and also to bear the expense of maintaining our own Government officials and military in those countries.

I feel that if this program can be maintained, it will not only tend to make better understanding of countries throughout the world but will pave the way for peace and good will throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, under this law the United States has exported nearly $4 billion in farm products since its enactment in 1954. This amount is nearly one-fourth of all our farm exports during that time.

Donations of these surplus products of ours has been a life source in countries who have been hit by famine, drought, and other disasters; thereby creating good will in many depressed areas of the world.

By putting a great portion of our surpluses into this program we have been able to moderately reduce our surplus at home and to save millions of dollars in storage and loss.

Also, under the barter system, which is a part of this law, we have been able to trade for many strategic materials necessary for our security and welfare. Nearly $900 million of the total amount of this program has gone into this barter transaction.

Also, for the needy people here in our own country, over 3 million Americans received commodities under this program last year.

Our school lunch program is also included in Public Law 480 and has received many supplies.

Mr. Speaker, an amazing thing to me and one that all our farmers are proud of is the fact that we farmers of America, with modern methods, producing from 280 million acres of tillable land with approximately 6 million farmers, can produce more than 170 million American people can consume and dispose of. Yet Russia with nearly 430 million productive acres and over 50 million farmers can hardly feed herself. It proves to me that our ability to produce agriculturally is perhaps our greatest asset for the security of the free world.

In short, it may be said that Public Law 480 has made it possible to utilize surplus farm products to pay a part of the cost of diplomatic and military missions in friendly countries; to pay a part of the cost of military and economic aid; to acquire additional strategic materials through a barter system to create economic development loan funds in friendly countries through sales for foreign currencies; to utilize American food surpluses for famine relief; and donations of food to religious and other charitable relief agencies.

As a result of exports under Public Law 480, we have exported 664 million bushels of wheat since its enactment; this is two-thirds of a normal year's crop in our country. A moderate reduction in our surpluses has been achieved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say again that I concur heartily with the provisions of Public Law 480 and recommend its passage.

The Hopeless Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Hopeless Hope," written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, and published in the Washington Sunday Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOPELESS HOPE

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate)

The hopeless hope, is a pungent phrase coined by one of the world's outstanding women—the First Lady of the Republic of China, Madame Chiang Kai-shek. It connotes the hopelessness of allowing any psychology of fear to determine the attitude and action of the free world as it faces the Communist conspiracy. This talented Christian leader who, on her visits to these shores, always captures America by her courage, her conviction and her charm, recently delivered a notable message at the University of Michigan. Facing boldly the contemporary hand wringing over the horrors of modern war, she declared, in a timely warning, that for some people, freedom and the value of human dignity which we were taught to cherish above all else had begun to be secondary to biological survival. "It is a tragedy," she said, "that some powerful minds have allowed themselves to be enmeshed in arguments over means such as relaxation of tension, appeasement, and finally slavery better than annihilation, groveling in the hopeless hope that life would be spared them." Then she added that those who take that attitude are ignoring the fact that if total darkness should fall upon the world, it would be they who have made the Communist conquest possible by destroying the will to fight.

Here is a practicing Christian, always bearing witness to her faith, declaring that the will to fight, the will to stand firm, must be kept at any cost. There were voices in the recent conference of Anglican bishops at Lambeth who represented those who, with quaking knees, are venturing to say that rather than bring the holocaust of nuclear war upon the earth, it would be better to allow the ruthless Soviets to accomplish their avowed goal of world domination. Such an attempt for peace in our time, Madam Chiang warns, is a hopeless hope. The hope of the world is in that knightly battalion of resisters, of which that great woman of free China is so inspiring an example as she sounds the solemn warning about the hopeless hope of coexistence. She and the generalissimo, living and serving as they do on the very edge of the Marxist inferno running its terrible course on China's mainland, belong to the noble army who have dared for a high cause to suffer, resist, fight, if need be, to die.

The clarion warning brought to America regarding the hopeless hope finds the sound of a great Amen in many editorials and columns in the public press. It is here, again and again, that genuinely Christian pulpits are set up. Here are ringing sentences lifted from one such recent statement, infinitely more Christian than the shameful suggestions of surrender from the lips of some ecclesiastics. "We have too great a faith to heed the craven voices—to say farewell to all our greatness, to surrender and submit. All the clanking apparatus of an iron empire with its many millions of slaves in uniform, with all its menace and threats, will not overwhelm this land nor terrify our people. Americans have fought before. They will fight again that freedom and mercifulness and goodness of heart shall not perish from the face of the earth." And to that, from millions and millions of true American hearts, comes thunderous approval.

Because of the faith which is the very breath of our democracy, where the rulers are not the elect, but the elected, America will continue to challenge the sinister system which we faced in spite of consequences in the horror and glory of the Korean struggle. Had we thrown Korea to the wolves of aggression, America could never have lived with herself again without loathing. And she must never rest until Korea's sundered body is united. If America stood aside now, while free nations are enslaved, she would be signing her own national doom. And so we insist that the pertinent message of Madame Chiang about the hopeless hope belongs under spires. For every spire is the symbol of a righteous sword. A peace gained by constant retreat because of the threatening blackmail of superior force is not peace, but war. Whenever a system with a completely unethical purpose to conquer the world reaches the stage of aggressive hostility a part of its technique is always to develop disarmament propaganda in the nation against whose life it is plotting. To weaken the national striking power is to vote to make it inevitable that the democracies shall be forced to do the bidding of moral perverts who have been allowed to fashion a preponderance of swords. Of course, force is never the last word. At best it but clears the way for the constructive agencies of friendship, good will, and cooperation to do their healing work so that at last swords can be turned into plowshares.

Men and women of religious faith, for whom the spiritual verities, denied and derided by the present-day rampant "gates of hell," to use a term which fell from the lips of Jesus, are now facing evil in forms as ugly and malignant as that which lifted Christ on two crossed beams of wood at the place called Calvary. Nothing but slavery awaits democracy, which, at its best, is the political expression of Christianity if it deigns to bargain in the deadly conflict now raging. Any appeasement of the heinous forces on the rampage directed by the mad master of the Kremlin would be but surrender on the installment plan. Every true democrat is a soldier in the front line trenches in this massive assault of demonic forces which trample with scorn upon the spiritual verities which flame in the teachings of the prophets of Israel and which are at the heart of the Christian revelation.

But this is the victory that overcometh even our faith. And we shall win, not because God is on our side, but because with a cross that turns not back we are on God's side. We shall fight to victory for the sovereignty of God, the omnipotence of love, the dignity of man, and the worth of moral values. But someone, looking with poignant desire at the hopeless hope for some face-saving pact with deviltry, says plaintively as he shudders at the possible cost of resistance: "But a man must live."

"But is it so? Pray tell me why
Life at such cost you have to buy.
In what religion were you told a man must live?
There are times when a man must die.
Imagine for a battle cry this coward's whine,
This liar's lie—a man must live.
The Saviour did not live. He died.
But in His death was life for all mankind."

Public-Be-Damned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in deleting from the supplemental appropriations bill funds for land acquisition for extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway was a tragic mistake. Study after study has been made of the Washington area and the problems brought about by the polluted Potomac. It has long been recognized that the Potomac River could be one of Washington's greatest assets. There is no question in my mind that its shores must be preserved from undesirable uses. The parkway would extend from the District line to Fort Washington in Prince Georges County, Md. The authority has existed for this parkway since 1930. The vast majority of my constituents feel most strongly that the parkway should be built and that park land should be provided along the shores of the Potomac. With the ever increasing pressures of metropolitan expansion, if this parkway is not provided, the land adjacent to this historic river will be carved up into subdivisions which would in turn be subject to health hazards and all other forms of inappropriate development. Millions of visitors each year visit Mt. Vernon. To allow unsightly developments to be created across the river from this magnificent memorial is unthinkable. Plans have now reached the advanced stage for the construction of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge which is to connect directly with the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Unless these two great projects are coordinated, land costs and values will mount to the point where it will be economically unfeasible to acquire the parkway land. It is my earnest hope that the Senate will restore this project which is so important to our Nation and that the House conferees will accept the Senate's action.

I wish to commend to all Members editorials which appeared in both the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Evening Star pointing up the need for extension of the parkway.

For the committee to base its action on the fact that local roads now serving the area are adequate, to me, indicates

an unawareness on the part of the committee as to the road situation in that area. I would like at this point to insert a letter from Mayor Clifford R. Armhold, of Forest Heights, Md., who has so effectively rebuffed the committee's statement:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 20, 1958]

NOSE-END VISION

The attempt of the House Appropriations Committee to kill the George Washington Memorial Parkway between the District and Fort Washington and to withhold funds for the purchase of land needed for the municipal stadium is nothing short of a public-be-damned attitude. Congress authorized the parkway project 28 years ago. Every year since then the need for conserving the waterfront along the Potomac for park and parkway purposes has become more evident. Yet the committee now says that funds for acquisition of the land will not be granted and that the private owners should feel free to go ahead with their developmental plans. The denial of funds to buy the 3 acres essential to round out the stadium site handicaps a project that Congress had specifically authorized only a few days previously.

Incredible though it seems, the committee voted to sabotage the parkway on the theory that local roads now serving the area are adequate. This seems to mean that its vision of the Nation's Capital for the future contains no better connecting link for a rapidly growing suburban area than the congested, substandard, two-lane Indian Head Road. Aside from this, the 1,150 acres of riverfront land sought by the National Capital Planning Commission in this area are designed to serve as a regional park. What the committee is now saying in effect is that the blindness of its present members should deny the benefits of this proposed park to all future generations.

It is true that Congress has procrastinated so long in buying this land that 16 houses have been built in the area. But the acquisition of these houses wuold be a minor expense compared to the tragic loss of this proposed park forever. It is difficult to believe that the Senate will acquiesce to this scuttling venture. The Maryland legislature has already voted to repay half of the $2 million that the NCPC is seeking to purchase this land. Congress cannot fail to do its part in regard to either the parkway or the stadium without inflicting a critical blow on the cause of good planning and sound development of the Capital City.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1958]

A BAD DECISION

The House Appropriations Committee's rejection of emergency funds to save the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County is a distressing mistake, which should be reversed promptly by the House.

Involved is a request for $2 million, to purchase nearly 8 miles of right-of-way along the Potomac River between the District line and historic Fort Washington.

These funds would buy about 70 percent of the 1,150 acres needed for the parkway. And Maryland has agreed to repay $1 million of the amount in annual installments. The committee denied this request, and strongly suggested that the entire project be abandoned. Its stated reasons for doing so, however, were so untenable that they hardly could have been based on anything but misunderstanding.

The reasons were that the costs are not justified in view of other demands on the Federal Treasury, that adequate roads already exist in the area and that the parkway project has caused "confusion and unsettled conditions" among property owners.

The facts are that the parkway has been authorized by Congress for 28 years, as part of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930. Any "confusion" among property owners in Prince Georges at this late date is no more valid than in Montgomery, Arlington, or Fairfax Counties, where the completion of land acquisition for other sections of the George Washington Parkway is still under way. Indeed, the real reason Maryland and planning commission officials made the present request is that new urban development is threatening to send land costs out of reach. Now, land is still cheap.

As to the contention that adequate roads already exist, the parkway is much more than a highway. Its roadways would be bordered by attractive parks, picnic areas, and waterfront facilities—1,100 acres of public open space which Washington will sorely need as urban growth continues. This park would become an invaluable asset to the National Capital, just as is its counterpart on the Virginia side of the river between Alexandria and Mount Vernon.

In the years since 1930, Congress has shown a traditional sympathy for the parkway, designed as a unit to extend from Great Falls on both sides of the Potomac to Mount Vernon in Virginia and to Fort Washington in Maryland. If the House commitee's ban holds up, we have no doubt Congress will regret it in years to come. And then it may well be too late.

OFFICE OF THE
MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL,
Forest Heights, Md., July 22, 1958.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The attempt of the House Appropriations Committee to kill the George Washington Memorial Parkway between the District and Fort Washington on the theory that local roads now serving the area are adequate indeed is incredible. On behalf of the residents of Forest Heights, Md., I should like to invite the committee's attention to an urgent need for modernization of the South Capitol Street-Indian Head Highway access and the need for supplemental roadways between the District and suburban southern Maryland. The South Capitol Street-Indian Head roadway is the only direct radial link between downtown Washington and a huge area lying directly south between Route 5 and the Potomac River. An especially critical 2-mile section lies between the South Capitol Street-Nichols Avenue intersection and the northern extremity of Forest Heights. This section is so heavily burdened by local and through traffic as to constitute a severe bottleneck seriously limiting the overall capacity of this entire suburban artery. Rush-hour traffic clogs this busy area for hours while the frequent addition of theater, racetrack, and Sunday-driver traffic creates even greater congestion. The close to 4,000 residents of Forest Heights and the many thousands of other motorists using South Capitol Street and the Indian Head Highway daily, as well as the businessmen plying it commercially, would greatly benefit from long-overdue action to increase the traffic capacity of this congested artery and to provide alternate routes, particularly one which also would bring with it such a much-needed regional park as has been proposed by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD R. ARMHOLD,
Mayor.

(Identical letters sent to the editors of the Evening Star and the Daily News.)

Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "If United States Broke With Kremlin," written by George Todt, and published in the Valley Times, of North Hollywood, Calif.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF UNITED STATES BROKE WITH KREMLIN

(By George Todt)

"And ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up."—Leviticus XXXVI: 38.

"Why continue any longer to treat a bandit government as a civilized entity?" is the question put to his readers this week by David Lawrence, one of the Nation's truly great editors, in his editorial contained in U. S. News & World Report. "Why accord the ruthless men in the Kremlin the prestige of membership in the family of governments?

"Why not instead indicate to all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain that the United States will maintain diplomatic relations with any government regardless of its economic ideology—but only if such a government is truly chosen by its people and is not a menace to the peace of the world."

I think we should buy that. It is a terrible thing to give the present Soviet cutthroat leadership our diplomatic recognition when this reacts to the detriment of the millions of enslaved humans behind the Iron Curtain who are struggling for liberty from their cruel taskmasters—and are humiliated in such efforts by seeing America in the foul embrace of the worst tyrants the world has ever witnessed until this time.

What is not generally known, because it is downplayed by most of the press and the ever-lovin' communications mediums of the United States for some strange reason today, is that there is a tremendous underground movement now going on—as there has been for many years extending into the past—inside Russia to liquidate the Communist conspiracy and thereby win liberty for the Russian people.

The latter hate their Communist overlords worse than we do, which is natural. After all, nobody knows the hatefulness and evil of the Red totalitarians more so than do the Russian masses themselves. They have been ground under the heels of these subhuman beasts of prey for 40 years—and in the process some 60 millions of their fellow citizens have been tortured, starved and eventually murdered. They are our best and perhaps most faithful allies. What are we doing to aid them?

The answer is: nothing at all which is helpful. But we are doing much to hurt their legitimate aims for freedom from the bestial tyranny imposed upon them by the Kremlin autocrats. For some reason, which is maddening to Russian patriots, our Government—as well as other ruling bodies of the Western Alliance centered in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—persists in making eyes at the Red leaders and doing little short of jumping in bed with them. Perhaps that will come later. Have we taken leave of our senses?

Now it is the considered opinion of some brilliant emigrant Russian minds—something of a white underground—that the greatest assist we could give to their compatriots in Mother Russia would be to break off diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R. immediately. If America should do this, they say, then it would give renewed hope and strength to the freedom fighters inside the Soviet Union.

But when and if the time comes that we should do this, then we ought, at the same time, to send a message of sympathy and assurance to the Russian people themselves—telling them that we stood ready to help them with material assistance to rebuild their nation if they might be successful in overthrowing their hated Communist dictatorship which has held them in bondage. And also assuring both the people and the leadership of the presently constituted Red armed forces that we would, under no circumstances, have any territorial ambitions at the expense of a future Russian government, but would fully respect the integrity of Russia as evidenced through the self-determination of her peoples. This could easily rock the Kremlin back on its heels.

Give the Russians a chance to revolt and only God knows what the answer might be—but what could be worse than the present state of affairs in which we now find ourselves? We are being steadily pushed back on the world stage because we unheroically decline to take an offensive posture. But the militant Reds are not afraid to do so. They keep constantly probing, probing, probing our defenses. They are moving into many critical areas which are vital to us because of lack of effective countermeasures and pressures on our part.

It is useless to attempt to make friends with these amoral atheists housed in the Kremlin. They have broken faith with everyone who ever attempted to do business with them: Worst of all, their own downtrodden people. Can we ever put our arms around this moral leper in the family of nations and remain clean ourselves?

The American Legion is one large patriotic organization, among many others in the United States today, which is increasingly calling for a diplomatic break with the Red brutalitarians. Their drive is making headway in all parts of the land. Which bodes well for our future. For America cannot afford to traffic with the Devil. Some of his red paint would be bound to come off on us in the process.

And at least some part of the red paint would be the blood of the 60 million humans murdered by the Kremlin despots since 1917—their own people! Pretty gruesome, what?

Achievement in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, July 22, 1958:

ACHIEVEMENT IN SPACE

It is significant that the Army now has declared, without qualification, that the so-called reentry problem has been satisfactorily solved. This confident new note is based on the fact that a full-scale nose cone or warhead of a Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missile—the one fired at Cape Canaveral on Thursday—has been recovered intact.

Since the same thing was accomplished with a Jupiter 2 months ago, and since there have been similar earlier successes with small-scale nose cones, the Army, with the Air Force and Navy agreeing, no longer has any serious misgivings about being able to launch IRBM's and intercontinental ballistic missiles whose warheads will not be disintegrated or literally burned up, as they reenter the earth's atmosphere. Not long ago the problem of protecting such warheads—the problem of insuring that they would survive the tremendous friction generated by their return, at a speed of about 10,000 miles an hour, through the heavy blanket of air around us—seemed to some to be almost insoluble. But now there appears to be no doubt that the scientists working with our Armed Forces have definitely solved it.

In a military sense, the chief meaning of this achievement (the Russians conceivably may lag behind us in it) is that it indicates impressive progress in the development of effective American ballistic missiles. More than that, in the nonmilitary field, it suggests that our country is rapidly acquiring the know-how for the safe recovery of both machines and humans launched into space for peaceful research and exploration. Buck Rogers certainly is beginning to look quite real.

Khrushchev and the Moslems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 22, 1958:

KHRUSHCHEV AND THE MOSLEMS

Nikita S. Khrushchev's recent efforts to appear before the world as protector of the Middle Eastern peoples' independence and freedom would be funny if they were not made in so tragic and grave a political context. We have referred earlier in these columns to the incongruity between Khrushchev's recently discovered passion for noninterference in the affairs of foreign nations and the reality of Soviet conduct in the Hungarian Revolution less than 2 years ago. There is no less incongruity between the current Soviet effort to pose as a friend of Moslem political rights and the reality of Soviet subjugation of millions of Moslems who have the misfortune to live under the Russian rule.

The Moslem peoples of the Soviet Union are generally believed to number between fifteen and twenty million persons. They include a variety of nations: the Azerbaidzhanis in the Caucasus, the Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tadzhiks, Kirgiz and Kazakhs in Central Asia, as well as other peoples. In terms of history, religious background, culture, and language, the ties of these peoples are with Turkey, Iran, and the other Moslem nations of the Middle East, but politically and economically today they are subject to the very different people who are known to history as the Great Russians of Moscow. In that respect, the Russian Communists such as Khrushchev have acted as true successors to their predecessors in imperialism, the Russian Czars, who first conquered these Moslem nations, destroyed their self-government and began the continuing efforts to destroy their Moslem religion, culture, and traditions.

Premier Khrushchev pretends to great and righteous indignation these days about American troops in Lebanon and British troops in Jordan. But what are Russian troops doing in Baku, in Tashkent, in Alma Ata and the other great centers of the Moslem peoples who live under the Soviet yoke? Why are the Kazakh people being buried under the deluge of Slavic settlers from European Russia, settlers who are plowing up the Kazakhs' pastures and turning what was once a great Moslem nation into a small minority in its own homeland? If self-rule is good for Egyptians and Iraqis, why is it not good for Uzbeks and Azerbaidzhanis?

Premier Khrushchev makes a mistake, we suggest, if he thinks that these questions do not occur to the Moslem peoples he rules. But an even greater mistake is being made by any Moslems who forget the history of Soviet misrule in the Caucasus and Central Asia and think there is anything genuine in the tears Khruschev now sheds over the Middle East.

United States Slowly Easing Ban on Trading With China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an article written by Robert T. Hartmann, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times July 13, 1958, entitled "United States Slowly Easing Ban on Trading With China."

This article reviews various highly significant happenings relating to trade with the U. S. S. R. and the Communist bloc, which I believe should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The instances discussed of where barriers are being eased against trading strategic and strategic-type goods with the Communists are very disturbing. Let us not be deluded. Every inroad made by the Communists in the arena of world trade will be a victory for the U. S. S. R. in its economic offensive against the free world.

We should never for a moment forget that Communist trade is dedicated to one thing—the strengthening of the Communist strangle-hold over all the people it can manage to trap in its ideological snare. Any economic gains that might accrue to countries of the free world through trade with the Communists are bound to be illusory and short-lived. By its own pronouncement, the Communist world is engaging in economic warfare to crush us. With monumental hypocrisy and deceit it is seeking from the nations of the free world the tools to fulfill its grim mission.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES SLOWLY EASING BAN ON TRADING WITH CHINA—BREAKDOWN OF QUARANTINE OF ASIA REDS SEEN AS INEVITABLE MORE THAN YEAR AGO

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—It can now be reported that the Eisenhower administration more than a year ago decided to accept as inevitable the gradual breakdown of barriers to free world trade with Communist China.

The United States as yet is not prepared to lift its total embargo on doing business with the Peiping regime. But it is, and for many months has been, resigned to the fact that its major allies, led by Great Britain, are going after Red China trade regardless.

President Eisenhower's principal concession to Prime Minister Diefenbaker during his Ottawa talks this week at last puts his public approval on this proposition. The United States agreed to make exceptions to its legal restrictions, under the wartime Trading With the Enemy Act, for Canadian subsidiaries of American firms who get orders from the Communist Chinese.

FORD OF CANADA CASE

The cause celebre in this political hot potato was a reputed inquiry to Ford of Canada from Red Chinese trading agents, who have been circulating freely in Canada lately, about buying 1,000 vehicles. Since this coincided with layoffs in the automobile industry, the CIO–UAW and Canadian politicians blew the firm's refusal up into an international incident of America extraterritorial interference.

Ford has denied this and Secretary of State Dulles never received any formal complaint from Canadian authorities, but nevertheless it was No. 1 topic of the Eisenhower-Diefenbaker talks from the standpoint of public interest.

United States Government sources are minimizing the importance of their decision, as they have each previous inch the administration has given in the controversy. They allege the Chinese Communists dangled an order before the Canadians only to damage the ordinarily excellent relations between the United States and its northern neighbor, and doubt that Peiping will put cash on the barrelhead.

But many Canadians, including Minister of Trade Gordon M. Churchill and James Muir, president of the Royal Bank of Canada—the dominion's biggest and most conservative financial institution—think otherwise. They are going all out to expand Canadian trade with the Chinese mainland while the rest of the West—especially the United States—warily hangs back.

The President's decision to give Canada its way should come as no surprise, however, to careful observers who have followed the sequence of events since he met with Prime Minister Macmillan in the spring of 1957.

Macmillan, at the Bermuda meeting, pressed for drastic relaxation of the Co-Com and Chi-Com lists of strategic items which most of the NATO powers (plus Japan in the case of Red China) voluntarily agreed not to ship to Communist countries. The Co-Com list, covering the Soviet Union and its European satellites, included mainly military items unavailable in Russia. But the Chi-Com list—applicable to Red China and its Aisatic appendages—was much more extensive. It included numerous (and profitable) controversial products which the West withheld from the Chinese mainland during the Korean war and afterward.

EXPERTS GIVEN TASK

It was announced in the Bermuda conference communique only that the technical experts of the two powers would get together and talk over revision of the forbidden lists, with a view to bringing them closer together, which was what the British wanted. The United States will continue its own embargo as far as China is concerned, however.

The experts have been meeting in Paris almost continuously ever since. Their conclusions are almost final, and although they have not been announced, it can be reported authoritatively that the two lists have now been merged into one.

In other words, henceforth it will be all right with the United States for any of its allies (and this includes Japan) to sell the Chinese Communists everything they sell the Soviet Union.

We will continue our total ban on traffic with Red China, North Korea, and Viet Minh, but the variety of goods United States businessmen may sell to Russia will be considerably increased when the new list finally takes effect. Meanwhile, the Commerce Department is on record as favoring equal opportunity for American businessmen to compete with British and European competitors in the Soviet market.

REVERSAL OF POLICY

The Times last March disclosed a secret reversal by Secretary of Commerce Weeks of a long-standing ban on selling United States tire-making know-how to a British combine building a $42 million ultramodern tire plant in the U. S. S. R. Two things were significant about this ruling, in the light of the top-level administration decision now known to have preceded it.

First, the reversal by Weeks authorized United States rubber engineering firms to sell their data directly to the Russians, or via the United Kingdom. Nobody had asked permission to deal with Moscow, so this was a gratuitous precedent, later explained as an "ad hoc" ruling (each case on its own merits) in denying it altered United States trade policy. (Presidential Press Secretary Hagerty used the same ad hoc phrase in Ottawa to mask the Canadian concession.)

Second, the Times followup of the tire-plant shift revealed it was the first such case under the Export Control Act to reach the Secretary of Commerce for decision in more than a year, that it had the approval of the State Department and other administration agencies, although the Pentagon admitted strong misgivings.

DISCUSSED MANY TIMES

It has now been confirmed from the most reliable sources that the subject was discussed at the Cabinet and National Security Council level many times prior to and after Weeks' ruling. Specifically, the Ford of Canada commotion was studied by Secretary Dulles and Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, who administers the Trading With the Enemy Act, and a United States policy determined before the President went to Ottawa.

Canada has held a middle position between Great Britain, which rushed in to recognize the Chinese Communists almost before their conquest of the mainland was complete (primarily for trade reasons), and the United States, which still refuses recognition.

The Northern Dominion has no diplomatic relations with Peiping, but does trade in anything not prohibited under the NATO ban. There is some support for recognition in Canada, but the Conservative Government has not yet espoused it.

UNITED STATES HOLDS OUT

The United States, though yielding gradually to the pressure from its allies, holds out on Red China trade and recognition (regarding them as substantially the same) for both political and practical reasons. The strong popular revulsion to Red China resulting from thousands of Americans killed and wounded by the Chinese in Korea has not diminished, as it has in countries whose contributions and casualties in the U. N. forces were relatively light. Senator KNOWLAND still speaks for these widows and bereaved parents in the United States Senate, and he is not alone.

Secretary of State Dulles has additional, potent diplomatic reasons for continued refusal to treat with Red China. The Chinese Communists still hold four Americans prisoner, and no concessions can be made until they are freed. Moreover, the effect of any accommodation with Red China on free Asian allies of the United States, especially Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan regime, must be carefully weighed.

This is the reason the administration's acceptance of the futility of forever quarantining the aggressor Chinese Communists is being exposed to the American public as slowly and softly as possible.

Still a mystery, however, is what logical answer can be given to American businessmen when Red China's commerce with the non-Soviet world begins to boom and they demand their cut of it. Even sooner, what will the United States Government tell foreign subsidiaries of American companies all over the world who want the same exceptions granted to Canada?

Luzerne County (Pa.) Residents of Lebanese Extraction Unanimously Support United States Intervention in Lebanon

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of July 18, 1958, disclosing that residents of Luzerne County of Lebanese Extraction unanimously support the intervention of the United States in the Lebanon situation:

LEBANESE HERE BACK UNITED STATES INTERVENTION

Wyoming Valley residents of Lebanese extraction—most of them residing in the Rolling Mill Hill section of Wilkes-Barre—are unanimous in their commendation of this country's intervention into the affairs of their strife-torn homeland.

Queries to religious and civic leaders among the Lebanese, many of them natives of the Middle East country now in ferment, have brought responses indicating high favor with the sending of United States Marines to Beirut, the Lebanese capital.

Rev. John Koury, pastor of St. Anthony's Maronite Church, Park Avenue, a native of Lebanon, said he and his 1,000 parishioners have been watching the developments with deepening interest.

CRY FOR JOY

"Some of my people cried for joy when they heard the Marines had been sent to Lebanon," Rev. Father Koury asserted this morning. He explained that most of the Lebanese in this country had fled their native land to escape the Moslem yoke, and asserted they have found liberty and opportunity in this country, in addition to the religious freedom they sought. In North and South America, he said, about 2 million Lebanees have settled, and of that total, about 85 percent are Christian.

Rev. David ElMouallem, pastor of St. George Maronite Church, Loomis Street, said the 600 members of his parish "have prayed continually for the success of this country's move of intervention. Many of us still have peo-

ple in Lebanon, and we pray for the peace of that country.

REBELS THREAT TO PEACE

"Believe me, if it weren't for the timely intervention of America, the rebels would have taken over that country, and would have imperiled the peace of the world." Rev. Father ElMouallem said conditions in Lebanon from which he emigrated 24 years ago, are poor, and poverty is everywhere. Each week, he said, he and his parishioners receive letters from that country, asking that aid in the form of foods and other items, be sent. He added that special prayers will be said in his church Sunday for the liberation of Lebanon from the Reds.

Rev. Herbert Nahas, of St. Mary's Syrian Orthodox Church, High Street, whose congregation of 1,000 includes about 200 from Lebanon, said they are all in accord with intervention in the Middle East.

Concerning the Syrian members, who comprise the majority of his parish, he stressed that the Christian Syrians are not part of the Syrian strife in the Middle East. Moslems comprise the vast majority of those now in Syria, he asserted, and the Christian Syrians here fled their homeland to escape persecution by Moslems. The Syrians in America, he said, are 95 percent Christian, while Syrians in Syria are 90 percent Moslem, Reverend Nahas pointed out.

Thomas C. Thomas, local produce merchant and civic leader, said he and others of Lebanese extraction in this area strongly support the sending of United States Marines to Lebanon.

"This country has been good to the Lebanese here, and to the country of Lebanon," Thomas said this morning. "We have found this country to be the best nation in the world, and we are strongly in favor of going to the aid of Lebanon to save it from the Reds' grasp in the Middle East."

Thomas, born here, recalled that both his parents, the late Mr. and Mrs. Charles Thomas, were born in Lebanon. His parents, he said, took the family to Lebanon and shortly thereafter, his father decided to return here. He boarded the ill-fated liner *Titanic*, and was lost when it sank in mid-Atlantic in 1912. Mr. Thomas' mother later returned to this country with the children.

Need for Facilities for Vital Army Activities at Fort Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we are in a critical and perilous time, internationally speaking. The Mideast is in an uproar, as we all know. The United States has made many commitments and I am indeed shocked to see that the House Appropriations Committee has made such drastic cuts in the administration's request for construction of permanent buildings and facilities of the Armed Forces.

This is no time to pull in and cut down on the Armed Forces program. The only thing that has prevented another world war has been the might and destructive force at our command. I do not know what motivated the committee. I do know, of course, that they have done what they thought was best and just under the evidence before them at the time they considered this bill. It seems to me, however, that since the hearings were conducted before the subcommittee the entire picture has changed. New demands are being made on our Armed Forces and their functions and programs have been vitally affected. I believe that the whole matter needs to be restudied in view of this situation.

I cannot speak authoritatively for the necessity for all of the projects contained in the request of the Defense Department. No doubt certain of these cuts maye be in order but I do know, however, that the new construction items requested at Fort Lee, Va., in my Congressional District, are badly needed. The original request from Fort Lee for fiscal 1959 contained several items which were later deleted within the Department but the two principal items deleted by the committee are essential to the proper functioning of the vital Army activities at Fort Lee. This is the home of the Quartermaster Training Command and is one of the most important Army installations.

The Quartermaster Corps has requested the construction of a permanent academic building for the quartermaster school and from my knowledge of the situation this is badly needed and will greatly benefit the quartermaster program. I feel that the deletion of this item will be detrimental to the training of quartermaster personnel. I earnestly hope that the Congress will approve the necessary funds to construct this academic building as it not only is a benefit to Fort Lee and to my district but to the entire country inasmuch as the quartermaster training there performs a vital service for the entire Army.

In addition to the academic building the committee has deleted funds for a nurses' quarters and this, too, is vitally needed at Fort Lee where a new hospital is shortly to be built and considerable medical activity is necessary.

I expect to pursue this matter further with the committee as well as in the other body. Of course, I have already taken this up with the Department of the Army and I can report that the Army is very upset about the action of the committee.

It is my feeling that we must keep our Armed Forces as strong as possible and provide these essential items.

The Welcome Increase in Employee Purchases of Stock in American Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, down through the years I have always felt that one of the important methods by which we can, and should, encourage greater cooperation between labor and management is to help give labor more of a stake in American industry.

For that reason, I have always supported, in principle, the concept of sound employee stock purchasing plans.

I am glad to say that these plans are on the increase.

An article by the distinguished president of the New York Stock Exchange, Mr. Keith Funston, as published in the Saturday, July 19, issue of the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette reported that no less than 45 percent of all of the companies listed on the exchange now have stock purchase, or stock option, plans for their employees.

In praising this trend, I am referring not merely to the plans whereby top-management can, as a bonus, receive stock at a stipulated figure; rather I am thinking, basically, of the plans whereby masses of employees—factory workers, white collar employees, and others—can regularly, or irregularly, buy stock in the companies for which they work.

I point out that these plans, necessarily, must be worked out extremely carefully.

EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE PROPERLY BRIEFED

The full cooperation of trade unions must be secured. Employees, themselves, must have a very clear idea of what they are subscribing for, and how, and when, and at what price.

They must not be oversold. They must realistically recognize that stocks will fluctuate; even in the very best so-called "blue chip" corporations.

In that way employees will not be disappointed when and if stocks go down, as they occasionally will, and if they stay down for a period of time.

After all, ours is a free-enterprise system which means that there may be loss, just as there may be profit. But good stocks held for a period of time should appreciate in value and should pay dividend returns as well.

AMERICA'S FUTURE IS BRIGHT

Fortunately, with the growth of the American market at home, and with the increase of the world market, with rising standards of living, with huge, unsatisfied demands still to be met, there is every reason to believe that American industry will continue to prosper.

Stocks are a worthy investment if soundly bought by individuals who can afford to buy them. I mean individuals who have already set aside money for other basic needs, including life insurance, their own home, cash to meet emergencies, and individuals who will take the time to study what they are doing.

Well over 8½ million Americans already own equity in United States business.

I stress investment—not speculation; for, although speculation has its legitimate place in the American risk-taking system, it should be indulged in only by those who can actually afford it.

Mr. Funston's article, to which I have previously referred, states the rising practice of "pay-as-you-go" methods, in particular, in purchasing stock.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPANIES WANT EMPLOYEES AS STOCKHOLDERS—SAVINGS FROM PAY OFTEN MATCHED

(By G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange)

NEW YORK.—A huge plus can be scored for the astuteness of business management these days—employee stock-purchasing plans are on the increase.

In fact, nearly 500 companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange alone have adopted stock-purchase or stock-option plans for their employees during the past 10 years. (This now represents about 45 percent of the companies listed on the exchange.) Many other companies, of course, have such plans and some listed companies have had them for as long as four decades. Sears, Roebuck, for example, first set up its plan in 1916; Pitney-Bowes inaugurated a stock-purchase plan in 1929.

The results of this encouraging trend are twofold: First, it provides employees with a new sense of loyalty and enthusiasm for the companies they work for—and own. Second, it helps instill in employees a growing awareness of the competitive problems of running a business and thus contributes to their understanding and efficiency.

There is the case of the accountant for an oil company. He is literally on a one-man crusade to boost business. His stock ownership has helped make him as enthusiastic as the company's best salesman when it comes to convincing his friends and acquaintances to use his firm's products. And he is so persuasive that his friends reason that the company must deserve their business. Or, consider the lathe operator who unashamedly admits that since becoming an owner in the business he is doubly careful about keeping his equipment in the best possible working order.

These may seem like minor incidents, but they represent, I believe, the enthusiasm of ownership. Individually, these employee shareowners don't own huge blocks of stock. Their investments total only a few hundred out of millions of shares outstanding. But they're employee-owners, not just employees. That difference makes all the difference.

DEDUCTED FROM PAY

Company presidents are quick to acknowledge the value of these plans. W. H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, says: "We feel the plan has been successful * * * and * * * has stimulated our employees' personal and active interest in the growth and development to a degree clearly beyond that which can be expected through employment only."

And R. J. Cordiner, president, General Electric, says his company's experience justifies General Electric's strong endorsement of the plans as part of a well-rounded program of employee benefits.

Or listen to Joseph L. Block, president, Inland Steel Co., who believes his company's stock-purchasing plan is "one of the reasons—and a significant one—for the favorable showing our company has been making."

Plans vary but the majority have some characteristics in common. They are voluntary, convenient, and—as a protection to employees—limit the amount that may be invested in stock purchases. All, of course, encourage thrift and spell out the risks, as well as the rewards of ownership.

Among the most popular of the stock-purchase plans are those in which employees save through payroll deductions, and their thrift is rewarded with a bonus of the company's common stock.

General Motors, for example, contributes $1 for each $2 of employee's savings. Half of the employees' savings is invested in Government bonds and half in General Motors common stock; the company's contribution is invested entirely in common stock. General Motors reported recently that 92,000 salaried employees (83 percent of those eligible) invested more than $48 million in the savings-stock purchase plan in 1957.

The General Electric variation of this plan, which was started in 1917, permits employees to buy an annual maximum of $525 in United States savings bonds by payroll deductions and deposit them with the company. If the bonds are left for 5 years, General Electric adds a stock bonus equivalent to 15 percent of the cost of the bonds. If the bonds are withdrawn during this time, the bonus is cancelled, but not the accrued income. At the end of 1957, employees participating in the plan had purchased $279 million worth of bonds and the company credited to their accounts more than 1 million shares of General Electric stock with a current market value of some $60 million.

USE MONTHLY PLAN

At DuPont, the company contributes $1 in common stock for every $4 employees invest in Government bonds. Nearly 60,000 employees are enrolled in the plan, and their assets total $57 million in Government bonds and $14 million in DuPont common stock.

The stock option plan allows employees to subscribe for common stock—usually at a discount and pay for it through payroll deductions over a specified period, frequently 3 years. The company usually pays interest on the savings. In this plan, an employee may realize a paper profit if the stock rises before the option is exercised and the stock is purchased. And by electing to cancel his option at any time, an employee can protect himself against a loss because of a downward trend in the stock price.

The pay-as-you-go method of acquiring stock is still another variation. The employee decides on the amount to be deducted from his salary—usually not more than 10 percent—and acquires his pro rata shares of stock through regular purchases made on the open market by the company with these pooled savings.

A most recent development of the pay-as-you-go principle is the plan instituted by American Motors. It utilizes the popular monthly investment plan offered by member firms of the New York Stock Exchange. Employees may buy American Motors or any other of the 1200 listed stocks available under monthly investment plan and have as little as $40 a quarter deducted from their salaries. Employees have the advantage of an inexpensive, systematic investment program under the company's long-established payroll deduction service. Furthermore, as a result of regular purchases under monthly investment plan, employees may take advantage of dollar-cost averaging—acquiring more shares of stock when the price declines and fewer when the market price rises.

It's clear, I believe, that stock purchasing plans—of all types—are growing in popularity much to the satisfaction of employers and employees alike. In the process, more and more employees are being provided with a direct interest in American business and an increasing awareness of the problems and responsibilities of management.

Small Business Administration Does Effective Job for New York Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sure my colleagues will be heartened, as was I, by the letter I received from a constituent, the Taffet Radio & Television Co., of Woodside, N. Y., regarding the effective assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration. This concern, a small manufacturer of electronic equipment, suffered an unfortunate fire several years ago, and had it not been for the timely assistance of the Small Business Administration the company may well have concluded its existence as another figure in the statistics of small-business failures.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Milton S. Taffet, president of Taffet Radio & Television Co., recounting his favorable experience with SBA, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFFET RADIO & TELEVISION CO.,
Woodside, N. Y., June 19, 1958.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity to intrude upon your very busy schedule and call to your attention the tremendous assistance that our company has received from an agency under your jurisdiction.

Our company, a small business in the true sense of the word, has been fabricating equipment for a number of years for various Government agencies including the United States Army Signal Supply Agency (Signal Corps.), the United States Air Force, the United States Navy, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We enclose, purely on an informational basis, a copy of our facilities list, and a copy of a list of the contracts which we have satisfactorily completed for these various agencies.

Approximately 2½ years ago, our company suffered a series of setbacks—we had a fire in one of our plants which not only cost us considerable financial loss, but also caused a number of months of production delays in our shipments. Although we managed to keep our contracts within contractual delivery schedules, we lost much efficiency, and as a result our financial picture suffered greatly. The above unfortunate incidents forced us into serious financial difficulties. As a result, recently when we bid on any sizeable contracts for various Government agencies, we were turned down on purely financial considerations, in spite of our excellent performance record. However, due to the foresight of Congress in setting up the Small Business Administration to handle just such cases as ours, we were able to continue to receive a number of sizeable awards. We have just recently been awarded a contract as a result of a certificate of competency No. COC–II–297.

I am happy to report that our financial picture is gradually improving to the point where shortly we will not require the help of the Small Business Administration in these matters.

Since the Small Business Administration was set up by Congress, we would like to express our deepest appreciation for the help of the Small Business Administration, and to you as a representative of Congress.

We know that often people do not hesitate to write letters of complaint about the various agencies under your control, and for this reason we feel that it is only fair to write and let you know how helpful this Agency has been. Would you, on your behalf, express our thanks to the Small Business Administration, and in particular to the New York office which services our area.

Very truly yours,

TAFFET RADIO & TELEVISION CO.,
MILTON S. TAFFET.

Fund for the Republic Finances FBI Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion's publication Firing Line has always been one of the most effective and accurate documents dealing with the threat to the internal security of this Nation.

The issue of July 1, among other things, refers to the recent controversy with Cyrus Eaton in which I was involved. I feel that my colleagues in the House who have received material from Mr. Eaton's public relations department should have the benefit of the other side of the issue as presented by the American Legion.

The article from Firing Line follows:

FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC FINANCES FBI SMEAR

Two months ago, the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic, in association with the American Broadcasting Co., commenced sponsoring a series of 13 television programs entitled "Survival and Freedom." Cyrus Stephen Eaton appeared on the fund's second program on May 4, 1958, and was interviewed by Mike Wallace. Eaton, a wealthy, aged, foreign-born industrialist, with a peculiar penchant for adopting the Soviet viewpoint, was the cat's-paw used by the fund to viciously smear the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The immediate reaction of several Congressmen to Eaton's remarks was a rally to the defense of the FBI. On May 8, 1958, the Honorable A. PAUL KITCHIN stated that Eaton, "innocently or otherwise * * * has done much to ingratiate himself to the international Communist conspiracy. Like the Soviets, he (Eaton) has not allowed the facts to influence his inane babblings." Congressman KITCHIN quoted an editorial from the Miami News of May 6, 1958, in rebuttal of Eaton's attack upon the FBI which concluded as follows: "Mr. Eaton is noted as a shrewd and capable businessman of vast interests. He has done this country a disservice by his thoughtless and baseless charges against the FBI." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1958, p. A4280.)

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1958, Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER declared that Canadian-born Eaton again made a tremendous contribution to the Soviet cause when he viciously attacked the FBI and the security systems of this Nation. "Eaton's scurrilous attack on the FBI and our security system climaxes a series of his public utterances which are being beamed by the Soviet propaganda machine to the four corners of the earth. Do not think that the Fund for the Republic did not put him on this program by design. It knew of Eaton's previous pro-Russian positions. It is more than coincidence that in December of 1955 the official Russian governmental organ, Izvestia, hailed Eaton for his expressions on peaceful coexistence; that another organ of the Communist international apparatus, New Times, in October 1957, contained an article by Eaton in which he rapturously extols the virtues of the Soviet Union."

Congressman SCHERER referred to a significant statement made by the late Georgi Dimitrov, a former instructor of the U. S. S. R.'s revolutionary Lenin School of Political Warfare, who taught that "one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists * * * one who is outside of our (Communist) ranks but defends Soviet international policy is worth more than a thousand party members." In drawing a comparison, Representative SCHERER stated while Eaton is "not a Communist, but who defends, as Dimitrov said, the Soviet Union and Soviet international policy is worth more than a thousand party members." On May 13, 1958, the Honorable PRINCE H. PRESTON added his voice to those colleagues who expressed "righteous indignation at the scurrilous attack" launched by Eaton against the FBI. Congressman PRESTON remarked: "In recent years, Eaton has won an eager following of Iron Curtain officials. He has entertained Soviet representatives at his country estate and has provided quotations for the Communist propaganda mills. He * * * has accused the United States of baiting the Russians and being primarily responsible for the tension which exists between our two countries." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1958, p. A4377.)

In a resolution adopted by our 39th national convention, the American Legion called for a congressional investigation of the Fund for the Republic and the cancellation of its tax-exempt status. On March 26, 1958, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), sent a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a staff study and questioning the tax-exempt status of the fund. The committee's study pointed out that "while some projects of the fund appear to be objectively presented, the majority of its operations are based on biased investigation and result in findings which not only fail to present both sides of a given question, but even further, actually conceal facts necessary for an honest understanding of the subject matter."

Congressman WALTER charged in his letter that "the program of the fund has been principally one of action and not of education. Among its chief targets have been congressional investigations of communism, Government security procedures, loyalty oaths and regulation of immigration. The fund has spent several million dollars opposing the denial of employment to security risks in Government and defense and other industries. The fund has financed attacks upon newspapers, magazines and individuals expressing positions with which it disagrees. It has financed preparation and distribution of books, magazines and articles to influence legislation. The fund has also financed attacks, unsupported by competent evidence, upon the loyalty, integrity, intelligence and mental stability of all confidential informants of the FBI who have testified in public trials or proceedings."

Replying to Eaton's assertions, Richard Arens, staff director of the HUAC, was granted equal time on an ABC television program on May 19. Arens announced that Eaton has been subpenaed by the HUAC "for questioning about his attack on Federal Security agencies and his defense of some Soviet policies." While stating that Eaton "is not a Communist," Arens declared Eaton "has extolled the virtues of the Soviet Union, attacked what he rather curiously characterizes as the anti-Russian belligerance of the United States and expresses his firm conviction that the masters of the Kremlin desire only peace." (See the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., May 20, 1958, p. A-4.)

In 1955, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee published a report entitled "Soviet Political Treaties and Violations." The committee studied "nearly a thousand treaties and agreements * * * which the Soviets have entered into not only with the United States, but with countries all over the world. The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise."

COMMUNISM IN THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON, D. C. AREA

On May 13, 1958, Superior Court Judge John T. Tucker, of Baltimore, sustained a ruling of the board of appeals of the State of Maryland Department of Employment Security which refused to allow compensation to Mrs. Jeanette K. Fino of 3105 Mondawmin Avenue of that city. The case stemmed from Mrs. Fino's discharge from the Sunray Drug Co. following her appearance before the HUAC on May 8, 1957. When questioned before the HUAC, Mrs. Fino invoked the fifth amendment many times regarding membership and activities in the Communist Party, United States of America. (See the Sun, Baltimore, Md., May 14, 1958, p. 38; and HUAC, Investigation of Communist Activities in the Baltimore, Md., Area, pt. 1, 1957, pp. 997–1004.)

In upholding the State of Maryland's position, Judge Tucker ruled "that a person who invokes the fifth amendment in an investigation of Communist activities may be denied unemployment compensation on the grounds that her conduct was deliberate and willful insofar as her employment is concerned." Testifying before the HUAC on May 7, 1957, Clifford C. Miller, Jr., a former confidential security informant of the FBI, identified Mrs. Fino as a member of the Communist Party. During Mrs. Fino's appearance before the HUAC, "she persistently invoked the fifth amendment when the committee displayed to her canceled checks drawn by her and payable to the F. & D. Printing Co., which (printed) the Daily Worker. Some of these checks were dated as recently as March 1957."

Irving Kandel, a Maryland chess champion, of 932 Brooks Lane, Baltimore, was removed from the Maryland Chess Federation on May 7, 1958, for his alleged membership and leadership in the Communist Party. Kandel, who was identified before the HUAC in 1957 as a former head of district 4 (Maryland-District of Columbia area) of the party, was the subject of a bitter controversy among the federation's 9 affiliated chess clubs. In April 1958, a spokesman for the Arion Chess Club, declared that "his club would resign from the federation rather than play with Mr. Kandel." (See the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 9, 1958, p. A–9; the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Md., April 10, 1958, pp. 51 and 60; and HUAC, Investigation of Communist Activities in the Baltimore, Md., Area, pt. 1, 1957, p. VIII.)

Emphasizing the seriousness of the situation, the Arion Club claimed many of its members had "worked for the Government on top-secret projects involved with the defense effort * * * (and) * * * to associate in a social organization with a man identified as a Communist would be exercising poor judgment." Members of the Glenn L. Martin Company Chess Club "objected to Mr. Kandel's membership and indicated they would withdraw from the federation if it remained in force. * * * Many of the Martin Club members felt they were jeopardizing their security clearances by remaining in the federation." (See the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Md., April 10, 1958, p. 51.)

Faced with the possibility of complete dissolution, the federation established a new organization called the Maryland Chess Association "based on individual rather than club membership." Following transfer of its "powers and funds" to the association, the federation "voted itself out of existence" which resulted in the cancellation of Kandel's membership. Kandel appeared before the HUAC on May 7, 1957, and invoked the fifth amendment 27 times when asked about alleged activities in the Communist Party.

He also took refuge behind the fifth amendment when questioned regarding "his present or past leadership of district 4" of the party. (See the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 9, 1958, p. A-9; and HUAC, Investigation of Communist Activities in the Baltimore, Md., Area, pt. 1, 1957, p. VIII.)

Victor Perlo, an identified leader of an important Soviet espionage apparatus which functioned in the United States Government prior and during World War II, reportedly spoke at a meeting sponsored by the Washington Citizens Area Forum on May 14, 1958 at the Cultural Center, 4402 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. The Communist background of the Washington Forum was disclosed in the April 1, 1958, Firing Line. Both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth T. Bently have testified before congressional committees that Perlo was affiliated with Soviet intelligence activities while employed in strategic positions in the Federal Government. (See Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report, Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, July 30, 1953, pp. 2, 3, 6, and 9; and HUAC, The Shameful Years, 1951, pp. 58–61.)

RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISION FAVORS A COMMUNIST LAWYER

On May 19, 1958, the Supreme Court of the United States summarily reversed a 6-month contempt of Congress conviction of veteran Communist attorney Harry Sacher, who refused to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1955, whether he was a past or present member of the Communist Party. In ordering the dismissal of Sacher's indictment, the Supreme Court based its decision on the Court's John T. Watkins ruling of June 17, 1957, which held that a witness could not be convicted of contempt unless a congressional committee "made clear to him the pertinence of its questions." (See the New York Times, May 20, 1958, p. C-23; and Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, report, Significance of the Matusow case, 1955, pp. 86 and 87.)

Justice Tom C. Clark filed a dissenting opinion with Justice Charles E. Whittaker concurring. In his dissent, Justice Clark "said at least 1 question about Mr. Sacher's possible Communist affiliation 'was vital to a matter in which the (Senate) Committee properly was interested—petitioner's (Sacher) role in a Communist conspiracy to procure (Harvey M.) Matusow's recantation'." According to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the committee, the "remand of the Sacher case in the first instance, allegedly under the doctrine of the Watkins case, was an unjudicial act * * * The Court was attempting, through its dicta in the Watkins case, to make the law of general applicability; and the Court has now applied such judge-made law to the Sacher case * * *"

Sacher, who has been a member of the Communist Party in its higher echelons", is a veteran defender of Communist cases. In 1952, he served a 6-month prison term for contemptuous harassing and defiant courtroom tactics while playing a major part in the defense of the 11 Communist Party national leaders who were on trial in 1949. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee stated that if any single quality can be said to characterize Mr. Sacher's appearances in defense of Communist cases, it may be said that it is his attitude of defiance toward constituted authority, thus repudiating the oath he took as a member of the bar to respect that authority.

A supporter of many subversive organizations since the 1930's, Sacher has been an active member of the National Lawyers Guild. Sacher was elected to the executive board of the guild during its 1957 convention. (See New York Guild Lawyer, March 1957, p. 8; and Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, report Significance of the Matusow case, 1955, pp. 103–107.)

Wisconsin's Fine Record of Conservation Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we recognize, the country needs long-range, as well as immediate, programs to strengthen the economy of the country—including conservation of our natural resources.

Extremely important among these, of course, is the particular need for carrying out effective conservation practices for conserving our soil and water.

I am proud to point out that Wisconsin has a splendid record in this field. During 1957, for example, our Wisconsin farmers had a top year in conservation accomplishments.

Among the major achievements were:

Over 1,700 basic soil and water conservation plans were developed by farm families with assistance of Soil Conservation Service personnel. More than 550,000 acres of soil surveys were completed, bringing the total to 11.7 million acres mapped to date.

The acreage of contour cropping established in 1957 topped 52,000 acres. Over 1,600 miles of waterways, terraces, diversions, and surface drains were installed. More than 2,000 acres of land were smoothed.

In addition to these accomplishments, pasture renovation amounted to nearly 30,000 acres; more than 26,000 acres of farm woodlots were protected from grazing; and nearly 3,000-odd acres were developed for wildlife habitats.

This fine record, of course, has been established through the splendid efforts of our farmers in cooperation with the high-quality leadership of the members of the Soil Conservation Service, members of the College of Agriculture, and others interested in the program.

Today, I call attention to the anniversary of a particular conservation project: The Coon Creek watershed project.

The project was organized a quarter century ago, by cooperating pioneer-spirited farmers. At that time, they established a 92,000-acre watershed in Vernon, La Crosse, and Monroe Counties. Thus, the Nation's first, large-scale demonstration of soil and water conservation was begun in October 1933. This erosion-control plan established a pattern of land use now prevalent throughout the Midwest.

Currently, second-generation, conservation-minded farmers are taking over the soil-saving practices started by their fathers in 1933. Interestingly, the concern for soil conservation is not limited to the farmers. Happily, the townspeople and businessmen of the valley, too, deeply sense the value of conserving soil and water.

According to Lincoln Knutson, cashier of the Westby-Coon Valley Bank: "Soil conservation has brought life to the community."

The current issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer—which has served Wisconsin farm families for 109 years—has an excellent article entitled "A Quarter Century of Conservation." This article outlines the historical development of the Coon Creek watershed project, up to the present time; in addition, it portrays the constructive way in which hardy, second-generation farmers—as well as other folks in the community—are carrying on dedicated work for soil and water conservation.

I request unanimous consent to have the article, preceded by a thoughtful quotation from Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk of the Soil Conservation Service on safeguarding the riches of the soil, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Thou shalt safeguard thy fields from erosion, thy living waters from drying up, thy forests from desolation, and protect thy hills from overgrazing by thy herds, so that thy descendants may have abundance forever." (Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk, Soil Conservation Service.)

A QUARTER CENTURY OF CONSERVATION

(By Bernie Manuel)

Leaving behind his native Gulbransdalen in Norway to search for new land, Helgi Gulbrandson walked from the Mississippi River to the center of the fertile valley in 1849.

The rich land of Coon Creek Valley attracted many other pioneers, who like Gulbrandson were interested in clearing the land for cultivation. Removal of the timber stand and poor tillage practices coupled with other forms of land abuse soon threatened the economy of the valley, however.

Good land, as well as poor, was broken by gullies which grew larger each year. The results of erosion and runoff caused loss of land from productive uses, and led finally to ruin and abandonment of many farms.

This was the situation when the Coon Creek watershed project was organized a quarter of a century ago. The pioneer spirit still clung to the farmers in the valley and they gave full cooperation in establishing the 92,000 acre watershed in Vernon, La Crosse, and Monroe Counties.

The Nation's first large scale demonstration of soil and water conservation got underway in October 1933, and the erosion control plan established a pattern of land use now prevalent throughout the Midwest.

Technical assistance for the project was provided by personnel of the Soil Conservation Service and the Wisconsin College of Agriculture.

Spurred into action by a pressing need for conservation practices and free materials provided by the Government, valley farmers used practices that had a healing effect on the scars caused by erosion.

Strip cropping of 8,000 acres was one of the principal practices used to combat the erosion. Terraces were constructed on 1,769 acres and trees planted on 725 acres. Better rotations and use of fertilizers also helped to improve conditions in the valley.

Today, 25 years later, a second generation of conservation-minded farmers have taken over the soil saving practices started by their fathers in 1933 and are just as enthusiastic.

"I've always known conservation farming," says Arlin Manske of Vernon County. "An erosion control program was started on this farm by my father when the watershed was first organized."

The memories of erosion caused by land abuse still cling to Wilfred Kotek, who fol-

lows the pattern set by his father, 25 years ago.

"I was 13 years old when the Coon Creek Watershed Project was organized," says Kotek, "but I still remember the old method of farming and the soil erosion that went with it."

Another firm believer in conservation practices is Ted Kamperschroer. "Erosion control methods that I have used since 1934 have raised the yield of my crops by at least one-third," he says. "Sure, fertilizer has been partly responsible, but what good is fertilizer when it's washed down the slope?"

Farmers in the valley are just naturally conservation minded, according to Artiz lean, president of the Coon Creek Flood Control Association. "They work together closely," he says, "and that is what it takes for a successful soil erosion and flood control program."

"The interest of the second generation in soil conservation is not limited to farmers. It extends into the townspeople and businessmen in the valley. Take Lincoln Knutson, cashier of the Westby-Coon Valley Bank.

"Soil conservation has brought life into the community," he says. "We are aware of conditions before the erosion control program of 1933 and the effect on the farm economy. Our bank is very interested in proper farming and conservation practices."

A new challenge of flood control now faces the valley and Knutson is backing a control program with the determination of his father, I. N. Knutson, who was instrumental in the organization of the soil demonstration area 25 years ago.

Erosion control work continues in Coon Valley today. Farm planning is much the same as when the project was first organized. The only difference is a new look on the hillsides where contour strips and terraces hold the soil in place.

Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine entitled "Saturday's Child of Ghana":

SATURDAY'S CHILD OF GHANA—HAVING FAR TO GO, KWAME NKRUMAH HAS GONE FAR, FROM AN AGITATOR ONCE JAILED BY THE BRITISH TO AN APOSTLE OF PAN-AFRICAN LIBERATION

(By Kenneth Love)

LONDON.—That old verse of folk prophecy, "Saturday's child has far to go," has reached a peak of fulfillment in Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, first elected leader of Africa's new 16-month-old state. He has jumped in a few years from an impecunious student and agitator, a man jailed by the British for revolutionary activities, to a militant statesman of continental stature and continental ambition—a Bolivar of the African bush.

This week his travels take him to Washington as a guest of President Eisenhower—a far distance from the steaming West African village of Nkroful where, by his own account, he was born "a yelling and kicking Saturday's child" nearly 49 years ago. (His tribe, the Nzima, names a child according to the day of his birth—Kwame is the name for boys born on Saturday.)

Although most Americans have eaten Ghanaian cocoa in their chocolate bars and many wear Ghanaian gold in their wedding bands, few could spot Ghana on a map or spell Nkrumah. Kwame Nkrumah, on the other hand, is well acquainted with the country he is visiting, for this will be his third trip here.

The Ghanaian Prime Minister's earlier visits were back in the days when his country was a British colony called the gold coast and he was a fiery, unsatisfied nationalist.

On his first trip—from 1935 to 1945—his main objective was study. And though he was obliged to garner money at a variety of jobs, and devoted further energies to pan-African organizations, he earned a total of four degrees—from Lincoln University, in Chester County, Pa., and the University of Pennsylvania.

He made his second visit in 1951. By then his circumstances had improved. He returned, an imorpant figure in the gold coast's largely autonomous colonial regime, to accept an honorary doctorate of laws from his alma mater at Lincoln.

The exchange of correspondence preceding his present visit began last winter when Dr. Nkrumah sent a personal message to President Eisenhower outlining Ghana's need for help to build a power dam and aluminum refinery on the Volta River. The President promised that his request would receive a sympathetic hearing by United States experts, and in March invited Dr. Nkrumah to make an official visit to Washington.

This time Kwame Nkrumah appears in America in the role of a respected national leader and as a powerful voice for all the emerging peoples of Africa.

It is difficult to escape his presence in Ghana. His portrait is replacing that of the British sovereign on coins, stamps, and currency notes.

A larger-than-life statue of him in prison garb has been erected in front of Parliament house in Accra. One side of its pedestal bears the legend "Kwame Nkrumah—Founder of the Nation," and on another are inscribed three of his own sayings that sum up his political philosophy:

"Seek ye first the political kingdom and all things shall be added unto you."

"We prefer self-government with danger to servitude in tranquillity."

"Our task is not done and our own safety not assured until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept from Africa."

As these quotations attest, at the core of the Ghanaian leader's thought is an implacable anticolonialism. He believes that all dependent territories, African or others, should be granted independence as soon as their inhabitants are willing to take on the responsibility of self-rule. If the colonial power refuses to grant independence, Dr. Nkrumah advocates Gandhi's method of strikes, boycotts, propaganda, civil disobedience and other tactics short of violence.

He is determined to make Ghana a base for pan-African liberation—an enlargement of his original goal to free all the British and French West African colonies and weld them into a West African federation. And he has made it a part of government policy that his country shall afford an asylum or refuge for all Africans who suffer from religious, racial or political persecution and intolerance.

In a recent speech he warned that "colonialism is not dead," adding that its new methods include "economic penetration, cultural assimilation, ideological domination, psychological infiltration, and subversive activities even to the point of inspiring and promoting assassination and civil strife."

Out of his passionate belief in anticolonialism flow these major conclusions: to make political independence a reality, the newly created nations must be economically free; they dare not wait for economic freedom, and socialism is the quickest way to their goal.

This is the way he has put it: "What other countries have taken 300 years or more to achieve, a once dependent territory must try to accomplish in a generation if it is to survive. Capitalism is to complicated a system for a newly independent nation," he continues, "hence the need for a socialistic society. But even a system based on social justice and a democratic constitution may need backing up, during the period following independence, by emergency measures of a totalitarian kind."

At one time Dr. Nkrumah was described in newspapers as a Communist. Indeed, he once had a party card but he never signed it. Now he calls himself a Marxist Socialist, and roots known Communists out of government service.

The momentum of the anticolonial struggle has not carried Ghana toward the Communist bloc. The country's economic and political ties, including commonwealth membership, and its outlook remain predominantly Western. Nevertheless, Ghana recently agreed to exchange diplomatic missions with the Soviet Union, and the Prime Minister has said he wants normal relations also with China in his hope to achieve friendship with both sides in the great power rivalry.

Calling his policy one of positive nonalinement, he explains that "It is only by avoiding entanglement in quarrels of the great powers that we shall be able to assert our African personality on the side of peace."

The country Kwame Nkrumah governs has a population estimated at 4,800,000—about equal to that of New Jersey, but in an area 13 times as large. Geographically, it presents a varied landscape of broad, flat plains along the coast, steeply rising tropical rain forests farther inland, leveling off into gently rolling grasslands. The inhabitants are divided into dozens of tribes—Ga, Ashanti, Fante, Ewe, Nzima—many of which still exercise enormous power over their members. In the great forest belts to the south the Ashanti maintain what is almost a separate kingdom.

The mainstay of the economy is the export of cocoa. Thus the country's biggest worry at the moment is the swollen shoot parasite, which feeds on the cocoa tree. Dr. Nkrumah's government has pursued the politically difficult but only sure remedy for saving the cocoa crop—farmers are required to kill every infested tree, a hard thing to ask of men unaccustomed to taking the long view. But the fight against the parasite is slowly being won.

Ghana's one-crop economy poses serious problems which the Nkrumah government is trying to overcome by a vigorous program of economic diversification. The most vital project is the proposed Volta Dam, which would enable Ghana to harness its one great river for hydroelectric power.

Israel, seen by Ghanaians as safely free of colonialist ambitions, and at the same time knowledgeable of the problems involved in starting an economy from scratch, is participating extensively in Ghana's development. She has supplied capital and personnel to help establish Ghana's Black Star shipping line, which now operates five ships, and is helping to start a merchant marine academy and a national construction company.

But Ghana needs foreign aid on a scale larger than Israel can offer. Also, Dr. Nkrumah wants to avoid obtaining too great a proportion of his aid from any single country—an example in the economic sphere of his policy of positive nonalinement.

The Prime Minister's character, like his career, is full of contrasts. His private behavior is engagingly modest. But his public conduct tends to be authoritarian, and he is capable of actions which his critics regard

as flights of megalomania and his admirers can only view with embarrassment. His critics charge Dr. Nkrumah with dismissing public officials who hold opposition views. They add that he fills the government-owned radio with propaganda for his Convention People's Party (the strongest and best organized political party in Africa).

The latest manifestation of Dr. Nkrumah's strong-arm policy is the Preventative Detention bill introduced by his government this month. It provides for the detention of persons for up to 5 years to forestall actions prejudicial to national security or the foreign relations of the state.

He was criticized for shifting the Governor General out of the windy, sea-sprayed splendors of Christiansborg Castle and taking up official residence there himself. But, say his supporters, this move was designed primarily to convince the unsophisticated Ghanaians that they had truly thrown off the British colonial yoke, despite the remaining symbols that go with Commonwealth membership.

Dr. Nkrumah faces as well the charges of those in Ghana who bitterly resist all change. From the very outset of his taking office, he has been under attack from the Ashanti and northern chiefs for his continuing pressure to diminish their feudal powers.

The authority of the chiefs is being deliberately eroded by laws and regulations, propaganda among the tribesmen, and bureaucratic intimidation. Dr. Nkrumah is aware that his appeal is fundamentally to the detribalized African. He offers a place in the modern scheme of things to the African who has lost or rejected the security of a place in the tribe.

In addition, Dr. Nkrumah offers a pride in Africanness, regarding even paganism as a part of the national culture that he hopes will produce an African way of doing things as an alternative to imitating western ways. He isn't above pouring libations on the ground at public ceremonies or purifying himself by walking barefoot through the blood of a sacrificed sheep.

Until his recent marriage, his eligible bachelorhood made him a choice subject for Accra's able gossips. Dr. Nkrumah has laughingly reported that they described him variously "as a Don Juan, an impotent man, and even a eunuch." And he adds that he is "a very normal man with probably more than average self-discipline." In explanation of his bachelorhood, he used to say that the shape of his fingers made it impossible to keep a ring on. This year he married Fathia Rizk, a somberly attractive 26-year-old Egyptian of the ancient Coptic Christian faith.

A captivating personality, he is a man of photogenic good looks, who likes to be with people. He loves the bustle and animation of international conference and official tours abroad. The excitement of crowds stimulates him to a flow of vivid speechmaking (he is a notable orator, provided he speaks off the cuff). At the same time, he professes a longing for solitude, and wishes he had a state yacht to escape in from time to time.

The Prime Minister's great charm is responded to by all segments of the population. Ghanaians call him "Kwame"—with no titles. He will share a bowl of fu-fu (mashed yams) with a nearly naked villager in the dusty doorway of a grass hut as readily as nibble caviar at a brilliant reception.

Some say his profound and unselfconscious identification with the people springs from his humble birth and early experiences. (A powerful northern chief has said that the Prime Minister's trouble was that he did not come from a good family.)

He was the only child of one of the wives of a gold trinket smith, who worked at Half Assini, 40 miles west of Nkroful. His mother was a mammy trader, one of those female entrepreneurs typical of the west African coastal tribes.

A few facts about his birthdate are certain: It was about noon on a mid-September Saturday in one of the years from 1909 to 1912 (Dr. Nkrumah opts for 1909 on the basis of some childhood memories). His mother had him baptized a Roman Catholic, and while still a young man he planned to enter the priesthood. Later he left the church, and now describes himself as a "nondenominational Christian." He was educated at Catholic mission schools and the famous Achimota College near Accra.

While continuing his studies in the United States, Nkrumah first encountered Jim Crow. He asked for some water at a counter in a Baltimore bus terminal, and the waiter suggested that he drink out of the spittoon.

Last October, in a more celebrated incident, a restaurant in Dover, Del., refused to serve Komla Gbedemah, his Finance Minister and chief political lieutenant. President Eisenhower, to make amends, invited Mr. Gbedemah to breakfast at the White House 2 days later.

It was Gbedemah who coached Nkrumah's Convention People's Party to its landslide victory in February 1951, while Dr. Nkrumah was serving the 11th month of a 3-year prison sentence for agitation and sedition.

To direct his party's progress, Dr. Nkrumah smuggled manifestoes and directives to Gbedemah, written with a pencil stub on sheets of toilet paper—the only paper obtainable in prison (he used to gamble or trade soap and other small articles for it). The publication of these writings during his internment provoked among his primitive followers the legend that he slipped out between the bars every night in the form of a white cat.

With his party's victory at the polls, Dr. Nkrumah was summoned from prison by the Governor, Sir Charles Arden-Clarke, to form his first government.

It must have seemed then to the young leader that he had reached the apex of his career. Today, as the horizons of emerging Africa widen, it looks as if Saturday's child has still farther to go.

Appeal for Development of Coosa-Alabama River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Alabama delegation are joined in a concerted effort to appeal to our colleagues for development of one of the Nation's greatest waterways, the Coosa-Alabama River.

The Senate has seen fit to appropriate $150,000 for planning and design of the Millers Ferry lock and dam on the Alabama River. Soon, the House and Senate conferees will meet to decide what the public works appropriations shall be.

It is our sincere hope and desire that this appropriation for the Alabama River will be approved.

Those of us along the Coosa-Alabama Basin have written to the House conference members, appealing for their support in retaining the Millers Ferry item.

This letter, which I wish to insert in the RECORD, is signed by Congressmen BOYKIN, GRANT, RAINS, SELDEN, and ROBERTS, of Alabama, and by Congressman MITCHELL, of Georgia. It was addressed to each of the House conferees.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1958.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: As a member of the conference appointed on H. R. 12858, the 1959 public works appropriations bill, you are no doubt aware of the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee amending this bill to include an item of $150,000 for planning and design of the Millers Ferry Lock and Dam on the Alabama River in the State of Alabama. We are taking this means respectfully to urge you and the other House conferees to accept this item as provided in the Senate version.

It is our sincere belief that an early beginning of construction on this already authorized project would not only benefit Alabama and the South, but would provide vast benefits for the entire Nation.

The Coosa-Alabama River, draining a basin 650 miles long and covering 22,800 square miles, flows from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. It is the second largest river flowing from headquarters in the Appalachian Mountains. Among the major centers along its bank are Rome, Anniston, Gadsden, Talladega, Montgomery, and Selma. More than 1.4 million people live in this basin and the great cities of Birmingham and Atlanta lie just outside its boundaries.

Full development of this waterway and basin would mean adequate hydroelectric power for industrial purposes, employment for its people, cheap water rate transportation, freedom from floods, and enjoyable recreation areas. The defense bulwark of our Nation would be substantially aided by the fast, safe movement of vital defense elements such as petroleum, chemicals, pulp, building materials, and ore. For the Coosa-Alabama Basin is rich in resources. Steel and iron mills along the river use ore coming into this country through the port of Mobile. Vast coal deposits are available for wider distribution if afforded river transportation.

Recognizing the staggering potential of this waterway, the 79th Congress in 1945 enacted Public Law 14, authorizing development of the Coosa Alabama, including construction of a multipurpose dam at Millers Ferry, and two other dams on the Alabama River. Since then, a private concern, the Alabama Power Co., has begun a multimillion dollar series of dams on the upper stretches of the waterway. The Federal Government has not kept the pace, and the work authorized 12 years ago on the Alabama River remains unstarted.

We believe that the time for this construction is compelling. We express the sentiment of the entire Alabama delegation, and affected sections of Georgia, when we again ask that funds in the amount of $150,000 be appropriated for this purpose at this time.

Very sincerely,

FRANK BOYKIN,
Member of Congress.
GEORGE GRANT,
Member of Congress.
ALBERT RAINS,
Member of Congress.
KENNETH ROBERTS,
Member of Congress.
ARMISTEAD SELDEN,
Member of Congress.
ERWIN MITCHELL,
Member of Congress.

The Court, the Constitution, and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana delivered an address before the students of Southwestern Louisiana Institute in Lafayette, entitled "The Court, the Constitution and the People."

Chief Justice Fournet has had a distinguished career as a practicing attorney, a public servant, a lawmaker and an outstanding jurist. Before his elevation to the highest court in his native State, Chief Justice Fournet served as lieutenant governor of Louisiana and as presiding officer of the State senate.

By virtue of his profound knowledge of law and his long years of training and practical experience in government, I know of no man better qualified than Chief Justice Fournet to talk before a student body about the court, the Constitution and the people. He knows so well that in practical operation our form of government resembles a three-lane highway, one lane being occupied by the legislative branch, represented by Congress, whose function is to make the laws and nothing else; the second being occupied by the executive branch, headed by the President, whose duty is to enforce the laws and keep the peace and nothing else, and the third lane being occupied by the judicial branch, represented by the courts, whose province is to interpret the laws and nothing else. And I know his deep concern about the fact that just as, if one motorist overlaps the lane of another someone will get hurt, so also, if the temporary servants in one branch of the government undertake to preempt the functions of one or both of the others, the rights expressly reserved by the 10th amendment to the States and the people will certainly be seriously impaired, if not ultimately destroyed. And yet, as befits the dignity of the high post he occupies, Chief Justice Fournet handled his assigned subject before the students of that outstanding institution in my congressional district calmly and dispassionately.

I procured a copy of this address for the use of the special subcommittee created last year to study questions raised by recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and I commend it to the careful study of all my colleagues in this body.

The address follows:

Meeting with you tonight is but the continuation of a day that will linger long in my memory as it is relived again in future transient reflections. It furnishes abundant proof of the fact that one does not live long before he realizes how short is a lifetime and how many added lifetimes he will need to deserve the kindness the world shows him in the first. For this reason I am thankful I enjoy good health. A weaker man might well be overcome by the kindness that has been showered on me on this day alone.

I was already overwhelmed this afternoon when inducted into honorary membership in the Pi Lambda Beta prelaw fraternity and the Pi Gamma Mu social science fraternity. Following this was the wonderful party given Mrs. Fournet and me by the Lafayette Bar Association. This banquet is indeed a fitting climax to a really wonderful day of wonderful experiences. Of course, I could add that it would be even more wonderful if I didn't have to make this after-dinner address. The mood in which I find myself at this moment is certainly more conducive to sitting back, relaxing, and enjoying myself.

Seriously speaking, while rank sentimentalism should never enter such festivities, I must give expression to the natural emotions evoked and begin by thanking all who have given so generously of their time and talents to those details that have made the occasion possible. I am very grateful to my good friend, J. J. Davidson for acting as toastmaster, and to your great President Fletcher for his kind words of introduction. My special thanks go to Jewel Parkerson Roy, who first conveyed to me the news I would be the recipient of these honors, and who has had such a large part in planning and coordinating the details that have made it a glorious success. To all who are here tonight—including those who have no other reason than personal friendship—thank you for the luster your presence adds to this already memorable day.

In informing me of my selection for honorary membership in Pi Lambda Beta and Pi Gamma Mu, Jewel wrote these were being conferred for my "long and distinguished service to our people in the fields of work represented" by these respective fraternities. If the performance of my duties in accordance with my oath of office—that is, to the best of my understanding and ability—merits this special commendation, then I am naturally filled with a deep sense of gratification, for the esteem of my fellow men is, in itself, the brightest medal, the highest award, I have ever hoped to receive. It is in this spirit that I have, with all humility, accepted the honors conferred upon me today. They will serve to stimulate my desire to raise to even loftier heights all future efforts I may be privileged to exert in promoting a better understanding by our people of the role the law and social sciences play in molding their lives under our constitutionally guaranteed government of freedom and happiness.

Many occasions arise that require me to speak to lawyers and judges—perhaps too many. For this reason I ask that my professional brothers bear with me as I address my remarks primarily to the student members of the host fraternities and to their faculty leaders. These teachers are, after all, the advance guard on the frontiers of human knowledge that is now forging for our students the vital link that will weld into their solution of the staggering problems of this space age the wisdom that has come to us from the ancients.

It is well known that when a Texas is asked to make a speech—in or out of Texas—the first subject that comes to his mind is Texas. I suppose it is almost as well known that when a judge is asked to speak, his mind turns automatically to the law and the courts. This is true in my case.

The judiciary was not originally my ambition in life. The advocacy of the cause of others and the political arena were more to my liking. But a man is not the architect of his own destiny, and, with the donning of the judicial robes, I turned from advocacy and politics and have made the law and the improvement of justice my life's work. To this end my paramount desire, outside of my regular court duties, has been to instill in our people a greater understanding of and reverence for the judicial branch of our Government.

That desire finds roots in an abiding conviction thatour American way of life depends upon public confidence in our courts and honor and respect for the men who wear the black robe upon its benches. This is so because under our system of government the courts occupy a unique position of extraordinary importance. Underlying their obvious function of reconciling the conflicts of individuals with themselves and with the State is the inherent task of keeping separated in their respective orbits of influence the State and Federal governments, and of maintaining in proper perspective those delicate checks and balances that prevent encroachment by the legislative, executive, or judicial divisions upon the prerogatives of the others. To this end the courts enjoy the high privilege of interpreting the Constitution under which we live and of judging the nature and extent of their own perimeter of influence. Judges are, consequently, with the exception of the people themselves, from whose hands alone can come the supreme law of the land, the final architects of our governmental structure. And the only restraint the Constitution places upon their exercise of this high function is that of self-restraint.

Justice Story—the great author, educator, lawyer, and jurist—once emphasized the importance of the role of the courts in our lives in this way, and I quote: "Where there is no judicial department to enforce rights, the Government must either perish by its own imbecility, or the other departments of Government must usurp power * * * to the destruction of liberty. The will of those who govern will become, under such circumstances, absolute and despotic; and it is wholly immaterial whether that power is vested in a single tyrant or in an assembly of tyrants."

Because, therefore, of a deep love of country, a consecration to our American way of life, and an empassioned belief in the God-given rights of man as set out in our Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in our Constitution.

I feel impelled tonight to comment upon the implications inherent in the recent trend of decisions in the Highest Court in our land that is causing much dissension and confusion among our people. This trend is not only undermining the confidence our people have long reposed in the Court's ability to preserve the fundamental and essential elements of government under a written constitution, but is having a marked effect upon the solution of the many problems that face our way of life in all of its many aspects.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the decisions of the United States Supreme Court that are subjecting it to the most adverse criticism it has had to weather in its long and honored history, even though this criticism is unquestionably exciting widespread concern for the Court's attitude to its proper governmental role and enveloping it with a thickening shadow of disrespect. Suffice it to say there is today a growing alarm among the people who feel this Court is gradually arrogating unto itself legislative power and executive functions never surrendered to the judicial branch of the Government or even contemplated by the leaders who molded the Original Thirteen Colonies into a united whole and which none of the illustrious and learned men who, until recently, graced that august bench, would have dreamed of exercising.

As a result, large segments of our people contend that something is happening to the law of our land and the supposed sovereignty of our States. Serious thinking and discussion by leaders in all walks of life is leading them to conclude that at no period in the history of our Republic has this country strayed further from the sound philosophy and principles upon which it was founded. Many are convinced that the Court is now—

before nebulous public resentment can become hardened public resistance—engaged in reshaping the form of our Government with a speed that will leave little recognizable in another generation. And, realizing that the easiest and quickest way our Constitution can be destroyed is in the Court, they read into this—whether rightly or wrongly—a suggested method whereby communism, reaching its deceptively paternal but erosive tentacles into even this high tribunal can, with confidence, undertake, in this vulnerable spot, its long-range plan of wiping from existence our beneficient guaranties of individual freedom under law.

These expressions on the part of so many of our people evidence a growing fear that our Republic will be destroyed if government under written law is permitted—unchecked—to give way to government of expedience dependent upon the will or whim of men swayed by shortsighted popular passions of the moment. To prove this fear is real and not imaginary, these dissidents point to rulings which they assert evidence the fact that the Court—with the stroke of a pen and without a vote at the polls or in legislative halls—is tipping so crazily our structure of triple checks the symmentry of the whole is becoming the trepidation of the balance.

Almost daily we find commentators, authors, and speakers, reaching unfortunately, a wide audience that is not entirely sure of the exact meanings conveyed, asserting that these revolutionary and far-reaching decisions are casting into oblivion the constitutional barriers that have long shielded the States from the creeping paralysis of an encroaching Federal Government, thus depriving the individual States of their sovereign rights so meticulously reserved in the Constitution. They say, further, that the Court with an increasingly nationalistic attitude is creating a Federal citizenship supposedly immune from State regulation and control, and also, in an overpaternalistic attitude, is, by resort to novel theories and unreasonable technicalities of construction, hedging individuals about with rights never intended by the Constitution, with the result that law enforcement is breaking down and peaceful citizens find it dangerous to venture onto our streets, while criminals walk them without fear of reprisal. In the process the Court has unwittingly trespassed upon two of the most basic rights of the States, that is, the police power whereby they maintain law and order, and the right of State courts to try and punish those who contravene State laws.

Possibly the gravest concern is being voiced by those who feel the trend of the Court's decisions shows a marked solicitude for subversives, and, in this way, furthers the cause of communism. The decisions evidencing this trend, it is asserted, are those that hamstring legislative investigations—so necessary for the proper functioning of our lawmaking bodies—by denying the right of committees to question the communistic leanings and actions of witnesses; strip from the Secretary of State his congressional authority to discharge known Communists in his ranks; nullify the right of States to ferret from their official family adherents of communistic ideologies under the pretext Congress preempted the field, although a contrary intention is expressed in the legislation itself; compel States to admit to the practice of law known Communists tainted with criminal backgrounds, despite the fact the State courts have, traditionally, been the sole judges of the moral fitness and character of those who would practice before them; and prohibit the States from removing Communists who have infiltrated strategically vulnerable positions in our educational institutions for the purpose of undermining—in their formative years—our impressionable youth, upon whose shoulders will rest the task of securing in tomorrow's world the liberties we have enjoyed in today's.

This alleged solicitude caused an Indiana Senator to say last year, in proposing legislation to restrict within constitutional bounds the Court's deflective wanderings from its judicial function, that "no conceivable combination of votes in Congress could have done as much damage to our legislative barriers against communism and subversion as the Supreme Court of the United States has done by its recent opinions."

Particularly alarming to the members of the legal profession is the fact that studies being made by Congress, bar associations, and other organizations reveal this usurpation of power by the Federal judiciary is being exercised without reliance on statutory law, constitutional mandate, or recognized legal principles developed in the jurisprudence, but, instead, upon books, treaties, committee testimony, articles, and pseudolegalistic papers that are without foundation in law and are, in fact, inimicable to our entire concept of government.

This brings to mind the unusual vision and foresight of Edward Douglass White, the only Louisianian to sit on our land's highest bench, when first ascending that bench in 1895 he pinpointed the danger inherent in a total disregard for constitutional precedents that have withstood all challenges for so many years. I believe his views in this respect, as well as his exposition of the function of the Court in upholding the Constitution, are well worth repeating, and I quote:

"My inability to agree with the Court in the conclusion which it has just expressed causes me much regret. Great as is my respect for any view by it announced, I cannot resist the conviction that its opinion and decree in this case virtually annuls its previous decisions in regard to the powers of Congress on the subject of taxation, and is therefore fraught with danger to the Court, to each and every citizen, and to the Republic. The conservation and orderly development of our institutions rests on our acceptance of the results of the past, and their use as lights to guide our steps in the future. Teach the lesson that settled principles may be overthrown at any time, and confusion and turmoil must ultimately result. In the discharge of its function of interpreting the Constitution, this Court exercises an august power. It sits removed from the contentions of political parties and the animosities of factions. It seems to me that the accomplishment of its lofty mission can only be secured by the stability of its teachings and the sanctity which surrounds them. If the permanency of its conclusions is to depend upon the personal opinions of those who, from time to time, may make up its membership, it will inevitably become a theater of political strife, and its action will be without coherence or consistency.

"There is no great principle of constitutional law * * * which has not been ultimately defined by the adjudications of this Court after long and earnest struggle. If we * * * are to appeal to the writings of economists in order to unsettle all these great principles, everything is lost and nothing saved to the people. The rights of every individual are guaranteed by the safeguards which have been thrown around them by our adjudications. If these are to be assailed and overthrown * * * the Federal Constitution is * * * of little worth. My strong convictions forbid that I take part in a conclusion which seems to be so full of peril to the country. I am unwilling to do so, without reference to the question of what my personal opinion on the subject might be if the question were a new one, and was thus unaffected by the action of the framers, the history of the Government, and the long line of decisions by this Court.

"The wisdom of our forefathers in adopting a written constitution has often been impeached upon the theory that the interpretation of a written instrument did not afford as complete protection to liberty as would be enjoyed under a constitution made up of the traditions of a free people. Writing, it has been said, does not insure greater stability than tradition does, while it destroys flexibility. The answer has always been that, by the foresight of the fathers, the construction of our written Constitution was ultimately confided to this body, which, from the nature of its judicial structure, could always be relied upon to act with perfect freedom from the influence of faction and to preserve the benefits of consistent interpretation.

"The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."[1]

While this warning apparently had a salutary effect, as the Court for many years clamped upon itself a proper judicial restraint, as above stated, we find that within the last two decades the Court is again, as the late Chief Justice Vanderbilt said, "fumbling at the task allotted it under the Constitution," in that its members seem determined to use the Court not as an agency for constitutionally shaping law, but as a forum for broadcasting individual theories and philosophies.

The really serious question all of this discussion, criticism, and confusion is bringing to the forefront is whether our Government under a written constitution is breaking down: whether the American theory that tried and true principles of government may be enshrined in a written constitution and entrusted to the courts for protection is proving to be illusory. Upon the way in which that question is answered depends the future of our Republic.

Let me hasten to assure you that although the conviction is growing the Court has done much damage to our Constitution and has strayed far from the sound philosophy in which it was conceived, this adverse criticism has not, as yet, done irreparable damage to the faith of our people in the Court as a necessary institution of orderly government, and the Court has not wandered so far from its assigned role it cannot be returned to its proper sphere. We do not, therefore, stand poised today in the center of such a crisis that hastily conceived plans must be accepted in the immediacy of the moment.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter very aptly pointed out in one of his concurring opinions[2] that "The accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however, slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority." The converse is equally true. Dangerous power, once assumed, cannot be destroyed in a day, or corrected with the stroke of a pen. The solution does not, therefore, lie in a rash of impulsive and lightly considered measures. In such a course lies as great a threat to the equilibrium that maintains the proper checks and balances in our political triumvirate as do

[1] *Pollock* v. *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. at p. 650).

[2] *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (96 L. ed. at p. 1170).

the present deflective tendencies of the so-called runaway Court.

The approach to the problem must, therefore, begin with confidence in the belief that enlightened and dispassionate public criticism of the Court's decisions will, in time, cause its members to reexamine their assigned function of interpreting, not making, the law; and to interpret that law in accordance with the intention of its redactors, leaving law revision and amendment to the people and their elected representatives. Only if this fails should resort be made to carefully considered plans for restricting the Court's jurisdiction in Congress within the authority vested in that lawmaking body by the Constitution. This way seem a slow method to an impatient man, but the alternative is misrule and a return to the tyranny from which our forefathers fled to found our Nation.

For this action to be effective, however, today is the time to carefully study the Court's traditional role in Government. Now is the time to formulate the constructive criticism and carefully considered disapprobation of the Court's departures from established constitutional doctrine that can, if voiced with sufficient force and volume, make itself heard in all three halls of Government.

Because citizen indifference and lethargy often reflect lack of information, it should be the duty of the legal profession to afford some leadership in directing the public's attention to this threat and to assist in the formulation of wise public opinion. But this responsibility does not rest alone upon the shoulders of the lawyer and the judge. It rests upon all citizens. And it does not rest heaviest upon the old and the retiring. It rests equally upon the maturing generations—the seedbeds generating today those forces that will determine the harvest of tomorrow.

It may be felt I have chosen an inappropriate audience of young, unseasoned minds before which to place such a weighty matter. I do not think so. It is among such young students as we have here tonight that lies the nucleus of the minds that will, in the not too distant future, take over the reins of government. In them, therefore, lies our hope for a return of the proper balance in our triumvirate of government and the preservation of our constitution if our way of life is to survive.

It is difficult for one generation to understand those who will one day supplant it, or for the newcomers, trying their strong young wings for the first time, to look upon their elders as capable of meeting on equal ground the foibles and complexities of a new age. Yet each succeeding generation seems to carve for itself its own special niche in the framework that has been built by those who have gone before, and, together, there is no task we cannot, with faith in our individual and collective resourcefulness and initiative, accomplish.

It is for this reason that I draw much comfort from the intelligent and courageous countenances of my audience, and particularly the younger members. My brief conversations today with these young college students has confirmed what I find everywhere. The youth of this Nation are conscious of the precious legacy of constitutional government to which they stand in heirship. And they can be relied upon to accept their responsibilities as citizens in their search for guidance in the future in the tradition of our country's glorious past.

I would admonish them tonight, however, to guard against, as Congressman WILLIS said in a recent speech, becoming so engrossed in the present-day emphasis on the sputniks and the muttniks, the brilliance of the atomic bomb, the speed of the guided missile, and the supposed progress Russia is making in the scientific field they will be weaned away from the erosions occurring in our constitutional government.

Instead, live closer to our constitution, and endeavor to fully understand its true meaning. Learn of the manner in which it was created, what its antecedents were, who wrote it, their philosophical and political aims, and how they devised this document as the necessary implement to the preservation of liberty as we know it. Recapture that meaning, revitalize the Spirit of '76, and make both an integral part of your educational heritage as free Americans. Let time increase—never diminish—their significance. Only when you fully know your rights under the Constitution and your power to change or protect it, can you make it serve to safeguard your freedom.

Young ladies and young gentlemen, the future is yours, and the opportunities for service and distinguished citizenship were never greater. I have full confidence that you possess the vigorous, imaginative, and courageous leadership so vitally needed today for tomorrow's world. And I have every faith that, with your guidance, our glorious heritage of freedom under the Constitution will be preserved, inviolate, for the generations that follow.

Outstanding University of Wisconsin Summer Course Emphasizes the Importance of Speech Therapy for the Nation's Children and Adults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the Nation's summer sessions at colleges and universities, a great many fine courses and institutes are being held.

Today, I should like to single out one, because it symbolizes, I believe, education at its best. Moreover, it symbolizes man's interest in helping others to help themselves.

OUTSTANDING LEADERS AT JULY COURSE AT MADISON

On July 14, there commenced at the University of Wisconsin, in Madison, a summer course which will conclude the coming Saturday, July 26. The course is entitled "The Rehabilitation of the Adult with Language and Auditory Disorders."

To this postgraduate course have come some of Wisconsin's most outstanding experts in the field of speaking and hearing. They have been joined there by leaders from other universities and speech and hearing centers and organizations in other States.

MAN MUST COMMUNICATE

So far as a layman is concerned, he may not realize offhand how important it is that youngsters or adults who may not speak or hear well should be enabled to improve their faculties.

Yet, as I have previously pointed out, notably in my Senate statement of April 3rd, which appears on page A3221 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, ours is a communications age. We must communicate with others; others must be able to communicate with us.

CHILDHOOD IS THE TIME TO BEGIN

One can hardly estimate the impact on the mind of a sensitive child if his schoolmates laugh at him and taunt him because he cannot speak or hear well. Can any human being estimate the amount of human misery that has been caused and the human suffering and anguish when, for example, a handicapped child runs away in tears because his playmates have teased him beeause of a lisp, a stutter or some other impairment?

Thanks, however, to speech and hearing therapists, those impairments, whether because of physical or emotional reasons, are being overcome with the inspired aid of inspired people.

This Nation needs more speech and hearings therapists, just as it needs more therapists to deal with other human needs.

THE SOUTH TAKES A CONSTRUCTIVE LOOK AT ITS PROBLEMS

I cite, for example, a splendid, frank report issued in 1955 by the Southern Regional Education Board, at 830 West Peachtree Street NW., in Atlanta, Ga. The report is entitled "Teachers for the South's Handicapped Children." The notable Commission on Training of Teachers of Handicapped Children reported that the South's handicapped youngsters needed 26,000 teachers, but that at that time only 3,700 such special teachers were available to cope with all such handicaps.

The largest group of handicapped children in the South—no less than 450,000 in number—is composed of those who have speech defects. Two thousand two hundred and fifty speech correctionists would be needed, according to the usual professional estimate. Yet, only 427 speech correctionists were available.

The report states that in the South there are 90,000 hard-of-hearing children. Three thousands teachers were need for them; but only 56 teachers were available for that work.

Let me say that these statistics regarding the inadequate number of therapists should not be regarded as a reflection on the South or as indicating that only the South is faced with this problem. On the contrary, the South is to be commended for the leadership it has shown. Moreover, if comparable figures were available for the Northern States, they would also show a shortage—possibly less acute, but nonetheless severe.

In connection with this problem, let no man point the finger of criticism at any State of the Union. Each of us should work to the fullest extent possible to meet the needs, both in our own State and in the entire Nation.

In the South there are a great many outstanding educators, outstanding therapists, outstanding school districts, and outstanding leaders. Our task is to encourage and stimulate the pioneering work in special education which has been done in the South and everywhere else in the Nation.

I send to the desk three items which I believe will illustrate the points I have made thus far.

LETTER FROM PROFESSOR IRWIN, IN MADISON

The first comes from my own State, and it is accompanied by excerpts from a fine letter to me from Prof. John V. Irwin, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic of the University of Wisconsin. So I submit excerpts from the university's publication on the summer course, including a list of the noteworthy visiting and home faculty.

The second item consists of excerpts from a letter from another honored director of a hearing and speech center, Dr. William G. Hardy, of the famed Johns Hopkins Hospital, in Baltimore. Earlier this year, Dr. Hardy submitted an informal analysis to an interested individual. The analysis is so helpful that I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

JANESVILLE CHILD HELPED BY THERAPISTS

Third, I submit an article, from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette, which explains how one youngster, born with a cleft palate and lip, is being helped to overcome her speech defect.

As Dr. Kenneth O. Johnson, executive director of the American Speech and Hearing Association, wrote to me:

The State of Wisconsin has excellent representation in the field of speech and hearing.

Dr. Johnson went on to point out that Wisconsin and other States would be helped if Congress enacted legislation to stimulate the use of therapy in this vital field.

America will pay a great price if it does not attend to this need—a price not simply measured in dollars and cents, but one measured in human distress, maladjustment, and inadequacy. Is it not far better to pay the more modest financial price of constructive and effective Federal, State, and local action? Are we not thereby helping to preserve human values?

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letters and bulletin, and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH,
Madison, June 10, 1958.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: A copy of your newsletter of March 13, 1958, has been called to my attention. In it I noticed with considerable interest the picture of you with the 1958 polio poster youngsters, and the accompanying statement that you made concerning your interest and efforts in connection with handicapped children.

It is, indeed, encouraging to those of us who are working at the grassroots level to find the kind of support that you are offering. As senior Senator of the State of Wisconsin, I hope you will continue to regard the investment of time and money in the training of those who will work with the handicapped as a legitimate function of Government.

I thought you might be interested in the summer programs of the University of Wisconsin at Madison with the speech handicapped. The brochure on the 2-week course in the Rehabilitation of the Adult With Language and Auditory Disorders describes one of our programs in this field. You will be interested to know that this particular short course has largely been made possible by the support of the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The bulletin of the department of speech describes on page 7 the children's clinics that will function this summer. Funds from a variety of sources support this fine program.

I should be very pleased to supply you with further information about activities in this field at the university.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. IRVIN,
Professor of Speech; Director, Speech and Hearing Clinic.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT SUMMER SESSIONS—A 2-WEEK COURSE IN THE REHABILITATION OF THE ADULT WITH LANGUAGE AND AUDITORY DISORDERS, THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, SPONSORED BY THE FEDERAL OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, THE SUMMER SESSIONS

SPECIAL FEATURES, JULY 14–JULY 26, 1958

Ten outstanding authorities in speech and hearing.

Twenty $100 traineeships available.

Completely air-conditioned classrooms.

Closed-circuit TV clinical demonstrations.

Registration for credit or for audit.

VISITING FACULTY

Virgil A. Anderson, Ph. D., professor of speech; director, speech and hearing clinic, Stanford University, California; author of Training the Speaking Voice and Improving the Child's Speech.

Harlan H. Bloomer, Ph. D., professor of speech; director, speech clinic, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; particularly known for his clinical and experimental work pertaining to organic speech disorders; contributing author to Handbook of Speech Pathology.

Leo G. Doerfler, Ph. D., director, department of audiology, University of Pittsburgh, Pa.; vice president, ASHA, 1958; authority on galvanic-skin response audiometry and consultant in audiology to the Veterans' Administration.

Jon Eisenson, Ph. D., professor of speech; director, speech and hearing clinic, Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.; president, ASHA, 1958; author of Examining for Aphasia and coauthor of Speech Disorders.

LeRoy D. Hedgecock, Ph. D., consulting audiologist, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; contributing author to Hearing Therapy for Children; speech-reading consultant for OVR-Hear Lip Reading by Television Series.

James F. Jerger, Ph. D., assistant professor in audiology, hearing clinic, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; active contributor to recent significant audiological research.

Kenneth O. Johnson, Ph. D., executive secretary, ASHA, Washington, D. C.; formerly chief, audiology and speech correction for the Veterans' Administration, and more recently director, San Francisco Hearing and Speech Center.

Frank M. Lassman, Ph. D., associate professor of audiology and speech, department of otolaryngology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; consultant in audiology to the Veterans' Administration.

J. M. Nielsen, M. D., clinical professor of medicne (neurology), school of medicine, University of California, at Los Angeles; author of Agnosia, Apraxia, and Aphasia.

Joseph M. Wepman, Ph. D., head, speech clinic, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; author of Recovery From Aphasia and coauthor of The Halstead-Wepman Aphasia Screening Test.

GENERAL INFORMATION, COURSE DESCRIPTION

Title: The Rehabilitation of Adults With Language and Auditory Disorders.

Purpose: The purpose of this course is to provide postgraduate study and training at a professional level for practicing speech and hearing therapists to enable them to work more effectively with adults suffering from language and auditory disorders.

Staff: The teaching staff of the course consists of 10 national leaders in the fields of adult language and auditory rehabilitation, plus 5 members of the staff of the University of Wisconsin.

University of Wisconsin staff members: Arnold E. Aronson, Ph. D., assistant professor of speech; John Z. Bowers, M. D.; dean of the medical school; Claude S. Hayes, Ph. D., assistant professor of speech; John V. Irwin, Ph. D., professor of speech; Edward P. Roemer, M. D., associate clinical professor of neurology.

Lectures: Closed-circuit TV demonstrations; discussions; integrated films, slides, transcriptions, original text materials.

THE JOHN HOPKINS HOSPITAL,
Baltimore, Md.

* * * * *

There are many ramifications in this matter of helping children with hearing, language, and speech disorders. In the first place, their numbers are growing. This apparently results from three things: (1) Prevalence of these disorders naturally grows as one aspect of general increase in population; (2) many children these days are being brought through stormy prenatal and perinatal environment who 15 years ago would have been on the lists of infant mortality; and (3) diagnostic differentiation is improving. The fact is that there are many more multiple handicaps among relatively well children than there used to be.

You may know of a survey made a few years ago by the Southern Regional Education Board, a general inquiry of all the colleges and universities in the 14 Southern States directed toward finding the facts regarding training facilities, number of trainees, number of employed teachers, number of teachers needed, and the like, relative to the atypical child (all types and kinds).

* * * * *

There are multiple problems regarding procurement of trainees, financing training programs, providing scholarships, and so on.

The other side of the picture has to do with the work of paramedicine, in terms of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, habilitation, and so forth, particularly in the preschool years. These are the main interests of an organization like my own department, and we all work closely with the people in the NIH, in several other departments of HEW, and at the State and local levels. It is important to attack these problems at the level of fundamental science and careful research investigation. This is equally true, of course, in education; much remains to be learned about specific procedures in training, so that these many crippled children can best be guided to develop the tools of learning which are explicit in hearing, in language-development, and in speech, as well as in reading. Excellent work is underway in many places at the local level, in health, and school-health programs; this needs manifold extension, in both health and education.

Various programs are underway, or in development, in many States, centering, for the most part, under the health departments and dependent on funds supplied by the Children's Bureau in maternal and child care and in crippled children's services. Having been the consultant in audiology for many years with the Children's Bureau, I have had an opportunity to watch (and in some part, to help) these programs develop. Much more needs to be done.

In other regards, many more trained researchers are needed. To this end, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and

Blindness, has instituted a new training course in otolaryngology. The work needed far supercedes traditional clinical training, and it will be necessary to interest more and more young professionals in the academic and research sides of medicine.

So, too, with the supply of teachers, particularly at the preschool and elementary levels. Every category of atypical children is in short supply, and there are relatively few teachers who can work at the public school level in hearing and language and speech. Much more has traditionally been done for the deaf child in residential education. Recently, however, there has been a definite trend toward developing better special educational services in the various communities. This cannot continue and mature until and unless more teachers can be interested in special education. This, in turn, requires the development of more and better departments of special education at the college level of teacher training. Some of the lag is financial; some reflects a longterm disinterest on the part of the typical educator in the problems of the atypical children. We meet this last almost daily. This probably involves a real job in public relations.

These, then, are a few of the aspects, all too briefly presented. One cannot buy intelligent, devoted teachers, clinicians, researchers, and college and university specialists: They must be trained and developed. Despite some of the current hue and cry about our national needs in high science, there are other needs that are quite as pressing. One wonders about the long-range objectives of a stellar program of defense (necessary as this is) when the evidence mounts so rapidly to demonstrate that larger and larger groups of our population are coming along as atypical, exceptional, defective, retarded, or otherwise deviant children, whose needs are not being met. Perhaps some of this in larger form will be forthcoming in the 1960 White House Conference on Children.

* * * * *

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM G. HARDY, Ph. D.,
Director, Hearing and Speech Center, Associate Professor of Otolaryngology, and Environmental Medicine.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette]

PLAYING GAMES HELPS THERAPIST OVERCOME CHILD'S SPEECH DEFECTS

(By Bernice Warner)

Little Martha Anderson, 4-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mr. John E. Anderson, 509 East Milwaukee Street, is one of those unfortunate children who was born with a cleft palate and lip. But, unlike children of an earlier era who were doomed to go through life with a disfiguring handicap, Martha is facing a future just as bright and full of hope as every other child.

Thanks to modern surgery, understanding parents, and the help of a trained speech therapist, Martha will enter kindergarten fully equipped to meet the challenge of a whole new world.

An exceptionally bright youngster, Martha is making such splendid progress under her therapist, Mrs. O. D. Miller, 521 North Ringold Street, that her lessons will end in the very near future. She is one of the lucky ones. An operation while she was still a baby was unusually successful. Only the retraction muscles were left affected, so that her greatest speech difficulty lies in the "S" sounds. The "L" gives her some trouble, but this comparatively minor.

Mrs. Miller has been working with Martha for some time, helping to restore the muscle movement of her mouth and lips. She is convinced that by the time Martha enters kindergarten, her speech will be completely normal.

THERAPY WORKED AS GAMES

Because of Martha's age, working with her has presented some problems, but Mrs. Miller has solved them by turning the speech therapy into games a 4-year-old can understand and enjoy. "Pounding the nail" involves a "tuh" sound and is repeated at increasingly fast rate; imitating the sounds of various motors gives exercise to the weakened muscles.

One of the most popular games with Martha is hide and seek, in which her teacher hides picture cards for Martha to find and identify. Another is follow the leader, with the pupil imitating the sounds the teacher makes, or vice versa. The earliest training was based on learning whether or not Martha recognized the difference between a correct and incorrect sound, and for this Mrs. Miller evolved a game that combined recognition with important muscular exercises. The teacher would show her pupil a picture of a simple object and then pronounce the name. If she pronounced it correctly, Martha would blow a feather into the air; if incorrectly, she was required to blow a ping-pong ball across the table. Originally unable to purse her lips, Martha now, through corrective exercise, has excellent muscular control in the affected area.

Mrs. Miller describes the Andersons as ideal parents who cooperate fully with their daughter's training. Sometimes work accomplished by a therapist is completely undone in the home, but this is not true in Martha's case. The Andersons work continuously and patiently with their daughter and have been an important factor in her remarkable progress.

Example of Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the world is on edge and tempers flare, it is good to read of an example of sportsmanship between peoples.

The following story has been read by millions of sports-minded people. I am pleased that a crew representing my State of Washington has perhaps brought a bit of better understanding by its members' conduct, their sportsmanship and their ability.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the story, written by George N. Meyers, sports editor of the Seattle Times.

P. S.—The Huskies Won.

The article follows:

HUSKIES THRIVE ON BORSCH AS DAY OF BIG RACE NEARS

(By Georg N. Meyers)

Moscow, July 17.—If borsch is the secret source of Russian rowing prowess, the Washington Huskies may make trouble for the Soviet shells in their international regatta Saturday.

Leningradskaya Hotel chefs have been serving the stuff in big ladles to the first American crew ever to row here.

"It tastes fine to me," said John Bisset, Washington coxswain. "As far as I'm concerned, it's a floating meal."

The oarsmen also are sampling beef stroganoff—the original version—and Siberian ravioli soup. Coach Al Ulbrickson forbids them to have anything to do with Moscow water; they drink synthetic fruit juice instead.

NONE BRAVE ENOUGH FOR KVAS

No one in the Husky party has been adventurous enough to try the Russian workers' favorite drink, kvas. It's a pale liquid made from dry bread.

Russian cake and ice cream, the Huskies find, go down as easily as at home.

The Huskies are taking their daily routine in Moscow in stride. Even without an interpreter they are brave enough to step up to a counter and buy postcards, using sign language.

Russians in the bigger hotels also are getting used to the Yanks. Some 1,600 American tourists now are visiting the Soviet Union.

VIEW FROM NO. 5 SEAT NOT ENOUGH

"I wish we could see more of this country ourselves," said Chuck Aim, Husky captain. "You don't see much from a No. 5 oar."

Ulbrickson is holding acceptance of entertainment invitations to a minimum. He figures his main job is making a respectable representation in the rematch with the Leningrad Trud Club Saturday.

The Huskies got a tremendous thrill last night out of attending a soccer game in vast Central Lenin Stadium, along with 100,000 cheering Russian fans.

The Huskies rowed as usual this afternoon on Khimkinskoe Reservoir, scene of Saturday's race. They were unaware of a political demonstration by 2,000 Russians at the American Embassy.

The time of the Huskies' Saturday race today was set at 8:10 a. m., Seattle time.

Segregation at Levittown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the July issue of the Bucks County Traveler there appeared an article by Alan Miller, editor and publisher of the magazine, commenting upon the recent announcement of Builder William Levitt that his Levittown in Burlington, N. J., will be limited to whites only. The subject of this article is a matter for the conscience of Congress and the American people.

LOOKING OVER THE COUNTY

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

"* * * And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually

pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

National holidays seem to lose their commemorative essence, especially when they fall on a weekend. There is something about the prospect of a few days of leisure, the lure of the road, the feel of the fishing rod, that betrays us into forgetting how hard won these holidays come to us. The brilliance of fireworks and the happy furor of parades have a tendency to obscure rather than emphasize the fact that men suffered, fought, died to give us almost every one of our major national days off.

It would be an utter negation of the spirit of their efforts even to imply that they did so grudgingly, and to indicate that anything less than joyful celebration of their success would be in order; we print the foregoing words from the Declaration of Independence, as a reader service and reminder for those who may find refreshment in a moment of rededication to great human aims.

Controversy is normally foreign to the intent of the Traveler, since there always seem to be enough people around to pick up cudgels of various sizes for causes of various merits. Once in a rare while, though, we think that the proprietorship of paper and print carries an obligation of good conscience and a word for the right.

Such an occasion arises with the recent announcement by Builder William Levitt that the privilege of purchasing a home in his new projected Levittown in Burlington, N. J., will be limited to whites only. He has further announced that 27 bankers have promised to provide $200 million in mortgage money for buyers.

Several organizations were quick to protest the announcement of this policy, and the State of New Jersey is at present holding the issue in prospective contest at law. We have scanned the press, both local and national, however, in vain search of comment, and we feel that there are a number of words to be said on the subject.

To be sure that they are said clearly, let us specify our own position in the matter. This is no attempt to say that anyone must be forced to live next to a Negro; individual right dictates a free choice of neighbors. Nor is it our purpose here to defend the Negro as a human being and citizen; that is the province of others, and still a matter of personal belief and preference. We are concerned, though, and distressed, by Levitt's violence to reason and principle, lovely daughters of the human mind.

On the 10th anniversary of Levittown, Long Island, Levitt loftily announced: "A purchaser is not just buying a house; he's buying a way of life. * * * A community builder who faces up to his responsibilities is a good citizen." It was even conceivable that despite the fact that he refused to comment on the disturbances of last fall in Levittown, Pa., some regret at the consequences of his policy might have entered Levitt's consciousness and tempered his future judgment. He has, to do him justice, personally piously deplored segregation, and has ruefully characterized it as an economic exigency of mass marketing of houses; sadly but adroitly he shifts part of the blame to the 27 bankers; and regretfully scoops up a profit which should not amount to less than $2 million on a venture of this size.

Levitt's houses are good value, and ownership of one of them is to an extent a privilege, an economic advantage. What a shame it seems to confer privilege and advantage on the man to whose level Levitt sinks in endorsing the emotional fallacy of racial desirability. What a remarkable gesture it is for a man who claims to face up to his responsibilities as a good citizen to place all the economic might and prestige of $200 million in support of the easy viciousness that insists that intermarriage is the Negro's fondest wish, that ritual infanticide is Jewish law, that the Pope has an office picked out in the White House.

It would seem reasonable to us that a man who is merely making an extra $2 million might do just as well to devote some effort to the constructive aim of proving that the Negro who enjoys sufficient economic status to own a Levitt house can be an acceptable neighbor to the man who has the good will to let him prove that economic circumstance can be a greater determinant of social desirability and self-respect than racial bloodlines.

All of this will displease some hasty readers. We hope, though, that they will understand that it is prompted not by disrespect for their preferences, but by great sadness at Levitt's position, which is offensive to logic, and degrading to human dignity. If he insists on attaching his name to each community he erects, could that name not stand for something more than an inverted ghetto?

Tallassee Tribune Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, one of Alabama's and one of the Nation's finest examples of good journalism is the Tallassee Tribune, which serves and is dedicated to the growth and prosperity of greater Tallassee, Ala.

This fine weekly newspaper, under the guidance of Editor-Publisher Herve Charest, Jr., has reaped many awards.

Among these awards was, in 1956, the National Editorial Association citation at third place winner in its circulation class in the general excellence classification.

Recognition again has come to the Tribune. At its annual convention recently, the National Editorial Association listed the Tallassee newspaper as one of 192 small-town journals to receive awards.

Bringing the Tribune award home was Paul Banister, veteran Linotype columnist-operator, whose column Flowers for the Living, took second place honors in competition with newspapers from over the Nation.

Mr. Banister's series of articles regularly chooses one of Tallassee's citizens to pay tribute to the citizen's contributions to community life.

I know the Members of the Congress join me in congratulating the Tallassee Tribune and Paul Banister for the splendid way in which they are dedicated to the highest ideals of American journalism.

Under leave to extend, I wish to include an editorial from the Tribune which appeared following the award presentation:

FLOWERS FOR BANISTER

Last year our coworker, Paul Banister, conceived the idea of writing a column bestowing flowers for the living on some of Tallassee's solid citizens.

The idea was to honor some of our everyday garden-variety citizens who by virtue of going about their daily business had, in some way brightened the lives of their friends and neighbors and made our community a better place in which to live. It was assumed that our more prominent citizens, by virtue of their wealth, social position or even business leadership, were subjects for newspaper stories week in and week out.

The column, like the idea, was good and our readers responded with a splendid show of enthusiasm.

Last week in Detroit, Paul's venture paid off in still another way. His column was awarded second piece in the national better newspaper contest conducted annually by the National Editorial Association. It marked the second national honor to come to the Tribune staff in 3 years. It was well deserved and we feel sure our readers will join us in congratulating Paul on this recognition.

And this is probably a good time to repeat the old saw, "If you build a better mousetrap (or write a better column) the world will beat a path to your door."

Defense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the July 17, 1958, issue of the Seattle Times, I believe, expresses the views of the vast majority of people in this country. I recommend it for all to read.

IN DEFENSE OF OUR OWN FREEDOM

The American people do not rejoice to see United States Marines debark in battle dress on foreign shores.

To many, the United States position appears awkward in view of United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold's apparent opposition to sending any sizable U. N. military force into Lebanon.

There is no call anywhere in our land to strike up the band or break out the colors.

Propagandists in Moscow, in Cairo and elsewhere to the contrary, we are not imperialists.

But we do intend to defend ourselves. And that, in essence, is what we are doing in Lebanon.

Modern defense frontiers do not begin along the 49th parallel or the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific. Nor do they all exist only in a strictly military sense.

The modern defense frontier cannot always be drawn on a map. Nor can the status of our defenses ever be measured precisely.

Involved are such intangibles as degree of influence, power, prestige and control in certain key areas of the globe. These intangibles bear direct relationships to such tangibles as air fields, oil fields and election results.

It is well in the present circumstances to remind ourselves of a fact that often has been pointed out before: There is more than one way in which our freedom, our security, and our independence can be lost.

This country could be the object of a direct and massive military attack. But it also could be nibbled to death. In area after area around the globe, our influence could progressively diminish, and that of our enemies could grow until our land becomes a fearful garrison state, and we are forced to live a rigid, wretched, rationed existence, surrounded by hostility—ready for the kill.

To prevent such a development ever from occurring, we defend various types of fron-

tiers thousands of miles to the east and to the west.

There are physical frontiers such as the Elbe River in Germany, the Strait of Formosa, and the center of Korea. And there are less easily defined frontiers having to do with maintaining certain positions of strength, control or influence in such areas as Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

Our position in the Middle East rests in part upon certain formal and informal understandings with allies in the area. The revolts in Iraq and Lebanon this week brought the United States to the point where it either had to take military action in accordance with those understandings or back down from them.

Just as in Korea, this country did not choose to back down. But also as in Korea, we are acting with legality, with caution, and with restraint.

We are not aggressors; we are not adventurers. We are defending a position that must be maintained. And it is our prayerful hope to do so without fresh bloodshed.

The arrival of British paratroopers in nearby Jordan gave notice that our strongest and closest ally is prepared to share the hazards and the problems of this undertaking.

The bipartisan support given President Eisenhower's action by congressional leaders reflects the general support of the American people.

Farm Bill Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

FARM BILL COMPROMISE

The House seems to have recognized the necessity of passing some farm legislation at the present session, though its tentative vote on Monday for an inadequate surplus disposal bill was disappointing. If the measure cannot be improved before the decisive vote is taken today, the conference committee will have an enormous adjustment task. Yet the important fact is that the House is moving to revive the authorization to sell agricultural surpluses abroad for foreign currencies. The law under which substantial quantities of price-depressing surplus commodities have moved abroad in recent years expired in June, and requests for more than $600 million worth of American surplus crops at world prices must be held up until Congress acts.

It is especially desirable to have a new authorization on the books before the harvest advances any further so as to avoid the cost of storing surpluses that are to move abroad. The best course for the House would be to accept the Senate bill, which provides for a 2-year instead of a 1-year extension, and a $3,500 million authorization instead of $1,500 million. The operation of such a program on an annual basis puts it under a serious handicap. The House bill also contains an unwise barter provision which is opposed by Secretary Benson on the ground that it would interfere with normal trade sales for dollars.

The same reasoning that is pushing the surplus disposal bill toward enactment should operate in favor of the Senate Agriculture Committee's production adjustment bill. This measure provides new programs for cotton, rice, corn and feed grains. In general it looks toward less Federal regulation and lower price supports. It represents a reasonable compromise between the Senate agricultural leaders and the Department of Agriculture, and for that reason seems to merit special consideration.

The House Agricultural Committee recently advanced an omnibus farm bill apparently designed to force the Eisenhower administration to abandon its farm policies or go into the congressional campaigns bearing the onus of a major farm bill veto. But the House itself rejected this measure, and, with net farm income running 22 per cent above the level of last year political pressure for the enactment of farm legislation has been greatly relieved. Yet failure of Congress to pass the Senate bill or something equivalent would leave cotton and rise farmers in a difficult economic predicament, for the liberalized quotas for those commodities expire at the end of this crop year, and acreage would have to be drastically cut next year if Congress should fail to act.

This situation ought to bring the earliest possible action on S. 4071 in the Senate. The House will then have to accept the compromise bill or take full responsibility for denying farmers the benefits of a reasonable program on the eve of the congressional elections.

Depressed Areas Need Help of Congress Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a request for a rule on area-redevelopment legislation, House-Senate bill 3683, is now pending before the House Rules Committee. With Congress scheduled to adjourn early next month unless the Rules Committee grants a rule immediately on this important bill, there will be no area-redevelopment legislation enacted by this Congress.

In the July 22, 1958, issue of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, the following editorial furnishes many good reasons why this Congress should approve area-redevelopment legislation before adjournment.

The editorial follows:

DEPRESSED AREAS NEED HELP OF CONGRESS NOW

The fate of the area redevelopment bill at this session of Congress will be on the line when the House Rules Committee finally gets around to holding a hearing on whether or not to allow the legislation out on the floor for a vote. And riding along with it will be the hopes of people living in the Nation's chronic pockets of unemployment for a new economic lift.

Pennsylvanians have a vital interest in this legislation. It would provide aid for these depressed areas, and the Commonwealth has more than its share. It's only fitting, therefore, that this State's congressional delegation is trying to push the bill out for action through the logjam of apparent indifference that exists toward it in the House.

This is no recession year legislation. Pennsylvania's hard coal regions have been feeling the pinch for years. These areas will need some Federal aid if they are to experience an economic revival through new industries and new jobs.

Neither is this a Federal handout. A Senate-passed bill, which the proposed House measure closely follows, would establish an Area Redevelopment Administration to handle revolving loan funds of $100 million each for industrial redevelopment areas, rural redevelopment areas and for public facilities to improve commercial opportunities.

For Pennsylvania at least, this is not a case of States and local communities asking Uncle Sam to do something they won't do for themselves.

The Commonwealth has an admirable record of achievement in this field through the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, which in the first 20 months of its existence has loaned out or committed $5,866,062 for factories in 30 communities. It has helped establish 47 new plants providing 3,800 new jobs. And 2 weeks ago, Governor Leader cited the self-help record of northeastern Pennsylvania communities which, in the 12 years before PIDA, financed 67 projects and created 17,730 factory jobs.

But this is not enough. Before this biennium is over, the $8 million appropriated by two consecutive legislatures is expected to run out. Congressional action is needed to supplement the effort on the State and local levels.

As Governor Leader said recently, "People are not interested in which party gets the credit for this legislation—what they want is action now and they have every right to expect it."

Pennsylvania's Representative HUGH SCOTT thinks the Rules Committee vote will be a close one. Close or not, this bill should be given its chance before the full House. There are no good reasons for killing this legislation again. The national blight of the depressed areas will not disappear by itself. It will take the sort of enlightened aid envisioned by this bill.

Wool Industry Needs Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to impress upon the Members of this body the absolute necessity for the extension of the National Wool Act prior to the adjournment of this Congress.

I appreciate that there are many on Capitol Hill who are saying that since the present act does not expire until March of 1959 there is plenty of time next session to extend the act.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the wool business is a great industry, a great private industry dependent upon private financing. I want to impress upon the Members of this Congress that within the next 30 or 45 days the sheep and wool men will have sold this year's crop of wool and lambs and will be going to their banker to arrange for financing for next year's operation. I want to impress upon each of you that no banker is going to finance any industry if that industry does not know or have a pretty good idea what its income will be.

When a sheep rancher has sold his wool, when he has sold his lambs, he

takes his checks to the bank and makes settlement with his banker, and at the same time he arranges for credit for the following year's operation. Unless the National Wool Act is extended, the banker will be forced to compute the income of his client on the basis of 35-cent wool instead of on the basis of about 65-cent wool. I need not tell you what this means to the sheep men. It means putting a great many of them out of business.

At this time when the Nation is so gravely concerned over our national defense, it would be pretty stupid for Congress to further reduce the national output of one of the most critical of all defense commodities, namely wool, and compel this Nation to depend for two-thirds or more of its wool supplies upon ocean shipments of from 5,000 to 10,000 miles.

The National Wool Act was instituted to build up the domestic wool industry. The build-up has started. Certainly this is no time to junk a program as vital to our national defense as the National Wool Act.

Observance of the 100th Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, January 1, 1963, will mark the 100th anniversary of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Abraham Lincoln. I am introducing today a joint resolution which would establish a Commission to develop and execute suitable plans for the observance of this historic event in 1963. The significance of this document as a milestone in forwarding the principles of democracy throughout the world is so tremendous that the Federal Government of the Nation which declared its concept would be remiss not to take the initiative in developing plans to commemorate and honor its issuance.

Historically, the Emancipation Proclamation has taken its place alongside of all of the great democratic movements of the ages. Historians place it in background against the growth of humanitarian feeling in the age of enlightenment in the 18th century, the spread of the doctrine of the inherent equality of men in the Rousseau movement and others, and the French Revolution in its battle for the rights of man—all leading to the increase of democratic sentiment and consequently to a growing attack on slavery.

While the Emancipation Proclamation was executed by Lincoln as a measure of military necessity and its provisions of freedom were limited to persons held as slaves within specified areas in rebellion against the United States, yet it is record in history that because it was the majority will of the people this edict did in fact result in abolition becoming a war aim. The Emancipation Proclamation is, therefore, in reality the ax which laid the first major blow to the shackles of slavery of millions of bondmen. Moreover, it was the Emancipation Proclamation which led to the reaffirming in our National Constitution of the guaranties of life, liberty, justice, and equality inherent in a democratic government for all people. On January 13, 1865, the United States House of Representatives proposed the 13th constitutional amendment, using the language "in honor of the immortal and sublime event." To remove questions of the legal validity of the proclamation as issued under the war power of the President and to liberate slaves everywhere in America and to assure their status from legal doubt, this national measure of ultimate emancipation was effected by the antislavery amendment to the Constitution.

It is herein that the massive and lasting significance of the Emancipation Proclamation lies. Democratic government is the product of a national faith that only in liberty, without hindrance, are the creative powers of men released that they might be what God intended them. The conflict between its founding principles and its practices had long bitten hard upon the conscience of the Nation. Freedom for all men, the prohibition of slave trade, was discussed when the Constitution of the United States was drawn up. Even earlier than this, on July 13, 1787, the Congress under the Articles of Confederation had passed the ordinance creating the Northwest Territory in which was provided that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted. Congress, itself, by summer of 1862 had imposed emancipation of slaves as a sweeping penalty upon rebels.

The Emancipation Proclamation, reaffirming the fundamental concepts of democracy, thus placed itself before the world as another landmark in man's undying struggle of the ages for civil, political, and personal liberty. For the Negro citizen of America, it is the base from which he has carried forward his struggle for the safeguarding, guaranty, and enforcement of these liberties to the present-day issues of enforcement of voting rights, school desegregation, the right not to be denied job opportunities because of race, the right to travel in human dignity, to be safeguarded by equal protection of the laws—all of the like matters of human rights with which we are today concerned as a Nation. The pursuit of liberty moves forward and will not be turned back.

The profound significance of this first effective document to apply the principles of our national faith to all men is seen today in the world all about us. That the desire for liberty is deathless and unrestrainable is evidenced in the revolts which engulf the world. Our own willingness to bear the costliness of our faith in liberty is starkly dramatized as we move today, as a nation, to give our assistance in preserving democracy.

In initiating now plans to honor the occasion of the issuance of this document on its 100th anniversary in 1963, the Government of the United States will again be reaffirming its faith and again giving leadership in a time when democracy is in crisis.

More Comments From Union Members Concerning Needed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include another series of comments which I have received from union members concerning needed labor legislation. I believe the membership will find these comments to be of particular interest, since they express the views of the individual member.

I think labor has a right to spend money for the kind of legislation it wants. I do not favor donating funds to the Democratic Party or a particular candidate for office. I know the individual union members do not like this either but they have very little to say about it. Union leaders are too often dictators of the very worst sort. It is inconceivable that our Government and its police agency are unable to do anything about the proven crooks and embezzlers, but allow them to stay where they are to continue their depredations. (Foreman, General Motors Corp.)

I, for one, would like to know where all the money has gone that the CIO has collected for the last 20 years. They should have the books audited and reported the same as any corporation, for the money belongs to the members, or does it? (Inspector, steering gear.)

I am a union member and it burns me up to have them spending my money on the Democrats. I don't think they should be allowed to support either party. Everyone knows the money is not donated as they claim.

I am in favor of laws to really clean the skunks out of organized labor. (Factory worker.)

I am not in favor of using any dues that I pay into a union to support a man that I am not in favor with.

Although I have been a member of a union for over 50 years, I am not in favor of the checkoff system. A person that does not want to join a union for his own good is of no use to the union as he is liable to be just a stool pigeon. (Retired locomotive engineer.)

So long as we are a democracy, I am against anything or anyone who insists that one has to pay for the privilege of working at any chosen profession or occupation, as the unions of today are doing.

At the start, the labor unions were for the working people but today, the exact opposite is true. Just a chosen few are prospering at the expense of the worker.

You can't control economy or anything else until this vicious circle of higher wages plus higher costs plus higher wages and so on, is broken. (Carpenter.)

My husband is a union member and works in a closed shop but he is not in sympathy with the wild demands the unions are trying to force on the automotive industry. Basically, the unions are good but now they have gotten out of control and need some changes. (Housewife.)

We have had too many elections where our ballots haven't been properly counted. By all means discontinue closed shops. (Pipefitter.)

In the labor department I believe the closed shop is unconstitutional. There should be no law that says a man or woman must belong in an organization in order to earn a living. When a man has to belong to any organization, he then fails to get as much out of it as he would if he could belong as a matter of choice. (Laborer.)

It is also very essential to clamp down on dictatorship in our labor unions. I am a member in good standing but I do not like to be pushed around. I favor a secret ballot in all union activity and also to make sure the ballots are counted right, especially under State or Government control. Maybe some of our brass hats would not be around very long. (Laborer.)

Visit of Ghana Prime Minister to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today we are honored to welcome a distinguished visitor once again to our country, the Honorable Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana. As one who has ejoyed the warm hospitality of the Prime Minister and his countrymen on two separate occasions, I should like to extend my heartfelt greeting to the Prime Minister and members of his delegation. It is my sincere hope that this visit will further strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two countries, and enhance our understanding of one another.

It has been only little more than a year ago—March 6, 1957—that Ghana attained its independence from Great Britain, thus becoming the first African-governed Dominion in the British Commonwealth. The excitement of that moment has remained in the memory of those of us who were privileged to attend the independence ceremonies in Accra. Emotion rode high as the old assembly was dissolved upon the stroke of midnight, and jubilation swept the massed thousands who stood on the Polo Grounds outside. Born in an atmosphere of confidence and determination, the new nation is best symbolized by the Prime Minister himself.

To Kwame Nkrumah, long champion of freedom for his people, has fallen the responsibility of guiding the young State in its formative years. To bring his country safely out of tribal law into the freedom of a Republic as we understand the term is a grave undertaking. He and his councilors will undoubtedly make mistakes. Let us hope that each such experience may bring him greater tolerance and wisdom, for all of Africa looks to Ghana, the symbol of the hope of all Africans south of the Sahara for eventual independence. Upon Dr. Nkrumah's success in dealing with these problems will depend in large measure the date of independence for millions of others. I believe that the Prime Minister is well aware of his responsibility to all of Africa and so to the world.

Much has happened since independence day. The first conference of independent African States was held in Accra; representatives to the United Nations and to certain countries have been appointed; development projects are receiving assistance at the rate of over $2,800,000 per month; trade missions have been exchanged with West Germany, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Israel; technical and economic assistance agreements have been entered into with the United States, the United Kingdom, and the United Nations; the Black Star shipping line has been inaugurated and a Ghana airline is in process of being negotiated; construction of a $22 million harbor is underway at Tema; pure water systems and electric power are being made increasingly available; road improvements in all regions of the country are underway; health campaigns have been organized; and educational facilities are being constantly expanded. In fact, no less than $36,400,000 have been allocated to education services in all fields at primary, secondary, teacher-training, technical, and university levels since the accelerated plan for education was commenced in 1951.

Nature has been generous to this small country of 4½ million people—a generosity that needs only the technical and economic assistance of more-developed nations to unlock her storehouse of abundance. Gold, manganese ore, bauxite, diamonds, palm oil, rubber, and timber are but a few of the resources with which she has been endowed. Water resources abound providing a potential source of vast industrial power, but as yet remain largely untapped. The great Volta Dam project symbolizes Ghana's industrial future. As the technological leader of the West, it is quite properly to us that the people of Ghana look for the assistance that is so necessary to the development of their economy.

I am confident that the Prime Minister and his people will not find us unresponsive to Ghana's needs and aspirations. Recognizing that her sound economic and political growth is in the best interests of the free world, we should be prepared to extend whatever technical and economic assistance we are able, consistent with her ability to progress. Already an American team has been dispatched to survey the possibilities of large-scale production of electric power and aluminum on the Volta River. A United States Technical Cooperation Mission has been established and projects initiated to help expand the cattle industry, establish a veterinarian and farmer's training institute, develop an agricultural extension service, and conduct further surveys of agricultural and livestock potential. Let us hope that this is only the beginning of a long and constructive era of cooperation between our two nations.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I once again express my pleasue on this occasion of Prime Minister Nkrumah's official visit to the United States. It is my profound belief that both our countries will be enriched by this experience. That it be followed by an increasing interchange of people and ideas, of understanding and of common interest is my hope.

Visit of Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to have the Right Honorable Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana, pay us a state visit this week. Dr. Nkrumah's visit has especial significance in its timing. It comes when the smoldering political hotbed in the Middle East begins to erupt into open flame. It comes following a tete-a-tete between President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt and Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, with Nasser thereafter openly proclaiming his intention to bring all of Africa and most of Asia under the domination of the United Arab Republic. It comes when the Congress has been trying to resolve the question of how much money to appropriate for our 1959 mutual security program.

Prime Minister Nkrumah and other Government officials in Ghana frankly express their hope for close ties with the United States, as the recognized leader of the free world. It is of paramount importance to the free world that leaders like Dr. Nkrumah and President Tubman of Liberia be upheld in their determination not to swap their precious political independence for economic or military dependence on the Communist bloc.

The countries of Asia and Africa make a third of the membership of that most important body, the United Nations. Generally, these countries have maintained neutrality as between communistic and free-world concepts. If their good will and the balance of power they hold are lost to democracy's cause, Communist domination through the United Nations Assembly is assured.

Last week's coup d'etat in Lebanon is part of a well-organized campaign, Communist inspired, to overthrow the forces of democracy in the Middle East. Even as the United Nations argues the propriety of United States action in sending requested military aid to the duly constituted Government of Lebanon in its valiant and desperate struggle to keep its alliance with the forces of democracy, radio Cairo is blasting forth with intensified effort to incite the people of neighboring Jordan to rise up and

slay their leader who also sides with democracy.

If the independent countries of Asia are to succumb one by one to communism under the guise of Arab nationalism, while the United Nations ponders its ability under the U. N. charter to cope with this type of indirect aggression, the continent of Africa will become the only remaining frontier toward which the free world can look with hope—the last line of defense to block the forces of worldwide communism. If the free world does not win Ghana and other independent nations of Africa as permanent allies, the alternative will be their alliance with the Communist bloc as its satellites. Africa, with its vast untapped or underdeveloped resources will ultimately become the focal point in the struggle between democracy and communism for domination of the world. We recognize this, and the Soviet Union is acutely aware of it, too. It is no secret that the Communist bloc is perhaps the most ardent wooer of Africa's expanse of potential wealth. We know, for example, that the Soviet Union already has diplomatic relations with Ethiopia, that it has been trying to establish such relations with Liberia and with Ghana, and that it has concentrated economic and military aid on Egypt and Sudan. Our Special Study Mission to the Middle East and Africa reports instances of cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and Ghana. The Soviet Union has offered scholarships to Ghanian students and has invited Prime Minister Nkrumah and a delegation from the Ghana Parliament to visit the Soviet Union. Communism, as such, is banned in Ghana, and the people eagerly embrace democratic concepts and institutions. The Soviet Union, however, is not discouraged by this setback. Through its scholarship and cultural exchange program, it plans to train a corps of individuals, indoctrinated in Communist concepts, who can initiate Communist front organizations within the country.

Aside from such offensive moves to gain a strong foothold on the African Continent, Communist countries have concurrently taken full advantage of every opportunity to undermine the confidence of African peoples in leading countries of the free world. Communist propaganda machines play upon racial discrimination and segregation practiced against Negroes in the United States. It capitalizes on instances where individual Africans suffer the indignity of racial discrimination in the United States and in Great Britain. The objective of such propaganda is to portray democracy in a most unfavorable light and hold Communist countries up before the eyes of the peoples of Africa as the real champions of racial equality.

One conclusion reached by members of our special study mission to the Middle East and Africa is that African nations are not now ready for independence and that, their colonial regimes removed, they will require economic assistance far into the unforeseeable future.

I cannot agree that the countries of Africa are not ready for independence simply because they are not economically self-sufficient—because they are not able to accomplish their own aims without external aid or cooperation. What nation—even among the long-established free nations of the world—is able to do so? The inability of nations to produce independently all the things their people need and want has been increased by higher living standards and by the fact that modern-day living has cosmopolitan aspects and strong tastes for foreign goods have been cultivated. Let us take the United States for an example. With all our wealth of natural resources, we are economically dependent upon the Continent of Africa for 100 percent of our diamonds, over 50 percent of our cobalt, and large percentages of our chromite and manganese. Thus, the interdependence of nations is more a natural and a technological phenomenon, not an index of weakness or a justifiable reason for excluding any of them from the society of free men. We have for years been going to the military and economic assistance of other independent nations, and I firmly believe that the interdependence of nations is by now well established enough for us, as the free world's leading power, to cease debating the idea of foreign aid or mutual assistance as if it were some untried and unproven principle and get on with the all-important task of seeking the most effective means and areas for applying the greatest amount of aid we can give.

I am aware that many Africans will themselves readily admit that they are not prepared to assume the full financial burden of self-government. But two world wars have brought strong hope to the colonial peoples of Africa as to those elsewhere. Thousands of them fought in World War I and more thousands in World War II. They witnessed in these wars the collapse of colonial empires. They have, meanwhile, watched the progress of India and other nonwhite governments in the Middle East. These developments have keenly whetted their appetites for independence and they are willing to learn to govern themselves the hard way, if necessary, through their own trials and errors. It is a key factor that the fires of nationalism have been unextinguishably kindled throughout Africa. Therefore—the continuing economic dependence of the area notwithstanding—the only question left of major concern is, Who is going to render the necessary aid—the free world or the Communist nations? With the intensity between democracy and totalitarianism mounting to explosive proportions, it is foolish to ponder whether we can afford to give necessary aid to the underdeveloped areas of Africa. More appropriately, can we afford not to give it? Our military bases in Africa are vital to the defense of the entire free world.

The Government of Ghana strongly desires to reinforce its political independence by strengthening its economic independence. Undoubtedly, other countries in Africa recognize this same necessity. On the anniversary of its independence, Ghana reported on its progress during the past year and its aspirations for the future. It was unanimously welcomed into the United Nations shortly after independence. It lost no time in establishing diplomatic relations with England, India, France, Liberia, and the United States. It has sent ministerial delegations to other independent nations in Africa and Asia. It has joined the International Bank for Reconstruction, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. Its basic crop is cocoa, but Ghana is working toward greater agricultural productivity. Research programs are underway to eliminate tropical diseases and to stimulate employment. Efforts are being made to broaden the scope of education, to improve roads and other internal facilities, and to encourage foreign investments.

It is of foremost importance that other colonial regimes in Africa pressing toward independence are looking to leaders like Nkrumah to develop independent African states which prove to the world the equal capabilities and potentialities of the black man once he is freed of his yoke. These colonial regimes will be guided in their resistance to Communist penetration by the success of Ghana and other independent nations in obtaining needed, effective aid from the United States and the rest of the free world.

The free world has an edge over the Communist nations, inasmuch as African nations express an overwhelming preference for democratic concepts. We cannot, however, afford to take an attitude of nonresponsibility with respect to their economic needs, for, as drowning nations, they would have no alternative but to grasp eagerly even the straw which communism would offer them.

In my visit to Africa last year to attend Ghana's independence celebration, I was keenly impressed by the evident confidence and belief in the dignity of man I witnessed, the dignity which comes only when man is truly free. Most assuredly, those people have no intention of trading their European masters for totalitarian rulers. As Vice President NIXON pointed out last year after his visit to Africa, it is not enough that we talk democracy, we must practice it in our domestic affairs and in our relations with other nations. Any assistance we give to other free nations must not be offered in an air of superiority or paternalism. There must be no question that we value and respect their friendship. And true friendship is a horizontal relationship. It does not follow vertical paths. You do not look down on friends; you look across at them.

In this spirit and cognizance, I join with the rest of the citizens of this country in extending a most cordial welcome to Prime Minister Nkrumah.

Soviet Schools Good—and Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the amazing progress of education in the Soviet Union is the subject of the third in a series of articles written by Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who has been traveling in Russia and its European satellite countries during the past several weeks. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News today, for printing in the Appendix:

SOVIET SCHOOLS GOOD—AND TOUGH
(By Walker Stone)

In the days of the czar, illiteracy was widespread in Russia and only the favored few could get an education. But the few schools of czarist Russia were good schools, and an educated Russian was a well-educated man.

The stern disciplines of the old czarist schools, and the high value placed on scholarship, have been retained in the Communist educational system. It has opened its doors to all Russians, adult as well as youth, and has achieved one of the world's highest literacy rates in a nation of 200 million.

The Soviet Union's preoccupation with mass education is exceeded only by its drive for industrial, military and political power—and is harnessed to that drive.

STATE ASSETS

The primary purpose of Soviet education is not to produce the "well-rounded man" in the classical sense. It is to produce more proficient men and women, whose knowledge and scientific training can be counted on to contribute to the productivity, the achievements, the military power and glory of the Communist state.

Despite rapid and vast expansion of the Soviet school system, there is no teacher shortage. Teachers are as well paid as doctors, and often much better. They enjoy a prestige in Communist society such as teachers have not known in America since the early days, when we too were trying to banish illiteracy and thought education something worth striving for.

COMPETITION

There is intense competition for teacher jobs. Only 1 out of 5 who apply is admitted to teacher training institutes.

The incentive motive—the carrot and the stick—applied so effectively in all lines of Soviet endeavor, also pervades the educational system.

A teacher in a secondary school has a norm teaching schedule of 18 1-hour classes per week. But he can double his salary by teaching 36 1-hour classes.

Scores of American educators have been surveying Soviet schools over the last couple of years under the cultural exchange program. They have been astounded by the lavishness and completeness of the physical plants of the Soviet schools and by the students' thirst to learn.

PRAISE

The principal of a high school in Westchester County, N. Y., sat beside me on a plane flying from Moscow to Warsaw. He had been in Russia a month, visiting schools, talking with teachers and students.

"Mine is one of the richest school districts in New York," he told me. "We have one of the finest plants. But I wish we had laboratories for physics, chemistry, and biology like I have seen in Soviet schools. And I wish we had students so eager to learn."

There is little "goofing-off" in Soviet schools—it is too important to the student to try to gain entrance to a university.

His income, his living standard and his position in Soviet society depends on how far he climbs the educational ladder.

In the first 10 grades—starting at age 7—there is some tolerance for slow learners, and tutors are provided to help them along. But once in a university, the student is on his own. Not only are the university teachers paid according to the quality and quantity of their work. Students are, too.

Because the Soviet state thinks it needs more scientists and engineers, students pursuing those difficult courses earn higher fees.

An A student earns a higher stipend than a B student, whose stipend is higher than a C student. And a student whose marks fall too low will be ousted from the university, and handed a shovel to dig ditches or engage in some other menial toil.

The heroes of the Soviet Union are the scientists. A scientist of distinction will enjoy a living standard of a Rockefeller or a Morgan heir in this country, with a rural estate, a chauffeur, and servants. His publicity in the Soviet press will rival that of such an American personage as Elvis Presley or Babe Ruth.

An American youth, whose papa pays the bill to let him enroll in a fraternity and join a college for the convenience of having a football team to root for, will not be well prepared to compete with the Soviet man of tomorrow.

Research Money Urgently Needed for Chemical Control of Pests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, great strides have been made in the development of chemicals to control insects and other pests. But we have also learned that the good done by some pesticides is far outweighed by the harm they cause to fish and wildlife.

The Congress has recognized the need for specific chemicals and poisons that will fight pests without destroying desirable life. Legislation is about to be enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct continuing research on insecticides, with fish and wildlife protection in the forefront. I hope that the authorization bill will be quickly followed by the full appropriation urgently needed to carry on this important work.

I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal pointing out the need for, and the success that can be expected from, detailed research in the field of chemical pest controls:

CHEMICAL CONTROL OF PESTS REQUIRES DETAILED RESEARCH

The manner in which sea lamprey larvae were killed without harm to fish and other aquatic life, described by R. G. Lynch in the Sunday Journal, is a potent argument for research in the field of chemical controls.

Man is resorting more and more to the use of poisons to fight insects. Such chemicals are invaluable to the housewife, the gardener, the farmer, the forester. But the Nation has had many a shocking demonstration that sometimes these things can do more harm than good—or so much harm that the net benefit may not be worth the cost.

The lamprey larvae could have been killed in Great Lakes streams with many poisons which also would have killed fish and other aquatic life. But the fish and wildlife service persisted in its search for one which would kill the pest alone—a "specific." After more than 5,000 chemicals had been tested, the researchers found what they wanted. So far, the researchers know of no bad secondary reactions.

Congress has before it legislation calling for similar research on all chemical controls. It takes time and money to search for specific poisons. Quite likely none can be found in some cases and then a decision must be made. But the case of the lamprey larvae dramatically proves that sometimes one can be found, and that the saving in other wildlife—in this case valuable food fish—will be well worth the effort and the cost.

Minnesota's Centennial

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some people love and appreciate a State because they were born in it; a person always is attached to the place of his birth and the familiar surroundings of his youth. But perhaps to as great an extent as almost any State in the Union, most of the people in Minnesota until quite recently were not born there, they came there. I am one of those many persons who are not Minnesotans by birth, something beyond our own choice. We voluntarily chose the States as ours. I was born and educated in Nebraska and got into Minnesota when I went to the Mayo Clinic years ago to work there as a young doctor. We liked the State and its people so much that Mrs. Judd and I decided it was the place where we wanted to live and work and bring up our children. We have never regretted that choice. The worst thing about serving in the Congress these 16 years, a change of occupation we never thought of at that time, is that we are not able to spend more time in Minnesota—its lakes in the summer, its snows in the winter, its warm-hearted friendly people the whole year round.

People of about 36 nationalities have participated in the building of the State of Minnesota, but there has been no racial or cultural friction in the history of the State. The early settlers had some trouble with the Indians a few times, due to difficulties usually brought on more by the white men than by the Indians.

A few years ago at the annual dinner of the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of

Commerce to which the young businessmen invite their bosses, the older generation of leading executives, I was reminded how recently so many of us had come to Minnesota. It included all the leaders who participated in the program. The mayor of the city was born in Sweden. The Governor of the State was the son of an immigrant from Sweden. The man who responded for the bosses, was the son of an immigrant from Norway. The president of the junior chamber of commerce was born in Greece. The program chairman was born in England. There was, of course, one from Canada. The man who was honored as the Young Man of the Year in Minneapolis was a Negro, grandson of a slave. Yet no one of them thought of himself or of any of the others except as fellow Minnesotans.

It seemed to me that this was typical of our country and of our State at their best. The only thing that counts is what the individual is himself.

The people who came to Minnesota were not driven there; they were drawn there. They were not refugees or displaced persons. They deliberately chose to leave lovely places in home countries that were at peace to come to Minnesota. The opportunities there, of all sorts, were so attractive that they were willing voluntarily to pull up their roots in their native lands in order to come to this goodly land and sink down here new roots and build their homes and their families and their churches and their schools and their farms and their highways and their industries and all the things that we are proud of there today.

Minnesota has been under four different flags. First she was under the French. St. Anthony Falls, where my own city of Minneapolis was started because of the waterpower there, was discovered by Father Hennepin. He and Father Marquette, Father Nicollet, and others were the pioneering French fathers who first explored the rivers and the land. Then for a time it was under the British flag, then under the Spanish flag until the Louisiana Purchase, when it came under the United States flag.

People in other States have come to think of Minnesota as Scandinavian, and it is true that the Scandinavians—that is, people from Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, and Finland—make up the largest ethnic and cultural group in our State. It is not generally realized that there are more people of German ancestry than any other single nationality.

By and large the predominant groups of immigrants were people skilled in forestry, agriculture, and the mechanical arts. Minneapolis, St. Paul, and our other cities have relatively few large mass production industries, such as the great flour mills, Minneapolis-Honeywell, Minneapolis-Moline, and so on. But there are literally hundreds of industries which employ 50 to 500 workers manufacturing articles that require precision work with metals and machines. The attention to detail and superior skills and proficiency required in their work carry over into their citizenship. They are generous supporters of causes and programs that build good communities.

Among the earliest attractions of the State, of course, were its waters and its woods. "This is the forest primeval, the murmuring pines and the hemlock," as Longfellow immortalized them, mostly in the northern half of the State. The people who were especially drawn there came largely from northern Europe, because the woods and the climate of Minnesota were so much like the lands from which they came. Unfortunately, a great many of those forests were slashed before scientific forestry was understood. Only now is a second crop beginning to mature, and a few sawmills are being set up here and there for the new crop of pine.

Agriculture developed in the southern half; not great fields of wheat and small grains as in States farther west and south, but family-size and family-operated farms. Specialized agriculture, particular dairy farms with milk, butter, and cheese, chickens, and eggs, and turkeys, thrived, because of the combination of climatic, soil, feed grains, and other conditions which are most favorable for those products.

Then the great Mesabi Range of iron ore deposits in the region from which our colleague [Mr. BLATNIK] comes, was discovered at the head of the Great Lakes. Minnesota added another string to her bow—mining. Most of the steel in the buildings of the whole United States and most of its bridges were constructed from iron ore out of the soil of northern Minnesota. And how many of the cities along the Great Lakes from Duluth through Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo—cities from which so many of our colleagues come, owe their growth and prosperity to iron ore from Minnesota.

Then, of course, in the most recent years, perhaps the fastest growing industry has been recreation. As has been said, we have sports all year round. We have 11,300 lakes—a few hundred more after 2 years of good rains. When I went to England one fall during the war and had opportunity to sit in on a briefing after a group of bombers came back from a raid over Germany, the first question one of the Minnesota boys asked me was, "How was the fishing this year?" The second boy asked, "What is the matter with our Minnesota football team this year?" I suppose that was not unique. If there is any family in Minnesota some of whose members do not go fishing a few times during the year and talk about it all the rest of the year, I have seldom run across that family. We not only fish in the spring, summer, and fall, but thousands sit hour after hour in little shacks fishing through the ice in the wintertime. We have other sports for every season—duck, pheasant, and deer hunting, canoeing, camping, sail boating, skiing—all of the great outdoor sports. More and more people in other States are discovering how good it is to spend the summers in Minnesota, even if they spend the winters in California, Arizona, Texas, or Florida. I think there will be an increasing semiannual migration of people, just as the birds do each spring and fall, going south for the winter and coming to Minnesota for the summer.

The great progress the State of Minnesota has made in the field of education has been mentioned. We have the third largest university in the Nation and some of its schools have worldwide recognition for the quality of their scholars and their instruction. We have several extraordinarily good colleges, standing at the very top in our Nation. To public life, Minnesota has contributed many outstanding leaders. Two of its present day sons occupy unique places in the hearts of our people, Charles Lindberg and Lauris Norstad, the commander in chief of NATO.

In politics Minnesota and her neighbors to the east and west, Wisconsin and North Dakota, have tended to experiment a little. We have almost always had a third, and sometimes a fourth sizable political party. We do not stick to tradition and party lines as do most people south of the Mason-Dixon line, for example. Therefore, you can never be quite sure what is going to happen in Minnesota politics. That is a part of the nonconformist spirit and the creative pioneering of the peoples who have helped to develop this State to such a wonderful extent in just 100 years.

Our human resources in the end are our greatest resource, our most valued wealth. Concern for its people has been the primary concern through all the years since the first pioneers came.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for the nice things that have been said about our State here today. We shall try to be worthy of a splendid past, and demonstrate that worthiness by making the second century even better than the first.

May I close with the opening line of our State song: "Minnesota, Hail to Thee."

Methodist Commission on World Peace Offers Constructive Proposals for Crisis in Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I received a statement by the Commission on World Peace of the Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Church which offers very carefully considered recommendations for dealing with the crisis in the Middle East.

I have always been impressed by the constructive and intelligent thinking which the religious organizations of America have contributed to the problems which confront our Nation in its international relations. In my opinion, because of the great degree in which moral considerations are involved in our international relations, religious leaders are especially qualified to help us to

think through these problems and to help us find solutions. There is no doubt, for example, that the work of religious agencies of all faiths in the field of technical assistance, relief, and rehabilitation among the people in war areas and economically depressed countries has been one of our best assets in our foreign relations.

Mr. President, I especially want to say a word about the chairman of the World Peace Commission, Mr. Lawrence Giese, of Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Giese's work in the field of world peace has earned him wide respect and appreciation among public officials and others who are interested and responsible observers of our international policies. Mr. Giese is the chairman of my own Advisory Committee on World Peace problems, and he has been exceptionally helpful to me in that capacity. I depend upon his advice, and I have learned to have great respect for his competence and knowledge in this field.

The recommendations of the Methodist World Peace Commission deserve thoughtful consideration. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix so that it will be readily available to all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE MIDEAST CRISIS BY THE METHODIST COMMISSION ON WORLD PEACE, WISCONSIN CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

We regret the use of arms by the United States Government in Lebanon. It has inflamed the Arab world, has given the Communists a powerful propaganda tool in the Mideast, and has enormously increased in risk of armed collisions involving major powers.

A major change in United States Mideast policy is called for. The present policy is founded largely on the belief that peace and stability can be achieved in the Mideast, and Communist influence kept out of that area, by uniting the Arab nations with the West in military alliances. Surely the inadequacy of this policy has now been amply demonstrated through Mideast events of the past several years.

We call upon the United States Government to reshape its Mideast policy into one that will replace the military emphasis with an effort to safeguard the vital interests of all those legitimately concerned with the Mideast, and with an emphasis upon a concern for the needs of the people of the Mideast. We believe that only thus can Mideast peace be achieved.

Such a new policy must guarantee protection to the Arabs against external interference in their drive for pan-Arabism, protection to Israel and the Arabs against armed attack from each other, assurance to the West that it will not be shut off from Mideast oil and that the Mideast will not go into the Communist orbit, and assurance to the U. S. S. R. that its Mideast neighbors will not be in hostile hands.

We believe that, in an effort to satisfy those basic requirements for Mideast peace, the United States Government should propose:

1. The complete neutralization of the Mideast. This would require ending shipments of arms into that area by either the West or the Communist bloc. A U. N. inspection system in the Mideast could give assurance that such arms shipments had actually halted.

Neutralization would require ending the Baghdad Pact, which is already practically demolished by the Iraqi rebellion. It would mean closing the British and United States military bases in the Mideast. But these are rapidly becoming obsolete with the advent of the missile age.

It would indeed be a profitable trade if, by relinquishment of these military factors of increasingly dubious value, the exclusion of Communist military interests from the Mideast could thereby be achieved.

2. A Mideast Development Authority that would seek to free the people of the Mideast from their grinding hunger and poverty, through such means as regional development of river systems, and exploration for and encouragement of the development of natural resources by private capital and Mideast governments.

This Development Authority could be supported by levies on oil shipments from Mideast ports, by giving the Authority control of Mideast oil pipelines and their revenue, and by contributions from the United States of America, Britain, and the U. S. S. R. These contributions would cost those three governments less than the military expenditures they are now making in that area, and would bring to them far greater security than do those present arms expenditures.

3. A Mideast disarmament plan for the Arabs and Israel that would involve reduction of those nations armed forces to the level necessary for internal order, with a U. N. inspection system to give each Mideast nation assurance that the others are abiding by the disarmament plan, and a U. N. force to guarantee the security of Mideast nations against attack from one another.

It is quite probable that the Mideast situation has become so inflamed that no reasonable policy or program will be accepted by the nations involved. But the possibility of a total and civilization-destroying war springing up in that area is so real and ominous that we are compelled to recognize that the self-interest of each can be served in the Mideast only as the common interest of all is made secure.

Leadership by the United States Government for the above suggested program will require a new sense of vision and purpose, one that is willing to subordinate temporary advantages in the cold war to the long-range task of ending the cold war.

We commend those Members of Congress, and the various newspapers who have exercised vision and courage at this time of aroused passions, and have stood firmly against the sending of United States troops to Lebanon.

We commend the United States Government for now seeking to settle the issue through the U. N. The church has a vital interest in the U. N. Believing that the U. N. is the world's best political hope for peace, the Methodist Church has worked vigorously for the support and development of the U. N. We urge all national governments to use the U. N. to the fullest in their relations with one another, and to comply with the decisions of the U. N.

We would suggest that the U. N. could be more effective in its work for peace if the nations would work through the U. N. at the "take off" point in their international policies, rather than waiting to call upon the U. N. when those policies have produced a "crash landing."

Who Owns Middle East Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal brings up to date and in complete form exactly who owns the Middle East Oil.

This article provides a solid factual basis for an understanding of the economic stake this country has developed in the past 10 years in the Middle East. It shows that Middle East oil production has jumped by a huge fivefold between 1946 and 1955, and that American financial interests increased their holdings from about a one-third interest in 1946 to a solid majority interest of 58.4 percent today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 21, 1958]

WHO OWNS MIDDLE EAST OIL

The Middle East, as the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and Africa, was for centuries of tremendous strategic importance in any international power struggle. That is why practically every great power of history was drawn there and every conqueror of note trod its sands.

In today's world, however, the Middle East is vital for another reason. This is its oil, essential to the industrialized nations of the free world—to keep their industrial machines whirring, their military machines operating, their economies prosperous.

The Middle East today produces more than one-quarter of the free world's oil supplies. It contains more than two-thirds of the free world's known reserves of crude oil. As demand increases, it will have to supply an increasingly larger share of the world's needs. Not until atomic power is widely available in the free world—10 to 25 years—will dependence on Middle East oil lessen.

Significance of Middle East production is shown by these 1956 (estimated) daily production figures in barrels: United States, 7 million; Venezuela, 2.4 million; total Middle East 3.3 million; Saudi Arabia, 1 million, tiny Kuwait, 987,000 and Iraq, 633,000.

World crude oil production increased from 2.7 billion barrels in 1946 to 5.6 billion barrels in 1955. Middle East oil production jumped from 265 million barrels to 1,190 million in the same time. Since 1946, approximately $2 billion has been spent in developing Middle East production and reserves. Much of this has been by American firms. American oil interests have a financial interest of 58.4 percent in the oil of the Middle East today. The 1946 interest was 35.3 percent.

The oil companies hold concessions from Middle East governments. With slight variations depending upon local conditions, the profits are split 50–50 between the governments and the oil companies. Direct payments made to the 6 major political oil-

producing governments in 1955 were around $900 million. The countries receive many indirect benefits—wages paid to native employees and expenditures within the countries by foreign employees and the companies. Allied industries provide employment for many thousands more. Indirect benefits add an income equal to one-half of the direct payments.

Following are details of ownership in major production areas:

Saudi Arabia: Concessions to 1999 and 2005 owned by Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco). Ownership of Aramco—30 percent by Standard of New Jersey, 30 percent by Standard of California, 30 percent by Texas Co., and 10 percent by Socony Mobil Oil Co.

Kuwait: Concessions to 2006. Owned on 50-50 basis by Gulf Oil Co. (American) and British Petroleum Co.

Bahrein: Concessions to 2024. Owned on 50-50 basis by Standard of California and Texas Co.

Iraq: Concessions to 2000. Owned by Iraq Petroleum Co. Ownership of IPC—23¾ percent to British Petroleum Co., 23¾ percent to Royal Dutch-Shell, 23¾ percent to Campagnie Francaise des Petroles, 23¾ percent to Near East Development Corp., and 5 percent to the Gulbenkian estate. Near East Development is owned 50–50 by Standard of New Jersey and Socony Mobil Oil Co.

Iran: Concessions to 1979, plus 15 years optional. Ownership an international consortium. Consortium division—40 percent to British Petroleum Co., 14 percent to Royal Dutch-Shell, 6 percent to Campagnie Francaise des Petroles, 7 percent to Standard of New Jersey, 7 percent to Standard of California, 7 percent to Texas Co., 7 percent to Gulf Oil, 7 percent to Socony Mobil Oil Co., and 5 percent to Iricon Agency. Iricon is comprised of nine American independents—Richfield, American Independent, Standard of Ohio, Pacific Western, Signal, Atlantic Refining, Hancock, Tide Water, and San Jacinto.

Bathing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a broadcast over radio station WINS, New York, Sunday, July 20, 1958:

BATHING

And now I turn to a subject on a lighter vein, but nevertheless, one that is very much a part of our daily existence. This topic was sparked by an account I read, emanating from the Public Health Service, as a result of some questions involving procedures to keep well.

Among the questions was, Are fewer baths advisable in winter? Public Health Service says that the skins of some people dry out in winter, but this is attributed to the low humidity in heated rooms or from harsh soaps that remove oil from the skin. Most bath soaps are mild. Public Health Service goes on to say how frequently you bathe is up to you to decide.

The Public Health Service mustn't read those soap ads, which very clearly imply that if you wish to be socially acceptable and not have your best friends not tell you, you had better climb in that old tub each and every day—rain or shine—hot or cold.

Upon looking into the origins of the ritual of the now daily bath and the relentless battle to keep Junior clean behind the ears, I came upon some odd but interesting bits of information. Such as—prehistoric man had a bed, shelves, and something like a cupboard—but no bath. Europe's first written records, the Bronze Age epics of Homer, indicate that the Greek tribes used to bathe in their rivers. If you couldn't swim, you weren't in the current social swim of that age and the Joe Miller of that day, commenting on unpopular foreigners, uttered the canard that they got washed but three times in their lives—when they were born, when they were married, and when they died. In the old days, the women washed their clothes with themselves—a trick they might be able to do today, considering how much nylon the ladies are wearing.

In the Old and New Testaments, many incidents relating to washing and the magical properties of water are recounted.

In India, Gandhi wrote of an acquaintance that he would pour water over himself—but never washed. The Hindu bathing customs go back some three or four thousand years and from the earliest records, the orthodox carefully sprinkled themselves, using little jars for the water, with the idea of spiritual purification rather than physical cleanliness. These ablutions were believed to be watched by demons and a detail overlooked could bring on disaster.

The priests of ancient Egypt drenched themselves with Nile water, often several times a day. They hoped to remove their sins—not their skins.

Besides the sprinkling, Hindus have given great importance to the idea of full immersion in water. It is considered a sort of insurance premium—to secure good luck or to avoid reincarnation as a maggot or a mango. For unknown centuries, Indian pilgrims have been making arduous journeys to holy rivers, pools, wells, and reservoirs connected with shrines.

The early Christians resorted to triple immersion for baptism. The practice of a single immersion for baptism was not adopted until the last years of the sixth century and persisted for 1,500 years. Today, a child may be baptized by anointing his head with holy water.

The Russians developed the most elaborate of bathing techniques from an ancient ritual of dipping newly born infants through a hole in the river that had been blessed. The Scythians, who inhabited what is now the Ukraine, on special occasions, would soap and rinse their heads and then crawl into small tents made of fleece draped over wood tripods. Inside, would be a dish of red hot stones, on which the bather threw hempseed. The smoke turned the tent into an excellent vapor bath and while sweating it out, the bather would apply plasters, made of moistened sawdust from aromatic trees. These were kept on overnight and the next day, the ancient would emerge sweet-smelling and glowing. The American Indians followed a similar technique before they ever laid eyes on a white man, as did the Mexicans. A similar arrangement was discovered in Ireland, and, of course, the Finns enlarged on this basic idea to accommodate 10 or more people. After beating themselves with birch twigs, the Finns take a brisk plunge in the snow.

The ancient Greek washed himself at a bath—rather than in one. You were expected to be clean then—but not too clean.

The use of hot water in the bath was roundly condemned by Homer and Hesiod as an unmanly practice. Although many Greeks were fond of open-air plunges in thermal springs—opinion for many years was against the use of hot water in the family basin or public wash houses. An old Athenian law actually forbade it. Nevertheless, most of the latter-day Greeks were oiled, scoured and rinsed—and with hot water—every day. Small and somewhat luxurious bathhouses for men had sprung up during the fifth century B. C. There were others for women. You followed a cold wash with a warm one—a custom afterward reversed by the Romans. All was quiet and respectable. Hippocrates advised that a bather should be orderly and reserved in his manner and it was considered the last word in boorishness to resort to a song in the bathroom.

During the heyday of Julius Caesar's grandfather, a 9-day interval between baths was quite common. There were a few public baths from 312 B. C. onward, but cold water was the only water on tap. Under the emporers, however, public bathing was popularized on a vast scale, and by the fourth century A. D., there were some 952 baths in Rome and the fad—shall we say—had spread elsewhere. * * * Gaul, Spain, Algeria and—less opulently—in Britain. Two famous baths were named for despotic emperors, Caracalla and Diocletion. Diocletion's was a trifle smaller than Madison Square Garden. It included a fair sized theater and a swimming pool 290 feet long. Caracalla's had lecture rooms and a library, the forerunner, no doubt, of the magazine rack in our modern bathrooms. The wealthy maintained smaller versions in their mansions and some of these so aroused Seneca, the tutor of Nero, that he held forth about the decadent luxury of the rich.

In those days, bathing was restricted by law and custom to an hour or so in mid-afternoon. The routine in these baths seems somewhat like that in our modern Turkish bath, the Romans not adding much to Greek practices. It is interesting to note that centrally placed furnaces supplied the heat for the various rooms and the rich could relax in smaller rooms where they listened to musicians, discussed busines deals and drank wine served by waiters. There were lotion rooms, and scent rooms, lined with beautiful mosaics—and all this cost but a few coopers and if you were poor, you could get it at public expense. The fall of Rome has been attributed to many things but there are some historians who maintained that the cause was due to the Romans spending so much time at the baths.

After the Arabs conquered former Roman territory, some of Mohammed's followers—despite his opposition—took over the baths at Alexandria and later generations, regardless of the religious tradition, built their own public baths, which were on a much more modest scale.

Down through the centuries, many people objected to bathing—but it made slow progress. Medieval Europe originated the bath proper—a functional piece of furniture, which, on some occasions could accommodate two people, with a tray stretching between them for meal service. Some were oval—some were circular—and some had tentlike superstructures—and some looked like sabots but in the 18th century, the bathtub as we know it today, began to shape up. Its evolution is much more easily traced in France and it is reported that one of Napoleon's relatives was the first in France to use a truly modern type bathtub.

The 17th century, it is believed, proved the stimulus for the revival of washing in general, altho some royalty were considered rather malodorous through the years, perhaps in more ways than one. The Grand Monarque of France, for instance, had the most sumptuous bath then in existence but he rarely went near it.

The Japanese are considered the cleanest people on the face of the earth. There was usually very little privacy in their baths. Every house in Japan has a bathroom with a big wooden tub and in 1895 there were 800 public baths in Tokyo, serving 300,000 persons a day. The Japanese believe in the psychological benefits derived from the

water. The tired laborer is expected to sing and feel at peace, once he is immersed.

Surprisingly enough, baths for private homes were denounced in America as repugnant to the American way of life. The White House did not have a bath until 1851, with President Fillmore standing firm against the most intense opposition. Americans may lay claim to inventing the shower as we know it in our well-equipped bathrooms and I think Americans may well lay claim to the steadfast barrage of information as to the effectiveness (socially and otherwise), of our soaps and detergents. Oil was used as the first washing material. Then soap, made of boiled goat's tallow and causticised beech ashes. Soap came into wider use in the latter part of the Middle Ages in Italy, and then in France, and in the 13th century, a factory at Marseilles made soap cakes with olive oil. England made soap from the 14th century on. American pioneer women made their own. Modern soap making dates from the discovery, in 1791, of the Leblanc process for the manufacture of soda from brine.

Speaking for myself, I think there is nothing more relaxing then a good warm shower or bath, with plenty of soapsuds, old Homer notwithstanding.

Commemoration Marking the 25th Anniversary of the Transatlantic Flight of Darius and Girenas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I was home in my district and had the great pleasure of attending two gatherings in honor of the Lithuanian heroes, Captain Darius and Lieutenant Girenas who made that fatefully tragic flight from New York to Kaunas, Lithuania, on July 20, 25 years ago. These brave men had served the United States cause of freedom as volunteers in World War I. Then as today, the love of God and freedom knows no boundaries.

One of my colleagues, ALVIN O'KONSKI, graciously accepted my invitation to address the American Legion Post called Darius-Girenas, on Sunday. He gave a most inspiring address and I am sorry that he had no advance text so that I could insert it in the RECORD. He will attest to the fine occasion Sunday and I am sure he was warmed as I was in noting the many thousands who viewed the parade of the Darius-Girenas Post commemorating the 25th anniversary of the sad flight of two great flyers.

Another splendid address was delivered Sunday by Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania here in Washington. It is an address containing a message of hope to those in Lithuania and a message which makes those of us living in America and other free nations more thankful than ever and more dedicated to preserving our heritage. Here is Mr. Kajeckas' address:

The following is an English summary of a speech delivered by Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania, at Marquette Park, Chicago, Ill., at a commemoration marking the 25th anniversary of the transatlantic flight of Darius and Girenas:

"For the benefit of those less or not at all familiar with the Lithuanian language, I should like to give a very brief summary in English of my speech.

"First of all, however, I would like to express my personal gratification at the presence here with us this afternoon of the honorable mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley. I know that his attendance, as well as that of our distinguished friends from the Congress of the United States, Congressmen ALVIN EDWARD O'KONSKI and EMMET F. BYRNE, is deeply appreciated by all of us.

"The transatlantic fliers Darius and Girenas, the 25th anniversary of whose flight we commemorate today, sought to see their beloved Lithuania free and independent. As volunteers in the United States Army during World War I, they had fought for the principle of self-determination of nations. After Lithuania became independent, they sought to raise her glory by the transatlantic flight.

"The nobility of this bold attempt is revealed in their last will and testament, in which they dedicated their flight to the spirit of resurrected Lithuania, wishing to inspire the youth of Lithuania to still greater deeds. And indeed, if we think of the Lithuanian youth rising en masse many times against the Russian Communists, even in the chains of Siberian slavery, we see that they have learned well the lesson of sacrifice and dedication that Darius and Girenas taught.

"We are reminded on this occasion that July, the month of Darius' and Girenas' great sacrifice, is a commemorative one. It was during this month in 1922 that the United States recognized the Baltic States de jure. It was also during July that the United States condemned in unequivocal terms the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. It is very gratifying that America, the adopted country of our brave flyers, continues to recognize prewar Lithuania.

"It is during this same month in 1920 that the Kremlin signed a peace treaty in which it solemnly pledged itself to renounce forever all sovereignty in regard to Lithuania, a peace treaty that was broken at the first opportunity, according to the now-familiar Soviet way of doing things.

"Finally, the American Declaration of Independence, also belonging to the month of July, affirmed that all men are endowed by God with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The declaration has great meaning for Lithuanians, for, as Abraham Lincoln pointed out, it promises freedom, not only to the people of this country, but hope for all peoples for all times.

"In conclusion, let us remember that, throughout all the pages of history, we find the glory of a proud nation reborn in the deaths of its heroes. Though the flight of Darius and Girenas ended in tragedy, it has lived to become a great triumph for Lithuania through the realization that men are willing to sacrifice their very lives for her greater glory. Today, 25 years after their flight, let the image of Darius and Girenas winning their way eastward toward the rising sun remind us that for those who look sunward, the shadows always fall behind. Let us remember that faith in an ancestral land is the sacred prerogative of all men; that individual courage in the face of overwhelming odds is the mark of a whole nation's character. And if Lithuania and the cause of her liberation always remain for us a matter of ardent love and dedication, then Darius and Girenas will live on in union with their ideals and greatest hopes. Then truly, their beloved fatherland, Lithuania, shall live on to see a new dawn of freedom."

Accomplishments of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Doris Fleeson in the Washington Star of July 21, 1958, entitled "Accomplishments of Congress" merits the attention of every Member of this body. The effectiveness of the 85th Congress truly dwarfs the ineptitude of the administration with which it is encumbered:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESS—LITTLE-NOTICED EFFICIENCY DRAWS PRAISE IN FACE OF INDIFFERENT ADMINISTRATION

(By Doris Fleeson)

In a remarkable reversal of their traditional roles, the 85th Congress is making a better-than-respectable record of governmental housekeeping, for which the Eisenhower administration will doubtless get the lion's share of the credit.

Congress has done this in spite of an indifferent President, an arrogant and parochial White House staff and a Cabinet whose congressional contacts are coolly formal when they are not absent entirely. Not even the dinner napkin appeal nor great personal warmth—those tried and true greasers of the political machinery—have been present.

The average Member of the House and Senate rarely sees the President and gets no attention whatever from the headline personalities of the administration, who prefer to entertain each other. It is harder for a politician to see Sherman Adams or his assistant, Gen. Wilton Persons, than it used to be to see Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Nonetheless, Congress has been practicing its art to considerable effect. It is true that it has proceeded with rare exceptions along well-trodden ways to which the President has also given lipservice. This is perhaps the reason why its pace-setting role has had so little general notice.

It is true also that the technical efficiency of the Democratic leadership arouses mixed emotions in the party. Party managers and intellectuals simply do not believe it can flourish as a mere upholder of the status quo; they want it to lead in the country's social and economic expansion. They are stoutly backed by labor and minorities, which are indispensable to party triumph nationally, and by most governors.

In both parties this is the era of the great drought so far as ideas are concerned. It does not alter the picture of Congress as an effective one within the limits it has set itself.

The President's debt to able individuals of the House and Senate is enormous. Last weekend furnished two examples.

The Senate Armed Services Committee gave him a Pentagon reorganization bill he can live with and got the Senate to approve it 80 to 0. It is a vote which puts heavy pressure on the House conferees, who must defend a bill the President doesn't like.

A Democrat, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, who frankly believes that our relative defense position is getting worse all the time, bucked members of his own party to push the new bill. Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, put it together by hand, and committee members, both Democrat and Republican, cheered them on unselfishly.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, climaxed his long effort to do a public-interest job of policing the airways by pushing to passage a civilian-controlled Federal aviation

agency to control airspace. It goes to the House, where, ironically, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Adams-Goldfine fame, expects to secure its approval by force of his knowledge and prestige.

A special laurel wreath is due to the Republican Senate leader, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND in all these matters. At least the majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and Speaker RAYBURN get some press attention for their accomplishments.

Senator KNOWLAND has stayed on the job here though his own campaign for governor of California, with all it means to his future, is bogging down. He has kept his promises to his Democratic opposite numbers and muffled criticism of a White House of whose acts he disapproves often more severely than any Democrat. It is evidence of that character which makes it hard for informed observers to get mad at KNOWLAND, whatever they may think of his views.

Closing a Loophole in Our Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 of this year I introduced H. R. 11691, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering. This measure was prompted by the Supreme Court's recent ruling that operators of gambling enterprises may deduct as ordinary and necessary business expenses amounts expended to lease premises and hire employees, even though their business is illegal.

As the law now stands, therefore, the bigtime gamblers of America are provided an open invitation to deduct just about any item they feel is essential to their operations, including police protection and thugs to intimidate competitors. My bill would put an end to this by prohibiting any such deductions if the expenses were incurred in furtherance of a gambling enterprise which is illegal under State law.

This proposal has gained wide support from various groups all over the country. Among the many editorials and articles which have come to my attention dealing with this subject, I enjoyed particularly a piece penned by Fred G. Stickel. In his weekly column, The Judge Says in the Caldwell Progress-Verona News of June 20, 1958, Mr. Stickel expresses his thoughts in a most readable style. I commend this unique column to the attention of all Members of Congress. I hope it will help spur action on this vital measure. Under leave previously granted, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

THE JUDGE SAYS
(By Fred G. Stickel, Jr.)
THE LOOPHOLE

Many of the United States Supreme Court decisions have recently been under severe criticism from highly responsible and knowledgeable sources. Defenders of the Court have contended that loose or improperly drawn legislation has made necessary decisions censured by some and that the decisions do not constitute judicial legislation or invasion of the province of the legislative branch of government or the imposition of personal policies and viewpoints or unrealistic reasoning stemming from inexperience and too long residence in an ivory tower and not enough exposure to the stream of life. The case of *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan*, decided by the Court in March of 1958, might well be seized upon to illustrate the views of critics and supporters of the Court. And, incidentally, the decision was unanimous, which of itself is something for which the Court might be praised.

The question was whether amounts expended to lease premises and hire employees for the conduct of alleged illegal gambling enterprises were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Court held that they were so deductible even though the taxpayers received income from bookmaking establishments in Chicago, Ill., and even though the Tax Court found these enterprises were illegal under Illinois law, that the acts performed by the employees constituted violations of that law, and that the payment of rent for the use of the premises for the purpose of bookmaking was also illegal under Illinois law.

Another unnecessary blow to law enforcement, a decision favorable to the law violator, and against the law-abiding and at the expense of the taxpayer, say the critics. Why should not the Court have cooperated with Illinois in the enforcement of its laws against gambling, continue such critics.

But, say the Court's defenders, the job of the Court is to interpret the law, not make it, and one of the criticisms of the Court is that too often it does make law.

The Court itself said: "Deductions are a matter of grace and Congress can, of course, disallow them as it chooses. At times the policy to disallow expenses in connection with certain condemned activities is clear." Here in the opinion of the Court the policy of Congress wasn't clear. "If we enforce as Federal policy the rule espoused by the Commissioner in this case," says the Court, "we would come close to making this type of business taxable on the basis of gross receipts, while all other business would be taxable on the basis of net income." And that probably was what Congress intended but declares the Court, "if that choice is to be made, Congress should do it." Admirable judicial restraint which the critics would say the Court might have exercised in decisions involving congressional intent as to legislation designed to curb Communists, where the Court was able to discover that Congress intended to preempt the field in legislating against the Communist and thereby to deprive the States of such power despite the long held and often praised system under which the State legislatures operated as laboratories in which to test out and experiment legislatively.

But the fact is that the congressional act which allowed deductions for "the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred * * * in carrying on any trade or business" did not expressly limit the deductions to legal trade or business or expressly exclude illegal trade or business although the tax court found no difficulty in reading the act as not allowing deductions, in determining net income, where the deductions consisted of expenditures made in connection with illegal acts.

The Supreme Court was able to reverse the tax court view by recourse to the regulations of the Commissioner making the Federal excise tax on wagers deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. "This," said that august Court, "seems to us to be recognition of a gambling enterprise as a business for Federal tax purposes. The policy that allows as a deduction the tax paid to conduct the business seems sufficiently hospitable to allow the normal deductions of the rent and wages necessary to operate it * * *. We said," continues the Court on the cited case, "that the fact that an expenditure bears a remote relation to an illegal act does not make it nondeductible."

Ain't law wonderful.

However, fortunately for the taxpayer, Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, disagrees with the Supreme Court interpretation. He recently stated in connection with a bill he introduced in Congress designed to correct the law as laid down by the Court, H. R. 11691, that "The Supreme Court has given organized crime a big break by ruling that gambling operators can deduct from their gross income the expenses of illegal operations. Congress has a moral obligatoin to close this loophole. * * * The Court in effect has said that since Congress has never expressly disapproved of these deductions there is nothing it can do. They have left the determination up to Congress. In my opinion there is no earthly reason why Congress should hesitate one moment in setting the Court and the gambling world straight as to its intentions."

Right you are Congressman and we not only wish you success in your efforts to close the loophole revealed by the Supreme Court and which it did not consider it could close, but we urge our readers to let their Congressmen know that Congressman KEATING should be aided in his effort. While that effort may strike only a relatively minor blow at organized crime, every blow as the Congressman says "counts in the struggle to eradicate the syndicates and their undesirable operations. They have been feeding on the good people of this land far too long. When it comes to paying taxes, they should be treated as what they are—not law abiding businessmen but out and out racketeers."

However, Congressman be sure that the congressional intent is crystal clear, so clear that he who runs may read—lest another loophole be uncovered.

Why is it that so often the law aids the violator? Maybe someday either a Court or the Congress will allow the homeowner to deduct his losses on the sale of his home in determining net income instead of confining him to including his profits in his income should he make any on such a sale. I repeat ain't law wonderful—I had almost said wonderfully funny. But then as Jefferson said: "Consistency is the last resort of fools."

Wrong Ones at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an editorial from the July 22 issue of the Indianapolis Star. I believe the comments expressed show a very realistic approach to the problems in the Near East. It would seem the course of logic to discuss the problems in the Near East with some of the principals involved, and perhaps gain a greater understanding of those from whom we are becoming increasingly separated. I trust the administration is giving careful consideration to proposals in this direction.

The editorial follows:

WRONG ONES AT THE SUMMIT

There is no reason at all to agree to a summit meeting with the Soviet Union now, despite the Middle East crisis. In our relations with the Soviets nothing has changed. There is still no agreement on what will be discussed; what agreements we want to make or try to make. And the Soviet Union, which has violated every agreement it has ever made with us in the past, has demonstrated no change of policy in that respect either.

What has changed by American intervention in Lebanon is the Middle Eastern situation. There is good reason to have a summit conference about this, but not with the Soviet Union. The kind of summit conference we need now is the kind proposed by former President Truman on Sunday. Truman proposed that President Eisenhower invite President Nasser of the United Arab Republic to the United States for a discussion of Arab problems. This is just plain good sense. For it is Nasser and his UAR, Nasser and his "positive neutrality," Nasser the symbol and inspiration of Arab aspirations for political and economic unity that is the central force with which the United States has got to deal in the Middle East.

We invited Kings Saud and Feisal of the old feudal Arab regimes, which Arabs are now trying to shake off, to come to America. But we have ignored and snubbed the one man who represents to the majority of the Arab world the renaissance of Arab culture, Arab progress, and Arab political union. We have treated Nasser as though he were an enemy while we let the real enemy, Soviet communism, walk into the Middle East almost at our own invitation. We have opposed Arab unity and self-determination while we let the Soviets support it. We have intervened in Lebanon to protect the status quo. But the Arabs don't want a status quo. That is what they are struggling against in their attempts to emerge from their colonial cocoon into the free air of national union and Arab independence.

If the United States wants a conference let's have it with somebody who can represent the Arab world and its hopes. We have got to face facts and Nasser is a fact. Arab unity and Arab nationalism are facts. We have got to deal with the Arab world as it is, not as we would like it to be.

We never thought we would be proposing that President Eisenhower take ex-President Truman's advice. But Truman is right as rain. We hope the President will take his advice this time, and ask Nasser to come to Washington.

Substitute Your Own Title

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gerald W. Johnson, which appeared in the New Republic magazine of July 21, 1958, makes most interesting reading, even if we think his title shows disrespect for high office:

DUMB CLUCKS AND RASCALS

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

There is a verse in the Bible that used to puzzle me greatly. It is in the 18th chapter of the First Book of Kings, where it is related that Elijah the Tishbite having made a weather forecast of the end of the current drought, called a conference at the summit of Mount Carmel and there saw his prophecy fulfilled. But how it was fulfilled. Fire plunged from heaven and consumed not only the sacrifice drenched with 12 barrels of water, but even the stones of the altar on which it lay. The priests of Baal were liquidated on the spot to the number of 850. A cloud no bigger than a man's hand suddenly loomed over the whole sky and the King, aghast, leaped into his whirlybird and hastily took off for Gettysburg or the equivalent thereof. Then comes the verse that long astonished me, ending the narrative and the chapter with these words: "And the hand of the Lord was on Elijah; and he girded up his loins, and ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel."

Even as a child in Sunday school I could understand what impelled the King to scram out of there, but why did the prophet outrun the chariot? He had foretold the event, and they had razzed him unmercifully, called him a prophet of doom and gloom. Then when things turned out as he had predicted it seemed to me that he should have been blandly complacent, rather than scared into breaking the sound barrier.

But I begin to understand now. A few days ago while looking through the files I came across a sentence published in this place on May 23, 1955. It read: "Judging by its first 27 months, the epitaph of the Eisenhower administration may be, 'It lacked mentality.'" The quotation was what a Republican Senator had said about Warren G. Harding in 1920.

Now I am no professional prophet, not even a good amateur, merely a dub; but today I know that when one's prophecy turns out to be not merely right, but too right, too godawfully right, the prophet's dominant emotion is not complacence but a powerful yen to get off the premises as if jet propelled. No wonder Elijah bolted.

He had one advantage over me. There is sound of abundance of rain, and I would fain take cover, but I have not the faintest idea in which direction lies Jezreel. In fact, I don't think there is any Jezreel, for we are stuck with this administration until January 1961, and that is a long time to endure lack of mentality in high places. For a very superficial study of history is enough to show that the state rarely, if ever, suffers as much damage from the depredations of a brainy rascal as it does from the dumb cluck who stupidly repeats the errors of his predecessor, even though he may be, morally, no worse than the average politician.

It is the dull repetition of previously exposed folly that is the most ominous sign at the moment. Lebanon, Little Rock, and Castro the bandit, have been fumbled, heaven knows, but they are, in some respects, new problems. Truman, Acheson, and Forrestal left no blueprints for dealing with them, and the worst that can be said of administration policy in these matters is that it lacks ingenuity.

By the same token, if present-day delators were charging certain lackeys of the administration with barratry, ecclesioclasm, defenestration and other malversations of an arcane and extraordinary quality, one might say that the rogues at least are ingenious. But when they repeat the exact stupidities that they were lately deriding in their predecessors, even that cold comfort is denied us.

When JENNER, BRICKER, KNOWLAND, and others asserted, as if it were an accusation, that the Eisenhower administration had borrowed its ideas from the New Deal, they were talking through their hats. If an idea is a good one, a man of sense takes it over, regardless of its origin. But now that it is apparent that some understrappers of this administration have borrowed from some understrappers of the Truman administration their snide and slippery procedures, the charge that the present regime has no ideas of its own gains weight.

First-rate statecraft ought to be copied, as there is usually nothing better available. But to copy methods of chiseling whose stupidity has just been exposed argues a barrenness of imagination that is beyond description.

This terrific fulfillment has jarred the prophet of 1955 loose from any feeling of complacence and filled him with an impulse to take to his heels, if he only had an idea which way to run. But with flight impossible, we can only brace ourselves to sweat it out. After all, Lady Luck may still be with us. Perhaps the recession has already touched bottom. Perhaps the Middle East will not take fire from Iraq. Perhaps Castro has by now recovered his senses. Perhaps despair will not drive the Arkansas Negroes into disastrous folly. But our hope is in the mysterious ways of providence, not in the mentality of King Ahab's court.

Agricultural Development and Assistance Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, again today as has been the case with farm legislation since 1955 we are confronted with legislation that—in my opinion—is almost a 50–50 mixture of good and bad.

This bill today incorporates an extension of our very successful foreign disposal program under Public Law 480 as it was inaugurated in 1954 and as it has been so successfully administered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. Under this program we have been able to reduce the national wheat surplus by over 100 million bushels. This program has served to build up our foreign markets without affecting the domestic price of our own farm produce.

A simple extension of this act is all that is required.

Yet—what are we presented with today? Much more than a simple extension. Under the provisions ordering the Secretary to barter away up to $500 million of our farm surpluses, we grant him an extension of power that would permit this country to do for schools in foreign nations what we have not allowed for our own schools. As I read this bill, the Secretary under this program is authorized to expend foreign currencies paid for our produce for the construction and support of private, nonprofit schools abroad sponsored by or founded by American citizens. How can we justify this program? How can we go back to our people and say that we feel our own public schools should be supported locally by local taxes and at the same time admit that we voted for a program that would give their taxes to schools in foreign countries for the education of foreign nationals?

I say we cannot. The section that embarks the Secretary of Agriculture on the foreign school financing spree should be eliminated.

The Secretary of Agriculture already has limited power to barter for disposal of farm surpluses. He opposes the expansion of authority this bill gives him. We are forcing upon him a program he does not want. And, I repeat, this Federal aid for foreign schools will be mighty hard to defend in the little red schoolhouses back home.

Seaway Will Open Five Lakes Full of Rivals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1954, in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, this House had two rollcall votes on a bill known as S. 2150, which provided for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. Representing, as I do, the major portion of the Brooklyn waterfront in the port of New York, I voted to recommit that bill to the House Committee on Public Works and voted against it on final passage.

The following newspaper article by Eckert Goodman entitled "New York's Port in a Storm" published in this morning's New York Daily News portrays the harmful effects of that bill upon the port of New York, its foreign trade, and the whole economy of the city of New York:

NEW YORK'S PORT IN A STORM—SEAWAY WILL OPEN FIVE LAKES FULL OF RIVALS

(By Eckert Goodman)

The St. Lawrence seaway, whose opening next year will touch off incalculable new competition for the already hard-pressed port of New York, has been described as "America's fourth coast" and a "gateway to the world's eighth sea."

It has also been called one of international shipping's biggest bundles of unknown quantities.

A 360-mile-long chain of interlocking lakes, locks, canals, and dredged riverbed between Lake Erie and Montreal, it will provide a continuous 27-foot channel for ocean freighters.

Thus the seaway is a vital link in a 2,400-mile inland waterway leading from the Atlantic Ocean north of Nova Scotia into the heart of America's Midwest, which claims two-fifths of the country's manufacturing and almost half its farm production.

Disregarding the $650 million St. Lawrence power project, whose three dams now pen up in a 25-mile-long lake what used to be the International Rapids, the seaway is largely an improvement of an existing 14-foot waterway which has been in use on the St. Lawrence for over a half a century.

IT'S BIG ENOUGH FOR MOST FREIGHTERS

But its 27-foot depth and 7 new 800-by-80-foot locks will enable an estimated three-fourths of the world's ocean going shipping to reach such inland cities as Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and eventually Milwaukee and Duluth.

The waterway's joint United States-Canadian Tolls Committee has estimated that it will attract some 25 million tons of shipping in its first full year of operation and more than 50 million tons annually by 1967.

Half a dozen United States steamship companies, including the Grace, Isbrandtsen and United States Lines, have announced that they intend to operate on the seaway; and its recent designation by the Maritime Administration as part of essential foreign trade routes to Europe and South America assures them of operating subsidies.

About 80 percent of seaway cargoes are initally expected to consist of bulk commodities like wheat, coal, and iron ore. But there are confident predictions that the proportion of high-revenue-producing general cargo, which every port on the Great Lakes is hoping to attract, will rise from a base of a million tons a year to nearly 7 million tons annually within a decade.

COULD COST US ABOUT 200,000 JOBS

Five years ago, Port of New York Authority analysts estimated that the seaway could divert more than 3,500,000 tons of general cargo a year from New York, an amount which could ultimately result in a loss of 200,000 jobs and a $1 billion payroll.

Since the study was made, the figures have been revised downward, but it is still generally agreed that the seaway will be a constant threat and could have a seriously damaging impact on the port's foreign trade and, hence, the city's whole economy.

The main advantage, claimed for the seaway is, of course, lower shipping costs. At present, the average Midwest shipper has to spend about as much to get his merchandise on a New York pier as it costs him to ship it to Europe. Even with toll charges and the extra distance they'll have to sail, steamship operators are sure they can do a lot better than that—and some of them seem to have more or less proved the point.

INLAND STUDY SHOWS A 20- TO 40-PERCENT SAVING

A group of Great Lakes manufacturers recently announced that a careful study, including generous allowance for unknown factors, had convinced them that the seaway would reduce their freight costs to Europe by between 20 percent and 40 percent, depending on the type of commodity.

A Milwaukee manufacturer has reported that he saved $5,000 in transportation charges by shipping a power shovel to France aboard one of the small, specially built foreign freighters which have been plying the St. Lawrence for years. And another claims an economy of $30,000 on the piecemeal movement of a medium-sized cement plant to Spain by the same little ships.

Midwestern seaport enthusiasts also like to point out that, by seaway, Cleveland will be 200 miles closer to Hamburg, Germany, than New York, and Duluth is almost 500 miles nearer Rotterdam by water alone than via New York by rail and water.

AND NOW THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

But even the most ardent seaway devotees are forced to admit that all is not clear sailing ahead, and a good deal remains to be spent and done if the trade route is to measure up to their highest expectations. Here are some of the problems:

1. The seaway will be closed down every year for 4 months, between early December and mid-April, by ice plus winter storms which make inland navigation hazardous.

2. The 27-year-old Welland Canal, which circumvents Niagara Falls and its rapids by lifting and lowering ships 326 feet in 8 locks between Lakes Erie and Ontario, is already jampacked on occasion and could easily become, with its partially one-way passage, a serious bottleneck.

3. The seaway's 27-foot-deep channel—in contrast with New York Harbor's 45 feet and Philadelphia's 37—cannot be safely navigated by ships with more than 25½ feet of draft, and is too shallow to admit more than 5 percent of today's American merchant marine freighters fully loaded.

4. It will cost at least $141 million in Federal expenditures to dredge deeper channels between the Great Lakes and leading into its harbors, and an outlay of some $100 million more by the 57 ports themselves to open the entire 2,400-mile route to sizable ocean commerce.

5. It is still hard to estimate ship operation costs accurately, because definite tolls, while suggested, have not yet been set, and use of the present waterway is free.

6. A whole new midwestern maritime industry must be created and trained to insure efficient financing, insuring, forwarding, and handling of foreign general cargo.

BUT SEAWAYERS SAY THEY HAVE ANSWERS

But seaway proponents claim to have answers to most of these problems. During the winter, while the St. Lawrence is closed down, they explain, bulk cargoes can be safely and economically stored; and railroads and trucks can be reutilized, even at their threatened higher rates, to transport general cargo to eastern seaports.

Besides, a method of preventing ice from forming by the release of air bubbles from underwater pipes has proved successful in certain Canadian and Scandinavian harbors, and eventually it may even be feasible to pump relatively warm water from the Great Lakes into the river to keep it from freezing over.

The capacity of the Welland Canal, which supposedly can handle double the 23 million tons of shipping a year it now accommodates, can be doubled again by construction of a new set of parallel locks, when traffic warrants the expense. Meanwhile a schedule can, perhaps, be worked out to prevent traffic jams.

As for the seaway's 27-foot depth, most steamship companies say they can operate their freighters profitably even if they aren't loaded down to their Plimsoll lines, by taking on and discharging portions of their load at Quebec and Montreal, or by carrying cargo which is bulky but relatively light.

THEY'RE ORDERING SHIPS SPECIALLY FOR SEAWAY

In addition, both Grace and United States Lines report that they have on order freighters specially designed for seaway use. This is also the case with several European companies, one of which, Holland's Oranje Line, has announced that it will put two specially built cargo-passenger vessels into service between Chicago and Rotterdam next summer.

Contracts totaling $42 million for dredging and deepening Great Lake channels have already been let by the United States Government, and work is proceeding apace under supervision of the Army Engineers Corps in such farflung areas as the Detroit River and St. Mary's River, which flows out of Lake Superior, 600 feet above sea level.

The Great Lake's ports themselves have earmarked millions of dollars for waterfront reconstruction and harbor improvements, and are cautiously contemplating the expenditure of millions more. Chicago, for instance, which has embarked on a $37 million port expansion program, anticipates spending 3 times that amount within the next 10 years.

Milwaukee is in the midst of building an $11 million pier and general cargo terminal; Duluth has begun construction of a $10 million waterfront installation; and Toledo, with a new $8 million railroad dock near completion, envisions spending $25 million more on port expansion as soon as it has been assured of a 27-foot channel.

It's in the export fields in which New York is now predominant—automobiles, industrial machinery, electrical apparatus, steel products, and fresh and frozen meat—that

the port is apt to be most sorely challenged by the seaway.

WE NOW HAVE 83 PERCENT OF AUTO EXPORTS

Last year 83 percent of the Nation's automotive exports passed through the port of New York. While most cars are shipped in knockdown condition for assembly after arrival, some are not; and a Milwaukee businessman pointed out a few weeks ago that from $160 to $200 a car was being saved on vehicles sent unboxed from Great Lakes ports.

Remarked the general manager of Willys Motors recently: "When it costs us $5.50 to get a jeep to the pier in Toledo, as against $53.62 when the port of New York is used, we are talking about a competitive advantage we thus have in the foreign country where the jeep is delivered."

THE GREAT LAKES ARE IN THE BIG LEAGUE

Another ominous note for the future was sounded by President Lewis A. Lapham of the Grace Line, speaking before a group of Wisconsin industrialists.

"The port of Milwaukee," he advised them, "may not immediately rise to such fame as the Braves, but they are both in the big league to stay.

"Ships always follow the cargo * * * and you need have no fear, the house flags of the world's fleets are in the lakes to stay."

Arms for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter which I sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, urging that mutual security aid be accorded to the State of Israel so that the free nation will be equipped to defend itself against aggression in the seething Middle East.

I have also asked that if it will result in swifter arms assistance for the Israelites, that the Israeli Government be permitted to purchase arms on the open market pending the closing of agreements entitling them to mutual security aid.

I also include a press release on this vital subject.

The letter and press release follow:

JULY 18, 1958.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is essential that the United States mobilize all possible strength to oppose the current threat to those nations of the Middle East which have demonstrated their friendship for the United States and look to the United States for support.

The State of Israel during the decade of its existence has effectively demonstrated its opposition to international communism and its determination to defend its independence at all costs.

In view of recent developments in the Middle East, and because the recent meetings between Nasser and Khrushchev may result in the Soviets furnishing additional arms to the United Arab Republic headed by Nasser, Israel has urgent need for adequate supplies of modern weapons and military equipment. I respectfully urge that you make use of the authority which you possess under the Mutual Security Act to provide such weapons and equipment to Israel on a grant basis, and, if such action would expedite the sending of arms and equipment, that you authorize the immediate sale to Israel of items most urgently required pending the completion of other arrangements.

Sincerely,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican, of Connecticut, has asked President Eisenhower to authorize shipments of modern weapons to Israel.

MORANO, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, suggested in a letter to the President that due to the critical situation in the Middle East Israel should be furnished military weapons under the mutual security program.

He emphasized that Communist arms have been going to the Arab forces, and that additional armaments were certain to result from the recent Nasser-Khrushchev meeting, making it imperative that Israel be equipped to defend its territorial borders and the cause of freedom should developments require such action.

MORANO said that if bringing Israel into the family of nations receiving mutual security aid would entail too much delay, then Israel should be permitted to purchase arms on the open market at once, pending the signing of MSA agreements.

"It is essential that the United States mobilize all possible strength to oppose the current threat to those nations of the Middle East which have demonstrated their friendship for the United States and look to the United States for support," MORANO said.

Reign of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, previously I had inserted into the RECORD an article from the magazine Wisdom on Pope Pius XII, dealing primarily with the life of this great religious leader until the time he was elected to the highest office in the Catholic Church. The same magazine also published an article on the period covering his reign. In order to complete the picture, I am inserting also this article, which is as follows:

POPE PIUS XII: HIS REIGN

(By Nazareno Padellaro and Robert L. Reynolds)

Pius XII received the tiara as though it were a helmet, for Europe was in arms.

The objects of Pius XII during the 6 tragic years from 1939 to 1945 are easily summarized: to bring to bear all the moral authority of the Holy See to avert war; to do all he could to limit it when it had once begun; to keep Italy from participation; to seek by every means to mitigate its horrors; to help the invaded countries; to save Rome; and to denounce unceasingly all tyranny and all crimes against humanity.

As he lifted his hand in the first of the countless apostolic blessings he was to give as Pope, what must have struck him above all else was his utter aloneness.

As Eugenio Pacelli, the new Pope always had been a man of ascetic life and considerable reserve. Now, his relationships with even his closest acquaintances were on a radically different footing. Visiting the sickroom of his old friend Francesco Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani soon after his election, the Pope saw the venerable churchman try to raise himself out of his bed. The effort was beyond him, and he said apologetically, "I beg Your Holiness' forgiveness if I am unable to render due homage." With a smile at once reassuring and wistful Pius answered: "Don't fatigue yourself. For this evening, let us be just Eugenio and Francesco."

It was a particularly difficult time to be without close friends. As the pontificate of Pius XI had drawn to a close the Vatican had seen the systematic violation of the concordats it had signed with several nations.

The Italian press talked about sowers of panic, alternating threats with abuse. But the Pope, in every allocution—and he delivered 14 during the month of May 1939—had one subject alone, which was peace. He addressed pilgrims and young married couples, recalling the foundations of the democratic virtues and assuring all who heard him of his profound anxiety over the uncertain fate of peaceful relations between the nations. He broached a theme to which he was to return vigorously many times: what fate would the future hold for those who sought to make strength triumph over justice? "The hand of Constantine," he said, "which built this temple to the glory of God, was the same as that which broke the cruel tyrants and gave freedom to the Church."

The Holy See exerted itself in every way possible to bring one gleam of reason into those last few tormented months. Less urgent business was postponed. A prudent reserve was maintained at the Vatican, but hope had not yet been abandoned:

"We do not wish, we have not the heart even now, to abandon hope that a sense of moderation and reality will at length avert a conflict which, by common consent, would exceed anything hitherto experienced in the way of spiritual and material ruin."

Paternal affection may have caused the Holy Father to turn a blind eye to the evidence. But other words show that this evidence could not forever be ignored; it dispelled the last vestiges of generous illusion. "In the present circumstances, we desire that this blessing shall be a pledge of peace: peace for Italy, for Europe, or for the world."

The signatures were hardly dry on the Nazi-Soviet pact in Moscow when Pius XII spoke in tones of solemn warning to the nations and their rulers who were rushing headlong toward disaster. Over the Vatican radio the voice of the Pope, the voice of truth, was raised, above base passion, in all its clarity: "If is by force of reason, not of arms that justice prevails; empires not founded upon justice are not blessed by God. Politics divorced from morality betray the very people who treat them as such." It was a prophecy. "Nothing is lost through peace. All can be lost through war." These grave words, slowly and solemnly uttered, were true then and will remain so.

On September 1, Cardinal Maglione was called to the telephone by Monsignor Orsenigo, who informed him that the German Army was already marching toward the Polish frontier. The secretary of state conveyed this news to the sovereign pontiff. Pius XII withdrew to his chapel to pray and weep: men who had always admired his imperturbability saw him shaken by sobs. Pius XII's personal Golgotha had begun.

As Primate of Italy, the Pope was afraid that the sufferings, misery, and privations entailed by war would be followed by a collapse of spiritual values among his people. If neutrality could be preserved, Italy would be an oasis of peace in Europe; but if Rome were caught up in the vortex of war many nations would find themselves cut off from the Holy See, notwithstanding the guaranties of international law and the Lateran treaties.

In spite of all the Holy Father's efforts, Italy now hurled herself into the furnace. The bells of St. Peter's seemed as though trying to drown the din of martial music. They seemed to carry the sad echo of that prayer whereby the Sovereign Pontiff, like a parish priest when great storms threaten the fertile fields, begs God to turn aside His wrath.

Now that the cause of peace had been lost, the Pope devoted himself exclusively to the interests of truth and charity. His addresses and letters together form a complete commentary on the situation. Strange as it may seem, they create a sense not of depression but of exaltation, proclaiming the Christian duty to ameliorate a world made hideous by war.

Victory seemed already within the grasp of the enemy, but Pius XII, addressing the peoples of the world, raised his voice against that triumphant might which proposed in its arrogance to establish a new order.

Christianity, said Pius XII, is invincible. This, he proclaimed, was so certain that the masters of the hour could never construct an enduring new order. The principles of their social morality did violence to the rights of nations, oppressed minorities, seized and monopolized economic resources; while they themselves practiced total warfare, depended upon the ever-increasing production of armaments and were guilty of religious persecution. The Pope condemned the characteristics of Hitler's new order as violations of the natural law of nations, unmasking to the world all that the so-called liberators were and all that they had done. "Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles there is no room for the violation of the freedom, integrity, and security of other states, no matter what may be their territorial extension or their capacity for defense."

Pius XII decided to reorganize the charitable work of the Holy See. Its central offices were in Rome, and it was in touch with correspondents all over the world. Twice a week, hundreds of parcels and letters were sent out to destinations in every continent. Those in internment camps and prisons began to live and hope anew. So as not to arouse the suspicions of censors whom nothing escaped, a special technique was used in the transmission and reception of news. Little by little, a vast card-index system was built up in which every card represented a personal tragedy and a personal hope.

In the year 1943 alone, 244,692 messages were transmitted in many languages by the Vatican radio.

The Vatican Relief Organization, on the other hand, worked in silence. It received gifts from many quarters, but no one will ever know by what secret paths the Holy Father's unlimited compassion reached the misery and hunger and despair of so many unfortunate people. Relief was sent to France, Belgium, and Holland; food and medical supplies to Greece, Finland, Norway, Abyssinia, Malaya, and the Philippine Isles.

But these are only examples; apostolic nunciatures and delegations all around the world did likewise. The gifts to prisoners of war, the assistance sent to the afflicted, showed that charity had never so many hands, nor hands so full.

Every department of ecclesiastical learning—theology in all its branches, scriptural exegesis, canon law, and liturgy—was provided for in prison camps. Professors and students alike were drawn from among the inmates themselves. It is impossible here to describe all that the Holy See did to assist the victims of war; but some idea may be obtained from the archives of the Swiss Catholic mission at Friburg, which sent out such material as scientific and other textbooks, as well as light literature and even gramophone records.

The Holy See took full advantage of its neutrality in working for prisoners in Japanese hands. In 1942 the Japanese Government appointed M. Harada as Minister to the Holy See. President Roosevelt had been forewarned of this; he raised no objection, and the work of the nuncio in Tokyo was greatly facilitated.

The Roman sky was clear and undisturbed; suddenly the antiaircraft defenses went into action. On every hand the cry was raised, "Rome is being bombed." People had no time to reach the shelters before the first bombs fell. The Basilica of San Lorenzo fuori le mure was hit. The attack continued for about 2 hours; incendiaries were used, and Romans noted a coincidence—on that date, almost 19 centuries earlier, Nero fired the city.

Houses were still collapsing, bombs still exploding, when Pius XII left the Vatican to see what damage had been done. His presence was stronger than that of death; many people left their shelters and gathered in the Piazza del Verano to pray with the Holy Father, who knelt, it is said, on a coat spread for him by a workingman. Then he had seen the diplomatic representatives of Britain and the United States, telling them that every time Rome was subjected to the outrage of aerial attack he would share the dangers to which his children were exposed.

Rome was declared an open city, and the Italian Government accordingly requested the Holy See and the Swiss Federal Council to notify the Governments in London and Washington that appropriate measures had been taken. The Romans in thousands went to the piazza before St. Peter's to express their gratitude to the Pope.

The King fled with his government; war was now at the very gates of Rome, and gunfire could be heard at night. The doors of St. Peter's remained closed for 3 days.

The Vatican now had Hitler's Germany on its frontiers, and two German sentries guarded the demarcation line at the far end of the piazza. A terrible manhunt began. Basilicas, churches, and presbyteries, convents, colleges, and hospitals all served as places of refuge for those who feared persecution. The Pope, precisely because he was so anxious to do all he could for the relief of the oppressed, had to prevent them from taking refuge in the Vatican, as many tried to do. If deserters and fugitives had found asylum in the Vatican, there would have been pretext for reprisals.

But if the Vatican could not open its doors, no one was turned away who sought refuge with a priest; indeed, many of those wanted by the Germans had disguised themselves as clerics or religious.

The sovereign Pontiff was the last hope of the Jews. He had already paid 12 kilograms of gold to save 200 members of that race, when the Nuncio to Italy, Msgr. Borgongini Duca, visited the concentration camps where foreign Jews were held and heard them ask in anguish whether they were to be delivered to the Germans. The Nuncio assured them that the Pope would intervene on their behalf; and, despite repeated demands from the German authorities, he managed to do so. Meanwhile, the clergy did all they could to hide the Jews, though at least one priest, Don Aldo Mell, of Lucca, was shot for doing so. In July 1944, a month after the liberation of Rome, the chief rabbi in Italy, Dr. Israel Zolli, made a solemn declaration in the Roman synagogue, paying tribute to the Holy See for having condemned the anti-Semitic laws and diminished their effects.

With the spring of 1945 the war drew to its end. What must be the first step in the work of restoration? The prompt and swift return of prisoners and the interned, military, or civilian, to their homes. The Pope, expressing the anxiety of countless families, demanded that the chains should be allowed to fall from those in bondage. He asked also that men should once more embrace the spirit of love, of concord, of goodwill; that they should have done with all hatred, distrust and bitterness. Recalling the words of the prophet Ezekiel, he prayed God to fulfill His promise: "I will give them a single heart, I will breathe into them a new spirit, and I will tear out from their bowels a heart of stone, to replace it with a heart of flesh."

Most observers thought, 18 years ago, that Eugenio Pacelli was elected to the papacy primarily because the church needed an experienced hand to guide her through the labyrinth of international politics. He had the requisite skills and he has performed this task well. But history may remember him for achievements quite different and, in the long run, more important.

First. He has used the powers of his office to make catholicism a good deal more meaningful to the faithful. He has relaxed certain regulations surrounding the Mass and the sacraments and encouraged increased participation by the laity in the ceremonies of the church.

Second. He has brought the papacy closer to the people. During his pontificate he has seen and spoken to more people than any other pope.

Third. While Pope Pius has generally remained aloof from the political struggle between East and West, he has been an intellectual and moral leader in the fight against communism.

Fourth. He has stressed the teaching role of the papacy. The burden of his words has been to remind men that life means little without respect for human dignity, faithful service to one's vocation and a continuing devotion to peace.

Over and above these specific achievements there has been, for the Catholic at least, the strengthening example of the man himself. Ever since the beginning of his reign, Pius XII has been photographed often, and his words and deeds have been widely reported. As they have watched the lines of age, illness and struggle etch themselves on his face, and as they have read his vivifying words, Catholics all over the world have been confirmed in their faith.

Among what might be called the specifically religious acts of Pius XII there are many which will insure his reign a lasting remembrance. Foremost among them is his encouragement of more intelligent participation by every Catholic in the church's official worship, called the liturgy.

In two encyclicals, one on the liturgy itself, the other on the music which accompanies it, he has repeated his conviction that the laity, who are required to attend Mass, should not remain dumb and idle spectators but should be urged to participate and taught how to do so. To make it easier for them to get to Mass and to receive holy communion, he has relaxed the fasting regulations associated with the sacrament and permitted Mass to be said in the afternoon. And to increase popular understanding of ceremonies other than the Mass, he has allowed wider use of the vernacular at baptisms, weddings, and funerals.

A lifelong ambition for almost every Catholic is to visit Rome and see the Pope. In the 18 years of Pius XII's reign, a staggering number of them, and of non-Catholics as well, have done so. Three periods stand out: World War II, when the Pope received

hundreds of thousands of servicemen and women of every allied nation; the Holy Year of 1950 and the Marian Year of 1954–55, during each of which the total number of pilgrims ran into millions.

The wartime audiences were a revelation, both for the Pope and the military. After an audience with United States sailors, one of their number led the rest in a rousing "Hip, hip, hooray—His Holiness."

Pope Pius moves among the crowds easily and graciously, firmly raising each person from his knees and greeting him warmly. He asks (often in the visitors language) where he comes from and what he does for a living. If anyone has brought along religious articles to be blessed, the Pope obliges readily. A flustered United States Congressman once pulled out a package of cigarettes instead of a box of medals.

It is not only private citizens who ask to see the Pope. Among prominent Americans he has received are Dwight D. Eisenhower (when he was still in uniform), ex-Presidents Truman and Hoover and Secretary of State Dulles.

For Pius XII, these audiences seem to be central to his mission as Pope, for though he is advancing in years and is not in the best of health, he continues to receive more than 1 million people a year. He imparts to each the quite justified conviction that the successor of Peter cares deeply about every member of his flock.

Whenever the Pope appears in St. Peter's Square, carried above the heads of the crowd in his gilded chair, a shout of "Evviva il papa" precedes him across the broad plaza. Like surf pounding a beach it swells, crests, and finally breaks, engulfing the spectator with its roar, and then ebbs to a murmur as the swaying figure moves on. In part, this overwhelming enthusiasm stems from the volatile Italian temperment. In part it reflects the almost universal personal esteem for Pope Pius XII himself. Essentially it springs from something deeper: the belief that the Pope is more than a wise and saintly man in glittering vestments; that he is, in fact, the representative of Christ on earth. For the Catholic he acts with Christ's authority to teach, guide, and govern the entire church, and though only a man, there is upon him the mark of the hand of God.

The Heavens Are Not Too High: An Address to the Graduating Class of 1958, New York Military Academy, Cornwall, N. Y., by Byron C. MacNaab, Chief, Convair Operations, Cape Canaveral, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 of this year, for the 69th time since 1889, the graduating class of the New York Military Academy gathered by the great elm in front of the barracks on the high ground overlooking the Hudson at beautiful Cornwall, N. Y.

The graduating class of 1958 heard the two messages that follow and partook of the program which under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD:

INVOCATION DELIVERED BY THE REVEREND ARNOLD A. FENTON, CHAPLAIN AT NEW YORK MILITARY ACADEMY, CORNWALL-ON-HUDSON, N. Y., AT GRADUATION EXERCISES, JUNE 7, 1958

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to behold this academy and to look down upon it with favor. Grant that there may be obedience to Thy holy will, and that good learning may flourish and abound. Bless those who teach and those who learn. Especially do we ask Thy blessing upon those who are graduating today. Give them grace to stand fast in the faith, to obey Thy word, to abide in Thy love that being made strong by Thy holy spirit, they may resist temptation and overcome evil, and finally inherit eternal life. All this we ask in Thy name. Amen.

THE HEAVENS ARE NOT TOO HIGH

(Graduation address by Byron G. MacNabb, class of 1928, at New York Military Academy, June 7, 1958)

I wish to extend by heartiest congratulations to you young men who are graduating here today.

Thirty years ago this week I sat in the chapel here at New York Military Academy and listened to a commencement speaker as you are doing today. After 30 years I cannot even remember the subject of that address. By the same token, I realize, to borrow a few words from Abe Lincoln, "You will little note nor long remember what I say here today." I know that this moment you are only hoping that I will finish what I have to say so you can get your diplomas and go your various ways. I assure you that I won't delay you more than 10 minutes. Right now you are feeling complacent and self-satisfied with your accomplishment in graduating from New York Military Academy. Let me warn you that you have many a rough day ahead of you on the way up the ladder of success, and if what I say here today helps even one of you to reach the top I will feel I have not talked in vain.

You young men who are graduating today are on the threshhold of the space age. We look to the younger generation to solve the many problems which we will encounter in our efforts to conquer outer space. It makes no difference whether you plan to be an engineer, a doctor, a lawyer, or a businessman, the space age will challenge your imagination and tax your ingenuity to the utmost. Exactly 54 years to the day were required in the air age to progress from the first successful flight of an airplane by the Wright brothers to the first successful flight of Convair's Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile. I predict that the developments of the next 10 years will make the developments of the last 54 years appear to have been made at a snail's pace.

You are the men who must meet the challenge of the space age. Men of my generation are only the Wright brothers of the space age. You men will be the Lindberghs, Rickenbachers, the Vultees, the Martins, the Northrops, and the Donald Douglases of the space age.

It took almost 500 years from the time Leonardo da Vinci first set forth the principles of photography until the first successful process was developed. It took 40 years from the time Faraday and John Harvey developed the electric motor until electromotive power was put to a practical use. It took from 1873 to 1920 for radio to progress from the idea stage to practical application.

In my era this time scale has been compressed to where the A-bomb was developed in 5 years and transistors were developed from discovery to widespread use in only 5 years.

In the space age developments will move at an even faster pace, for we cannot afford a leisurely pace, and if you hope to succeed in this age you must continue to build on the solid academic foundation you have obtained here at New York Military Academy.

Regardless of what profession you choose to follow I warn you that there is no such thing as a short cut to success. Success comes only as a result of hard work. Here at New York Military Academy you have been given a solid foundation in your academic studies. More important, however, is the fact that you have received excellent training in the principles and importance of teamwork, the ability to take orders, to carry them out, and to be leaders of men. You will note that I have said that you have received here a solid foundation, but a foundation is not enough. You must continue to build on this foundation and it has been my experience that you can never stop building if you wish to continue on the road to success.

There is a great deal of talk today about the weakness of the American educational system—I do not subscribe to this school of thought. The weakness in our educational system is not in the schools but in the students and their parents. Our colleges are equipped to provide the finest possible type of higher education but too many of our college students today take the path of least resistance in obtaining a college degree. Briefly, too few students today are willing to work hard and their parents are unwilling to insist that they do so. Too often even among the parents the word "college" is associated with football rather than education.

If you are to keep pace with the space age you need no magic formula—you need only a solid background in the fundamentals of education. Mathematics, physics, chemistry, and a good command of the English language are the basic tools you will need. No scientific problem can be solved without mathematics, and chemistry, and physics provide an understanding of the world around us and are the keys to the problems of the world of outer space. Stop for a moment and think of the challenges of the engineering problem of weightlessness, the psychological problems of survival in a confined space for long periods of time, the medical problems of maintaining human life in space, or the legal problems which will face the "space" lawyer of the future.

Not since the days of Columbus and the discovery of the New World have young men faced such a wonderful opportunity for adventure and new discovery. Use your brains—work hard—let your imaginations work overtime—develop an infinite curiosity—learn to express yourself so others can understand you—be loyal to the man you work for and to the men who work for you—learn to be the kind of a leader you would want to have as a leader but above all learn to understand and be tolerant of your fellow men.

If you have a solid educational foundation and you follow these simple rules you will find as it says in the motto of Convair Astronautics that "The Heavens are not too high".

NEW YORK MILITARY ACADEMY 69TH GRADUATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1958

GRADUATION

The Star-Spangled Banner.

Invocation, Rev. Arnold A. Fenton.

Address to the graduating class, Byron Gordon MacNabb, New York Military Academy, 1928.

Presentation of diplomas, Bartlett E. S. Chappell, dean.

Awarding of medals and honors, Brig. Gen. Nelson Dingley III.

Presentation of achievement alumni award, George L. Strang, 1930, president of board of governors, New York Military Academy Alumni Association.

Benediction, Rev. Almos F. Gaudette.

The Alma Mater.

HONORS AWARDED FOR THE SCHOLASTIC YEAR 1957–58

Head boy gold medal, Daniel Irwin Konover.

Achievement alumni award, Joseph Solomon Dornbush.

The H. M. Scarborough award for distinguished scholastic achievement, Daniel Irwin Konover.

Hardy gold medal for school leadership, Donald David Bonanno.

The Laidlaw athletic award, Rafael A. Pizzo.

The Allan Rabinowitz trophy, Chris Constantine Parkas. To that graduate in the college preparatory course who has been in attendance for at least 4 consecutive years, and who has made the greatest overall improvement in scholastic work.

The Joseph C. Younes memorial trophy, Carlos Alberto Corredor-Ortiz. Awarded in recognition of superior achievement in senior mathematics.

The following gold medals are awarded for proficiency in academic subjects: Chemistry medal, open to seniors and juniors, Robert A. Vogel; physics medal, open to seniors and juniors, Carlos Alberto Corredor-Ortiz; biology medal, open to all classes, Stephen Lewis Weisel; English medal, open to seniors, Carlos Alberto Corredor-Ortiz; Latin medal, open to seniors, juniors, and sophomores, William John Gallicano; French medal, open to seniors, juniors, and sophomores, Robert A. Vogel; Spanish medal, open to seniors, juniors, and sophomores, Brian J. Duffy; German medal, open to seniors, juniors, and sophomores, Thomas George Knapp; mechanical drawing medal, open to all classes, Ernest Hulsizer; freshman medal, open to freshmen only, Gregory A. Hill; social studies medal, William John Gallicano.

Rensselaer Alumni Association medal, Joseph Solomon Dornbush. Offered at this academy to the member of the graduating class who has done the best work in mathematics and science during his course.

The Sovatkin memorial scholarship awards given by Mr. Edward J. Sovatkin in memory of his son, Stanley B. Sovatkin, class of 1932:

The Sovatkin memorial award of $25 for excellence in the two courses, United States history and world history, Michael R. Halperin.

The Sovatkin memorial award of $25 for excellence in science, Stephen B. Barasch.

The Sovatkin memorial award of $25 for excellence in English, Peyton Boswell III.

The Sovatkin memorial award of $25 for excellence in mathematics, Carlos Alberto Corredor-Ortiz.

The Daughters of the American Revolution award, Michael R. Halperin. To the senior cadet making the highest average in American history, a gold watch to be presented by Mrs. Thurman C. Warren, Jr., State regent, New York State organization, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Wright Hall parents' scholastic improvement award, Otis W. Stephens. To that cadet in Wright Hall who by industry and zeal has shown the greatest improvement in his academic work.

Medal, best scholastic work in Bard Hall, Morley Shelman.

Dr. Leon Hermann award, Richard Wallace. Awarded to that cadet in Bard Hall who by his conscientious effort has improved in scholastic endeavor. The trophy will be permanently possessed by Bard Hall with the recipient's name inscribed thereon.

The Rae Grossman memorial trophy sponsored by Mr. and Mrs. Arnold J. Canton, Peter Metralexis. In annual recognition of that cadet in Bard Hall whose academic achievement throughout the year has been significantly marked by hard, consistent, and diligent effort, this trophy, remaining at the academy and inscribed each year with the name of the winning cadet, is commemorated in a silver medal to be awarded to the recipient.

Best drilled infantry cup.

Best drilled special unit cup.

DIPLOMA LIST, 1957–58

Robert Jay Abend, Robert Joseph Agnoli, Jose Guillermo Alberni Boudet, Leonard Howard Ashbach, Stephen B. Barasch, Donald David Bonanno, Peyton Boswell III, Elroy H. Botwick, Enrico Joseph Bovera, Edward M. Brewer, Jr., Arthur James Burlington, Jr., Carl C. Buschmann, John David Castellitto, Luis Antonio Cavalieri B., Carlos Alberto Corredor-Ortiz, Frank Anthony Corigliano, Alfred Beveridge Dedel, John Anthony Louis DeSalvio, Dirk Ross DeWitt, Joseph Richard Donovan, Joseph Solomon Dornbush, Temistocles Fernandez Colmenares, Cosimo J. Filiberto, Anthony M. Frisina, Manuel Jose Garcia-Tamayio, Edward Joseph Gray, Jr., Gordon H. Groland, Michael R. Halperin, Sylvested J. Hamilton, Floyd Edwin Harris, Stephen D. Harrison, Robert W. Hertz, Michael Herwig, John Leonard Hines III, Jorge Bernardo Hung, Juan Marcos Imery, Ronald Morris Jackson, Nicholas F. Jaenichen, Robert C. Johnson, Thomas P. Kennedy, Thomas George Knapp, Daniel Irwin Konover, Arturo Leon, Jerold Kobrick Levien, Tubilo Lombao, Jr., Carlos Manuel Londono, Phillip Lovitt, Malcolm C. Lunn, Kevin John McHugh, Carmine Joseph Mancuso, William J. Masilotti, Jr., Guitze Rafael Messina, Michael Morchower, Thomas M. Murphy, Marcus Whitman Muth, Robert A. Neild, Chris Constantine Parkas, Philip Warren Perry, Raphael A. Pizzo, Gerald Alfred Pucillo, Alfonso Riveroll Estrada, Andres Jeronimo Rolando, Michael P. Romain, Herbert Charles Ross, Jr., Sanford Scott Rothman, Charles Malcolm Sage, Jr., Michael Henry Savod, Victor C. Scallo, Thomas F. Schaffran, Frederick H. Schroeder, Richard A. Schwartz, Richard D. Schwartz, Ronald Seppi, Robert W. Smyth, Robert Rubin Stroh, Jack Tenbekjian, Juan Antonio Tinoco, Pablo Uribasterra, Manuel L. Weinberg, Richard Weiner, Fairfield Whiting, Jon Enoch Yellin, Ernest I. Zima, Jr.

Postgraduates: Lawrence S. Hoyns, Richard Bryant Nelson, Gene August Perla.

Winning Essay and Book Selections in Milwaukee Library Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this spring the Milwaukee Committee for National Library Week conducted a contest among the young people of the community. Each contestant selected 25 books that he would want to own—for knowledge, for understanding, for entertainment. The first prize was won by John Woodmansee, of 2927 East Newberry Boulevard. His prizewinning essay and list of books follow:

[From the Milwaukee Public Library Milwaukee Reader]

TWENTY-FIVE BOOKS

My reasons for wanting to own the particular books I have chosen are almost as varied as the selections themselves.

Some of the books—many, in fact—will help me better to understand the world in which I live, and the people who have made it what it is.

Our vast culture is important in this respect, as the marvelous world that our authors, poets, and composers have created has become a part of our own world.

The old masters, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Bronte, Twain, Dumas, and, appearing in the Oxford Book of American Verse, Poe, Whitman, and Longfellow, their works, as well as the works of the new masters, O'Neill, Sandburg, O. Henry, Hemingway, Steinbeck, have not been omitted from the list.

The composers, too, are important and even though their works have to be heard to be appreciated, I will learn something about them in the books A Journey to Greatness, A History of Music, and Bach.

To understand the world in which I live I must also understand another world, too, the world of science. To discover the sea in Rachel Carson's The Sea Around Us, to learn of the stars and planets, the rocks and trees in Palmer's Natural History are things which I want to do very much now, especially since I have started to work on this contest.

Equally important to greater knowledge of the world is a knowledge of history. By understanding the world of yesterday through history, it is possible to understand the world of today. In this subject, I have chosen Epic of America as a good general American history; I have pinpointed various moments of the story of man in this country and others with A Tale of Two Cities, The Red Badge of Courage, and All Quiet on the Western Front; finally, I have chosen a book about a man who I think has done more for this country than any other man, Abraham Lincoln.

And then, too, I have selected books of quite a different nature, the ones you can just sit back and enjoy for their humor. The Private Dining Room and The Thurber Album are two of these, and, although a much older work, Don Quixote, promises to be just as enjoyable.

I am also looking forward to some interesting science fiction which I have enjoyed in the past but not added to my library.

All and all, should I receive the books I have mentioned, ahead of me there would be a wonderful summer of reading, as well as increased pleasure in books throughout the years to come. To me, there is something specially thrilling about each title I have chosen.

To enrich a mind, to bring on a laugh, to sway a heart—these are some of the things that a book—and sometimes only a book—can do. I have selected mine with these ideas—and many more—in mind.

Abraham Lincoln, by Carl Sandburg (the one-volume edition containing The Prairie Years and The War Years); Nine Plays by Eugene O'Neill; The Complete Short Stories of Mark Twain; Bach, by Albert Schweitzer; The Sea Around Us, by Rachel Carson; Jane Eyre, by Charlotte Bronte; The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci (in the Modern Library Edition); The Private Dining Room, by Ogden Nash; The Complete Works of William Shakespeare; The Red Badge of Courage, by Stephen Crane; The Complete Works of O. Henry; Famous Science Fiction Stories (A Modern Library Giant, edited by Raymond J. Healy); Don Quixote, by Cervantes; A Journey to Greatness, by David Ewen; The Thurber Album, by James Thurber; Epic of America, by Adams; All Quiet on the Western Front, by Erich Remarque; The Oxford Book of American Verse; Vanguard, by Caidin; A Field Guide to Natural History, by Palmer; A Tale of Two Cities, by Charles Dickens; A History of Music, by Paul Lang; The Old Man and the Sea, by Ernest Hemingway; The Grapes of Wrath, by John Steinbeck; the Count of Monte Cristo, by Alexander Dumas.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*..6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*..
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*..
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*..University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*..5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B Everett, *N. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*..The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*....The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*..Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*...
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*...
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*..
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Church, Jordan, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4853 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the International Cooperation Administration with respect to certain allegations made before Senate and House committees and on other occasions by witnesses who have appeared before the committees. It is a statement from the ICA, and is in the nature of an answer to the various charges which have been made in one field of activity or another.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF SPRUILLE BRADEN BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JULY 18, 1958

Mr. Braden's statement contains a number of statements of or assumptions as to alleged fact concerning the mutual security program. The following comments are restricted primarily to an analysis of the factual representations.

Perhaps the most frequent and basic condemnation of the mutual security program in this statement is that ICA and its programs are wasteful, inefficient, extravagant and dishonest. However, no specific cases are cited in this statement. ICA and its operations are under constant, careful scrutiny by many agencies and individuals both public and private. Congress and the General Accounting Office conduct regular, careful examinations of the program. A compendium of specific criticisms arising from a variety of sources was carefully examined this year and the record of this examination (ICA Answers to Criticisms of the Foreign Aid Program, House Foreign Affairs Committee print, March 14, 1958) would indicate that the program has been conducted remarkably well, that only a very small proportion of those criticisms were entirely valid, and that in these rare instances, corrective action has been completed or is underway. There is no doubt, however, that the program by its very nature is faced with severe difficulties in working effectively with a wide variety of governments and peoples with differing objectives and standards. Continued objective examination of the operations of the program performs a valuable service.

More specifically, Mr. Braden has raised the following items on which comment seems indicated.

Item: ICA is a horrible example of dishonesty.

Presumably this would relate to the integrity of ICA personnel. Throughout the history of the agency, there have been only a very few cases in which employees have been found guilty of malfeasance (see answer to question No. 1, House Foreign Affairs Committee print, March 14, 1958). The small number of cases which have been discovered is strong evidence of the effectiveness of the agency's effort to insure that its personnel maintain a high degree of responsibility and integrity.

In testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East regarding charges made about the program in Laos (hearings, May 7 and 8, 1958, p. 10) program a General Accounting Office witness stated:

"From all the evidence we have had, we can say, Mr. Chairman, we have no evidence at all that there was any fraud, malpractice, or wrongdoing on the part of the United States officials."

There are of course many problems in working with officials in underdeveloped countries with widely differing concepts and standards. To meet these problems rather than avoid them, to help our friends to improve and develop is a major element of the mutual security program.

Item: Accounting and control of foreign aid funds are deficient.

The problem of controlling and auditing foreign aid funds has been intensively examined not only by the executive branch but by several congressional committees and the General Accounting Office. ICA maintains careful controls, audits and end-use checks throughout its program. This cannot be expected to be fully and immediately effective, however, where it extends into the operations of the governments of many undeveloped countries. In fact one of the major objectives of the technical assistance program is to assist these governments to improve their public administration.

Item: The foreign aid program is conducted by an inflated bureaucracy.

Personnel figures for the mutual security program are given in detail during the course of the presentation of the program to Congress. A table summarizing personnel figures for 1953, 1957 and 1958 is included in question No. 2 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee print of March 14, 1958. It should be particularly noted that 86 percent of ICA's total personnel is in the technical cooperation program and an additional substantial percentage is directly involved in conducting assistance projects under other categories of aid. Thus, ICA personnel to an overwhelming percent is not administrative but rather a major component of our assistance to other countries, composed of technicians either directly hired by ICA, employed by other government agencies such as the CAA or employed by contractors performing program activities required in assisting friendly countries. Another important fact ignored in the broad charge of inflated bureaucracy is that the 86 percent of ICA personnel referred to above is attributable to $132 million of the total of about $1.3 billion programed for economic assistance for fiscal year 1958. This $132 million is the technical assistance program which is acknowledged as one of the most successful programs and the one that most effectively provide people-to-people contact so important to the objectives of mutual security.

Item: ICA has not rebutted Mr. Braden's earlier statement of January 30, 1958 and ignores documented criticisms.

ICA submitted to the House Foreign Affairs Committee a detailed analysis of Mr. Braden's address of March 16, 1958 as published in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1958. Furthermore ICA has taken particular care to solicit and respond promptly to criticisms. This has been commended frequently by Members and committees of Congress.

Item: ICA has classified many of its operations and documents which makes adequate congressional investigation impossible.

ICA's records are fully available to the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office maintains in ICA a staff of accountants and auditors who have access to the agency files without formality. Classification of documents has been conscientiously kept to a minimum and any information in documents which must remain classified has been made available to the committees of Congress and by these committees to the Members of Congress. (See statment of Dr. Morgan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7539, where he called attention to the Members of the House that they were welcome to examine all the information and data prepared and presented by the executive branch as part of the presentation regardless of classification. This invitation was extended at the beginning of the hearings. During the debate moreover the basic presentation documents consisting of six large volumes of facts and figures were available for inspection at the tables of the managers of the bill.)

Item: The billions already in the foreign aid "pipeline" do not require further appropriations until all questions about ICA operations are answered; $12,129,307,500 would be in the "pipeline" if the requested funds for fiscal year 1959 were appropriated. This vast amount is evidence that Congress has abdicated its responsibilities.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee report on the Mutual Security Act of 1958 (pp. 12–14) summarized the committee's careful analysis of the unexpended balances in the foreign aid program. The report states that "the fiscal side of the mutual security program compares favorably with that of other Government agencies. In most cases it is considerably better." The $12 billion figure is erroneous. The estimated unexpended balance at the end of fiscal year 1958 for the entire mutual security program is $5.1 billion which is a sharp reduction from previous years:

[In billions]

1953	$10.0
1954	9.5
1955	7.9
1956	6.3
1957	6.1
1958	5.1

The program cannot for long spend more than is appropriated to it or it would be bankrupt.

Item: The administration's intensive propaganda campaign and pressures have prevented the full truth about mutual security being known by the American electorate.

Facts about the mutual-security program—both favorable and unfavorable—and arguments pro and con have been made available to the American people through reports from Congress, information supplied by the executive branch, reports in the daily press, radio, television, and in many public

meetings. Every request for information from the Congress or from the American public has been responded to.

Item: Congressman BYRD's and Senator JENNER's criticisms of ICA operations and all other opposition and criticism is snowed under by the administration.

Criticisms of the foreign-aid program have received extraordinarily broad circulation. For example, an article signed by Congressman GEORGE MEADER was published in the Readers' Digest, a magazine with the largest circulation in the world, estimated at about 17 million copies per month. ICA has repeatedly welcomed constructive criticism. Much of the most widely circulated criticism, however, has been based on misinformation. ICA considers it essential to keep the record straight.

Item: Congress has very little basic knowledge to go on in voting appropriations. The Hoover Commission recommendation has been forgotten. Except for the General Accounting Office spot checks, no one has carried out an impartial and comprehensive field survey to trace past appropriations to final use.

The Hoover Commission recommended that there be a full analysis of commitments against unexpended balances with a view to possible substantial reductions in future appropriations. Congress concentrates particularly on just this element of the mutual-security operations in determining future appropriations requirements. There is full, continuous disclosure of the status of funds. General Accounting Office studies are extensive. Special congressional studies are frequently conducted by both the House and the Senate. Several elements of the executive branch, too, keep careful watch on this. It would not be an exaggeration to state that the mutual-security program is subject to more study, investigation, and scrutiny than any other Government program. Annually four committees review the program. In addition, at least one subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee investigates special phases of mutual-security-program activities.

Item: Though the foreign-aid program is damaging to the United States economy and a serious drain on United States resources, the administration this year justifies it as a cure for the recession.

The administration has done no such thing. The National Planning Association has estimated that 715,000 jobs in the United States are derived from the foreign-aid program and concludes that reduction in the foreign-aid program would add to unemployment.

Item: "On January 5, 1958, the Iranian Ambassador criticized our aid as far from adequate and said that the Middle East and Asia, unless we did better, would have to throw in their lot with the Communist world."

This remark of Mr. Braden's is a gross distortion and misrepresentation of the position of Ambassador Amini. The Ambassador's remarks are available from the Iranian Embassy. The Ambassador was full of praise for the United States aid program. He was bitterly critical of Soviet actions and policies and at no time did he suggest that Iran would go over to the Communists.

What he did say in his speech was:

"International communism is now fully exploiting the poverty-stricken conditions of the people of the underdeveloped world. Unless the free world offers an effective and decisive remedy to raise the standard of living of these people, accommodating the minimum requirements of their living conditions, these underprivileged people will have no alternative but to throw in their lot with the Communist world. It would be much wiser to treat the patient before the disease has reached a fatal stage."

Item: ICA has supported a Communist regime in Bolivia and has fostered expropriation of private mining interests by providing an investment guaranty to an American firm enabling that firm to take over the interests as a receiver of stolen goods.

There have been certain strong Communist-oriented elements in the Bolivian Government. This constituted a serious threat to United States interests. As a part of our policy of countering this trend, the United States concentrated particularly in shoring up the anti-Communists in the government party. This was accomplished particularly by providing substantial assistance mostly in the form of surplus agricultural products until the economy of the country could be stabilized. The results have been encouraging. The Bolivian Government is now popularly supported and the Communist threat has been effectively met.

The investment guaranty referred to is not a form of direct financial assistance to the country. It is insurance against expropriation or convertibility of a new investment and does not involve using mutual security funds unless a valid claim develops. There was no reason to deny to the South American Gold & Platinum Co., a United States corporation which had met the requirements fully, an investment guaranty available to private American investors without discrimination.

Support by Reserve Officers Association of the United States of the President's Action in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Rear Adm. Leon J. Jacobi, national president, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, at the White House, July 24, 1958, for himself, and Col. Louis O. Gravely, USAR, Ocala, Fla., national vice president, Army; Col. John W. Richardson, Jr., AFRES, Detroit, national vice president, Air Force; Comdr. John Enis, USCGR, Omaha, national vice president, Navy; Col. John T. Carlton, USAR, Washington, D. C., national executive director.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. LEON J. JACOBI, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, JULY 24, 1958

In behalf of the thousands of citizen-reservists of the United States, I have just called upon the President of the United States to convey to him our deep commitment to his purposeful stand for peace in the Middle East. The President asked me in turn to thank the Nation's reservists for their stated accord with his action.

Many of the members of our association have participated as combatants in 3 conflicts within the past 40 years. We know first hand of the perils of warfare and the accompanying heartaches, and indescribable hardships. The Nation's reservists are those who under the American system must furnish much of the leadership and the major manpower for any struggle.

We also are citizens who face major obligations in the political, social, and economic facets of American life. We know from history the folly of appeasement, or quailing in the face of clearcut challenges.

If a free civilization is to survive in this swiftly changing world, the United States must be firm, resolute, and positive in opposing aggression, or any subtler force which would destroy for us or our free allies the right to our liberties. We must recognize also that there is being waged aggression of ideas and this aggression must be countered with the same decisiveness as we must counter a military threat. The United States has no honorable alternative to its present course, embracing risks though it does.

We believe the perseverance of our Government in the face of obvious challenges deserves the support of all citizens. All citizens must also prayerfully sustain our Nation's position.

Summit Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Next Week in New York," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. I think the editorial is informative. It deals with a question of great importance to all of us.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 24, 1958]

NEXT WEEK IN NEW YORK

The United States is in the position of being forced reluctantly to attend a party in its own back yard determined in advance not to like it. This is the worst possible attitude in which to cope with an overebullient and self-invited guest in the person of Mr. Khrushchev. If there is to be a meeting of the western leaders with the Soviet chieftain at the United Nations Security Council next week, along with Mr. Hammarskjold, Mr. Nehru and representatives of Arab nations, let us by all means make the best of it and not regard it as a defeat before it takes place.

Surely the first requirement is to end the negative stance. This means close consultations with the British, French and Canadians, particularly, and the burying of any miffed feelings over misunderstandings. Beyond that, there ought to be a cold assessment of western concerns in the Near East and a willingness to accommodate these concerns to current realities and possibilities while the West seeks effective checks against subversion and indirect aggression. And there ought to be, in respect of form, generosity in welcoming Mr. Nehru and the Arab representatives. There is no point, either, in forcing the issue of Nationalist China whatever the technical rights; let there be a separate Security Council subcommittee for the meeting if need be.

Mr. Khrushchev has had his way at the outset largely because western ineptitude has played into his hands. But this does not

mean that things will all go his way. With his transparent emphasis on the United Nations, there will be an opportunity to confront him with the Soviet sabotage of efforts to strengthen the U. N. in the Lebanon situation. There also may be some virtue in talking frankly face to face with Arab leaders. In short, this is a call for the United States to show that it is not afraid of discussion and that it has both flexibility and confidence in itself and its friends.

Representative Charles O. Porter and His Efforts in the Case of Gerald Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly heroic and persistent congressional crusades in recent years has been that of Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of the Fourth Oregon District, to determine the fate of his constituent, Gerald Murphy, who has disappeared in the Dominican Republic, and may be the victim of foul play.

The Grants Pass Courier, a prominent daily newspaper in Mr. PORTER'S district, has paid tribute to the Congressman's tirelessness in an editorial which declares that Mr. PORTER "is doing an excellent job of informing the American people."

This editorial from the Courier, which is published in the mining and lumbering center of Grants Pass, Oreg., was reprinted in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of July 17, 1958, and I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of our colleagues of the Senate and the House. The Register-Guard has the largest circulation of any newspaper published in the district represented by CHARLES O. PORTER.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of July 17, 1958]

PORTER'S FIGHT WITH TRUJILLO PUBLICIZES DOMINICAN MESS

(Editorial from the Grants Pass Courier)

People in this end of the Fourth Congressional District have refused to get very excited over Representative CHARLES O. PORTER'S feud with Gen. Rafael Trujillo, dictator of the Dominican Republic.

For one thing, Representative PORTER has been working on behalf of constituents in the Eugene area; the parents of Gerald Murphy, who apparently was assassinated in connection with Dominican intrigue. Murphy, to most people, was an American soldier of fortune who became involved in international intrigue and paid with his life. That has happened many times in the past to other adventurers. They know they are taking great risks when they get into this league.

We are in complete agreement with Representative PORTER'S condemnation of Generalissimo Trujillo, however. The Dominican dictator has retained Morris Ernst, known as a brilliant lawyer, in an attempt to whitewash the Murphy affair. Representative PORTER charges that Ernst will receive a total of $90,000 as a retainer and for expenses.

The Trujillo's, father and son, are unsavory characters. The generalissimo is a typical Latin American dictator, out to feather his own nest without heed for the people.

Son Rafael, Jr., is the international playboy who showers Hollywood movie stars with automobiles and other lavish gifts. Sent to the United States to attend the Army's Command and General Staff School, he failed to graduate. Instead, to the great indignation of Trujillo, Sr., he finished his classes only with a "certificate of attendance."

The Dominical Republic—it is a republic in name only—has been receiving foreign-aid funds from the United States Government. Trujillo, Jr., denies that the millions he squanders come from this foreign aid, but it certainly doesn't set well with the American people to see their tax money going to a dictator who has such low regard for public opinion.

The palatial yacht of Trujillo, Jr., for instance, is reported to be equipped with rugs and oil paintings valued in excess of $70,000. This yacht still is moored in the Los Angeles harbor while the dictator's son continues his romancing. He is the father of six children, by a wife he has discarded as incompatible.

Representative PORTER may not get very far in his fight with Trujillo, but he is doing an excellent job of informing the American people about the Dominican mess. Just why our State Department feels it necessary to extend foreign aid to such a government is beyond comprehension.

Archbishop Michael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the death of Archbishop Michael, the head of the Greek Orthodox Diocese in North and South America.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

The religious world mourns the death of Archbishop Michael the head of the Greek Orthodox Diocese in North and South America. Archbishop Michael was one of six presidents of the World Council of Churches. He was elected to that post at its convention in my home State in Evanston, Ill, several years ago, and had rendered much prestige and service to that post prior to his death.

Those of us who were present at the second inauguration of President Eisenhower were greatly impressed with this great spiritual media of orthodox faith who rendered one of the four prayers at the President's second inauguration. He was the first of the Greek Orthodox faith to be invited to render a prayer at a Presidential inauguration. Archbishop Michael was elected archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Diocese of North and South America in October of 1949 and he has created a most impressive record during the period he has served in this hemisphere.

The Greek Orthodox Church has made tremendous strides during that period and it has gained in prestige to the point that it is now well recognized as one of the four major religious faiths in this country. Archbishop Michael was the spiritual leader of over 1 million Americans of Greek descent and a spokesman for over 5 million communicants of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1954, he enrolled President Eisenhower in the Grand Order of the Holy Sepulchre in recognition of the President's efforts toward world freedom, justice, and peace.

Archbishop Michael was regarded as one of the most learned clergymen in the Greek Orthodox Church. In addition to Greek, he was fluent in English, French, and Russian. He wrote several books on the administration and teachings of the Greek Church.

His passing deprives the world of a great churchman and a great humanitarian. I know that my colleagues on the Hill join me in expressing our deepest sympathies to the millions of Greek Orthodox communicants in this country.

Herbert Hoover: A Man of Good Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, all of us, regardless of party, are so proud of the activities of Herbert Hoover. He is, without question, the outstanding man of the world without portfolio. His recently published book, The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson, is a masterpiece.

I was greatly pleased to read in the Pittsburgh Press last Sunday an article written by Mrs. Walter Ferguson, praising Mr. Hoover's distinguished service to our country and to the world and referring to him as perhaps the greatest humanitarian of our century.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN OF GOOD DEEDS

(By Mrs. Walter Ferguson)

Every true American must have had a warm little glow 'round his heart at the news of Belgium's reception of Herbert Hoover. Not only because he represented our country abroad, but because life has brought him the honors he so richly deserves.

Herbert Hoover is perhaps the greatest humanitarian of our century. Yet for years he was berated up and down the land as an enemy of the poor, the oppressor of the downtrodden, and a man without a heart. He was blamed for the global depression in 1929 by his political enemies. Neither Republicans nor Democrats can plead innocent to the charge of twisting truth and exaggerating error to suit their purposes. And fate made Hoover an excellent target for the barbs.

Being a good Quaker he never answered his critics. He merely went on day after day, doing his best, helping his country, helping people, living according to the principles in which he believed. As President, he refused part of his salary. In an era during which men and women have used their high

offices to make private fortunes, he has never lowered his ethical standards.

He has recently written a highly praised book, The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson, another of our great humanitarians. There he gives a sympathetic picture of a President whom he knew well and worked with, a man who fought a brave fight against fatal odds and died of a broken heart.

Hoover's task of distributing food from America to the many hungry in Europe after World War I was done under Woodrow Wilson, and made him a beloved figure in the Eastern Hemisphere.

But it is Herbert Hoover the man who engages our attention now. How well he exemplifies our concept of a true Christian. He has never ceased doing good. He has never hated his enemies. He forgave those who persecuted him. Now in his old age he remains head and shoulders above the petty souls who in years past echoed the smears against his character.

The Nature of Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues a sound and lucid article by Charles L. Bartlett, which was published in the Chattanooga Times of July 20, 1958. At this time of crisis and revolution in the Middle East, it is vitally important that we be mindful of the true nature of these nationalist uprisings in the underdeveloped nations of the world. The true revolutions are not the mere military coups; rather, they are simply the reflections of the broader revolutions of rising expectations and demands of backward and underprivileged peoples whose interests are becoming increasingly more dominant. Mr. Bartlett pointedly notes, and I must agree, that we must recognize and deal with those interests, if in the long run our own interests are to be served.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WASHINGTON
(Chales I. Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—Amid the clamor of events which has followed the overthrow of the Iraq Government, the major point has largely been lost that the administration which went down in the dust of the Baghdad streets was a corrupt and unpopular government by any standard.

There may have been agents of the Nasser and even of the Communist underground in the movement which took control of Iraq on Monday but unofficial observers just back from Iraq believe firmly that all the elements of a revolt, untainted by Nasserism or communism, were present in the emerging middle class, army officers, and civilians, who hated the ruling faction with a passion.

It has been impossible to find in Washington this week any United States official, no matter how well informed, who could point to solid evidence of foreign intervention in the overturn.

This was a high-handed autocratic and corrupt government playing an international game that had no favor with the educated middle classes who loathed the heavy hand which Britain had maintained in their affairs for almost 40 years. The wily Prime Minister, Nuri Said, was viewed as the instrument of British policy and accordingly hated as a British stooge.

The young king, Feisal II, was a cipher in the regard of his countrymen, he lacked the oratorical gift which is the essence of leadership among the Arabs. When his grandfather was placed on the throne by the British in 1921, the Arab governor rode at the head of the procession saying, "for Allah's sake, cheer." After 37 years, the Iraquis, who had never cared much for independence on the artificial terms in which it was given to them, still found little to cheer about in their monarchy.

Some who have visited in Iraq very recently maintain that the government was only popular with its top officials and with those who had fat contracts. The corruption was widespread and minor officials who wanted a better job had to make payments up the ladder.

Against this background there was the problem of a painful inflation which made it a struggle for the middle classes to hold the status which they prize so dearly. The average salary of the Government worker is about $150 a month and out of this he must pay for the $57 suit and the fountain pen which are the proud symbols of the educated. Rents in Baghdad are fantastically high and some of this educated class hold as many as 3 or 4 different jobs just to make ends meet.

It is true that the Government had instituted an extensive public works program to bring roads, dams, and irrigation to the country but most of these are up in the mountains and away from the city where they could not be appreciated by the dissidents.

The Arab word for imperialism is "isti'mar" and it means using one's strength to take advantage of the weak. This was the catchword of the Iraq revolt and it was drummed home in every propaganda broadcast because it summarized all the grievances, foreign and domestic, and called to mind not only the suppliance to the West but the harsh treatment, including death and imprisonment, which had been the lot of those who dissented from Government policy.

Nasser is a hero to these people, the experts maintain, because he stood up to the West and because of a mistaken notion that he had rid Egypt of corruption. He has also become the symbol of the national Arab State but there is a surprising expectation that the new Government will move reluctantly to join the Arab republic. Having gained control of some $200 million in annual oil revenue, the new Government leaders are not likely to be eager for a broader association which will make these funds a part of the common Arab treasury. There are also tribal differences in religion which may keep Iraq out of the UAR.

The rule of King Feisal was certainly not government at its best and it is a sad reflection of the intricacies of world politics that United tSates prestige must be tied so firmly to decaying and inflexible governments which will inevitably yield to the ambitious pressures of the middle classes that are springing up in backward countries around the globe. This is a movement which the United States must harness and not oppose or it too will ultimately go down in the dust.

The Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Dead End Street," by Walter Lippmann, published in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune; also an article entitled "Preview of Foreign Policy Referendum," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of July 18, 1958, dealing with the Middle East crisis.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

DEAD END STREET
(By Walter Lippmann)

As things stand at this moment, the notion of a summit meeting in the heart of New York City has the characteristic of one of those nightmares in which one feels compelled to do what one desperately does not want to do. At this time, a public confrontation between Eisenhower and Khrushchev would be a ghastly spectacle, almost certain to poison the air still further with charges and countercharges. Moreover, there are great risks that the local police would not be able to maintain perfect law and order during the visit of a man who has in the cosmopolitan city of New York so many embittered enemies. Beyond that, there does not now exist as between Washington and Moscow a basis for negotiations. Both have talked themselves into extreme positions from which it is most awkward to make any concession.

Yet the fact is that the President has been pushed and pulled by the British Government, and by widespread public opinion in Germany, in Scandinavia, in Japan, and elsewhere, to a grudging acceptance of the idea of a summit meeting on the Middle East. Why, we must ask ourselves, do Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles find themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea, between having a conference which would now be dangerous and refusing to have one which is dangerous too?

They find themselves in this dilemma because they have no Middle East policy and have therefore lost the diplomatic initiative. The right and effective answer to Khrushchev's call for a summit conference was not to refuse it and leave it there, was not to accept it and to be entangled from there on. The right answer would have been to propose the terms of a settlement which included but extended beyond the withdrawal of the marines. Such a proposal would be something substantial to talk about in place of the talk about where and when to talk.

Unfortunately, we do not have negotiable terms of settlement to propose. The Anglo-American intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan was carried out to prevent their collapse. But this was a hurried reaction to the unexpected news from Iraq. It was not a deliberate act of policy.

We find ourselves, therefore, in a dead-end street. The presence of our troops not only does not promise a settlement of the revolutionary condition which caused us to send

them in—the longer the troops stay, the harder it will be to withdraw them without precipitating the disaster they are meant to prevent.

Thus, it is true that neither the Lebanon nor Jordan can be stabilized and made secure without a wide settlement beyond their frontiers.

There is a school of thought both here and in Britain which argues that the only settlement which is acceptable and which will really settle anything will be one which folowed a restoration in Iraq and the elimination of Nasser. They would do now what Eden and Mollet attempted to do at Suez some 2 years ago. They are prepared to defy the Soviet Union and they would by force of arms establish a British-American protectorate in the Middle East.

There is a kind of logic in this view. But those who hold it are living in the wrong century. Relatively speaking, particularly in the Middle East which borders on Russia, the Soviet Union is incomparably a stronger power than was Czarist Russia in the 19th century. The Arab revolution, of which Nasser is the most conspicuous but not the only champion, did not exist at all in the imperial days of the last century. Moreover, and this must not be overlooked, the democracies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization must be considered. They cannot be counted upon to go all the way in case of a military showdown over an Arab country in the Middle East.

If, therefore, the day is past and gone forever when the Middle East can be stabilized by western military power, we must seek an accommodation with the new powers in the Middle East—namely, with the Soviet Union and with Nasser's confederation.

What other line of policy is conceivable? None, unless it can be called a policy to do nothing but dig in where we are in the Lebanon and in Jordan, and for the rest to trade insults with Nasser and Khrushchev. We shall get the worse of the exchange of insults, in that it is always easier to denounce intervention than to defend it. Let us have no illusions then that we can dig in and sit it out hoping that something better will turn up.

Unless there is a reasonably prompt settlement in the Lebanon with the marines withdrawing, their continuing presence will embarrass us everywhere in the world. They were sent in in order to prove to the Turks and the Pakistanis and others that our military promises will be honored. But if the marines stay on and become an army of occupation, there will be some serious second thought not only among the nations guaranteed but also here among ourselves who must provide the guarantees.

It is, therefore, a very great interest, one might without exaggeration call it a vital interest, of the United States to work out by negotiation an honorable exit for the marines. This may be impossible, given the revolutionary character of the Nasser movement. But it may not be impossible, if it is seriously and thoroughly attempted, given on the one hand the military weakness of the Arab States and on the other their great need of the West in the oil business and in their economic development.

[From the New York Times of July 18, 1958]

IN THE NATION—PREVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY REFERENDUM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The comments on the Middle East situation made in the Senate this week by Democratic Members merit a listing in the new chapter of history now being written in that area. That is because these comments are a preliminary outline of foreign policy issues on which the Democrats now expect to go before the voters of the United States. But the immediate consequences of President Eisenhower's decision to land marines in Lebanon may postpone a comprehensive submission of this referendum until the polls of 1960. And successful final consequences would alter it fundamentally.

The principal Democratic commentators were Senators MANSFIELD, of Montana; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. There are several reasons for selecting FULBRIGHT's remarks for inspection. He is the ranking majority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations; and because he originated the successful program for the international exchanges of high school and college students his views perhaps attract a larger audience among young people and their teachers in other countries than any other American legislator can assemble.

What FULBRIGHT had to say was brief, and restrained by the current crisis. But, as he noted to his colleagues, if any comment on the mideast events were to be made at this time there had to be some mention of their causes. His enumeration of these did not reach some of the deeper roots of the problem that took hold during the Truman administration. Instead he offered this recent catalog:

The United States continues to have no long-range policy to serve as a guide to the required day-to-day decisions.

THE REASON FOR VACILLATION

It has never (for example) made the fundamental policy decision whether Arab nationalism—epitomized in Nasser—was a force with which we should try to work, or a force which we should oppose. As a consequence our day-to-day actions have vacillated between tempting Arab nationalism with offers of assistance and taunting it with refusals to sell wheat and other petty annoyances.

In the Mideast, as elsewhere, the United States has relied on military pacts and doctrines without relation to the question whether the dangers involved were of a military nature or their solution was possible by military means.

This has caused us to lose touch with the ordinary people. In few of the newly independent countries have we an understanding of the motivations of the common man. In most of these areas the United States has dealt with princes, potentates, big business men and the entrenched, frequently corrupt, representatives of the past.

THE SOURCE OF REVOLUTIONS

There is a question whether we have not been so obsessed with our fear of (International) communism that we are unable fairly to appraise the motivations of such violent revolutions as are occurring in the Middle East. The Kremlin's approval, for obvious self-interest, of these revolutions does not necessarily mean the Kremlin is their dominant force or factor. But, as in the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine, the United States recognizes only one brand of revolution—that which is directed by (international) communism.

Hence people everywhere who aspire to the good life are unable to identify their desires with our policies.

In the meeting of congressional leaders with the President Monday the Senator asked some questions which projected his thought that obsession with (international) communism may blind our authorities to other sources of revolution. But in reply the President and Secretary Dulles were positive that the violence in Lebanon and Iraq was inspired and supplied by a Nasser-Soviet combination of mutual interest. And Dulles referred to the documentation of this with respect to Lebanon by Government intelligence units that was published in this newspaper today.

In his speech FULBRIGHT saw proof of his charge that the United States has lost touch with ordinary people in the fact that our intelligence units were completely unaware of the plot that overthrew the pro-western Government of Iraq. But that was no job by ordinary people. Members of those very classes which FULBRIGHT criticized United States agents for dealing with exclusively conceived and executed it.

To Meet the Education Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the New York Times a letter to the editor entitled "To Meet the Education Crisis." This very fine letter calls for leadership in the field of education. It endorses Federal funds for school construction. In fact, it calls for a broad program of increased support for educational needs on a Federal, State, and local level.

I wish to congratulate those who have signed it. They are performing a truly public service.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 11, 1958]

TO MEET EDUCATION CRISIS—FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TO AROUSE PUBLIC IS DEEMED ESSENTIAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We read with great interest the incisive letter of Hon. Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, in your issue of June 27 with reference to the recent Rockefeller Fund Study Committee on educational needs in the United States. We wholeheartedly concur with his conclusion that we can have only as good an education for our children as we are willing to pay for.

The New York Times also published the equally excellent report by United States Commissioner of Education L. G. Derthick, on the competence and quality of the Russian school system. This report, too, in the words of Mr. Silver, should be required reading for every citizen.

Both the Rockefeller and Derthick reports point up the necessity of awakening the American people to the role of the school in our society. It is essential to the accomplishment of this that the administration and the Congress stop sweeping our need for schools under the rug.

The thought that the Federal Government would spend up to $2 billion a year for the next 5 years for school construction would not be a shocking one to the American public, but would be one which they would accept as readily as the fact that we spend over $40 billion a year for our national defense.

MATCHING OF FUNDS

The Nation needs dramatic leadership in the field of education. New school buildings erected with a real assist from Federal funds should spur local school district to do their part toward matching these funds to meet local needs. More than this, once the school buildings are built it would be an

incentive to the States and local districts to fill these buildings with skilled teachers at necessarily increased salaries.

A climate of opinion from the activity of the Federal Government would be created so that education would be given proper consideration by so-called opinion molders. Communities then would more readily vote for local taxes to support education, thus reversing the present trend. Only through Federal leadership with its ability to affect the entire Nation will we be able to meet the present crisis in education.

It must be met now. This too is national defense.

WILLIAM B. NICHOLS,
President,
BETHUEL WEBSTER,
Chairman, the Board of Trustees,
FRANK E. KARELSEN,
Chairman, Executive Committee of Public Education Association.
NEW YORK, *July 7, 1958.*

Scholarships for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the president of one of America's outstanding engineering schools, a man who has given his life to higher education, Dr. F. L. Partlo, of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City, S. Dak.

His ideas on this proposal for the Federal Government to go into the program of scholarships for higher education are worth the time of every Member of Congress to read. His letter is in part as follows:

In the first place, this whole plan is being put forward as an emergency measure with a 4-year duration. Don't let anybody fool himself regarding this temporary scheme. There isn't anything temporary about it and the promoters of it know very well that it is only the first step in a growing and expanding permanent program. If the Congress enacts this bill it will have another Frankenstein monster on its hands.

Ours is a small college and yet we are able to operate a scholarship program amounting to over $20,000 per year entirely outside of our institutional budget. If the Federal Government goes into wholesale scholarships it seems quite likely that the sources of funds for the program now in operation will substantially dry up—and where, then, is the net gain. Applying the ratio of college age populations to the proposed up to 100,000 4-year scholarships would give South Dakota about 130 per year. Applying to this the ratio of enrollments at the School of Mines and Technology to total in the State would give the School of Mines and Technology approximately 10 such scholarships per year. At $500 each in a 4-year period the annual amount would approximate our present scholarship program. I would prefer that we continue with what we have.

Title III provides for student loans. We now have 3 loan funds which are taking care of our most pressing needs. I do not think there is a real possibility in financing education through borrowed money, but I firmly believe that it could be done through private enterprise and that it does not have to be done with Federal funds. As a matter of fact, the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association is making a careful study of this possibility at the present time. Title VI gets into the field of fellowships for graduate education wherein I can see the possibility of a legitimate Federal concern and responsibility.

Title VII has some real interesting and profound potentialities for the do-gooder, the social planner, and the socialistic schemer. In the field of guidance, counseling, and testing we have a fine device for the shaping of youthful minds by a federally centered body through the device of granting or withholding funds depending upon what the State would do with them.

It is my judgment that H. R. 13247 should go down to defeat.

It's a Good Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the 1940 census, Oregon's population for the first time exceeded the 1 million figure, and by 1950 the population exceeded a million and a half. The migration to Oregon has been the subject of millions of words of prose, cast in the form of editorials, tourist news, business analyses, industrial surveys, and, not to be overlooked, letters to the folks back home. No extensive study has ever been made, that I know of, in which the thousands of new Oregonians revealed why they came to this particular Pacific Coast State. I would like to see such a study undertaken. One question that should be asked would find out how many had come to Oregon, left the State, and then returned. This, I am sure, would reveal a definite pattern—migrants who leave and in time return.

A few years ago an article on Oregon in Holiday magazine was bitterly criticized by many Oregonians. The author, H. L. Davis, a novelist and former Oregonian, postulated that newscomers to Oregon stay for a few months or years and then move on. I am persuaded that his postulation would have been more accurate had it also indicated a heavy return trek to Oregon. I offer this as a casual observation, based on the frequency with which I am told, "After we had once lived in Oregon we were not happy until we had returned."

I offer these comments, Mr. President, after reading an editorial entitled "It's a Good Place To Live." A simple, accurate statement, the title is, nonetheless, eloquent. So that it may be properly appreciated, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, from the July 15, 1958, issue of the Pendleton East Oregonian, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE

The state department of planning and development, created by the Oregon Legislature of 1957 at the request of Governor Holmes, is engaged in a highly competitive enterprise. Dozens of other States have agencies that are working at the same job, trying to lure industries and business enterprises.

The people who are engaged in this pursuit can talk to prospects on several points, including availability of raw materials, availability and cost of labor, availability and cost of power, gas, and water, markets for products, transportation, warehousing, and storage facilities, taxes, community attitudes, and climate.

These factors vary, of course, in their importance to businesses and industries that are looking for new locations. And it is obvious, too, that some factors are big cards in the hands of some States while others are better left unmentioned.

After touring Oregon last year and writing a series of articles on the economy of the State, we concluded that most of the industries that will come to Oregon will do so because of availability of raw materials. If low-cost hydroelectric energy is in ample supply it also can be a factor in attracting industry. Other factors on the positive side are, it seems to us, less important than those two.

Having arrived at these conclusions, we found extremely interesting a study made by the bureau of business research at the University of Oregon at the request of the State department of planning and development. The June issue of Oregon Business Review has a report on the study, Why Do New Business Enterprises Decide To Locate in Oregon? It is written by the director of the bureau, Wesley C. Ballaine.

According to the study, two factors have dominated in the decisions of owners of business and industries recently located in Oregon. One is availability of raw materials, and the other is a desire to live in Oregon.

The latter factor is an interesting one. After we had made that tour of the State we were asked on several occasions, "Why, if freight rates discriminate against businesses and industries in the Northwest, if big markets are many miles away, if Oregon's tax structure creates hardships for corporations—why, if those conditions exist, have so many large industries located here and not some other place?"

The persons who asked were thinking, we found, of Jantzen Knitting Mills, Hirsch-Weis, Iron Fireman, Pendleton Woolen Mills, and a few others—industries that did not locate in Oregon because of availability of raw materials. We are not sure the answer was correct, but we replied that those industries had been, in all cases, established by Oregonians who preferred to live in Oregon—that that could be the only reason they set up shop here instead of going to areas closer to major markets.

We think these cases bear out the findings of the survey made by the Bureau of Business Research. It found, "A highly significant aspect of this study is the importance given by respondents to a desire to live in Oregon. This was especially true of the nonlumber manufacturing group, that is, the type of industry that can be attracted to Oregon by State and local efforts." The survey learned that 49 businesses had been attracted to Oregon for that reason.

Oregon has some real handicaps when it goes on the prowl for new businesses and industries. But it has some good points, too. And don't overlook that old chamber of commerce line, "It's a good place to live."

Proposed Regulation of Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Shirley Povich and published in today's Washington Post, dealing with sports, and particularly with a bill relating to baseball, football, and other sports.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING, WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

In contrast to the docile, company-man attitudes of the major league baseball players who testified before the Senate's antitrust committee, the athletes who toil in pro football are saying they don't want to hold still for too much power in the hands of the club owners.

They're kicking up a fuss at the House-passed blank check given the owners of all sports teams and urging the Senate to take a hard look at the bill that would make absolute dictators of the owners in their relations with the athletes.

"Club owners have proven over the years that they abuse the players when they have been given a free hand," said Bill Howton, Green Bay's crack pass-receiving end. As president and spokesman of the National Football League Players Association, he doesn't want the owners freed from court scrutiny of their dealings with the athletes.

This was vastly different from the testimony of the big-shot baseball athletes who are willing to place their fate in the hands of the owners and rely on their bounty. Ted Williams, Stan Musial, Mickey Mantle, and Robin Roberts said, in effect, they were willing to trust the owners.

Theirs could have been slightly prejudiced testimony in view of their delightful experiences with the baseball owners. Williams is currently drawing $125,000 for six months work, Musial is a $100,000 wage earner. Mantle's pay is up to $70,000 and Roberts has been a $50,000 man. The Senate subcommittee didn't summon any of the Nats' $7,000 minimum men, of whom there are a few.

But the football players prefer the Celler bill that was beaten in the House, the one that put the owners under "reasonably necessary" restraints that permitted the athletes to take their grievances to court. They're wary of the House-passed bill granting complete antitrust immunity to their employers. Mainly, they fear they'll have no place to go with complaints except to an owner-paid commissioner.

In fact, the whole pro football industry would be willing to settle for the Celler bill. It would represent a great advance for pro football, putting it on an equal footing with baseball. The latest Supreme Court decision held that football is answerable to the antitrust laws, and the game is in an uneasy position, vulnerable to costly suits by unhappy players.

It is when the subcommittee gets around to questioning pro football on its so-called college draft that it could strike pay dirt. The truths of that situation when fully developed could be sufficient to jolt the Senators into wonderment how the pro football league has gotten away with their unconscionable draft of college boys all these years.

Organized baseball never has presumed that pro fotball's kind of draft is necessary for its game. The baseball people admit that they envy football's ability to get away with the maneuver which takes all choice of team selection away from the graduating collegian, and which eliminates costly competitive bidding by the clubs. But they havent' dared to install the same device.

The pro football people don't give the graduating collegian any freedom of choice. A pro team needing a halfback says, in effect, to the object of their choice, "You belong to us. You will play pro football for this team, at the salary we pay you, or you must find some other profession because no other club in our league will hire you."

It is the purest preemption, accompanied by a barefaced threat of boycott as the alternative of the graduating collegian, who must agree to forfeit his bargaining rights if he wants to play the game. And how did the club come into ownership of the player? That was simple. They drew his name out of a list that appeared on a blackboard at the owners' annual meeting. Simple as that.

The wonder is that Congress has held still for the pro football draft all of these years in the light of the wide notice given the goings-on at the draft meetings. And vastly mistaken is the impression that pro football needs such a draft to equalize the playing strength of the clubs.

The Nation would be outraged if business firms other than football were to use the same tactics with graduating collegians. If such as General Electric, Westinghouse, and Du Pont, in campus interviews were to inform graduating engineers that they had no choice but to join a particular firm, or get out of the engineering business, there would be a huge outcry, plus the demand for respect for birth rights, constitutional rights, and bargaining rights.

H. R. 3

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I support the provisions of H. R. 3, one of the effects of which will give back to the States the right to enforce their State sedition statutes. Such is the purpose of the bill I introduced on this subject, H. R. 1129.

In Florida, our State treason and insurrection laws have been in the statutes since 1868. Since 1941, Florida statutes have made it a felony to advocate by word of mouth or writing the overthrow of our constitutional form of government by force or violence or by any other unlawful means. Additional statutes dealing with this general subject were passed in 1949 and 1951. I was privileged to be a member of the Florida Legislature when in 1953, the Subversive Activities Act was enacted which made it a felony to become or remain a member of a subversive organization.

I supported this legislation then because I felt it was a proper field for State legislation. Every State and all of the citizens within that State have the interest and right to combat subversive influences and activities within their communities.

I introduced H. R. 1129 because I felt the Supreme Court's decision in the Nelson case constituted an unwarranted and unnecessary invasion of the rights of the States in this field. Further, I believe that it was never the intent of Congress in enacting legislation dealing with subversive activities, to deprive the States of the opportunity to enforce their own sedition statutes, or to vest in the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction in this field.

I am gratified by the overwhelming vote given H. R. 3 in the House.

Presidential Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Kansas City Times-Kansas City Star of Monday, July 21, 1958, makes sense and deserves the particular attention of those who are opposing the Presidential retirement bill:

PRESIDENTIAL PENSIONS A NORMAL OBLIGATION

This should be the week of action on the presidential pension bill. It is hard to see how the recipients of congressional pensions could fail to provide for the highest office of the land.

Reasonable security for a former President or his widow is simply good public policy. It is outrageous to think that the former head of the great United States could be forced to sell the reputation of his office in the marketplace.

Against objections based on political animosities the Senate passed the bill last year. Now the same kind of opposition is encountered in the House. Chiefly it appears to come from some Republicans who don't want Harry S. Truman to have a pension.

This is no issue of personalities. It isn't a question of anyone's feelings for or against Mr. Truman, for or against Herbert Hoover, for or against Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The bill would be passed for the high office. It would apply to the holders of the office through the predictable future. It isn't a question of whether any individual needs the money. The United States cannot put its former Presidents on charity basis to receive financial help according to need.

A President's responsibilities to the public continue long after he leaves the office. He may or may not continue to be a party leader. The whole country looks to him for informed views on major issues. He must carry a heavy correspondence, the reason for the franking privilege and a clerical staff. He should be in a position to continue the associations with world leaders and American leaders made during his Presidency. He should be able to keep up his end of the entertainment involved in such associations.

It is doubtful that a President can save much, if any, money during his tenure of office. Unless he has money when he takes the office he will have little or nothing when he leaves. Presumably he will be able to get a good price for his memoirs which is a proper and standard method of accumulating something. But memoirs are not a reliable source of income for many years of retirement. Of course the prestige of the Presidency would command a good salary in

private employment. That's the point. The pension bill is intended to make unnecessary that kind of trading on the office.

Except for the involvement with personalities we can't see how this proposal would even stir an argument.

United States Struggles for U. N. Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Drew Pearson has an extremely disturbing analysis, published in this morning's newspapers, of the great loss of American influence throughout the world caused by our lack of leadership and imagination and our most unfortunate failure to buttress our military power with intelligent, thoughtful, effective, diplomatic know-how.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STRUGGLES FOR U. N. VOTE
(By Drew Pearson)

The American public does not know it, but all last week and early this week there has been more diplomatic armtwisting, more table-pounding, and more due bills collected by American diplomats at the United Nations than at any other time in American history. The arm-twisting has been to drum up a two-thirds vote in the U. N. General Assembly to get a U. N. police force to take over for the marines and thus get the United States off the hook and off the beaches in Lebanon.

The U. N. vote-getting has not been easy. Here is how some of the onetime friends and allies of the United States have reacted:

In Latin America: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Mexico have been cool. They argued privately that the good-neighbor policy has become a series of visits by American bigwigs and they are tired of smiling faces behind champagne glasses lifted to toast an empty policy. They point out that they are summoned by American-delegation office boys at the U. N. and told how to vote. They are telling American diplomats that they are tired of voting on instructions from the State Department.

In Europe: West Germany, an anchor member of NATO, has been grumbling against American intervention in Lebanon. Norway, Denmark and Belgium are irritated. The French, though for intervention, are most unhappy over the fact that some 1,800 of their troops have been anchored off Beirut for almost a week, anxious to go ashore, but unwanted.

In Asia and Africa: Japan, which we have depended upon as our chief Far Eastern ally, has been on the other side of the Lebanese fence. Saudi Arabia, which we have wooed and courted, sidestepped an O. K. for the use of the Air Force base in Dhahran, and refused to send oil to Jordan, even though King Saud, less than a year ago, had stationed his troops in Jordan to rescue King Hussein. Indonesia, India, and most African-Asiatic states are against United States.

Remarked one Latin-American ambassador: "How can I possibly explain to the people of my country why we should vote to take over for the United States marines in a little country few of them have heard about and which they think is being occupied solely to protect American oil?"

WHY WE SLIPPED?

In the last few days, some diplomats have been telling each other: "We've got to pitch in and save the United States. We can't allow her to lose face. It was bad enough to have Britain and France shown up as weak powers after Suez. We can't have the same thing happen to the United States."

All the above is not pleasant to contemplate. However, the American people would be guilty of keeping their heads in the sand if they did not wake up to the facts. And these unpleasant facts indicate how badly American prestige has slipped.

The question is—why? The answer, in brief, is that world leadership goes to:

1. The strong.
2. Him who leads.

On point 1, for the last 10 months, it has been obvious that our one-time scientific and military supremacy has been going to the nation which was able to put a ton-and-a-half sputnik in the skies, and was able to test a long-range intercontinental missile as early as May 1957. In contrast, our ICBM, the Atlas, went p-f-f-ft at Cape Canaveral on July 19, the same day Khrushchev was demanding a summit meeting in brutal, bulldozing language.

On point 2, a nation which leads must not be a nation which waits. It must solve problems before they become acute. It must use imagination and inspiration. It cannot rely on bluster and talk. We have been talking big and carrying a little stick. We have been bragging about outer space, but beeping with a tiny sputnik. We have been talking about massive retaliation and agonizing reappraisal when the world knew we weren't going to attack massively with the atomic bomb, and the world has now come to realize that we have to undergo an agonizing reappraisal of our own policy of brinksmanship.

One policy we may have to reappraise is that of policing the world on the other side of the globe—the equivalent of Russia landing troops near our border in Nicaragua, Guatemala, or Mexico.

Squaw Mountain and Fire Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, commemoration exercises will be conducted at Greenville, Maine, for the Squaw Mountain Lookout, the first forest fire tower ever erected in the United States.

This will be a signal event, for it honors the institution of a planned defense against the all-consuming fires that once rampaged, unchecked, through our timberlands and threatened to destroy our forests.

Because of the important part forest fire control plays in our national complex, I insert in the RECORD the following report on Squaw Mountain Lookout and its relationship to the development of our Nation's forest fire fighting system:

At the turn of the century, America had no forest fire detection and suppression system as we know it today. Forest fires burned across the country, destroying huge acreages of timberland annually. Few and untrained hands were lifted against the insidious enemy and little, if any, thought was given to detecting fires while they were still small.

Stimulated into action by the severe fires of 1903, several Maine timberland owners, operators, and other interested people began to give their attention to the recurring problem. Names such as Elmer Crowley, William Shaw, W. J. Lannigan, and Payson Viles cross history at this point.

Crowley and Shaw, both associated with the M. G. Shaw Lumber Co., then operating in the vicinity of Greenville, conceived the idea of a permanent lookout on Squaw Mountain. The idea was encouraged by Lannigan and Viles and in 1905 the project was underwritten by the M. G. Shaw Lumber Co.

The lookout was placed in operation on June 10, 1905, with William Hilton of Greenville, now vice president of the Great Northern Paper Co., Bangor, as the first observer, or watchman as he was called at that time.

The first entry in the log kept by Mr. Hilton reads:

Commenced work Saturday, June 10, 1905; clear, south wind.

Hilton served as observer from 1905 through 1908. During the first year he lived at the M. G. Shaw logging camp, making the trip up and down the mountain each day.

The value of Squaw Mountain Lookout was demonstrated many times in 1905. Other lookouts followed in quick succession, and in 1909 all lookout stations in the unorganized towns and plantations were absorbed into the Maine Forestry District upon its creation by the legislature.

Yes, the whole concept of fire control started in Maine, right there at Squaw Mountain. And from the humble beginning, the combined State foresters of this country have built the largest forest fire protection force in the world. Three thousand three hundred fire towers now keep vigil over the non-Federal forest land of America. In 1911, 6 years after Squaw Mountain tower was erected, the Weeks law was enacted by Congress to provide Federal participation in forest fire control. At that time only 61 million acres of State and privately owned forest land out of a national total of 427 millions acres were under organized protection. By 1925 protection had expanded to include 178 million acres in 29 States. Last year more than 395 million acres were being protected.

The year 1925 saw 135,000 acres of our Nation's timberland burned, or 13 percent of every million protected, and the size of the average fire was 280 acres. Last year only twenty-eight-hundredths percent of the protected area was burned and the size of the average fire had diminished to a little over 17 acres.

Total United States expenditure for State and private forest fire control amounted to $3,604,000 for 1925. Last

year expenditures reached $45 million, of which $35 million were State and private funds and $10 million were Federal.

In the early years forest fires were controlled by the States mainly by manpower and hand tools; there was little so-called heavy equipment available. During the last 10 to 15 years tremendous strides have been made not only in efficiency of equipment but also in the number of such facilities used among the various States. Tanker trucks and power pumps, for example, increased in use nationally from 2,170 in 1945 to almost 3,800 in 1957. Only 4 airplanes were a part of State facilities in 1945 compared to 135 in 1957. Over the same period the number of fireline plows swelled from 326 to 1,694 and radios more than tripled in number from 3,356 to 12,452.

Throughout these fifty-odd years Maine has been a leader among other States, both in expanded protection program and increased efficiency. From that early beginning on Squaw Mountain, Maine, now has 113 lookout towers. In addition, there are 160 trucks, 238 power pumps, 2 airplanes, 301 radios, and 2,550 miles of telephone line. Much of this equipment was acquired after the catastrophic fire year of 1947. Today Maine protects 100 percent of its 17 million acres of forest land. Last year only eighteen-hundredths percent of these lands was burned compared to the national total of twenty-eight-hundredths percent, although 726 fires occurred, and the fire season was severe.

This is a record of which Maine citizens may justly be proud. There is also another reason for them to feel particularly proud, for history records that this country's first fire control tower was erected on Squaw Mountain, at Greenville, Maine.

H. R. 13478, a Predator Fish Control Bill Is Urgent Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this House has enough problems effecting his own district and constituents, I am sure, without looking for more. Notwithstanding, I am going to discuss momentarily a serious situation in connection with coastal fisheries, in particular those in the Puget Sound and Pacific Northwest waters. However, I am hopeful of especially sympathetic understanding from those colleagues who come from agricultural areas.

Mr. Speaker, when a pest in the nature of a harmful weed or disease spreads through farming countryside, an individual farmer on his own is helpless. Infections like this are public problems and can only be controlled by group measures. Thus we have Federal programs under direction of the Department of Agriculture.

Federal participation is even more essential in the fishing industry since the sea and waters from which the fishery harvest is obtained is all publicly owned. Conservation and control of fishery resources must be a Government function.

In this connection, I recently introduced H. R. 13478 which offers the only practical means of controlling a predator which has been increasing in numbers during recent years in west coast waters and in New England waters, too, I am informed. This predator is a serious source of depletion of our fishery resources. I refer to the dogfish shark which causes great loss of valuable fish and damages the fishermen's gear as well, and like a weed or insect on the land must be controlled.

My bill provides for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to encourage the farmers of the sea themselves to reduce the depredations of this predator species of fish.

And, as I have indicated, I seek support for enactment of my bill into law and plead for understanding and support from not only the Members from coastal States familiar with fishing problems but also from those Members who appreciate similar blights in relation to crops and products of the soil.

Because the fishermen of Puget Sound and my State of Washington are suffering on account of the dogfish shark I have been in touch with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the following excerpt from correspondence with this Bureau speaks for itself:

> Those advocating the control of the dogfish shark point not only to their predatory nature, but also to the nuisance aspects where they interfere with the commercial fishing operations. Frequently such large numbers of dogfish are present that the fishing gear is ineffective in capturing desirable species. Control of the dogfish shark would probably be feasible only through their capture by commercial fishing gear. It is hoped that additional technological study will develop new uses for dogfish shark as an animal food which will make it profitable to fish commercially for this species.
>
> During World War II, and the years immediately following, the dogfish was fished extensively for the vitamin A content of its liver. Total catches for Washington and Oregon reached a peak of about 23,000 tons in 1944, but dropped abruptly after 1949 when vitamin A was synthesized. The technological staff of the Bureau has proposed a research program to study the feasibility of utilizing dogfish in pet foods, fish meal, and as food for furred animals. This study would include as well a fundamental investigation of the chemical composition and properties of dogfish designed to yield data of maximum value in promoting the commercial utilization of this species. It is the Bureau's view that the Federal Government can contribute most to the solution of the dogfish problem through the initiation of a comprehensive technological study of this nature.

Owing to the seriousness of the dogfish problem and its effect on conservation of salmon and other fish resources—as that quotation reveals—the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has instituted preliminary planning for a research study as to the feasibility of the use of these fish by processors in some way such as in animal food.

I have suggested for such a study the use of the staff and facilities of the College of Fisheries of the University of Washington, but implementation of any research of that kind must be delayed until at least fiscal 1960 because funds are not available. Meanwhile the situation is urgent and, therefore, legislation such as H. R. 13478 is needed. I would hope this would be a stopgap yet practical means of controlling the dogfish population.

Let me point out that several studies as to the diet of the dogfish from the stomach analyses show that about two-thirds of the food of this predator is fish of all types and one-sixth is shellfish. Thus the dogfish destroy a vast quantity of marketable fish—a truly fantastic quantity of protein food that should be conserved for orderly harvesting.

Also as I said earlier trawlers and salmon gillnetters suffer an economic loss to their gear in the amount of untold thousands of dollars yearly due to the involuntary capture of nets full of these dogfish.

The Director of the Bureau, Donald McKernan, recently wrote a letter in which he said:

> You are quite right in assuming that they—dogfish—can be best taken by the commercial fishermen. In fact, I doubt that there is any other way in which they could be taken successfully.

This legislation is needed now and I hope Members will support it at the appropriate time. Meanwhile in the Senate a similar measure introduced by the senior Senator from my State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is being considered. The time for adjournment is short but I hope there is still time to bring relief to the fishing industry.

Still the U. N.'s Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on July 21, 1958:

STILL THE U. N.'S BUSINESS

That Nikita S. Khrushchev's demand for a five-power summit conference tomorrow to deal with the Middle Eastern crisis will prove acceptable to the West appears extremely unlikely. The time element has already proved an insuperable obstacle.

There are other major hurdles in the way. Among these is the obvious fact that Khrushchev has so patently utilized this opportunity to distort the record, and as an occasion for laying down the official line of Moscow for the party faithful abroad. These dodges do nothing toward easing matters in the Middle East or solving problems there.

The Russian party boss is also repeating on this occasion the tactics he invoked immediately after the launching of Sputnik I last autumn. Then, as now, his aim was to hustle the West, inadequately prepared, into a summit meeting through threat and beguilement, so as to cash in swiftly on the worldwide concern generated by that demonstration of military prowess.

From the tone and temper of this newest demarche it is clear, finally, that Khrushchev's aims include exploiting to the full the opening presented by the Middle Eastern muddle at the assizes of world opinion in Asia, Africa, and Europe. Candor compels admission that he has already achieved substantial success on this point. Witness the world reaction to his message.

Were these the sum and substance of this latest development, they would mean that diplomatic sparring on the Middle Eastern problem is continuing, and is as dangerous as ever. But there is more to the message than familiar distortions and adroit diplomacy.

Two striking facts stand out. In listing conferees for a possible summit meeting, the Russian has been content to stipulate that but one Communist government—his own—would be represented there. In addition to urging a conference of the U. S. S. R., the United States, Britain, France, and India, he also proposes that Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, be a participant.

Thus, despite the thunder reverberating through this highly tendentious document, Russia is recognizing the role of the United Nations as a restraining factor in the crisis. That is certainly reassuring. It adds to evidence, hitherto more or less piecemeal, that the Soviet Union has no present intention of embarking upon military adventures, however determined Khrushchev may be to exploit the West's dilemmas.

Khrushchev's plan further details Moscow's intention of utilizing the U. N. by proposing that any solutions a big power conference might frame should be sent directly to the Security Council for implementing decisions and action. In the Council Russia, of course, holds a veto power. Moscow's approach accordingly foreshadows recourse to the favorite Communist diplomatic tactics—endless wrangling.

In view of the fact that the Soviet delegate only last week vetoed the United States proposal, backed by 8 of the 11 Council members, that a U. N. police force be dispatched to Lebanon and Jordan to safeguard the existence of their governments; and in view of the pledges of the United States and Britain to withdraw forces when such a U. N. police agency is created, it would seem clear that the proper answer to Khrushchev's message should be to press the call of the U. N. General Assembly and seek a new verdict there, where no veto exists. That, rather than meeting at haste at any summit anywhere, would make sense.

Boating Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support the House's action in passing H. R. 11078, to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories and possessions and providing for cooperation with the States in this matter. Our Nation is possessed of an abundance of streams and larger bodies of water. Certainly Chicago, my home city, has a great deal at stake in this bill. When the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, and all Chicagoans are awaiting this important event, the giant ships from all major cities of the world will sail down the St. Lawrence seaway into Chicago's beautiful harbors.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, and serving on the Subcommittees of Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control, I am vitally interested in navigation projects, flood control problems, and safety measures pertinent to these subjects.

The Third District of Chicago is located on Chicago's southwest side. As such, residents are a bit removed from lake front, and have no true body of water that can be used for recreational purposes. Persons living in areas further south and west in Cook County are still further removed from water recreational facilities. With the advent of water skiing, the ever increasing popularity of the sport of small boat craft, there is a need for safety regulations. I understand that there are now about 30 million people who indulge in the small boat craft. When hearings on H. R. 11078 were held in Chicago, my good friend, Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, presided at them. As he has told us, the committee heard over 70 witnesses, not all of whom were from Illinois but many were from States contiguous to Illinois. The witnesses favored this proposal.

Looking ahead I think is necessary. I hope that residents of my district as well as those in other districts located in southwest Cook County will have water recreational facilities. I introduced legislation recently providing for the conversion of a swamp and marsh area known as the Stoney Creek Watershed into a chain of lakes suitable for swimming, boating and other recreation connected with water. I have introduced legislation to continue the Cal-Sag navigation project. Both of these areas while not actually in the Third District are directly adjacent to it. The residents of these areas would be the beneficiaries of my proposals. New and expanded industries or businesses will develop in this part of Chicago. The number of small craft owners will increase. With this, there will be a great need for adequate safety precautions.

Another consideration is that this proposal which I voted for does not infringe on States rights nor does it permit encroachment into State affairs and private affairs by the Federal Government.

Peace Won't Be Vetoed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on July 23, 1958:

PEACE WON'T BE VETOED

The Soviet veto of the Japanese resolution on Lebanon shows clearly the nature of the Russian Communist interest in the Middle East. Moscow's desire is not to promote peace but to exploit discord. Nevertheless, peace has resources yet to be explored in the Security Council and possibly the General Assembly of the United Nations.

First, Secretary General Hammarskjold can do a great deal under the original Swedish-sponsored resolution, which authorized the present U. N. observer group in Lebanon. This does not give all the authority that could be wished, but it does make possible a corps which can serve as eyes and ears to the U. N. and its members.

Second, the Security Council itself, as Britain and the United States are pointing out, can provide all the essentials of a summit conference such as Soviet Premier Khrushchev advocates, and can make it even more meaningful than his plan.

Third, if an appeal eventually is taken to the General Assembly, the West is putting itself in a position to gain rather than lose at the bench of world opinion.

The Council debate has shown how empty are the Soviet pretensions of wishing a real settlement in the Middle East. It has fulminated for withdrawal of American troops from Lebanah, yet has twice resisted the only practical measures which could bring about such a withdrawal and still protect this small nation from externally aided subversion.

Under such conditions it is impossible even to credit the Moscow regime with good faith. Its position is essentially dishonest.

The Soviet Government has tried to bypass the U. N. by its summit conference proposal. Stuck with its challenge of asking an Assembly session, it revived the summit talk as a substitute. It could use a small chiefs-of-state meeting as its propaganda sounding board without the presence of small nations whose security might be jeopardized as Lebanon's has been.

If a direct meeting between heads of state is desired, that can be obtained by the simple expedient of Premier Khrushchev, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Macmillan, and others acting as their own chief delegates at a convening of the Security Council. This would have the great merit of keeping negotiations in the direct line of U. N. procedure rather than as a substitute for it.

One or two further touches might be recommended, since Soviet diplomacy has been ready to broaden Big Four conferences. The Council should invite President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, and King Hussein, of Jordan, to attend as representatives of the peoples whose destines are being discussed. And if personnel for an expanded observer group could be drawn chiefly from Asian and African countries, that unit would probably be the more acceptable.

The resources of world diplomacy for peace and security are only beginning to be developed. International communism will find they cannot be stifled by vetoes or propaganda.

More Reasons for Making Hawaii a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, at frequent intervals during the 85th Congress, I have been privileged to call

to the attention of the Members of Congress the exceptional qualifications of the Americans of Hawaii whom I have the great honor of representing in the Congress. I have continued to point out that while the American citizens of Hawaii are of many racial ancestries, they are nonetheless red-blooded Americans, fully participating in all phases of American life.

I am indeed honored to be able to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that the 121st Signal Detachment, Hawaii National Guard, has been honored by being announced the winners of the National Guard Association Trophy, the Pershing Trophy, and the National Guard (State) Trophy in competition with all other National Guard units. The Hawaii National Guard achieved this outstanding recognition by surpassing equally outstanding units from every State in the Union.

All three trophies are for the highest figure of merit attained by a team in its record practice conducted during the calendar year with .30-caliber service rifles or carbines. Any squadron, group, headquarters, company, battery troop, group headquarters detachment, or similarly sized unit that is federally recognized and which is authorized to fire a .30-caliber qualification course is considered.

Teams consist of all individuals who are carried on the rolls as members of the unit during the period in which firing is conducted.

The National Guard Association Trophy is an honorary award only. It remains permanently in the headquarters of the National Guard Association of the United States, Washington, D. C. It is inscribed with the name of the unit attaining the highest figure of merit of all competing units. The National Guard Association also presents a Certificate of Victory to the outstanding unit.

The Pershing troop award is made to the winning unit in each Army area. They receive a Pershing Trophy for permanent possession. It is also awarded by the National Guard Association.

The National Guard State Trophy is a revolving trophy awarded by the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice and is awarded to a unit in a State or Territory to hold for 1 year until called for by the State adjutant general. The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice also awards a Certificate of Victory to each of the winning units.

The 121st Signal Detachment, under the command of W. O. Herbert Hiroshi Nakaya, has demonstrated a high standard of efficiency in training and maintenance, in addition to outstanding technical proficiency with individual weapons. This unit had a figure of merit of 97.50 percent, which not only placed them first in the Territory of Hawaii, but first in the Army area and finally first in the entire country.

Farm Surplus Reserve Great National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years high administration officials and particularly the Secretary of Agriculture have bemoaned the existence of surplus farm commodities in the United States.

I have taken strong, strong exception to this attitude and have insisted that surplus food is a great national asset if properly used.

A food reserve is an essential national defense component. It can be a boon to our own needy citizens. It can be a tremendous instrument for peace and freedom if used wisely as a basic part of American foreign policy.

On July 20, 1958, I read a most interesting article by Associated Farm writer, Ovid Martin, pointing out that our so-called farm surplus is not really very large in terms of our present position as a leading world power. Mr. Martin says that our food reserves would be quickly exhausted should we become involved in war.

Mr. Martin's article from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of July 20, 1958, is included as follows:

FOOD SUPPLY SHORTAGE SEEN IF WAR COMES

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's farm surpluses would melt away quickly should the country become involved in a big new war.

Without doubt, shortages would develop quickly for some items and rationing would be needed to assure equitable distribution and to prevent skyrocketing prices.

Recent developments in the Near East, involving the landing of United States armed forces in troubled areas, have set farm and food officials on a new appraisal of the food-supply situation.

There are some surpluses, but they are limited almost wholly to food raw materials, such as wheat for flour, corn and other grains for livestock and poultry feed.

True, the Government does own stocks of such items as butter, dried milk, cheese, rice, and dry beans. But measured against year-long needs, they are insignificant. Take butter for example. The Department owned nearly 100 million pounds June 1. This represented only about 5 weeks' supply for consumer markets.

The Government holds no stocks of meats. The only surplus available are those held in processing and distribution channels and those represented by livestock still on farms.

It would be possible to step up meat production somewhat, but not for long unless grain production were increased. Present surplus stocks of corn and other feed grains—while at record high levels—represent only about 6 months' requirements.

Only in the case of wheat are the stocks sufficient to maintain a high consumption rate for an indefinite period. Of course, there is a possibility the United States would be called upon to share these supplies with allies.

Now plentiful, sugar would become hard to get in the event of a conflict. That is because his country depends on offshore producing areas such as Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippine Islands for nearly two-thirds of its needs. Wars interfere with oceanic movement of sugar.

Much has been said about the milk surplus. About 5 percent of the production has been moving into government surplus stocks—in the form of manufactured products—under price supports.

But this 5 percent would be absorbed quickly through increased civilian and military demands. In wartime, civilians tend to buy more heavily of food. That is because supplies of other consumer goods usually are smaller than in peace time.

Undoubtedly, the meat situation would warrant speedy government action in event of a war. Supplies now are running below a year ago and consumers would like to have more. The per capita consumption is averaging about 151 pounds a year compared with a postwar peak of 167 in 1956.

Egg production is below a year ago and considerably below levels of World War II. Production of poultry meat is larger. But certainly there are no surplus stocks of these poultry items.

The government owns some surplus soybeans and peanuts, raw materials for vegetable oils used in making shortening, margarine and similar foods. These stocks are insignificant from the standpoint of annual requirements.

Of course, agriculture has a large unused productive capacity in the form of cropland idled under crop control and soil bank land retirement programs.

The extent to which this land could be put back to use would be governed to a considerable degree by the availability of additional manpower, farm machinery equipment and supplies.

Nixon Offers a Foreign Policy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 21, 1958. The address of Vice President NIXON to which the editorial refers was an informal talk without manuscript. Because it was so comprehensive, well-reasoned, and convincing, it can be of great assistance to persons who are uncertain as to why it was both right and necessary to go to the assistance of a beleaguered friend, Lebanon. It was placed in the RECORD by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator THYE, and appears on pages 13272–13274 of the RECORD for July 22, 1958.

The immediate objectives were to protect American lives and to demonstrate that the United States can be depended on to support democratic governments, at their request, against aggression from within as well as from without. If independent countries were to have their confidence in the word and the will of the United States shaken, they would have no choice but to bow to Communist pressures and the United States would soon stand alone and in mortal danger. The emergency action in support of hard-pressed Lebanon presented admittedly grave risks; any other course presented greater risks.

But any such action, at best, only buys time and opportunity to devise and put into operation promptly positive programs that will meet the more basic needs and desires of affected peoples; freedom from alien control, economic betterment, and internal democracy—in that order.

The Vice President stated, with equal persuasiveness, the case for such long-range programs, using afresh the ideological weapon of the American Revolution which is more responsible than anything else for the unrest and aspirations that now demand American leadership in satisfying:

NIXON OFFERS A FOREIGN POLICY PLAN

Vice President NIXON made a magnificent defense of the administration's intervention in the Middle East in his speech Saturday at the Aquatennial luncheon for Minnesota's newspaper editors.

Yet even more significant, in our opinion, was his recognition that this action was only a stopgap and what is needed is a new, long-range foreign policy that will recognize and respect the deep desire for change that is being expressed by the people of the Near East, Far East, Africa, and even Latin America.

"Our major problem in the years ahead," the Vice President said, "is to develop more effectively than we have the kind of programs in the information field, in the economic assistance field and in other areas which will identify American policy with the aspirations of these peoples."

Those aspirations, the Vice President emphasized, are: first and above all, national independence, recognition of their dignity as nations and individuals and their equality; second, at a much lower level—but still important—economic progress, and third, at the lowest level at this point, individual freedom.

As NIXON said, this is what the people of the United States and our Government want for ourselves and what we believe our policy is designed to provide and encourage for others. The Vice President pointed out that this message has not been adequately portrayed to the world. We agree. But we would add that too often America's policies have not been designed with these goals and objectives clearly in mind, either.

The Vice President said—and we hope his words were heard throughout the world—that we should talk more about "the promise of the American revolution" than about the threat of Communist revolution. And then he added these significant words:

"The American Revolution caught the imagination of the world one-hundred-and-eighty-odd years ago because we stood then for independence for nations no matter how small, for economic progress and for freedom. We stand for the same things today.

"And our problem in the world is to convince the masses of the people (and) the intellectuals in all the world that the United States and those with whom we are associated * * * are the protagonists of the real, the true revolution, rather than the Soviet Union."

We hope the Voice of America and the other agencies of the United States Information Service are broadcasting the Vice President's speech throughout the world. For it contains the kind of an appeal that too often has been lacking in recent years because of our overriding concern with nuclear weapons, defense pacts, and military aid.

Such defense preparations are needed too—in greater or lesser degree—but there is even more need for the kind of an approach to the people that the Vice President outlined in his speech in Minneapolis Saturday. We hope our State Department can build on the foundation NIXON laid.

Fairfield Jaycees Set Record by Taking the Largest Number National Awards Ever Bestowed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winnsboro News and Herald, Winnsboro, S. C., of July 26, 1958:

FAIRFIELD JAYCEES SET RECORD BY TAKING THE LARGEST NUMBER NATIONAL AWARDS EVER BESTOWED

The Fairfield Jaycees walked away with top honors at the Jaycee National Convention in Los Angeles, Calif., last week. They were selected as the outstanding chapter in the United States, located in towns of 5,000 population or less. For this they were presented the Clarence H. Howard award, which is the most coveted award for Jaycee chapters. In addition to this they received six awards for various civic projects. This is the largest number of national awards ever received by a single Jaycee chapter in any one year. The projects were as follows:

First place: Community health.
First place: Public affairs.
First place: Sports activities.
Second place: Publications.
Second place: Interclub relations.
Second place: Youth welfare.

The Fairfield chapter received statewide recognition at the Jaycee State Convention in Myrtle Beach a few days earlier. They were selected as the oustanding chapter in the State, located in towns of 5,000 population or less. They were also selected as the outstanding chapter in the State regardless of population group. The local president, Fred Phillips, was selected as one of the six outstanding chapter presidents in South Carolina.

The Fairfield Jaycees conducted an impressive, well balanced group of civil projects throughout the year.

Last year's officers of the local chapter were F. C. Phillips, president; W. D. Bozard, first vice president; W. J. Arnette, second vice president; F. C. McMaster, secretary-treasurer; H. R. Jones, W. R. Traylor, Tom Weir, M. W. Chappell, E. P. Ferguson, Marion Frazier, directors.

New officers, recently installed, are H. R. Jones, president; F. C. McMaster, first vice president; J. R. Stevenson, second vice president; J. L. Shaw, secretary-treasurer; W. J. Arnette, W. D. Bozard, Alan D. Bogge, J. P. Harrison, W. T. Weir, and Ed Puryear, directors. F. C. Phillips is a national director.

Joint Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial, "Joint Effort," appearing in the Newark Evening News of Monday, July 21.

As the Representative of Orange and East Orange in the House of Representatives, I am proud of the fine spirit of intercity cooperation displayed by the two cities. As the editorial points out, our communities must join together to solve the complex problems confronting our urban areas.

As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have the pleasant duty of currently helping to draft Federal legislation providing for a long-range extension of the urban renewal program, with additional capital grant authorization.

The editorial reads:

JOINT EFFORT

In crowded Essex County the urban complex produces problems that do not stop at municipal boundaries. Orange and East Orange are taking steps to see that solution of these problems do not stop there either. Moving jointly on commercial, housing, and transit projects, they display a heartening new spirit of intercity cooperation.

Officials from both cities are coordinating urban renewal plans in what David Davies, regional representative of the Urban Renewal Administration termed an effort rather unique in the history of that Federal Agency. A blueprint for revitalizing Orange's fifth ward was doubled in size to 100 acres when East Orange applied for funds to redevelop the Doddtown section adjacent to it.

Noting that housing and business blight do not stop at a city line, Orange Mayor Riley hailed the prospect of working with East Orange on this project as a first step toward regional planning. His counterpart, Mayor McConnell, pledged complete cooperation of East Orange's planning agencies in developing this and other plans to improve living and working conditions in their cities.

With impetus from East Orange both cities last year coordinated rush-hour traffic bans and timing of signals to ease congestion on Main Street. This week planning boards of the two municipalities will discuss how to locate East-West Freeway access ramps so as to serve both East Orange's Brick Church and Central Avenue business districts and Orange's Main Street stores. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the State highway department.

Engineers and consultants are studying an intercity traffic loop that would make Oakwood Avenue and Hilliyer Street in Orange one-way south and Harrison Street, in East Orange one-way north, thereby easing traffic flow in both Oranges.

Isolation of metropolitan communities—often self-imposed—has intensified social and economic problems. They await solution through joint effort.

The Myth of Anti-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. W. S. Woytinsky, distinguished economist, describing his observations during an 8-month tour of Latin America. This is the second of two articles by Mr. Woytinsky appearing in the New Leader. The first was introduced into the RECORD on July 18 and appears on pages A6488–A6490.

EIGHT MONTHS IN LATIN AMERICA: THE MYTH OF ANTI-AMERICANISM—2

(By W. S. Woytinsky)

In the course of the 8-month, 15-nation Latin American tour from which Mrs. Woytinsky and I have just returned, people asked us constantly about life in the United States. Elevator boys, waiters, taxi drivers, store clerks, everybody wanted to learn something about working conditions, wages and job opportunities in our country. To go to the United States appeared to be the dream of almost every person we met. High-school pupils dreamed of a United States college education, university students asked about the chance of getting a visa and a job here.

In Santos, Brazil, we asked two teen-agers for the road to Monte Serrat. Learning that we were North Americans, they volunteered to accompany us. They did not let us pay their fare at the funicular railway that leads to the summit and were happy when we accepted a local drink from them—juice pressed from sugarcane right before our eyes. One of them spoke English fairly well; the other understood but could not speak. During the walk they inquired about California, Texas, and various universities. The first planned to go to the United States for good after graduation from high school; the other doubted his ability to face competition in the United States.

More than once sentries at public monuments showed us around, then asked about a visa for this country. On the Copacabana Beach in Rio de Janeiro, two youngsters swimming next to me asked whether I came from the United States. When I said yes, they called another boy who could speak English, and in no time I was surrounded by a crowd of young people, swimmers and divers. They shot questions at me about universities and job opportunities; they were excited and happy to get firsthand information about the "promised land."

The tremendous interest of Latin American youth in the United States is evidenced by the success of the so-called binational institutes. We visited and lectured in many of them. Some counted their enrollment in thousands; occasionally one had more students than the local university. These included not only teen-agers but many professional and business people. Officially, the task of the institute is to teach English and English literature; actually, it introduces its students to North American civilization. We also heard that many Latin American young people are enrolled in our universities; I do not know the exact number, but it must be substantial and steadily increasing.

This interest marks a very important shift in the cultural orientation of Latin American countries. Only two decades ago, families that could afford to educate their youngsters abroad sent them to Europe, mainly to France. Now the United States is the beacon. The new generation of intellectuals returning from this country brings back new customs, ideas, and attitudes. Without prejudice to their traaditional Spanish magnificence and ornamentation, Latin American cities begin to acquire more and more similarity with the United States scene. We observed this, for example, during the pre-Christmas shopping season. The show windows of the department stores in Sao Paulo and Rio displayed our traditional Christmas decorations; even Santa Claus was there, driving his sleigh in the midst of tropical vegetation.

The traditional pattern of thinking inherited from colonial times is beginning to yield to new influences. What is this pattern? Extreme centralization of government; striking contrasts between rich and poor; a deeply rooted conviction that hereditary wealth is the key to politics, and politics the key to further accumulation of land and money; lavish expenditures on ornamentation of the capital city, public buildings, and private mansions; contempt for manual work and often for any economic activity except that based on land ownership and politics.

These characteristics were not equally evident in all countries that we visited, but they are somehow related to what some Latin American writers used to describe as Latin humanism, as opposed to the materialistic and pragmatic United States civilization. We observed vestiges of this heritage from the colonial era not only in such countries as Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru but also in Chile and to some extent in Argentina. There is much less, of course, in Brazil and Mexico.

Yet we also met people of another psychological bent—among the managers of the steel mill in Huachipato, Chile, and the directors of the Cauca Valley project in Cali, Colombia; in business circles in Mendoza, Argentina; among the economic leaders of Mexico and the directors of Volta Redonda and Petrobras in Brazil. The new-type intellectuals combine the refinement and artistic spirit of the old Spanish-American aristocracy with the dynamism, ambition, and vision of modern times. They speak our language even in Spanish.

The political transformation and economic revival of Latin America are manifestations of this major cultural revolution. Each step in this direction narrows the gap between the two parts of the Western Hemisphere, brings our Latin American friends closer to us.

Driving through a Latin American city, one sees signs including the word "Servicio" on some public buildings. It is a reminder that the respective agency has been established by the cooperative efforts of the national government and the Inter-American Institute or the point 4 mission. In any Latin American country one crosses Franklin Roosevelt or Lincoln Plaza, drives along a Roosevelt Boulevard or park, sees a Roosevelt hospital, a Roosevelt high school, or a Roosevelt youth or sport association. The Latin Americans have accepted Roosevelt and Lincoln in their pantheons along with such native liberators as Bolivar and San Martin. The name of F. D. R. is not associated with the Democratic Party, nor is that of Lincoln with the Republican Party. Both signify aspects of United States civilization which touch the heart of Latin America.

One aspect of our economy that has deeply impressed economic thinking and planning in Latin America is the Tennessee Valley Authority. We observed its influence in the magnificently daring Cauca Valley project, which the local inhabitants refer to as the Lilienthal plan because former TVA Chief David E. Lilienthal greatly contributed to its formulation. We also saw its influence on the far-reaching program of integrated regional development in Chillan, Chile, and found it in the regional development programs in Brazil. We visited the foundations of the Papaloapam project in Mexico, which has not yet reached its full extent but promises to become the Mexican TVA.

Unfortunately, not all visitors from this country realize the significance of such links between Latin America and the United States. * * *

The campaign built around the slogan of "people's capitalism" has been successful, in my opinion, but too often our economy has been pictured to Latin America as a General Motors or Ford catalog—an abundance of shiny cars, electrical appliances and gadgets, and no soul.

We also found that some of our businessmen are not successful goodwill envoys. Some express their bitterness about high taxation, about what they consider insufficient tariff protection of domestic industries and, most of all, the timidity of the United States Government in dealing with the monopolistic power of labor unions. Some representatives of American firms also show lack of respect for Latin Americans, describing them as lazy, unreliable and irresponsible. To be sure, we met American business people who were competent and had a deep understanding of local conditions. Yet the fact remains that the attitude of certain persons from the United States is bound to provoke resentment and plant suspicion of this country's friendship for Latin America.

In our lectures, we tried to portray the United States as we see it: hardworking people, deep respect for work in all its forms, opportunity for all as the key to social equality, little respect for hereditary wealth but a profound appreciation of individual success and of individual effort even when it has not been crowned with conspicuous success. We spoke of the United States as a community of free people who have mutual respect and have learned to work together, trusting one another. We stressed that, while the rich people in our country live in the same luxury as the rich in poorer countries, the difference is in conditions of life for the masses. We explained that our mass production is based on mass consumption, on the availability of a broad domestic market created within the framework of our democratic society. At the request of our audiences, we elaborated various aspects of our economic and social structure, always in terms of human relations and human attitudes rather than of dollar and technical achievements.

More than once, the USIA members who attended our lectures told us of their surprice that these features of our system are so seldom presented in United States literature. Perhaps they are so obvious as not to need elaboration in books designed for domestic readers. But here, I believe, is a gap in our cultural work in Latin America. Apparently Washington has made little effort to establish clearly in the minds of our Foreign Service people what aspects of the United States economic and social system can be expected to have appeal abroad.

This confusion has still another implication—namely, that our cultural representatives abroad are not given any reliable yardstick for judging to what extent the people, and particularly the intellectuals, in foreign countries are friendly or unfriendly to the United States. We met instances in which the desire of a country to have its own government exploit its petroleum resources was considered an unfriendly attitude toward the

United States. Even the operation of the railroads by the government was frowned upon. I do not wish to exaggerate the significance of such appraisals, but I fail to see how the vital interests of the United States are affected by a foreign government's policies concerning its petroleum or railroads.

Apart from such preconceptions and within the means at their disposal, I believe that our cultural agencies are doing a respectable job. Their libraries are well organized and attended, and their publications well selected. It would be unjust to hold them responsible for the fact that people abroad are not as well informed about the United States as we would like them to be.

The strongest point in the work of the United States in the countries we visited is, of course, the activities of the International Cooperation Administration (point 4). We met competent and devoted people among our extension agents, educators, engineers, medical men and other experts—men with missionary zeal, clear understanding of their program's purpose and real interest in the people. Every member of the point 4 mission feels himself surrounded by friends in Latin America. More than once when local people spoke warmly of point 4 personnel, we remarked: "They are typical of the United States, they are of the breed that has built the United States and continues to build it." Unfortunately, point 4 remains known only within the communities it directly affects. People on the east coast of Latin America, for example, know little or nothing about its work on the west coast.

The great majority of Latin Americans look to the United States as the beacon of their cultural, economic, and social evolution. The rising tide of anti-Americanism feeling in Latin America is a myth, whether it rests on misinterpretation of the mood of Latin American peoples or on the wishful thinking of our enemies. It is a dangerous myth—the sooner we get rid of it, the better it will be for our policy in Latin America.

Public opinion here has accepted the outrageous behavior of mobs in Caracas, Venezuela, and other places as evidence of a strong undercurrent of anti-American feelings in these countries. This view has been used as an argument for revision of our policy and for increased United States aid to Latin American countries. If this reasoning is correct, my wife's and my own highly favorable observations could be used as an argument against increasing United States aid to Latin America. To my mind, this kind of thinking is utterly absurd. It actually amounts to saying to a foreign country: "If you are not satisfied with the aid the United States gives you, let your hoodlums attack our dignitaries or burn our information offices. Then Uncle Sam will give you more." Thus our aid would become either blackmail or a means of buying friends.

Foreign policy cannot be based on such considerations. It must rest on a clear definition of our objectives in each particular area. What are our objectives in Latin America? To pave the way for the investment of our private capital? To insure our control over the natural resources of foreign lands? To build up outlets for our exports? To influence their economic policy in accordance with principles which we do not apply consistently at home?

For all considerations of this type I would substitute a simple statement: We are vitally interested in the progress of democracy and in economic and social progress in these countries, as the road to prosperity, unity and strength in the Western Hemisphere. This progress can be achieved only through the free individual efforts of the respective nations, but we can and should foster their efforts and contribute to their success.

More specific questions concerning our policy can be answered in the light of this general principle. This principle demands, first of all, revision of our foreign-trade policy in Latin America. When the interests of our domestic producers and consumers clash with those of that area, we must realize that the interests of the latter are not alien to us. Compromises must be sought and found.

Our cultural work in Latin America must be strengthened in scope and depth. We must expand our technical aid and be ready to help Latin American countries financially in their projects, encouraging those that are most promising. We cannot remain neutral in the fight between progressive and reactionary forces, and must not glorify dictators because of concessions they have given to our private companies. Each dictatorship is a setback in progress that we consider vital. We must do our best to dispel the vicious myth that the United States is sympathetic toward reactionary forces in Latin America. This myth is the strongest weapon of the Communists, and is as widespread in Latin America as the myth about the "anti-American" feelings of Latin America in the United States.

Newark in Her Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial entitled "Newark In Her Debt," that appeared in the Newark Evening News on July 21. As the editorial states, Doctor Fried has enriched her adopted land and Newark especially. She takes with her the profound gratitude and affection of her fellow citizens, and their best wishes for continued success and happiness. Doctor Fried translated into action our ideals of democracy and freedom, and her dedicated service toward building better citizens and a better community has enriched the lives of countless families.

The editorial reads:

NEWARK IN HER DEBT

Newark will lose a dedicated and resourceful community leader when Dr. Antoinette Fried leaves next month as executive director of Fuld Neighborhood House to work in East Harlem.

Dr. Fried has spent 13 years at the agency which serves the neighborhood surrounding the Rev. William P. Hayes and Felix Fuld Court housing projects in the central ward. But the fruit of her work stretches beyond these boundaries, even to West Germany, where, under a State Department program in 1954, she advised educators and social agencies on human relations techniques used in the United States.

Cooperation with a variety of groups and progressive—often unique—programs tailored realistically to meet local needs characterize Dr. Fried's work in Newark. Under her direction Fuld House has become the only agency in the city to employ a detached worker to help hard-to-reach youth who on their own initiative would not take advantage of traditionally organized programs. A combination work and recreation program for teen-age boys, operated by the agency in cooperation with the Essex County Park Commission, is another practical result among many of Dr. Fried's progressive leadership.

A cultured native of Vienna, she has enriched her adopted land and Newark especially. She will be missed.

Momentous Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of July 21, 1958:

MOMENTOUS WEEK

This may be a momentous week in the affairs of man as Uncle Sam strengthens his landing forces in the Middle East and Russia's top brass insists on a top level conference between the Soviet Union, United States, England, France and India on the knotty problem that has been created in Lebanon and Jordan.

The thought persists in United States that if Mr. Khrushchev wants to contribute something to world peace he should operate through the United Nations and muzzle the man who now represents his country in that organization.

You may have heard two able men comment on the troubled crisis on Meet the Press program on your TV last evening, Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey Republican, JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama Democrat.

Both agreed, President Eisenhower had no alternative left to him when President Chamaun of Lebanon asked for help. Both men were as one in thinking the United Nations should carry the ball from here on in so United States forces in that country could be withdrawn with speed.

A resolution to that effect was defeated in U. N. Security Council last week by use of the Russian veto, an instrument the Soviet Union has used many times in the past to defeat measures not to her liking.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. SPARKMAN were in agreement Russian propaganda efforts were far more efficient than those of America and may have had much to do with the Arab nationalist movement that has been gaining momentum of late. They thought it would be a fine gesture to invite NASSER to Washington and there show him actual proof we have no desire to expand our territorial holdings or force our way of government on any other race of people.

Since World War II this country has spent more than $900 million in the Middle East in an effort to win friends, but when the showdown comes we find ourselves out on the well-known flimsy limb.

America, the friendliest of all the major powers, has failed miserably in gaining friendships through giveaway programs. It is difficult for one on the sidelines to say just where Uncle Sam stubbed his toe.

For America it has been likened to chasing the pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow, and finding nothing but delusion at the end of the trail.

Every taxpayer in America has contributed of his or her earnings to the wealth that has been sent to the Middle East and other parts of the globe to help other lands,

other people regain their economic equilibrium after the war, and in many instances save them from starvation.

We have been paid back by insults and outright condemnation; part of the price all distributors of worldly goods have encountered since the world began.

Today, because of our generous benefactions we find ourselves up to our neck in Middle East turmoils, a respected representative of the Nation kicked and spat upon in South America, reviled in many European countries where we have been playing Santa Claus since the early days of World War I.

One wonders if it would not be better for United States to withdraw within its own shell, expand her defensive strength and let the rest of the world stew in its own juice.

Shooting War Unlikely Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the Editor's Report of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, which concerns the present Lebanon situation:

EDITOR'S REPORT: SHOOTING WAR UNLIKELY NOW

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst Newspapers)

Call it what you will—war of nerves, cold war, hot war—what it is, is a mess. Nevertheless, I don't think it is going to turn into world war III, and I'll tell you why.

I don't mean to imply that it is a mess because of what we have done or that we should have done it sooner or shouldn't have done it at all.

Conditions and circumstances in the so-called Middle East—brought about by the different races and religions and national interests and ambitions, and schemes and intrigue, great wealth beneath the ground in the hands of a few and extreme poverty on the surface suffered by the many—are made to order for Russia's global scheme to bring about the downfall of the capitalistic system and the countries of the free world.

There are two major principles involved. One is moral and involves our belief that countries and individuals should be free to determine their own forms of government by ballot and not by bullets.

The other is oil.

The economies of countries in Western Europe would come to a grinding halt without the oil and petroleum products of the Middle East, better than 60 percent of which they consume annually. It follows, therefore, that if this oil were denied Western Europe these countries would have to go to the Western Hemisphere for it at considerably greater cost, as was done during the few weeks when the Suez Canal was closed a couple of years ago.

I got it from a top government authority in England when Bulganin and Khruschev visited there a couple of years ago, that they had been told the Mideastern oil was so vital to England's very existence that she would have no alternative but fight for it, were there even any possibility of it being denied her.

I believe the way it was phrased was, "rather than be economically slowly strangled to death England would prefer to die fighting."

It is just as vital to the existence of the other western European countries. In other words, the stakes in this game are so high that nobody can afford to run a bluff. Sure as shottin' somebody is going to be called.

There is, too, the added dangerous complication that Nasser has become so committed to the principle of Arab confederation and convinced that he should head it that he, too, has gone beyond the bluffing stage. While he may not have actually committed or perhaps even contemplated the assassination of young King Faisal of Iraq and his Prime Minister, he certainly has condoned it and shown his approval by immediately recognizing the assassins as the de facto ruling government.

It is quite conceivable that the Arab States might some day form themselves voluntarily into a confederation and nationalize the oil fields, in which case the countries of Western Europe would be forced to make the best deal with the confederation that they could. After all, the Arab States would certainly want to sell their oil to somebody.

Normally this continent does not need it and Rusia, who exports oil, does not need it. Therefore, Western Europe would be the logical customer in whoever's hands the oilfields repose.

Russia could probably afford to contract for all of it and run the price up, to force the free countries of western Europe to deal on its terms. However, I don't think even Russia could afford to do that for long.

The West must be gambling that while Russia would like to bring about a situation which would cause such consternation in the West, the Communists will not precipitate the unthinkable destruction of world war III, just to temporarily embarrass the countries of western Europe.

In a nutshell, Europe needs the oil and has it now, Russia hasn't got it and doesn't need it and, therefore, it is doubtful that the Russians would bring about their own destruction (which world war III would do among other things) over the present issue.

Nikita Krushchev told the Hearst task forces on two different occasions that he believes that eventual dominance of communism was inevitable and that time was on the Communists' side. If he honestly believes that, I agree with the thinking of the major Western Powers that he will not risk self-destruction to bring about an end which he thinks he will attain by peaceful means in a relatively short time.

Nasser too believes in the eventual formation of an Arab confederation and he would indeed be a fool, which I don't think he is, to precipitate a global conflict—again with certain self-destruction—for his goal, which he, too, believes he will attain fairly shortly.

As I have said before I don't have a reliable crystal ball—I wish I did have—but my guess is that Bob Murphy, of our State Department, who is now in Lebanon as the ace troubleshooter of President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles, has the best chance of any western diplomat of easing tension and getting the Arabs at least to listen to our side of the case.

Bob has courage, intelligence, and skill and from what I can gather from Washington he has been given a free hand to play it the way the ball bounces. He enjoys the trust of the Arabs, the respect of the British, and has had the confidence of the President since the time that Bob served as General Ike's diplomatic advisor in the North African World War II campaign.

Among his first duties, I would guess, is to see that President Chamoun, of Lebanon, keeps to his pledge not to seek an unconstitutional second term, and that the election July 24 for a new president takes place on schedule. But I wouldn't be at all surprised if Bob Murphy came up with far more important accomplishments. He's a good man to keep your eye on.

The crystal ball gets real foggy when I seek in it an answer as to whether we are going to oust or deal with the present government of assassins in Iraq. In this connection, I do not see that Nasser's secret meeting with Khrushchev necessarily means Russian intervention. You will notice that Nasser has been talking it up about protecting Iraq, but he hasn't said a word about moving against the American or British troops in Lebanon and Jordan.

The one most likely circumstance of Russian intervention is that Iraq will ask Krushchev to parachute reinforcements into that country, which is exactly what England did at the request of King Hussein, of Jordan. The danger there, though, would be that Russian paratroops might be fighting British paratroops and that could easily ignite the world.

Returning to my belief that the Russians do not want to start world war III, my guess is that they will not play with fire. Since the end of World War II Russia has avoided military contact in any situation other than those with foregone conclusions, such as picking up the Baltic states and maintaining the position of its troops at the end of World War II in Central Europe.

Reaching across Iran to get into an almost certain fight becaues some hot-headed Arab soldier shot his king, I suspect, would not be their idea of a good deal.

My guess—and I hope and pray to God that I am right—is that forceful action of the United States, Britain, and France in seeking to maintain peace and return to the status quo ante, which is diplomatic lingo for "as you were," will prevail.

Soviet Insincerity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the millions of people the world over who look to the United Nations as the instrument for collective security find the Soviet's constant resort to the veto in the Security Council a discouraging thing. It is most regrettable that the very world agency which was created for the purpose of furthering the cause of peace thus finds its basic purpose flouted by the chronic Soviet dissenter. And yet, even this device of negation utilized by the Russians may serve the useful purpose of exposing to the world the insincerity of the Soviets. Truly, it is by deeds, not words, that nations as well as individuals are judged.

A very able exposé of Soviet insincerity in its U. N. actions is contained in an editorial of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, in its issue of July 22. Captioned "Red Insincerity Exposed by Soviet's U. N. Action," the Gazette's editorial aptly defines Russia's real objectives and then proceeds to destroy the Soviet case.

I commend the reading of the editorial and I include it for the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

RED INSINCERITY EXPOSED BY SOVIET'S U. N. ACTION

If there had been any doubt about Russia's real objectives in the Middle East and

its insincerity in posing as a paragon of peace, that doubt was removed Monday by the Soviet's opposition to the Japanese compromise plan for easing explosive tensions in Lebanon.

The Japanese plan, designed to permit the withdrawal of American marines from Lebanon, simply gives Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold blanket authority to strengthen the U. N. observer organization in Lebanon in whatever way is necessary to protect the political independence of that country.

The United States gave its approval, saying the plan offered a way to get United States marines out of Lebanon. Great Britain followed with an offer to work out a plan with Hammarskjold to permit the withdrawal of British forces from Jordan.

France, Sweden, and other countries threw their support to the plan as a means of settling the danger-fraught situation in the Middle East.

But the Russian delegate, Arkady A. Sobolev, refused to go along. He said the Soviet Union could not support the Japanese plan because it would amount to a tacit approval of the United States landings in Lebanon and the British landings in Jordan. He said it would, in effect, make the U. N. a party to the intervention.

By his actions, Sobolev was overlooking, or ignoring, the very purpose of the U. N., which is to settle disputes and maintain world peace. And if the U. N. cannot intervene when the peace of the world is threatened, then certainly it cannot function in the purpose for which it was created.

While he did not say it in so many words, Sobolev strongly indicated that Russia would resort to its old standby, the veto, to block the Japanese plan. This would be the Soviet's 85th Security Council veto in what can be nothing less than a deliberate effort to keep the world in chaos.

What, we ask, could possibly be wrong with a plan that would accomplish the withdrawal of foreign troops and at the same time set up safeguards for maintaining a small nation's political independence?

The answer, of course, is that such a plan could have only the highest sincerity of purpose in protecting both justice and peace.

But we don't think Russia wants the United States marines withdrawn from Lebanon or the British from Jordan. This would interfere with the Soviet's propaganda machine in its efforts to stamp the West as warmongers and to keep the Middle East in a turmoil.

By its actions in the Security Council, Russia has shown the utter fraud of Khrushchev's five-power peace conference proposal.

And this gives us the big hope that Russia has been so diabolically clever in its scheming that its insincerity will be fully exposed, and fully realized, by all nations of the world, including those in Nasser's sphere of influence.

Residents of Luzerne County (Pa.) Endorse the President's Action in Lebanese Situation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was featured in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of July 20, 1958, setting forth the opinions of a cross-section of Luzerne County residents on the President's action in the Lebanon crisis:

COUNTY RESIDENTS SAY IKE WAS RIGHT SENDING UNITED STATES FORCES TO LEBANON

The vast majority of Luzerne County residents endorse President Eisenhower's decision to send United States military personnel into Lebanon to protect American interests there and to safeguard that country from aggression, a survey by the Sunday Independent showed yesterday.

While the opinions, voiced by county residents from Duryea to Hazelton, showed overwhelming support for President Eisenhower's action, there was some criticism that his decision came at a late date.

There also was a sprinkling of we should mind our own business attitudes.

But by far, most of those interviewed claimed that President Eisenhower acted correctly in sending American troops into Lebanon.

Here are the opinions of a cross section of Luzerne County residents:

Joseph Blaski, Hanover Township: "It certainly looks bad right now, but I don't think the President had any other choice but to send the Marines into that area to keep the Communists and their pals from taking over more territory."

William Kennedy, Wilkes-Barre: "The thing had to be called some time, so I guess this was as good a time as any to find out just how tough this guy Nasser is and how much help he can expect from the Russians."

Donald L. Honeywell, Wilkes-Barre: "My only fear is that those countries we thought were friends of ours will not support us now and the American forces will have to be pulled out with a great deal of loss to our prestige."

Abe Drubey, Jr., Wilkes-Barre: "The idea of an all-out war is not a pleasant thought, but the way things have been shaping up, a showdown had to come some time."

Al Ruck, Nanticoke: "No real point in me worrying about it right now. If there's a war they'll call us back soon enough. Of course, I'm not so sure the old uniform and I are still the same size."

Mrs. Betty Pleban, Lee Park: "The President had to have sound reasons for his actions and it's time we called a halt to some of the things that are happening to the free word."

Edward C. Curley, Wilkes-Barre: "I hope all this blows over and that the Russians and their friends get the idea that the United States is not going to put up with any more of their moves to control people."

William Smedley, Kingston: "The President is a former military man and undoubtedly felt that the situation called for the drastic military move that was made. I think most Americans will back him up 100 percent."

Carl B. Olsen, Trucksville: "We're not exactly weaklings from the military standpoint and it's time we stood up to the saber rattling that the Russians have been doing."

Joseph Gunning, 1714 Wyoming Avenue, Forty Fort: "President Eisenhower's decision to send United States Marines into Lebanon is good leadership. To have the Big Stick in a key spot will have a tendency to slow up the policies of Russia. Our action was necessary if any kind of freedom is to prevail in the Middle East."

Chief of Police John Adams, Luzerne: "President Eisenhower's decision to send troops to strife-torn Lebanon no doubt is necessary. I am certain the President consulted with leaders of Congress and Senate before he took action."

Beverly McHugh, 74 South Atherton Avenue, Kingston: "I hope President Eisenhower did the right thing when he sent troops into Lebanon."

Gordon James, Rural Delivery 2, Dallas: "The President did what was right. It was the only choice he could have made if we are to live up to international agreements and preserve the United Nations."

George H. Waters, 99 West Union Street, Kingston, retired Metropolitan agent: "What I would like to know is how President Eisenhower is going to get the marines out of Lebanon, without the Nation losing face. It could be worse if DICK NIXON was in the White House."

Edward Crossin, Mercer Avenue, Kingston, president of the Greater West Side Memorial Post, Disabled American Veterans: "What else could the President do?"

Burgess Jack Dempsey, Wyoming: "I hope that the decision of President Eisenhower to send troops in to Lebanon was not too late. I am inclined to be just a little on the pessimistic side right now."

George Hewitt, 175 Main Street, Luzerne: "The decision of President Eisenhower to send the Marines into Lebanon was for the best interest of the Nation. We cannot continue to put up with the ruthless actions of Russia who are trying to undermine our influence for justice and equality."

Fred P. Gibbons, 970 Wyoming Avenue, Forty Fort: "The President is right. It is about time the Nation told Russia where to get off. Sending the Marines into Lebanon is one way to do it. We have had too many sad experiences, such as dealing with Hitler to procrastinate when it comes to stopping Nasser and the Soviet Government. I am for a strong determined policy."

Jerry Iscovitz, 126 Main Street, Luzerne: "I believe the President acted for the best interest of the American people. Our relationship with dictators and aggressors have been costly, when they are permitted to become well entrenched. We cannot permit the free world to become imperiled."

Mrs. Cyrus Shearer, 31 East Walnut Street, Hazleton, mother of Pfc. James Shearer, one of the Hazleton marines who landed in Lebanon: "First, let me say I am deeply concerned about my son. Our whole family is worried. I don't know whether it was the right thing to do (sending troops in). President Eisenhower is a military man and I guess he knows what he is doing."

John Bove, 536 Wyoming Street, Hazleton, father of Cpl. Robert Bove, the other Hazleton marine landed in Lebanon: "What can I say? The whole thing is a little too deep for me. I can't commit myself one way or the other. I do feel definite U. N. action should be taken and, if needed, other troops from other countries should be sent in. It goes without saying that my wife and myself and all of us are worried for the safety of our son and the other marines."

Attorney Anthony C. Falvello, 35 West Diamond Avenue, Hazleton, a veteran: "There is no question about it. President Eisenhower should have strengthened our friends in the East much sooner. One must consider the valuable oil lands there and it is essential that those oil land areas remain under a government that is friendly to us."

Victor C. Diehm, 627 West Diamond Avenue, Hazleton: "I believe the move was in order. I discovered while traveling through Europe recently that the popularity of the United States was low in many quarters. Many people feel the United States is too vacillating—afraid to take a firm stand on many issues. I believe the recent move will help our prestige throughout the world and I think the U. N. should act promptly and make sure the situation doesn't get out of hand."

George Chisnell, 504 West Diamond Avenue, Hazleton: "I think the move by the President minimized the possibility of a general war. I have the utmost faith in him.

not only as President dealing in civilian matters, but with his military background I believe he is completely cognizant of the strategic timing of the move."

Mrs. John Cembrock, Heights: "There was nothing else that the President could do. I have a son in the Army and I pray that nothing serious will result from the landing of the troops."

Mrs. Walter Cunningham, Wilkes-Barre: "Things are happening so fast that I can't keep up with them. I suppose the President did the right thing. They know a lot more in Washington about those things than we do."

Mrs. John Gilboy, Dallas: "It is about time that some action was taken. We just can't let those Russians push us around without doing something about it."

Mrs. Mary Francis, Wilkes-Barre: "All I can say is that I hope the President's action doesn't mean another world war. I have lived through two of them and this time, everyone will feel the effects."

Mrs. Ann Herring, Wilkes-Barre: "I don't know anything about world problems. Let the politicians settle them."

Mrs. Della Grabowski, Lyndwood: "The President was absolutely right. We had no other choice."

Ernie Sfarnas, 8 North Main Street, Pittston, businessman: "I think it's about time. We made our mistake 15 months ago when the British and French had Nassar hiding in the cellar. We should have helped them, not stopped them."

Louis Schiffman, 104 William Street, Pittston, businessman: "I don't think President Eisenhower could have acted any differently. There was little choice in the matter and I feel he knows what he's doing."

Mary Finnan, 714 Hawthorne Street, Avoca: "I think the President did what was right, but I bet Truman is getting a kick of it since he was criticized for going into Korea. Don't you think the State will go Democratic this year?"

Stanley Turkos, 500 Stephenson St., Duryea, businessman: "I think we beat Russia to the draw. We've got to protect our own interests in all parts of the world."

Mary Norris, 34 North Main St., Pittston, saleslady: "I think the President was right. The Russians have to be stopped from undermining and stealing countries. No one wants war, but the Russians have to be stopped."

Ned Levey, 314 Race St., West Pittston, businessman: "I think it was a good move. President Eisenhower took the bull by the horns after we were pushed to the walls."

Steryl Serfoss, 101 Philadelphia Avenue, West Pittston: "The President carried out the Eisenhower Doctrine passed by Congress with an amendment by Senator MANSFIELD, from Montana, directing aid to any country as long as such aid is requested and is considered vital. In this case, it was both requested and vital."

John E. Romanowski, Nanticoke: "Time will tell whether the action was right or wrong. We are proud and honored to have our son serving with the Marines in Lebanon but definitely worried."

David Jones, Nanticoke merchant: "The United States made a smart decision by moving into Lebanon before trouble started. It should have been done years ago in the case of Hungary."

P. J. Guesto, Ashley pharmacist: "I think we were right but, at the same time, hope it doesn't lead to another war."

Benjamin F. Howells, Nanticoke publisher: "President Eisenhower is to be commended for this action. The United States should take a positive and definite stand and stop being bluffed by the Communists."

Rev. Herbert G. Nahas, pastor of St. Mary's Syrian Church, Wilkes-Barre: "Because of our close contact with the people of Lebanon through the American University of Beirut the American way of life is well understood and dear to the educated youth of Lebanon. They understand our free way of life and as a result of the principals of democracy they have learned at the American schools, both missionary and cultural that we have founded there in Lebanon. I feel that the intellectual core of the Near East in general will be in complete sympathy with the problems facing the free world."

Henry Mack, Laurel Street, Wilkes-Barre: "It's time something is done to bring peace to the world. One thing is sure, you can't underestimate this country of ours. We're well prepared and we can strike anywhere in the world on a few hours' notice. We should back our President in time of trouble."

Ray Ulisch, Wilkes-Barre: "I don't like wars but if they push us around it's time we put a stop to it. We have a military man as President and he proved his ability during the last war. I feel sure he knows his way around now."

Ralph Lorenzotti, South Washington Street, Wilkes-Barre: "We're all worried about fighting wars but if we have to fight Communists then it is time we put our shoulders together. God is on our side and we know we're right."

Frank Yuknavitch, Wilkes-Barre Township: "None of us likes wars but we can't stand being pushed. We have a great country and it's worth defending anytime. Ike must know his job. He has had a lot of experience."

Thomas C. Thomas, Pennsylvania Avenue at Union Street, Wilkes-Barre: "I am in full accord with President Eisenhower. The country of Lebanon is outstanding for its educational background, having the American University in Beirut. Our country as a whole should back our President."

Rev. John Koury, pastor of St. Anthony's Church, Wilkes-Barre: "The idea of Eisenhower is the life of Lebanon. Without the American idea Lebanon would be a mere mouthful for the Republic of Egypt. The people of Lebanese descent in this country are thankful to the United States Government and President Eisenhower for the support of the Lebanon Government."

Tom A. Evans, city treasurer: "The President's action has my full approval. He has proved himself in war and peace and in these troubled times every American should be glad that such a man is at the helm as Commander in Chief to guide our military decisions."

Samuel Thomas, produce merchant: "If it means keeping the Reds from getting a foothold I'm for it, you bet."

William D. Jones, public safety director: "An ounce of prevention is always worth a pound of cure in my book and I think Mr. Eisenhower prescribed the right dosage when he sent the Marines to this troubled spot to make it clear to the whole world that we never let down our friends and allies."

Benjamin Dalassandro, central city bartender: "I am glad to see the Marines move in fast. We have always waited to take the first punch. It's time we got in the early licks to show we mean business."

Attorney Reynold J. Kosek, veteran of 5 years' service in World War II: "I served under General Eisenhower and have great respect for his wisdom in military matters. His handling of the present situation proves, I think, that we have an aggressive Commander in Chief in the White House and that's good for the Nation in these times of international unrest."

Fire Chief Ambrose Saricks: "In our business we have a saying 'stop 'em (fires) when they're small.' The same is true, I believe, in the handling of world affairs. The President was right in stepping in at the kindling point in Lebanon and not waiting until he had a general alarm on his hands."

James Corbett, Navy veteran and ILGWU recreation director: "This time we didn't wait until it was too late. I think the President was right in sending the marines pronto. Looks to me as though the situation is well in hand."

John Bonk, Laurel Run: "It's about time we showed Russia we mean business."

Mrs. Blanche Jones, Laurel Run: "Eisenhower knows what he is doing. After all, he was the military leader for the Allies during World War II."

Walter (Blaze) Martin, Plymouth, captured in north Africa during World War II: "Eisenhower is acting properly to avoid the mistakes of the last war. If the Allies showed a firm hand when Hitler started to grab Austria and Czechoslovakia, we would have had more men to fight for freedom in the first war and maybe he would never have reached Africa."

Stanley Gryskiewicz, Plymouth: "By sending a formidable force to the Middle East at this time, Eisenhower might be doing the world a service. I don't think Russia wants war any more than we do but she understands force better than diplomacy."

Frank Nemshick, Edwardsville: "Our job is to build a strong civilian defense unit at home to prepare for emergency. Let's get out and volunteer for home-front service and leave the international problems to Washington."

Police Officer Gus Snyder, Larksville: "I agree with Eisenhower. That gang with Nasser has been bulling its way long enough and Russia is behind them. See how quick Russia recognized the new group in Iraq. If we leave them go they'll take over all the countries. Give it to them now in the language they understand and we will avert more serious trouble."

William Kelly, Plymouth: "We probably would have avoided a lot of this if we encouraged the British and French to hold the Suez Canal when their paratroopers took it. Eisenhower has the right idea in sending the marines. My old outfit knows how to do a thorough job."

Police Chief Larry Kendig, Plymouth: "There probably was nothing else to do except what Eisenhower did. If we left things go, they would grab up all the small countries and we would really be in trouble. Ike called their bluff and I think they will back down like Nasser did in the Suez Canal deal."

Edward Yob, Plymouth: "Look what happened in Europe, Korea and China where the Communists were allowed to move in before we acted. Eisenhower is profiting by mistakes of the past. He had to offer a hand to our friends or lose face as a military power and champion of the free world."

Joseph W. Urban, 30 New Sullivan Street, Swoyerville: "I believe in defending ourselves. I'm against Communists. If they need me I'll go, even if I was in World War I."

John Fabian, 79 Milbre Street, Swoyerville: "If you have to, you have to."

John Saxon, truck driver, 247 Slocum Street, Swoyerville: "I think President Eisenhower was right in sending troops to Lebanon."

Anthony Janowski, 22 Gillespie Street, Swoyerville: "My opinion is that the American troops should be there."

Sam Dia Maria, 278 Slocum Street, Swoyerville: "I believe our troops should have never been sent to Lebanon. It is none of our business."

Stephen R. Stefanides, 33 Gillespie Street, Swoyerville: "I don't like to see our troops go over there. We should mind our own business."

Sam Slomowitz, 326 Hughes Street, Swoyerville: "I definitely approve the Eisenhower decision."

Steve A. Farris, 274 Chapel Street, Swoyerville: "I am firmly convinced this is a long-range program on the part of the Russians

and against all free countries. The sooner we stop it, the better for all."

John Dorish, Sr., 410 Main Street, Swoyerville: "Personally I feel it is the right move to send troops there."

A Contrast Which States the United States Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the sight of Khrushchev shedding crocodile tears is not very impressive. Perhaps, swayed by his own bloated importance, he is going in for broad comedy. In any event, Khrushchev is weeping copious tears over the fact that the United States Marines and soldiers are in Lebanon, at the specific request of the Lebanese Government, to protect that country from aggression by infiltration. Khrushchev finds this most outrageous. He is working overtime to get the last drop—tear drop—of propaganda out of it. He very conveniently forgets that he ordered Soviet military forces into Hungary to crush Hungarian patriots, under the cover of deceit, while pretending that the Kremlin would enter into discussions for the peaceful settlement of the Hungarian uprising. The Soviet doublecross in the Hungarian crisis was one of the most infamous acts in history.

All of this is ably recited in a timely editorial in the July 22 issue of the Charleston Daily Mail entitled "A Contrast Which States the United States Case." For the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

AMERICANS IN LEBANON, RUSSIA IN HUNGARY; A CONTRAST WHICH STATES THE UNITED STATES CASE

By way of clearing its throat and giving due notice, the Soviet Government notes that it will "not remain indifferent to acts of unprovoked aggression in a region adjacent to its borders."

For the Soviets this is fairly polite talk and fairly reasonable, too. The United States would say exactly the same if the Soviets, or anyone else, made an aggressive move in the direction of Mexico, Venezuela, or Paraguay.

Since the Monroe Doctrine, the United States has taken an unfavorable view of European interest in American affairs, and we may gain some insight into Soviet thinking simply by imagining what the United States would do if Soviet marines plied ashore on the beaches of Vera Cruz.

What remains to be decided, then, is a twofold question:

Is the Marine landing at Beirut an act of aggression—unprovoked or not?

The Soviets excluded, how will the rest of the world look at it?

As to the first the evidence seems to be on the American side. The invitation to land was legitimate enough. The act itself seems to have taken place in an atmosphere of peace and good will. No one, it is worth noting, is being shot at, and no one has been killed. If this is aggression, it is a fairly new and generally wholesome variety.

As to the second question—whether the rest of the world will lean to the American or the Soviet interpretation—the final answer is not available yet, but the voting in the United Nations suggests the trend. Save for Sweden and Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, the rest of the members accept the American view: That this is not an act of "unprovoked aggression," as the Soviets have it, but the gesture of a great power toward one of its firm allies.

If further argument is required, it might be pointed out that American intervention in Lebanon is considerably less aggressive than Soviet intervention in Hungary. On that contrast, the United States might well rest its case.

Tenth Anniversary of Congregation Beth Hillel of Washington Heights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and with the unanimous consent of the House, I am pleased to set forth an historical summary of the Congregation Beth Hillel of Washington Heights in my congressional district.

Congregation Beth Hillel was founded in 1940 through the initiative and energetic efforts of Samson Schmidt, who, an American by birth, had returned to this country in 1932 after having lived in Munich for several decades. During the following years he kept in touch with the ever increasing number of his coreligionists from Munich who were seeking a haven from Nazi persecution in New York City. Being aware of these Jewish immigrants' need for a congregational bond, Samson Schmidt began to pursue the possibilities of establishing a replica of their former congregation. This plan took on concrete form when in 1940 their long-time rabbi, Dr. Leo Baerwald, arrived in New York and expressed his readiness to assume once again the responsibility of serving as spiritual leader to his reborn congregation. By that time the number of Jewish immigrants from Munich living in Washington Heights had increased to several hundred. Due to the tireless efforts on the part of Samson Schmidt and Rabbi Baerwald, in collaboration with other dedicated men and women, the new congregation Beth Hillel was founded in 1940. Its first president was Dr. Herman Schuelein, whose well-known name and highly esteemed personality added to the prestige of the young congregation.

During the high holy days of that year, inaugural services were held at the former Paramount Building in Washington Heights. From the outset the large attendance, even at the regular Sabbath services, augmented by numerous nonmembers living in the neighborhood, bespoke the great need for such a congregation in that area.

According to the classifications customary in the United States, Beth Hillel may be considered a conservative congregation. Services were conducted in the order of the old Munich prayerbook, retaining also the familiar cantorial melodies. Due to this familiarity the congregation, from the very beginning, felt at home in the services held in their new country. During the early years, in the interest of the older generation, sermons were delivered exclusively in German. This was not only a linguistic expedient, but it also strengthened the common ground of thinking and raising questions. However, in recent years, especially under the leadership of Rabbi Dr. Hugo Stransky, who took over in 1955 from Rabbi Dr. Baerwald, for the sake of the younger generation, and as their elders have become more familiar with the language of their new country, sermons have been given alternately in German and English. English has also been the language of teaching in the religious school from its inception as well as of all cultural and social activities sponsored by the youth group and by the younger members of the sisterhood.

In 1941, the newly founded Congregation Beth Hillel was greatly strengthened by its merger with a kindred group from Nuremberg. Under the leadership of their former rabbi, Dr. Isak Heilbronn, whose untimely death occurred in 1943, and the trustee, Richard Jung, a number of Jewish immigrants from Nuremberg had at first joined an existing American congregation in Washington Heights. Finding that this solution did not meet their need for spiritual and cultural cohesiveness amidst the many difficult adjustments necessitated in the new country the members of the former Nuremberg congregation then decided to join their brethren from Munich so as to be able to worship once again in their familiar tradition.

The expanded Beth Hillel flourished under the joint spiritual leadership of Rabbis Baerwald and Heilbronn and to Richard Jung's dedicated collaboration on its board of directors. By the end of the forties the family membership had increased to about 2,000 souls, for whom the old Paramount Hall now proved wholly inadequate, even including other rooms in the same building where subsidiary services were conducted during the holy days. The growing religious school also pointed up the need for larger, more appropriate quarters. In September 1948, on its 8th annversary, Beth Hillel was able to inaugurate its own building at 571 West 182d Street, originally built by the Government for post office purposes. Thanks to the generosity of the congregation it was possible to purchase this building and to commission the architect, Fritz Nathan, to rebuild it as a synagogue and Jewish center.

Since that time Beth Hillel of Washington Heights has been growing further; not only in membership, which now amounts to about 750 families, but also in its cultural, educational, and social programs. An active sisterhood, parents' association and youth group, a dedicated Chevra Kadisha, a substantial and informative bulletin; these are some

of the aspects of congregational life which strengthen the bond among its members, under the administrative guidance of a board of trustees of 24. The presidents of the synagogue were Dr. Hermann Schuelein, Richard Jung (who died in 1957), Louis Bauernfreund, and Dr. Leopold Landenberger, and at present Dr. Paul Simon.

When Rabbi Baerwald retired in 1955, he continued to take a lively interest in the affairs of Beth Hillel. Under the leadership of the succeeding Rabbi, Dr. Hugo Stransky, the congregation has continued to grow in vigor, incorporating in its program many features adopted from its American counterparts and involving the younger members for more active participation. Dr. Stransky has had a most distinguished record as a religious and civic leader. He is a native of Prague, Czechoslovakia, where he served for 9 years as rabbi. During World War II he was a rabbi and Army chaplain in England; from 1947 to 1951 chief minister of Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, Melbourne, Australia; and from 1952 to 1955, principal rabbi in New Zealand.

Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following statement on right-to-work laws by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam is one that I believe contributes significantly to the case against such legislation. The broad point of view which Bishop Oxnam presents cuts across the lines of self-interest of either labor or management, and is therefore an important consideration of the merits of the case. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of his message in the RECORD:

THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

(From an address by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Baltimore Conference, Westminster, Md., June 7, 1958)

So-called right-to-work laws are fraudulent. They are neither intended nor designed to guarantee work or to establish the right to work. These laws are sponsored by the same reactionary forces that once sought to destroy labor organizations. When the churches in 1908 declared, "The churches stand for the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing," men of similar mind declared the social creed of the churches to be radical and subversive. Yesterday, intelligent and two-fisted individualists sought, by the use of the labor spy and the black list, by intimidation and force, to destroy the labor movement. Greedy and undemocratic powers that maintained the 12-hour day and by every device from company housing to depressed wages sought to resist the introduction of democracy into the economic order are among those who today sponsor these right-to-work laws. The public is being deceived by the machinations of these stupid men who misrepresent the wise and far-seeing leaders of contemporary business who long since have seen the wisdom of dealing with organized labor, of meeting at the bargaining table, and of using the mind instead of the fist to reconcile differences.

Americans believe in the right to work. They resent the parasite, and see work as an obligation. But just as the Communist deliberately misuses such worthy terms as "peace," "democracy," and "justice," so, too, clever crafty and highly paid public relations experts have designated these endeavors to weaken labor as right-to-work laws. They would return to the jungle of industrial struggle, instead of marching forward to the bargaining table with its sensible and scientific cooperation.

Actually, a sanctimonious subterfuge is being foisted upon the public. The real purpose of these laws is to deny both management and labor the right through collective bargaining to establish a relationship wherein all of the workers belong to a union and, through representatives of their own choosing, bargain collectively with all of the employers in a particular industry, whether local or national, through representatives of their own choosing.

The executive board of the division of Christian life and work of the National Council of Churches has declared "that union membership as a basis for employment should neither be required nor forbidden by law: the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining."

The board of social and economic relations of the Methodist Church has stated, "Such laws are miscalled 'right-to-work laws,' since they do not oblige anyone to give an individual a job. * * * We hold that 'union membership as a basis for continued employment should be left to agreement by management and labor, through the process of collective bargaining.'"

The archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ohio have said, "There are certain abuses which sometimes creep into the labor movement, but we are convinced that 'right-to-work' laws are not the proper means to correct them. * * * As to the present issue before the electorate in Ohio, we are convinced that a 'right-to-work' amendment would not solve our problems, but lead to a more intensified struggle for domination and thus postpone an era of peaceful cooperation."

The Reverend William J. Smith, S. J., director of the St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations in Jersey City, N. J., has said in a pamphlet entitled "What's Wrong With Right-To-Work Laws," a pamphlet that carries the imprimatur of Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, that "the one right that a misnamed 'right-to-work' law touches upon directly is the right of freedom of contrast between union and management. It denies to both these parties the right to agree voluntarily to a union-shop contract." He refers to the union shop as one where "a company and a union agree voluntarily that all employees represented by the union in the plant should become members of the union." This is based upon the principle "that the worker who is sharing the benefits of the collective bargaining contract should have sufficient sense of social justice to carry his share of the cost." Father Smith continues, saying, "A Taft-Hartley collective-bargaining contract covers all employees in the bargaining unit. The union becomes the exclusive legal agent of all the employees. The benefits accruing from that contract are bestowed upon all without discrimination. The full weight of supporting that contract and its legal agent, however, falls only upon the beneficiaries who volunteer to become union members. In our opinion, it is sheer inconsistency to state that all the burdens of that contract should fall only upon some of the individuals covered by it."

The Protestant churches in Ohio have spoken through the general assembly of the Ohio Council of Churches, saying, "We urge the citizens of Ohio to reject legal proposals which will make either the open or union shop compulsory. Such proposals are undesirable and incompatible with the development of such management-labor relations as are in accord with the public interest."

Current exposure of corruption in some unions has been seized upon by those who would destroy all unions to foster right-to-work laws. The high standards of integrity and the democratic practices of the great unions of this nation are not known to large numbers of people who think of all labor as led by corrupt tyrants. The achievements of American labor in raising the standards of living, carrying democracy to the democratic order, ridding the American labor movement of subversive elements, and of maintaining a stable economy are matters of proper pride and constitute a fundamental bulwark against the inroads of totalitarian and atheistic materialism. The right-to-work law means a return to the battlefield. The most significant progress has been made in industrial relations where the workers belong to the union and the union, through its representatives, meets management, through its representatives and together they think out the problems that should not be fought out.

The law requires an employer to bargain collectively with his employees when, after a properly supervised election, the bargaining union is decided upon. It is far wiser to have all of the employees belong to that union, sharing in their obligations as well as in their benefits. Even if there is disagreement upon this proposition, a law that forbids employers and employees from entering into agreements to establish a union shop is in no sense a right-to-work law.

For purposes of illustration, we Methodist ministers belong to an annual conference. Agreement has been reached in the democratic general conference of the church where our laws are passed concerning membership in an annual conference. All ministers who are to be appointed to our churches by a bishop must belong to the annual conference. The general conference determines the educational qualifications of our ministers. The annual conference votes upon the admission of members to the conference and insists that certain standards shall be maintained. The effect of a law similar to the right-to-work laws in methodism would mean simply that any individual who wanted to serve in one of our churches might do so, if the church wanted to employ him. Before very long, our standards would be gone and the whole responsible system based upon law would break down. The doctors have their medical societies and maintain their standards. A right-to-work law carried out in the medical profession would mean that subject to State law, any doctor, no matter what school he graduated from or whether ne graduated from any school, might go out and practice medicine. It would be solely up to the person who wished to employ him. Lawyers who have their bar associations may well ponder these right-to-work laws. The purpose is not right-to-work. The real purpose is to weaken and eveuntally to destroy the democratic labor movement.

Yesterday, the great insurance companies were under investigation in New York. The makers of munitions were investigated, so too the powerful financial agencies of the country. There was much that was discovered that needed proper control. No one is objecting to an investigation of corruption in the labor movement or anywhere else. There are practices that are not only immoral but ought to be criminal. The right-to-work laws have nothing to do with the question of corruption in business or in

labor. They are a dangerous proposal, conceived in hypocrisy, and proclaimed in Pharasaic deceit. The forward-looking businessmen of America who have long since recognized the wisdom of the organization of labor and the propriety of collective bargaining should speak with single voice to strike down this pretense.

The Responsibilities of the Negro Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital and important institutions for keeping alive the democratic traditions of this Nation is a free and unfettered press. Newspapers of America have, for the most part, sought to live up to their responsibilities as quasi-public agencies, in the belief that an informed public is an alert public, ever sensitive to possible encroachment both from within and without our borders.

Over 150 American newspapers are published primarily for Negro readers, and it is particularly true that these papers, weeklies, except for two dailies—Atlanta, Ga., and Chicago, Ill.—have rendered exceptionally distinguished service with sustained editorial support to the high principles of our Constitution. In so doing, they have served by helping to keep America strong.

A few weeks ago, the publishers of these papers, the National Newspapers Publishers' Association, were addressed by the President of the United States. The occasion was a summit conference called in the Nation's Capital, bringing together Negro leaders from every section of the United States.

Shortly thereafter, the group met in an annual session in Philadelphia, Pa., to consider, among other aspects of their publishing enterprises, the manner in which Negro newspapers might further live up to their responsibilities and obligations to the people of America.

One of the panels of this conference was addressed by Mr. M. A. Lockhart, director of advertising and promotions of the Amsterdam News, a great newspaper published weekly in the city of New York. The Amsterdam News, I am proud to state, is a potent factor in informing the Negro public of Metropolitan New York concerning contemporary social, economic, and political issues.

Excerpts from Mr. Lockhart's address before the distinguished National Newspaper Publisher's Association follow. They are particularly pertinent to the responsibilities of the American press in that Mr. Lockhart pulled no punches in urging his listeners to maintain only the highest standards of journalism; especially in relation to the Negro consumers, who annually pour some $17 billion into our American economy.

Quotes from Mr. Lockhart's address:

The United States Supreme Court's decision, in 1954, on public school integration, marked one of the most momentous milestones in American race relations. Although it concerned the educational world primarily, we can accurately state that it has already had far-reaching effects on the business community.

Newspapers and other forms of advertising media have paused to take a good long look at the Negro market. What they see is largely an image created, for the most part, by the Negro newspaper. For this, we can take a bow; since there can be no gainsaying the fact that Negro citizens, both individually and organized, have depended on their own papers to help muster public opinion, behind the quest for what we call first-class citizenship.

It follows in logical sequence, therefore, that if we helped create what amounts to social revolution, we must not permit ourselves to fall victim to the changes we have sired. Rather, we should, after making an accurate estimate of the current situation and finding ourselves in a deep hole, regard that hole as a foundation upon which to build for the future. * * *

Negro publishers have become step-children in the advertising family, largely because they have failed to live up to the responsibility inherent with the quasi-public status we seek to enjoy.

The fact that lineage in Negro papers has slumped to a danger point is due to the fact that we have not lived up to the rules of the game. The past decade has seen the newspapers of the Nation challenged by TV and radio to the point where we have ultra-selectivity, and no publication is going to receive anything better than token recognition unless through sheer merit.

The basic need is to build a bridge of understanding and information between the Negro papers and the advertising world; the agencies, the media directors, and plans boards. If we want to be a part of top policy, then our policies must match top policy, both in standards and requirements. Without attempting to sermonize, suppose we analyze some of the basic shortcomings we need to overcome.

Research: The science of finding out what people buy and want. How pitifully little research is conducted by Negro newspapers.

It was President Eisenhower, I believe, who said, "In a free economy, people do not always buy just because they have the money. Theirs is the sovereign right of choice."

Most certainly, we should make factual and documented information about the Negro consumer—his wants and aspirations—a genuine and not a conjured up part of our selling tools.

We have likewise failed to give any semblance of hard-hitting merchandising support to our advertisers. Even though we are aware of the hand-in-hand relationship between advertising and merchandising, we allow pinch-penny attitudes to color our thinking.

These are just some of the areas of operation where we might pause for reappraisal. Among others are proper editorial support for the product we advertise, technical deficiencies, and above all, the editorial content of the papers themselves. Certainly, far from being least in importance, the reading content of our papers is generally not up to standard as far as adequate coverage is concerned.

In setting our sights to the future, it might be well for us to make partnership our goal. Not partnership in the strictly legal interpretation, but rather as associates in the chosen task of making this American economy a fabric of such durable and unpiercable composition, with the free interchange of information and ideas leading us on to the ultimate democracy for which we strive.

Community Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman, I believe that a Representative should remain close to his people and should know the needs of his community. A legislative forum is one of the best means for a Representative and his constituents to exchange their ideas for mutual benefit. I have worked closely with parent-teacher associations, trade union groups, fraternal orders, athletic clubs, churches and synogogues, tenant organizations, civic groups, and have received the benefit of their views.

On May 22, 1958, I cosponsored a legislative forum. A summary of the discussion and results will prove interesting reading.

The first annual legislative forum sponsored by the East Harlem Council for Community Planning and the Yorkville Civic Council with Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO was held on May 22, 1958, at the Ruppert Brewery at 1639 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The purpose of the forum was to explore areas of particular concern to the Yorkville and East Harlem communities and areas where the various agencies and community groups might be able to make a contribution by working together. The nonpartisan forum was mainly directed toward suggesting legislation to assist these goals with the idea of making the various, city, State and Federal legislators aware of the proposals adopted by the forum.

After the opening address by Rev. George Todd, chairman of the East Harlem Council of Community Planning, indicating the purpose of the conference and welcoming the participants, the conference was divided into four separate panel discussion groups as follows:

Housing in East Harlem: The chairman of this panel was Hortense Gabel, deputy State rent administrator. The panel speaker was Herman Cohen, executive director of the legislative committee on housing and multiple dwellings.

Housing in Yorkville: Victor Remer, assistant director of the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, chaired this panel and Robert I. Randall, treasurer of the Citizens' Housing and Planning Council, was the speaker.

Youth and schools: Hugh K. Johnson, acting chief of street club work for the New York City Youth Board, was the chairman, and Jean Rubin, staff associate for public affairs at the Community Service Society, was the speaker.

Economics and the consumer: Commissioner Edward Corsi, executive director of LaGuardia House, chaired this panel. Murray Kempton, labor columnist at the New York Post, was the speaker.

PANEL SUMMATIONS

Housing in East Harlem

Mrs. Gabel eloquently described the East Harlem community—the dilapidated tenements, the overcrowded rooming houses, the thousands of families displaced to make room for the gigantic housing projects which will soon house 25 percent of the population. She made a plea for more intensive and imaginative planning, for the utilization of underoccupied, underused or badly

used land, and lastly, for the construction of scattered smaller housing projects better related to the community.

She was joined by Mr. Cohen in outlining the various legal tools which can help relieve and correct our inadequate housing conditions. The rent control laws still necessary in the face of the continuing housing shortage, the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs bill which can be the key in promoting the racial and economic integration of our neighborhoods, the State neighborhood slum prevention plan which would make it possible to preserve the character of a neighborhood through rehabilitation or construction of various kinds, and the Mitchell Lama law which would fulfill what may now be our greatest need—middle income housing.

Public interest, participation and pressure were held, both by the speakers and the audience, to be the keys to the enforcement of existing laws, to the promotion of new ones as needed, to the proper functioning of the various city agencies, and even to securing vacant land for future building.

Housing in Yorkville

Both Mr. Remer and Mr. Randall described the serious and growing housing situation in Yorkville. It was noted that thousands of Yorkville families have already been evicted and many thousand others face eviction for the erection of high rent luxury apartment houses in New York's new garden spot. The problems facing elderly people and others on fixed incomes were explored as well as the difficulty in securing adequate new apartments at moderate and low rentals. Accordingly, the 7 proposals adopted by the panel follow:

1. The establishment of a central city relocation in which private real estate interests could participate. This group would set fair standards, list potential relocation sites, synchronize demolition and building schedules, etc.

2. Compel builders to relocate as part of the requirements of procuring certificates of eviction. (Lack of free housing market). This would mitigate tenant hardship and facilitate repossession of properties by reputable builders.

3. Persuade the comptroller to utilize more frequently the tax abatement powers he possesses to stimulate new low and middle income development and the rehabilitation of existing structures.

4. Persuade private, nonprofit agencies, to sponsor Mitchell Lama construction for the desperately needed low-middle income families.

5. Develop some small, scatter site, public housing units in Yorkville.

6. Develop a master plan like the one being developed in the West Side project area by the planning commission to insure upgrading and to sustain balance. (This might be done by a total regional zoning code plan which would be set up to ensure the building and/or rehabilitation of diverse kinds of housing.)

7. Start to build immediately on vacant areas all over New York, under existing Federal legislation, temporary, but good basic housing, to shelter families in transition because of either public or private construction or rehabilitation.

Youth and the schools

Mrs. Rubin presented to the panel a comprehensive view of existing services and the obvious gaps in service available to the youth in the community. Both the speaker and the chairman made reference to inadequate budgets for casework services, shelter care, out-patient mental health care, and welfare assistance. The unmet educational needs of the community were explored with suggestions that existing remedial reading classes be increased, that the bureau of child guidance secure additional financial contribution, and that preemployment continuation facilities be expanded. The recreational needs of the area have not been satisfied. A recent request for 10 new summer community centers was rejected without even 1 such center authorized. A communitywide program with various agencies lobbying most actively for increased expenditures for the youth was advocated. It was felt that legislation currently pending in the Congress could be of real assistance in providing tools for the youngsters in the area. Federal aid to education, federally endorsed scholarship grants, and Federal funds for child welfare services were cited as examples.

Economics and the consumer

Mr. Kempton discussed the lack of productivity involved in many industries today and compared the desire of the automobile industry to produce larger and more chrome-spangled cars with the need for more small and simple cars. He suggested a broad hospital-construction and roadbuilding program, stating that hospitals and roads were needed regardless of the salutory effect that such programs might have on the sagging economy. Mr. Corsi, drawing upon his vast experience in labor matters in New York, participated in the discussion of the problems of the present recession. Congressman SANTANGELO, who was present for this panel discussion, reported on the antirecession bill he had introduced and called for increased and extended unemployment-insurance benefits.

PLENARY SESSION

Following the panels, a report was made to the entire assembly of the progress in each of the areas. Reverend Todd then introduced the keynote speaker, Congressman SANTANGELO.

Congressman SANTANGELO emphasized the changing nature of the community of East Harlem and Yorkville and the related problems created by the economic and social transition there. He pointed out that the objective of our housing and social program is not only to eliminate slums, but also to develop a balanced community where families of different economic levels may live side by side and asserted that while public housing is popular in New York, its faulty administration has uprooted and dislocated families who have lived in the community for decades and brought about economic ghettos. In order to achieve the goal of balanced communities, he has introduced legislation which would prohibit local housing authorities from considering the income of minors for the purpose of admittance to public housing and continued occupancy there, but would include such income when fixing rentals. While Federal regulations do not restrict the permissible income of minors, local authorities have adopted restrictive eligibility requirements. In recognition of the paradoxical situation which exists in Yorkville where low-cost housing projects with rentals at $10 per room per month are being constructed within a few blocks of luxury apartments renting at $75 per room per month, he recommended that the Government or a citizens housing group should seek to build spot projects within the income limits of the community's residents. Stressing that the upheaval of present structures has also adversely affected senior citizens who are widowed or single, he recommended that the eligibility age for singe persons should be reduced to 60 years and that more apartments for single persons should be provided, with high priority given to such dislocated single persons.

On the problems of our youth and juvenile delinquency, Congressman SANTANGELO affirmed that responsibility for the welfare and morality of our young people must be restored to parents and schoolteachers. He also called for greater understanding and courage on the part of public officials in regard to children who have been in trouble and wish to rehabilitate themselves by obtaining gainful employment in governmental agencies. Civil-service positions, postal employment, licenses and responsible positions are denied to these delinquents who have transgressed instead of being made available to them in a spirit of constructive cooperation. Congressman SANTANGELO deplored the lack of Federal aid for school construction which is so desperately needed in our community.

In regard to the problems of economics and the consumer, Congressman SANTANGELO commended the chairman of the panel, Edward Corsi, who, as industrial commissioner, has been a vocal spokesman for higher minimum wages and broader coverage for unemployment insurance. He also noted with approval that Congress, to combat the recession, has adopted many work programs. He suggested further that the Federal Government establish a fund to make Federal grants available to localities in need of schools and hospitals.

Congressman SANTANGELO pointed out that while the housewife is complaining of the high levels to which consumer prices have risen for food supplies, farmers have received less of the consumer dollar. At present the farmer receives only 40 percent of the consumer dollar and the remainder is going to the food chains and distributors.

Congressman SANTANGELO promised to continue his advisory council meetings and expressed his hope that other legislators would follow his lead in establishing community forums in order that greater cooperation take place between representatives and their constituents.

Dr. Ernest Gruening, the Real Pioneer of Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, every great cause has its foremost crusader, its Richard the Lionhearted, its peerless leader.

In the case of Alaskan statehood, this individual has been Dr. Ernest Gruening, who served as Alaska's Governor from 1939 until 1953, and whose book The State of Alaska has been the real handbook of the statehood movement.

As one who has visited Alaska many times as a civilian—and also as one who served in the Alaskan theater of war in our Army during World War II, from 1942 until 1944—I can testify that Ernest Gruening was carrying on a lonely battle for statehood, when some of the present summer patriots of statehood were actually in opposition.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an eloquent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 21, 1958, paying tribute to Ernest Gruening's pioneering role in the movement for Alaskan statehood, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE FOUGHT FOR 25 YEARS

Countless people, many of them no longer living, share in the victory that now at-

tends the 40-year struggle to bring Alaska into the Union. In the current Congress, the constructive efforts of Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND and Senators JACKSON, NEUBERGER, CHURCH, MORSE, and KUCHEL, among others, stands out. In the House, passage was due in large part to the strategy of Representative O'BRIEN of New York, who found a legal but seldom used way to get the bill before the House even though it had been smothering for 10 months in HOWARD SMITH's Rules Committee.

On the executive side, Secretary of Interior Seaton gave infinitely more help than his predecessor, Douglas McKay. But there is little doubt that no one else did as much as Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska for 14 years by appointment of the late President Roosevelt and since 1956 a "Senator" from Alaska in the anticipatory congressional delegation elected by the people of Alaska 2 years ago. It is safe to say that no one else has seen as much of Alaska as Ernest Gruening. As governor he visited not only remote points on the mainland, but the many islands of the Aleutian chain. The leading book on the subject, The State of Alaska, is his, and he gave it that name 4 years ago as evidence of his faith that statehood was coming.

It takes nothing from the contributions of many others in Alaska and Washington to say that the blue ribbon in the statehood fight goes to Ernest Gruening for his unrelenting battle over a full quarter century.

Representatives Walter and Hillings Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, by far the vast majority of those who come to our shores from foreign countries to make this their future home become fine, upstanding, and patriotic citizens of the United States and contribute much to its progress and welfare.

An increasing and alarming number, however, are or become members of the Communist conspiratorial apparatus, subversives, racketeers, or just common criminals. The law properly provides, in order to protect our internal security, that such persons forfeit their right to residence in this country. After due trial, they are deported, usually to the place from whence they came. In case after case through legal maneuverings and outright abuse of our judicial processes, these deportees have flaunted the law and remained in this country for many, many years, some indefinitely.

Congressman FRANCIS WALTER has introduced legislation which, if enacted, will prevent these abuses of our hospitality and judicial processes. He has been vigorously and conscientiously supported in his move by Congressman PAT HILLINGS, of California. Both of these dedicated Members of the Congress are to be commended for their efforts and foresight.

The Los Angeles Examiner, in a lead editorial on July 21, 1958, clearly and succinctly points up the issues involved. The editorial follows:

URGENT REMEDY

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the House of Representatives has reported favorably on a bill intended to make major reductions in the periods of litigation that are serious and often dangerous obstacles to final disposition of deportation cases.

Introduced by Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, this measure has been given immediate urgency by the flagrant case of William Heikkila, of San Francisco, native of Finland and an admitted one-time Communist, who has been either the beneficiary or the victim—according to whose viewpoint is consulted—of 10 years of protracted deportation proceedings.

But the necessity for the legislation sponsored by Mr. WALTER is the bitter fruit of long and tragic experience. Throughout all the years of our neglect in this matter, as he emphasizes, many subversives and conspirators against the peace and security of the United States, and many hoodlums, gangsters and criminals menacing the property and lives of decent people, have been able to remain in this country with immunity from our laws and with contempt for our society.

Mr. WALTER makes a special and proper point of the fact that the program he proposes for the remedy of judicial abuses in deportation cases will provide full protection for aliens and citizens alike in all the vital areas of their constitutional rights.

But this phase of the problem is put in its proper perspective by Representative PAT HILLINGS, Republican, of California, and a member of the subcommittee, who is vigorously supporting the WALTER proposal. As Mr. HILLINGS says, the safeguarding of constitutional rights is a basic duty of the Congress, but it is an equally challenging obligation to correct the great weakness of a judicial system that is inoperable for long periods of time against the most dangerous of our enemies.

It is one of the essentials of protective law in this field, as he insists, that these enemies "will not be allowed to make a mockery of our courts after once receiving their protection."

The Walter bill is presently before the full Judiciary Committee of the House, and its consideration by that group and eventually by the whole Congress should be free of all delay. The basic principle here involved is that those who would destroy us are left free to do so, as long as this reckless gap in our security system remains.

Popular Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Mirror of July 9, 1958:

POPULAR JIM FARLEY

Big Jim Farley, 1 of the 2 or 3 favorite citizens of New York, has announced that he will be a candidate for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. Usually the Mirror does not concern itself with primaries. The parties set up candidates; the people make the choice.

But James Aloysius Farley is something different. He is not only a man, he is an institution among us. He is not only a politician but a respected and even beloved citizen. Go to any public dinner, whether it is a charitable, a religious or a political gathering, and watch the universal good cheer that greeets the mention of Farley's name. Always the applause for him is the greatest.

This is not because he was Franklin D. Roosevelt's campaign manager. Republicans applaud Farley as vehemently as Democrats do. It is not because he was once a member of a Presidential Cabinet; in New York, there are lots of those around. It is because he is Jim Farley.

It is said that some of the Democratic leaders are opposed to Farley because he broke with Roosevelt over the third term issue. That he did and more honor to him for putting country above personal interest. At any rate, Jim Farley holds the respect and affection and can get the votes of Democrats and Republicans and it seems to us that it would be a short-sighted politician who would decline to give Jim the honor that he merits.

Well, we said our piece in defiance of all our rules and we hope that Jim gets the nomination no matter who is against him. If it is left to the people, Farley cannot lose.

Nutrition and Medical Problems—Distinguished Service of Dr. Tom D. Spies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the recent convention of the American Medical Association in San Francisco, Dr. Tom D. Spies, director of the nutrition clinic at Hillman Hospital, in Birmingham, Ala., was presented the association's distinguished service award. The clinic's outstanding contributions to medical knowledge in the field of nutrition and nutritional disorders are widely known and appreciated. I am proud and delighted that the American Medical Association has presented its highest award, which has been given only 10 times in the 108 years of its existence, to this outstanding Alabama doctor and research director, Dr. Spies.

Earlier this year the legislature of Puerto Rico enacted a resolution expressing official recognition to Dr. Spies for his discoveries which have been so beneficial to humanity and for his interest in Puerto Rican hospital institutions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the June 7 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association about Dr. Spies' work. The editorial is entitled "Nutrition and Medical Problems."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUTRITION AND MEDICAL PROBLEMS

The chemical composition of any food, drug, or poison taken into the body can have a profound effect on one's body, mind, and spirit. Heretofore nutritionists have

been chiefly concerned with determining the chemical composition of the foods most commonly used, with little thought for their relation to medical problems. No one has been more active in bringing this relationship to both nutritionist and physician than has Dr. Spies, whose latest contribution to this field appears in this issue. As in almost any field, what at first appeared simple is found with each new discovery to be anything but simple. Although research rarely does and is not expected to give us definitive answers to all questions, every advance in our knowledge of nutrition should when properly applied aid in building health and preventing disease. Many diseases formerly of unknown origin are now recognized as due wholly or in part to chemical imbalances within the body.

In any effort to prevent disease early recognition is an important factor. Diagnostic criteria originally based on descriptions of far-advanced cases of such diseases as pellagra and sprue are of little or no value in early recognition, and when recognition of the cause of a direase leads to prevention the advanced cases become a rarity. This necessitates setting up new criteria for finding the early and the chronic but mild cases—always a more difficult problem. Meanwhile many such cases go unrecognized, misdiagnosed, and improperly treated. It is difficult to think of a more frustrating experience for such a patient than to go on for years labeled a hopeless neurotic. These patients can never get well on placebos or bromides, but when the deficient element in the diet is supplied they promptly regain their health.

Another important point to remember is that apparently no one develops a deficiency of only one of the water-soluble vitamins. It seems to be necessary when such a deficiency is discovered to search for others and correct them. Unlike smallpox, one attack of a nutritional deficiency does not confer immunity. The only prevention is a daily supply of all the necessary elements in the diet. Of course no one should get the impression that all dieases are caused by a nutritional deficiency or can be prevented by an adequate diet. The important thing to remember is that chemical imbalances in the body may play a part in any disease and do play a large part in many a condition in which the possibility of nutritional deficiency is not even considered.

Lest We Forget—That Khrushchev Is a Ruthless Murderer and Enslaver, Not a Peacemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eloquent editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 24, 1958:

JUST 20 YARDS FROM FREEDOM

The item took only one paragraph to tell on the Associated Press ticker. But it spoke volumes.

This is what it said:

"An unidentified man in civilian clothes ducked out of some bushes in Communist East Berlin today and began running toward the border of West Berlin. An East German guard fired one pistol shot. The man died—20 yards away from the border."

Only 20 yards away from freedom. And willing to risk death to obtain it.

No matter what soothing notes may come from the Kremlin, about the easing of tensions in a fear-haggard world, the central fact remains that a Communist state is a prison, and that its inmates would flee it, if they could. That is what the Hungarians tried to do, and the Poles are still trying to do. President Nasser of Egypt would do well to ponder these facts before he lurches any further, of his own volition, into the all-too-eager arms of the bear that walks like a man.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley delivered at the opening ceremony of the 84th grand lodge session of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on Sunday evening, July 6, 1958:

Dear brother Elks, as many of you know, I have seldom missed an Elks national convention since my first convention in Atlantic City over 40 years ago. From time to time I have been honored by the privilege of addressing these gatherings of my brothers and fellow Americans from every site of land under our flag. I am doubly honored tonight for it is my great privilege and pleasure to extend to this 94th grand lodge session of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks the official greetings of the city of New York on behalf of our distinguished mayor, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner.

Other duties that took him out of the city tonight made it impossible for Brother Wagner to be here and personally bid you welcome to our great and wonderful city. His regret is the greater because, as a past exalted ruler of New York Lodge No. 1, the founding lodge of Elkdom, Mayor Wagner is himself a member of this grand lodge and shares with all of our 1,200,000 brothers throughout America the love and affection that we hold for the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

It is always a very special occasion when the Elks return to New York for the national convention. New York is hometown to all Elks, wherever we live, for it was here 90 years ago that our order was founded. It was from New York City that the actors and entertainers who conceived the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks and who in their travels introduced it to distant parts of the land and passed on to other men the high ideal of a brotherhood united by the principles of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity.

It is with rightful and justifiable pride that New York looks upon the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks as one of its finest contributions to the people of America.

Today, there are more than 1,840 Elks lodges, and every week the number grows. They are in the great cities, in small cities, and in the villages throughout our land. Wherever they are the Elks Lodge is, always has been and, thank God, always will be the home of stouthearted Americanism. The history of our order covers half the history of our country. And in that time, in war or in peace, the Elks have been determined and aggressive defenders of liberty, and unyielding foes of all who have sought to destroy or weaken it.

We preach Americanism. We teach Americanism. We practice Americanism. We do these things not from a blind acceptance of the past but because we know that we are the inheritors of political, social, and economic ideas and ideals that have answered the prayers in men's hearts, and are the source of our strength and greatness as a nation.

Because of our firm faith in the American dream, we have never lost confidence in our way of life. Sputniks may rise into the heavens, sent there by slaves who serve the desperate ambitious of dangerous men. They may strike fear in the faint-hearted, and cause those of little faith to speak admiringly of Communist triumphs. But we Elks know better. We know that, as long as we Americans remain true to ourselves, so long as we stand faithful to the concepts embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and symbolized by the magnificent statue that stands in the harbor of this city, then America will stand always as a rock against which communism and every tyranny will break and perish.

As conservative as Elks are, with respect to any attempts to tamper with our liberties, we are just as liberal when it comes to lending a helping hand to those who have suffered the hurts of life, to guide our youth toward the greatest fulfillment of their hopes and talents. As a measure of this liberality, this generous spirit that animates the men of Elkdom, our order last year spent more than $7 million for benevolent programs so many in number and so varied in character that they cannot be listed in detail. And the dollars invested in them are indeed a poor measure of their worth. A far better measure is the many thousands of crippled children whose bodies have been restored at our hospitals—the thousands of cerebral palsied youngsters who have been taught to talk, to dress and feed themselves, and who have known the immeasurable thrill of joining other youngsters at school and at play, because the Elks provided the treatment that set them free.

When our colleges open their doors next September, several hundred young Americans will be able to enter those doors only because the Elks dug into their pockets and gave them scholarships. Some of these young people are superior students, enormously gifted, others are average. But they all have talents that our country needs, and they will be able to make their greatest contribution to society because of the generosity of Elks.

And always, do we remember the men who defended our liberties and who today lie wounded or ill in hospitals. In gratitude for their sacrifices, the Elks—throughout the year and in every veterans' hospital in the land—bring to these men entertainment and recreation. We remember them at Christmas and other special occasions. In these and other ways we try to bring cheer and pleasure, to share a little the load they bear and, above all, to make them know that we do not and shall not forget.

These, my friends, are some of the true measures of Elkdom. They are in fact a reflection of the true greatness of America. They are the real spirit of America, the spirit that gives meaning to the words of our Constitution. This is the spirit that flames from the torch high over New York Harbor, high over America, across the world—and sends its message of serene defiance to sputniks everywhere.

Proudly, indeed, the city of New York welcomes the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to the city of its birth. We rejoice in Elkdom's achievements. We know that this grand lodge session, at the business meetings that will get underway tomorrow, will chart a course for future achievements for the betterment of all America. Our city offers you all its resources for your comfort and convenience while you attend to the business that brings you here. And, as the most hospitable city in the world, New York bids you, when the time comes to play, to enjoy to the fullest the pleasures of the good life that we offer in such abundance. For that is traditional with Elks, we know the joyousness of life when enriched with good fellowship, and who want to share it with others.

Language and Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of my special interests has been America's deficiency in the language field. It is so shocking and appalling that it need not be whipped to death. Frankly, if there were no other excuses for the Elliott bill, the language provision alone would be worth the entire program. This should not be misconstrued—I am in favor of the entire program.

Anyway, an excellent editorial in last night's Washington Evening Star should be brought to the membership's attention, and I herewith submit it.

LANGUAGE AND OUR SCHOOLS

In declaring that the study of a modern foreign language should be included in every American child's upbringing—from the third through the sixth grade, and preferably for a consecutive 10 years—the United States Office of Education has put a timely warning finger on another great weakness of our school system, public and private alike.

A few statistics are enough to point up the seriousness of the situation. Half of the Nation's 23,000 high schools, for example, do not have a single class in any of the modern foreign languages. Similarly, in those that do have such courses, less than 15 percent of the student body enrolls in them. As for the college level, only about the same percentage studies French or Spanish or a comparable tongue, and fewer than 8,000 Americans are engaged in trying to learn Russian. By way of contrast, an estimated 10 million Soviet students are now studying English.

These are facts that have led some of our highest educational authorities to warn that the United States is the most backward of all major nations in the vital field of language competence. Moreover, it is likely to remain that way as long as our elementary schools—unlike those in Europe, on both sides of the Iron Curtain—fail to do something about the problem. That is why the Office of Education has put special emphasis on the idea—an idea which our District educators are wisely trying to put into effect—of starting courses in French, Spanish, etc., as early as the third grade.

If such a program were adopted throughout the country, beginning at this elementary level, our high schools and colleges in due course would almost certainly show a vastly enlarged enrollment in language courses. As matters stand now, however, the enrollment is woefully deficient, and this is a fact that can be dangerous to us vis-a-vis Russia in a competitive world where we can ill afford to be relatively illiterate or tongue tied.

Paving the 1,500-Mile Highway to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent action of the Congress in adopting legislation to make Alaska our 49th State has resulted in a great deal of public interest in the characteristics and the economic future of this most northern territory under the American flag. This interest has naturally been particularly intense in the Pacific Northwest. Many excellent articles, editorials, and columns about Alaska have appeared recently in the press in Oregon. Similar interest has also been shown in the bill S. 4097, which I have introduced with 9 cosponsors to provide for the paving of the only overland link between Alaska and the other 48 States—the Alaska Highway.

As a sampling of these expressions of interest, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD able editorials from the Eugene Register-Guard of July 13, 1958, and from the San Francisco Examiner of July 8, endorsing the Alaska Highway project; two articles by Mr. A. Robert Smith from the Medford Mail Tribune of July 6 and the Portland Oregonian of July 13; and the first installment of an article on the economic development of Alaska by Mr. Ivan Bloch, industrial-relations consultant of Portland, in the same issue of the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of July 13, 1958]

A BETTER ROUTE TO THE NORTH COUNTRY

A proposal that stirs the imagination is that which Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, with an assist from Vice President RICHARD NIXON, is advocating for a cooperative agreement between this country and Canada for improvement of the fabulous Alcan Highway. Under this proposal, in which 3 other Democratic Senators and 2 Republicans join Mr. NEUBERGER, the United States would put up $66 million and the Canadian Government a like amount of money, plus grants of right-of-way. Over a 6-year period the money would straighten, widen, and pave the British Columbia and Yukon sections of the highway which runs from Edmonton, Alberta, to Fairbanks, Alaska.

The 50-50 split of the cost seems fair. This country needs the highway more than Canada does, especially now when we find ourselves (or soon will find ourselves) with a State that is beyond our natural borders. But much of the benefit would be Canada's. Not only would the improved roadway open up much of the northern British Columbia and Yukon country to the outside world for industrial purposes and provide new markets for raw materials produced there, it would also prove an incentive for tourists who are intrigued by the chance to see some of the last real frontier on the North American Continent. And as tourists appear, so do accommodations for them. The Canadians, we think, would be dollar-foolish if they turned down this country's offer.

The industrial and commercial possibilities are enormous. But, this sunny afternoon, we are more intrigued with the highway as a tourist attraction, as a pipe through which we may float while seeing an exciting part of the world. These days, with longer vacations and more powerful automobiles, a trip of this length, nearly 6,000 miles round-trip from Eugene could be attempted. And if time did not permit the full trip, it would at least permit penetrating deep into the Canadian "bush" for a week or two or three.

Such a trip would differ from a trip of similar length in this country in one important respect—the element of adventure. The traveler on United States highways is rarely far from a gas station, a hot-dog stand, a curio shop. He is secure in the knowledge that help is never far away. Not so up there. The motorist who undertook the trip to Alaska would have to be prepared to change his own tires (not just the wheels, but the tires), install a new fan belt and make other emergency repairs on his car. He'd need to carry extra gas and extra water, to prepare his own meals and generally to shift for himself. And, at least until the tour grew too popular, he'd really be "away from it all" for a few weeks.

How the editorial imagination does wander this sunny afternoon. After the Alaska trip, all armed with new knowledge about changing tires and fan belts, about combating bears and mosquities, the tourist would come home for a year or two of the old grind. And then what? Then, of course, it would be nice to go the other direction, south through Mexico to the Panama Canal, when the Pan-American highway is a reality.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of July 8, 1958]

ALASKAN HIGHWAY

The cooperative project proposed by Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, for an all-weather paved highway linking the new State of Alaska to the rest of the Union, is one of the necessities created by the new relationship.

It requires the hard surfacing of 1,200 miles of highway, all within Canada, which makes the sharing of the costs of the program between the United States and Canadian Governments one of the conditions of the program.

But the reaching of an equitable basis for agreement in this matter is so important, and eventually so beneficial and profitable, to all the vast areas affected that a minimum of delay is reasonably anticipated.

As Senator NEUBERGER sensibly sums up the matter: "The development not only of Alaska, but of the intervening areas of western Canada will be hastened by an all-weather paved highway and benefit both countries and all people concerned."

Adequate highway facilities are an absolute must for the proper implementation of the status of statehood which Alaska now enjoys, and as Senator NEUBERGER wisely suggests, the American Secretary of State should be promptly given the necessary authority to negotiate the needed agreement with Canada. It is part and parcel of the good-neighbor tradition, of which the St.

Lawrence seaway program is a magnificent example.

There is abundant precedent for the expenditure of American tax dollars on highway projects in another country, where our own vital interests are so richly served. In the case of the still uncompleted Pan-American Highway, the United States is bearing almost the whole burden of cost, and it will eventually justify itself in not only better trade but infinitely improved hemispheric relations.

[From the Medford Mail Tribune of July 6, 1958]

PAVING ALASKA HIGHWAY MAY BE DISCUSSED AT CANADA MEETING

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President NIXON plans to try persuading President Eisenhower to take up with Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker this week the proposal of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, for paving the highway which links the new State of Alaska with the Northwest.

Eisenhower is going to Ottawa for talks with Diefenbaker July 8 through 11. It will be their first meeting since the Canadian Conservative leader won a smashing national election this spring.

NEUBERGER introduced a bill last Tuesday to authorize a cost-sharing plan with Canada for paving the 1,200 miles of gravel-topped road to Alaska running through Canada. The 300-mile portion of the Alaska highway in Alaska has been paved.

SERVED IN ALASKA

The Oregon Senator, who served in Alaska in the Army during World War II and helped build the long overland road to Alaska, told the Senate:

"We have just completed action on the historic legislation that will take into the Union a great new State—a State larger in area than Texas, a State whose mountains include a higher peak than any in the present 48 States, a State with vast natural resources and with a growing population of splendid, patriotic Americans. Now, let us make it possible for more Americans to get there."

After his speech, Vice President NIXON called him to the rostrum to express his support for the idea. NEUBERGER noted that he had a bipartisan group of Senators sponsoring the bill with him—Senators WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, NORRIS COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire, and FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota.

THINKS IDEA GOOD

Next day NIXON informed NEUBERGER that he'd rounded up two more Republicans—Senators GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, and ARTHUR WATKINS, Republican, of Utah. He said he thought the idea was so good he planned to urge the President to discuss it with the Canadians this week.

"We've got to do this," NEUBERGER said NIXON told him. "We might as well do it now. It will put people to work, and it will help solidify our relations with Canada."

The bill authorizes $11 million for each of 6 years starting next year, on condition that Canada share costs and agree to maintain the road after it's finished. Canada would also agree to make it accessible on free and nondiscriminatory terms to American traffic with reciprocity on licensing vehicles and operators.

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST

The Bureau of Public Roads estimates the total cost at $125 million. This includes $15 million for making the 110-mile connection with Haines also paved.

A study is now being made by the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, set up early this year, of the feasibility of building a more direct road between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. The existing highway goes far inland. It is also to examine the prospects of a railroad linking the 49th State to the rest of the Union. One was declared feasible during the war, but the highway was built instead.

More and better overland transportation between the Northwest and Alaska will be demanded by the expected rise in tourist trade alone. The American Automobile Association last week predicted that statehood would stimulate tourist interest in Alaska.

"With the Pacific Northwest as the gateway to Alaska, existing facilities for automobile, plane and ship travel to the new State probably will be expanded as tourist demands develop," the AAA reported.

The motor trip to Alaska, AAA added, covers approximately 2,350 miles from the United States-Canadian border to Fairbanks and requires under normal road conditions a minimum of 8 days from Seattle. AAA said the best time to make the trip is from June through September when temperatures range from 35° to 75°.

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 13, 1958]

CITIZENS OF ALASKA LOOK FORWARD TO TOSSING OFF SHACLES OF COLONIAL GOVERNMENT

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—When word was flashed to Alaska that the statehood bill had passed the Senate, the citizens of Anchorage touched off a huge bonfire containing 49 tons of wood. Into the fires of celebration, officials tossed two documents, the Organic Act and the Jones Act.

This was a symbolic act, like burning the family mortgage or an oppressive financial obligation which had at long last been satisfied. For Alaska it was symbolic of throwing off political and economic shackles that have long been a part of Territorial status.

It was preparation for a new era of economic development in the new State of Alaska, finally freed of the discrimination that retarded development of the Territory for many years.

The Organic Act of 1912 was what made Alaska a Territory with limited powers of self-government, mainly the power to elect a legislature. Prior to that, Alaska constituted a civil and judicial district subject to the laws of Oregon. The Statehood Act will bring Alaska up to full-fledged political equality with the other States, allowing full powers of self-government, including such rights never before enjoyed in Alaska, as voting for President, Governor, and United States Senators.

The Jones Act symbolizes what many Alaskans have called her colonial status of the past, economically—a general condition in which the Territory was exploited by absentee-owned companies more concerned with shipping raw materials out than finished goods in. The Jones Act helped keep it that way.

Passed by Congress in 1920, the Jones Act requires all cargo between the United States and its Territories or possessions to be hauled on American ships, although recently an exception has been made to permit Canadian ships to serve just southeastern Alaska.

Until Coastwise Line and, later, the Alaska Freight Line started service from Portland and other west coast ports, Alaska Steamship Co. had a monopoly on all Alaska shipping, through the port of Seattle. Seattle terminals imposed a special charge which Alaskans had to pay. In his authoritative book The State of Alaska, ex-Gov. Ernest Gruening explained it this way:

"On shipments made from the east of the United States through Seattle, consigned to the Hawaiian Islands or to Oriental ports, the total handling charges were 30 cents a ton wharfage, and all other costs were absorbed by railroad and steamship lines. But for the same type of shipments consigned to Alaska, there was an unloading charge of 65 cents a ton, a wharfage charge of 50 cents a ton, and handling charge from wharf to ship of 60 cents a ton.

"These charges, which in the aggregate were over five times the cost of Hawaiian or Oriental consignees or shippers, had to be paid by the Alaska consignee or shipper.

The Jones Act was named for a Seattle Senator of that era, Wesley Jones, a Republican. The statehood bill repeals the section of the Jones bill affecting Alaska.

How much of a factor this will be in fostering competition and cheaper freight handling for Alaskan shipments remains to be seen. It is counted by some Alaskans as a major breakthrough against discrimination, but to date, neither the Maritime Board nor the ICC looks for any dislocation of trade or commerce.

Gruening, who is expected to run for one of Alaska's Senate seats, recalls that the Jones Act put one Alaskan businessman out of business after he had developed a midwest market for Sitka spruce. Business was possible when he shipped his product via Vancouver, British Columbia, at a cost of $5 per thousand board-feet, but became impossible when he was compelled to ship via Seattle, where he was charged over twice as much, $11.

After statehood is a legal fact, all Alaskan shippers will be able to use United States or Canadian shipping lines, also use Canadian ports if they prefer. This will further break the monopoly long enjoyed by shipping interests operating out of Seattle. It is expected to reduce tariffs and increase service due to competition.

Shortly after Alaska gets settled into the saddle of State government, it is expected to receive jurisdiction from the Interior Department of its salmon fisheries—for many years its most lucrative resource. When this happens, fish traps, long ago outlawed in the Pacific Northwest, are expected to be outlawed in Alaska. Alaskans hope this and other conservation practices will help revive the depleted salmon runs. The fish traps are mostly owned by Washington State interests, who have had more power in Washington, D. C., than have Alaskans in setting fish regulations over the years.

Repeal of the Alaska section of the Jones Act and transfer of the fisheries to State control are expected to break much of the stranglehold Seattle has held on the Alaskan economy. Fortune magazine, in a major article on Alaska's economy, reported that Seattle banks, labor unions and wholesalers, along with the canned salmon industry, were intent on opposing statehood or any form of local development that might loosen its own lucrative grip on the Alaskan economy. It added:

"Alaska's absentee owners, like most people geographically separated from their capital, are preoccupied with profits, protection and the bearing of as few burdens as possible."

These interests have long maintained that Alaska can't afford to pay the costs of State government, that the economy will suffer from excessive taxes.

Near the climax of the Senate debate on statehood, Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton sent to the Capitol an analysis to refute

this argument. Seaton calculated that State government will cost Alaska about $6,350,000 a year, but that new revenues coming into the State treasury will amount to about $5 million a year. The net cost of statehood, then, should be only $1,350,000 beyond the $15 million which Territorial government cost Alaskans last year.

Chief among the new revenues will be 90 percent of the revenue from oil and gas leases ($3 million a year) and 70 percent of revenues from sale of Pribilof Island sealskins ($1 million).

Another big advantage to the new State will be control of 102,500,000 acres of public lands now held by the Federal Government. This is about 26 percent of the entire State. The original lands—which would have given Alaska about half its public lands—which would have given her about the same State-Federal ratio that Oregon has—but this was scaled down by the House.

Seaton figures the State will collect about $500,000 annually from fines, fees, forfeitures, and 5 percent of proceeds from sale of public lands.

But possibly more important to Alaska in the long run is that State lands may be opened to new settlers on lenient terms. Some of these settlers, of course, may be industrial pioneers looking for inexpensive mill sites.

Gov. Mike Stepovich, who may run for the office to which President Eisenhower appointed him or for the Senate, is confident Alaska's population will be counted in millions, not thousands, in a few decades. He favors using the land the State will get to attract newcomers.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON said the other day he wouldn't be surprised if Californians didn't migrate to Alaska in generous numbers, now that the Golden State is fast filling up. Seaton said, lightheartedly, that Alaska could then bid for a major league baseball franchise and play night games under the midnight sun without the high cost of artificial lights.

Stepovich and his predecessor, Gruening, agree that Alaska's growth is as promising as that of Scandinavia, which supports a population of 15 million, in an area similar in climate, topography, and resources.

One aid to increasing the population would be improved transportation to Alaska. The presidentially appointed Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission is now studying feasibility of a shorter route than the present Alcan Highway, preferably one closer to the coast which would link southeastern Alaskan cities, especially Juneau, the capital, to the Pacific Northwest by road.

Within Alaska, road building has been an unsteady business, fluctuating mostly with defense requirements. Last year a new era of road building opened under the Federal-aid highway act, which for the first time included Alaska, thanks to an amendment sponsored by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. NEUBERGER now wants to see the United States and Canada join in paving the 1,200-mile stretch of the Alcan Highway which is still gravel so the 49th State will be joined to the other states by at least one hardtop highway.

The Rail and Highway Commission is to look into the possibility of building a railroad all the way to Alaska. The only railroad service Alaska now knows is the Government-owned Alaska Railroad from the port of Seward to Fairbanks. It will remain federally owned and operated under statehood.

Inasmuch as Alaska has a short growing season, its variety of agricultural products is limited, although truck crops grow to astronomical size because of the longer dose of sunshine during those midsummer days of 21 hours of daylight. But as her population expands, she will be a growing market for Northwest farm produce, as well as other consumer goods manufactured in Northwest factories.

"It's not going to happen overnight," cautioned an Alaskan businessman who has worked hard for statehood, "But now we're on the way."

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 13, 1958]

STATEHOOD STATUS TO EASE STIFLED DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKAN RESOURCES

(By Ivan Bloch)

The granting of statehood for Alaska will have profound influence on that vast area's industrial potential. To date, development of Alaska's resources has been substantially stifled by a morass of absentee-applied rules, regulations, and statutes of the Federal Government. The local ability of the Territory to finance public and private developments has been highly limited by restrictions of laws, some ancient and no longer applicable.

The enormity of Alaska's land area, the incredible roughness of some of its terrain, the inaccessability of many of its parts, and the past uncertainties of its political status have made rational examination of its resources both expensive and difficult. And, yet, certainty does exist with regard to a number of specific items of development. The existence of the new State will do much to lessen the past hesitancy of private capital to explore, probe, and develop many more in the next few immediate years. This summary will deal only with these major items about which actual facts are available, and which are likely to become reality well within the next decade.

1. The forest resources of Alaska are already being utilized for industry, and major establishment of large processing-plant units is current. A dissolving woodpulp plant has been in operation for the last 2 years or so near Ketchikan. Another such plant is rapidly approaching full operating stages at Sitka. This plant has been built by Japanese interest with its output for Japanese consumption. Two more pulp and paper units are in advanced-planning stages for location in the Juneau and Wrangell areas. These southeastern forest-products operations are all geared to sustained-yield units, guaranteeing perpetuity of timber supply.

The interior forests of central Alaska are being studied, particularly in the Anchorage area. Large stands of hardwoods, predominantly birch, may sustain a specialty pulp product, valuable as an admixture for softwood pulps at Pacific coast points.

2. With regard to mineral resources, a few may be singled out for likely major development during the next few years. It is known, of course, that Alaska possesses nearly all of the metallic ores regarded as strategic and critical; but with some exceptions, to date, actual development has been very meager.

Southeast Alaska possesses an outstanding massive deposit of titaniferous iron ore. Programs of vigorous exploration and metallurgical research are now being pursued by at least one major steel company on the Klukwan deposits near Haines. This may become a major source of iron materials (and some others) for west coast and Far Eastern use. Also in southeast Alaska, there exist very large deposits of relatively low grade nickel ores on which exploration is also moving apace. There are many other possibilities regarding copper, cobalt, pyrites, and many important nonmetallics in this panhandle of Alaska.

The Kenai Peninsula has been a supplier of metallurgical chrome ore for some years. Interest is substantial in the possibilities of an electric furnace ferrochrome installation near the deposits. Occurrences of other ferroalloy material are known to exist in that area of central Alaska.

In the Copper River area, intense exploration is underway regarding copper and other metals.

The Kuskokwim and Yukon Basins are also of mineral interest. Platinum and mercury have been produced for years. The vastness of that area still obscures potential.

In the Alaska and Brooks Ranges of western Alaska, basic geologic information is sparse, and outside of traditional gold in the upper Yukon and Tanana Valleys, there is evidence of copper, antimony, nickel, and a number of other important industrial minerals. The possibilities of utilizing local limestones, shales, and coal in the Ralibelt midway between Anchorage and Fairbanks for the production of cement have been under study for some time.

The foregoing are indeed feeble tokens of what exploration by modern, airborne, geophysical methods may eventually reveal. Alaska's new status as a State is quite likely to provide an incentive for the expenditure of large sums of private moneys for mineral development heretofore inhibited under territorial conditions.

3. Perhaps the most exciting field of development involves petroleum resources. During the past 2 years, every major oil company and many others have been systematically engaged in geophysical exploration and actual drilling. A major exploratory well in the Kenai Peninsula brought in by Richfield 2 years ago triggered a real oil rush in all of Alaska. The major commercial interest centers in a large bandsweeping, crescent-like, from the Anchorage area through the Kenai Peninsula, Cook Inlet, across the base of the Alaska Peninsula into the upward of Bristol Bay. Also the very recent release by the Secretary of the Interior of some 20 million acres in the famous naval petroleum reserve, north of the Arctic Circle and to the Arctic Ocean, now engages additional major attention. Other Alaska areas are also under consideration by petroleum interests.

The tremendous importance of these oil developments is readily apparent. To begin with, these oil reserves are under the American flag. Geographically, they are closer to United States points of consumption than those from Borneo, Venezuela, and the Near East. On the basis of what appears to be reliable economics of production and tanker shipment, the potential cost of delivery to existing Puget Sound and potential Columbia River refineries would be highly competitive over present sources. The near-future requirements for Pacific coast petroleum products cannot fail to justify full utilization of these petroleum resources even though those north of the Arctic Circle may require somewhat more time to reach optimum production.

Also to be noted are what appear to be very large natural gas potentials north of the Arctic Circle, some 400 to 500 miles north of Fairbanks. Plans for the exploration of these valuable chemical raw materials and fuels are under consideration by at least one major company.

It is also quite possible that moderate-sized refineries to meet local, civil, and military demands will be established in the Cook Inlet-Anchorage and Fairbanks area.

The Price of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend and revise my remarks I include the address by the very able Secretary of the Army, Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, delivered at the Kiwanis International Convention in Chicago, June 30, 1958. Secretary Brucker's remarks are a significant commentary on the contributions being made by the Army to the national defense:

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

It is a high compliment to be welcomed with such cordiality to the platform of this great convention of Kiwanis International. I feel privileged to have been a member of Kiwanis since 1922, and to have served a decade ago as president of the mother club—Detroit No. 1. I have cherished the opportunity to play even a small part in the inspiring programs of community action which Kiwanis has carried forward through the years to strengthen the foundations of freedom and responsible self-government.

As we look out upon the world today, how could we fail to realize that America stands at a momentous crossroads of destiny? Instance is piled upon instance to impress upon us that the diabolic Communist conspiracy has by no means slackened its attack upon the free world, nor abandoned in any particular its ambition to shackle all mankind with the grim chains of a Red despotism.

The most recent Communist atrocity in Hungary, the shocking execution, the brutal murder, of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian patriot leaders involved in the ill-starred revolution of October 1956, again underscores in blood the elemental barbarism of the Soviet Communist character, and brings into new and sharper focus our clear and present danger.

The brazen announcement just 2 weeks ago that these men who had vainly striven for liberty against the cruel and unbearable Soviet tyranny had been put to death by Soviet Russia's Hungarian puppets, after their safety had been solemnly guaranteed, was another explicit warning that the Communist conspiracy intends to stamp out all opposition, and inflict its evil will upon all mankind at any cost.

We have every reason to know what we can expect of the Soviet Union.

Its hand can be seen in the troubles of the Middle East, where the threat of open warfare looms like an ugly specter.

The Kremlin meddles incessantly in Asia and Africa, fomenting unrest in an effort to exploit natural ambitions for the political independence, and pervert them to the advantage of the Communist cause.

The established pattern of Communist attack was apparent in recent disturbances in South America.

The Soviets have placed every obstacle in the way of finding solutions to vital issues which will affect the people of the whole world for generations to come. It is damning evidence of the true purpose of their military power that they have stubbornly resisted every effort to work out any international agreement embodying reasonable inspection safeguards which might lead to the limitation of armaments—particularly nuclear armaments—and the permanent reduction of the nuclear peril which hangs over the world.

Behind the Communist purpose to destroy us stands the might of the largest mobilized military forces on earth. We must recognize that in a time of nominal peace, the Communist world is on a war footing. The military might of 8 million men under arms, over 400 ground divisions, 500 far-ranging submarines, and more than 25,000 modern aircraft, constitute the "clenched fist" with which Soviet leaders have promised to destroy us. The Soviet Union is concentrating virtually all of its best scientific and engineering talent on the frenzied development and production of ultramodern weapons, including intercontinental nuclear ballistic missiles, and other technological devices in order to place in the hands of the plotters of the Kremlin the power to dominate the land, the sea, the air, and even outer space. We must not forget for a moment that they are ready and waiting to move in swiftly for the kill if they should ever manage to catch us with our guard down.

How can we expect the Soviets to use their military might?

How can we best defend ourselves against it?

It is imperative that we be prepared for every eventuality, for a war or a limited war, for an atomic war, or one in which atomic weapons are not used, for a war fought by Soviet troops against the main bastions of freedom, or a war fought by puppet volunteers in an effort to nibble away the fringes of the free world. It does us little good in the long run to be able to deter an enemy from one kind of aggressive action, if we leave him free to pursue with comparative impunity another course by which he might attain the same result. We must not forget that if we were unprepared for limited war, we would be helpless to deal with any attempt at piecemeal conquest except by precipitating the suicidal nuclear holocaust we are striving by every means to prevent.

It is the combined strength and versatility of our Armed Forces, our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, integrated in a great defense team forming the keystone of a worldwide system of collective defense linking the United States and 45 other nations, which deters the Soviets from unleashing their military might in an effort to achieve their goal of world domination.

No amount of talk about the vast power of strategic nuclear weapons can obscure the pressing necessity for balanced forces such as are required to support our defensive commitments against the power of the Soviet troops ranged opposite our own troops and those of our allies in the front lines all along the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and ready to attack at a moment's notice.

Nearly half of the United States Army is deployed overseas at this moment, standing shoulder to shoulder with the troops of our partners in the defense of freedom. The presence of our soldiers in fighting array, armed with the most modern weapons, including tactical nuclear missiles and rockets, stimulates the morale and stiffens the resistance of our allies. It constantly reminds them, not in mere words but in the solid substance of American men and American armaments right there with them, that we are in this crusade for peace together, and that we intend to see it through together. It also has a very discouraging effect upon any plans the Communists might have to extend by force the bounds of their "empire of fear." It is noteworthy that they have so far atempted armed encroachment only where resistance was feeble or nonexistent. Defensive strength, coupled with determination, has effectively dampened Soviet enthusiasm for military excursions. No Soviet aggression has yet been launched within range of American guns.

The United States Army of today is characterized by balance and versatility. It is built to fit the pattern of the space-atomic age. It is prepared to meet the requirements of the entire spectrum of war from an all-out nuclear conflict throughout the whole wide range of lesser enemy operations which are possible, and which would pose a grave and direct threat, not only to the security of the United States but to the very existence of civilization as we know it today. Our Army has a one-two punch—the ability to fight effectively with either atomic or nonatomic weapons—which is the key factor of our national power to apply military pressure with precise discrimination in order to deter aggression on the spot, anywhere in the world. Moreover, in any kind of war which might be thrust upon us—large or small—that one-two punch would be indispensable to ultimate victory.

The ability to make prompt and decisive response to any situation is esential to the prevention of war or the winning of a victory in this modern age. The United States Army's Strategic Army Corps, consisting of 2 airborne and 2 infantry divisions, armed with atomic weapons as may be appropriate to any situation which might arise, is ready to move out by intercontinental airlife at a moment's notice to cope with Communist armed aggression anywhere in the world. "STRAC" it is called, S-T-R-A-C—and its slogan is based on those letters: "Skilled, Tough, Ready Around the Clock." Any aggressor who challenged it would soon discover that it lives up to that slogan. The capability of STRAC as a ready force was dramatically demonstrated a few weeks ago, when two companies of the 101st Airborne Division stationed at Fort Campbell, Ky., one of its component organizations, with no prior warning were alerted for transoceanic air movement at 3:55 one afternoon. At 8:35 a. m. the following morning—only 16 hours and 40 minutes later—the two companies, comprising about 500 men, together with all their necessary vehicles, weapons, ammunition, and rations, had been set down, ready to go, 1,740 miles distant from Fort Campbell. That is our modern Army in action.

Less than 2 months after Explorer I went up, the Army orbited another satellite, Explorer III. Because of its eccentric orbit, and its extensive instrumentation, Explorer III was able to provide immensely valuable information on air density, temperatures, micrometerorites, cosmic radiation and other flight conditions from 1,740 miles in space down to the outer reaches of our atmosphere. It transmitted this information by means of two radios and a miniature tape recorder no larger than a king-size cigarette package which broadcast on command what is stored up during each circuit of the earth. From every standpoint, Explorer III has been an extremely important instrument for the advancement of our scientific knowledge.

The United States Army's participation in space programs is based upon the fact that its experience and existing capabilities and facilities enable it to aid materially in the advancement of national space programs, in full cooperation with the Navy, the Air Force, and civilian agencies, leading to our national goal, which is the dedication of space to the benefit and not the destruction of mankind. A satellite is an ideal instrument to provide comprehensive meteorological information leading to more accurate weather predictions. A satellite containing radio-relay equipment would be an important supplement to our present worldwide communications system. Messages originating in the Pentagon, for example, could be transmitted to such a sat-

ellite, recorded, and rebroadcast on command to addressees in distant parts of the world. One satellite of this type could handle the entire radio traffic to and from Washington.

On May 22 of this year, a letter addressed to me by the director of the missile firing laboratory at Cape Canaveral, Fla., was delivered to me in the Pentagon. It was a very unusual and significant letter because it had been carried in the tactical warhead of an Army Jupiter missile over 1,000 miles through space, and dramatically demonstrated the Army's completely successful solution of the problem of protecting a missile nose cone and its contents against the intense heat generated when it reenters the earth's atmosphere at supersonic speed. The solution of that problem was basic to the development of a successful intermediate range ballistic missile. That letter is evidence of a first for America which we have every reason to believe has not yet been matched by any other nation.

The Army's arsenal contains more than 10 types of missiles and rockets precisely adapted to the accomplishment of its varied tasks. Tactical surface-to-surface missiles range in size from the mighty Redstone, which can deliver a nuclear warhead more than 200 miles, to the relatively tiny Dart, which is capable of destroying the heaviest tank. To carry out its major responsibility for the ground defense of the United States against air attack, the Army has surface-to-air missiles—Nike Ajax, Nike Hercules, and Hawk—which effectively cover the whole span of aircraft altitudes from the treetops to the highest flown by planes, and are capable of dealing with any type of aircraft now in operational use.

All in all, counting our experience with the Jupiter-A, the modified Redstone which preceded Jupiter-C as a test vehicle; the Jupiter-C, and the Jupiter itself, the Army has attempted 38 launchings of the big missiles in its Jupiter program. Twenty-nine were successful, completely successful, shots. They accomplished everything planned. Seven were partially successful, they all had successful launchings, but then, for various reasons, did not entirely meet the scientific requirements which had been set up. Only two did not score at all. Americans have every right to be tremendously proud of this splendid record. It stands up against even the most wildly optimistic Soviet claims.

To be strong among nations, and capable of deterring aggression and defending our liberty, we must first be strong within our own Nation. No other land has ever enjoyed as great an abundance of material things as does America today. But material things will not preserve our freedom. It is not what we have but what we are, which is the true substance of our strength. In the final analysis it is not what is done in our State capitals, or in Washington, which has the most far-reaching significance for America, but what is done in the local units of government throughout our Nation. That is why the community programs of Kiwanis are of such transcendent value.

The idealism of so many millions of brave and true people in all walks of life who have lived, worked, sacrificed, and died for America through the years—the idealism which "gives primacy to spiritual rather than material values"—ought to be the moving force in all our lives, for in a very real sense every American holds in his hand the destiny of the Nation.

It is the duty of each one of us to pay the price of freedom in the golden coin of courage, self-discipline, devotion, and steadfast adherence to the great tenets of our American faith.

Euratom—Statement by Gen. Julius Klein, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in Euratom, as I am in Euromarket and I am pleased to submit a statement on Euratom by a very distinguished Army officer and friend of mine, for whom I have an affectionate regard, Gen. Julius Klein. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, RETIRED, BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1958

Gentlemen, I thank you for the invitation to appear before your committee today. The subject before you is a vital one. It assumes even more importance in the light of the present crisis.

My name is Julius Klein. I am a resident of Chicago. I am a retired Army officer, with the rank of major general.

It has been my privilege to serve as consultant to the late Sentor Taft, of Ohio, and to the Senate Armed Forces Committee in the 80th Congress. And later, in 1954, as you may recall, I performed a special mission in Western Europe for the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is a matter of great pride to me that gentlemen on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and the House described this as a mission well done.

Now I have just returned from a 2-month visit to five European countries, including some of the major member nations of the European Atomic Energy Community, such as West Germany, France, and Belgium.

Although I was not an official representative of the United States Government during my journey, I had the privilege of renewing my friendship with a number of high officials of these governments, as well as with several prominent officials of Euratom itself.

I wish to make it plain that I represent my own views solely in this testimony—as a retired Army officer who has tried to serve my country in a number of civilian capacities. My interest in this question is based solely on my concern for what is in the best interests of the United States and its foreign and economic policy.

Gentlemen, I found almost unanimous opinion that the program proposed by President Eisenhower, and which is now pending before this committee, would be of great significance in the advancement of worldwide peaceful uses of atomic energy.

We need only to look at the headlines from the Middle East to understand the urgency of this legislation.

There is no doubt in my mind that, technically and commercially, the joint program will be of benefit to the United States as well as to Euratom.

My journey abroad enabled me to obtain conclusive evidence of the determination of the Soviet Union to impress the people of Europe with their industrial progress, particularly in the field of nuclear power development. This is an area that is receiving maximum Soviet attention.

As the President has said—and I quote—In the face of challenges to the West this (Euratom) program offers heartening evidence of the fundamental unity of purpose for the common good which exists among the free nations of the world today and illustrates our basic desire to concentrate on harnessing the atom for peaceful purposes—unquote.

I should like to give you an example of the way in which the Soviet propaganda works.

While overseas, I attended the first World Public Relations Congress, which was held in Brussels last month. I was a delegate of the American Public Relations Association.

A delegation of three members representing the Soviet Union was seated at the opening of the congress. This delegation promptly proceeded to use the congress as a forum for the distribution of sinister propaganda against the United States and the rest of the free world.

Although the congress had barred political and controversial issues from its agenda, the Soviet delegates hammered away at their favorite theme—that the United States was seeking war, whereas the Soviet was seeking only peace.

I recall that one of the Soviet delegates obtained recognition and addressed the congress in this fashion:

"In the Soviet Union we have 2 million workers utilizing atomic energy for peace, and, not like the United States, for war."

After a few more utterances of this type, I obtained recognition. Among other things, I pointed out that the Soviet brand of public relations was best evidenced by the events in Hungary and Poland, and in the executions of Nagy and Maleter. And I made it quite plain that the Communist propagandists were ignoring the fact that the Eisenhower doctrine of atoms for peace was of worldwide importance, and that they would do well to subscribe to it.

At that point, the chairman of the congress ruled the Soviet delegates out of order. And we were able to get on with the business at hand.

I cite this incident, gentlemen, only to highlight the fact that the Soviet Union is pursuing a course of attempting to undermine all that the western nations are seeking to accomplish in the way of world peace.

May I remind you that the Congress already has enacted legislation to share the military secrets of the atom with our friends in Great Britain and, to a lesser extent, with France.

Now we are presented with the opportunity to share the peaceful, as well as the military, knowledge with our allies of the Western World.

Should we fail to grasp this opportunity now, the result would be to add weight to the Soviet contention that we are interested only in atoms for war, and not atoms for peace.

The Soviets aim at using their scientific and economic resources to strike at the basic institutions of the Western World's free enterprise system.

The President's atoms-for-peace program was a vital step in checkmating this Red design. An equally important step was the formation of the European Atomic Energy Community.

And now comes the pending international agreement between the United States and Euratom. This proposal clearly constitutes recognition that multilateral action by the Western community is required to safeguard the free economic system of the West in the key area of peaceful use of nuclear development.

It is unfortunate that the proposal comes late in this session of Congress. But I voice

the hope of all with whom I talked that it is not too late.

It is never too late, gentlemen, to adopt measures for peace.

You will recall that when President Truman made the fateful and correct decision, as Commander in Chief, to unleash the atom bomb against Japan, and thus hasten the end of World War II, he made a fervent prayer that someday this great source of energy might be used as a blessing to the world—and not for the destruction of mankind.

The Eisenhower atoms-for-peace doctrine, which the Soviet propagandists have tried to ridicule from one end of the earth to the other, seeks to divert the awesome power of the atom into peaceful channels so that men, women and children everywhere need no longer live in fear.

And now comes Euratom—an agency operated by men dedicated to peace, by men free from the taint of socialism, communism, or other "isms," under the chairmanship of the distinguished Monsieur Armand. I have had the privilege of meeting these men. And I am impressed by their determination to make Euratom work for the benefit of you, and me, and our fellowmen.

The member countries have assigned their most distinguished and ablest statesmen to the task of promoting peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Euratom represents a prime opportunity for United States participation in a concerted effort by the free world to preserve the basic institutions of western free enterprise.

It affords the opportunity to demonstrate to the underdeveloped countries that western science and technology have immense contributions to make to the peaceful development of new sovereignties.

It can help to further respect for institutions of private enterprise by demonstrating that western aid is not trailed by the political strings that bind Soviet offers.

In my conversations abroad, I fould considerable interest in the fact that the British Government has offered to conclude an agreement with Euratom. As you know, negotiations are well underway.

Prime Minister Macmillan recently was asked about these negotiations by a member of Parliament. I would like to quote his reply.

He said, "The American agreement provides the framework for the joint construction of prototype reactors of American design, which still are in the development stage and which will be partly American financed. The United Kingdom offers a fully developed power reactor system which is already available for use in this country and for export on ordinary commercial terms. Her Majesty's Government hopes to conclude agreements with the (Euratom) community, and with appropriate member governments, which will provide the framework within which exports can take place."

In the course of my discussions, I found that there is no question but that British type power reactors are at the moment further developed than the American type. And, furthermore, I was informed that they can produce electricity at a lower rate than reactors developed in the United States.

But, at the same time, I was given to understand that Euratom holds to the view that the Community should explore the possibilities of American as well as of British type reactors. Euratom proposes to construct big powerplants in order to find out which type—in the long run—will prove to be the more economical.

The feeling is strong that this construction program, when linked to the joint research and development plan put forward by President Eisenhower, will provide a major incentive for European industry—for free private enterprise, which the Free World needs.

And this is the nub of the program.

We must prove that the American type reactor is geared above all other types to the peaceful uses of this tremendous energy.

Obviously, Euratom will only buy reactors of this type if the nations of the Community are convinced that these reactors are economically sound. The program now before you endeavors to carry this conviction abroad.

There are other compelling reasons—call them selfish, if you wish—why we must be closely identified with Euratom.

European nations have long been the source of many scientific developments, many of which have been of material benefit to the American people.

We, too, have contributed much in this field. But one can never be too old, or too learned, to ignore the progressive ideas of others.

As you gentlemen will remember, the whole field of atomic development was opened to us through the genius of Americans of foreign extraction—men who were refugees from their hard-pressed native lands—men of the stature of Einstein, Teller, Fermi, Szilard, and von Neumann, and others of like talents.

The President is now asking us to contribute to Euratom. But we can also learn from Euratom.

We have only to gain by this association.

Earlier, I stated that there is desire—intense desire—on the part of those with whom I conferred for action on this program before the adjournment of Congress.

Let me explain the reasons behind this desire.

Recent events in Europe have upset the time schedule for implementation of the European Common Market. These, in turn, could have a noticeable effect upon the progress of Euratom.

Premier De Gaulle has informed the president of the European Parliamentary Assembly that it is his intention to respect the European treaties now in force. But he has not denied his skepticism of these agreements.

The French economic situation is such that the entire Common Market faces delay in getting under way—at least, in getting under way to the extent originally planned, and hoped for, by the member nations.

It remains now for Euratom to give proof of the vitality of European integration through the program now before the Congress.

My consultations abroad have convinced me of one vital fact:

If this program should be rejected by the Congress, the result could only be to increase skepticism of United States policy and the sincerity of the Eisenhower atoms-for-peace plan within the European community.

Rejection also would be considered generally as a sign of distrust—rightly or wrongly—and as a retreat from United States policy for the unification of a free Europe bound to America in the peaceful pursuit of life.

I don't believe that it is an overstatement to say that Europe might undertake to try its hand alone, collectively or individually, politically and technically, in the event that this program should fail.

I do not pose as an expert in the field of atomic energy. U–235 is a mystery to me, as it must be to many people. I can report only the results of my conferences.

If Europe must travel alone, I am told, industry there will have no choice but to engage in the construction of natural uranium-type reactors. Reactor technology offers limited possibilities—due to the huge costs involved. Should European industry be committed to natural uranium-type reactors, the fewer would be the possibilities for development of American type reactors in Europe. My friends in Euratom have told me that they would deplore such a situation.

Also, in my discussions abroad, I found apprehension in the original proposal to grant inspection rights to the atomic energy agency now located in Vienna. This, as you are well aware, would have amounted to letting the Soviets take part unilaterally in atomic control in Western Europe. Our allies, naturally, could not accept such a plan.

It is gratifying to know that Euratom intends to keep its skirts clear of any Communist plan for mutual inspection, and that such a proposal does not appear in the program submitted to you.

Euratom has taken steps to set up its own control system under which nationals from six different nations shall have the right to investigate in other countries than their own. That, gentlemen, is the free world's way of doing business. By insisting upon an unrestricted control system, Euratom has done a great service to the objectives of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

As a layman, I have tried to bring you only the thoughts I assembled during my tour of Western Europe. They came to me from many sources. They came to me from men and women sincerely interested in putting the atom to work for peace.

Euratom is a step sorely needed in this period of crisis abroad. As the President has said: It will bolster the strength and solidarity among the free nations of the world.

I earnestly urge its approval.

Thank you.

American Federation of Musicians Honor Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, July 23, 1958, was an eventful day for the State of Oregon and Oregonians in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere.

Last evening the American Federation of Musicians saluted the State, its society and friends in the Capital, distinguished Oregonians in government and Mr. Herman D. Kenin, newly elected president of the International Musicians Union. Herman Kenin, a man of warmth, humor, and vigor, is outstanding in the musical field. He comes from Portland, Oreg., and only last month was elected to head the 264,000-member AFM.

In a splendid evening of live music under the stars, the 55-member Watergate Summer Symphony Orchestra treated audience members to lively renditions of hit melodies from Broadway musicals, after the crowd of several thousand was welcomed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, distinguished dean of Oregon's congressional delegation.

The multistarred concert featured a stirring initial symphonic performance of the official Oregon State song, Oregon, My Oregon. The version was arranged and conducted by Mr. Toby Tyler. The lyrics were sung by personable Gene Archer.

It was a proud night for Oregonians and AFM members, climaxed by a na-

tional introduction of President Kenin and the State song over the Mutual Broadcasting System's vast network. The symphonic version of Oregon, My Oregon will be heard often in my State during the centennial celebration next year.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the radio script from the Watergate broadcast, the program for the evening, and articles and editorial comment relative to the Oregon State song:

ANNOUNCER. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Ken French speaking for the Mutual Broadcasting System from the famous Watergate on the historic Potomac River in the Nation's Capital where tonight we are about to bring you a portion of the concert by the Watergate Summer Symphony Orchestra being presented by the American Federation of Musicians. The orchestra conducted by Dr. Henry Goldstein comprises members of the Washington, D. C., Local, No. 161, of the American Federation of Musicians and tonight's concert salutes the State of Oregon, the Oregon congressional delegation and Mr. Herman D. Kenin.

Dr. Goldstein is now making his entrance to the conductor's podium and we start this portion of the concert with the Watergate Summer Symphony Orchestra playing selections from the Broadway musical success, My Fair Lady.

Orchestra: My Fair Lady.

ANNOUNCER. As a feature of this Oregon celebration tonight on the banks of Washington's broad Potomac, it is my pleasure now to present a distinguished adopted son of Oregon. Himself an accomplished musician, a former practicing attorney, and for the past 14 years an international officer of the Musicians Union, he is enthusiastically welcomed here tonight by one of the largest and most distinguished gatherings of Oregonians ever assembled in the Nation's Capital. Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to introduce the newly elected president of the American Federation of Musicians, Mr. Herman D. Kenin.

Mr. KENIN. Thank you Mr. French. This is indeed the happiest homecoming a man could ever hope to enjoy away from home. Incidentally, yours is my first public introduction since I assumed the leadership of the American Federation of Musicians early last month. I can only hope that succeeding introductions of me in my sometimes controversial official capacity will be half so kindly. Circumstances have decreed that I must reside far from my beloved Oregon, but the memories of this cordial and gracious reception will soften any pangs of homesickness. It is a privilege to participate in any history-making first occasion, and especially in a coming-out party for our Oregon State song. My chief satisfaction, however, is that tonight history will be made by live musicians playing lively music from an orchestration arranged by Mr. Toby Tyler a long time member of our local musicians union. Ours tonight is the rare opportunity to remind tens of thousands of listeners that the music which is our American heritage can be created and kept alive only by live musicians. What the music machine gives us is but the parroting of the live musicians artistry. Yet, sadly, those machine-made sounds are threatening to mute forever the creative voice of a basic American art. But I won't intrude further a sad note upon so happy an occasion. Rather, I would remind my listeners, and particularly my fellow Oregonians, that we are indebted for this history-making event to the fact that the State of Oregon numbers among its distinguished congressional delegates a private investigator of the persevering school of the late Sherlock Holmes. I refer, of course, to Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, who does not confine his investigative prowess wholly to the domestic scene, but sometimes practices his talents abroad, to the discomfiture of dictatorships, and to his everlasting credit. Yet, I predict history will record that one of his finest hours as a private eye was achieved in ferreting out of dusty archives the all-but-forgotten State song of Oregon. When Congressman PORTER told me of his recent achievement in perpetuating American music through the rediscovery of this age-yellowed sheet music, originally written for piano in 1920 by Henry Murtagh, I promised him we would prepare an arrangement of it for symphonic production and rededicate it to a great State that soon will celebrate its centennial. The song, Oregon, My Oregon may not find a place on the Hit Parade because Mr. Tyler's arrangement is not at all reminiscent of Rock 'n Roll or even Dixieland music, but I am confident its rediscoverer will add to his renown as a Member of Congress who can produce the music as well as the words. Thus, it gives me much pleasure to introduce to you the Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER, Member of Congress from Oregon. Mr. PORTER.

Mr. PORTER. Thank you my friend, Herman Kenin. It is a tribute to your untiring work on behalf of the American Federation of Musicians that you have been elected to succeed Mr. Petrillo. I believe that as the leader and spokesman for a great labor union, you will do much to sustain the cause of "live" music. Tonight we have heard fine examples of the talent of American Federation of Musicians members. And, we will soon hear a symphonic version of the Oregon State song which that leading newspaper columnist George Dixon commented on. George called the words sheer horror. Humor is humor, but this is going too far: Here are the words of Oregon, My Oregon.

"Land of the Empire Builders,
Land of the Golden West;
Conquered and held by freemen,
Fairest and the best.
Onward and upward ever,
Forward and on, and on;
Hail to thee, Land of Heroes, My Oregon."

Sheer horror, ladies and gentlemen? I think not. What do these words tell us? Land of the empire builders—builders of an empire based on hard work, courage, and tolerance of the other fellow's views; land of the golden west—golden refers to sunsets and how we feel, not to material wealth; conquered and held by freemen—we shall ever be in debt to the free men and women who bravely pioneered our land; fairest and the best—no question about this; onward and upward ever, forward and on, and on—there is still pioneering to be done in our great State—hard but satisfying work for all of us; hail to thee, land of heroes, my Oregon—heroes indeed—all those who seek to be worthy of this many blessed portion of our great Nation. Sheer horror, these words? No, indeed, but fitting words for stirring music. It is now my privilege and pleasure to present to you the Watergate Summer Symphony Orchestra conducted by Mr. Toby Tyler, featuring Mr. Gene Archer and their rendition of Mr. Tyler's arrangement of Oregon, My Oregon.

(Orchestra: Oregon, My Oregon.)

ANNOUNCER. The Mutual Broadcasting System has brought you a portion of the concert by the Watergate Summer Symphony Orchestra presented by the American Federation of Musicians. This program came to you from the famous Watergate on the historic Potomac River in the Nation's Capital, and saluted the State of Oregon, and the Oregon congressional delegation. Heard on tonight's program were Congressman CHARLES O. POTTER, of Oregon, and Herman D. Kenin, newly elected president of the American Federation of Musicians. The orchestra was conducted by Dr. Henry Goldstein and Mr. Toby Tyler. The vocalist was Gene Archer. This broadcast was produced and directed by Phil Lampkin, director of music for the Mutual Broadcasting System. This is Ken French speaking.

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS IN COOPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS, PRESENTS THE WATERGATE SUMMER SYMPHONY IN HIT MELODIES FROM BROADWAY MUSICALS AND FEATURING THE FIRST SYMPHONIC PERFORMANCE OF OREGON, MY OREGON, OFFICIAL OREGON STATE SONG

(This added concert of Washington's Summer Jubilee Festival Salutes the Oregon State Society, Distinguished Oregonians in Government, and Mr. Herman D. Kenin, newly-elected president of the American Federation of Musicians, also of Oregon)

PROGRAM NOTES

Tonight's concert is the first of six Watergate concerts to be offered each Wednesday evening through August, featuring members of the D. C. Federation of Musicians in symphonic, jazz, and country and western music.

The succeeding five concerts are made possible by the Music Performance Trust Funds through a grant by the recording industries, and in cooperation with the D. C. Federation of Musicians.

A 25-minute segment of tonight's concert will be broadcast live coast-to-coast over the Mutual Broadcasting System, commencing at 9:35 o'clock. Ten minutes before broadcast time the program director will instruct you in the audience participation for this broadcast.

Reserved seats for Oregon State Society members have been provided tonight because they are present especially to hear played for the first time anywhere a symphonic arrangement of their official State song, Oregon, My Oregon. The song was rediscovered recently by Oregon Representative CHARLES O. PORTER. President Kenin of the American Federation of Musicians, himself an Oregonian, promptly asked the D. C. musicians union to prepare a symphonic arrangement of the State song.

Thus, Oregon Night at the Watergate salutes the hundreds of members of the Oregon State Society in the Nation's Capital, many distinguished Oregonians in governmental service here and an adopted son of Oregon, Mr. Kenin, who only last month was elected president of the 264,000-member American Federation of Musicians.

PROGRAM, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 1958, 8:30 P.M.,
DR. HENRY GOLDSTEIN, CONDUCTOR, WATERGATE SUMMER SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

The National Anthem.

I Love Washington (Edward R. Carr), conducted by Eddie Pierce, sung by Gene Archer.

Selections, The King and I (Richard Rodgers).

Piano duo, medley (Vincent Youmans), Mel Clement and Helen Myers, pianists.

Seleections, Show Boat (Jerome Kern).

Intermission.

Coast-to-coast broadcast (Mutual Broadcasting System).

Selections, My Fair Lady (Frederick Loewe).

State song, Oregon, My Oregon. Music by Henry B. Murtagh, words by J. A. Buchanan, sung by Gene Archer, arranged and conducted by Toby Tyler.

Piano duo, Medley (Cole Porter).

Symphonic scenario, South Pacific (Richard Rodgers).

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 18, 1958]

MUSICAL CRISIS SOLVED FOR CENTENNIAL

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—For many years, an indignity has been imposed upon those displaced Oregonians who, by the chance of politics

or the lure of money and fame, have made their home in the Nation's Capital.

When they attended those familiar social functions—say a big political banquet—along with natives of the other States, one point of discomfort to loyal Oregonians inevitably arrived.

It would come when the orchestra began honoring the various States. When the band struck up The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You, the Texans in the house would act like loyal Texans always act. The Californians would go wild over California, Here I Come.

As the musicians delighted one State group after another with their official State songs, the Oregonians finally had to face the music—the band never knew Oregon, My Oregon.

Fresh from the grassroots of Oregon, Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER noticed this soon after he arrived here early last year while attending a Democratic dinner. Much to his chagrin, he reported:

DUM, DUM, DUM

"When Oregon was saluted, the orchestra played one of those nameless somewhat tuneless, mixtures of notes.

"Always, at the functions I've attended, the orchestra or pianist or chorus fills in with 'dum, dum, dum'. The dums signify nothing other than an awkward musical bridge."

Because he liked the song, which the State went to much trouble to select, and to correct this slight against Oregon, PORTER dug into the matter.

The Society of Oregon Composers held a contest in 1920 to pick a State song. From 50 entries, it selected Oregon, My Oregon. The lyrics were written by a municipal judge who liked to write poetry, J. A. Buchanan, who died at Astoria in 1936. Composer was Harry Murtaugh, who played the piano during silent movies, but left Portland years ago and has not been heard from since World War II when he passed through town with a war bond selling group. The State legislature in 1927 made it official under the title, "Land of the Empire Builders."

NEVER COPYRIGHTED

PORTER learned from the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, that no copyright had ever been issued for the song under any title. The Portland music publisher, Irving E. Sklare, obligingly sent him 50 copies of the song, which the Congressman distributed to the Washington, D. C., Federation of Musicians, with this comment:

"Frankly, I flinch when a musical bridge fills the spot where a few health strains of Oregon, My Oregon would warm the loyal hearts of Oregonians attending the function."

The local musicians are especially anxious to prevent congressional flinching in the music field these days, what with a bill now pending to reduce the tax on all places that feature live music—a tax which the musicians claim has thrown many of them out of business because many cabarets avoid the tax by replacing the band with a jukebox.

STARTED REHEARSALS

All the local band leaders were promptly supplied with Oregon, My Oregon, and the union promised PORTER they would soon be able to swing right into it on request.

Moreover, the United States Navy Band agreed to make an arrangement of the song and be ready to perform for Oregonians by June 1. The Navy may even record it, though this can't be sold commercially.

And Dean Theodore Kratt of the University of Oregon School of Music has indicated to PORTER he could have a choral arrangement made as a student project. A. Verne Wilson, supervisor of music, Portland Public Schools, said he would take it from there and have a high-school choir record the song.

Oregon, My Oregon is in for a needed revival, just in time for the big centennial that is coming up next year.

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review of February 20, 1958]

SINGING FOR OREGON

Thirty-one years ago the legislature made it official, Oregon's State song was to be Land of the Empire Builders, or more simply, Oregon, my Oregon.

It is a lilting tune, easy to sing and understand—but now in 1958, only a few Oregonians know the words and sing out when it is played for group singing. We'd better brush up on it this year to get ready for next year's centennial.

We are grateful to CHARLES PORTER, the zestful young Congressman from the southwest Oregon district, for his initiative in popularizing the song with bands and orchestras in the National Capital. Now let's do as well, or better, here at home by singing it in our schools, grange, clubs, and community meetings until we know it.

To refresh your recollection, here are the words of our song. It's a good song, as good as the famous State songs of Texas, California, or Indiana and almost as taking as Oklahoma's or Maine's:

"Land of the Empire Builders,
Land of the Golden West;
Conquered and held by freemen,
Fairest and the best.
Onward and upward ever,
Forward and on, and on;
Hail to thee, Land of Heroes, My Oregon.

Land of the rose and sunshine,
Land of the summer's breeze;
Laden with health and vigor,
Fresh from Western seas.
Blest by the blood of martyrs,
Land of the setting sun;
Hail to thee, Land of Promise, My Oregon."

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 21, 1958]

STATE SONG

A. Robert Smith, our Washington correspondent, reports that Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER has decided to do something about the ignorance, in Washington, D. C., of Oregon's official song, known variously as Oregon, My Oregon and Land of the Empire Builders.

That's fine. We hope the song becomes known across the land, but we also suggest it is not exactly a familiar song right here in Oregon. When we read Bob Smith's piece, we tried out a few bars on our monotone and found that, to save us, we couldn't get beyond "Land of the golden west." (That shows how long it's been since were were in the seventh grade.)

Since this is Oregon's 100th year of statehood, it behooves us to learn as much about Oregon as we can. Earlier we suggested boning up on Oregon history and literature and spending the summer on "See Oregon first" vacations. Now we suggest that Oregon residents brush up on their State song. It can be found, words and music, on page 123 of the current Oregon Blue Book.

Oregon, My Oregon is no Maryland, My Maryland, or California Here I Come, but as State songs go it's far from bad.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of June 8, 1958]

STATE SONG PROGRESSING

Oregon, My Oregon, also known as Land of the Empire Builders, the Oregon State song, is making heartening progress.

We lamented here a few months ago that no one seems to know it very well—if at all—and that it was being neglected. And it's a good tune.

Since then, we understand that at least one young men's service club in town has started singing it at the beginning of its meetings. And, according to evidence from some school-age youngsters we know, it is a part of their music repertory.

Now we are informed that it's beginning to get through in official circles in Washington.

Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER earlier this year got in touch with the District of Columbia Federation of Musicians, and suggested that Oregon's song be played at functions where the various States are saluted by their official songs. In the past, Oregon's tribute has been sort of undistinguished musical bridge which meant nothing.

As a result, the District's orchestra leaders were tipped off to this unsatisfactory situation, and at one recent function, the State's song was given a lively and well-rendered version, PORTER reports.

Which is all to the good.

Hon. George H. Christopher, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Missouri has sent many able Representatives to the Congress of the United States; however, to my knowledge no other Member has more quickly joined in the conflict for the common good of all people than the gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD abundantly proves that GEORGE CHRISTOPHER has always spoken, fought, and voted for legislation which would be of benefit to veterans, laboring people, students, educational leaders, farmers, and the business and professional men and women who serve and supply them. Such a record has seldom been equaled and never exceeded. No vote cast by my friend, GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, in 6 years of congressional service can be pointed out as wrong for the people of his district, State, or Nation.

Here is a man who firmly believes that democratic institutions are never done, that they may be compared to living tissues, always a-making, and although it may be strenuous, this thing of living the life of a free people, as we do in our Nation, we cannot escape the burden of our inheritance.

It is good to come upon such a man on occasions—to rewarm our hands at his fire of enthusiasm, to stand face to face with his ideals, to reckon again with our duties, to take fresh view of our aims and to gain strength from his courage.

Such talent, enthusiasm, and courage could not long go unrecognized, and it gives me much pleasure to extend at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD five letters written by farm veterans, and rural electrification leaders in which they recognize in appropriate form the fulfillment of my colleague's responsibilities to the American people.

The Congress of the United States, the people of the Fourth District, and the Nation as a whole still need the service of this man in the Congress.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GEORGE: As I read your recent letter my thoughts turned to the many outstanding Members of Congress that the voters of Missouri have sent to Washington and to President Harry Truman under whose administration and leadership you served the farmers of the United States.

Events on the Washington farm front today have been greatly altered with the pressure from the White House and the Department of Agriculture always on the side of lowering farm prices. In spite of glowing reports, farmers' bargaining power is becoming weaker with vertical integration an increasing threat to their economic interests.

About the only solace that we in agriculture have today is the knowledge that men such as yourself are still in the Congress and the prospect of increasing their number.

I am grateful for the opportunity this reply to your letter has given me to express appreciation for your many services to the farmers of the United States.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President.

MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Columbia, Mo., June 24, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
United States Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER: Recently I have had occasion to review your voting record over the years on matters of import, and particularly on questions of farm legislation and also those related to REA. I have been impressed with your performance in this regard, and feel that you have always kept foremost the best interests of farmers and agriculture in general.

If you have occasion to come by Columbia when you are next in Missouri, I would be most happy to have an opportunity to visit with you.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED V. HEINKEL,
President.

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION,
Corning, Iowa, July 9, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
Adrian, Mo.

DEAR SIR: As president of the National Farmers Organization and as a farmer in northwest Missouri, I wish to express my thanks to you for your constant efforts in the House of Representatives to improve the agricultural economy for the family type farmer.

In reviewing your past efforts I know of no Senator, or Congressman, that has a better record for the American farmer in the Halls of Congress.

In my opinion your services to agriculture in the Congress of the United States is equal to any that can be found.

Very truly yours,

OREN LEE STALEY, *President.*

NATIONAL RURAL
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: This is in reply to your letter of July 15 asking whether this organization has a record of your support of the rural electrification program during your terms in the Congress, and, if so, what it shows. Yes, we compile a running voting record of all Members of Congress with regard to matters vitally affecting the rural electrification program.

I am pleased to enclose herewith a copy of your voting record on such matters. You will note that on pages 24 and 25, it shows your voting 100 percent in favor of the program on every vote that you cast, and it shows only two absences when rural electrification matters were being voted upon.

This confirms my personal knowledge that you have been one of the hardest and most dedicated workers on behalf of the rural electrification program in the Congress during the years that you have been there, and I might add that you have been one of the most effective because of your keen debating ability. The rural electrification program nationwide is greatly indebted to you for such a fine record of support.

With highest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER: Before Congress adjourns I would like to take this occasion to express to you my sincere thanks and appreciation for the wholehearted support and splendid cooperation which you have always extended on behalf of veterans' legislation.

As you know, since you have been a Member of Congress and especially during your service on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have requested you, on numerous occasions, to introduce bills covering veterans' legislation in which the American Legion was interested, and you have always complied with my requests.

I am also grateful to you for the fight you have waged and the arguments you have advanced on many occasions when matters of interest to veterans and their dependents came before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for consideration.

In addition, I would like you to know that I personally appreciate the numerous interviews which you have been good enough to grant to me in connection with our legislative program and for the excellent advice you gave me on occasions too numerous to mention.

With warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Depressed Areas Need Help of Congress Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 22, 1958. The passage of the area redevelopment bill is of vital importance to Pennsylvania and should be acted upon without further delay.

DEPRESSED AREAS NEED HELP OF CONGRESS NOW

The fate of the area redevelopment bill at this session of Congress will be on the line when the House Rules Committee finally gets around to holding a hearing on whether or not to allow the legislation out on the floor for a vote. And riding along with it will be the hopes of people living in the Nation's chronic pockets of unemployment for a new economic lift.

Pennsylvanians have a vital interest in this legislation. It would provide aid for these depressed areas, and the Commonwealth has more than its share. It's only fitting, therefore, that this State's congressional delegation is trying to push the bill out for action through the logjam of apparent indifference that exists toward it in the House.

This is no recession year legislation. Pennsylvania's hard coal regions have been feeling the pinch for years. These areas will need some Federal aid if they are to experience an economic revival through new industries and new jobs.

Neither is this a Federal handout. A Senate-passed bill, which the proposed House measure closely follows, would establish an Area Redevelopment Administration to handle revolving loan funds of $100 million each for industrial redevelopment areas, rural redevelopment areas and for public facilities to improve commercial opportunities.

For Pennsylvania at least, this is not a case of States and local communities asking Uncle Sam to do something they won't do for themselves.

The Commonwealth has an admirable record of achievement in this field through the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, which in the first 20 months of its existence has loaned out or committed $5,866,062 for factories in 30 communities. It has helped establish 47 new plants providing 8,800 new jobs. And 2 weeks ago, Governor Leader cited the self-help record of northeastern Pennsylvania communities which, in the 12 years before PIDA, financed 67 projects and created 17,730 factory jobs.

But this is not enough. Before this biennium is over, the $8 million appropriated by two consecutive legislatures is expected to run out. Congressional action is needed to supplement the effort on the State and local levels.

As Governor Leader said recently, "People are not interested in which party gets the credit for this legislation—what they want is action now and they have every right to expect it."

Pennsylvania's Representative HUGH SCOTT thinks the Rules Committee vote will be a close one. Close or not, this bill should be given its chance before the full House. There are no good reasons for killing this legislation again. The national blight of the depressed areas will not disappear by itself. It will take the sort of enlightened aid envisioned by this bill.

Minnesota Offers Many Attractions for Visitors and Homeseekers

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in extending to all Members of the House an in-

vitation to visit Minnesota's Theater of the Seasons during this our centennial year. Vice President NIXON blazed the trail last Saturday when he journeyed to the land of 11,007 lakes to open Minneapolis' annual celebration of its world-famed aquatennial. Members who may find themselves a little too busy just now to follow the Vice President's example and take part in that summer festival may perhaps be able to make amends for this inadvertent slight to our great State by visiting Minneapolis' sister city, St. Paul, during Minnesota's invigorating winter season and joining in its exuberant tribute to King Boreas Rex during the week of its winter carnival. Members who may be afflicted with ochlophobia and may wish to avoid the vast crowds which frequent both of these celebrations can find many a green and secluded spot within the State where they may rest from the heavy burdens of statesmanship and devote themselves to swimming, boating, hunting, fishing, or merely passively contemplating the natural beauty of the North Star State. Wherever they may go they will be sure to encounter that characteristic hospitality of her citizens to which Mr. Fernós-Isern, the Commissioner of Puerto Rico, has so graciously paid tribute. The warm friendliness of which Mr. Fernós-Isern spoke arises not merely from compassion on the part of Minnesota's citizens for the inhabitants of lands less delightful to behold, but betokens in many cases a feeling of identification with the visitor, for Minnesota, as I have remarked before on the floor of the House, is a miniature United Nations. Members of many races, who have come from many other parts of the United States and from many foreign lands have played a part in her hundred-year saga, and their descendants today have at least a latent racial memory of what life was like before they or their forbears moved to what we in Minnesota regard as a land only "This Side of Paradise" to borrow the title of a novel by one of Minnesota's most famous sons, F. Scott Fitzgerald.

Many a casual visitor to our State has later returned to become a permanent inhabitant. Those who, while grateful for the solace afforded to mind and heart by Minnesota's natural beauty, may be unwilling or unable to devote full time to the contemplation of that beauty can find ample opportunity within our progressive State for the exercise of their commercial or professional talents. Minnesota has long been considered one of our Nation's great agricultural States. It has been such in the past and is so today, with some 180,000 farms, 4 out of 5 of which are owner-operated. Yet industry is by no means a minor factor in the economy of the State. In 1948, for the first time in the history of the State, the dollar value of manufactured products exceeded cash farm receipts. Sauk Centre, Minn., was the setting of Sinclair Lewis' famous novel, Main Street, and there are many Main Streets throughout the State whose small-business men did nearly $4 billion of retail sales in the calendar year 1957.

Physicians know Minnesota as the home of the Mayo Medical Center and of the University of Minnesota hospitals. The famous Sister Kenney, it will be remembered, when she came to this country to advance her great crusade against crippling polio, established herself in the city of Minneapolis. Intellectuals need not fear that they must abandon their books and scholarly interests and immerse themselves wholly in nature when they settle in our green and rustic land. They can turn for intellectual stimulus to the University of Minnesota with its many extension and community-service programs to 1 of our 5 State colleges, or to 1 of 14 excellent private colleges. The musically inclined can look to the performances of Minneapolis' world-famous symphony orchestra, and to many college and civic music groups throughout the State. The art lover will find a number of first-rate art galleries and abundant evidence of creative activity in painting, sculpture, and architecture. St. Johns University, one of our fine private colleges, has recently embarked upon a 100-year building program, employing the services of the eminent architect, Marcel Breur, which has won international recognition.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is not only one of our country's finest vacation lands but offers many advantages—economic, social, cultural, climatic—to him who would make his home among us. He will find even in our largest cities much of that unassuming friendliness and concern for the welfare of one's neighbor which is habitually associated with the small midwestern town. In 1858, when Minnesota was admitted to the Union, it had a scant 150,000 inhabitants. Today it has over 3 million, but its dynamic and expanding economy, based upon a rich endowment of natural resources, can accommodate many more. Minnesota's territorial seal bore the motto, "Quo sursum volo videre"—I wish to see what lies beyond." This is a fine emblem, I think, of the habits of thought which have characterized Minnesota's ambitious and forward-looking citizenry during the first 100 years of the State's existence, and which will continue to mark its unflinching acceptance of the role it is called to play in the century to come.

Why This Difference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the vast majority of American citizens are prompt in taking care of their income tax obligations to their Government. And the Internal Revenue Service is properly vigilant, in the majority of cases, in seeing that each person bears his fair share. Therefore I was surprised to read recently that a large industrial firm, the Lebanon Woolen Mills Corp., has not filed its income tax returns since 1952. To date there has been no explanation for this slipup. But there must be an explanation and I hope it is forthcoming soon if for no other reason than to renew the assurances we have been receiving of late that certain gift givers are not the recipients of any special considerations in the Nation's Capital.

Some of the questions which have arisen in my mind in recent months are aptly expressed in an editorial in the July 26 issue of Labor, the weekly newspaper for railroad brotherhoods. I recommend it to my colleagues.

WHY THIS DIFFERENCE IN COLLECTING TAXES?

The House committee investigating the Adams-Goldfine case, headed by Congressman OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, has performed a public service by spotlighting this question: Why are businessmen allowed to get away with all sorts of tax dodges, and sometimes practically thumb their noses at Uncle Sam's tax collectors, when wage and salary workers are required to obey the letter of the law and pay every tax penny they owe?

If that seems pretty strong language, just consider the following reasons for asking the question:

As an article in the Scripps-Howard papers reports: "One of Bernard Goldfine's companies—Lebanon Woolen Mills Corp.—has not filed its income tax returns since 1952. Another Goldfine company, Northfield Mills, Inc., has not filed its fiscal 1956 tax return, due a year ago.

"Goldfine also has failed to file his personal Federal tax returns for 1956, and has received an extension for filing his 1957 returns, which were due last April 15.

"Internal Revenue officials," the article points out, "said they could not explain the Service's failure to compel Goldfine's mills to file tax returns."

The United States income tax collectors do not go so easy on a worker. In the first place, his taxes are deducted from his pay, so he has no chance to dodge. In the second place, if he failed to file a return tax men would promptly crack down on him and make him pay penalties.

Not only that, but an editorial in the Machinist, weekly newspaper of the machinists' union, points out graphically what happens to a worker if he is unemployed and can't pay taxes on his past income. As the editorial says:

"Last week the Internal Revenue Service admitted that its collectors have been seizing unemployment-compensation checks due jobless workers who are behind in their taxes. Now the same Internal Revenue Service reveals that Textile Millionaire Goldfine has not even filed his (personal) income tax returns for either 1956 or 1957."

Commenting on this situation, Congressman LEROY ANDERSON (Democrat of Montana) said: "I can't see why Uncle Sam should reach into the meager assistance to a parent with children, for a bare bread-and-butter living, and take part of it away." This would be stopped by a bill which Anderson and some other Members of Congress are pushing.

Because of Goldfine's gifts to "Assistant President" Sherman Adams and other high officials, an article in U. S. News & World Report magazine says: "People are raising questions about the deduction of gifts in figuring income taxes." The article's answers to those questions boil down to this:

The ordinary individual cannot cut his income taxes by deducting the cost of gifts, "because the ordinary individual's wage or

salary is not dependent on giving gifts. To be deductible, gifts other than charitable donations are required to be business expenses."

In other words, the giver has to expect something in return, something that would help his business.

Thus, as Labor pointed out last week, Goldfine either expected something in return from President Eisenhower's right-hand man, or Goldfine was doing some tax dodging, and Uncle Sam's tax collectors—at least, so far—have let him get away with it. They would have said "No" in a hurry if some ordinary individual, instead of a wealthy businessman, had tried to deduct the cost of a gift from the income on which he pays taxes.

United Board, Carton Official Favors Extension of United States Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include, herewith, a clipping from the Springfield (Ohio) Daily News, of July 11, concerning the remarks recently made by Mr. William S. Stuhr, president and board chairman of the United Board & Carton Corp., at the 19th annual State convention of the Ohio Department of the Marine Corps League.

The newspaper article follows:

UNITED BOARD, CARTON OFFICIAL FAVORS EXTENSION OF UNITED STATES TRADE PROGRAM

(By Bill Norman)

"Extension of the trade agreements program for at least 5 years is important because it would lend needed stability to the program, not only to trade itself but also to United States overseas investments, which a liberal trade policy encourages."

This was the comment made Friday by William S. Stuhr, of Weehawken, N. J., president and board chairman of the United Board & Carton Corp., which has plants in Springfield and Urbana.

He is in Springfield to make an address before the 19th annual State convention of the Ohio Department of the Marine Corps League.

The convention is being hosted by the Springfield detachment of the Marine Corps League and Auxiliary. It got under way Thursday and will conclude Saturday night following the talk by Mr. Stuhr, installation of newly elected officers, and a military ball in the ballroom of Hotel Shawnee.

In discussing the trade agreements program which is now before Congress, Mr. Stuhr stated that he has been a proponent of liberal trade policy for many years and is greatly interested in the legislation now before Congress covering the program.

"Our program by now has become an integral part of our foreign policy. It is difficult to see how we can cultivate friendship in other areas of international relations if we refuse to play ball, or play it reluctantly, with stipulations that are too stringent when it comes to foreign trade," he said.

"And that becomes a vital consideration now that Russia has openly launched a broad, powerful economic offensive and will shoot out another trade mission at the drop of an invitation anywhere," he continued.

"We suffered a psychological setback before the eyes of friendly nations when Russia became the first to launch a satellite. And we'll suffer another setback if we tighten rather than loosen our trade terms with those countries that want and need to sell to us," Mr. Stuhr said. "We have launched a satellite, too, and we are certainly capable of sustaining a powerful economic offensive to keep free countries out of the Russian bear hug."

He continued by saying that many of the free countries the Soviet Union is wooing must trade to live and if they can't do business with the United States they will do it with Moscow.

"Moreover, many of those countries are sources of materials we must import that are vital to our economy and military strength. If and when those countries fall into the Communists' economic orbit we will find those sources cut off and that is obviously a part of the Kremlin design," he concluded.

Top Woman Protestant Is a Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see a recent article which appeared in the Detroit, Mich., News of May 16, 1958. That article sets forth how one of my constituents, Mrs. Jesse Jai McNeil, was chosen president of the United Church Women, an organization composed of women of all Protestant and Orthodox religious groups. Mrs. McNeil is a much respected member of the Detroit community and has been active in civic, church, and charitable affairs in Detroit and the State of Michigan. Her husband is Rev. Jesse Jai McNeil, pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church, vice chairman of the Michigan Corrections Commission, and vice president of the Michigan Council of Churches.

Election of Mrs. McNeil is indeed, proof that we in Michigan recognize her ability and integrity.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the appendix of the RECORD:

TOP WOMAN PROTESTANT IS A NEGRO

Michigan's Protestant and Orthodox churchwomen today elected a Negro woman as their president for the first time.

She is the cultured, personable Mrs. Jesse Jai McNeil, wife of the senior minister of Detroit's Tabernacle Baptist Church. Her husband also is vice chairman of the Michigan Corrections Commission and vice president of the Michigan Council of Churches.

Mrs. McNeil said she was "both happy and humbled" when delegates chose her for their 1958 leader at the annual meeting of the United Church Women of Michigan, women's department of the Michigan Council of Churches.

The women's session was held in Grand Rapids' South Congregational Church.

Election of Mrs. McNeil was hailed by Mrs. T. D. Stilwell, of the United Church Women of Detroit, as a stride toward "unity of churchwomen in the task of establishing a Christian social order, in which all areas of life shall be brought into harmony with the life and teachings of Jesus Christ."

"I realize," said Mrs. McNeil, "that our policy of integrated leadership will be watched and serve as an example in the other State organizations in the United States."

SETS EXAMPLE

"That we have adopted such a policy demonstrates also to those abroad that we in America are bringing our practices into conformity with our ideals.

"In our churchwork, such as sponsoring the World Day of Prayer, we come in contact with churches of all nations, and to them this election will seem a vindication of our American way of life."

Mother of four children, Mrs. McNeil has traveled abroad extensively with her husband. She was an official observer at Britain's Triennial Congress of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

HOLDS DEGREES

She holds degrees from Howard and Fisk Universities, studied neuropsychiatry at Duke University and was a National Public Service fellow in sociology at Columbia University.

She is a member of the human relations workshop team of the United Church Women (UCW) of the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii; the commission on cooperation of the World Council of Churches and the national board of managers of the churchwomen's department of the National Council of Churches of Christ.

She has been vice president of the Michigan UCW for 4 years, and she has served as president of the Doty School PTA, as a board member of Lucy Thurman Branch, YWCA, and a member of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

While gratified at the new honor given her today, Mrs. McNeil did not forget to speak of the encouragement given her by her husband and their children, Jesse Jr., 12; Genna Rae, 11; Kenneth Ross, 9, and Brenna Jean, 7.

The Role of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, everyone who is interested in understanding the rightful role of the Supreme Court in our Government ought to read Judge Learned Hand's recent book entitled "The Bill of Rights." In its issue of July 23, 1958, the Asheville Citizen, of Asheville, N. C., carried an excellent review of this book written by Edwin M. Gill, State treasurer of North Carolina, who is a profound scholar in governmental and legal fields. I ask unanimous consent that this review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered printed in the RECORD as follows:

FAMED JUDGE LEARNED HAND SAYS COURTS SHOULD INTERPRET, NOT CHANGE LAW

(By Edwin Gill)

At a time when the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States are noted for injecting into their opinions their social and economic predilections, it is refreshing to read the words of Judge Learned Hand who is known chiefly for his objective approach, his impartial spirit, his sense of history, and, above all, his profound knowledge of the law.

Others who sit upon the bench may strive to be crusaders, reformers, advocates, prosecutors and lawgivers, but Learned Hand is content to be a judge, wielding the authority of such office with the humility of one who considers himself a servant of the law, fully conscious of the fact that he is not infallible.

In this slender volume, which is based upon Judge Hand's Oliver Wendell Holmes lectures, a number of searching and fundamental questions are asked, all of which have to do with the function of the Federal courts in declaring invalid statutes of Congress or of the States or acts of the President, because they are in conflict with the 1st, 8th, and the 14th amendments to the Federal Constitution, which Hand calls The Bill of Rights.

Although the Constitution does not expressly give to the Supreme Court of the United States the authority to pass on the constitutionality of acts of Congress, the Executive and State legislatures, Hand agrees with John Marshall that such authority is necessary to the orderly conduct of our Government. Judge Hand would, however, greatly limit the area in which the Court should intervene.

From long experience, Hand has learned that justice is more apt to be relative than absolute. He feels that the advocacy of ideas under some circumstances may properly be restrained; that in a constitutional democracy such as ours, neither speech, nor religion, nor the press is absolutely free. He contends that the rights of life, liberty, and property are equally guaranteed and can find no justification for the theory that by the expansion of the "due process clause" of the 14th amendment, one of these rights is entitled to more protection than another. In passing upon the constitutionality of acts of Congress or of the States, Judge Hand holds with those who feel that the Court should not concern itself with the wisdom of such legislation but with the power of the legislative branch to enact such laws. He respectfully demurs to the idea that the Court should constitute itself a guardian of the faith and morals of the public, quaintly observing: "For myself, it would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians, even if I knew how to choose them, which I assuredly do not."

Judge Hand adheres firmly to the time-honored doctrine of the separation of powers—that laws should be made by the legislative, administered by the Executive and that the Court should limit its activity to a sincere effort at interpretation, guarding the Constitution from invasion by either of the other branches. He believes that a judge can properly advocate changes in the law, but that when he sits upon the bench his motive should be to interpret the law as it is, rather than yield to the temptation to change it by judicial fiat. He believes in the rule of law, and sees it weakened and betrayed when judges decide to depart from their judicial function and become lawmakers.

It is interesting to note that in his discussion of the segregation cases, Hand expresses wonder that the Court felt it necessary to intervene; he confesses that he does not know the implications of these decisions, saying: "I cannot frame any definition that will explain when the Court will assume the role of a third legislative chamber and when it will limit its authority to keeping Congress and the States within their accredited authority."

As I interpret his philosophy, Judge Hand believes that the survival of democracy and free institutions depends not so much upon the restraints written into the Constitution—as great and as necessary as they are, but upon the restraints voluntarily imposed by judges, presidents, governors, legislators, and the people, upon themselves—that self-discipline is the hallmark of freedom.

It is significant that toward the close of this volume, Judge Hand quotes at length from the address written by Benjamin Franklin and read by James Wilson to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, which was characterized by great tolerance of the views of others and modesty as to his own wisdom. In quoting Franklin, he seems to say that we got the Constitution in the beginning because of the temper of men like Franklin, and that we will preserve it only by continuing to practice their wise and tolerant spirit.

Do judges make law, or do they only discover it? On this controversial subject, there is a whole library of legal literature. Ordinarily in construing a statute the court's path is clear; it simply explains the language of the statute, resolving conflicts and clearing up ambiguities. But when the problem involves great constitutional questions that arise when statutes collide with the organic law, the dividing line between interpretation and change by judicial decree is sometimes shadowy. There are those who contend that by the very nature of the judicial process, it is inescapable that judges do make law; their position is that to contend otherwise is to support a legal fiction; that in rendering a decision, a judge necessarily adds something of his own to the total legal structure. However, this may be, there are judges who strive to uphold the concept of interpretation and there are judges who seem to embrace willingly the idea of change through judicial review. It goes without saying that Judge Hand is a judge who strives to avoid the very appearance of "legislation" through judicial action and sets as his goal the interpretation of existing law. This does not mean that Judge Hand is a slave to the past, nor is he in bondage to the letter of the law. In The Spirit of Liberty (Papers and Addresses of Learned Hand: Knopf 1952), Hand describes his approach to the interpretation of law as follows: "The duty of ascertaining its meaning is difficult enough at best, and one certain way of missing it is by reading it literally, for words are such temperamental beings that the surest way to lose their essence is to take them at their face. Courts must reconstruct the past solution imaginatively in its setting and project the purposes which inspired it upon the concrete occasions which arise for their decision."

When faced with mounting demands for changes in the Constitution, there are always those who look for short cuts, who feel that the end justifies the means, that the great Gordian knots of constitutional problems should be dramatically cut by judicial review rather than unraveled by the more prosaic, time-honored method of amendment. As I interpret his position, Judge Hand dissents from this viewpoint. In an age in which highly-placed officials are often tempted to extend their authority unreasonably in order to satisfy the emotionally charged demands of the hour, Hand counsels patience, tolerance and self-restraint. In a power-hungry world, he stands for moderation.

This book will live. It will take its place with such classics as The Common Law, by Holmes, and The Nature of the Judicial Process, by Cardozo; down through the years, it will constitute a forceful and eloquent protest against any and all usurpation of public authority.

Important Work Being Carried On by World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am honored to say that I had the privilege of participating in a testimonial luncheon for our Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service on July 1, 1958. It was one of the most inspiring affairs that I have ever attended, with some of the leading doctors and laymen who are interested in medical research in attendance. Dr. Burney gave a very vivid account of the important work that is being carried on by the World Health Organization and I am pleased to include his address at this point:

ADDRESS BY L. E. BURNEY, M. D., SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

It is difficult to express one's feelings on an occasion like this. As all of you know, public testimony of civic and professional esteem is deeply gratifying to the average recipient—and I am no exception to the average.

Let me begin then by expressing my heartfelt thanks to my friends and colleagues in the National Capital area for their thoughtfulness in arranging this very pleasant affair.

A public health administrator perhaps finds it easier to reconcile such evidence of esteem with his own limitations. This is because, of all careers, a public health career depends upon the stature of the organizations one serves and upon the stature and dedication of one's fellow workers.

The honor you are according me, then, is one that I am privileged to accept on behalf of the entire staff of the Public Health Service; and on behalf of the delegates to the 11th World Health Assembly, whose work in Minneapolis laid the groundwork for new victories in the struggle for better health.

From my personal observation and the comments of delegates from all parts of the world and of the WHO staff, it appears that the 11th World Health Assembly will stand as a milestone in the history of WHO.

I should like to give you my personal impressions of the meeting and a very brief highlight of its achievements.

What made the Assembly so memorable to me was the wonderful spirit of harmony, friendship, and understanding that pervaded all the deliberations. It was attended by delegates of all 85 active member states—the largest participation in WHO's history—by observers representing the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and 32 international nongovernmental organizations interested in health. The delegates are health experts, outstanding health leaders of their respective countries.

It was a genuine honor to preside over such a group, particularly in view of the spirit of unity that prevailed. Issues that might have aroused controversy were resolved in the friendly atmosphere of cooperation and compromise. Even in such a sensitive field as the health aspects of atomic energy, the

approach was calm and the outcome was harmonious.

The delegates to the Assembly gave serious consideration to the world's pressing health needs and how they can be met. The decisions they reached will affect the health and well-being of millions of human beings, from the remote villages of Asia to our own great cities. Nearly 800 health projects in almost every country and territory of the world were adopted by the Assembly as part of the 1959 public-health program of WHO. These ranged from global malaria-eradication projects to the strengthening of training programs.

As significant as these actions are, they are matched in importance by the opportunity the Assembly afforded to exchange views and cement friendly relations with the health leaders of other nations. This is the essence both of communication and of international understanding. Communication permits us to put science and technology into practice, as rapidly as possible, in the interests of human health. International understanding is basically an extension of understanding between individuals and is the road to international stability and peace.

I have participated now in three World Health Assemblies and I can testify to the tremendous benefits of such face-to-face communication. The opportunity to renew old friendships and to develop new ones among the world health leadership is of incalculable value to the cause not only of human health but of international good will.

Moreover, such relationships are important because of the pattern of cooperation which has been established between WHO and its member nations. This pattern has a familiar ring to us in the United States; it is comparable in many ways to our relationship in technical matters between Federal and State agencies, and between these agencies and voluntary organizations.

WHO provides expert consultation and assistance to member countries. It develops and demonstrates public health methods which are new, or new to the nations concerned. It helps train health personnel. It stimulates cooperative action among nations on problems requiring such action. And in regional and worldwide meetings, such as the one which has just been completed, it determines the future shape of health programs throughout the world.

Thus, although the member nations of WHO are independent countries, they are succeeding, through WHO, in building on a world scale the techniques of cooperation which have proved so effective in our own country. They are, in short, building a true world community of health effort in a democratic fashion.

That the goal of the highest attainable standard of health for all peoples is being vigorously pursued was brought forth dramatically in the 10th anniversary commemorative session which preceded the Assembly. I wish each of you here could have heard the eloquent statements of delegates from nation after nation, describing what has been accomplished within the past decade with and through WHO. I was deeply impressed, as were my colleagues and the other delegates, to hear this catalog of progress in human health made possible by a decade of international health cooperation. What was even more important was the promise of continued strength and greater accomplishments in the future.

This session heard many distinguished speakers, including our own Secretary, Mr. Folsom, the Director General of WHO, Dr. Candau, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, who greeted the delegates on behalf of the President of the United States.

At the Assembly itself, the delegates adopted the largest budget ever provided for WHO, a sum of about $14.3 million. And for the first time, the budget was adopted by acclamation.

Considerable attention was given to the world-wide malaria eradication campaign. The delegates expressed satisfaction with the results of this program to date and at the same time urged an intensification of efforts. It was noted that there are still an estimated 150 million cases of malaria, with about 1.5 million deaths each year.

I was particularly gratified that the United States has made a special grant of $5 million to WHO for the malaria eradication campaign. In voting this grant last year, the United States Congress once again demonstrated its continuing interest in world health work.

Other Assembly actions called for increased emphasis on environmental sanitation; charting of a global campaign to eradicate smallpox; and renewed efforts in tuberculosis and other infectious diseases. New fields will be opened as WHO expands its work on such problems as the health implications of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Perhaps the event of greatest long-range importance was the Assembly's action with respect to international medical research and training. Endorsing a proposal submitted by our United States delegation, the Assembly requested the Director General to organize a special study of ways in which WHO can stimulate and coordinate international research and the development of research personnel. Secretary Folsom and Dr. Milton Eisenhower offered a research grant of $300,000 to the World Health Organization to help finance such a study. The Assembly authorized the WHO to accept this grant and proceed with the study, reporting a plan for international research and training, with cost estimates, to the Twelfth World Health Assembly in 1959.

I am sure that you will be gratified by our country's leadership in this significant move toward greater international cooperation in the research effort which underlies all health progress. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message to Congress last January emphasized the great potentialities for human betterment through science and research. With this declaration he captured the imagination and enthusiasm of his own Nation, and of people throughout the world.

The action of the World Health Assembly, in the opinion of your delegation, demonstrates that the peoples of the world stand ready to contribute to and support research for better health through international action.

It will seem natural to you, I am sure, that your government has taken strong leadership in this field of international cooperation. The medical and biological research effort in the United States is recognized as outstanding throughout the world. It has already produced dramatic results. It has been made possible, of course, only through the understanding and the generous support of the Congress. It has been greatly expanded during the past decade through the action of many voluntary organizations, and private foundations. The Public Health Service is privileged to administer the programs representing the largest share of the Government's participation in medical and biological research and, in so doing, to work in close cooperation with research leaders and voluntary agencies throughout the country. In our judgment and that of our colleagues, increased international effort in the health sciences offers tremendous promise, not only for the health of mankind but also for world peace.

This opinion is reflected in a recent statement of both Houses of Congress, "declaring it to be the policy of the United States to continue and to strengthen mutual efforts among nations for research against diseases, such as heart disease and cancer, and, inviting the World Health Organization to initiate studies for the strengthening of research and related programs against such diseases."

I have left for last the one other point that made the assembly particularly noteworthy of me. As you know, this was the first time that the governing body of the World Health Organization has met in the United States.

There is no question that this single event has had more immediate benefits than many larger undertakings of our country to cement friendly relations with the nations of the world. Health representatives of these nations, many of them for the first time, had an opportunity to meet our people and observe our way of life first hand. At the same time, a great many of our citizens, particularly those in the Midwest, became acquainted not only with the World Health Organization but also with leading men and women from other nations.

I cannot tell you how much this has meant in goodwill and understanding. One delegate told me that "the people of Minnesota have not only opened their homes to us but also their hearts and their minds." Another said that his ideas about the United States had always been somewhat critical; but in his 3 weeks here he was so impressed with the genuine sincerity, friendliness, and warmth of our people that his ideas had changed completely.

As proud as I was to be president of that great world health assembly, I was even more proud of the way in which my fellow Americans responded to the meeting and welcomed the delegates to their homes and hearts.

Thank you again for this honor and your gracious words. In honoring me, you are paying tribute to all the men and women who work on behalf of world health. We look to the future with great anticipation and determination. We are here again demonstrating that men of good will, working together, can contribute mightily to the greater wellbeing of people throughout the world and to man's dream of peace with freedom.

I am reminded of an inscription that appears on the Union Station here in Washington—a translation from the Spanish. It reads: "He would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him." We in the United States have a great deal to give. We have much, as well, to receive. Through this interchange of knowledge and of friendship our Nation is enriched. So, too, are the nations of the world.

Is Rehousing for People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able address entitled "Is Rehousing for People?" which was delivered by Nathan Straus, of New York, one of the leading experts in the entire housing field during the last 25 years. In his stimulating and interesting address, he pointed out the enormous difficulties with which we are faced in connection with the relocation of families by reason of the urban rede-

velopment and the highway programs and the complete inability to deal with those programs in the absence of adequate housing for families of low incomes.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS REHOUSING FOR PEOPLE?

(By Nathan Straus)

Is the objective of an urban redevelopment and rehousing program to help people or to beautify the city? The question is not intended facetiously. It comes to mind almost inevitably, if any serious study is made of the effect of the New York City redevelopment program.

We are informed that about 5,000 families will be relocated over the next 3 years in connection with the building of the Lincoln Square project. The word "relocated" is a convenient evasion of the fact that these unfortunate families are being thrown out of their homes—many of them, with nowhere else to go.

Here are a few typical examples, as reported in the daily newspapers.

A 70-year-old widow occupying an apartment for which she pays $36.80 per month is one of those evicted. She has been unable to find an apartment execpt at a monthly rental of $50. That is, she will be forced to pay one-third more rent than she has in the past. It is true that she will receive a one-time relocation bonus amounting to $312.92. But that money will be swallowed up in moving expense and the increase in rent, in less than a year. Her case is typical rather than unique.

Another family consisting of a man, his wife, their baby son and his wife's mother—four in all—occupy a flat for which they pay $22.70 a month. It consists of 4 rooms, so the rent is less than $6 a room. The apartments to be built on the Lincoln Square site are going to rent for upward of $47 a room. As one of the evicted tenants says: "We couldn't even rent a closet in them."

The real-estate concern in charge of relocation frankly admits that it has only 400 apartments available in all parts of the city and that these apartments rent for from $50 to $85 a month.

It is a fact that 1 family out of 4, now living in the Lincoln Square area, is theoretically eligible for an apartment in a subsidized public housing project. However, the eligibility is largely a theoretical benefit, an empty gesture, since, in fact, there is a long waiting list for apartments in public subsidized housing in this city.

Even though many of the tenements in the Lincoln Square area are firetraps and even though many of them may be vermin infested, nevertheless, on a cold night, any roof over the family's head is better than a park bench.

The plight of low-income families, to be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project, is characteristic of urban redevelopment throughout the United States.

Things are no worse in New York than in any other American city—except that redevelopment of slum areas has proceeded at a more rapid pace here than elsewhere. While our newspaper headlines read "High Rent Apartments Still the Trend in Manhattan" and "Lincoln Square DP's Ask the Planners: Where Do We Go?" as far out as the west coast, the pattern is duplicated.

One of the worst examples of mismanagement in the United States is that of the city of Los Angeles. There, a fine program of subsidized public housing, approved by the Federal Government, was rejected by the voters, just as it was all ready to go into actual construction. This negative result was the product of a campaign of vilification and misrepresentation by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the United States Savings and Loan League, unfortunately abetted by the two leading newspapers of that city.

The outstanding success achieved by this campaign of misrepresentation by the real-estate lobby is well indicated by the fact that even as generally reliable and distinguished a representative of the Nation's press as the Wall Street Journal on July 17, 1951, printed the following headlines: "Los Angeles Folk Fume Over Huge Project." "Roar of Protest Against Public Housing."

The truth was that the city council had approved the public-housing program by a vote of 10 to 5. The truth was that the public-housing program had been endorsed by every local veterans' organization, all local-labor organizations and more than 70 other civic groups.

The low-income families of Los Angeles are today paying the penalty for the success of this vicious propaganda. Thus the New York Times, writing of the Los Angeles project on last June 8, reported, under the headline "Vast Building Plan Is Set in Slum" that "the 9,000 present residents of the hill will be resettled, virtually all the buildings in the 22-block area razed, and the tract relandscaped and rebuilt to accommodate 6,000 to 8,000 residents in style. What will become of the people who live in the firetraps and rabbit warrens atop the hill is an unsettled question. The redevelopment will be on somewhat a luxury basis, with apartments renting upward from $50 a room a month.

It must be unpleasant indeed to be the head of a family, worrying about where to find a roof to shelter wife and children, only to be informed that his fate is an unsettled question. Tearing down slum buildings may be esthetically satisfying and emotionally soothing but does not, of itself, improve the living conditions of low-income families. On the contrary, it may aggravate their plight.

The basic fact is, that even with Government aid under the FHA program and other forms of assistance, very little of the new housing provided by private speculative builders is within the means of even a family of average income. Obviously none of it is within the means of families in the lowest income groups, those who, of necessity, are compelled to live in slum areas.

About one-quarter of the families in the United States can afford to buy the cheapest new three-bedroom houses available at the end of 1957. Three-bedroom apartments are even scarcer and even more expensive than three-bedroom houses. A three-bedroom apartment rents for a minimum of about $110. This condition is true across the Nation. To afford such apartments, a family should have an annual income of not less than $7,000.

The problem of rehousing is essentially a national one that can be solved only on a basis of national financial assistance. WMCA calls again for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Government.

Moreover, WMCA would like to suggest that, just as a would-be automobile manufacturer in another country comes over here to study what has been done so successfully in Detroit, or physicians and surgeons come to New York City study the best in medical science, so officials in charge of our urban redevelopment and rehousing program might well study what has been done successfully abroad—especially in England and in Sweden.

According to Mr. Eric L. Bird, editor of the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, "In Britain new construction generally precedes slum elimination." This, let it be noted, is said of a housing program that has been continued under Conservative and Labor governments, with only minor modifications since 1922. The 2 top years of public housing construction in England were under Conservative governments—in 1928 and 1939.

In Sweden, which hac carried out, in the opinion of qualified observers, the most successful rehousing program anywhere in the world, the philosophy of housing and the pattern followed is similar.

The best of Sweden is represented by Velingby, a new satellite town a few miles outside of Stockholm. It was completed last year. Velingby is not a group of tall apartment houses, huddled together in a few acres. It consists of hundreds of acres, laid out as apartments, individual homes, groups of two-story housing for elderly people, playgrounds, recreational parks, decorative fountains as well as wading pools. There are restaurants, there are bandstands. There are office buildings, where employment will be provided for those who live in the new city. There are sites available for leasing to private concerns, on which factories will be erected, to provide more employment. This is real redevelopment, having as its key a better life for the people of Sweden.

Let it be understood that WMCA has nothing but admiration for the ideals of urban redevelopment and specifically for the Lincoln Square project, which will replace a rundown area of antiquated tenements and superannuated buildings with a cultural center of the greatest city in the world. This is a project in the finest tradition of civic planning.

But slum clearance is not the cause of better housing. It is the result, the end product of a soundly planned rehousing program.

WMCA believes that, before a single building is torn down, subsidized public housing, equal in quantity to the number of families to be evicted and the rentals paid in those buildings must be built to house the tenants. You can put a side of beef in cold storage for a year. You cannot do the same to an American family.

Nearly twenty thousand human beings are being evicted or will be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project. WMCA believes that our immediate and pressing problem is to address ourselves to helping them. Let us not neglect their plight. Let us not forget that rehousing is for people.

Brussels World Fair Opened by Good Will Tour of New York Post 209

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an article that appeared in the July issue of the American Legion magazine, entitled "Brussels World Fair Opened by Goodwill Tour of New York Post 209."

Members of Advertising Men's Post, No. 209, of the American Legion, in New York City, and members of their families, made a goodwill tour of Europe and were the first group of Americans to visit the Brussels Fair.

The story follows:

BRUSSELS WORLD FAIR OPENED BY GOODWILL TOUR OF NEW YORK POST 209

Forty members of Advertising Men's Post 209, American Legion, New York City, and 34 members of their families, returned to

New York May 4 after a 21-day goodwill tour of Europe, on which they were hailed as the first party of Americans to visit the Brussels Universal and International Exhibit, 1958.

In addition, the 74-member touring Legion group contacted leading citizens, businessmen and government officials in France, Belgium, England, and Italy on unofficial goodwill errands at the request of People-to-People, Inc.

Traveling entirely at their own expense, the New York Legionnaires, carried scrolls and gifts from several United States organizations which they bestowed upon European dignitaries.

The Legion party participated as the only American citizen group on hand at the official opening of the Brussels Fair grounds by King Baudouin of Belgium.

Then, as American dignitaries opened the United States pavilion, they presented to it the official New York State flag on behalf of Governor Harriman.

The party presented gifts of portable typewriters to Pope Pius XII; to Msgr. John P. Abbing, head of Italy's nine boys' towns for homeless Italian youth; and to Commander Richard Colville, press secretary to Queen Elizabeth of England.

Heading the party were Post Commander Thaine Engle, manager of broadcast promotion, National Broadcasting Co.; Post Vice Commander and Tour Committee Chairman Gould Kardashian, assistant vice president Chase Manhattan Bank of New York; and Tour Committee Vice Chairman Louis Weintraub, head of the New York public relations firm of Louis Weintraub Associates.

In Brussels, where the party was greeted on its arrival by the color guard of Antwerp Post 1, Post Member Lyman G. Bloomingdale presented a scroll to the Brussels Crippled Children's Institute in the name of Just One Break, Inc., New York organization to aid the handicapped whose program is strongly backed by post 209.

The Ford Motor Co. tendered a reception for the group at the Royal Automobile Club in Brussels, to which it invited leading Belgians with the same occupations as members of the Legion party. The members spent a pleasant evening of shoptalk comparing notes with their Belgian professional counterparts.

Post Commander Engle reported that European radio and TV men were exceptionally curious about American broadcasting and envied America's nongovernment broadcasters their great freedom.

Earlier, in Paris, post members had been entertained by Paris Post 1 while their wives visited the Christian Dior fashion salon.

The French Government arranged a tour of Sorbonne University, and an official reception was given the group by the president of the City Council of Paris.

En route to London, the boat train was crowded with 1,300 British schoolchildren returning from a holiday in Germany. The Legion group contacted the teachers and had several hundred of the children in their compartments for the trip, with whom they swapped notes all the way to London.

In London, insurance men in the group paid a people-to-people visit to Lloyds of London, while Kardashian and Weintraub went to Buckingham Palace to give Commander Colville his typewriter, a gift of the American Public Relations Association.

The first Friday in Rome was a full holiday—Liberation Day—in observance of the initial landing of United States troops in Italy in World War II.

The Post members laid a wreath on the tomb of the Italian Unknown Soldier and were received by the mayor of Rome.

The leaders of the group dined with Commander Borré of the American Legion Department of Italy and Department Adjutant Carmine Casolini.

The entire group had an audience with Pope Pius XII at the Vatican, following which His Holiness personally accepted the gift of a portable typewriter, especially made by employees of the Remington Rand plant in Milan, Italy.

From the Vatican, the Legionnaires went directly to an audience with Italy's President Gronchi, to whom Karadashian presented a 1922 United States Peace silver dollar as a token of the Legion's hopes for peace.

The Italian President extended the interview, shook hands with all 74 of the party, inquired into the occupation of all of them and told them that striped pants diplomacy is all right, but the people-to-people idea, as epitomized by the traveling Legionnaires, was even more important.

Fifty Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, here is the dramatic and absorbing story of the pulp and paper industry's rise to maturity in the South—the story of men, places, and events historians on some day in the future will forge into milestones. Fifty Years of Progress is taken from the Forest Farmer of July 1958:

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS

(By Frank Heyward, Jr., director of public relations, Gaylord Container Corp. division, Crown Zellerbach Corp.)

The expansion of the southern pulp and paper industry the past 20 years has been one of the highlights of the industrial development of the Nation. Only a comparatively few years ago, the manufacture of pulp and paper was of minor importance to the South's economy. Today, this region manufactures more wood pulp than all other regions in the Nation combined.

Prior to 1925, the southern pulp and paper industry consisted of 18 to 20 small mills widely scattered from Virginia to Louisiana. About one-third of these mills was located in the hills and mountains of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee where they manufactured board from blight-killed chestnut. Only nine mills operated on pine wood. The combined output of the pine consuming mills was far less than that of any of the larger type present day kraft mills.

In 1936 the South's daily pulp production was only slightly more than 5,000 tons; by 1946 it was 16,000 tons; and by 1958 it had become 39,600 tons. Four mills now under construction will increase the daily capacity to well over 41,000 tons.

Probably the first successful effort to manufacture paper from southern pine took place in 1878 at the Marietta Paper Manufacturing Co., near Atlanta, Ga. This paper was made from shortleaf and loblolly pine groundwood with a mixture of rags.

The first continuous production of pulp from southern pine was begun in 1891 by the Carolina Fibre Co., now Sonoco Products Co., of Hartsville, S. C. The mill began on groundwood and soon changed to sulfite. The Covington, Va., mill of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. began its operation in 1900 on spruce and soft hardwoods. By the mid-1920's, pine sulfate pulp had practically replaced spruce sulfite.

The Champion Paper & Fibre Co.'s, Camden, N. C., mill was built in 1907. The first pulp was made from chestnut and other hardwoods. Later sulfite pulp was manufactured from spruce and hemlock. Champion, realizing the limited supply of readily available spruce and hemlock, was one of the pioneers in research on the manufacture of sulfate pulp from pine wood. As a result, when this company's bleached sulfate mill began production at Pasadena, Tex., in 1938, the result was white papers of highest quality from pine.

The sulfate process had its inception in the South on a commercial basis when the Halifax Paper Co., of Roanoke Rapids, N. C., blew its first digester on February 26, 1909. This operation was followed by one of the Yellow Pine Paper Mill Co., of Orange, Tex., in 1911, where E. H. Mayo changed an unsuccessful soda process to successful kraft production. Mayo is generally credited as being the man most responsible for the successful development of the pulping of southern pine by the kraft process.

In 1913, the Southern Paper Co., of Moss Point, Miss., began operations. At the time the company was organized, there was still much skepticism as regards successful pulping of southern pine. Efforts to finance the company in this country proved futile. Successful financing was completed with British capital only after both bleached and unbleached kraft paper was made from southern pine pulp manufactured in Sweden.

After early difficulties, the company employed Mayo as general manager and immediately began making a satisfactory kraft sheet. In 1928, this mill was bought by International Paper Co. Mayo's technical knowledge was fully utilized by International in the operation of its early mills. In the mid-1930's, he became a consultant and supervised pulp operations when Union Bag came into production at Savannah—and later when the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. began operations at Cantonment.

Other early southern mills, all of which made kraft pulp from pine, and the dates of their first operations are: Chesapeake Corp., West Point, Va.; Bogalusa Paper Co., now Gaylord Division of Crown Zellerbach Corp., Bogalusa, La., 1918; Kansas City Fiber Box Co., now International Paper Co., Bastrop, La., 1921; Hummel-Ross Fibre Corp., now Continental Can Co., Hopewell, Va., 1922; and Brown Paper Mill, now Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., Monroe, La., 1924.

An individual whose name is closely connected with the early southern paper industry is the late R. J. Cullen, of International. Cullen made his start with the Louisiana Fiberboard Co. at Bogalusa. This venture proved unsuccessful and the mill closed. In 1919 he became general superintendent of the Bogalusa Paper Co. Shortly afterward, he built the Kansas City Fiber Box Co. mill at Bastrop, La. Cullen soon enlarged the original mill and then promoted and built a second, the Louisiana Pulp & Paper Co., also in Bastrop. After selling the two Bastrop mills to International, Cullen joined the company and became president of Southern International Pulp & Paper Co. International's Camden, Ark., mill was built in 1928 under Cullen's leadership, the Mobile mill in 1929, and Panama City mill in 1931.

Another rugged individual who contributed greatly to the development of the South's pulp and paper industry was the late J. H. Allen. A successful lumberman from Arkansas, Allen entered the paper industry as a lieutenant of his close friend, R. J. Cullen. He played an important part in establishing International's mills at Camden, Mobile, and Panama City, and later Union Bag at Savannah. He finally organized and built his own mill, the Florida Pulp & Paper Co., now St. Regis, at Cantonment, Fla.

Allen's enthusiasm for the potential production of the South's forests knew no

bounds. His favorite thesis was, if a profitable market for timber is established, people will grow trees. The high level of tree farming in the South today attests the truth of this belief. It was indeed fitting that Jim Allen was chosen as the first president of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association when it was organized in 1939.

The spectacular expansion of the South's paper industry may be attributed to the nationwide increase in per capita consumption of paper and also to the success of southern pipe pulpwood as a raw material for kraft products. Per capita consumption of paper in the United States was 58 pounds in 1899, 282 pounds in 1945, and 435 pounds in 1957. Although paper manufacturing increased tremendously on a nationwide basis, the rate of increase for the South was even more rapid. Chief reason was the fine grades of bleached and unbleached sulphate pulp used largely for container board.

It was inevitable that the paper industry would ultimately make its greatest development in the South with its tremendous timber resources. However, two events hastened the day. The first of these was the forest survey made by the United States Forest Service. This project, begun in the early 1930's, was the first truly authoritative report on the South's forests. The survey reported not only the quantity of timber by species but also the industrial use, mortality, growth, and most important of all, occurrence. From the survey reports, therefore, paper companies interested in possible expansion were able to pinpoint the timber supply by survey unit, of which there were about five per State.

The second important event to influence the paper industry was a slight, elderly man with the fire of genius and the ardor of a crusader. This was Dr. Charles H. Herty, already well known to the naval stores industry because of his work on gum production soon after the turn of the 20th century, and in the field of industrial chemistry because of his work with the dye industry in Germany after World War I as a Government representative.

In 1927, Herty visited the 86,000-acre naval stores operation of Alex Sessoms in southeast Georgia. Where forest fires had been excluded, slash pine had reproduced in incredible numbers. Herty was greatly impressed and wrote of his visit to the Sessoms property as follows, "A problem remains to be solved, and that is the utilization of the thinnings, which are of a size for the production of wood pulp. This is a question of transportation and of research, whose successful outcome may have tremendous economic importance, not only to the South, but to the constantly increasing number of industries throughout the country dependent upon wood pulp as raw material."

It was generally supposed at that time that the pines used as a source of naval stores would be too resinous to be used for pulp. To throw light on this point, Herty sought the cooperation of the Hercules Powder Co. of Brunswick, Ga. There sawdust made from slash pines was analyzed for resin content. The sawdust was specially prepared by Alex Sessoms for Dr. Herty. To Herty's amazement and delight, a resin content of only 1.38 percent was found. This indicated that the sapwood of slash pine was much lower in resin than the heartwood. And, as the young pines did not show heartwood formation until 10 to 12 inches in diameter or larger, Herty concluded that resin would not be a great problem in pulping young pines thinned when of small size.

Further cooperation, this time with the Castanea Paper Co. of Johnsonburg, Pa., revealed that young slash pine was readily reduced to a light colored pulp by the sulphite process. Furthermore, this pulp was easily bleached.

Still further preliminary work was conducted by Herty through the help of the Carolina Fiber Co., of Hartsville, S. C. This company prepared ground wood pulp of good color from young slash pine.

This was enough for Herty. He began at once to seek means of establishing a research laboratory. He met success at Savannah, Ga., where the city made available to him an old warehouse with power, steam, and water provided free.

From the beginning of his first research, Herty stated that his purpose was to adopt standard pulping methods to southern woods. Many times he pointed out that there was no so-called Herty process, and many times more he pointed out that his laboratory had never engaged in work on the pulping of southern woods by the sulphate process.

When Dr. Herty produced good groundwood pulp from southern pines and hardwoods, the press sensed the possibility of something sensational. Shortly afterward, the announcement of the production of newsprint from 7-year-old planted pines made headlines in some of the largest papers in the Nation. In its enthusiasm the press credited Herty with work he neither performed nor claimed, especially research pertaining to the sulphate process. He tried to point this out but the confusion persisted. The press recognized no distinction between mechanical, sulphite, and sulphate processes. Pulp was simply pulp.

In one attempt to clarify the situation Dr. Herter stated: "In the early part of the century soda pulp was prepared from these pines. In 1911, though it was held by the industry in the North that it would be impossible to make sulphate from southern pine, Mr. Ed Mayo successfully did so at Orange, Tex."

The occasion of this statement was the 73d convention of the Electrochemical Society, Inc., at Savannah in 1938.

With respect to research accomplishments on the sulphate process credited to him by the press, Dr. Herty wrote as follows to the editor of Science magazine, "This is an error which has frequently been made in recent weeks, particularly by correspondents of the daily newspapers not familiar with the history of the manufacture of pulp and paper. * * * For instance, in its account of the Fernandina celebration about a month ago, the New York Times correspondent stated that I was the discoverer of the process for making kraft pulp and paper. * * *

"Let me say that the kraft pulp and paper industry has been in existence in the South for the last 27 years.

"The man who was responsible for that development is a man living and working here in Savannah, namely Ed Mayo, who was a pioneer in the field and who struggled with those same difficulties, prejudices, and skepticism which we have been going through in trying to start the newsprint industry from pine in the Southern States."

Herty made countless speeches pointing out that only forest fires could prevent the development of a newsprint industry in the South. He stated that if the fire scourge were eliminated, the region could and would grow enormous quantities of fiber which would be irresistible to a greatly expanded pulp and paper industry.

Although Dr. Herty's researches were confined to the mechanical and sulphite processes, there is no doubt that his crusade in behalf of the making of newsprint from Southern woods made a great impression on kraft pulp manufacturers. They, too, were equally interested in the benefits and advantages of Southern forests which he publicized so effectively.

When Dr. Herty died in 1939, it was with the realization that his work had borne fruit. Because at that time Southland Paper Mills, at a mill site in Texas named Herty in his honor, was under construction. This was the first mill to produce newsprint commercially from Southern pine.

Rounding out the Southern pulp industry are wallboard mills of Flintkote, United States Gypsum, Celotex, National Gypsum, Johns-Mansville, and Masonite, dissolving pulp mills of Rayonier and International, and the cigarette paper mill of Ecusta Paper Corp. at Pisgah, N. C.

Lastly, the most recent unit of the South's pulp industry is the bagasse mill of the Valentine Pulp & Paper Co., of Lockport, La. This mill manufactures newsprint and high grade white papers from sugar cane fiber. This source of fiber was used in 1898 at Braithwaite, La., by a mill which operated at intervals until purchased in 1915 by E–Z Opener Co. In 1931 most of the equipment was moved to Tuscaloosa by Gulf States Paper Corp.

Although the pulp and paper industry has made spectacular development the past 25 years, its future appears equally bright. Recognizing that a permanent supply of fiber is basic to its operation, the industry is engaged in the most comprehensive forestry program ever undertaken in this country. Not only does it employ the most modern forestry practices in administering its 18½ million acres of fee land, but it supports a conservation association whose objective is to show the other fellow how to grow a tree crop. As a result, the industry faces the future with confidence, secure in the belief that through up-to-date tree farming practices its raw material supply will present a firm base for an even greater future expansion.

Bricks Without Straw

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, some years ago I had occasion to read the transcripts of the proceedings of the House of Representatives, beginning with the 1st session of the 60th Congress down to date. I read, or at least turned, every page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from 1907 down through the current session. It was interesting to note, incidentally, that the quotation most frequently cited by the Members of the House in their speeches here on the floor during those years was a stanza from Goldsmith's Deserted Village:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

The last time I was in Europe, in every country we visited I insisted on going out into the country and seeing "the bold

peasantry, their country's pride" and of observing their farming methods. And I was inexpressively shocked by what I saw.

I was astonished to find in Germany, a country which has produced the greatest physicians, the greatest painters, the greatest musicians the greatest scientists, the greatest poets, as we traveled down Hitler's great autobon, a people so different, so unprivileged that they seemed to be of a different nationality. They were farming with hoes and plows pulled by oxen. Only three tractors were seen in that entire trip through the empire.

We found likewise, in rural France, in Turkey, in Greece, even in democratic England, an entirely different people from those found in the cities, a peasantry, of such lower social, economic and cultural status as to seem to belong to a different era.

When I came back home—and I never appreciated our country, our Government, our way of life, so much as when I stepped off the ship at New York—when I got back home, and Ida and I, returning from a meeting, would drive at night along the paved highways that led even to the remotest countryside, we could see the REA electric lights gleaming from every farmstead, the antennas of television sets, the comfortable homes with running water and central heat, the evidences of limed soils and terraced fields and tractors and landscaped lawns. And what was so much more important, an intelligent, progressive, cultured farm people.

We do not have the counterpart of European peasants in America. We are a homogeneous people. Unlike any other country in the world, there is no line of demarcation between our urban and rural populations. Wherever you meet them in the city or the village or the country they are identical in dress and speech and culture. We are all Americans.

But two nationwide influences have been in effect the last few years here in America, one, the organization of the workers of America, and the other, the concentration of wealth and financial power in industry and commerce. Both are profoundly affecting our national economy and both are in effect driving a line of cleavage which sets the farmer apart and which if continued will eventually and inevitably reduce him to a position of economic inferiority. Both have attained their advantageous positions through legislation enacted by Congress and signed by the President. Labor laws, immigration laws, wage and hour laws, collective bargaining and similar legislation enacted by the Congress have placed organized labor in a commanding position where he dictates wages, hours, and conditions of labor.

Tariff laws, tax, banking, commerce, trade, rate, marketing, and other legislation establish corresponding advantages and controls on the other side. But the farmer has been denied legislation which would give him a voice, either in fixing the amount of his own wages or prices, or in the market in which he must buy his own necessities. He is not allowed to have anything to say about the price of what he sells or what he buys. That road leads eventually to peasantry and peonage.

Great men, leading great movements—Gompers, Green, Lewis, Murray, Tobin, Reuther, Meany, and their associates and successors—organized the workers of America.

Under that movement we have divided and distributed the wealth of America. Formerly the prosperity of the country was monopolized by a few men at the top. Great fortunes were built up. But the man at the bottom, the worker whose labor created that prosperity had little part in the enjoyment of the wealth he created. Unionization has equalized incomes and has brought the worker a fair share of the national income and national prosperity.

All except the farmer.

While the wage of every worker in the Nation has gone up continuously since the close of the World War, the farmer's income has been almost as consistently down.

When I first came to the House, there was not a labor union in the district from which I came. It was an agricultural district and not a community was to be influenced by a vote for labor in the House. But it seemed to me that agriculture and labor had a common cause. Both were preyed upon by the same predatory interests and obviously they should work together. For that reason I have consistently supported labor legislation, beginning with the first Wagner bill and have never cast a vote that was not friendly to labor in the years in which labor was slowly building support in the House and in the country.

But the favor has not always been returned. And while labor has forged ahead agriculture has lagged behind and on a rollcall vote last week the labor vote in the House refused even to consider a farm bill.

Commentators in the newspapers referred to it as a smashing victory for Secretary Benson, but of course Secretary Benson had nothing whatever to do with it. A farm reporting agency briefly and accurately sums up the situation as follows:

> The balance of power that decided the outcome was the group of 90 city Democrats who voted against the bill. They voted their resentment against southerners who had opposed labor law liberalization, and racial integration.

None of the 90 cared anything about Benson or were influenced by him in the slightest. None of them had any affiliation with any farm organization. It was merely pique on a matter wholly unrelated to the farm bill. But they overlooked obligations that should have been regarded. And because I have voted for labor on more rollcalls than any one of the 90 Members who defeated the farm bill, I feel free to remind them of that obligation.

The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, announces this morning that the farmer's income has increased 22 percent in the last year. Of course such a statement is entirely misleading. The 7 years drought which depleted all herds in the Southwest, and the successive freezes in the fruit and vegetable areas, bring about purely temporary advances in prices—all of which the Department of Agriculture itself takes care to tell you will decline next year when normal conditions are resumed. The truth about the matter is that slowly but surely the farmer is being starved out. The proof is—and even the Department of Agriculture will not deny it—that the farmers are leaving the farm by the millions. That is a complete answer to all the hypocritical statements based on juggled bookkeeping they can make.

The first half of 1958 realized farm net income was $12,300,000,000; the total farm net income $13,100,000,000. Whichever way you measure it there has been a drop of from $1 billion to $2 billion on an annual basis in farm families' net incomes from farming during Secretary Benson's tenure in office. The cumulative loss of income on American farms since he took office has totaled almost $18 billion. The remarkable thing is that while the farmers' income has decreased $18 billion, the cost of running Mr. Benson's Department of Agriculture has increased from $1 billion to more than $5 billion a year.

Over the same period of time since Secretary Benson has been in office, the prices received by the farmers dropped from a 1952 average index of 288 to an index of 255 in June 1958.

The parity ratio dropped from 100 percent in 1952 to 84 percent in June 1958. That is bringing it down to date.

The prices paid by the farmer went up from an index figure of 287 in 1952 to an index of 305 in June 1958. It was less than one-third of 1 percent below the historic high in April 1958. There is no wonder that farm income is lower now than when Secretary Benson took office, no wonder that we have 600,000 fewer farmers now than when he took over and put the sliding scale into operation.

Then, now, upon what basis does the Secretary make his statement? Of course there has been an increase in the price of livestock. There has been an increase in the price of fruits and vegetables. Not to the extent that he would have you believe, because he counts in not only the farm income but also the money the farmer makes off the farm. Life on the farm has become so precarious and so unremunerative that the farmer and his wife have to go off the farm and get a job outside to keep the farm going.

Why has the cost of cattle and hogs gone up? Has it been on account of anything Mr. Benson did or the Department of Agriculture did? Four or five unseasonal frosts in the South have reduced the supply of fruits and vegetables and of course raised the price of what they did produce.

We have had 7 years of drought in the Southwest—Texas, Oklahoma, and neighboring States—which have forced the farmer to liquidate his herds.

This year, for the first time, we have had abundant rains and all over the country men are seeking to rehabilitate their breeding herds, and cattle are at

a premium. That, and that alone, has increased the price of cattle and hogs, because the two go together. And, mark you, Mr. Chairman, it will not continue. The Department of Agriculture itself predicts that next year prices will drop. When we get our herds filled, when we start marketing again in the livestock sections, when the abnormal demand ceases, the farmer will still be receiving less and paying more.

So the Secretary of Agriculture has done nothing for the farmer, and we are doing nothing for the farmer except to live at his expense. What sort of moral code is it, to live at the expense of another man through a process that will take away from him the products of his toil, his sweat, and his investment, and not give him a fair price for it, especially at a time when we are getting the biggest price for our labor ever known in this country or any time in history.

Let us also remember that a very large part of the increase from 1957 to the first half of 1958 is a result of a $700 million a year rate of acreage reserve payments this year under the Soil Bank program. There is another thing that is temporary. Let us remember that Secretary Benson will not be paying out any acreage reserve money next year.

But even with this in mind look at 1958 as against the year before the Benson program was inaugurated. These statistics, remember, are taken from the Department of Agriculture report:

1. Parity ratio is down 16 percent.

2. Prices received by the farmers are down 7 percent.

3. Prices paid by the farmer are up 6 percent.

4. Retail prices of food are up 6 percent.

5. Prices received by farmers for food commodities are down 7 percent.

6. Purchasing power of farm net income is down 14 percent.

7. The number of farms in the United States is down 600,000; 600,000 farm families have been starved off of the farms.

That in itself is the final and decisive criterion by which this Department should be judged. Something is radically and drastically wrong when 600,000 farm families are driven from the farm because a farm family never deserts the farm as long as they can exist there. They love the land and they never leave the land except as a last resort.

8. Mr. Chairman, Government expenditures for the Department of Agriculture are up 500 percent. I do not know what the extra 400 percent is for, but, certainly, whatever they are paying them for is not for anything they are doing for the American farmer.

9. Government expenditures for farm income stabilization is up more than 1,000 percent, but they have not stabilized anything.

Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the House, and I would especially like to plead with the 90 Members of the House who voted down the farm bill, who denied us even the chance to debate it, to amend it or to change it or discuss it, the opportunity to meet your views on this vital matter. You who voted to deny the farmer even the chance to be heard, to present his cause when starvation stared him in the face.

You who would not give him his day in court. Is that American?

Why did you deny the farmer the right to be heard, to take his case to the jury? Because you were afraid it would increase the price of food in the cities, increase the price of food to your constituents? Your constituents get more and better food for an hour's labor than ever before.

But let us take it categorically:

First. Your constituents work 5 days a week, but the farmer works 7 days a week.

Second. Your constituents, for whom you denied the farmer the right to be heard, works 8 hours a day, but the farmer gets up while it is still so dark he has to light a lantern, and he comes in to supper long after sundown. And, he is out in the night at lambing time and farrowing time and when predatory beasts threaten his flocks. Your constituents, for whom you deny the farmer a fair price, do not have to make sacrifices like that.

Third. And, your constituent is the worker for the family.

Nobody else in the family works. But, out there on the farm every child works from the time it can walk. You have child labor laws in the cities, but you do not have them on the farm. You have anti-sweat-shop legislation which protects the women against sweatshops in the cities, but they work constantly on the farm. And, if it were not for the work of these women and children you would not have the food you get. You not only deny the worker his wage but you deny his wife and children the pitiful price of child and sweatshop labor.

In the city the wife of your constituent has time for the social life in the community. She can attend pink teas, go to the afternoon theater, or she may get a job and double the family income.

And in that connection I include without comment a letter to the Washington Post printed on the editorial page:

WORKING WIVES

There are many husband-and-wife teams working throughout the Nation, due to the fact that these wives are so eager to forsake their family and home responsibilities in favor of the business world. I suggest that the Government solve the unemployment problem by making it compulsory for the husband to resign his job, thereby letting the little woman bring home the money.

It is these avaricious married women who crave the extra luxuries of life that are responsible for the huge unemployment figure. If married women, and I would like to make this clear, who have husbands earning sufficient incomes to support them in comfortable circumstances, stayed home where they rightfully belong and tended their children, the way they should be cared for, we would have less juvenile delinquency and plenty of jobs for heads of families and others who are in dire circumstances due to the recession.

RICHARD A. VEEVERS,
Houston, Tex.

Fourth. Your constituent works largely in steam-heated rooms in the winter and often in air-conditioned shops in the summer. But, the farmer works out under the sun in the blistering days of summer and in the frost and cold of winter, in the rain and in the snow and in the storm when the stock and the poultry must be cared for and the smudge pots must be put out when the temperature drops. Have you considered that when you would not let them bring the farmer's wage here to the floor?

Fifth. And, your constituent can get an insurance policy to protect him and his family, but the farmer's occupation is so hazardous that he cannot get standard accident insurance. I applied for an accident policy some years ago, and when they asked me what my occupation was I said I was a farmer, and they regretfully returned my application and said they were not insuring farmers against accidents; that the business was too hazardous. Then I sent it back and I wrote that I was a Congressman. Right away they sent me a policy. You know, we get shot at once in a while, but even at that our occupation is not as hazardous as that of the farmer. Of course, I subscribe to many country papers, and there is hardly a week some paper does not carry an account of a farmer getting his arm torn off by a farm machine, or of an instance in which a tractor rolled over on him and he died there slowly after long hours of waiting.

The insurance companies will not insure him. They will insure your constituent in his steam-heated room and air-conditioned shop where he is earning many times what the farmer gets. But you will not let the farmer, with 1 arm off, or 1 leg off, even talk about what wage he ought to receive for his toil and sacrifice.

Sixth. Your constituent lives in the city with every convenience about him. You have gas, water, electricity, heat, schools, churches, theaters, service stations for his car, shops and streets and transportation, all within a few steps. The farmer and his family must live an isolated life, frequently in remote sections where, according to statistics, a disproportionate number of farm women are sent to the insane asylum every year. Would you be surprised at that? But you will not give us a chance to pay her a living wage for the food she helps put on your table.

Seventh. You have the privilege of collective bargaining.

If an employer in any shop here in Washington called a member of the union and tried to bargain with him on the amount of his wages, he would be laughed at. You do not dicker about the amount of your wages. That is all fixed under a law passed by Congress. But the farmer does not have any voice whatever in fixing the amount of his wages, in fixing the price of his products, in fixing the rate of return on his investment. He is not allowed to have anything to say about it. He drives up to the market with his cornucopia of plenty for your table and he asks, "What are you paying today?" And no matter what they are paying, and although it

may be below cost of production, he takes it, and there is no shop steward or walking delegate to appeal to.

Then when he gets his pitiful little check, he goes across the street to buy the necessities of life. And he asks, "What is the price?" And no matter what the price is, he pays it or he does not get the goods. He pays the other man's price. I ask you, what business could survive under conditions like that, where the consumer fixes the price of the farmer's labor and also fixes the price of the necessities which he must buy? It cannot be done. And yet you would not even let us talk about his wage on the floor of the House.

Eighth. Even such inadequate wages as he receives are uncertain and subject to change without notice. The price of hogs, eggs and butter, for example, vary from day to day over a wide range. He never knows when he plants a crop what he is going to get for it. He never knows when he farrows his pigs what they will bring him. It is all a gamble. Some other fellow has the say-so. And still he serves you better, and more faithfully than anybody serves you in either your business, your industrial operations or your home life.

He must buy machinery and seed and fertilizer and insecticide. He must make commitments and sign notes at the bank. But before harvest, farm prices may drop so drastically that he will be left holding the bag. He has to take a risk your constituent is never called on to take. But you kick out his bill before the Clerk can even read the title to the House.

Ninth. And remember that the farmer must have ample capital. It costs money to be a farmer. Farming is a big investment. Any farm anywhere of any kind would cost from $15,000 to $35,000. Of course a good farm would cost $150,000. But he has to have from $15,000 to $35,000 even to get the farm. Then on top of that he has to have a minimum of $5,000 for machinery. The day has gone by when you could hire labor. You cannot get anybody to work for wages on the farm, you have to do it by machinery.

But still you do not let the farmer have anything to say about the income on that investment. Every man who owns stocks and bonds has to have his dividends. On his notes he has to have his interest; but not the farmer. He must have a farm. He must have machinery. Then he must have livestock. And you will not even talk here on the floor about letting him have anything at all on his investment, on all that amount required to start farming.

What does your constituent have to have? He has to have a pair of overalls and a wristwatch to be sure he does not work overtime. Still you legislate for him and let him fix his wage. But the farmer, who has to have all this investment does not get a chance to be heard.

Tenth. Here is another very interesting thing. When payday comes around, your constituent walks up to the window and gets his check, or he gets cash in hand. He would be surprised indeed if he went to the window and they said, "There is no check here for you."

But the farmer can work all summer long, in the heat and in the rain, and make every sacrifice, and when the time comes for him to get his paycheck and he goes up to the window they say, "Why, there is no paycheck here for you. Don't you remember we had a drought, we had a flood, we had the boll weevil. No check here for you."

Americans love fair play. We do not like to see a fellow kick the underdog, but we do not object to kicking the underfarmer who feeds us.

Ezra Taft Benson flaunts an honored name. But, he is unworthy of that name. He has brought reproach upon the name of a family honored for the great service it has rendered the Nation and all mankind. Ezra Taft Benson is evil personified. He has brought more tears to the sunburned cheeks of American farm women than any man in American history. He has denied proper food and adequate clothing and equal school advantages to more farm children than any man who ever sat in Washington. He has implemented the greed of corporations which have grown fat on the unrewarded toil of countless men, women, and children. He has brought heartbreak to young couples working from morning starlight until evening darkness 7 days a week in a hopeless effort to start life on the farm. He has denied medicine and hospitalization to the men who toil and sweat in the blistering summer sun and freeze in the frost and chill of the winter day desperately trying to make enough to pay interest and taxes. He has denied them the pitiful proceeds of beneficial crops and well-tended herds. No man in the annals of the American Republic has deliberately brought such undeserved suffering and unjust wages for backbreaking labor and has inflicted greater deprivation on children doing men's work, and enduring privation at a period of life when it stunts both mental and physical growth as that pliant tool of predatory wealth and oppression, Ezra Taft Benson. He has destroyed the small farm family, the wellspring from which through generations has flowed the wholesome stream of men and women reared far from the slums and teeming hotbeds of social vices and isms in the city. He has driven uncounted thousands of families from the farm tilled by their fathers for generations.

No such migration has cursed any people since Israel, condemned to make bricks without straw, fled from a kindred spirit and oppressor in ancient Egypt. He has done more than that. He has done worse than that. He has deliberately set class against class. He has engendered a prejudice on the part of the city consumer against the farmer.

Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, in its last issue, quotes a retired Iowa farmer as saying he is disturbed by the public's bitter attitude toward the farmer. He says the farmer is being blamed for everything from the recession to the high cost of living.

Ezra Taft Benson has deliberately fostered that idea. His strategy is to divide and conquer. He not only prejudices class against class, and consumer against producer, but he cleverly sets commodity against commodity.

And in that connection, the day has gone by when a bill for 1 crop or 2 or 3 crops can be brought to the floor and the growers of other commodities left to bring in a separate bill, or as usually results, left without legislation.

Cotton, for example, has had more legislation and more administrative consideration over the years than all other agricultural products combined. Missouri produces more cotton per acre than any State in the Union. I have supported and voted for every cotton bill passed by the House in the last quarter of a century. I recall vividly the opening days of the First World War. I sat on the platform beside Speaker Clark when a bill was brought in to put a ceiling on the price of wheat. In some surprise, I said: "Why, Mr. Speaker, why don't they include cotton? Cotton is just as essential to winning the war as wheat." Looking straight ahead the Speaker answered: "The cotton boys are too strong for us."

Mr. Chairman, I am through voting for any bill providing relief for any one or two commodities. Any fair bill must include all agricultural commodities. All for one and one for all. And for the first time in my life I must vote against any cotton bill that comes out on the floor without provision for all other farm products. We are through with divide and conquer. It is a device by which farmers are being driven off the farm, region by region.

In the first 6 months of this year farm employment averaged 5,580,000 compared with 5,729,000 a year ago. The last census report said that all of the 300,000 decline in 1957 was accounted for by self-employed farmers and their underpaid farm helpers.

We are giving no heed to the destruction of the small farm. But all great men of every city—lawyers, doctors, engineers, artisans, merchants and others—have come from the farm. The last two Presidents came from mortgaged farms out in the Central West. The city does not support itself in population. Left alone the city would die. It would perish physically and spiritually, were it not consistently fed by this constant influx of fine men and women who have been reared out on the farm under the sky and with their feet on the ground by devout mothers and fathers. You never saw a red flag above a farmhouse.

There is another significant trend. Many of those left on the farm are either too old for employment or too young to be employed. The recent explosive increase in our population has so increased the ranks of the consumer, and the years of hard tillage have so depleted our arable land, through attrition and erosion, that in the near future we will approach the line of subsistence.

Some time in 1970 we are going to pass the mark where there will not be enough land to support the people. You will call on the farmer and he will not be there. You cannot educate a farmer out of a book or in a college of agriculture.

There is only one way and one place to train a farmer and that is on the farm. A bold peasantry when once destroyed can never be supplied.

Guidance, Counseling, and Testing in the Proposed National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with those parts of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 that deal with guidance, counseling, and testing, as well as the identification and encouragement of able students.

Under the relevant title Federal assistance would be provided to encourage the States to develop and expand programs for the early discovery of student aptitudes, and for the maximum development of these aptitudes through improved counseling and guidance services in the high schools.

I have ample, adequate, and irrefutable evidence to back me up when I say that proper guidance is one of the greatest needs of our educational system. In a sense this type of help is more urgently needed than direct financial assistance to the school and the student. The will to want an education is the most important factor in the achievement of that objective. Moreover, the loss of valuable human resources through lack of full educational development of each student is a subject of serious national concern.

In 1956 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy urged that remedial action be taken to provide—and I quote from the Joint Committee's report—"a stronger program for identifying the ablest students in our high schools at an early age and presenting them with challenging courses to stimulate their minds."

The Joint Committee included guidance and counseling among its major recommendations and suggested the following approach which might assist in meeting this requirement:

Early identification of potentially ablest students: At present only 4 out of 5 students in the top quarter of their class finish high school. Only 2 out of 5 in the top quarter go on to college. Many with high potential simply do not enroll in college preparatory programs. In order to recoup this loss of potential talent it is proposed that statewide testing start at the 8th or 9th grade level rather than the 12th. This would help insure that the ablest students don't drop out of school and that they take the kind of courses necessary for college entrance.

The importance of guidance and counseling in our increasingly complex society also was emphasized in the second report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School which pointed out:

There is no doubt that talented young people are our most valuable national resource. The loss both in human and in social terms that results from failure to identify, inspire and assist able young people for further education and training is incalculable.

Proper identification of talent requires the skilled use of all the resources that a sound guidance and counseling program in the secondary schools can muster. To be most effective, this process of identification must start early. While each individual as he matures is expected to develop the ability to direct himself toward meaningful life goals, many need much assistance and all need information. Sound guidance and counseling services provide the student with facts about himself and his environment as a basic framework for thinking logically about his goals and relating this thinking to his abilities.

There are many more careers to choose from today than there were 20 years ago, and the number will rise. Yet today's student has no added time to decide, and no prior experience to guide him. He requires continuous, capable assistance as he proceeds through and beyond high school.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report on Education, published last month, also underscored the Nation's need for adequate, effective guidance, counseling, and testing programs to identify and motivate potentially capable students. This need was summarized as follows:

One of the most important goals of any education system is to identify and guide able students and to challenge each student to develop his capacities to the utmost. Tests are most effective in measuring academic aptitude and achievement.

Used with a sound understanding of their strengths and limitations, present testing procedures can contribute significantly to a program of talent identification.

But testing procedures unwisely used can do harm. A few basic considerations must be understood: First, tests are effective on a limited front. Second, no single test should become a basis for important decisions. Third, test scores are one kind of data to be placed alongside other kinds of data.

The identification of talent is no more than the first step. It should be only part of a strong guidance program. As many teachers as possible should be trained to take part in it. As many high schools as possible should have special guidance officers.

The objective of all educational guidance should be to stimulate the individual to make the most of his potentialities. The fact that a substantial fraction of the top quarter of high school students fail to go on to college is a startling indictment of our guidance system.

The general academic capacity of students should be at least tentatively identified by the eighth grade as the result of repeated testings and classroom performance in the elementary grades. An adequate guidance system would insure that each student would then be exposed to the sort of program that will develop to the full the gifts which he possesses.

Our schools have made far more progress in identifying different levels of talent than in the development of programs for these different levels. Adequate attention to individual differences means rejecting a rigid policy of promotion by age; and it means sensible experimentation with various kinds of flexibility in the curriculum to meet the varying needs of young people.

The significance of guidance in a modern education program has been described by many experts in the field. Space permits me to quote only a few of the witnesses who appeared before our committee to urge improved guidance, counseling, and testing throughout the Nation. Mr. Arthur A. Hitchcock, executive secretary of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, outlined the significance of good guidance programs in our schools and pointed out that—

During the past several decades, and more particularly in recent months, many authoritative persons in education, in other professions, in business, and in industry have spoken vigorously of the need for good guidance programs in the schools of this Nation. * * * The last White House Conference on Education pointed up the need for guidance most clearly, and, in nearly half of the State conferences preceding the meeting in Washington, persons not in education stated the necessity for guidance most strongly.

May I cite only one authority, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education for the State of New York. He stated recently, "Guidance is looked upon by laymen, as well as by those in education, as an integral and vital part of the educational process. The education profession and the public have come to expect substantial contributions from guidance in assisting boys and girls toward optimum development, for their own fulfillment and for their economic and social contributions."

Guidance is important in the schools, but its significance goes into the roots of this Nation.

In its recent statement of policy concerning the Nation's human resources problems, the American Personnel and Guidance Association endeavored to point out the significance of good guidance services to the basic values of this Nation in the statement that freedom of choice can "be enriched through the educational process, for persons can grow to the height of their potentialities when (1) they know their potentialities, interest, and values; (2) they have the opportunity to develop them through education; (3) they know about the complex rapidly changing career picture; (4) they are motivated to develop their potentialities and to relate them to the opportunities in our society."

In placing the development of individuals in a democratic society in its setting of freedom to choose one's career, the statement reads:

"This generation has been called upon to make a decision that will shape the destinies of many future generations. At the heart of this decision lies one of this Nation's basic freedoms—freedom of choice."

Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, declared that—

The proper function of these programs is to accomplish something that cannot be done by a scholarship program alone, namely, to identify able students fairly early in their educational years, and to help them to take the courses and develop the plans that will enable them to continue in educational channels to the point where they can make full use of their abilities.

It is literally true that a considerable number of bright children do not know that they are bright, do not think of themselves as profiting from going to college, and do not recognize the opportunities that would be open to them with further education.

Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, pointed out the value of guidance service when he described the results of several well-designed studies as follows:

In an experimental study extending over a period of several years * * * [one researcher] compared the progress and adjustment of a group of students receiving guidance services in a high school with a matched group in the same school receiving no organized guidance. On some points there were distinct differences favoring the experimental group receiving the benefit of guidance services. Only 10 percent of the control group became honor students in high school, while 27 percent of the experimental group made honor grades. There were considerably fewer curriculum changes made by the guided group and after graduation from high school 53 percent of the guided group gained college admission as compared with 35.6 percent of the unguided group.

It is clearly indicated from the testimony that good guidance and counseling programs are a valuable and useful weapon which can be employed effectively to prevent dropouts from school, and to guide students into school programs for which they are best suited.

We must, if we are to reach our maximum strength in the development of our human resources, provide meaningful assistance to improve and expand guidance and counseling programs in our schools. The urgency of the situation is well illustrated by facts recently brought to light by authoritative studies.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School reported that—

There is wide variation from school to school and from State to State in the distribution of counselors, the number of students per counselor, and counselor competence. In 1952 only 4 States had counselors serving at least half-time in 50 percent of more of their high schools, and only 13 had counselors on this basis in more than 25 percent of their schools. The best current estimates indicate the equivalent of 11,000 full-time counselors in the schools against an estimated need for 16,000 to provide minimum service, or 26,000 for recommended services (1 counselor for every 300 pupils). High-school enrollments will be increasing so rapidly during the next several years that the present counselor shortage will increase unless the numbers now enrolled in preparatory programs are greatly increased. The Committee believes that efforts to recruit and train more counselors should be stepped up substantially.

Dr. Derthick in testifying on the need for more and better-trained guidance personnel observed that—

Test results and other cumulative students' data can result in good educational planning by students and their families, only if the facts are properly interpreted and utilized by the students and their parents. Yet it is estimated that not more than one-half of the high-school students in the Nation are provided with the services of a well-rounded counseling program. Contributing to this situation is a severe shortage of qualified guidance personnel.

As might be expected, there is wide variation from school to school and from State to State in the distribution of counseling personnel employed, in the extent of counselor preparation, and in the number of students which each counselor must serve. Altogether the Nation's schools now employ approximately 26,000 counselors, including both full-time and part-time personnel. In terms of full-time equivalents, there are approximately 11,000. The best current estimates put the need at 15,000 additional counselors in the public high schools alone, if these services are to be provided adequately. Yet, in 1956, only about 2,500 graduate degrees were granted by institutions of higher education to serve all levels of education in guidance and personnel work. Also, it is known that not all of these entered education and that there is considerable turnover among counselors in secondary schools.

I think we know that industry, among one of these agencies, is draining off the counselors, having realized their great aid and advantage.

The present yearly supply of adequately prepared counselors is little more than enough to meet current replacement needs.

A total of 41 States employ some personnel charged with counseling and guidance responsibilities. However, the State departments at this time generally are not staffed sufficiently to provide the professional leadership, consultative services, research, and publications which are required to promote the necessary expansion and improvement of guidance services in the local schools. The 41 State programs employ a total of only 63 persons, counting both full-time and part-time personnel, who are responsible for giving professional leadership for these services. A recent survey of the State departments indicated that the difficulty in providing adequate guidance services, at both the State and local levels, is attributed to inadequate financial support for these services.

On the basis of these facts and information it is my opinion the provision for guidance, couseling, and testing in the proposed National Defense Education Act is fully justified.

Under the provision in the bill, $15 million would be authorized for each of 4 years beginning in fiscal 1959 for the purpose of making grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining programs of testing guidance and counseling in public secondary schools. The funds under this program would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative school-age populations. The States would be required to match their allotment dollar for dollar beginning in fiscal 1960.

In addition to this program the bill also provides for an authorization of $6 million for each 4 years beginning in fiscal 1959. The purpose of this is to provide assistance to institutes in guidance and counseling established by colleges and universities, which will conduct summer or regular sessions for the training of persons employed in a public school system who are in a guidance and counseling capacity. This assistance would be in the form of stipends to the guidance personnel in attendance and direct payments to institutions for the cost of such institutes. This program is similar to that of the National Science Foundation institutes for science teachers and is designed especially to encourage professional study in the field of guidance. These provisions, I believe, are urgently necessary to the overall improvement and expansion of guidance services in the Nation's educational system.

Phony Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, some of us, after spending too long a time in the rarefied atmosphere of the city by the Potomac, become disillusioned and fearful that our efforts to inform the public at large about legislation pending before the Senate or the House are doomed to failure.

For 5 days, on the floor of the Senate, I argued against the cries of appeasement and moderation that were characteristic of the arguments advanced in behalf of the Kennedy-Ives bill which has been termed—only by its supporters—as a labor reform bill.

I have never felt that it was a labor reform measure and so stated many times on the floor of the Senate, as well as in the Labor Committee.

It was, at the time of its passage, nothing but a patent attempt to satisfy the need for good labor legislation by a piece of legislative sleight of hand.

I was heartened, therefore, to read an editorial published in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star of Wednesday, July 23, 1958. This editorial, entitled "Labor Bill Is Phony," expresses my sentiments about the bill much better than I can do so myself, and I am particularly happy to note that editors throughout the country have lifted the mask of the Kennedy-Ives bill and disclosed it for what it is—a sheep in wolf's clothing.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BILL IS PHONY

The Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill, passed by the Senate 88 to 1 last month, has been termed "a fraud," "a phony," and "a sweetheart" bill by those who have taken the trouble to study its provisions.

Its drafting was pretty much dominated by union politicians and lobbies. When Republican Senators like KNOWLAND, MUNDT, and GOLDWATER tried to insert into the Senate bill provisions that would have struck at root evils being turned up by the McCLELLAN rackets committee, they were shoved aside. Several provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were actually weakened. And by clever juggling of provisions intended to hit at union racketeering, the bill actually provided legal means of further harassing employers and threatening them with prison when they carried out decent and forward-looking programs of employee relations.

During the writing of this Senate bill, a labor lobbist, former Congressman Biemiller, actually established himself in the Senate Labor Committee's room and gave advice on the altering of authentic reform amendments offered on the floor of the Senate. The bill has been termed in some

circles a "union organizational assistance bill."

This bill is now before the House, where it is proposed to ramrod it through with amendments barred. House Democratic leaders are gambling that election-bent Representatives will be glad to get a labor bill behind them without having to antagonize labor politicians. Because the bill is labeled a labor reform bill, Congressmen can face voters angered by the revelations of labor hoodlumism with this phony bill and say, "We made good." The Democratic leadership is also gambling on the effect of that 88 to 1 vote for the bill in the Senate. But can Republicans forget that the Senate voted the Kennedy-Ives bill on assurance by the Democrats to Senator KNOWLAND that his demands for real reform statute would be encompassed in another labor bill to be put through at this session? Having got the Kennedy-Ives bill through the Senate there was prompt default on that promise.

If Republican Congressmen think they can make any hay with the voters by support of the Kennedy-Ives bill, they are badly mistaken. An effort has been made to give the bill the appearance of an administration measure. But it is glaringly clear that the bill has been evolved by the Democratic majority in Congress to derail an honest effort to come to grips with the racketeering and hoodlumism brought to light by the rackets committee.

The Kennedy-Ives bill, as it is presented to the House, should be defeated, and alert Republicans can defeat it. It is a tricky bill, a hurtful bill. Far better to let this session be in complete default on a labor-reform bill than to accept the phony reforms put into the Kennedy-Ives bill. A fresh start can be made at the next session; and the McClellan hearings as well as the Hoffa threat of setting up a transport-union empire indicate that the country needs something more than a piece of sweetheart legislation whose writing was coached by the labor lobbies and politicians.

The rackets committee had voiced belief that three steps should be taken: put union funds into the class of legal trusts and fiduciaries; permit States to act against racket or recognition picketing in cases where the National Labor Relations Board failed to assert jurisdiction; insure secret ballots by union members of vital union decisions. The provisions were skidded out of the bill by skillful labor manipulations.

The Taft-Hartley Act was meanwhile weakened in several particulars, aimed largely at harassment of employers. The least of these was the compulsion put on employers to sign an anti-Communist oath. The bill changed the Taft-Hartley definition of supervisors to expand the number of workers who could be unionized; it concentrated even more authority in the NLRB; it shortened to 7 days from 30 the required time in which a construction worker must join a union; and it granted to former workers the right to vote in a representation election—a voter, in short, need not be an employee.

But the major blow at management was the requirement that money spent in fostering and improving employee relations in an industry has to be reported to the United States Labor Department if the sum is over $5,000. Failure may be penalized by a $10,000 fine and a year in jail. The bill mouths a phrase about "activities intended to influence or affect employees in the exercise of their right" to organize and bargain. But the wording is intentionally so vague that any employer trying to establish good industrial relations—even installing a pension system—and communicating with workers would have to file details with the Secretary of Labor or go to jail.

Under another section, the same penalty would apply to the employer if it was determined that his pension system, bonuses, hospital benefits, recreation program were designed to influence workers in their right to organize.

The racket hearings have strongly indicated that the country needs a labor-reform bill. But what was produced under lobbyist influence in the Senate, and is now offered on a this-or-nothing basis to the House, is at the opposite pole of what the country demanded. At this late hour in the session there is but one possible course—to vote it down.

Let's have a fair, honest piece of legislation, or none at all.

Plush Office for Lincoln Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an Associated Press dispatch by Robert Novak which appeared in the Illinois State Register, July 16, 1958, concerning the extravagant expenditures of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in equipping their headquarters in the National Archives Building.

I also include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "What Would Mr. Lincoln Say?"

Although I was honored to be appointed by the Speaker as a member of this Commission, I want to make it perfectly clear that I deplore the extravagant amount of money that has been spent on the Commission's office. As this Chicago Tribune editorial says, one of Lincoln's most admirable traits was his simplicity. I wish this characteristic of Lincoln could have been kept in mind by those responsible for this extravagance.

[From the Illinois State Register of July 16, 1958]

LINCOLN COMMISSION EQUIPS PLUSH OFFICE

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—A short term Government Commission has spent more on furnishing and equipping its office than it originally was expected to spend throughout its existence.

The Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, expected last year to use only $10,000 all told in tax money, has spent $15,713 to get its office in shape.

The group, charged with celebrating the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth next year, has used almost all of its initial $37,500 appropriation without starting on its proposed special projects budgets of over $150,000.

The Commission's current spending was disclosed in minutes of a recent meeting by its executive committee.

Those minutes showed the Commission purchased $7,250 worth of furniture from a Washington store without going through the usual Government procedure of competitive bidding.

Congress authorized only $10,000 last year when it created the Commission. But $37,500 have been appropriated to date, and the Commission is asking another $140,000 for the current fiscal year.

The Commission spending of $36,420 so far includes:

Renovating and carpeting the Commission office in the National Archives Building, $4,048.

Furniture for the office, $7,250.

Office equipment $4,415.

Publication of 75,000 copies of a Lincoln Commission handbook, $8,000.

The Commission moved into its offices Tuesday and will leave early in 1960 when the life of the group ends.

The minutes, prepared by assistant executive director John E. Allen, justified purchase of the furniture without competitive bids on grounds it would take 90 to 120 days to obtain Government issue furniture.

As for the expense of placing carpeting over linoleum, Allen wrote:

"Carpeting the office was considered necessary in view of the required dignity of the office."

Allen today told a reporter the Commission doesn't consider the expenses at all out of line.

The minutes of the Commission meeting also indicate the eight-member commission staff may soon begin to experience the Washington phenomenon of perpetual growth.

Bertha Adkins, women's director of the Republican National Committee and the Commission's executive committee chairman, suggested the Commission now should hire an administrative assistant and a press agent.

[From the Illinois State Register of July 22, 1958]

WHAT WOULD MR. LINCOLN SAY?

(Editorial from Chicago Tribune)

Congress last year established the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in the expectation that with $10,000 it could figure out a suitable way of observing the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth—which will be next February 12. For the celebration itself, more money would be made available.

Since then, it now appears, the Commission has been busy establishing itself in a most un-Lincolnlike manner. It has run up bills of $36,420 without even mentioning any celebration, and is asking another $140,000 for the current year. Among its expenses have been $4,048 for redecorating and carpeting its Washington office; $7,250 for furniture, and $4,415 for office equipment. We have not been told whether an electronic calculator has been bought to make sure that 1959 is the correct year.

One of Lincoln's most admirable traits was his simplicity. His life shows us that a man can achieve greatness without squandering money on luxuries. He was amazed when his new stepmother, the former Sarah Johnston, moved into the humble Indiana log cabin with such unheard-of riches as a bureau for her clothes and a chair or so. He wrote the Gettysburg Address on the back of an envelope.

Perhaps the most effective way the Commission can put across its message is to disband, leaving only its office, just as it stands, with a sign saying "Abraham Lincoln was a great man. This is the sort of office he never had."

National Retarded Children's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, with the gentleman

from Connecticut, Congressman MAY, a joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the period from November 16 to November 28, 1958, inclusive, as National Retarded Children's Week. Its purpose is to urge the people of the entire Nation to give their heartfelt support to the appeal for understanding of the National Association for Retarded Children, and its more than 600 member units in every State of the Union, including, of course, my own State of Rhode Island.

We are living in an age of medical miracles. Many devastating diseases have been, to a great degree, eliminated or controlled by the medical discoveries of the last three decades. Many people are now living who—had it not been for the antibiotics, for the sulfa drugs, for insulin, for new vaccines, for a variety of new operative techniques—would have been dead of heart disease, diabetes, malaria, polio, pneumonia, and a host of other diseases.

This age of medical miracles, however, is just beginning. The strides which have been taken are great ones; those which are yet to be taken are greater still. On every hand, mysteries confront us, the mysteries of cancer, for example, the mysteries of the many cardiovascular diseases, of the arthritic diseases, of mental illness, of a variety of neurological diseases, and many, many more. The list of medical problems awaiting solution is a long one. Prominent on this list is mental retardation.

Mental retardation is not a single disease entity. Its origins are many and diverse, its manifestations are varied, its implications manifold. It does not matter, however, from what point of view we regard mental retardation. From any point of view, it is a pressing and serious national health problem.

It is serious because of its size. About 1½ million children of school age are retarded, and about 3 million of the remainder of our population.

It is serious because of the kinds of disability suffered by its victims, and the problems and heartaches faced by their families.

It is serious in its economic implications for our Federal, State, and local education, health, and welfare services.

Like many of the other health problems we face today, mental retardation is beginning to show that it, too, is vulnerable to the probing attacks of medical research. Scientists are discovering how the various kinds of retardation differ from one another, and they are learning something about causes, prevention, and therapy. Investigators have discovered, for example, that errors of body metabolism are responsible for at least two types of mental retardation, and they are working on preventive and therapeutic diets to remedy the fault. Some kinds of retardation are now known to be caused by certain infectious diseases in the pregnant mother; preventive public-health measures can be and are being taken here. Birth injuries are responsible for still other kinds of retardation; ever-improving prenatal and perinatal care and obstetrical techniques can help cut down the number of these injuries. And there are still other kinds of mental retardation whose causes are beginning to be understood and against which preventive action is being taken.

There are, of course, many forms of mental retardation whose causes are still a mystery, and for which there are as yet no corrective therapies. Prospects for progress, however, are excellent. For one thing, it has been discovered that, regardless of cause of retardation, a great proportion of retarded children can derive substantial benefits from educational experiences directed specifically toward developing the aptitudes and skills they possess. Just a few years ago, most of those who were mildly to moderately retarded faced the prospect of an empty, unproductive, and unsatisfying life in a society which wrote them off as hopelessly limited and beyond help. Today, because of the efforts of dedicated and patient teachers, many of those who are only moderately retarded have high hope for socially useful and personally rewarding lives.

All over the Nation we can see the results of the combined efforts of private citizens and volunteer groups and the Federal, State, and local levels of government. Private groups stimulate action; they press for better educational opportunities for retarded children and for improved training and rehabilitation facilities; they urge the passage of legislation designed to aid in the fight against retardation; they serve to inform and educate the general public. Government does its part by conducting and supporting research, by aiding in the creation of educational and medical facilities for the retarded, by helping train personnel to work with the retarded, and by assisting in the development of new and improved teaching and rehabilitation methods. At the Federal level, for example, the National Institute of Mental Health is both conducting and supporting a variety of research projects on many aspects of mental retardation and is supporting the training of professionals to work with the retarded. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is conducting a broadly based study of the perinatal conditions so clearly related to mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and other disorders. The Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are also contributing mightily to the fight against mental retardation by supporting medical, educational, and rehabilitation facilities for the retarded all over the country.

Much is being done to reduce the problem of mental retardation. But much more remains to be done. And while the research and teaching contributions of the professionals in the field are vital, they must be built on a firm base of public awareness and support. Without it, future achievements will be limited indeed. It is to broaden and strengthen the base of public support, therefore, that I offer a joint resolution for a National Retarded Children's Week.

We have all seen many times what splendid contributions an enlightened citizenry can make to the battles being fought against disease, ignorance, poverty, and other kinds of human distress. The contribution can be especially great for mental retardation, because the way in which a community handles the problem is a direct reflection of the views and attitudes of its citizens. In an informed community, we are likely to see adequate educational facilities for the retarded, good coordination of medical and rehabilitation services, and a progressive and supportive public attitude. In an uninformed community, we are likely to see the old ignorance and hopelessness.

To awaken the American people to the problem of mental retardation, then, and to inform them of our progress in solving it, on behalf of the National Association for Retarded Children and its many State and local chapters all over the Nation, on behalf of the parents and families of our Nation's 1½ million retarded children, and on behalf of the children themselves, who cannot speak for themselves, I offer this resolution for the establishment of National Retarded Children's Week.

For Secretary Dulles and Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, publisher of Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune sets out facts which might give our State Department leaders constructive suggestions on future Mideastern policy:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of July 16, 1958]

BECAUSE WE LACKED A POLICY

Events in the Middle East are developing with extreme speed, and almost entirely adversely for us. The situation is much as though a house of cards has started collapsing. The news may get much worse before we can make it any better—indeed, if we are able to improve it at all.

What is being demonstrated is our basic lack of understanding of the Middle Eastern situation and our lack of a firm, continuing policy for dealing with it.

In the past America had the friendly regard of the Arab world. When other nations were exploiting the area through their colonial policies, we were sending in teachers and helping the Arab peoples.

But since World War II we have been consistent in the Middle East only with our blunders. We have not done everything wrong, but we have more debits than credits to our score. And when we have made a favorable opportunity for ourselves, we usually have thrown it away the next moment.

We endorsed the formation of Israel, and we helped greatly in nudging the British and French out of the Arabian peninsula. But we then failed to undertake a continuing responsibility for that area; we failed to move into the political vacuum that was created.

With respect to Israel, for example, we have shied away from giving the positive

guarantees, that the new state would not be shoved into the sea and also that it would not be permitted to march against its neighbors. * * * And when Israel, in company with Britain and France, moved against Egypt, we stepped in to halt the fighting—but we only restored the status quo; we did nothing to clear away the basic causes for the Israeli attack. We have nobly tried to feed the Arab refugees, but have not adequately recognized what a festering sore they were in the Middle East. We have kept the sore open, instead of curing it.

As for the Baghdad Pact, which seems to have gone down the drain as a quick consequence of the Iraq revolt, we helped to draft it but we never joined it. We had a foot inside the door, but always one left outside.

Mostly we have failed to understand the upsurge of pan-Arabism. We underestimated Gamal Abdel Nasser, and not so much the man as the sentiment behind him. We have talked anticolonialism and yet have gone along with the French in their endeavor to subdue Algeria. In the Arab world itself, we have appeared as trying to buy support rather than help old friends. And we have lost the friends.

It is simple to blame Russia, but it is no adequate explanation. The Russians have largely been profiting only by our mistakes, moving into the opportunities we presented to them. Our policy hasn't failed; we have just never had a sound and consistent policy for working with the Middle East. And now that a first rate crisis has come, we are in an extremely difficult situation. The 5,000 marines in Lebanon may be only a token of our eventual involvement.

What To Do About Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Boston Globe on Sunday, February 24, 1957, with reference to legislation now pending before the Congress. It was authored by my very good friend, John Harris, who is the political editor of that newspaper. I believe that the fruits of his research will be most interesting reading for my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT EX-PRESIDENTS—WHILE PRESIDENT PROPOSITIONS TRUMAN ABOUT TRIP TO GREECE, CONGRESS DEBATES RETIREMENT PAY FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVES—MOST NEVER NEED IT, SOME NEED IT BADLY

(By John Harris)

President Eisenhower's effort to enlist ex-President Harry S. Truman as a goodwill envoy to the Middle East invites attention to a century-long debate Congress has resumed—what the Nation should do about our former Presidents.

Many ideas have been advanced. They have ranged the gamut from making ex-Presidents nonvoting Members of the Senate to chopping off their heads when they finally leave the White House, a grisly suggestion once made by a former Chief Executive.

Congress is presently on the verge of solving part of this long-neglected problem. The Senate, with few dissents, has voted to grant pensions to these elder citizens of the Republic and to their widows. An identical bill is now pending in the House, which last session permitted similar legislation to die in committee.

Gratitude, it is said, is not a marketable commodity. All too many of our former Presidents have sadly found this to be true.

Our two living ex-Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman, are fortunately not in want. This session's brighter prospects for the Presidential pension bill, however, must be gratifying to all thoughtful citizens. Even more than insurance for the future, it is, after a fashion, a redress for our past negligence.

DEATH SAVED JEFFERSON

Witty Dolly Madison, who was to suffer, put it vividly as she looked out one day upon the trees at the side entrance to the President's house. "The President of the United States," she murmured, "usually comes in at the iron gate and goes out at the weeping willows."

A visitor today to the grandeur of Monticello would find it difficult to appreciate the anguish of its master, the author of our Declaration of Independence. Jefferson's dedication to public service caused him to neglect his private affairs. Only the generosity of a wealthy widow furnished him the ready cash to meet the demands of the Capital's butcher, baker, and candlestickmaker so he could avoid the risk of debtor's prison when he left the White House.

"Nobody," said Jefferson, "was ever more determined than I was to leave this place clear of debt." Even worse debt was ahead. It has been blamed on Jefferson's incurable hospitality, though the cause was more the decline of Virginia plantations, a farm problem of its day.

He sold land, mortgaged Monticello, to the hilt. To obtain funds, this man who said, "I cannot live without books," sold his library he had been collecting for a half century. It became the foundation of our present Library of Congress. Finally, to satisfy creditors and to keep his family from penury, he resolved to sell his remaining holdings through a lottery and sent his grandson on a melancholy mission to obtain a lottery license from the State of Virginia. Death alone spared Jefferson from being evicted.

FIGHTING POVERTY

The fate of Jefferson's two disciples, James Madison and James Monroe, was similar.

Grants given Monroe by Congress did not adequately cover his claim and fell far short of meeting his debts. He lost his Virginia estate to creditors. He spent his final days living on the charity of relatives in lower New York City and we have a pathetic picture of the author of the Monroe Doctrine walking Broadway—"a stooped old man, clothed in a shiny suit and battered beaver hat, giving every evidence in his facial expression of deep-seated unhappiness."

Madison, shocked by Jefferson's bankruptcy, tried retrenchments on his own Virginia plantation which his widow would one day lose. To provide her with some estate, Madison, despite failing eyesight and rheumatic hands, copied the precious notes he had made during the secret debates of the convention which drafted our Constitution.

Dolly Madison eventually sold them to Congress for a fraction of their worth.

She lived for years in the Capital in honored but genteel poverty, her food often supplied from the market basket of her neighbor, Daniel Webster.

Financial woes beset Andrew Jackson in his declining years. "Poverty stares us in the face," he wrote on one occasion. Though gravely ill, he traveled to New Orleans for the 25th anniversary of the battle, a trip made not to gather further honors but to raise money to meet the debts of his beloved stepson.

General Grant, second youngest of our Presidents with presumably many years ahead, was a man without an occupation when he left the White House. The collapse of his venture in Wall Street left him penniless. To satisfy creditors he even pawned the mementoes of a lifetime, his swords, souvenirs and gifts.

The general's greatest battle was his final one. Despite the ravages of cancer, he struggled to dictate and write two volumes of memoirs to provide his family with funds.

"Every day, every hour, is a week of agony," he said; finishing his task 4 days before he expired.

Congress has been more kindly with presidential widows. Some, whose husbands died in office or were assassinated, were given grants of the remaining year's salary.

To some, beginning with Mary Todd Lincoln, Congress voted a $5,000 pension and the franking privilege—one first extended to Martha Washington. Mrs. Lincoln, after Lincoln was shot, went to Germany to recover her health. Finding herself in need, she wrote a most moving letter to the Speaker of the House to request a pension.

NATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

Teddy Roosevelt considered the disposition of ex-Presidents one of America's biggest problems. The pros and cons on it are threadbare from argument. Andrew Carnegie's offer—in 1912—to furnish $25,000 pensions through private benefactions did not meet with public approval. Great Britain has long provided pensions for its Prime Ministers. We have provided pensions for generals and admirals—but none for the Commanders in Chief.

Now Congress, about to act, has repeated all the favorable contentions in a report on the pending bill. They are commended reading for those who may still dissent.

Assurance of financial independence for our former Chief Executives, says the report, is more than a matter of equity. It is good business for the American people. Our interest in Presidents does not cease when they leave office. They have obligations which continue. So have the American people.

We should see to it ex-Presidents can be asked to render further public service without hardship to themselves or their families.

Poles, Czechs, Hungarians Still Look to the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the editor in chief of Scripps-Howard newspapers, Mr. Walker Stone, gives his impression of where this country stands with the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, in his fourth article which appears in the Washington Daily News today. Mr. Stone has been traveling in Russia and the European satellite countries during the last several weeks. With permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Stone's article to be printed in the RECORD:

POLES, CZECHS, HUNGARIANS STILL LOOK TO THE WEST

(By Walker Stone)

The Polish guide had proudly shown me through the old town of Warsaw. Every house and shop and cathedral had been rebuilt around the old square and along the

narrow, winding streets, just as they had been for centuries before the Nazis came. We stood on the cliffs overlooking the Vistula River.

"There," he spat, "is where the Russians camped while the Nazis destroyed our city. When the battle ended, there were only 20,000 of us left in Warsaw."

Later the guide, reluctantly, took me atop the skyscraper Palace of Culture, a towering edifice of wedding-cake architecture, a gift of the Russians to the Poles, to celebrate victory over the Nazis. From the tower you could look over a Warsaw which had been 85 percent destroyed by war, and is about 50 percent rebuilt.

DIDN'T WANT TO

The guide was reluctant because he did not feel comfortable in the structure.

"It gives me the creeps," he said. "It is a very expensive building the Russians gave us. All this marble and all these ornaments could have provided housing for 30,000. Very expensive. Very expensive, for us Poles."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In Prague, one Czech stopped another, asking, "What time is it?"

The other Czech looked at his wristwatch, mumbled: "It's 10 after 2, thanks to the Soviet Union."

In its brief history as a free republic, between the First and Second World Wars, Czechoslovakia was one of the most prosperous of European countries. Living standards then were much higher than they are now, although now they are higher than in Poland or Hungary, and far higher than in the Soviet Union.

The Communist press in Czechoslovakia daily extols the benefits that flow from the Soviet Union and the evils brewed by the western "imperialists." Hence the time of day becomes, in grim jest, a Soviet blesssing.

RIDDLE

"Do you know why," goes a Czech riddle, "Khrushchev got off the plane at our border and rode into Prague on a train?

"He was afrad he would crash on our high living standard."

Things have not gone as they should under Communist bureaucracy, so there was a big shakeup—and much scrambling for the good jobs. Each applicant had to be examined according to his proletarian background—

First came the potato, who made this claim:

"I provide food for the workers, and am entitled to preference."

The selection commmittee, however, ruled:

"Yes, but you have the wrong background. You originated in America."

Next came the stork, who proudly said:

"See, my beak is all red."

"But," ruled the committee, "on those long legs you live on a too-high level."

Came next the pimento.

"See," said the pimento, "I am solid red."

"Ah, yes," said the committee, "but you were once green." (The color of the farm party, which the Communists overthrew to gain power.)

Then came the bear. "I am," he said, "a worker in the forest. My father was a worker in the forest. My grandfather was a worker in the forest."

Ruled the committee: "You have a fur coat. Your father had a fur coat. Your grandfather had a fur coat. You cannot qualify."

HUNGARY

When the Moscow radio announced the execution of Imre Nagy and General Maleter, the news touched off demonstrations in many places in the free world. But it caused no reaction on the streets of Budapest.

In this beautiful spot, where the Blue Danube flows cold and gray and bosomy of commerce, between the spectacular cliffs of Buda and the smoky flats of Pest, the people were in no mood to demonstrate. They had had their fill of revolt, unaided, a year and a half ago.

After all, who were Nagy and Maleter, except a couple of Communists who at last had fallen victim to Communist tyranny? In that year and a half since the great Budapest uprising, when thousands had been slaughtered by Soviet guns, hundreds of other Hungarian patriots, not stained by communism, had been executed, with no notice taken by the outside world.

The Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs, feel their true ties are with the Western World. Their values are western values. But so long as Russians troops are so close, they cannot choose sides.

A Historical Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Arizona editor William R. Mathews, the publisher of Tucson's Arizona Daily Star, is not only a knowledgeable man on international affairs, but is one of the country's most outspoken editors as well. Last Sunday in his newspaper he published a hard-hitting editorial which, in harsh terms, criticized our actions in the Middle East crisis.

As one who believes that we need the cleansing influence of self criticism now as never before, I present, in that spirit, this sobering commentary:

[From the Arizona Daily Star of July 20, 1958]

A HISTORICAL WEEK

This week of July 14–20 has been a week of shame in American history. It has been a week of shame, because the Washington Government has deceived the American people in its action in landing marines in distant Lebanon. It has deceived the people by stating excuses that are either not true, or that, in telling only part of the truth, leave a false impression. It has conducted itself in a manner that for many years previously it denounced when others similarly conducted themselves. Until this week it has scorned and ridiculed the use of indirect aggression as an excuse for such a lawless act.

It has invaded with its Armed Forces a little country in which a rebellion was going on. It has done so on the mere oral request of its weak President, who is due to leave office in a few months, and who deliberately refused to consult his own parliamentary leaders.

Let it be noted that in giving the excuse of indirect aggression the President and the Secretary of State deliberately left out the word "Communist." They had to do that, because there was no immediate danger of Communist aggression in that country. American newsmen on the spot, of known repute, and the Secretary General of the United Nations, who was sent there to investigate, agree that there was no danger of Communist aggression. The fight was one between Moslem Arabs favoring Nasser, and Christian Arabs, favoring the West. Thus we land troops to put down a rebellion in Lebanon, but at the same moment allow our citizens, many of them, to be kidnaped and held prisoner by a rebel regime in Cuba.

The truth should be told. Two important facts are involved that for some reason have not been revealed. The first of these is that the rebellion in Lebanon and the one in Iraq have behind them the deep-seated, widespread hatred among all Arab people of the State of Israel. Just as the entry of the Christians of the Crusades of 10 centuries ago united the Arabs of those days, so has the entry of Israel in our own time.

The indirect aggression that Washington uses as an alibi represents an attempt of the Arabs to unite, first to make their united country independent of all other political powers. What is wrong with that? The humiliation they have suffered from centuries of subjection, they wish to bring to and end. What is wrong with that?

Why are not the people of the United States informed about these aspects? Why are they so carefully concealed that only those who have been on the spot know these truths?

Secondly, the United States, through its delegate to the United Nations, former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, upon the instructions of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles engaged in one of the most brazen campaigns of diplomatic blackmail that the world has seen in many a year. The news dispatch reads, he warned that "the U. N. may collapse if it fails to cope with a master plot to take over the Middle East by indirect aggression." In other words, he warned that unless the other nations of the world, at least two-thirds of them, went along and approved of America's and now England's lawless acts, our country would no longer support or work with the U. N.

It was America that took the lead in creating the U. N. For an American representative of the U. N. to talk to it in that kind of language dishonors his own country. That is shameful, too.

Fifty years ago this joint Anglo-American action would have been considered normal. But look at what has happened in the past 50 years. No one has done more to break up such a use of armed might than America itself. We have denounced it as colonialism. Behind the break-up were the growing aspirations of people in the backward areas like the Middle East. We drove Britain out of Egypt. Britain drove France out of the Middle East in 1941. We drove Britain out of the Middle East in 1948. And now at this belated time in history we are emulating a practice that we used to condemn.

We have gone into the Middle East with armed forces, but in so doing we should realize that, while we may for a time intimidate these Arab peoples, it will not be long until they unite in spite of our military intimidation. We wil lose just what we have sought to gain.

We should hang our heads in shame; shame, if not for the indefensible immorality of our act, for our stupidity.

Priest To Celebrate 50 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include in the RECORD an article from the Phoenix Gazette of July 12 commenting upon the approaching golden jubilee in the Franciscan Order of the Reverend Albert Braun, O. F. M. Father Albert is one of

Arizona's most distinguished citizens, having served as a chaplain in both world wars and spending the greater part of the Second World War as a prisoner of the Japanese. At present Father Albert is pastor of the Sacred Heart Church in Phoenix. This parish has four mission churches, all of which were built with Father Albert doing a great deal of the physical work himself. On July 26 a public ceremonial to his long public service will be held:

PRIEST TO CELEBRATE 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

The Reverend Albert Braun is preparing to observe his golden jubilee in the Franciscan Order of the Catholic church at a solemn Mass at which he will renew his vows.

The Mass will be celebrated at 9 a. m. July 26 at Sacred Heart Church, 920 South 17th Street, of which he is pastor.

At 69, Father Albert's 50 years have included serving the Indians, helping the poor, building churches, and seeing active duty as an army chaplain.

During his service in two world wars he was injured once, decorated, and survived the death march on Bataan. He spent several years as a prisoner of war.

Born in Los Angeles, he entered St. Anthony's Seminary in Santa Barbara, took his novitiate training at St. Elizabeth's in Oakland and then went to the Old Mission in Santa Barbara, where he was invested.

His first assignment was to work with the Indians on the Apache reservation at Mescalero, N. Mex. In 1918 he entered the army as a chaplain for the Sixth Infantry.

The same year he was wounded near Romaine, France, and received a citation. From there he went to Trier, Germany, and after his discharge in 1919, he became a member of the Reserves.

Father Albert went back to the Indian reservation and started to build a church of native rock as a monument to war veterans. The construction, with the help of the Indians, was done by hand, and the work work was so tedious it took many years to finish.

Meanwhile, he was called into active duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps in New Mexico. After the CCC move ended, Father Albert's army career was not over. In 1940 he was called back into the army as a captain instructor of chaplains at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

The next year he left for duty in the Philippines. He was one of the survivors of the death march with General Wainwright and spent the rest of the war as a prisoner of the Japanese.

He won the respect of men of all races and creeds during his prison stay. A token of their affection is graphically told in a Christmas gift they gave him in prison.

They made a booklet of scrap paper. An artist drew a religious picture for a cover and then the men all gave testimony to his understanding and kindness. There were men who wrote their thanks to him for taking beatings for them, men who showed their gratitude for his covering up for them to keep them out of trouble, and appreciation from those in the infirmary for whom he had swiped extra food.

Until a message came over the radio Christmas of 1944, his associates stateside thought Father Albert was dead.

At the end of the war he retired to Mescalero to finish his church. At its dedication General Wainwright brought his Army band to play. The Army was not through with its chaplain, though. In 1947 he was recalled and sent back to Fort Sam Houston, where he remained until age caught up with him.

It was then he came to Phoenix and St. Mary's Church. For a period he taught at St. Mary's High School. Four years ago he was sent to Sacred Heart as pastor.

A student of history, he attended Arizona State for a while to get his doctorate, but seeing the need of the people in South Phoenix for additional churches, he started building with a zeal.

He has built four churches, doing a great deal of the work himself, from digging ditches to shingling roofs. They include Sacred Heart, Santa Isabell, Magnolia and 18th Street; St. Mary Magdalene, 11th Street and Hilton; Santa Rita, 904 South Starr, and a center at 910 South 16th Street, for instruction and recreation.

With no less energy, he is building a school, which will be ready to serve the first two grades by next fall.

Father Albert's alert eyes mirror his sense of humor and bounce with his energy. An avid card player, he hasn't much use for television because he believes it wastes conversational time.

Following his Jubilee Mass of thanksgiving, he will be honored at a brunch at the Hiway House. That evening the people of his parish will have a fiesta in his honor at Sacred Heart church ground.

Science Aid in Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Americans are hoping this Congress will enact constructive legislation to expand scientific education before adjournment. The Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune outlines the thoughts of most people on this important problem:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of July 19, 1958]

SCIENCE AID IN PROSPECT

Congress appears to be coming to life on the matter of aid to science education. There are prospects for enactment before the session ends of a measure even more generous to college students than was proposed by President Eisenhower.

The report from Washington that passage is a good possibility comes just as a report is received from another group of American educators on the status of science education in the Soviet Union. The group, including President Herman B. Wells, of Indiana University, has just returned from a tour of Russian universities.

As other such reports have done, the one from the college presidents stresses the intensity of Russian efforts in the field of higher education. The United States group found fault with some of the Russian aims but they did not question the "deadly seriousness" with which the Russians have dedicated themselves to the school program.

It may be true, as Edward Crankshaw reported early this week from London, that the extreme Soviet emphasis on engineering training is producing an oversupply of engineers. The Russians for the present seem to have more young graduates than their industrial setup can absorb. But that situation certainly is less to be criticized than our own, where we have been lagging in the education of young people in the scientific and technical fields.

The bill now being advanced in Congress would attempt to correct our deficiencies by extending scholarship aid to qualified young people in these fields. The President's proposal, made early in the year, calls for 10,000 scholarships a year. The House bill proposes 18,000 to 23,000. And the House bill is more liberal than the President's in several other regards.

For one thing, it would extend the first $500 of a scholarship grant without regard as to the student's need. Eisenhower had proposed a needs test for any amount. Perhaps a token grant should be made to any student qualifying for a scholarship, as is done in the National Merit Scholarship program, but it is hard to understand why substantial aid should be extended to students who don't need the money.

The number of scholarships is debatable. But if an error is to be made, we would rather it be on the side of authorizing too many, rather than not enough grants. A compromise between the White House and Capitol proposals should be easily reached.

The important thing is that there be action, and hopefully that it be speedy enough to permit the program to be of help next fall. The bill has been tagged as the National Defense Education Act, to ease its way through Congress, and certainly it will be of defense benefit. But the fact that it basically is Federal aid to education is turning out not to be the handicap some thought it was.

Polls made by several Congressmen show strong public support for Federal aid in science, mathematics and foreign language fields. The public apparently is much more understanding of the need than some Members of Congress have been.

Our Middle East Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William H. Stringer, in a piece he wrote this week for the Christian Science Monitor, tersely outlined the dilemma that confronts us today in the Middle East. I believe his piece, which follows, deserves the close scrutiny of our colleagues:

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—If anyone has a sure-fire antidote for indirect aggression in the Middle East, he should contact Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Mr. Dulles has tried all sorts of formulas—and now this direct intervention in Lebanon and Jordan—but that man Nasser keeps right on scheming along.

Ask a high administration official why the United States, with Britain, moved into the Middle East thus formidably, with marines and aircraft carriers, and paratroops. The answer you will get is that the main reason was not oil, was not geography, was not anything but a determination to protect the small nations against indirect aggression.

In short, the way the Eisenhower administration reasons it, if the United States had not sent the marines into Lebanon following the Iraqi coup, no small country in the entire stretch of territory from Morocco to southeast Asia would have felt safe from indirect aggression.

Indirect aggression may be described as the seizure of somebody else's country by infiltration, massive propaganda onslaught, plotting against established authority, smuggling in of arms and commandos, assassination, and coups d'état. This is what hap-

pened, Secretary Dulles would affirm, in Iraq. It is what was barely prevented from happening in Jordan. It is believed behind the civil war in Lebanon, where, it is averred, as late as last weekend the rebels were receiving instructions from Syria's capital, Damascus, over an open telephone line.

If the United States had stood by idly or merely asked the United Nations to pass pious resolutions while not only Iraq but Jordan and Lebanon were seized by plotters friendly to Colonel Nasser, then—so Washington vigorously reasons—no small, beleaguered government anywhere would dare to resist.

No small nation would believe that it was healthy to be a friend of the United States. No small ally would believe that alliance with Washington was anything but the slenderest, unreliable reed.

So Washington landed the Marines. Previously it had sought to stem indirect aggression by canceling the Aswan Dam, in Egypt, and by inviting King Saud to Washington, in Saudi Arabia, and by relying on the shrewdness of wily old Premier Nuri, in Iraq. None of these devices has been successful.

Now Washington readily admits that landing the Marines does not, in itself, solve any Middle Eastern problem. The regimes in Lebanon and Jordan are bolstered while the Marines and paratroopers are camped beside the government buildings. But what happens when they are withdrawn?

The United States, of course, has turned to the United Nations for solution. It is seeking to find some way to establish what might be termed a stronger United Nations presence in Lebanon, strong enough to assure national independence, strong enough to allow the marines to go home.

Ideally, this would mean U. N. troops or a strong observer corps patrolling the Syrian frontier, and token U. N. forces on call in Lebanon's capital. Whether the United Nations can be persuaded to order such patrols into being, in either Lebanon or Jordan, is of course problematical.

For the moment, the United States has countered indirect aggression. The small governments around the periphery of Africa and Asia are, it hopes, bolstered and strengthened. They have seen how quickly American military power could come to their rescue. They have discovered that the Soviet threats have not put everyone into a paralysis of inaction.

But a truly great question remains: What is to be Washington's policy when the marines have gone home? Even if United Nations forces remain on guard, they cannot stay forever.

The United States has many friends in North Africa and in Asia. There are more peoples in the Middle East who would be friendly if they were treated as neutrals. Washington now should be readying its post-Lebanon diplomacy, based on a thorough understanding of the many forces at work all the way from Morocco to southeast Asia.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1959—Emergency Funds for Schools of Public Health Training Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes before House passage of the 1959 supplemental appropriation bill last Tuesday, I received word that the President had signed H. R. 11414, an act amending the Public Health Service Act, authorizing the Surgeon General to make certain grants-in-aid for provision in public or nonprofit accredited schools of public health of training and services in the fields of public health and in the administration of State and local public health programs.

Members will recall that this emergency legislation was unanimously passed by the House on May 5, 1958. It authorizes the Surgeon General to allocate $1 million in grants to enable the 11 schools of public health to train badly-needed specialists for Federal, State, and local public health agencies. These schools are located at the universities of Michigan, Minnesota, California, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Johns Hopkins, Tulane, Harvard, Yale, Pittsburgh, and Columbia.

As was pointed out in the committee report and in the House debate, these private and State-supported institutions are now incurring an annual deficit of over $3 million in subsidizing the training of public health personnel for the public service throughout the Nation. This bill had wide bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. It is a 2-year emergency program, effective with the fiscal year which began on July 1, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of the action on this bill unfortunately prevented the inclusion of necessary funds in H. R. 11645, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation measure. H. R. 11414 was unanimously passed by the other body in the identical form of the House version on July 10, 1958, but by then the appropriation bill was in conference.

Presidential approval of the bill came too late for either committee or floor consideration of a request for the inclusion of the necessary funds in the supplemental appropriation bill acted on by the House on Tuesday. It will therefore be necessary to request the Appropriations Committee of the other body to add an additional $1 million to H. R. 13450 and take it to conference, so that the emergency public health training program provided for in H. R. 11414 may be initiated during the present fiscal year. Unless funds are included in this bill, 1 year's operation of the 2-year emergency program will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that this action is necessary because there was no opportunity for the House Appropriations Committee to consider this item. If funds are subsequently added to H. R. 13450 by the other body, Members and the House conferees may therefore be fully informed as to the reasons for such action.

I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the distinguished chairman of the Labor-Health, Education, Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee. He has written me as follows:

I am glad that you have brought this matter to my attention. I strongly support the objectives of H. R. 11414 and agree that the necessary funds for this important emergency public health training program must be included in H. R. 13450. It is unfortunate that the timing has made it impossible for the request for the funds to be considered by our committee and trust that they will be added by the Senate and taken to conference.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Is Rehousing for People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able address entitled "Is Rehousing for People?" which was delivered by Nathan Straus, of New York, one of the leading experts in the entire housing field during the last 25 years. In his stimulating and interesting address, he pointed out the enormous difficulties with which we are faced in connection with the relocation of families by reason of the urban redevelopment and the highway programs and the complete inability to deal with those programs in the absence of adequate housing for families of low incomes.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS REHOUSING FOR PEOPLE?

(By Nathan Straus)

Is the objective of an urban redevelopment and rehousing program to help people or to beautify the city? The question is not intended facetiously. It comes to mind almost inevitably, if any serious study is made of the effect of the New York City redevelopment program.

We are informed that about 5,000 families will be relocated over the next 3 years in connection with the building of the Lincoln Square project. The word "relocated" is a convenient evasion of the fact that these unfortunate families are being thrown out of their homes—many of them, with nowhere else to go.

Here are a few typical examples, as reported in the daily newspapers.

A 70-year-old widow occupying an apartment for which she pays $36.80 per month is one of those evicted. She has been unable to find an apartment execpt at a monthly rental of $50. That is, she will be forced to pay one-third more rent than she has in the past. It is true that she will receive a one-time relocation bonus amounting to $312.92. But that money will be swallowed up in moving expense and the increase in rent, in less than a year. Her case is typical rather than unique.

Another family consisting of a man, his wife, their baby son and his wife's mother—four in all—occupy a flat for which they pay $22.70 a month. It consists of 4 rooms, so the rent is less than $6 a room. The apartments to be built on the Lincoln Square site are going to rent for upward of $47 a room. As one of the evicted tenants says: "We couldn't even rent a closet in them."

The real-estate concern in charge of relocation frankly admits that it has only 400 apartments available in all parts of the city and that these apartments rent for from $50 to $65 a month.

It is a fact that 1 family out of 4, now living in the Lincoln Square area, is theoretically eligible for an apartment in a subsidized public housing project. However, the eligibility is largely a theoretical benefit, an empty gesture, since, in fact, there is a long waiting list for apartments in public subsidized housing in this city.

Even though many of the tenements in the Lincoln Square area are firetraps and even though many of them may be vermin infested, nevertheless, on a cold night, any roof over the family's head is better than a park bench.

The plight of low-income families, to be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project, is characteristic of urban redevelopment throughout the United States.

Things are no worse in New York than in any other American city—except that redevelopment of slum areas has proceeded at a more rapid pace here than elsewhere. While our newspaper headlines read "High Rent Apartments Still the Trend in Manhattan" and "Lincoln Square DP's Ask the Planners: Where Do We Go?" as far out as the west coast, the pattern is duplicated.

One of the worst examples of mismanagement in the United States is that of the city of Los Angeles. There, a fine program of subsidized public housing, approved by the Federal Government, was rejected by the voters, just as it was all ready to go into actual construction. This negative result was the product of a campaign of vilification and misrepresentation by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the United States Savings and Loan League, unfortunately abetted by the two leading newspapers of that city.

The outstanding success achieved by this campaign of misrepresentation by the real-estate lobby is well indicated by the fact that even as generally reliable and distinguished a representative of the Nation's press as the Wall Street Journal on July 17, 1951, printed the following headlines: "Los Angeles Folk Fume Over Huge Project." "Roar of Protest Against Public Housing."

The truth was that the city council had approved the public-housing program by a vote of 10 to 5. The truth was that the public-housing program had been endorsed by every local veterans' organization, all local-labor organizations and more than 70 other civic groups.

The low-income families of Los Angeles are today paying the penalty for the success of this vicious propaganda. Thus the New York Times, writing of the Los Angeles project on last June 8, reported, under the headline "Vast Building Plan Is Set in Slum" that "the 9,000 present residents of the hill will be resettled, virtually all the buildings in the 22-block area razed, and the tract relandscaped and rebuilt to accommodate 6,000 to 8,000 residents in style. What will become of the people who live in the firetraps and rabbit warrens atop the hill is an unsettled question. The redevelopment will be on somewhat a luxury basis, with apartments renting upward from $50 a room a month.

It must be unpleasant indeed to be the head of a family, worrying about where to find a roof to shelter wife and children, only to be informed that his fate is an unsettled question. Tearing down slum buildings may be esthetically satisfying and emotionally soothing but does not, of itself, improve the living conditions of low-income families. On the contrary, it may aggravate their plight.

The basic fact is, that even with Government aid under the FHA program and other forms of assistance, very little of the new housing provided by private speculative builders is within the means of even a family of average income. Obviously none of it is within the means of families in the lowest income groups, those who, of necessity, are compelled to live in slum areas.

About one-quarter of the families in the United States can afford to buy the cheapest new three-bedroom houses available at the end of 1957. Three-bedroom apartments are even scarcer and even more expensive than three-bedroom houses. A three-bedroom apartment rents for a minimum of about $110. This condition is true across the Nation. To afford such apartments, a family should have an annual income of not less than $7,000.

The problem of rehousing is essentially a national one that can be solved only on a basis of national financial assistance. WMCA calls again for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Government.

Moreover, WMCA would like to suggest that, just as a would-be automobile manufacturer in another country comes over here to study what has been done so successfully in Detroit, or physicians and surgeons come to New York City study the best in medical science, so officials in charge of our urban redevelopment and rehousing program might well study what has been done successfully abroad—especially in England and in Sweden.

According to Mr. Eric L. Bird, editor of the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, "In Britain new construction generally precedes slum elimination." This, let it be noted, is said of a housing program that has been continued under Conservative and Labor governments, with only minor modifications since 1922. The 2 top years of public housing construction in England were under Conservative governments—in 1928 and 1939.

In Sweden, which has carried out, in the opinion of qualified observers, the most successful rehousing program anywhere in the world, the philosophy of housing and the pattern followed is similar.

The best of Sweden is represented by Velingby, a new satellite town a few miles outside of Stockholm. It was completed last year. Velingby is not a group of tall apartment houses, huddled together in a few acres. It consists of hundreds of acres, laid out as apartments, individual homes, groups of two-story housing for elderly people, playgrounds, recreational parks, decorative fountains as well as wading pools. There are restaurants, there are bandstands. There are office buildings, where employment will be provided for those who live in the new city. There are sites available for leasing to private concerns, on which factories will be erected, to provide more employment. This is real redevelopment, having as its key a better life for the people of Sweden.

Let it be understood that WMCA has nothing but admiration for the ideals of urban redevelopment and specifically for the Lincoln Square project, which will replace a rundown area of antiquated tenements and superannuated buildings with a cultural

center of the greatest city in the world. This is a project in the finest tradition of civic planning.

But slum clearance is not the cause of better housing. It is the result, the end product of a soundly planned rehousing program.

WMCA believes that, before a single building is torn down, subsidized public housing, equal in quantity to the number of families to be evicted and the rentals paid in those buildings must be built to house the tenants. You can put a side of beef in cold storage for a year. You cannot do the same to an American family.

Nearly twenty thousand human beings are being evicted or will be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project. WMCA believes that our immediate and pressing problem is to address ourselves to helping them. Let us not neglect their plight. Let us not forget that rehousing is for people.

Neglected Areas of Education and the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to fully realize what it means to live during times of explosive scientific development. Now we know that man's entry into space is limited only by the boundaries of time needed for research. This scientific research is man's last barrier to new adventure and discovery in the universe. Only an educational system alerted and equipped for the times can trigger a projection capable of surmounting science research barriers.

In the interest of the national survival we must provide stimulus to the States for the improvement and the further development of their public school programs of education and training in the sciences and foreign languages. We have more than sufficient evidence of the immediate dire need for this type of assistance to our public schools. In fact, as the committee reports on H. R. 13247 stated:

There is no question as to the need for strengthening and expanding the teaching of mathematics, science and modern foreign languages in our elementary and secondary schools. The vital importance of these subjects to our natural defense and to the conduct of our foreign economic, cultural, and diplomatic relations is inescapable. Instruction in these subjects—utilizing modern techniques and equipment—must be adequate at the elementary and secondary school level if we are to produce the educated people our Nation needs in the years ahead. The plain cold fact is that these subjects are neglected ones in all too many of our schools today.

Dr. Lawrence Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, described the background of the situation when he testified before our committee that—

It scarcely needs to be said that we have entered a new era, an era unfolding as a result of new knowledge of the universe and the continued development of new sources of energy. In many respects what recently was in the future, as conceived in the minds of men, is already here. We have been startled by recent developments and the accelerated pace with which the doors to nature's secrets are being opened.

The relative recency of the entrance of the laboratory sciences into the curriculum undoubtedly is one factor limiting the character and degree of science offerings in the schools. Many of our schools never have had suitable laboratory facilities, and in school after school the few science courses that are taught are often of a very inadequate nature, with instruction by teachers with less than desirable qualifications for the task. In recent years even the more favored schools have suffered sharp limitations on their science programs, as we shall show. These and other conditions have contributed to a critical imbalance in the curriculum, instruction, and student enrollment. * * *

Today most of the States do not have the leadership needed to promote the necessary modernization and upgrading of instruction in mathematics and science.

Resulting in part from lack of personnel, most of the States have not developed modern mathematics and science courses of study and teachers' guides.

The need to improve the science curriculum in our public schools is described in an article by Mr. Elbert P. Little in the Science Teacher Magazine, as follows:

The teaching of science has changed, and changed substantially, in the half century, both in content and in technique. But on the whole, the changes have consisted in addition to the structure that existed 50 years ago, or in alterations to the existing structure. Lately there have been repeated intimations that this piecemeal reconstruction has long since failed in its purposes; that a new structure is now necessary; and that it must be designed from the ground up.

The expense of equipment for science laboratories has forced many schools to resort to nonlaboratory methods of teaching. In many instances, it was reported during our subcommittee hearings, it is not uncommon to find a complete absence of laboratory facilities in the required general science and biology courses, to say nothing of those sciences requiring more complicated and expensive laboratory equipment.

The cost of science laboratory facilities was outlined by Dr. John R. Ludington, of the United States Office of Education, during our hearings when he pointed out that—

A general science laboratory would run $6,000; a biology laboratory, $6,700; and physics labs tend to run about $9,600; chemistry laboratories a little higher—$12,600.

In addition to those figures, we have various items of student apparatus and teacher demonstration equipment, chemicals and consumable supplies.

These figures for a general science laboratory run about $1,200 to $4,300, depending upon the size and the desires of the school. A biology laboratory would run from about $3,200 to $8,200. A physics laboratory would run from $3,400 to $8,900; and a chemistry laboratory, $2,400 to $7,200.

The problem of the lack of adequate science facilities and equipment in many of the Nation's schools is further complicated by the most vitally important need of all—a shortage of science and mathematics teachers. This fact was underscored during the subcommittee hearings when it was pointed out that—

A number of factors contribute to the difficulties which school systems face in developing adequate programs of mathematics and science. However, let us consider the problem of the teacher. Certainly all of us would agree this is a prime factor. It applies in other fields, of course. But the shortage is considerably more severe in the fields of mathematics and science. Moreover, the preparation of those presently engaged in these fields is less adequate than in other subjects.

The competition for teachers qualified in mathematics and science is definitely more critical today than heretofore. Several States which have conducted studies of teacher supply in science and mathematics report that only about one-third of the science teachers are full-time teachers of science and two-thirds teach these subjects merely on a part-time basis. Information drawn from 32 States indicates that in 1958 less than half of both the science teachers and mathematics teachers were devoting full time to the subject. This situation is most common in small high schools.

There has been an alarming drop in the number of science teachers trained annually. In 1950, 9,096 qualified science teachers graduated from our colleges. In 1956, only 4,320 were graduated a decrease of more than 50 percent. A slight improvement over the latter figure was noted in 1957 when the number increased to around 5,000. Moreover, for a variety of reasons, of those graduates prepared to teach science only about 60 out of every 100 actually accept teaching positions. In contrast, more than 80 percent of those who prepare for elementary schoolteaching enter teaching immediately.

On the basis of these facts and additional evidence presented to our subcommittee it is my opinion that the provision in the proposed National Defense Education Act to provide Federal assistance to the States to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction is urgently needed and fully warranted.

As outlined in the committee report on H. R. 13247:

This title authorizes grants to the States to assist over a period of 4 fiscal years in establishing and maintaining a 2-part program for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools, both administered in accordance with a single State plan (as approved by the Commissioner of Education) for accomplishing the purposes of the program.

First, there is authorized the appropriation of $60 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of special equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in the public elementary, and secondary schools of the State, and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such equipment.

Secondly, there is authorized the appropriation of $5 million for each of the 4 years for payments to State educational agencies for the expansion or improvement of State supervision and related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction, and for the administration of the State plan.

Statement by George J. Burger Before the Senate Committee on Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate Finance Committee on July 16, 1958.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, JULY 16, 1958

I am George J. Burger vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for inviting me to appear and give testimony on the subject matter before your committee, and this confirms your letter to me of June 27, 1957.

Mr. Chairman, if time permitted I could build a case on the facts that would disclose rank discrimination in the excise-tax levy presently imposed on the stocks of tires and tubes in the hands of independent retailers that smells to the high heavens.

In my private capacity, and then again in my official capacity with the federation this past decade, we have appeared before committees requesting correction, beginning with February 6, 1942, before the House Small Business Committee. Then again, before the Committee on Ways and Means June 1947, February 20, 1951, October 1955, January 1956, November–December 1956, and January 7, 1958. Before the Senate Finance Committee July 6, 1950, March 1957, and the record will also disclose filed statements on this subject matter before the Senate Finance Committee. November 1957 before the Senate Small Business Committee.

It might be of interest to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for me to quote the colloquy that took place before the Senate Banking Committee on June 18, 1957, between Senator HOMER CAPEHART and Mr. Dan Throop Smith, of the Treasury Department. Now bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that this subject matter was not before the Senate Banking Committee at the time, but hearings were being held on the Small Business Administration Act.

"Senator CAPEHART. Yes. I would like to ask Mr. Smith this question. It is a problem here that I wish would also get an answer for us on. This has to do with small business, and particularly with the tire retailers of the United States. As you know, when they ship tires they have to pay the excise tax on it, but when the manufacturer who owns his own retail stores sells it, he can put all of the tires he wishes to in the retail stores without paying tax on them. That seems to be unfair to me, and it seems to be placing a burden on the independent tire retailer which is not placed on the manufacturer who owns retail stores.

"Of course, you understand this not only applies to tires and tire manufacturers, but any manufacturer where it is a product subject to excise tax.

"Mr. SMITH. Surely.

"Senator CAPEHART. Where he has retail stores, you see.

"Mr. SMITH. Yes.

"Senator CAPEHART. It applies to many other items in addition to tires.

"Mr. SMITH. Yes.

"Senator CAPEHART. It is in the law and your position is that what I consider to be a discrimination is a part of the law?

"Mr. SMITH. That I am qiute sure of.

"Senator CAPEHART. And the only way to correct it is to correct the law?

"Mr. SMITH. That I am quite certain of.

"Senator CAPEHART. Thank you very much.

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Internal Revenue Department, I presume it is, give us a ruling that can be made a part of this record as to why the independent retailer of tires must pay the tax when he receives the tires, whereas the manufacturer can send all of the tires he wishes out to his retail stores scattered all over the United States, with many of them next door to the independent, and he does not have to pay the tax until he disposes of them. I would like to know whether or not it is an interpretation of the Internal Revenue Department that these independents must pay the tax, or whether it is a part of the law. At the moment I do not know.

"Mr. SMITH. I will be glad to comment on that now, because I do happen to be familiar with it.

"Senator CAPEHART. If you are familiar with it and care to answer, fine.

"Mr. SMITH. I think it is a completely unambigous interpretation of the law, because the law is imposed on sales.

"Senator CAPEHART. In other words, you are following the law?

"Mr. SMITH. Yes. There is nothing in the excise tax law which imposes a tax other than at the time of the sale. This was a subject which was considered in the Ways and Means Committee in the bill which was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee a matter of a few weeks ago now, when considerable consideration was given to this. I do not recall exactly how it was finally handled in the bill, but I remember one point that came up in our analysis of it in the Treasury Department was to the effect that credit terms typically given by the manufacturers to retailers were such that in point of fact the tax was due at least in many instances on the sales by the manufacturers through their own retail stores quicker than the tax was due from the independent retailers under the terms of credit that were offered; but I will be glad to get additional information for you."

So it is self-apparent that this discrimination has been a matter of record with many Members of the Congress, and no correction forthcoming.

In the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes of the Committee of Ways and Means, December 31, 1956, on page 6, the report states:

"However, it is understood that only 3 tire manufacturers currently operate company-owned retail stores, and that quantities of tires marketed through these outlets represent only a very small percentage of the total volume."

Of course I have personal knowledge of the rubber tire industry, being an independent member of that industry for close to 50 years, and I know that the findings as reported above do not check with the record.

Early in 1957 the public relations department of Fuller & Smith & Ross, Inc., of Cleveland, Ohio, whose client was the Pennsylvania Tire Co., held a contest through Nation's independent tire dealers, and put the question: "What's wrong with the tire business?" Their report discloses: "Dealers cite company-owned stores as greatest evil in tire business." We had no part, direct or indirect, in developing this contest and I might say that with the reports coming in from independent tire retailers in metropolitan areas throughout this Nation, with no exceptions or omissions, they cite this as the ever increasing peril to their business future. Why? Because of the expanded operation of these manufacturers retail stores throughout the Nation. In fact, it was stated very recently at an annual meeting of the United States Rubber Co., in answer to a question from one of their stockholders as to whether they planned to go into the company-owned store field that they are giving consideration to the proposition.

The National Independent a publication devoted to the interests of independent tire sales and servicing dealers throughout the Nation recently made a survey on this discrimination, requesting their readers to advise them as to what, if any injury was accruing to them as a result of the discrimination in the imposition of the excise tax on their stocks of tires and tubes, and that of their main competitor—the manufacturers retail stores. The result of this national survey as disclosed by the National Independent, May 29, 1958, was, and I quote: "$4,500 frozen assets; that is the meaning of Federal excise-tax-collection method to average dealer who replied to our recent survey. It's a measure of the advantage this law gives to company stores. Our hope for correction is now with Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and his Senate finance group."

With the recent highway construction bill and the added taxes on tires and tubes this developed an even greater financial liability on the independent retailer from which the manufacturers retail stores are exempt.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for any reduction of taxes, but in view of the fact that the Government is primarily interested in the greatest tax income of all descriptions why does the Government close their eyes to this gravy train of additional taxes?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, these major companies owning and operating retail stores are in a far better financial position to carry the advance payment in excise tax than are the run-of-the-mill of independent retailers. It's beyond us to understand why the Government continues to play Lady Bountiful on such a deplorable situation and it is our hope and plea that your committee will recmend that adjustment be made on this tax levy discrimination.

It should be so ordered that wherever tires and tubes are sold to the consuming public the stocks of tires and tubes carried by that establishment should carry the tax levy in the same manner as applies to independent tire retailers.

Surely, after 16 years, let this plea in behalf of small business be finally resolved in correction.

Puerto Rico Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding Puerto Rico's constitution day.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

This date is doubly significant to the people of Puerto Rico. Exactly 60 years ago today the United States landed troops in the Spanish colony of Puerto Rico. And exactly 6 years ago today the Island of Puerto Rico became a "free associated state" of the United States—it became the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

While the people of the United States share with their fellow citizens in Puerto Rico an enthusiasm and respect for the achievements of the commonwealth, there is also much here of great significance to millions of other peoples in the world. Six years ago the United States granted to the people of Puerto Rico the form of government they had democratically chosen for themselves. That in itself has great meaning for the world today; but even more importantly, let us look at what Puerto Rico has done with its freedom.

In the years since commonwealth status was granted, Puerto Rico has embarked on an energetic program of development and growth, characteristically termed "Operation bootstrap." It was just that, too. By every legitimate device of encouragement and cooperation, the government of Puerto Rico has brought new industry to the island, has provided new jobs for the people of Puerto Rico, and has provided a better life for all.

It was not too many years ago that Puerto Rico was a shameful testimony to colonial neglect. Now the commonwealth has the next highest standard of living in Central America. Puerto Rico has induced a major program of capital investment and expenditure, but it has not done this at the expense of its people. Hand-in-hand with industrial expansion has come growth of educational and public health facilities. The total life of Puerto Rico's citizens has been attended to, not just the business and economic sector.

And this is probably the most important thing to note on this sixth Puerto Rico constitution day. Self-determination of colonial peoples can be achieved within the framework of democracy. Underdeveloped areas can be brought up by their own bootstraps without the dire consequences too often associated with investments by colonial powers.

Today we can certainly say that Puerto Rico provides clear evidence of the superiority of freedom, clear evidence that the democratic way of life remains one of this Nation's most important exports.

Ethical Standards in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the radio stations in this country which takes frank and open advantage of the right of FCC licensees to express editorial opinions on the air is station WMCA in New York City. Every week, WMCA broadcasts the outspoken and thoughtful editorial opinions of Mr. Nathan Straus.

Mr. Straus is a man of liberal views and of a sincere and broadminded concern for the issues of public policy which confront the people of the great metropolis during the course of each week's news developments. On Friday, July 11, Mr. Straus' thoughtful editorial broadcast was devoted to the current interest in the investigation of the episodes involving Mr. Sherman Adams, Mr. Bernard Goldfine, and certain regulatory agencies of our Government.

Unfortunately, the text of the entire broadcast would be too lengthy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under our rules. However, because Mr. Straus comments at length on certain remarks I have made on this issue, as well as on the proposals made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], along with his New York colleague in the House of Representatives [Mr. KEATING], I thought that Mr. Straus' text was of such interest that it should be brought to the attention of other Members of the Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that excerpts from it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, on an earlier date some of the issues of money and influence in politics which were brought to public attention again in the Adams-Goldfine case were also discussed by the very able and thoughtful commentator, Mr. Edward R. Murrow. Mr. Murrow devoted a part of his Columbia Broadcasting System radio commentary on June 25 to a discussion of the problem of campaign financing, including the proposal of President Theodore Roosevelt for Federal financing of essential campaign costs which I have been urging in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that this part of Mr. Murrow's broadcast be printed in the Appendix.

Finally, I also ask to have included an editorial from the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal of June 30, entitled "Sauce for the Gander" endorsing my proposal that Members of Congress be subject to the same rules of conflicts of interest as apply to executive officials.

There being no objection the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BROADCAST OVER STATION WMCA BY NATHAN STRAUS, JULY 11, 1958

Although this editor expects to omit the weekly WMCA editorials during the summer months, a matter of great public concern deserves immediate editorial comment. We refer, of course, to the Adams-Goldfine case.

Here is the kind of dramatic story that tickles the imagination. Few people like a sanctimonious egoist. It is hard to resist the temptation to be gleeful when a man who has spent much of his life in polishing his own halo, discovers that it has slipped and become a noose.

* * * * *

Sherman Adams, commonly referred to in Washington as Assistant President, has admitted to activities that are not only generally regarded as improper, but actions in all respects identical with those for which he has forced other Government officials to forfeit their jobs. Sherman Adams, who has ousted several high Government officials for acceptance of gifts and gratuities from men involved in cases before Federal Government agencies now admits that he himself has accepted such gifts and gratuities. Sherman Adams may have a pure heart, but he certainly does not have clean hands.

* * * * *

But there is still another aspect of the subcommittee hearings on the conduct of Sherman Adams. It has been admirably stated by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. Senator NEUBERGER said:

"I believe it is time to place in perspective the episode involving Sherman Adams.

"Sherman Adams is the victim of a system under which the spending of large sums of money on politics and politicians is virtually taken for granted among substantial segments of our society. He may not have been an innocent victim. I do not condone his conduct. But I think we should be honest and realistic in appraising it.

"After all, it is not so long ago that the acceptance by a prominent politician of an $18,000 expense fund from real estate and oil operators was turned into a personal triumph over a nationally broadcast television program. Do the gifts to Sherman Adams, about which we have heard so much, add up to a fraction of $18,000?

"When Sherman Adams committed his errors of judgment in doing favors for his friend, the public is being left to infer that he did this because of Mr. Goldfine's vicuna coats and hotel suites. Yet is Sherman Adams any more indebted to Mr. Goldfine for gifts than a man who sits in the Senate or in a governor's chair is indebted to those who collected $100,000 from big-business men or from trade-union political-education funds to pay for his campaign expenses?

"Is Sherman Adams, with his $2,400 rug and $700 vicuna cloth coat more obligated to render unethical favors than is a Member of Congress who is dependent every few years on 20 times that amount from bankers, natural-gas and private-utility owners and distillery executives to finance his billboards and radio and TV shows? What is the difference between one gift and another?

"What is morality in government? Was it virtue for utility stockholders to contribute enormous sums to the Eisenhower campaigns, and then for the President's assistant, Sherman Adams, to call the SEC to postpone a crucial hearing in the Dixon-Yates case—but immorality for the same Sherman Adams to inquire from the SEC about the case of Mr. Goldfine, from whom he had received a $2,400 rug?

"Is it morality for oil and gas tycoons to stage great benefit dinners to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars for the campaigns of Members of Congress in distant States who will vote to lift Federal control from offshore oil deposits or from natural-gas prices—but immorality for Sherman Adams to sign a hotel bill to the account of his friend, Mr. Goldfine?"

WMCA heartily endorses the point of view expressed by Senator NEUBERGER. It is high time for Congress to adopt for itself a code of conduct identical with that by which it judges—and indeed, sentences in the court of public opinion—members of the executive branch of the Government.

Until the same code of ethics is applied to members of the executive branch as to members of the legislative branch, such investigations as the present one certainly smack of hypocrisy. Congressmen cannot well profess horror and shock at the discovery that a man in the executive branch of Government has accepted gifts and contributions. Hardly any Congressman has not been guilty of similar conduct—on a larger scale.

Some of the finest legislators in both the Senate and the House of Representatives have shown distaste for this strange difference in standards of conduct. In 1951, a subcommittee, headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, studied the subject, and made concrete recommenda-

tions to the Congress. Nothing came of the Douglas committee recommendations.

Within the week, Senator JACOB JAVITS and Representative KENNETH KEATING, Republicans, of New York, have introduced bills looking toward the establishment of a code of ethics for Congressmen. WMCA hopes that, at this session, action will be taken on these bills. But, judging by past experience, this hope is apt to be disappointed.

In studying the establishment of a code which would limit the apparently limitless freedom of members of the legislative branch to accept gifts, gratuities and favors, under the present custom, WMCA believes that Congress might well consider simultaneously whether the restrictions now imposed on members of the executive branch are not unduly severe. Specifically, the requirement that such an official dispose of all of his private investments in corporations which might have a conflict of interest with a public regulatory agency, seems unnecessary, extreme and unfair. The same purpose might be achieved, as others have pointed out, by requiring merely that every important official in the executive branch make periodic disclosure of all of his holdings in private corportions and other private business enterprise, as well as a detailed listing of all his sources of income.

The Congress has a responsibility to watch carefully over the administration of the agencies, departments and programs which it establishes. In carrying out this duty, a Congressional subcommittee may find it necessary to investigate the extent of improper influence, whether by the White House or others, over an agency in order to discover whether the agency is really "independent." But this important work of the Congress should be carried on—and can be carried on—without violence to the rights of citizens and without undermining the confidence of the public in Congressional procedure.

WMCA urges the following program. One, the congressional subcommittee investigating the Sherman Adams-Goldfine case should stop its circus antics and settle down to the business at hand, while scrupulously avoiding character assassination on the basis of unsupported hearsay evidence.

Two, full TV and radio coverage of the subcommittee hearings should be permitted—and even encouraged. It is highly educational procedure for the people of the country to be able to watch their Government at work. Moreover, attendance by sight and hearing, though not in the flesh, will enable the people to form an opinion as to the credibility of a witness.

Three, WMCA urges that Congress go forward immediately with a thoroughgoing examination of its own conduct, with early adoption of a code of ethics for its own members identical with the code imposed on members of the executive branch of the Government.

EDWARD R. MURROW WITH THE NEWS, CBS RADIO NETWORK, JUNE 25, 1958

This is news:

* * * * *

It is now becoming almost fashionable to say that the case of Sherman Adams will, after all, do some good. It will somehow focus attention on the receiving of gifts, and the exercising of influence. This may be true, for a short while. But there isn't much evidence that publicity produces probity.

It is at least worth noting that most of the members of Mr. Adams' own party who have been asking for his dismissal, are those who are up for election in the autumn. Those who do not face the possibility of being dismissed by the voters appear to take a more charitable view of Mr. Adams' actions. It would be possible to conclude that the definition of ethical conduct—the determination of what is prudent and imprudent—depends to a considerable extent upon whether the politician making the judgment is up for election or whether he isn't—a kind of timetable opinion.

The Democrats, of course, do not have to search their conscience, past speeches or actions. They can pose as the defenders of everything ethical, decent, and downright upright—no influence, no hostages, no gifts. This is particularly true if their memories are sufficiently short. The Democrats have received a political bonus in the Adams case, although, it's probably true to say that they would have preferred to have had it delayed for about a year, so that it would have helped them more in 1960. It is a harsh and unpleasant fact that our political system depends in large measure upon gifts and influence. If there should be removed from Washington all those politicians who have accepted gifts or exerted influence, the political population would be decimated. This is true, not because the men are venal, dishonest or unethical. It is true because of the system. Every candidate who accepts a campaign contribution is somehow beholden to the giver, whether it be a labor union, a public utility, a personal friend, or any group, organized or unorganized. These men once elected may show the utmost indifference to the interests of those who contributed to their campaign funds—some do—but they have nevertheless accepted a gift of value.

When a heavy campaign contributor to either party is named to a Cabinet post, or made Ambassador to a major foreign power, this, of course, is not a business transaction where a position is purchased for a price, but there is a certain resemblance.

The acceptance of campaign contributions must, to a certain extent, influence the politician and his vote. And the attempt by the politician to influence regulatory and other administrative agencies is inevitable—not because he has been bought, but because he knows the local situation and his political future may well be involved. The alternative to the exercise of this type of influence would be to have decisions in vast areas of government made exclusively by the burgeoning bureaucracy in Washington, without any influence being brought to bear by the representatives of the people who will be primarily affected by the decision.

Political campaigning becomes increasingly expensive. The demand for campaign gifts increases. The control of regulatory agencies in Washington over the affairs of persons and corporations also increases. The present system of political gifts can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. But a workable alternative is hard to come by. Perhaps the size of campaign contributions should be further reduced. Perhaps closer scrutiny of disguised corporation and labor union contributions would help.

It might even be possible to devise a method whereby national elections would be nationally financed, where all private contributions would be banned, and where the taxpayer would pay the whole of the cost. Theodore Roosevelt once played with this idea. But it would present enormous difficulties, and not alone in the field of allocation, administration, and policing. It could also raise a fundamental question of personal freedom. In some countries voting is compulsory. We have never done things that way, apparently believing that the individual has the right not to vote. About 40 percent of us generally don't vote in a national election. If political campaigns were to be financed at the public expense, then the 40 percent could really claim taxation without representation.

It ought to be possible to devise a better method for handling our affairs.

* * * * *

The American humorist, Finley Peter Dunne, was like Will Rogers in that he really knew his politics. Dunne once remarked that "a man who would expect to train lobsters to fly in a year is called a lunatic. But," he said, "a man that thinks men can be turned into angels by an election is a reformer, and that man remains at large."

Goodnight and good luck.

[From the Beaumont (TEX.) Journal of June 30, 1958]

SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

"Who is going to police the policeman?" This is the question Oregon's Democratic Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER keeps asking as he presses for passage of a measure that would make Members of Congress pass a law to police themselves.

Specifically, his bill would compel the Members of Congress and other high Government officials once a year to file a report on the sources and amounts of each item of income or gifts that exceed $100. The report would include speaking or writing fees and a statement of assets and liabilities and dealings in securities or commodities during the previous year.

Senator NEUBERGER makes no apologies for Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams. He knows the overcoat of publicity is a political windfall for his party this year. Yet he says the inconsistency between the rules which Congress, with a great show of righteousness applies to executive officials, and its failure to apply identical standards to its own Members, undoubtedly has reflected adversely on the reputation of Congress in the public mind.

The Oregonian's concern should be shared by more of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle in Congress. It should be shared by all American voters who gave them their seats. The men who make our laws and appropriate our tax money should be subject to the same scrutiny as those who serve in the executive branch of our Government.

Influence-peddling is no less of an evil for one than it is the other. It may never be entirely eliminated from our elective system of government, but it should be minimized as much as possible. Congress ought to see that it is.

Tribute to the Late Walter A. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State of South Carolina has lost one of its most valuable and best loved citizens with the death of Walter A. Johnson, the athletic director at Presbyterian College, at Clinton, S. C.

Coach Johnson was much more than an athletic director. His name is known everywhere in South Carolina. His strong character, high ideals, and his genuine affection for his fellow man, influenced the lives of many thousands of South Carolinians. It can be truthfully said that he made South Carolina a better place in which to live.

Walter Johnson was a native of the great State of Minnesota, but he spent 43 of his 65 years in South Carolina, as head of the athletic department at Presbyterian College. During that time, Presbyterian College acquired a national reputation for the excellence of its athletic program. Walter Johnson believed

that every student should participate in some form of athletics. He believed in physical fitness, and his beliefs led to a broader appreciation of the values of athletics throughout the State.

He was a director of the South Carolina Boys' State, a brigadier general in the National Guard, and an honoree of the Fall of Fame of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., and the State, of Columbia, S. C., relating to his death.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 24, 1958]

WALTER A. JOHNSON

Some years ago the students of the University of South Carolina presented an award to Walter A. Johnson, coach and director of athletics at Presbyterian College in Clinton for many decades.

The presentation expressed appreciation for "an influence helpful to college sports far beyond the campus of the institution he directly serves."

That was a fitting recognition of Coach Johnson's service to athletics on his own campus, throughout the State and over this entire region.

But such was the character of the man who was the beloved dean of college coaches and athletic directors in our State that, long before the close of his colorful career, his helpful influence reached far beyond the field of sports.

Walter A. Johnson was an educator and a soldier, having attained the rank of brigadier general in the National Guard. He was a sportsman who sought to extend direct participation in some form of athletics to everyone possessed of the skill and desire and did as much as any one man ever did to broaden the appreciation of the best in athletics.

But his finest achievement was as a great human being, a friend to mankind, his personality as a Christian gentleman.

This State will long be in his debt.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of July 24, 1958]

WALTER JOHNSON

Death, coming quietly in the night, removed Walter Johnson from the scene yesterday, but the influence of his life will carry on for generations.

Coach Johnson spent 43 of his 65 years as head of the athletic department at Presbyterian College. The imprint he made there, and in many other South Carolina undertakings, makes his name synonymous with good sportsmanship, fair play, loyalty to Christian ideals, and strong character.

During his career he received many offers to go to larger and more lucrative fields, in political and business areas as well as in his chosen profession, but he declined them all to remain where his heart was.

He was selfless in his service to others, whether as coach or athletic director, as a brigadier general in the National Guard or director of South Carolina Boys State, as a neighbor or a friend. In his dealings with people he was guileless and sincere. He never magnified a fault; he never failed to emphasize a virtue. His enthusiasm was infectious, and often even electrifying.

South Carolina was fortunate that young "Swede" Johnson, an outstanding athlete in his own right, chose this State for his life's work. The monuments of his memory—and already there are several—will not outlive the fruits of his example and leadership.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Flops Again," from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of July 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 19, 1958]

FOREIGN AID FLOPS AGAIN

(Editorial from the Chicago Tribune)

The first thing to note about the bloody revolt in Iraq is that, once again, we have before us an example of dismal miscalculation in Washington.

Once again we have a demonstration that the economic aid we have been scattering through the Middle and Near East in the hope of winning lasting friends has been wasted. Soon we may discover that our aid was worse than wasted, for the weapons that we sent to our supposed good friends under the title of military aid may be turned against us.

The latest available accounting of what our International Cooperation Administration has spent in the region from Egypt to Pakistan covers the period from April 1948 to March of this year.

It shows, to select a few examples, that our Government has obligated itself to pay Egypt $61 million and has actually given $41 million.

Iran did better. It has been promised 318 million and has actually received 273 million in the decade.

IRAQ GETS SHARE

Iraq has been regarded as a British responsibility but, even so, Iraq has been promised a total of 14 million and has received 12 million.

For Israel the corresponding figures are $291 and $282 million; for Jordan, 59 and 56 million; for Lebanon, 36 and 20 million; for the support of the Baghdad pact, we promised $12 million last year but so far have managed to hand over only $107,000.

We have pledged 370 million to Pakistan and paid 253 million. The corresponding figures for Turkey are 663 million and 579 million.

The grand total for the decade for the region described by the ICA as "Near East and south Asia" is nearly $3.2 billion of obligations and 2.7 billion of actual expenditures.

CAN'T BUY FRIENDS

For the first three quarters of the fiscal year that ended a few weeks ago the obligations assumed were $112 million and the payments 261 million. Possibly believers in the foreign aid nostrum will argue that the obligations assumed were materially less than in any of the other recent years, but the argument fails because the money actually spent includes gifts authorized in previous years and is hardly less than the recipients have become accustomed to getting.

A foreign policy founded upon buying friends with cash has failed. Egypt and Syria are now clear off the reservation. The government in Lebanon is in trouble. Iraq's government, assumed to be friendly, has been overthrown. The future of the Baghdad pact as a means of halting the southward spread of communism is, to say the least, a dark one.

Let those who have insisted all along that American taxpayers are getting their money's worth for the enormous burden of foreign aid they have been carrying explain, if they can, what went wrong. To the rest of us, the answer is obvious. What went wrong was a foregin policy based on a monstrous miscalculation of what can be bought with money.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the July 17, 1958, issue of the Milwaukie Review, of Milwaukie, Oreg., appeared an eloquent and persuasive editorial against the institution which we know as capital punishment.

One of the most shocking and poignant statements in the editorial is that every person executed in Oregon for the last 21 years has been defended only by a court-appointed lawyer. In other words, the men put to death by the State in Oregon have been men who were too poor in purse to employ their own legal defense. Does this not tell us that the electric chair and the gas chamber seem to be reserved, in large measure, for those who are in poverty and without substantial financial backing?

The people of my State will vote November 4, 1958, whether or not they want to continue the death penalty as part of Oregon's penal system. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Milwaukie Review, which has been written by one of the outstanding members of the Oregon State Senate, the Honorable Monroe Sweetland, of Clackamas County, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Sweetland is editor of the Milwaukie Review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review of July 17, 1958]

IF WHAT YOU WANT IS EXTERMINATION

"If what you want to do is exterminate, I can pick out 200 men in my custody who are far more dangerous to the public than the men in death row."

Thus spoke Richard McGee, chief of California's prison system, in testifying against capital punishment in Sacramento recently.

Between now and November 4th Oregonians will be deciding whether or not they will vote to remove the death penalty from Oregon's Constitution.

If Oregon joins the growing number of States and nations which have abolished the death penalty we will be doing the right thing on several counts:

1. The statistics and the record show clearly that the death penalty does not deter crime, but rather makes difficult the conviction of most persons accused of capital crimes.

2. Executions are almost exclusively reserved for the helpless, poor and racially

unpopular. Every person executed in Oregon for the last 21 years has been defended only by a court-appointed lawyer, being unable to employ his own. Other first-degree murderers escape the maximum penalty.

3. Those who commit murders, as a group, are not considered by penologists to be as unredeemable or as menacing to society as several other types of felons. ("Habitual criminals," etc.)

4. If our purpose is justice and redemption, to kill the accused removes the last chance to correct our errors. Last week in a southern State a convicted man, sentenced to death, was released when another confessed the murder. Last month an Oregon man was convicted of murder, and within 2 weeks the chief witness admitted she lied in the testimony which convicted him. These instances occur every year.

5. Killing under any pretext is contrary to all religious precept except among the most retributive and primitive religious sects.

When Oregon voters approve abolition of capital punishment, the maximum penalty, except for treason or a second killing while under sentence, will be life imprisonment, with strict limits on parole. We will join the States of Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Delaware, Maine, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin and the soon-to-be State of Alaska. Most of the advanced nations have abolished it including Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium. The death penalty is finally in its last months in England, where only 150 years ago there were 200 crimes punishable by death.

It is difficult for people to be unemotional about capital punishment, but we hope that before they emote over the issue on November's ballot, that they will examine the facts. Then let the emoting be done on a basis of supportable fact, rather than hobgoblins of prejudice inherited from the dark past.

Nearly every prison warden, including that tough hombre, Warden Clarence Gladden of Oregon, oppose the death penalty. Those men know. We hope Oregon voters will strike the bloody relic from the Constitution. We will have better law enforcement and more accurate justice if we do.

A Vicious Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the so-called wilderness bill.

This editorial was written by Gideon Oppenheimer, publisher of the Caldwell Times, a daily newspaper published at Caldwell, Idaho.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, through this editorial, to some of the unsavory features of this bill, which has been supported with many high-flown phrases and presented as the peak of conservation for the Nation.

This editorial points out the cold economic blight which the bill would bring to the State of Idaho, without bringing the results the proposers of this measure allegedly espouse, development of resources for the most benefit to the most people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VICIOUS BILL

The so-called wilderness bill, hearings on which open in Washington, D. C., next week, is a bill designed to deprive Idaho permanently of any hope for economic growth. It would freeze 65 percent of our area as a playground for the rest of the country.

Becoming the vacation spot for the Nation would not be uninviting. Florida and Nevada have done well as tourist spots and Maine would be permanently poverty-stricken if it were not for summer time tourst dollars.

However, the bill would not develop the recreational potential of our primitive areas. It would merely leave it as it is now—a playground for a few millionaires and inaccessible to the average Idahoan or visitor.

As Canyon County's Representative George L. Crookham, Jr., pointed out to the Times yesterday, even our most highly industrialized States at one time were wilderness.

A bill such as the Neuberger-Humphrey bill would rob the Gem State of any possibility of joining the progress of our sister States.

We have been lagging behind for too long. The wilderness bill would make certain we would never catch up.

Puerto Rico's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to express my congratulations and my best wishes to my fellow citizens of Puerto Rico on the occasion of this sixth anniversary of the act which elevated Puerto Rico to the status of a free commonwealth associated with the United States of America.

I want to congratulate the people of Puerto Rico on the advancements which have been made since that date of July 25, 1952.

I also want to congratulate my fellow citizens on the leadership of the Commonwealth—leaders like your Governor Muñoz-Marín and your Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN. I have always maintained that any nation or any state or any city can remain strong if it has wise political leadership, wise economic leadership, and wise spiritual leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and pleasure to visit the island paradise of Puerto Rico on several different occasions. It is my hope that I will be able to visit the island again several times in the future.

I have followed with interest the new developments in Puerto Rico. I have found the people taking a greater and greater interest in their Government and in civic affairs. The Commonwealth has a good government, wisely investing the legislative power in a senate and house of representatives; executive power in the hands of a Governor who is elected by the people; and a good judiciary composed of a supreme court and a lower court system.

It is my belief the Commonwealth will continue to build for the good of all our fellow citizens who live there. The Commonwealth will develop an ever growing economy in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to congratulate the fine American citizens of the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in analyzing the recent vote of the House of Representatives in favor of H. R. 3, the so-called States rights bill, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., pointed out that public sentiment in favor of restoring to the States their proper rights and powers is growing.

There can be no doubt that the people of the State of South Carolina are greatly concerned with the trend toward centralization of the Government at the expense of the sovereign States, and, ultimately, at the expense of every individual. I believe that this concern is growing throughout the Nation, as reflected by the recent vote of the House of Representatives, and I hope that the Senate will have an opportunity to cast a similarly favorable vote for H. R. 3 at this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Greenville News, entitled "Vote Shows Concern Over Court Trends," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it appeared in the News on July 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[For the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 24, 1958]

VOTE SHOWS CONCERN OVER COURT TRENDS

A vote of great significance for this country was the heavy majority—240 to 155—by which the House last week passed the Smith bill designed to curb the power of the United States Supreme Court to nullify State laws.

The final fate of this bill, of course, is still uncertain. It may not pass the Senate, and if it does it may run into a veto, since some administrative departments oppose it. But the vote reflects a steadily growing public sentiment that recent trends in Supreme Court decisions are threatening impairment of the proper rights and powers of the States in the regulation of affairs within their borders.

The House vote, in which many Republicans as well as Democrats, mainly southerners, supported the bill indicates strong approval of its principles in all sections of the country.

In recent years various Supreme Court decisions have been criticized by thoughtful

citizens of all sections, because of their trend toward making Federal law the exclusive power and nullifying State laws on the same subject.

In several instances the Court has ruled invalid State laws on various subjects on the grounds that by enacting nationwide laws the Congress has preempted those particular fields of law.

The most recent case was that of Steve Nelson in Pennsylvania, who was convicted of subversive activities in the State courts under State laws. The Supreme Court overthrew the conviction, saying that Federal laws superseded the State laws.

In another case, the Court held that State laws pertaining to the inspection of foods and drugs and establishing certain sanitary standards were invalid because the Federal Government had taken over this field through the Pure Food and Drug Act.

Yet, it has been freely admitted that the Federal Government does not have enough authority and enough personnel to fully protect the public in all of the States against impurities in the food they eat and the drugs they take.

The effect of these decisions is to prevent the States from protecting themselves in areas in which the Federal Government cannot or does not act. The trend established by these decisions could gradually eliminate all police and regulatory functions of the local governments.

There is more than a principle involved here, as important as the matter of States rights is. Also involved is the matter of practical administration. In many areas of regulating public service and preventing crime, local authority can be more effective than either State or Federal authority.

That is what Congress is trying to protect. The bill just passed by the House is intended to stop further encroachment of the court on such State and local authority. Members of Congress have denied that their intention in passing the legislation in question was to circumvent or replace State or local laws.

Thus, they spelled it out: * * * unless Congress, in passing a certain act, specifically says so, no Federal law shall be interpreted as superseding State laws on the same subject, so long as the State and Federal laws are not in direct conflict and the conflict cannot be reasonably reconciled.

In the cases in question, there were no points of conflict between State and Federal laws that could not be reconciled.

This bill is far from being an answer to the grave problem of the assumption of the lawmaking power on the part of the Federal courts. It may not even be given final approval.

But it is a step in the right direction, and the character of the vote indicates that concern over the usurpation of legislative and executive power by the Supreme Court in particular is beginning to be nationwide.

Conditions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Get Ground Rules Straight," from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of July 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GET GROUND RULES STRAIGHT

What are we willing to fight for and against in the Middle East?

If, as could well happen, American blood is spilled in Lebanon or Iraq, what will American soldiers be dying for?

In our book, we can throw ideology out of this one. For, we are not fighting communism in the Middle East. We apparently are prepared to fight, rather, an emotional reaction on the part of the Arab world which transcends nationalism but has the same quality.

As the Wall Street Journal so aptly points out:

"Now it may be true that in one sense we are here opposing Moscow. But this is only because Moscow has shrewdly and opportunistically allied itself with the forces in the Middle East which we have chosen to oppose. In no sense is this a battle against communism as an ideology, as in Korea, a war against Communist imperial aggression.

"What we are struggling against in the Middle East is a rising tide of people's deep emotions. It is not, strictly speaking, nationalism, since the emotions involved are not localized by accepted national boundaries. It is not Nasserism, as it is often called, because it did not originate with Mr. Nasser nor will it disappear with Mr. Nasser. The best term is probably 'Pan-Arabism'."

And that pan-Arabism is compounded of pent-up feelings, sparked by centuries of colonialism, of the certainty on the part of the Arabs that they have been had by the British, the French, and, yes, the Americans.

This, it seems to us, is one instance where the Russians are in a position to speak our usual dialog. We would admit there is a difference. The Reds are speaking out of cynical hearts. In the past, when we have talked of saving the world for democracy or of working for the ultimate freedom of mankind, we have had the saving grace of being naive but honest.

And the tragedy is that this country, as usual, is following the pattern of the civilized world. We make our big move too late.

Recent history proves that if Hitler had been stopped when he marched into the Ruhr, World War II might never have been sparked. If Mussolini had been halted when he marched into Abyssinia, Fascism might have been stopped in its tracks.

If Japan had been brought to book when it first invaded China, Pearl Harbor would not be a day of infamy in this country's history.

And now we come to another big "if."

If the United States had not adopted its policy of 1956, when Britain, France and Israel were intent on putting the quietus on Nasser, American forces would not have been put ashore in Lebanon in 1958 and a dangerous prelude to world war III would have been avoided.

We have stumbled into an untenable position through a miserable series of mistakes in judgment and we're stuck with it.

There is evidence that the Iraq revolt—naturally exploited by the Soviet—stems from Britain's insistence on keeping a puppet king on the throne who was both unpopular and weak.

The United Nations insists that its inspection team did not find the evidence of infiltration into Lebanon by forces inimical to the present government. It further insists that its team of observers—numbering 135—is perfectly capable of doing the job we have assigned 5,000 Marines and 1,600 airborne troops.

And should the whole thing explode into global war, we would paraphrase a veteran phrasemaker by commenting.

Never will so many have done so little too late.

United States Ships Should Be Permitted To Use the Welland Canal Without Paying a Toll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the Seaway Authority of Canada proposes to charge tolls for the use of the Welland Canal is a matter of great concern to citizens of Ohio and other Great Lakes States. Approximately 75 percent of the traffic passing through this canal is Great Lakes commerce.

For decades Canadian ships have freely enjoyed the use of three American locks at the Soo, where their own lock has virtually been retired, and all American channel passage rights in lakes waters. It would seem that our representatives in the toll discussions would be in a good position to insist that the Welland Canal be kept free of tolls. This is especially true since the United States is spending approximately five times as much in deepening the connecting channels as Canada spent in improving the Welland Canal.

I have written Mr. Lewis G. Castle, Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, urging that everything possible be done to keep the Welland Canal free of tolls. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD my letter, together with editorials from the Cleveland News of June 20 and the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 19:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1958.

Mr. LEWIS G. CASTLE,
Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASTLE: The announcement that the seaway authority of Canada proposes to collect tolls for passage through the Welland Canal is a matter of great concern to citizens of Ohio since approximately 75 percent of the traffic passing through the Welland Canal is Great Lakes commerce.

It would appear that the United States negotiators lost an exceptionally fine opportunity in their negotiating with the Government of Canada in not insisting that the Welland Canal remain free of tolls inasmuch as we are spending about 5 times as much in deepening the connecting channels as Canada spent in deepening the Welland Canal.

It should also be pointed out that for decades, Canadian ships have freely enjoyed the use of 3 American locks at the Soo, where their own lock has virtually been retired, and all American channel rights in lake waters.

In case you have not seen it, I am enclosing a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland News on June 20.

Would you be good enough to advise me what action we may take in this matter. It is my understanding that the entire program of tolls is to be reviewed in Ottawa and Washington hearings on August 6. I urge that everything possible be done to keep the Welland Canal free of tolls.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Cleveland News of June 20, 1958]

TOLLS AIMED AT FREE LAKES

For more than 100 years, the United States and Canada have been good neighbors in the free use of navigable waters touching their shores.

This accord has been one of the great traditions of peace and commerce during that century.

No ships using the Great Lakes or its locks system have been charged tolls. No ships using the Canadian-owned Welland Canal as part of their lakes passage have been assessed.

This neighborliness has been a tribute to the excellent trade relations between the two countries.

Now Canada, in a surprising reversal of its long-standing position, has decided that, with the St. Lawrence seaway's debut, all vessels using the Welland Canal or any part thereof, no matter who flag they fly, will pay tolls.

Through its seaway agency, the Canadian Government asserts that this toll program must be instituted to pay for the capital cost of deepening the Welland, as well as for its operation and maintenance.

This disservice decision is especially painful. All Canadian ships for decades have freely enjoyed the use of three American locks at the Soo, where their own lock has virtually been retired, and all American channel passage rights in lakes waters.

Naturally we are reluctant to attach an interpretation of reprisal to this action, but it has the earmarks. Canada vigorously sought a policy of no tolls for the seaway against American wishes, since it expects to underwrite its share of the seaway development through the sale of public power, and now through the Welland fees.

The United States entered this compact with Canada for constructing the seaway as a cooperative project only with the understanding that seaway tolls would be agreed to, and set by both nations.

Canada's imposition of Welland tolls can hardly be considered less than punitive when its effect on American iron ore and steel companies, which have substantial mineral holdings in Labrador, is measured.

Unless Canada chooses to strain this spirit of open and free Great Lakes, it should give serious thought to reconsideration of this policy before the entire program of tolls is reviewed in Ottawa and Washington hearings August 6.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 19, 1958]

BATTLE OVER TOLLS

The battle over tolls to be charged vessels using the St. Lawrence seaway has begun. Hearings are to be held in Ottawa and Washington August 6. Prospective shippers are concerned lest the tolls be so high as to discourage full use of the facility.

There is more than this at stake, however. The proposal of Canada to charge tolls for the use of the Welland Canal would actually penalize interlake shipping which is in no way related to the seaway.

Vice Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, has called on the State Department to make an appeal to Canada to cancel the proposed tolls. He pointed out that the Welland Canal has been toll free since 1871, as are all other Great Lakes connecting channels. Moreover 75 percent of the traffic through the Welland Canal last year, amounting to 16 million tons, was not seaway traffic. It was traffic between ports on Lake Ontario and those of the other Great Lakes. The proposed tolls on this tonnage would amount to about 6 cents a ton of cargo delivered and would add to the cost of goods produced or consumed in the Great Lakes area.

Admiral Spencer's point is that Canada should pay for improvements to the Welland Canal, just as the United States will pay for improvements on its connecting channels, which are toll free.

We believe this point is well taken. It is a matter which should be settled before the hearings on the seaway tolls get under way.

Address by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield at Simon Bolivar Stamp Ceremony

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the Post Office Department dedicated a set of two stamps in its Champion of Liberty series honoring Simon Bolivar, the great South American patriot and leader.

In a ceremony held in the Postmaster General's reception room before a distinguished group of visitors, including the entire Latin American diplomatic corps and representatives of the Congress and the Government, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield delivered an eloquent testimony to Simon Bolivar and his great contributions to the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Summerfield's remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD AT SIMON BOLIVAR STAMP CEREMONY, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 24, 1958

The Champions of Liberty commemorative postage stamps being issued by the United States are focusing worldwide attention upon outstanding leaders and fighters for freedom.

Although these great benefactors of humanity lived in many different lands, their lives were always dedicated to militant leadership in mankind's eternal struggle for justice.

The first of these commemorative stamps was released in August 1957, in memory of Ramon Magsaysay, the late President of the Philippines, who devoted his exceptional bravery and unimpeachable integrity to the cause of freedom until his life ended so tragically after 50 short but memorable years.

President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and I am sure also all these many distinguished guests assembled here today, join me and my colleagues in the Postal Service in a sense of gratification and of fulfilment, too, that the second issuance of these stamps is dedicated to Simon Bolivar.

Later this year the third set of Champions of Liberty stamps will pay tribute to Lajos Kossuth, the Hungarian patriot, and next February, the fourth will honor another famous South American fighter for freedom, Gen. Jose San Martin.

Simon Bolivar, who was affectionately acclaimed by the people he free as the Liberator, was born 175 years ago in Caracas, Venezuela, and died 47 years later near the village of Santa Marta, Colombia.

His was a short existence when measured by the ordinary life span. But the Liberator was not an ordinary man and his manifold deeds in behalf of Spanish-America's liberation are testaments to his greatness.

Simon Bolivar was far more than the leader of a revolutionary army; he was the father of the revolution that brought freedom to his people.

Simon Bolivar was only 22 years old when he made his famous vow in 1805 in Rome, swearing to dedicate himself to the cause of freedom.

To the fulfillment of that sacred oath, Simon Bolivar gave his material fortune, his tremendous strength of mind and body, and, in the end, his very life itself.

The Liberator's military exploits place him among the great captains of all times. At the age of 42, he had been in the field for 15 years and had directed nearly 500 battles over some 3 million square miles of territory. He had led his armies of barefoot heroes through the steamy boglands of the Magdalena Valley in his march to liberate Bogotá as well as over the towering ice-capped peaks of the Andes on numerous occasions, at altitudes up to 15,000 feet.

Early in 1829, the final victory was won and the lands which today comprise the Republics of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela were free. Panama had, of her own will, also come under his protection.

As a man possessed of broad vision, objective political reality, and an unshakable conviction of the true causes and meaning of freedom, the Liberator also ranks high among the most farsighted statesmen of history.

His three outstanding documents were the Manifesto of Cartegena, the Jamaica Letter, and the Bolivar Constitution. In addition, his many speeches, proclamations, and vast amount of correspondence to people throughout the world mark him as one of history's clearest thinkers and writers, and the most articulate, colorful, and spontaneous orator of his day.

He lived in the 19th century, but his thoughts, his philosophy, and his conception of the need for Pan American Union and solidarity are of equal significance to all of us today nearly two centuries later.

His amazing prophetic Jamaica letter outlined the need for a union of all the Republics of America—not governmental—but rather of peoples united for mutual protection against encroachment of decadent political philosophies.

The liberator sincerely believed in freedom of speech and of the press and granted them to the fullest extent. He did not believe in force as a substitute for reason. In the Bolivar Constitution of 1819, he wrote:

"Nothing is so dangerous as permitting unlimited power to remain in the same citizen for a long period of time. That system of government is the most perfect which produces the greatest measure of happiness, social security and political stability for its people."

Simon Bolivar—the Liberator—fought to destroy tyranny. He believed it better to die for freedom than to live in slavery; that freedom and democracy go hand in hand but that democracy must balance the demands of liberty and those of stability within a free society to prevent the rise of anarchy.

Importantly, too, he believed that international problems can be best met by the free peoples of the world bound together in a common determination to seek all solutions

through peaceful negotiations, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust.

It is most fitting and proper that so distinguished a man should be honored by the issuance of these United States Champion of Liberty commemorative postage stamps.

The likeness of Simon Bolivar reproduced on these beautiful stamps is based on a portrait painted by Ricardo Acevedo-Bernal which was kindly furnished the Post Office Department by the Embassy of Venezuela here in Washington. The three artist members of the Department's Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee—Messrs. Arnbid Copeland, Ervine Metzl, and William Buckley—collaborated on the visual plan for the stamp which was so skillfully engraved and printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

These new stamps are being issued in both the 4-cent denomination for use on first-class mail in the United States as of August 1, 1958, and in the 8-cent denomination for international surface mail. We have authorized an initial printing of 120 million of the 4-cent denomination and 40 million of the 8-cent denomination. Tomorrow both these stamps will be on sale in the Nation's 36,605 post offices. Their widespread use throughout the world will reemphasize the importance that Simon Bolivar's life and deeds hold for all liberty-loving peoples.

It is now my pleasure to present autographed albums of these Simon Bolivar stamps to a group of distinguished persons.

"Seward's Folly" Looks Like a Wise Purchase 90 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the voice of United States is heard in editorials and comments from newspaper publishers and editors. One such excellent expression is found in an editorial from the News-Herald, Marion, Ind., dated July 18, 1958, which I ask to have included under unanimous consent in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

"SEWARD'S FOLLY" LOOKS LIKE A WISE PURCHASE 90 YEARS LATER

Credit for wisdom often comes late in life. Sometimes it comes long after death.

Such is very definitely true in the case of William Seward, Secretary of State in the Cabinets of Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson.

Nearly 90 years ago, Secretary Seward engineered the purchase of Alaska from Russia. The total cost was less than $8 million. Alaska is 2½ times the size of Texas.

Pricewise, the United States paid less than 2 cents an acre for this fabulous land.

Seward's action was not popular. Politicians stormed and newspapers ranted. Several parsons preached sermons. Senators just getting into stride on the Lincoln myth, spoke strongly along the lines, "If Abe were living, this foolishness would never have been permitted."

Alaska was tagged "Seward's Folly," "Seward's Icebox," and other names unprintable in a family publication.

Time has vindicated William Seward. Even discounting the treasures already removed from Alaska's soil and streams, and the treasures still untapped, the old boy made a pretty shrewd deal.

If Alaska had remained in Russia's possession, who can imagine the fortifications and airfields that would have been built there since 1945?

Get your map and take a look at Alaska—and the short bomber distance from Alaska to the ring of cities constituting the United States of America's heart—Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Denver, St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Louisville, Pittsburgh, and Toledo.

Mr. Seward bought more wisely than he—much less his critics knew, or lived long enough to ever know.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal News of Nyack, N. Y., of July 19, 1958:

MISSED BOAT

The Democratic Party of the State, if it wants to turn to its advantage the very evident popularity of James A. Farley, needs only to give him the nomination for United States Senator. Apparently, for reasons best known to the party's present guidance, it doesn't want to, gets only lukewarm to the suggestion, and hopes the gentleman from Grassy Point will stop rounding up convention backing. It would appear from way down here in the southeast corner of the State it's a very vain hope; the Democrats don't have another candidate strong enough to head him off in popular support.

Popular support is where the Farley strength lies. We know him down here as a neighbor; it's startling, though, when you get the comments from other far corners of the State and points midway from men who know what their Democrat voters are thinking. Admittedly the present Democratic command is different from what it was in the days Farley strength was at its peak, yet Farley strength shows few indications of decline. His hold on old friends and on new ones is little short of amazing; political faith is of small consequence, it would appear.

That letter directed to the Republican organization in the county urging endorsement of Mr. Farley is little short of being unique. Can you imagine what would happen to a similar letter urging support of Thomas K. Finletter or Mayor Robert Wagner? If one had been written, it would either go into the circular file or be hooted down with laughter. The Republican organization took no action—but it thought well enough of the suggestion to let it be made public.

Nor would there be anything surprising if county Republican voters, in the course of the poll that is scheduled, were to register heavy support for Mr. Farley. He is a very favorite hometown son, a man of national prominence who refuses to shake the brickyard dust from his shoes. County Democrats have surely missed the boat by yards and yards and are in a most embarrassing spot; even if Mr. Farley were to miss out on the Democratic nomination, the county organization should have been beating the drum for him 5 minutes after he announced he was ready and willing as a candidate.

Republicans at the State level can turn things generally to their own advantage. If Democrats refuse Mr. Farley the nomination, then there's a broad avenue of attack not only on a weaker candidate but on the slight the party handed one of its lifetime stalwarts. If Mr. Farley is nominated and runs away from the rest of the ticket, as seems possible, the slim margin by which the Democrats took the State 4 years ago slides off the edge. Moreover, if that happens, the State Democratic organization is in for a reshuffle and the present leaders don't want that.

The amusing thing in the whole picture is the almost complete Democratic silence on the Senate nomination; the big brass is pretty much over a barrel and knows it, will have trouble getting out of its unpleasant position. Saving face, which is always a political necessity, is very difficult. Meanwhile, to make it more unpleasant, the Republicans sit back and laugh appreciatively.

The raised eyebrows on local support for Mr. Farley have been amusing, too. We had not heard it was necessary to be either Democrat or Republican to support a native son. It's very much a privilege to be able to back a native son who has risen to national prominence and there's no reason we know of it's necessary to swallow the whole kit and kaboodle. We might be more inclined that way if the party organization had shown any particular political talent.

We have an idea Bill Vines, county vice chairman for the Democrats, was wearing political hobbles he didn't quite relish when he said for the organization anent the Farley candidacy that he wasn't surprised by Republican support and that the Democrats have plenty of able candidates. Bill Vines doesn't make with lame political talk normally and that statement did limp badly, as he very well knew it did.

Maybe the Democratic organization figures it knows what its's doing and can come up with a more able candidate than Mr. Farley. No harm in thinking so; no harm in disagreeing, either. Mr. Farley himself is not above disagreeing with the party, something he did very clearly and concisely when he walked out on a third term for Roosevelt. He didn't renounce his Democratic allegiance, just stayed off in the background with a great many more party members who felt as he did. Possibly the same Democratic faction that plugged for the third and fourth terms is running the present show—but the voters have altered their viewpoint in the interim.

Somehow or other, though, we have an idea Mr. Farley will come up with the Democratic nomination, not from those in present control but from those political warhorses who know a good candidate when they see one and put him on the ticket. They're the ones who talk Mr. Farley's language.

Reuther Powerful Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that United Auto Workers' President Walter Reuther is 1 part labor leader and 9 parts politician. While correct in principle, this appraisal is conservative in proportions.

No pork chop laborite, he; wages, hours, and working conditions, matters of primary concern to other union men, are of little interest to this skilled political practitioner. A fair conclusion, shared by a number of Reuther's oppo-

nents within the labor movement, is that he is merely using the UAW and its highest office, to further his own political ideology.

The UAW springboard has long since sprung, launching him into the outer space of Michigan, California, Arizona, and national politics. In these busy days, he finds scant time to delve into the humdrum affairs of the auto workers. One can picture a lightning-fast entry into the office of the UAW treasurer, now and then, for funds with which to support some favored candidate, an equally lightning-quick exit, and back to the hustings.

A one-time admirer of Soviet Russia—"Carry on the fight for a Soviet America"—a full-time Socialist—"If fighting for a more equal and equitable distribution of the wealth of this country is Socialist, I stand guilty of being a Socialist"—Reuther has kibitized every national event of publicity value for the past 20 years, from his vantage point in the UAW. He has submitted to the general public, unsolicited "Reuther" plans for salvaging the stricken French liner, *Normandie* for producing 500 aircraft a day with surplus auto manufacturing machinery, for construction of a portable foxhole. If all of Reuther's plans were laid end to end, they would reach from the cloakroom of the United States Senate—where he has been known to hold press conferences—to the California Governor's mansion—a gleam in his twinkling eyes.

A man of many words, Reuther has made no secret of his ambitions. They have been delineated, in the first person, from thousands of platforms over a period of 2 decades.

We must remake the economy of this country—

He has said—

We can no longer afford to confine ourselves to bargaining over wages and working conditions. * * * We must seek a real voice in the making of fundamental economic decisions.

Reuther believes the time is here when labor must take over some of the functions of management and government. His idea is to compel management to accept the cooperation of labor, meaning Walter Reuther, in setting up production designs and schedules. He believes government should do the overall economic planning, and that government should lend a compassionate ear to the voice of organized labor, which is to say, Walter Reuther.

We have not forgotten that free-enterprise initiative did not meet the requirements of war, and it will not meet the requirements of peace—

Said Reuther in 1944—

We will permit free, private enterprise that degree of freedom necessary to make its maximum contribution in terms of employment; but if free, private enterprise fails to meet the requirements of our Nation * * * then government will not hesitate to take those steps necessary.

This ominous threat reveals the real Walter Reuther. Do not underestimate his means for making the threat a reality.

In the old days he toyed with the dream of a third party as a vehicle for his Socialist-Marxist political thinking. This idea was shelved after his tremendous success in the elections of 1948, but hangs like the sword of Damocles over the heads of many public officials, including governors and Members of Congress, who owe their position to Reuther support. These Reuther satellites must toe the line, or else.

The grand stategy for 1958 is to put more of these Reuther satellites in orbit, in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and in several governor's mansions, and thus to prepare for 1960, and the White House.

He cannot get away with it if the American people know and understand his motives. Instead of carrying on the fight for a Soviet America, let us carry on the fight for a free America.

Our Recreational Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial written by Mr. Bill Colvin, managing editor of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury newspaper. Mr. Colvin's excellent comments concerning the Nation's recreational resources appeared in the newspaper on July 15, 1958. His observations are worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

HOPE WE FIT IN

Congress is preparing to take a critical look at the Nation's recreational resources, with a feeling in mind that America neither has enough playroom nor is adequately preparing for unprecedented demands on its outdoor areas.

With facilities of our national parks and other Federal recreational facilities already strained to the breaking point, Congress at last has heeded the concern of various outdoor groups and has authorized a massive inventory job.

As an indication of what is happening in the way of visitor increases to these national playgrounds, Congressional Quarterly reports these examples:

"The United States Forest Service anticipates 66 million visitors to the national forests in 1962 and 82 million in 1968. It had only 6 million visitors in 1920, nearly 53 million in 1956. Its visitors total is expected to increase by nearly 1,400 percent in the 42-year period from 1926 to 1968.

"The National Park Service system was designed to handle 25 million visitors annually. It had 22 million in 1946, 59 million in 1957, expects 80 million by 1966. Its visitor total is expected to increase by nearly 400 percent in the 20-year period from 1946 to 1966.

"Other recreation areas report the same heavy use. The Army engineer recreation areas had an increase in visitors over a 7-year period from 16 million in 1950 to 60 million in 1957."

State parks, the report continues, are experiencing the same type of thing.

All say they are having heavy increases in numbers of fishermen, boat enthusiasts, bird watchers, wildlife photographers, hikers, and mountain climbers. Ninety-two million visited State parks in 1946 and by 1957 the total had climbed to 216 million.

Several obvious factors are accountable for these outpourings into our recreational facilities. Population increases naturally take care of much of the increase. But today incomes are higher, pensions are more substantial, it's easier to travel longer distances, weekends have stretched.

Paradoxically there are more persons traveling farther to see and do things while on the other hand the "at home" outdoor playgrounds are anything but suffering for use; in fact their visitor increases are comparable to the big national parks and forests.

What the future holds is pretty well told by recent trends but the problem of providing space is complicated by the diminishing areas available plus the skyrocketing costs of acquiring the playground sites that should be set aside and preserved.

The National Park Service, for example, declined in 1935 to acquire a stretch of seashore deemed natural for recreation and wildlife protection. Today the costs have soared to $110,000 a mile—and most has been bought and subdivided by private speculators.

Congress, now aware of the predicament, has authorized an unpredecented inventory. In establishing the mechanics of finding out what is happening to the quantity and quality of our outdoor playgrounds, the House committee stated:

"It is imperative that the outdoor-recreation resources be accorded the same recognition and consideration as all other resources essential to the economic and social welfare of the Nation. Outdoor-recreation resource use and development must be evaluated and carefully planned on a long-range basis.

"Our Nation can no longer afford the extravagance of the piecemeal planning, neglect, and indifference which has prevailed in the past."

Where does this area fit in this inventory to be taken by a new Federal commission?

A vast area of the prairie grasslands, we believe, is worthy of preserving into a national facility containing not only the natural beauties but also telling the story of the pioneers, the Plains Indians, etc.

It means also that local communites like ours must upgrade and increase their own recreational facilities. Not all the job can be done by the Federal Government, nor is every citizen satisfied by the big parks. The State, likewise, must keep the pace, too, with more outdoor playgrounds, and more visitor accommodations.

Federal cognizance of the problem is encouraging and thereby it should encourage similar, smaller-scale action at local and State levels or the situation will never be solved.

Tribute to Representative Charles O. Porter, of the Fourth Oregon Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, reassuring editorial support and encouragement for Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of the 4th Oregon district, have come from the largest newspaper published in that district, which is also his own hometown daily, the Eugene Register-Guard of Eugene, Creg.

In its issue of July 18, 1958, the Register-Guard, under the title of "Hero Everywhere Except Back Home?" strongly emphasizes that CHARLES O.

PORTER has firm backing and support in his home district for his efforts to champion the eternal cause of democracy among our sister nations of the continent to the south of us, Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial backing up Representative CHARLES O. PORTER be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene Register-Guard of July 18, 1958]

HERO EVERYWHERE EXCEPT BACK HOME?

CHARLIE PORTER, Congressman from this district, is winning editorial pats on the back from some of the Nation's most influential newspapers.

The New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor both have had nice things to say about CHARLIE since his reception in Venezuela as a champion of democratic ideals and an opponent of dictators.

Congressman PORTER'S popularity with Latin Americans also has been recognized in magazines of note, including Newsweek, Time, and U. S. News & World Report.

But now comes Salem's Capital Journal to observe that our CHARLIE is a hero known far and wide—a symbol of opposition in the United States to offcolor good neighbors, largely as the result of his tilting with Dictator Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. Yet, says the Salem paper, Oregon's Fourth District Representative in Congress "still isn't exactly a hero in his hometown. * * *"

The Capital Journal, noting that former Eugene attorney PORTER'S rise to international renown has been meteoric since he undertook to investigate the mysterious disappearance of a Eugene pilot in Trujillo's republic, suggests that his activities may bring about a complete reevaluation of United States foreign policy in respect to Central and South American nations. In milder terms, the Christian Science Monitor has pointed to a similar conclusion, suggesting that the United States State Department should be as forthright as CHARLIE in defining its position on dealing with dictators.

There's no doubt that Congressman PORTER is now one of Eugene's most widely known personalities. And despite the Capital Journal's view, there's little doubt that his energetic inquiries into the disappearance of pilot Gerald Murphy have won him many new friends here at home.

If there's any truth in the statement that CHARLIE isn't regarded entirely as a hero in this, his own hometown, it's because it's hard to believe he's taking the adulation that seriously himself. The Capital Journal forgets that PORTER convincingly proved himself popular throughout southwest Oregon by winning election to Congress 2 years ago in a race against the district's veteran representative, Harris Ellsworth, another fellow with a lot of friends and admirers.

The Capital Journal forgets that "a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country" most likely because the people back home still regard him as one of themselves, and, in a democracy, that's exactly as it should be.

Thirtieth Infantry Division Receives Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce into the RECORD the commendation accompanying the award of the Croix de Guerre with palm by the French Government to the 30th Infantry Division at that division's recent 12th annual convention in Washington, D. C. The commendation was movingly delivered to the assembled members of the 30th Infantry Division Association at the principle convention banquet on the 11th of July 1958, by the distinguished Minister of France M. Robert Valeur.

There is no question but that the 30th Infantry Division which shed copious blood on French soil played an essential role in the liberation of France in World War II. As a former combat infantryman, it is particularly pleasing to me that the 30th Infantry Division which was made up in large part by citizens of the State of Tennessee was accorded this distinct honor by the Government of France. The fact that the honor has been bestowed some 14 years after the division's great campaign is particularly convincing evidence that the 30th Infantry Division merited the appraisal of General Eisenhower's personal historian as the outstanding division in the European theater of operations.

I see in this award more than mere appreciation by France for the efforts of one military unit. I think it can be accurately stated that this declaration was given by the Government of France as a living symbol of the great alliance that has always existed without interruption between the two great democracies since before the turn of the 19th century.

I cannot allow this occasion to pass without recording my high regard for the present government of Premier de Gaulle. I have long been an admirer of General de Gaulle and it is my honest belief, which is now being widely shared in this country, that the forceful and imaginative policies of this great man will not only bring France through a dangerous period, but will restore to her a large semblance of her former glory.

INTRODUCTION OF ROBERT VALEUR BY RALPH E. BECKER, PRESIDENT, 30TH INFANTRY DIVISION ASSOCIATION, JULY 11, 1958, BANQUET, 12TH ANNUAL REUNION

This is the moment of the convention which I, personally have been looking forward to for many years. I am going to introduce a representative of the Government of France who will bestow upon this division an honor which we are proud to say we earned.

The fact that it is awarded at such a late date is even stronger proof of its justification.

On behalf of all the men who fought and died in that wonderful country that is France, I wish to thank the Government of France for this great honor which they have so generously and eagerly decided to award the 30th Infantry Division.

I believe that this decoration is more than a recognition of the work of our Division in World War II. It is in truth a living symbol of the vitality of the warm and deep-rooted relations that have always existed between the United States and France. It is my great pleasure to present—officially representing His Excellency, Herve Alphand, the Ambassador of France—the Minister of France, M. Robert Valeur.

SPEECH GIVEN BY ROBERT VALEUR, MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY, EMBASSY OF FRANCE, CONFERRING OF THE CROIX DE GUERRE UPON THE 30TH UNITED STATES INFANTRY DIVISION, HOTEL SHERATON-PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 11, 1958

I am pleased to announce to you, on behalf of the Ambassador of France to the United States that, by decision No. 38 of July 7, 1958, the Minister of the Armies of of the French Republic has conferred the Croix de Guerre with palm upon the 30th United States Infantry Division for its meritorious conduct in the Battle of France during the Second World War; with the following citation:

"The 30th Infantry Division has played an outstanding role in the liberation of France in 1944.

"Formed from National Guard units from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee, the 'Old Hickory' Division was called into Federal service in 1940. It was commanded by Maj. Gen. Leland S. Hobbs, now retired.

"Arriving in England in February 1944, and landing at Omaha Beach, in France on D plus 9, the division first saw combat as a unit on July 7, when it made a two pronged assault crossing of the Vire River and the Vire et Taute Canal, the opening blow in the drive to capture St. Lo. After almost 2 weeks of heavy fighting in the hedgerow terrain of Normandy, where advances were made from one tiny field to another, the division contributed handsomely to the eventual capture of St. Lo.

"Designated to take part in the initial ground phase of Operation COBRA, the massive breakthrough maneuver launched west of St. Lo, the 30th Division captured Hebecrevon after a bitter fight and swept the west bank of the Vire River for a distance of more than 7 miles. The breakthrough had been achieved.

"Rapid advance for the 30th Division came to an end when it met the powerful 2d Panzer Division defending Tessy-sur-Vire. Four days of hard struggle ensued. At the end, the 30th was in possession of that strategic crossing point over the Vire River.

"Replacing another division on August 6, the 30th took over positions in Mortain preparatory to continuing the rapid advance of the breakout. Before the troops of the 30th had settled into their new positions, the Germans, shortly after midnight, launched their first full scale counterattack since the Allied invasion of Normandy. Attempting to retake Avranches and thus arrest the American breakout, the

Germans sent three panzer divisions in an attack through Mortain.

"Surprise and the momentum of the initial thrust carried the Germans well into the 30th Division rear areas. A battalion of the 120th Infantry Regiment, ensconced on the strategic height of Hill 317, was encircled and isolated. The force of the blow threatened not only to overrun and destroy the 30th Division but also to nullify the results of the American breakout.

"Between August 7 and 12, in defensive action not exceded in bitterness during any phase of the European campaign, the 30th Division, though outflanked and threatened with complete encirclement, stood and fought. The tenacity of the surrounded battalion on Hill 317 is a superb example of battlefield courage and indomitable will, characteristic of the entire division effort. Mainly through the magnificent fighting of the 30th Division, the German counterattack was turned back.

"Moving by truck to Dreux on August 19, the Thirtieth attacked on the following day and, in 6 days, cleared 30 miles along the Eure River to help eliminate the remaining German pocket of resistance west of the Seine River.

"The Thirtieth crossed the Seine and helped extend the bridgehead already established at Mantes-Gassicourt. In 3 days, by August 29, the German defenses there were cracked, and a situation suitable for mobile warfare existed. During the last 2 days in August, the Thirtieth drove forward 11 and 15 miles, and it was obvious that the time had arrived for rapid motorized pursuant of the retreating enemy.

"With an objective more than 100 miles away, the town of Tournai across the Belgian border, the 30th Division started on a wild advance late on September 1. Less than 30 hours later, the division was on its objective, after having met and subdued pockets of resistance along the way.

"This puts an end to the operations of the 30th Division in the battle of France although this unit continued its magnificent fight through Belgium, across the Rhine, and into the Elbe River.

"In the course of this magnificent campaign, the 30th Division suffered more than 26,000 casualties. It captured more than 50,000 prisoners. Its members received 6 Congressional Medals of Honor and 65 Distinguished Service Crosses. As a unit, the division earned 8 distinguished citations and 2 Belgian Fourrageres. Its 3 infantry regiments earned the Croix de Guerre. Now the Croix de Guerre with Palm is being conferred upon the division as a unit in recognition for the outstanding part it played in the liberation of France.

"Twice within a generation, the United States has come to the help of France in her hour of need. Twice American boys have come to our distant land to free it from a cruel foe. Twice American boys have fought heroically and shed a generous blood on our soil.

"In conferring its highest military distinction upon the 30th United States Infantry Division, the Government of the Republic of France wishes to express the heartfelt gratitude of the French nation to the American Nation which are forever linked for the triumph of the cause of freedom.

"Ever since the signing of the historic Treaty of Alliance and Amity of 1778, France and the United States have been closely linked in war and in peace, because of the faith they so ardently share in this ideal of freedom.

"It is this common ideal which explains why, beyond momentary difficulties and obvious differences in their ways of life, there is a profound affinity between the French and the American peoples, which are just as dedicated today to the triumph of freedom as they were 180 years ago, in the glorious times of the American and of the French Revolution."

Antitrust Restraints Essential in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my statement before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on H. R. 10378 and S. 4070, Thursday, July 24, 1958. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H. R. 10378 AND S. 4070, THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome this opportunity to testify on the organized team sports bills, H. R. 10378 and S. 4070.

It is unfortunate that Congress, during these parlous times, must give its attention to special legislation for organized professional team sports. I am sure you will all agree that many of the other domestic and international issues that now confront Congress overshadow these sports bills.

The Supreme Court's decisions on professional sports, however, call for Congress to take some action. In the first place, the Supreme Court has rendered contradictory decisions on the application of the antitrust laws to the business of presenting professional team sports exhibitions. Further, in both the baseball and football cases, the Supreme Court suggested that Congress clarify its intent on the relationship of the antitrust laws to these businesses.

There is another reason that requires this subcommittee to make a careful and penetrating examination into the issues involved in these bills. Both S. 4070 and H. R. 10378, as it passed the House, represent a new departure in Federal legislation dealing with interstate commerce. These bills repudiate the antitrust policies that have been the cornerstone of our Federal interstate commerce legislation.

These bills contain a novel approach to the discharge of Congress' responsibility. Customarily, controversial practices that affect interstate commerce are subject to the antitrust laws and are resolved in the forum of the Federal courts. If in special circumstances we grant exemption to an industry from the antitrust laws, in the past we have vested responsibility in some Government official or body to supervise the affairs of the exempted industry. These bills, however, in complete disregard of our custom and experience, would vest unfettered control over the interstate business of professional team sports exhibitions in the hands of a small number of private club owners. Unlike any other business in the United States, the club owners would not be responsible to any kind of governmental authority for the essential parts of their business operations. We should proceed with the utmost caution on such a course.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time of the subcommittee to analyze the various Supreme Court's sports decisions, or to describe the general nature of these sports enterprises. I would like, however, to supplement my statement by inserting in the RECORD at this time a copy of House Report No. 1720, of the Committee on the Judiciary, entitled "The Applicability of Antitrust Laws to Organized Professional Team Sports." On pages 2 through 7, this report sets forth these matters in detail. It is clear that these sports are substantial businesses in interstate commerce.

The Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary on two occasions has conducted extensive investigations into the business of organized professional team sports. In both of these investigations the subcommittee concluded that these sports should have special treatment under the antitrust laws. Both times the committee concluded that there should be application of the rule of reason so that team sports would be neither completely exempt from, nor tally subject to, the antitrust laws.

The subcommittee's 1952 report, which resulted from its study of business practices in organized baseball, concentrated on the operations of baseball's reserve-clause system. On page 231, the subcommittee unanimously concluded:

"A statute granting a reasonably limited exemption for the reserve clause would avoid the principal objections to either a blanket immunity or a flat condemnation of organized baseball's reserve rules. For this reason the subcommittee has carefully considered the wisdom of recommending the enactment of broadly phrased legislation intended to accomplish this objective. Such a bill would state in general terms that the antitrust laws shall not apply to reasonable rules and regulations which promote competition among baseball clubs, even though they restrain competition for players' services—as does the reserve clause—provided that such rules guarantee players a reasonable opportunity to advance in their profession and to be paid at a rate commensurate with their ability. This type of legislation would lay down a rule of reason for baseball. It would give no protection to activities designed to thwart geographic realinement of major league franchises, or to arbitrary blacklisting of players in the course of a 'war' against an independent league. On the other hand, the reasonable and necessary utilization of the reserve clause would be protected against successful antitrust attack."

In 1957, after the Radovich case, the subcommittee studied carefully the organization and practices of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey. On the basis of this study, the Antitrust Subcommittee concluded that special application of the antitrust rule of reason was justified, so as to exempt those activities that were reasonably necessary for continuation of the sports. The Judiciary Committee agreed with this conclusion. The bill recommended by the Judiciary Committee accommodated the national antitrust policy to the public interest in assuring that the team sports continue.

The bill recommended by the Judiciary Committee made it clear that the Sherman, Clayton, and Federal Trade Commission Acts apply to the four named team sports, but provides that certain activities in these sports, that might otherwise be held to violate the antitrust laws are to be permitted if reasonably necessary for continuation of the sport.

The Judiciary Committee bill declared that certain activities, because they are reasonably necessary to the achievement of the objectives considered fundamental to continued public presentation of professional sports contests, would not violate the antitrust laws. These basic objectives were (1) the equalization of competitive playing strengths; (2) the right to operate within specified geographic areas, which would in-

clude (3) reasonable regulation of telecasting and other broadcasting of sports contests; and (4) the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

The Judiciary Committee bill's exemptions from the antitrust laws would have included, if reasonable and necessary to the continuation of the sport:

1. Baseball and football's reserve clause recognition systems, football's player draft, the farm systems, and the draft and waiver rules;

2. Territorial restrictions and such regulation of TV and radio broadcasts as are needed to preserve these territories;

3. The creation of the office of a commissioner, with authority to take action as needed to protect the honesty of sports contests;

4. Such agreements and rules among the teams involved as necessary to continue the sport.

It is unfortunate that the House of Representatives rejected the "reasonably necessary" test and adopted the bill which was substituted for the Judiciary Committee's bill. Without the "reasonably necessary" test, complete exemption from the antitrust laws is given for nearly all parts of organized sports business.

The opponents to the Judiciary Committee's bill contended that unless complete antitrust exemption is given to the club owners, even for unreasonable actions, the courts would be flooded with a multitude of antitrust suits. This argument has no merit.

Football, basketball, and hockey now all are subject fully to the antitrust laws. There has been no great multitude of antitrust suits in these sports. There has been no harassment by litigation.

It is commonplace for businessmen to raise the specter of litigation when amendments to the antitrust laws are considered. This is the time-honored argument when any effort is made to curtail the abuses of the powerful. The same arguments were made when the Sherman Act was originally considered.

These arguments were not persuasive then and should not be persuasive now. Application of the antitrust laws has not resulted in unjustified litigation. No industry has been destroyed by application of the antitrust laws.

Baseball's club owners use this argument to mask the real reason they were opposed to the Judiciary Committee's bill. The real reason is that they want to be free to continue to be unreasonable in the way they manage baseball's business.

You will note that the bill recommended by the Judiciary Committee was phrased in general terms. This accords with the wise practice of drafting antitrust legislation so that the law will be flexible and thus be able to meet changing circumstaices and new industry practices. It would be self-defeating, I think, to attempt to enact a code which would specify in detail the particular sports activities that would be exempted from the antitrust laws and those specific activities which would remain subject to the law.

It is far preferable for Congress in sports legislation to enact general antitrust guides and standards which the courts can apply. Congress must permit as much flexibility in the management of these businesses as is consistent with the public interest in assuring continuation of the sports contests.

I would like now to turn to H. R. 10378, as amended by the House of Representatives, and Senator HENNING's identical bill, S. 4070. The effects of these bills may be summarized as follows:

1. Complete exemption from the antitrust laws for all essential aspects of the business or organized team sport exhibitions is granted. The bill is a repudiation of the antitrust laws and the policies they represent.

2. Under the bill only minor operations in the sports exhibition business, such as the sale or lease of ball parks and the operation of peanut and other concessions, would be subject to the antitrust laws.

3. Club owners could arbitrarily and unfairly restrain trade for purposes totally unrelated to continued presentation of sports contests. Club owners, for example, could agree: (a) not to recognize any players' association; (b) that no more than one team could be located in any metropolitan area, regardless of size; or that some areas of the country would never qualify for major league ball; (c) that the same interests could own or control two or more clubs. This is the present situation in the hockey league.

4. Although restraints on a citizen's right to pursue his trade or profession historically have been prohibited, players will be deprived of any disinterested forum in which they can secure redress for their grievances. The bill ousts the courts entirely and no objective arbiter is substituted. The bargaining position of players, and the players' representatives, is destroyed by the bill.

5. The bill permits the club owners to be absolutely free, with no restraint on their actions. The public interest in the continued availability to the public of sports contests, therefore, is not protected. There is no reason for antitrust exemption other than to protect the public interest in the continuation of the sport.

6. Club owners would be free to boycott and to take other reprisals against former players no longer in the organized sport, or against business interests not directly engaged in the organized sport. Sports commissioners could blacklist, boycott, and censor sports announcers and commentators on TV and radio broadcasts and newscasts. In this connection, I would point out football's constitution and bylaws already provide, in article X, which was adopted in 1957:

"SECTION 1. Any contract entered into by any club for telecasting or broadcasting its games shall be subject to the conditions that—

"(a) The sponsor, the contract itself, the broadcasters who telecast or broadcast such games, and men who do the color; also any person or persons who do a pre-game and/or post-game show from inside the park, must have written approval of the commissioner of the National Football League. * * *

"(b) Any broadcaster may be removed by the commissioner for conduct considered by the commissioner as detrimental to the National Football League or professional football."

The commissioner, of course, has virtually unlimited power to determine what, in his judgment is detrimental to the National Football League, or to professional football.

7. Almost the entire United States could be blacked out from telecasts of major-league baseball games, whether or not the blackout is needed to protect minor-league territories. In addition, the major leagues could blackout United States free television in order that they could charge for games on pay-TV or on closed circuit TV.

I understand that the subcommittee has already given considerable attention to the serious impact the bill could have on radio and television broadcasts of sports contests. At the present time, no sport, not even baseball, has any antitrust exemption for restraints on radio or television broadcasting. Personally, I have great reservations about the necessity for any special antitrust treatment for sports with respect to radio or television.

It seems clear, however, that in baseball the major league television broadcasts constitute a threat to the minor leagues. Accordingly, even though an other industry was involved, the Judiciary Committee's report on H. R. 10378 stated, on page 9, that the "reasonably necessary" test "* * * will permit reasonable arrangements in baseball between the major and minor leagues to protect the territorial markets of the minor leagues from penetration by radio and television broadcasts of the major leagues. These arrangements, of course, may include only those restraints which are reasonably necessary to assure continuation of the sport."

Without the "reasonably necessary" test, which was recommended by the Judiciary Committee, however, the club owners may take any action they desire, no matter how unreasonable. That the club owners may take unreasonable action in the television field is apparent from the proposal that the Department of Justice already has refused to approve. Under the 75-mile rule sought by organized baseball, approximately two-thirds of the United States and almost 90 percent of the United States population could be blacked out from television broadcasts of major league games.

It should be borne in mind that baseball proposes to black out major league games even if the affected minor league is not actually playing a game. Under the day and date rule, major league games would be blacked out in the afternoon even though the minor league team was not going to play until night. Clearly it is unreasonable to deprive the public of the right to see a broadcast of major league games to this extent.

In his testimony on July 16, Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick told you that enactment of these bills would not result in such a TV blackout. He says the owners would not act unreasonably in this regard. He may be right. It is quite possible that the major league owners' greed for money, even at the risk of destroying the minors, cannot be controlled by the Commissioner, even if these bills become law.

Ford Frick's own statement shows that money, not the welfare of the minor leagues, determines the club owner's actions in the TV question. Mr. Frick stated in this regard:

"There will be as much broadcasting and telecasting as the proper protection of gate receipts of other clubs will permit, because the major league clubs need the revenues from broadcasting and telecasting to stay in business."

Another aspect of restrictions on radio and television broadcasting that should be noted, is the fact that the right to exclusive territories would carry with it the right to control competition from radio and television broadcasts in that territory. If the subcommittee determines that no regulation of broadcasting or telecasting should be permitted, it will be necessary to do more than strike out clause 4 on page 2 of the bills. In addition, a specific exception will have to be added in clause 3 to eliminate the right to control telecasts and broadcasts within the specified areas.

I hope that the subcommittee will not conclude that this bill would be accepted if something were done to "clean up" the radio and television situation. There is no justification for Congress to grant a complete antitrust exemption for the internal operations of these organized sports businesses.

It should be borne in mind that the office of the commissioner cannot be relied upon to protect the public, the players or the sport. The commissioner is paid by, and his office is controlled by, the club owners. Their interests are the interests he protects.

Ford Frick, for example, cannot control the baseball owners. He admitted it to the committee. With respect to bonus payments for players by the major league teams, he said: "It's absolutely haywire, downright crazy." Still he does nothing to clean up the situation. His office is too frail a reed for us to rely upon.

Business practices that have developed over the years in these sports, involving the

reserve clause, the territorial rights of the clubs, and the creation and operation of the Office of the Commissioner, contain opportunities for grave abuses. Congress cannot delegate control over these business practices entirely to private parties.

In order to make this clear on your record, I shall spend the balance of my time in an examination of the club owners' abuses in these sports, particularly in organized baseball.

COURT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court has never ruled upon the legality of the business practices that are employed in any of these team sports. All that the Supreme Court has ever done is to decide that the business of professional baseball was not in interstate commerce while the business of professional football was in interstate commerce and, therefore, subject to the antitrust laws.

Over the years, however, lower courts have had an opportunity to examine the organization and practices of professional baseball. In each instance, the Court has been severely critical of what it found.

Gardella case

In the Gardella case in 1949 the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed the trial court and held (2 to 1) that the business of baseball was in interstate commerce. Judge Frank there stated (172 Fed. 2d 402, 409) that he would overrule the 1922 Federal Baseball case because "* * * we have here a monopoly which, in its effect on ballplayers like the plaintiff possess characteristics shockingly repugnant to moral principles that, at least since the War Between the States, have been basic in America, as shown by the 13th amendment to the Constitution, condemning 'involuntary servitude,' and by subsequent congressional enactments on that subject."

Chase case

In 1914, Judge Bissell, in a New York Supreme Court decision, found that baseball was not in interstate commerce and therefore not subject to the Sherman Act. Judge Bissell, however, remarked upon the way the owners of professional baseball clubs operated their business, in the following words:

"There is no difference in principle between the system of servitude built up by the operation of this national agreement, which * * * provides for the purchase, sale, barter, and exchange of the services of baseball players—skilled laborers—without their consent, and the system of peonage brought into the United States from Mexico and thereafter existing for a time within the Territory of New Mexico. * * * The system created by 'organized baseball' in recent years presents the questions of the establishment of a scheme by which the personal freedom, the right to contract for their labor wherever they will, of 10,000 skilled laborers, is placed under the dominion of a benevolent despotism through the operations of the monopoly established by the national agreement." (*American League Baseball Club* v. *Chase* (149 N. Y. S. 6, 19 (1914).)

Surely statements such as these from objective and dispassionate jurists must give us pause. The business with which we are dealing commonly engages in trade restraints which have long since been outlawed in every other American commercial area. We cannot close our eyes to the facts. We cannot give total immunity from the antitrust laws to the owners of these business enterprises. There is nothing to justify the grant by Congress of absolute authority to the club owners to operate their businesses (unlike any other businessman in the United States) under no legal restraints whatsoever.

Business practices

The reserve clause recognition system among the owners—where every member of the sport agrees that one club will be given the exclusive right to the services of a particular player—frequently has been used as a bargaining weapon to keep down player salaries.

Ty Cobb case

In the 82d Congress, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted an intensive investigation into business practices of professional baseball. Ty Cobb, one of the truly greats of baseball, testified at those hearings, and told about abuse of the reserve clause system as early as 1914. Ty Cobb described to the committee the threats he received from the owners of the Detroit Tigers when he asked for more money.

In 1912 Ty Cobb had earned a salary of $9,000. In that season he led the American League in batting for the sixth consecutive year and so asked for an increase in salary to $15,000. Mr. Navin, the owner of the Detroit Tigers, finally gave Ty Cobb the following ultimatum: "You will play with Detroit, otherwise you will never play in organized baseball." (H. Rept. No. 2002, 82d Cong., 2d sess., Organized Baseball, p. 217.)

Only a threat of congressional investigation at that time on the ground that the reserve clause "looks like peonage" forced the Tigers to come to terms with Ty Cobb. Public opinion may be relied upon to help out an exceptional player when he has been threatened by the owner; however, public opinion cannot be relied upon to protect the rights of the average player from the greed of the men who own their contracts.

Mickey Owens case

The record of the Antitrust Subcommittee is replete with instances where baseball club owners have abused their powers. Group boycotts by the owners are customary where a player has been suspended by the commissioner for violations of the rules handed down by the owners. These boycotts are employed against players even after they have left organized baseball and have entered another line of business. Agreements exist whereby, stadiums and ball parks are denied even for exhibition game purposes. No player in organized baseball can appear in such an exhibition game on penalty of being blacklisted himself. Whatever may be the justification for discipline within the organized team sports, certainly there can be no condonation of organized group boycotts against persons no longer within the organized sport. However, that is the situation that now exists in organized professional baseball and will continue unless some responsibility is fixed upon baseball club owners by removal of their antitrust exemption.

Disregard for public

The history of baseball is replete with instances of arbitrary refusal on the part of the club owners to authorize the creation of new major league teams or the transfer of major league teams to new markets. Only recently, after extensive criticism in the press and in Congress, has organized baseball made any effort to reflect the population changes in the growth of the United States. Even now the adjustment made in major league baseball has been to take major league teams from the east coast and put them on the west coast rather than to create new major league teams or another major league.

Yankee monopoly of New York

Baseball's present lack of responsibility under the antitrust laws is reflected in the situation where, by agreement, organized baseball has given to the Yankees the exclusive right to the New York City market. Unless the Yankees consent, no replacement can come to New York to take the place of the Dodgers and the Giants. Surely such an agreement was unreasonable. Nonetheless it can be perpetuated if baseball's total exemption from the antitrust laws is continued.

In conclusion, I would say this. It would be better, in my view, to have no sports legislation whatsoever, even though the Supreme Court has rendered contradictory decisions, than to enact these bills your committee is considering. Our antitrust policies should not be repudiated in this manner. Complete antitrust exemption should demand a much more persuasive justification than these club owners have thus far been able to show.

Eighty-fifth Congress Approves Code of Ethics for Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker. The 85th Congress, in putting its official approval on a code of ethics for Government service, has taken a constructive forward step in a difficult field. The final approval by the Senate was on July 11, 1958. Although this is but an expression of the opinion of Congress, it may still be not the least of the acts of this Congress. The code reads as follows:

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Any person in Government service should:

1. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

2. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

3. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought.

4. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

5. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.

6. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

7. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties.

8. Never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit.

9. Expose corruption wherever discovered.

10. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

The report of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee reads as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 175) setting forth as the sense of Congress a Code of Ethics for Government Service, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this resolution is to set forth in a readily understood but meaning-

ful manner basic standards of conduct as a guide to all who are privileged to be a part of the Government service. The word "guide" is used advisedly. The resolution creates no new law; imposes no penalties; identifies no new type of crime; and establishes no legal restraints on anyone. It does, however, etch out a charter of conduct against which those in public service may measure their own actions and upon which they may be judged by those whom they serve.

The original framers of this resolution, together with all those who now support its adoption, do not contend for a moment that it will wash all evil from the soul of the Government or the individuals therein. They do believe strongly, however, that it can do no harm and has great possibility of doing much good.

At the very least it may serve to encourage the thoughtless to be more thoughtful. It may cause caution instead of carelessness. It may add strength to the weak and refortify those who are strong.

Additionally, it may serve to spearhead other steps that will encourage or require greater fidelity to public trust and at the same time put a brake on those who contribute to thoughtless or deliberate derelictions in an effort to obtain special favor or personal gain.

COVERAGE

The committee understands and intends that this resolution apply to every servant of the public whether he be the President, a Member of Congress, a lifelong career employee, or an employee engaged only on a temporary basis to expedite the movement of mail during the Christmas rush.

The committee does not subscribe to or could it support any code of principles that applied only to some and not to others. It believes there is no room in a great democracy such as ours for any set of double standards.

In that framework, the committee unanimously approved the resolution as providing a needed yardstick for the use of all who serve in the Federal service and for the use of those being served with which to measure and judge the propriety of official and personal conduct of every public official and employee—whether elected or appointed—and without regard to the position held or the duties performed.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATORS RICHARD L. NEUBERGER AND JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.

We strongly support and commend the code of ethics provided in this bill. A meaningful code is long overdue. It should serve as a guide for the executive and legislative branches alike, and for policymaking officials as well as their subordinates.

Precepts of this kind frequently can serve as a standard and an inspiration to good conduct and sound behavior.

At the same time, we desire to stress that this code alone is not enough. After all, it is a statement of principles which is without specific enforcement provisions.

We believe that, in the long run, there will be required definite and explicit conflict-of-interest statutes which will govern the executive and the legislative branches with respect to gifts, disclosure of outside income, and other matters. We also suggest far more stringent regulation of political campaign contributions and similar matters, and consideration of such reforms in this field as originally were proposed by President Theodore Roosevelt and others long ago.

In advancing these views, we criticize no individuals or party or group. All in public life face such problems equally. Many innocent people of high personal ethics have been embarrassed and perplexed by situations that arise so frequently under existing conditions. We trust, therefore, that the present laudable code of governmental ethics will be reinforced in the early future by reforms of greater stringency and efficacy.

The report of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 175), proposing a code of ethics for Government service, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

STATEMENT

House Concurrent Resolution 175 is essentially a declaration of fundamental principles of conduct that should be observed by all persons in the public service. It spells out in clear and straightforward language long-recognized concepts of the high obligations and responsibilities, as well as the rights and privileges, attendant upon service for our Government. It reaffirms the traditional standard—that those holding public office are not owners of authority but agents of public purpose—concerning which there can be no disagreement, and to which all Federal employees unquestionably should adhere. It is not a mandate. It creates no new crime or penalty. Nor does it impose any positive legal requirement for specific acts or omissions.

The code of ethics provided by this resolution has the strong support of organized labor. It has the unqualified endorsement of the Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO, and other representatives of Federal employee unions. The Civil Service Commission, which is the central personnel authority for the Federal Government, has reported its full agreement with the purpose and nature of the resolution. The Department of Justice has concurred in this view. The Comptroller General of the United States, the independent authority established by the Congress to watch over expenditures of public funds, has stated that such a code of ethics will be useful in placing Government personnel on notice of what actually is expected of them and, in addition, giving notice to those dealing with Government personnel as to just what such personnel may and may not do in the performance of their public duties. This unanimity of opinion extends largely to the Congress, and some 30 Members of Congress have introduced similar resolutions in the past few years.

The committee emphasizes that this resolution in no way reflects on the integrity or the efficiency of the great body of Federal employees. The vast majority of men and women in our Government are conscientious, able, loyal, and honest public servants—above criticism in their official conduct. Their personal and official actions are guided by ethical standards as high and strict as the letter and spirit of any code that could be written into law. These men and women will welcome the adoption, in this code of ethics, of an affirmation of their own high standards. It will strengthen their hand in guiding and correcting any tendency toward cynicism of the high trust associated with public service, or deviation from proper conduct, that is bound to occur among some few in a Government as great and complex as the Government of the United States. A strong and unwavering policy, known to all both in and out of Government, is the best protection against lowering of ethical standards in the day-to-day performance of official duties by our more than 2 million Federal officers and employees.

In the judgment of the committee, the effectiveness of this resolution lies in simplicity and directness of its language. It does not pretend or purport to create new or unfamiliar standards. It is a concise restatement—as a part of the laws under which the Federal Government operates—of the principles of conduct in the public service which always have been expected by the American people.

This and earlier proposed resolutions have been given careful and extensive consideration by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee over the past several years. A number of committee suggestions and recommendations for clarification and improvement have been incorporated in House Concurrent Resolution 175. All points of difference, and all questions of policy, with respect to the language of the resolution have been resolved. The committee knows of no objection whatever to the resolution in its present form.

There will be no additional cost as a result of approval of this resolution.

The favorable reports of the United States Civil Service Commission and the Comptroller General of the United States on House Concurrent Resoltuions 5 and 43, 85th Congress (similar to H. Con. Res. 175), follow:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1957.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letters of January 17, 1957, asking for the Commission's views on House Concurrent Resolutions 5 and 43, introduced by Congressman BENNETT and Congresswoman ST. GEORGE, respectively, setting forth a code of ethics to be adhered to by all Government employees, including officeholders.

The subject of ethics and morality of Federal employees is vitally important to a free government. While public employee morality has improved tremendously in this country in the past 75 years, this is an area where perfection will never be reached. The executive branch is very conscious that constant emphasis must be given to the basic thought that those holding public office, as servants of the public, are not owners of authority but agents of public purpose. It is possible that a code of ethics to which Federal employees can look as a guide to conduct would help to reemphasize the importance of this subject and contribute to a further improvement of public standards. The Commission, therefore, is in full agreement with the general purpose and the nature of the resolutions.

House Concurrent Resolution 43 is identical with the resolutions introduced by Congressman BENNETT and Congresswoman ST. GEORGE in previous Congresses. House Concurrent Resolution 5 contains the amended language which was worked out by a subcommittee, chaired by Congressman RHODES, of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, after their hearings on March 26, 1956. These amendments took into account a number of technical suggestions made by the Commission.

Congressman BENNETT on February 21, 1957, sent us a marked copy of House Concurrent Resolution 5 containing several further changes of wording as shown in the enclosure.

The Commission is in full agreement with the general purpose and nature of House Concurrent Resolution 5 and House Concurrent Resolution 43 and fully endorses House Concurrent Resolution 5. The editorial revisions proposed by Congressman BENNETT appear desirable.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:
Sincerely yours,

HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 6, 1957.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter dated January 17, 1957, and undated letter, both acknowledged on January 18, 1957, transmitted House Concurrent Resolution 5 and House Concurrent Resolution 43, respectively, for a report thereon by our Office. This Office is in agreement with the purpose of these resolutions and regards House Concurrent Resolution 5 as the preferable of the two.

House Concurrent Resolution 5 and House Concurrent Resolution 43 are similar in that both resolutions would establish a code of ethics in the Government service which, in the sense of the Congress, should be adhered to by Government officials and employees including officeholders. However, House Concurrent Resolution 5 embodies certain changes in language which were suggested by the Civil Service Commission and developed in the hearings before your committee upon consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 2 and House Concurrent Resolution 17, both of the 84th Congress; and we regard the changes as desirable modifications.

Concerning the need for the establishment of a code of ethics for persons in the Government service, we believe that the large majority of all Government personnel need no reminder such as the suggested code of ethics to guide their activities, official or personal, being already possessed of moral standards of conduct as strict in letter and spirit as the proposed code of ethics. However, we recognize that in our complex Government it is impossible always to exclude from employment every person of unscrupulous character who may be cynical of the high trust associated with Government service. Any suggested course of conduct as is contemplated in the proposed code of ethics probably would have little or no deterrent value as to such persons.

We feel that the best protection to the public against questionable activities of Government officials is constant and unwavering vigilance by those charged with the administration of the departments and agencies. In recent years many of the executive departments and agencies have provided, through appropriate regulations, codes of conduct to be followed by their officers and employees. Many of the regulations and codes are more comprehensive and strict than the code proposed in the current resolutions and provide suitable penalties for violations thereof. We believe such codes of ethics are useful because they place Government personnel on notice of what actually is expected of them and in addition they provide notice to those dealing with Government officials as to just what the official may or may not do in the performance of his duties.

Accordingly, we favor the adoption of the current resolutions notwithstanding that many Government departments and agencies have regulations governing the conduct of their employees. Such a code, while without the status of a mandate, would have a salutary effect and should provide a basis and incentive for the promulgation of more definitive regulations by all Government departments and agencies on the matter of ethical conduct of their officials and employees, thus emphasizing to all concerned the interest of the Congress in this matter.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of Comptroller General's Order No. 4.25 governing the conduct of the officers and employees of the General Accounting Office.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General of the United States.

Food Field Reporter and Grocery News a Nationwide Marketing Newspaper of the Food and Grocery Industry Opposed H. R. 9521

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial appearing in Food Field Reporter of July 21, 1958. Food Field Reporter is a nationwide trade paper of the food and grocery industry. The editorial sets forth the carefully thought out opposition of the editors of that publication to H. R. 9521, a bill to eliminate the requirement of the food, drug, and cosmetics law that fresh produce be labeled to show use of postharvest pesticide chemicals.

I hope all will read this editorial and will come to understand the real danger of passing legislation like H. R. 9521.

The first danger most easily apparent is that there is a substantial increase in the burden on the Food and Drug Administration, with resultant increased danger to the consuming public.

The second danger which the editorial points out under the heading "Take It Easy, Boys" is that passage of unwise legislation may lead to much more severe and restrictive legislation on this food and drug subject in the future, possible some of which will even be definitely anti-industry.

The editorial follows:

TAKE IT EASY, BOYS

There seems little reason to doubt that the fresh fruit and vegetable industry has amassed enough political strength to push through Congress the Haley bill (H. R. 9521) to eliminate the present Food and Drug Administration rule that fresh produce (including retail displays) be labeled or placarded to show use of postharvest fungicides.

In our opinion, however, there is ample reason to doubt the wisdom of using this strength to accomplish what the produce men want.

The question at issue here, it seems to us, is whether an important segment of the food industry should use its political strength to crush a vital right of its ultimate customers—the housewives and families of the Nation. This right is simple and fundamental—the right to know what one is buying to eat. It is a right which has long been accepted as a basic part of our country's food laws, both National and State.

During hearings before the Health and Science Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee industry representatives argued that no harm could come to consumers if they are not told that some of the fresh produce they buy has been chemically treated. It was argued that the Miller pesticide amendment afforded protection and that, in any event, no one could understand the chemical names used on placards.

Neither of these arguments is good enough. The Miller amendment is designed only to see that harmful quantities of pesticide residues are not present on produce. It does nothing to inform consumers of what might be there. And there is every reason why consumers should be so informed, even granting they don't know what the additive is. There are many reasons why consumers want to know what is in or on their food, including medical and religious reasons.

We doubt whether the produce industry realizes the extent of concern around the country about the Nation's food supply. This concern is the result of increasing publicity, some legitimate and some of the sensational food faddist crackpot variety. But it would be a grave mistake for the produce industry or any other branch of the food industry to write off this concern as coming only from the lunatic fringe. There is too much evidence that many normal, intelligent Americans don't want their food supply tampered with in any way.

If the produce men are successful in their fight it is wholly possible that eventually the exemption will bring on far more severe regulations at some future time. This could come about through granting of similar exemptions to other branches of the industry for processed foods. These branches certainly are as much entitled to withhold vital information from consumers as the produce field. If the movement snowballs it could easily arouse public opinion to the point where legislation more restrictive than that now on the books would be adopted by Congress.

The Mideast Situation Belongs in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it may or may not be an unforunate matter that the President's best wisdom has ordered our troops into Lebanon, but it is useless to argue about that now. Our clear patriotic course now is to go along with the President in a demonstration of unity, while permanent solution of the problem is sought within the United Nations. We can thus, at least, try to prevent any additional triumphs of Soviet propaganda.

We may be certain that the Russians will make the most of our entrance into Lebanon and try to convince the rest of the world that it is an imperialist gesture toward war and not, as it is truly meant to be, an attempt to promote peace.

In my opinion, it is most essential that we make every effort to counteract the Russian propaganda, and it would appear that the best way to do so is to pursue a solution through the United Nations. It is vitally important that we show the world that we will not reject even the germ of an idea or a proposal that could help the cause of peace. It is also vitally important in this propaganda battle, I think, not to abruptly reject any Soviet suggestion for solution, even though we feel that their motives are false and hypocritical.

We have been on the losing end of too many propaganda battles with the Russians in the past, and it is imperative that the prestige of the United States be salvaged in this complex Lebanon and Mideast situation. The forum in which that can be accomplished is the United Nations, and I most earnestly hope that the President will insist that any nego-

tiations be conducted within that international organization, originated for the purpose.

Meanwhile, let us pray divine guidance for the President in this historical hour while we remain united behind him.

Graduate Education Expansion Programs in the Proposed National Education Defense Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of national security, especially during these tense times of international turmoil, the provision in the proposed National Defense Education Act for the expansion of the Nation's graduate education programs is of unprecedented significance to the American educational system. The urgency of our need dictates that we provide more adequately for the staffing of our institutions of higher education.

This need for assistance to graduate education programs existed long before the stark realization of sputnik's challenge and the resultant widespread recognition of America's educational shortcomings. In fact, many of these educational deficiencies had already been analyzed by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School and presented in their second report to the President last July. I was especially impressed by the foresight of the Committee members when, in their consideration of graduate education, they affirmed that—

At the present more than 225,000 ful-time and part-time instructional staff members serve in 1,900 colleges and universities, of which over 1,300 grant at least one kind of degree.

A number of variables, including the speed with which enrollments rise, student-teacher ratios and the rate of faculty turnover, will affect the total needs for college teachers in the next several years. Taking conservative estimates with respect to these variables, somewhere between 180,000 and 270,000 new college teachers must be recruited in a dozen years—between 15,000 and 22,500 annually. Less conservative assumptions would indicate a considerably higher need.

The graduate schools, source of the most advanced education for college teachers, are currently awarding about 9,000 doctoral degrees annually. Into teaching go probably no more than 5,000 of these candidates, a considerable proportion of whom are already engaged in teaching before receiving their doctorates. The cumulative deficit at the doctoral level is an alarming prospect.

About half of the new college teachers now come from other sources than graduate schools. One source is high-school faculties. But since the quality of college education is heavily dependent upon strong secondary schools, this is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Further aggravating the problem is the aging of the population of college teachers, more than 35 percent of whom are already 45 or over, and the relatively small pool from which to recruit. The 24- to 45-age group in our population is already relatively small. Because of the low birth rate of the depression years this group will actually decrease in the next decade, just when the student population is reaching new heights. Faculty reduction by death and retirement appears likely to accelerate at a time when the student population is increasing from the present 3 million to an estimated 6 million.

The President's Committee further reported:

Important areas of knowledge such as the fields of classical learning, history, literature, philosophy, the social studies and theoretical science have their principal, if not unique, sponsorship in the universities and colleges. Salaries in these fields are not so affected by outside demand as in the professional and technological fields.

Yet we dare not concentrate on certain fields of serious present shortage in the competitive market, to the exclusion of other fields, for we must look forward to long-range progress in all fields of knowledge. Indeed, in a society with increasing technological bias it becomes increasingly important that high talent be attracted into research and teaching in the social studies, the humanities, and pure science.

More evidence of the need to assist in programs for graduate expansion to provide for the staffing of the Nation's colleges and universities was presented during the recent house hearings on scholarship and loan programs when Dr. Lawrence Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, testified that:

Attention has been called repeatedly to the critical shortage of first-rate teachers in this country today. The need is great at all levels of education, and it is becoming increasingly pressing in the institutions of higher education. The colleges and universities will soon be flooded with students far beyond their present numbers, and they will therefore require greatly increased numbers of teachers.

It will take more of an effort to find and train these teachers than is generally realized because today the graduate schools of our universities award annually somewhat less than 9,000 doctoral degrees. This degree represents the desired and standard preparation for teaching in college. It is to be hoped that in the years ahead more students will receive it, but present trends are not reassuring. The output has been almost at a standstill for a number of years.

Here I want to say a word about the qualifications of new full-time college teachers. Recent studies indicate a deterioration in these qualifications. For example, in 1953–54, 40 percent of all college teachers held doctoral degrees, but in this same year only 31 percent of the new college teachers had such degrees. Three years later the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent, which represents a serious loss indeed.

In the same statement, Dr. Derthick emphasized the need to improve college-level teaching in certain essential fields. Dr. Derthick said:

The quality of new full-time college teachers is uneven as between the different subject-matter fields. The deterioration is felt more severely in fields with which the Nation is now much concerned—physical science, mathematics, and engineering. In these the percentages of new full-time college teachers with the doctorate declined in 3 years by 18 percent, 40 percent, and 30 percent, respectively.

Many of the graduate schools have few students because the schools do not have the resources to instruct larger numbers. Graduate education is costly. It requires extensive and costly library and laboratory facilities. The direction of graduate students is largely on an individual basis, which means that the ratio of teachers to students is necessarily high. Moreover, many graduate students have families for whom living accommodations must be made available. This heavy cost limits the number of universities that can offer acceptable opportunities for graduate study.

Consequently, today there are only some 163 institutions out of a national total of 1,856 that confer doctoral degrees based on graduate instruction. Sixty-nine of these are under public control and 94 are under private control. In the year 1955–56, 60 institutions each conferred fewer than 10 doctoral degrees, and 103 conferred 10 or more. Only a few—27 to be exact—awarded more than 100 such degrees. It appears, therefore, that a considerable potential exists for increasing the output of our graduate schools.

The extreme importance of the role of the Federal Government in aiding the expansion of graduate education through a program of fellowships was supported by the testimony of Dr. Philip Coombs, director of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, when he stated before the subcommittee:

I believe the Federal Government can do more than it is now doing to assist in this direction without in any sense taking over control of education.

First, higher education in the United States today is seriously threatened by an erosion of quality. This erosion is already taking place, due in no small measure to inadequate economic resources and to the inefficient use of those resources. The decline of educational quality, which we can ill afford at this point in history, can only be averted if our colleges and universities are better financed, if they succeed in getting a larger share of the Nation's finest manpower for teaching, and if they make the most efficient use of that manpower and other resources.

It seems to me that there are two factors here. The first and most basic is that our economy, our society as a whole, is up against an overall shortage of high ability manpower, not only in science and engineering, but in other fields as well. This not because we have a smaller supply than we used to have but, rather, because the dynamic growth of our economy has created a much greater demand than ever.

The second factor is that teaching is at an increasing competitive disadvantage in bidding for its share of this limited supply of well-educated manpower. We have allowed economic rewards for teaching to deteriorate in relation to the rewards for other occupations. We have allowed the prestige of teaching, apart from the economic rewards, to deteriorate relative to other fields demanding the same quality of manpower.

To correct the situation, it seems to me, we must move in two directions. First, we must do everything we can to expand the overall supply of highly trained manpower. This we can only do through strengthening education, and it is a slow process. We cannot perform miracles in a year or two, but we must start promptly toward this long-run goal.

Secondly, we must put teaching in a stronger competitive position, partly by raising salaries substantially, but also by utilizing good teachers as effectively as we can, thereby making the supply go further. We must make teaching much more attractive, not merely in financial rewards but in the challenge of the work itself, so that our ablest young people will enter the field in large numbers.

The urgency of this need for a program of graduate felowships was also stressed by Dr. Charles C. Cole, Jr., of Columbia University who urged on behalf of the Association for Higher Education that:

> Congress * * * provide Federal funds for the support of a program of fellowships for 5,000-graduate students the first year of its operation.
>
> We also urge that students granted scholarships and fellowships under any new Federal program that may be enacted be left completely free to choose their own subject-matter fields of study and occupational objectives in the recognized institutions they choose to attend, without any limitations imposed by their acceptance of such scholarships or fellowships.

The value of Federal assistance for the expansion of graduate education programs was again underscored by the testimony of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell, representative of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association and president of the University of Arkansas, when he noted that:

> Most of the proposals before Congress involve increasing the supply of students, while the primary need of our colleges and universities is for help with which to make it possible to educate the students now enrolled and to be enrolled, whether measures to increase this number are adopted or not.
>
> This is not to say that there is no place for scholarship and loan programs and we do not wish to be categorical on that, but we do say that if we want to talk about quality education we have to talk about more than increasing the supply of students in the colleges and universities.
>
> I just say that we often debate in this country now the either-or of quantity and mass education as against quality. Certainly we need to do both; that is, we need to educate all the people and we need to provide quality education at every level.
>
> I cannot speak too strongly in support of these measures to provide graduate fellowships.
>
> Baccalaureate-degree graduates, particularly in sicence, engineering, and mathematics, have many immediate and well-paying offers of employment in industry. The alternative road to a doctoral degree and qualification for high-level basic and applied research and teaching is long and the financial problems serious, particularly at the normal time of marriage and establishment of a family. Adequate fellowship help is essential.

The vital need for this program was outlined more fully in Dr. Caldwell's prepared statement for the subcommittee in which he asserts:

> The provision of additional and substantial graduate fellowships is essential in both the long and short run. It will have an early impact on our supply of highly qualified personnel. Baccalaureate-degree graduates, particularly in science, engineering, and mathematics, have many immediate and well-paying offers of employment in industry. The alternative road to a doctoral degree and qualification for high-level basic and applied research and teaching is long and the financial problems serious, particularly at the normal time of marriage and establishment of a family. Adequate fellowship help is essential.
>
> We need to strengthen and expand graduate schools through the Nation and one very practical way to do it is to give aid to qualified graduate schools and to award some fellowships through the graduate schools.

The House Committee on Education and Labor report on the proposed National Defense Education Act—House Report 2157—points to this same necessity for a fellowship program:

> One great need of the Nation is to increase the number of highly trained persons produced by the graduate schools of our universities. There is a special need to increase the number of graduates who will teach in the colleges and universities since today the number of persons with the degree of doctor of philosophy (the standard degree for college teachers) who enter teaching is decreasing. For example, a recent study found that among 829 colleges and universities in 1956 a total of 1,196 teaching positions remained unfilled. In 1953–54, 40 percent of all college teachers held doctoral degrees, but in this same year only 31 percent of new college teachers had such degrees. Three years later the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent, which represented a serious loss.
>
> Only some 160 institutions of higher education confer earned doctoral degrees. About 60 confer fewer than 10 degrees each and between 25 and 30 award more than 100 each. Thus, about 75 institutions conferring between 10 and 100 degrees provide a considerable potential for increasing the output of graduate doctoral degrees. With some financial assistance to these institutions and financial aid to graduate students, graduate education will be materially expanded.

A majority of the full House Committee on Education and Labor concurred with the testimony presented to the subcommittee, thus decisively substantiating the demand for Federal assistance in this area. As the committee reported:

> The expressed aim of the program is, in addition, to further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

The program would provide for the award of 1,000 fellowships for the first year and 1,500 for each of the 3 succeeding years. Fellowships can be retained for 2 years following the initial year of award.

Fellowship holders will receive a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year of study following the baccalaureate degree, $2,200 for the second such year and $2,400 for the third such year. An additional amount of $400 for each such year will be awarded for each dependent of the fellowship holder.

Fellowships are to be awarded by the graduate schools of universities following approval of the Commissioner of Education based upon a finding that the graduate program of the university has been expanded or is a new program. On the basis of such finding, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution the sum of not less than $500 or not more than $2,500 per academic year which is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of a new graduate program or the expansion of an existing graduate program which is reasonably attributable to each fellowship authorized to be awarded by the approved institution.

Holders of fellowships will be required to maintain satisfactory academic standing and to devote essentially full time to study or research in the field in which the fellowship is awarded. Fellowship holders will not be permitted to engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment by the institution in teaching, research, or similar activity.

I believe that the report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School and the facts presented to the House subcommittee by prominent leaders in the field of education constitute more than ample evidence of a role to be fulfilled by the Federal Government in the expansion of graduate education programs in the United States. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 under the provisions of title VI would establish this vital Federal assistance.

Defense Reorganization for Essential Military Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be called upon to exercise our responsibility of enacting legislation essentially needed to provide military unity and restrain the unhappy rivalries existing among the separate branches of our armed services.

We can each have sincere and conscientious differences as to the precise legislative provisions to accomplish the desired objective. For instance, some of us very earnestly feel that the right of the individual services to come directly to Congress with complaints and recommendations should be preserved, while others do not so feel. Some of us may disagree as to the retention of congressional veto power over changes in combat functions within the services, but few of us will disagree that, in time of war or imminent hostilities, the President's power should be unlimited.

Despite any differences that Members may have about the measure to be presented, the bill, in my opinion, does provide some substantially forward steps. It is designed to give the Defense Secretary clear power to assign weapons to services of his choice and to centralize research and development under a single director. The power of unified commanders over all forces under them ought to be, and is, spelled out to prevent conflicts of authority among and between rival service commanders.

It is our clear duty to conscientiously attempt the enactment of a measure that will remove, so far as reasonably possible, the disastrous jealousies that admittedly exist among the services, and that will provide for the centralization of research and development under one director, in order to stop the appalling waste of

the taxpayers' money due to the duplication of efforts and absurd competition among the services in this vital field of Russian challenge.

In our exhortations for unity among the armed services, it is encumbent upon us to show an example of unity here, to restore the confidence of the American people in the Congress and in the military forces. Let us resolve our differences and patriotically provide a bill that will do the job.

Shrinking Playgrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest in the July 24 issue of the Washington Star Sylvia Porter's column which contained some very enlightening data concerning the present state of our recreational resources.

I believe it will be of equal interest to my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SHRINKING PLAYGROUNDS
(By Sylvia Porter)

You go to the public beaches along the Atlantic coast and the crowds of people are actually frightening. You go to a National or State park for a family picnic and you find that all the good spots had been snatched up before 10 a. m. You go to what you recall as a charming, out-of-the-way lake and you discover that the boat traffic on the water is almost as bad as the car traffic on the road.

Our National Park Service system was designed to handle 25 million visitors a year.

Last year 59 million visited our national parks; this year millions more will be swarming around and the system figures that by 1966, 80 million will be jamming into the parks.

The United States Forest Service had 6 million visitors in 1926.

In 1956 the total of visitors was nearly 53 million and the Service estimates the increase in the number of visitors between 1926 and 1968 will be close to 1,400 percent.

In 1946 the State parks chalked up 92 million visits.

In 1957 the State parks recorded 216 million visits.

The Army engineer recreation areas reported 16 million visitors in 1950. They reported 80 million visitors in 1957.

INVENTORY PLANNED

The facilities of the national parks and national forests already are strained to the breaking point and Congressional Quarterly flatly states, the concern of all who know the facts is that "as a Nation, we are running out of adequate outdoor recreation areas to play in."

A few weeks ago Congress passed a bill providing for the first national inventory of the country's outdoor recreation resources.

Under the legislation a bipartisan 15-member Presidential commission, including 8 Members from the Senate and House, will be set up to make an inventory of all land and water areas in the Nation usable for recreation. The inventory will be by States and regions and private as well as public land will be included in the survey. The commission also will study what European nations—particularly Switzerland and Sweden—have done to meet their needs for recreation.

The deadline for the commission's report is September 1, 1961.

You don't need me to give you proof on what is happening to the outdoor recreation areas of the Nation. But you well might ask, "Why?"

TWO MAJOR REASONS

A first great reason for the appalling deterioration is that so many more millions are going in for outdoor recreation of every type.

Increased leisure time, the trend toward longer vacations, longer weekends, and more frequent vacations are a vital part of the picture.

The second great reason is that the number of outdoor playgrounds has been declining steadily.

As Congressional Quarterly rather poignantly puts it, nearly all adults remember a quiet swimming hole or picnic area we visited as children. Now on that spot is likely to be a new housing development or a new industrial factory or a Federal Government installation.

Both the quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities are in a steady and alarming decrease, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported earlier this year.

We are extravagantly and wantonly dissipating resources which are essential to our social and economic welfare. The waste must be stopped. Hopefully, the unprecedented inventory just authorized marks the beginning of a turn in the shocking trend.

Scripps-Howard Editor in Chief Jogs American Readers With Stimulating Article on Meaning of Struggle With Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, believing that my colleagues will want to read the stimulating views of Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who recently returned from extensive travel in Russia, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include his article from the Cleveland Press of July 22, 1958:

SAYS UNITED STATES CAN LIVE WITH REDS, BUT NOT PEACEFULLY
(By Walker Stone)

If we don't get off our big fat comforts, we're going to be stomped into the ground.

Events in Iraq and Lebanon illuminate the struggle in which the West has taken a stand to halt the spread of gangsterism and world power gained by assassination and subversion

Whatever happens in the Near East will not end the struggle. It will continue through the lifetime of all who read this—since Americans and others who have known freedom will not supinely yield to slavery.

To prepare ourselves for the great test of strength we cannot avoid, we must rid ourselves of two myths now prevalent in America.

One is the myth of peaceful coexistence. We must try, of course, to coexist with the Russians. They are a powerful nation of 200 million, occupying a sixth of the earth's habitable area. But we have to get over the wishful thought that they are going to be easier to live with, no matter whether the top ruler is Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Khrushchev, or whoever.

Peaceful coexistence, in the sense we understand it, implies a trust in which we might relax and pursue our pleasures. The Communist system, which pervades everything Russian, rules that out.

The primary aim of communism—at once a religion and a political and economic philosophy—is frankly world dominion and complete mastery over the lives and minds of men.

The other myth we must get rid of is that we can survive against this Soviet plot without toil and sacrifice.

It is easy for an American newspaperman, after traveling in the Soviet Union, to stress the hard life and low living standards of the people. But that would give a dangerously false impression of their dynamic energy, their state of mind and their power to produce in competition against us.

Living standard comparisons never are printed in Russia and wouldn't be believed if they were.

The average Russian's diet of bread and potato soup, borscht with cabbage and an occasional chunk of meat would not satisfy an American accustomed to culinary variety and abundance. But what the Russian eats suits his taste and provides him with the calories he needs to maintain health and vigor.

In the city he may live in one room with his family, and share the kitchen and bath with other families. If he lives in the country he may have no indoor plumbing at all—probably never has seen such luxury.

Similar Spartan standards did not diminish the survival of American pioneers. Only half a century ago, they lived in one-room sod houses with dirt floors and ate what they could grub from barren plains.

These privations toughened our pioneers who had one advantage in common with the average Russian of today. They didn't know they were underprivileged.

They worked hard and had faith in the future. Though the Russian is an automaton, he feels he is a part of a collective society, and that next year, and the next, things will be better.

He does not compare his lot with American or other western standards of which he knows nothing. His comparison is with what he had under the czars or more likely, during the earlier days of the revolution.

A westener coming into Moscow may be impressed by the absence of Brooks Bros. suits and modish dresses. He had better be impressed by the absence of patched clothes, so prevalent only a few years ago.

And he had better be impressed less by the continuing shabbiness of the people than by the hustle and purposefulness of their stride—a people on the make and on the go, a people hurrying to their date with destiny.

Praises FHA in Appraisal of Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience in Congress, and I suppose the same would hold true for

other Members, that for the hundreds of criticisms received of a Government agency you will only receive 1 or 2 commendatory letters. Recently, I was informed of a letter that had been received by Mr. Thomas Barringer, of the Federal Housing Administration, located in Washington. The letter, from Mrs. Malcolm S. Morse, of 1 Denfield Court, Rockville, Md., relates the very favorable experience that her family had in purchasing a home subject to FHA appraisal. Through the protection of that appraisal her family was saved from the purchase of a house that had defects, not apparent at first, and that would have been costly to have repaired. This letter gives further evidence of the fine job that the FHA is doing in fairly appraising the value of homes in a way that promotes buyer confidence and purchase for value received.

The letter follows:

ROCKVILLE, MD., *July 8, 1958.*

Mr. THOMAS BARRINGER,
Director FHA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARRINGER: We want to take this opportunity to tell you what a blessing we have found the FHA appraisal.

Ours is a family with six children and somewhat limited funds, as you might expect. We had purchased a house on Oakridge Avenue, Chevy Chase, at $23,000, subject to FHA appraisal. We loved the house and thought it was well worth the amount asked.

The FHA appraisal came in as $19,000 and you can well imagine that we were quite shocked. However, using this figure as a real warning that the house might not be worth $23,000, my husband made a very thorough investigation. He found many things that he had not noticed before, and realized that the house has many defects that obviously made it worth only the $19,000 figure used by the FHA. However, without the FHA appraisal, we would have suffered a real loss and would have incurred considerable expense after moving in.

Although the real estate agents would have the prospective buyer think otherwise, we have since found that the FHA appraisal is remarkably accurate. In our own house, the appraiser came within $100 of the actual cost, and we have since been advised that their appraisals have been used as the actual sale price; and the purchaser has enormous protection thereby.

Because of our faith in the FHA appraisal and this experience, we will buy nothing without this insurance. Many, many thanks for this wonderful service you provide us with.

Very sincerely,

TRUDY MORSE
(MRS. MALCOLM S.)

Schedule of Open Office Hours in the 10th District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe most people will agree that the first duty of a Congressman is to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session so as to be able to vote on legislation that comes up for consideration. Another important duty of a Congressman is to participate in committee work in an effort to assist in framing sound legislation for consideration of the House.

My experience has been that the duties of a Congressman do not end with adjournment of Congress. I have found that being a Congressman is a full-time job. Whenever Congress is in session, a Congressman should be in Washington at his post of duty. And when Congress is in recess, he should spend most of his time in the district affording his constituents an opportunity to confer with him personally about legislative matters and personal problems.

It has been my practice to schedule, as soon as Congress adjourns each year, a series of open office hours in each of the counties of the 10th district. I plan to continue that practice this year. Subject to change if Congress has not adjourned, I am today announcing that I will be present and available for conferences and discussions with any and all constituents who wish to see me about any matter of interest to them, between the hours of 10 a. m. and 4 p. m., at the following places:

Lincolnton, August 23, at my own office in Lincolnton.

Charlotte, August 25, at No. 239, Post Office Building.

Bakersville, August 26, at Mitchell County Courthouse.

Newland, August 27, at Avery County Courthouse.

Hickory, August 28, at Hickory City Hall.

Morganton, August 29, at Burke County Courthouse.

Newton, August 30, at Catawba County Courthouse.

Special appointments are not necessary. Every citizen is invited, irrespective of political affiliation. Past experience indicates these conferences can be helpful. It is really surprising how beneficial it can be when a citizen and his Congressman sit down face to face and discuss matters of mutual interest.

Later on I intend to extend these open office hours, as I have done ever year since I have been in Congress, to the various towns and local communities in the district. Public announcement will be made of the times and places of these additional grassroots conferences.

The Flag Law—And Its Problems—By Chairman Clarence E. Harper, American Legion, Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 14, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, after my introduction of H. R. 12044 I sought the advice of the distinguished veteran comrade Clarence E. Harper, chairman of the ceremonials commission of the State of Illinois, who is one of the best-informed experts on flag etiquette in Legion circles. He also holds the distinguished honor of membership on the national trophies, awards, and ceremonials committee. His close association with my dear brother Elliodor, chairman of the Americanism committee of the State of Illinois American Legion in this phase of Legion activity, resulted in many practical changes that contributed to the greater dignity and patriotic emphasis in flag ceremonies and related interpretation of flag presentments.

And so I am pleased to include Chairman Clarence Harper's informative letter as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
CEREMONIALS COMMISSION,
July 19, 1958.

Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
United States Congressman,
House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I was very happy to have the opportunity to talk with you at our Cook County Council Fourth of July show.

It was especially gratifying to know that there is a bill before Congress to consider approval of the revisions and additions to Public Law 829, 77th Congress, which we commonly call the flag law.

The American Legion has, for a number of years, tried to get these changes approved either by Presidential proclamation or by an act of Congress.

As you know, I have been very much involved in the publicizing of flag etiquette in the Department of Illinois.

Elliodor and I were closely associated in publicizing flag etiquette, not only throughout the American Legion but with civilian groups. The highlight of our activities was the Flag Day observance which we held annually at Congress Plaza and Michigan Avenue.

The section of Public Law 829, 77th Congress, with which we have had the greatest confusion is paragraph (K) of section 3, which describes the position of the flag, when displayed from a staff in a church or a public auditorium.

The portion of this which leads to the greatest amount of confusion are the words that are bracketed in the following quotation from paragraph (K):

"When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. [But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform]."

Gridley Adams, who was founder and director-general of the United States Flag Foundation and chairman of national flag code committee, which represented 112 patriotic and fraternal societies, and who was also coemender of the Federal Flag Code (Public Law 829), states in his booklet entitled "So Proudly We Hail" the following comment in connection with paragraph (K) of section 3:

"NOTE.—This rule has caused more inquiries than all other flag letters put together; so many persons have read this literally. The apparent error in the above rule is in its stating 'elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform' without saying that if there is no room in chancel or platform for a staffed flag to stand and must therefore be placed on the floor in line (the 'military right of line') with those in chancel or on platform who are facing persons in front who are facing them, then that is strictly in accordance with the spirit of Public Law 829. Being the symbol of our Government the flag outranks us all. (It is never dipped to a living person; not even a President.) Therefore, no man ever stands on the flag's own right, except a color guard with a rifle over his shoulder. Thus the congregation or audience should always see the flag of those in chancel or on platform at their left. If the audience is a demimilitary body and brings with them their own United States flag it is placed at the extreme right hand end of the front row of such body. (In Episcopal churches the chancel is a part of the congregation; therefore the United States flag is properly placed back of the altar rail, and at the right of the altar, or host, and which faces the minister and choir boys who, upon singing the glorias, always face toward the altar. (In the complete 48-page book this is gone into in greater detail.) A bill has just been introduced in the Congress to so amend this rule K as to preclude any misunderstanding."

As you may remember, the national executive committee of the American Legion, at their meeting of May 5–7, 1947, approved this interpretation of Public Law 829:

"The national colors and post flag, when in position, shall be in position at either side and just in advance of the commander's station; the national colors on the right of the commander, the post colors on his left when facing the audience, even though the commander is on a platform and the flags (colors) are posted on the ground level."

This is the exact wording as it is given on page 74 of the 1957 edition of the manual of ceremonies.

I believe you know that it is common practice for the Chicago office of the American Legion to refer all interpretations of flag etiquette to me. This was done at the request of Elliodor many years ago. As a consequence, I have had questions asked of me and the most frequently quoted question is the proper position of the American flag at a church service or meeting, when there is no chancel or platform. When I give the American Legion interpretation, most individuals, especially if they are not Legionnaires, will question my answer and, in many instances, will insist that I am incorrect.

When the individual posing the question is an American Legionnaire, I reply that "a good Legionnaire will observe the interpretation approved by our national executive committee."

It has been my experience that the general public looks up to the American Legion as an authority on flag etiquette. Under the circumstances, it is important that our replies for information on flag eitquette are authoritative.

You can render the American Legion and any others who are interested in flag etiquette an excellent service if you can get approval of the suggested amendments or additions to Public Law 829, 77th Congress.

Cordial regards and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE E. HARPER,
Member, National Trophies, Awards, and Ceremonials Committee.

And So With Krebiozen—"A Truth Once Established by Proof Neither Gains Face by the Consent of All Scholars Nor Loses Certainty Because of the General Dissent" (Ibid-II, 15)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished professor of physiology at the University of Illinois has every reason to be exhuberant over the Sloan-Kittering Institute for Cancer Research report in its experiments conducted through the use of krebiozen, a new drug. This controversial matter was presented in 2 articles listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues of May 29, 1958, page A4957, Krebiozen, a Treatment for the Cancer Patient› A Plea for a Fair Evaluation; and June 12, 1958, page A5370, Krebiozen Report.

Perhaps the light of reason will now influence the American Medical Association through its officials to permit a "lead kindly light" research approach to determine the scientific evaluation of krebiozen in cancer study.

The world's greatest newspaper, the Chicago Daily Tribune, has been in the forefront in reporting the recent developments as to the research study of krebiozen as a biological active substance and in a recent article reported as follows:

IVY CONTENDS REPORT BACKS CANCER DRUG—SHOWS KREBIOZEN CAN BE USEFUL

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, leading proponent of krebiozen, claimed Tuesday that a report of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, as far as it goes, supports his contention that the disputed drug is useful against cancer.

"An understanding of this report," Ivy wrote the American Cancer Society, "emphasizes anew the importance of facilitating * * * the double-blind controlled study recommended to your society in February by the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

"CONFIRMS OUR THEORY

"The Sloan-Kettering report, as far as it goes, confirms in detail the theory on which krebiozen was produced, and provides additional evidence showing why our contention that krebiozen is therapeutically active in some cancer patients should be correct."

The Sloan-Kettering report was an account of researches the institute conducted on cancer and was not the result of an investigation of krebiozen.

There were indications last month that the society's therapy committee then examining Ivy's proposal, would reject it as not providing an objective test. But it also was expected that in rejecting it the committee would outline a proposal which it could approve.

BACKS DRUG 7 YEARS

Ivy has claimed since March 1951 that krebiozen—discovered by a Serbian-born physician Dr. Stevan Durovic—is an agent with merit for the treatment of cancer. The fact that on October 22, 1951, the Journal of the American Medical Association stated that tests of krebiozen fail to confirm its beneficial effects did not shake his confidence in his judgment, and in Tuesday's letter he repeated what he said 7 years ago, that krebiozen may prove to be a key to the cure and perhaps the prevention of cancer.

Ivy, head of the department of clinical sciences at the University of Illinois, noted in his letter that the Sloan-Kettering report stated: "There is reason now to believe that natural defenses against cancer exist. It has proved possible, by manipulating and enhancing these defenses, to cure laboratory animals with some types of transplanted cancer."

TELLS OF RESEARCH

His own researches, Ivy wrote, led him in 1956 to state: "Since the start of the krebiozen investigation, and especially since 1951, we have been gratified to note the growing interest in the problem of the mechanisms concerned in providing the body with a natural resistance to cancer and how this resistance may be increased."

"It is further stated in the Sloan-Kettering report," Ivy continued, "that 'different types of cancer may stimulate a common cancer resistance factor, or that different kinds of cancer have something in common that stimulates bodily resistance.'

"I should like to emphasize the great responsibility which now confronts the American Cancer Society. It is and has been my considered and sincere conviction that krebiozen represents the only presently available fruit of this new understanding of the problem of cancer to which the Sloan-Kettering researchers are contributing so outstandingly."

The Cross Florida Barge Canal Now Approved by Army Engineers as Economically Justified in Addition to Defense Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Cross Florida Barge Canal has been authorized by Congress on the basis of its defense values, without relying upon economic considerations. This was done in 1942—Public Law 675, 77th Congress. The defense values have increased in the ensuing years, and are greater now than they have ever been. I have been this week informed by the United States Army engineers that the project is justified on economic considerations, this being the result of a recent study by the engineers. The letter received reads as follows:

JULY 23, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: Knowing of your interest in the Cross Florida Barge Canal, I wish to inform you of the results of an economic restudy of the project which has recently been completed.

As you may recall, the project was authorized in 1942 by Public Law 675, 77th Congress, as a high level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, in accordance with plans set forth in a letter of the Chief of Engineers dated June 12, 1942, and later printed in House Document No. 109, 79th Congress. The project provides for a channel 107 miles long, 12 feet deep and at least 150 feet wide, with 5 locks. The Federal cost is currently estimated to be $164,600,000 and the non-Federal cost is estimated to be $5,500,000.

Congress appropriated funds for an economic restudy of the project in the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1956. This restudy has now been completed by the District Engineer at Jacksonville and the Division Engineer at Atlanta.

The Chief of Engineers finds that the project is economically justified with a ratio of benefits to costs of 1.05 to 1, based on the prospective peacetime use of the canal over its economic life. Consideration also has been given to the views of proponents of this canal as to its usefulness to national defense in time of war. During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would, and could, have been moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The savings in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. However, the national defense values of civil waterway projects are not susceptible of monetary evaluation under present conditions. Accordingly, no monetary benefit was assigned in this restudy to any national defense value of the Cross Florida Barge Canal project.

The Chief of Engineers has reviewed the findings of the reporting officers and concludes that the project should again become a part of the Corps' active backlog of authorized civil-works projects.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. PERSON,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. Speaker, I am also happy to include at this point an important report to the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, this being made by Hon. Henry H. Buckman, an outstanding engineer. The report shows the absolute necessity for the early construction of this canal, based upon only one aspect of its defense value—the necessary movement of oil in time of war. This report reads as follows:

JUNE 1, 1958.

To: Read Adm. R. M. Fortson (United States Navy, retired), managing director the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida.

From: Henry H. Buckman, engineering counsel.

Subject: The position of the United States with respect to the war time supply of petroleum for the Atlantic seaboard area, and its relation to the completion of the Intracoastal Waterway from Trenton, N. J., to the Mexican border by the construction of the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

The position: (a) Normal annual petroleum requirements of the above area have increased since the beginning of World War II from 561,370,000 barrels of 1,211,869,000 barrels in 1957, or more than double.

(b) The entire United States petroleum supply in a future World War must be assumed to originate in the United States or contiguous land areas.

(c) Presently existing overland petroleum transport facilities can transport to the Atlantic seaboard area less than half the minimum deliveries which will be required.

(d) Either (1) additional overland facilities must be provided, or (2) the greater part of the supply for the Atlantic seaboard area must move, if that proves possible, by the open sea in the face of enemy action and with the resultant draft on available tankers and naval escort resources, plus losses.

Thesis: The completion of the Intracoastal Waterway is fully justified by the single fact that it affords the most expedient and by far the most economical solution of the problem presented by the position as stated above.

TABLE 1.—*Sources*

All data in this memorandum are derived from official sources. These include:

The Department of the Interior, Oil and Gas Division.

The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

The Petroleum Administration for War, records.

The Interstate Commerce Commission.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated total minimum wartime petroleum deliveries required by the Atlantic seaboard area, and portion deliverable by presently existing overland facilities*

	Barrels per year
(A) Actual 1957 deliveries (from U. S. Bureau of Mines):	
Via ocean tanker:	
Imports:	
Crude	240,000,000
Products	194,544,000
From United States gulf ports (crude and products)	689,823,000
From California (residuals, lubricants and others)	979,000
Total by ocean tanker	1,125,346,000
Via pipelines	64,584,000
Via Great Lakes tankers (estimated from 1956)	1,407,000
Via inland waterway barges Ohio River as far as Pittsburgh area) (estimated from 2d quarter, 1956)	21,633,000
Via tank car (estimate from 2d quarter, 1957)	4,272,000
Total 1957 deliveries to area	1,217,242,000
Less shipments from area by pipelines	5,373,000
Net 1957 input to area	1,211,869,000
(B) Adjustment of foregoing total to meet wartime requirements: [1]	
Basis: Percentage increase in last full combat year of World War II over last previous peacetime year (1941), equals approximately 11 percent	133,306,000
Total estimated minimum wartime deliveries required	1,345,175,000
(C) Delivery capacity of presently existing overland facilities (see table 3):	
1. By pipelines	358,240,000
2. By tank car	264,303,000
3. By existing inland navigation channels	46,587,000
Total	669,130,000
(D) Estimated minimum wartime deliveries to the Atlantic seaboard area which must move by ocean tanker or by additional overland facilities yet to be provided	[2] 676,045,000

[1] Total deliveries to Atlantic seaboard area in last prewar year (1941) were 561,370,000 barrels. In the last full combat year (1944), after rationing, deliveries had increased to 624,880,000 barrels, or about 11 percent.

[2] Slightly more than 50 percent of the minimum required deliveries. Note that this 50 percent is more than 6 times the deliveries by ocean tanker in 1944 by which time the Navy was able to afford supposedly adequate escort and when tanker supply was increasing. This failure to use ocean tanker transport was due either to inability or to a preference for the overland routes. Either assumption affords striking support for the thesis.

TABLE 3.—*Capacities of presently existing overland facilities for delivering petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard area*

(A) Existing liquid pipelines plus the so-called Big Inch line assumed to be converted to liquids: [1]	Barrels per year
1. Big Inch	117,705,000
2. Little Big Inch	82,855,000
3. Plantation lines	91,250,000
4. Ohio lines (into W. Pa.)	32,850,000
5. Southeastern	14,600,000
6. Laurel	18,980,000
Total pipeline capacity	358,240,000
(B) Existing tank car capacity [2]	264,303,000
(C) By existing inland waterways to western fringe of area (table 4)	46,287,000
Combined total capacity of all existing overland facilities	669,130,000

[1] Capacities of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch lines are derived from the records of the Petroleum Administration for War. Capacities of the other lines are furnished by the Department of the Interior, Oil and Gas Division.

In addition to the liquid lines there exist certain lines carrying gas, including the so-called Big Inch (24-inch dia.). It is claimed by certain of those engaged in pipeline transport that, in time of war, these gaslines could be converted to liquid transport and would prove adequate inasmuch as, with any given pipe cross section, more B. t. u. may be moved in liquid than in gaseous form. While such conversion is theoretically possible, it is practicably not generally achievable. Municipalities and industry in the areas now geared to gaseous fuel supplied by these gaslines could not be generally readjusted to liquid fuel in time of war without disastrous effect on the war effort. This claim of the feasibility of such conversion appears to be prompted by an unwillingness to see competing forms of transport developed. The conversion of the Big Inch from gas to liquids, assumed in the above tabulation, has been chosen to represent an optimistic maximum practicable conversion of the gaslines to liquids during wartime.

[2] The estimate of tank car capacity is derived thus: Maximum performance of the rail carriers in any one year of World War II (1943) was 310,945,000 barrels. The ICC advises that there are today 15 percent less tank cars than in 1943. Hence by deducting 15 percent from 310,945,000 barrels, the figure 264,303,000 barrels is obtained, representing the maximum annual capacity of the rail carriers that may be reasonably expected.

TABLE 4.—*Maximum annual petroleum deliveries to Atlantic seaboard area during World War II, actual 1957 deliveries, and estimated minimum required deliveries in a future war*

Facility	Maximum annual movement in period 1942-44, inclusive (barrels per year) [1]	Year	Percent [2]	1957 (barrels per year) [3]	Percent [2]	Estimated minimum for future war (barrels per year) [4]	Percent [2]
Tank cars	310,945,000	1943	61	4,272,000	0.3	264,303,000	20
Pipelines	267,485,000	[6] 1945	40	64,584,000	5.0	356,240,000	27
Barges and lake tankers [5]	46,587,000	1944	7	23,040,000	2.0	[5] 46,587,000	3
Total overland	524,268,000	1944	84	91,896,000	8.0	669,130,000	50
Ocean tankers	142,573,000	1942	32	1,125,346,000	92.0	[7] 676,045,000	50
Total movements	624,947,000	1944	100	1,217,242,000	100.0	1,345,175,000	100

[1] Records of the Petroleum Administration for War.
[2] Percentage of total annual movements in period indicated.
[3] U. S. Bureau of Mines, Monthly Petroleum Reports.
[4] Based on PAW records, and data furnished by U. S. Bureau of Mines and the Interstate Commerce Commission.
[5] This assumes that the Intracoastal Waterway remains uncompleted and that barge movement is limited to presently existing Mississippi Valley channels which permit delivery (via the Ohio River) only to the western fringe of the Atlantic seaboard area, i. e., the Pittsburgh area. The limitations on this movement are inherent, i. e., the absence of a connecting barge channel with the east coast, and the relatively short navigation season in the lakes area.
[6] The year 1945 is taken in the case of pipelines because it was not until that year that the full performance of both the Big Inch and the Little Big Inch lines could be measured.
[7] This assumes that movement by ocean tankers is the only recourse, and that such movement is practicable in the face of the newer, high-speed and atomic-powered and atomic-weaponed submarines. The assumption is a violent one, inasmuch as the amount of petroleum indicated is 6 times that moved in 1944 when the Navy was able to afford supposedly adequate escort, and when tanker supply was on the increase.

TABLE 5.—*Comparative cost estimates of 3 alternative solutions of the problem of supplying petroleum to the United States Atlantic seaboard in time of war*

1. By completion of the Intracoastal Waterway from Trenton, N. J., to the Mexican border by construction of the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal at an estimated cost of	$ 175,000,000
2. By the construction of 6 Big Inch pipelines at a present-day cost of $195,000,000 each, or a total of	1,170,000,000
3. By naval escort of ocean tankers (if available) at an indeterminate cost in losses of escort vessels and tankers with cargoes and personnel. Estimated on the basis of United States and British tanker losses during World War II, the total dollar cost of losses in such a supply line in a 3-year war would exceed	2,000,000,000

The Golden Out-of-Order Plan in Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Golden's solutions to some of the problems of the South are not unknown, I know, to many of my colleagues. As editor and publisher of the Carolina Israelite, Mr. Golden has his own unique forum for the presentation of such schemes as his out-of-order plan. This, some might remember, consists of hanging an out-of-order sign on a segregated public facility marked "colored." We are told what happens then in the following excerpt from the May-June Carolina Israelite, which I include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks for the amusement of those with a sense of humor:

One of the great retail chainstores has put the Golden out-of-order plan into operation and with considerable success. They placed an out-or-order sign on the "white" drinking fountain in most of their stores in the upper South. Within 6 weeks everybody was drinking the "colored" water without any bad effects, physical or emotional; and all the signs came off, "out of order," "white," and "colored." There is a problem, however. In most of these stores they made this experiment in the basement, and naturally they could not put an out-of-order sign simultaneously on the other floors. The whole idea would have been given away and made matters worse. I understand they intend to stagger the out-of-order signs from now on. They'll put them up on the second and fourth floors and then double back to the main and third floors. This thing has to be done—gradually.

You throw a tiny pebble into a stream and you never really know the extent of the ripples.

In a seminar on education in Tennessee I suggested to the Negro parents to make sure that their children study French immediately upon entering high school. We know of course, that there is no vertical segregation, but if the vertical Negro suddenly begins to talk French, he can even sit down without creating any serious emotion among the whites. I had a fellow try this out on the cashier's line at the A. & P. store. He suddenly asked the cashier about some product in French, and the white folks ahead of him acutally broke ranks to give him priority.

Of course there could be too much of a good thing. If the Negroes of the South follow my suggestion it is possible that within 20 years they'll all be talking French; it would no longer be a novelty. But by that time there may not be need for any more Golden plans.

The Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is an article in the New York Times of this morning which demonstrates conclusively the wisdom of Congress in passing the highway bill. Congress early this year saw the need to move. There were highways that needed to be built. There were men that needed to be put to work.

We passed a bill. And this morning it was announced that the volume of construction contracts awarded for the Interstate Highway System last month was almost double that of the month before.

Mr. President, this is Congress at its finest. This is the kind of action that gives people confidence in their Government.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRACTS UP 50 PERCENT FOR ROAD BUILDING—JUNE AWARDS $195 MILLION—$133 MILLION ALSO GIVEN IN HIGHWAY AID BY UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The volume of contracts awarded for the Interstate Highway System last month was almost double that of the month before, the Bureau of Public Roads reported today.

June contract awards amounted to $195 million, covering 369 miles, compared to $105 million in May, for 215 miles.

In addition, the Bureau reported $133 million of contract awards for 1,998 miles of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions.

A spurt in highway building in recent months has been a factor in keeping construction activity strong, helping to offset the cutback in expansion of industrial facilities.

This year's Federal highway legislation, made liberal in the name of combating recession, included a special $400 million Federal-aid fund.

The Bureau reported that under this program, as of June 30, construction was under way on 358 miles. The estimated cost of this mileage is $24,700,000, of which $16,600,000 is Federal funds.

Interstate highway construction underway on June 30 totaled 3,167 miles, estimated to cost $1,740,000,000. On the lesser roads—primary, secondary, and urban—construction was underway on 23,330 miles, estimated to cost $2,220,000,000.

Other economic reports of the day showed department store sales continuing to exceed last year's levels, and railroad freight business staging a revival from lower levels in early July.

The Federal Reserve Board reported that department store sales last week were 2 percent greater than in the same week last year. Sales were improved in 7 of the 12 Federal Reserve districts.

Department store business has been better than a year ago for a number of weeks, but for the 6½ months since January 1 it trails last year by 2 percent. Only the New York district has shown an improvement over last year, and that only 1 percent.

The Association of American Railroads reported that freight car loadings last week had totaled 381,817 cars, which was 18.5 percent greater than the week before. Loadings continued to be substantially below year-ago levels, however. Last week's figure was 21.7 percent lower than the same week last year.

Attorney Meyer "Duke" Kaufman, World War I Veteran, Dies at 71 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago members of the Illinois delegation from the Chicago area know that a good samaritan died the other day, Tuesday. No one seemed to care much except his immediate family and the press boys, police, and the legal fraternity around the police courts building in Chicago. He was the courtroom battler of another generation—fighting for the rights of the poor at the bar of justice where real justice must be held inviolate, the poor man's supreme court—the municipal court—where the very roots of the elemental law, in its application creates respect and instills confidence in the citizen, alien or newcomer in our American institutions.

Duke, as he was called, was a fiery orator and respected for his knowledge o fthe law—with or without fee he put forth every effort to win his cause. He spent his life in defending the poor and unfortunate members of our society in the criminal courts—certainly, it is not a financially remunerative field of law; but in the end, at last there is a self-satisfaction of having done a great service for the weak, disillusioned, and forgotten members of society, who needed an understanding friend to battle for their liberty and protect their rights.

As a young lawyer, I watched this seasoned veteran unfold his defense with masterful technique. He was a true lawyer of the old school both in forensics and knowledge. I learned a great deal from him, and know that a peerless legal light for the defense has entered the shadows. God will be good to him because he served those who needed him most, and had less to give. Charity is the greatest virtue of life—and Duke was the personification of the greatest of all virtues.

Our heartfelt condolences to his dear widow, Ann, and his four sisters and brother who can be proud of his career. He served man well and leaves a blessed memory for his friends to remember—with prayers.

Knowledge: Our Strongest Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Mr. Henry Kaiser, Jr., at the annual conference of the American Library Association, held in San Francisco on July 15, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE: OUR STRONGEST WEAPON

Good afternoon, friends. It is an honor to have been asked to share some of my thoughts with so distinguished and wonderful an audience. The cause you pursue is the furtherance of knowledge and truth among our fellow men. I don't think there is a greater cause anywhere. Without knowledge we are in darkness. Without truth we are slaves.

Two months ago, on May 12, to be exact, I was passing in a car along a street in Oakland, very near our Kaiser company headquarters. We stopped for a moment at an intersection, and I happened to glance out of the window, where I caught sight of the afternoon newspapers. Their headlines contained the announcement that a library of ours had been burned in Beirut. "United States Library Burned," that's what the newspaper said. Well, friends, it's an old story, isn't it? As our car moved on past that intersection, and into the flow of traffic, I reflected that I had just seen history repeat itself, not for the first time, nor the thirtieth, but for the millionth or twice that.

And it set me to thinking, as I am sure it would you, that people are very aware of the power of ideas; and if these ideas do not agree with them, or threaten their security as despots or tyrants, they will be greater objects of fear than a dozen atom bombs or the appearance of a thousand soldiers in the streets.

The American library at Beirut was burned not because it contained books or pamphlets but because it contained ideas. Book burning has gone on ever since books were written. But call it by its real name—idea burning—and you see both the futility of the deed itself and the strength of that which can never be burned.

We are in a world which is making noises like it was going to crack right down the center with the strain of two conflicting ideas. To save this world and ourselves from destruction we will have to make use of the strongest weapon we have, the weapon of knowledge.

We must arm ourselves with knowledge. We must grow up to ourselves and the promise of this great country. We must better understand the meaning of liberty, what it means to be a free individual.

I don't know whether or not we really understand these things. We've come to accept them, and we sloganize about them. But then we sloganize about a great many things. Slogans are convenient. You can hang your hat on them, along with all the thinking that's supposed to go on underneath. But when it comes to democracy and freedom these things you have to know, and not just you and I but our young people, too, and our very young. And we have to know them as well as Franklin and Jefferson knew them, which is to know them as live things and not as words in a book.

How much of our knowledge is in our hearts instead of on our tongues? How much do we really reflect on the life about us? How much do we really value that system of government which can operate freely in Washington, and freely in the 48 States, and freely, at the same time, through every county, city, township, and hamlet of this Nation?

To know these things, to really know and to love them, is to be strong in that knowledge. For you cannot know these things in this way without effort.

You people are the guardians of a wonderful institution—the American library. On a library's shelves what do you find? Why, books, of course. And pamphlets, you say. And magazines.

No, what you find there is something like this:

"We have got as far as we have because we produced a certain kind of human being. That human being is, first of all, a fellow with his eye on the future and not on the past. He likes to go off on his own and start something. This fellow has emerged out of the concept of equality—which means every person has a right to a break."

Dorothy Thompson said that.

And a little further along, on the shelves of this same library, you might find this:

"The man who regards his own life and that of his fellow creatures as meaningless is not merely unfortunate but almost disqualified for life."

The writer? Albert Einstein.

A library is not just a storehouse of knowledge. It is an arsenal of truth, a living and vital part of a free society.

And yet how little we know.

I have said, in the title of my talk, that knowledge is our strongest weapon. I believe it is. I believe that our survival will depend upon how much we know and how wisely we use what we know to defend ourselves.

The other day a group of Russian journalists were passing through San Francisco.

"We are most impressed," one of them said, "by the very great interest here in Russian youth. Everywhere we go there are questions about our young people and our students. But, judging from the questions asked, Americans know very little about Russian life. That, we think, is too bad."

I think it is, to, and I would like to ask, Why don't we?

True, the Soviet Union hasn't made it very easy for us to know them, but on the other hand how easy have we made it for ourselves? I think we have to be fearful of erecting an Iron Curtain of our own in this country. We have to fear becoming what might be called "intellectual isolationists," out of the apprehension that our youth, if brought into contact with Soviet ideas, might fall in love with those ideas. I think our young people are more intelligent than that. They are not babes in arms, and we had better stop wrapping them in swaddling clothes and feeding them by a single formula if we want the America of the future to be guided by men and women whose decisions are based on sober knowledge rather than superstition and bias.

Communism, or any similar "ism" is as hateful to me as it is to you. But I think we have to dig beneath it, and understand its roots, before we can hope to nullify the poison of its leaves and branches.

A short time ago I asked a librarian friend of mine this question: "What are the Russians doing with their libraries?"

He answered: "A great deal, I suspect, only it's rather difficult to find out just exactly what. The moment you start asking questions about Russia, people are ready to call you a Communist."

We had better disabuse ourselves of this practice; for believe me, friends, what we don't know can hurt us and hurt us deeply.

Right now we are very busy trying to "keep up with the Khrushchevs," putting great stress on science, technology, the teaching of physics in our junior and senior high schools, and the like.

But science is only a part of knowledge; and America will survive, in the long run, not on the kind of chemicals she produces in her laboratories but on the kind of men she produces on Main Street and on Capitol Hill—men of vision and resolve.

I think we have to develop in our young people a greater love of the humanities as well, a keener interest in literature, history, and government, a deepr awareness of the problems and destinies of other races and nations.

Our wonderful exchange should be trebled, even quadrupled, over what they are now. Our political-science courses should be brought down from the universities into the high schools, along with more intensive work on languages and comparative history. Our students should know something about England, China, India—yes—and about Russia. They should read her history under the Czars and under Lenin and Stalin. And they should know something about the different religions of this world, because to know a people's religion is to know why they act as they do.

The American Library Association can play a great role in all of this. For what I am suggesting is not just an educational revival in America but an educational coming of age.

We cannot afford to be half educated. We cannot afford to do things halfway. We must turn everything to our use, and waste nothing.

It reminds me of a story they tell about Henry Ford. Ford once specified that a shipments of engine parts, should be delivered in wooden crates, of a certain size. These wooden crates, he further directed, should be held together by screws, rather than nails. He even wrote down the exact size of the screws he wanted, and the exact place they should fit into the boxes. And all this for just ordinary, everyday shipping crates, mind you.

Well, the manufacturers of the engine parts grumbled, but they agreed to the conditions. If Ford wanted to make a lot of fuss about shipping crates, well, that was the privilege of an eccentric genius. They would play along with him.

Came delivery day and revelation. For lo, and behold, the sides of those wooden shipping crates turned out to be exactly the size of the floorboards, of Henry's model T's. With each screw hole correctly spaced and drilled, the boards were ready to be slipped right into place. Henry Ford's whimsy had been the work of a genius, all right, but hardly an eccentric one.

Waste nothing. Let us use our minds, every corner of them.

And who can tell but that our efforts might one day lead us to peace rather than war? Certain it is, that if we allow ignorance to prevail, any hope of peace must be put aside forever.

For ignorance is weakness, and the weak die.

As William Randolph Hearst put it: "Whatever begins to be tranquil is gobbled up by something that is not tranquil."

Ignorance breeds tranquillity.

In the Kaiser companies—say Kaiser Aluminum, Kaiser Steel, or Willys Motors—we try to study every move our competitors are making, just as they study us. We get to know our competitors. We analyze their products—their selling techniques. If instead of doing this, we tried to pretend our competitors did not exist—our markets would soon be taken away from us and we would be through.

Russia is there. China is there. And Russia and China are not going to grow weaker, but stronger. Their youth are being educated—drilled, if you like—and they are learning about us. They are going to know us better than we know them, unless we get busy and put aside our comic books, and our pulp novels, and our easy reading habits—and go to work.

And I mean we are going to have to work hard, not only to acquire knowledge but to bring knowledge to others—and to cultivate a ground in which knowledge can flourish.

And I think in connection with this, that libraries must look upon themselves not as storehouses, but as town halls, where opinions can be exchanged between individuals and groups, as well as between readers and authors; where more and more adult classes may be held, in the evenings, on weekends, during that leisure time we are so hotly pursuing; where youth groups can be organized for after school and evening symposiums; where films may be shown; where great music may be heard; where leading authorities the world over, may be invited to speak before, and participate in, open discussion groups.

It is not enough that we in industry, should rely upon libraries as sources for our research material. Nor that universities should be centered around them. You need to reach the people. The voter, the man responsible for those who will make the decisions for each of us.

I should like just for a moment, to ask this question: You people have a product—what is being done to improve this product? What is being done to bring people off the streets, and out of their homes, to use this product?

You and I can sit here all day, and talk to each other about the need for knowledge. And I can say, and you can agree with me, that knowledge is a wonderful thing. But unless you get people to seek out this knowledge, you are not doing the job.

One of our most intense pursuits is the pursuit of leisure time. Television is aware of this pursuit—so are the movies—so is radio—so are newspapers and magazines. Furthermore, they are doing something about it.

You might say all these media are competitors of yours. Well, they are—but only because this is a hungry world, and the race to satisfy that hunger will fall not to the swiftest, but to the most imaginative—the ones who make the most imaginative use of modern techniques to satisfy the oldest hunger of all—the hunger to know things.

Honestly, now, what do you suppose the average man would say, if he were asked to give his impression of a typical library? He's standing on a street corner, in the bright sunlight, with the traffic hooting and honking all around him. And he is asked: "What, sir, is your impression of a public library?"

Would he think of something bright, amusing, attractive? Or would he recall something bound in by rules? Something with a "no this" and a "no that" wrapped around it, like lengths of old muslin around a mummy? Something musty, dark and forbidding? Something not to go forward to, with light spirit and eager brain—but something to avoid like an empty warehouse on a Sunday afternoon?

If this latter picture is the one conceived by Mr. Average-Man, then, indeed, is your job cut out for you. It doesn't matter whether this picture is true or not. You may know it's not true—and I may know it. But if that is the picture that is in the public mind, then you have got to get down to the business of correcting that picture. Maybe it's a job of public relations. If so, it's your responsibility to go out and find the people to help you solve this problem. You've got to get out and do something, if you want to change this picture—right or wrong. But this again comes right back to the basic need—a selling job. If you've got the product, are you selling it? And if you haven't got the product, what are you doing to get it?

You are not just keepers of our books—not just warehousemen of our ideas—you are there as well, to stimulate thinking-power, and to enrich our vision.

There's a barber I know. I've known him for quite a few years, and I like him. I like the way he cuts my hair. His name is Bill. Well, Bill hasn't had many customers out near where I live—and so, after quite a few years, he's decided to move to another location. I'm not sure Bill is going to make it at that new location. And there's a reason why. I don't think the people in the new neighborhood are going to be any more attracted, by the condition of Bill's windows, floors, and shelves, than were the people in the old neighborhood.

I used to say: "Bill—why don't you clean up a little? Make the place look nice?" "Sure, Mr. Kaiser," he'd reply—"I'll do that."

But the very next time I'd visit him, it would be the same thing. The last time I went there, in fact, there was a "Closed" sign hanging in the doorway. Well, knowing Bill, I knocked anyway—and sure enough, out he came. He had forgotten to turn the sign around when he came to work that morning.

Bill's not going to make it, until Bill changes. You've got to have the product first—and then you've got to sell that product. You can't wait, like Bill, for the people to walk in on you. You've got to go out and get 'em. You've got to advertise for them.

Progress is slow, I know—sometimes painfully slow. I'm sitting in a wheelchair—now this wheelchair is made of steel mostly, and it weighs around 45 pounds. That may not seem like much—but stuff somebody like myself into it, weighing around 200 pounds—and wheel me around all day, and it begins to grow on you—if you know what I mean.

Well for over a year now, I've been trying to promote the idea among one of the largest manufacturers of these things, to make them out of aluminum, and shed about 25 pounds of weight. Well, I can't be too sure, and I certainly don't want to be labeled a wild-eyed optimist—but I think that idea of mine is just beginning to penetrate where it should. It's taken about 14 months of persistent pushing, but I think they're getting the idea.

Pushing—that's the word. You've really got to push in this world, or you're run over before you know it, by someone who's pushing harder. Let me remind you—there's only one way to push, and that's forward.

Furthermore, what began as a purely personal inquiry on my part, has led to the discovery that this particular company which makes these wheelchairs turns out about 60,000 to 80,000 each year—not a bad market for Kaiser Aluminum, should that idea of mine ever bear fruit.

I can't tell you librarians how to improve your product; except that communications is a very broad thing, and I think you've got to be just as broad. I don't think we can afford to be book collectors only, when ideas are being communicated in film, over television networks, through records, and by every electronic means at our disposal.

There's a library going up in San Leandro. I kind of admire the way they're going about it. I've looked at their plans. They've got space for a theater and projection booth, and a music library, and there's a garden air about the children's room and in the walks. It breathes, it has life, it is not just a depository, not a vault, it is a place of beauty and light.

And once you improve your product think of the selling tools at your disposal, think just of television. Here is a magnificent tool which you can use to bring people out of their homes and off the streets into your libraries. How much use are you making of

it? Or are you being hopeful like Bill the barber, waiting for people to walk in under their own power? That could be a long wait.

Right across the bay, in Oakland, we have a new television station— KTVU. Now I am quite sure that this station has public service time available for announcements. And it's also got a big following, because it is showing some of the best movies around. Now has anybody from the Library Association approached KTVU, and asked for free time, to get people to come to the library? If so, I haven't heard about it.

You know, it's easier to use television than to lose it. No amount of wishful thinking is going to make television pack up its bags and move away. It's here, and though network time may be too costly there are local stations like KTVU, here in the bay area, which can be used. Are you letting this opportunity escape you? Think about that for a moment. And think, also, of your product. You can't rush out and sell something that isn't sellable.

The problems before us are complex and multidimensional. We cannot hope to solve them as half-educated, one-dimensional people.

By providing America with the tools and the facilities to meet this challenge you will be rendering a great and immeasurable service.

But let me remind you, once again, that we cannot wait forever to take up these tools and use them, nor can we wait for the public to discover them on their own.

To sum up, it seems to me that you have two jobs ahead of you. First, to improve the 14,163 libraries of the United States and Canada. I am surprised there are not more. There should be, considering the fact that we have 150 million people in this country and another 14 million in Canada. And secondly, to bring the people in, new people, and not just hundreds of them but thousands. Do not wait for them, bring them in.

And if you do these two jobs you will help America grow stronger in mind as well as in material goods.

"What do we plant when we plant a tree?
We plant a ship that will cross the sea,
We plant a mast to carry the sails,
We plant the planks to withstand the gales—
The keel, and keelson, the beam and knee—
We plant a ship when we plant a tree."

May each of us, together, plant a tree which will carry America and the free world forward to the bright future under full sail.

Thank you, friends, good luck and God bless you.

White House Conference on the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most important things that could be done at the present time is to give deep consideration to the problems of our senior citizens.

Yesterday the House Education and Labor Committee approved a bill calling for a White House conference on the aging. This is a constructive forward-looking step.

This is a country in which we are not making full and adequate use of many of our experienced people. It is time that we acted to take advantage of this tremendous reservoir of talent which now is put to little use.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks the United Press article printed in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE PARLEY ON AGING IS BACKED

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The House Labor Committee approved today a bill calling for a White House Conference on the Aging.

The bill, approved by a voice vote, directs President Eisenhower to schedule the conference before September 30, 1960.

The conference would make recommendations to the President in such fields as employment, housing, medical care, and community activities for the elderly.

In general, the conference would follow the pattern of the White House Conference on Education in late 1955. It would be preceded by State conferences under the supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill would authorize $50,000 to finance the cost of planning State conferences and sending State delegates to the national session.

The committee also approved a bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to establish safety regulations for stevedores and longshoremen. It added a provision opposed by the administration to require the Secretary to appoint a committee representing unions, industry, and the Coast Guard to advise him on safety standards.

Nasserism and Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent days we have heard a great deal about Nasserism and nationalism. The point has frequently been made that these two movements are not necessarily identical, although in the current Middle East situation it is increasingly hard to separate them.

In this connection, two items in the press have come to my attention which I think bear close reading. The first of these is an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald for July 24, 1958, entitled "Nasser and Nationalism." The second is an article from the London Times, written by one of its special correspondents, entitled "Springs of Arab Nationalism."

I ask unanimous consent that these two items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 24, 1958]

NASSER AND NATIONALISM

There is a strong temptation to blame the Wetsern predicament in the Near East on the mere machinations of Nasser and the Communists. Such a simple assessment not only misses the more basic cause of the unrest, it also leads to wrong conclusions as to what would be a wise course in the future.

Colonel Nasser has given expression to a particularly virulent kind of nationalism, and the Communists have been quick to exploit it in terms of the disruption of old power relationships. Nasser, though he by no means has the military machine of a Hitler, has some of the same megalomaniacal ideas and has embraced some of the same subversive tactics. But nationalism in the Near East existed long before Nasser, and it would exist in one form or another without him today.

What is happening in the Near East is a facet of the anti-colonial revolution that has swept Asia and is sweeping Africa. This revolution owes more to the ideas of jefferson and Gandhi, and to the centrifugal effect of two world wars, than to any current political maneuvers. Sometimes the revolution is blind; colonialism is associated with the presence of the western white man irrespective of the libertarian framework western institutions may have brought, and irrespective of the fact that the old kinds of exploitation are rapidly passing.

It would be a great mistake to assume that Nasserism and Arab nationalism are synonymous, and that if only somewhat Nasser's influence could be checkmated old relationships could be resumed. The nationalist fervor in the Near East is something much larger than the immediate problems presented by Nasser's subversion. It is rooted in a heretofore largely inchoate striving for dignity and importance, a feeling of community based upon common religion and language, an abhorrence of symbols of past repression. To many, Nasser seems to represent success in this endeavor, whatever his methods.

Yet there is a constant danger that the American and British expeditions to Lebanon and Jordan will create just such an impression. The dispatch of American troops to Lebanon was in response to repeated appeals, but it had less to do with the immediate situation in that tiny republic than with the revolution in Iraq. There was a feeling in western capitals, probably correct, that if nothing were done to bolster friendly governments others would topple or that there might be a more serious kind of intervention. However necessary was the response when it came, it had earmarks of panic and desperation. To think that the presence of American troops had solved the more basic problem, or that Nasser's subversion alone was responsible for the turmoil in Lebanon, would be monumentally foolish.

The important question, of course, is what we do in the future. If we are lucky, we may persuade members of the United Nations to take over the task of protecting the integrity of Lebanon and Jordan; we also may be able to establish some more effective guaranties against indirect aggression. But, barring the indefinite use of force which would be as repugnant to Americans as to the Arab peoples, we are altogether unlikely to see the reestablishment of old relationships in the area.

This, in turn, poses a challenge to American and western thinking. For real stability in the Arab Near East may well lie with independent neutrals rather than with shaky allies. There is no reason whatever to yield to the aggressive manifestations of Nasserism or to abandon our commitments; but there is every reason to accommodate western interests to Arab nationalism and to seek ways of channelizing that nationalism along moderate lines at the same time that steps are taken to make available alternate oil sources. That means heeding the counsel of authentic nationalists in such countries as Tunisia and the Sudan; it means, also, using

the tools of imaginative political and economic policy in anticipating new eruptions. Above all it means recognition of the inevitability of change. If we are to have any influence in minimizing violent change in the Near East, then we must be prepared to assert ourselves in helping bring about constructive change.

[From the London Times]

SPRINGS OF ARAB NATIONALISM

The emotion which persuades a Beirut taxi driver to display a photograph of Nasser, or a Syrian president to unite his country with Egypt, or a Baghdad mob to burn the British Embassy, is usually described as Arab nationalism. But, although in some ways it is parallel to—and indeed springs from—the national sentiment which turned Europe into nation states, it is an emotion with its own special complexities. 'Aruba, "Arabism" or "Arabdom," the word which is on the lips of every politician and the pen of every journalist, means the fact of being an Arab. The positive elements of Arabism are not so much racial as a sense of common history, and, much more potent, the existence of a common language. Islam, which provides a common pattern of social behavior as well as a divinely inspired book in the Arabic language, is perhaps the strongest element of all, though it is still heresy to orthodox nationalism to suggest that there is any essential division between Christian and Muslim Arabs.

At least as strong as the positive elements of Arabism are the negative. In its present form it means, above all, not being ruled—and preferably not being influenced by—non-Arabs. It means not admitting any form of commercial, diplomatic, or intellectual inferiority. Arabism is attached to no particular social or political beliefs, though its leaders usually have, or soon adopt reformist programs. For the man in the street, however, Arabism is something that can stand by itself. If he is poor, or his landlord tyrannous, the administration corrupt, elections crooked, or life generally frustrating, this is almost certainly the fault of alien influences which the triumph of Arabism will sweep away.

Arab nationalism has grown in this way because it is based on an apparently inexplicable humiliation. There, in the seventh and eighth centuries, was a blaze of glory, unique in its suddenness and extent. From, so it seems, virtually nothing the Arabs produced a prophet, a religion, an empire, and a civilization, which made the name "Arab" inferior to none and dominant from Spain to India. Then came centuries of decline and decay until, by the time when, in the 19th century, Arabs first began a critical survey of the world they lived in, the only genuinely independent Arabs were those so poor and remote that it had been worth nobody's while to subjugate them. What had gone wrong?

The dawn of this critical period, and the birth of Arab nationalism, is usually associated with the rise of Mehemet Ali in Egypt. Mehemet Ali was the incarnation of the negative elements of Arabism. * * * Impatient, brutal, thrusting western techniques on a torpid populace, Mehemet Ali was the Peter the Great of the Arab world.

The positive aspects of Arabism first emerged most clearly in Lebanon where, owing to the existence of a solid Christian community, intellectual influences from Europe most easily took root. These Lebanese Arabs who simultaneously rediscovered the past heritage of their race and the present achievements of Europe, and then compared them with the stagnation of Ottoman rule, had no choice but to become political.

It is all very recent. Arab nationalism was a matter of secret societies until the First World War. Men like Nuri es-Said and Shukri Kuwatly of Syria belong really to the first generation of Arab nationalism. It is partly because the whole period of political growth for the Arabs, from scratch to the age of the United Nations and the hydrogen bomb, has had to be compressed into less than a century, that their ideas seem often simultaneously very muddled and very simple. So many doctrines, suggestions, and outside forces are pulling them hither and thither, that it has been simpler to sum up their belief in a word, Arabism, which is something that can be felt so strongly that it needs no analysis.

Since the first generation, of course, Arabism has taken specific directions, or, rather, it has run up against specific obstacles which have diverted its course into new channels. The consequences of the First World War were disillusion. No doubt they were disillusioning for all the combatants. But the Arabs were less used than tired Europe to seeing political illusions vanish in a puff of smoke. Unity, independence, glory—all the things they had excitedly come to think of as being within reach, evaporated. Humiliation had become more profound. And the scapegoats were at hand—western imperialism, Zionism, and treacherous leaders. These are still the scapegoats.

For disciples of Arabism, too much has gone wrong to make it possible to do without guilty men. The Arab League has failed. The Palestine war failed. In spite of independence, unity has not materialized. It is Nasser's achievement to have fitted all his acts into the picture that Arab nationalists had drawn of a savior.

As has happened in the case of many other political prophets, Nasser's standing as the incarnation of arabism tends to increase in proportion as his direct influence decreases. Egyptians may still be proud of him, but most of them lack the terrifying fanaticism that his name can conjure up in countries like Iraq, where Nasser worship was officially forbidden. Nasser's neighbors in the Sudan and Libya and Lebanon know that his meddling has frequently taken forms—violence, incitement to murder—which are hard to reconcile with any principles of behavior, let alone the brotherhood of all Arabs.

If it were possible for the Arab countries to try the experiment of unity, under Nasser or anyone else, they would probably come to realize that political ideals are not as easy of realization as they seem. The contradictions and rivalries in the vast extent of the Arab world would be shown to spring from realities, and not to be inventions of imperialism. Neutrality and isolationism would be found to be incompatible with cutting a commanding figure on the world stage.

But, at present, it is not possible for the Arabs to feel that they are in sight of their goal. A sense of victory has not obliterated a sense of humiliation. Anyone who urges them to press on, and who unearths more sinister forces working against their interests will find a response. This is not strange. Arab nationalism is still young enough to be working out its character. The trouble is that it is clearer about its enemies than its friends, and that the working-out process has to go on in the most sensitive part of the world's surface.

Review of United Nations Role in Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 23. It is an excellent review of the developments to date in the United Nations with respect to the difficult situation in the Middle East, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

A REVIEW OF MIDDLE EAST CRISIS AND ROLE OF THE U. N.

The struggle over the Middle East in the United Nations boils down to this:

The United States is trying hard to have the cloak of United Nations moral approval thrown over its intervention. Russia is equally determined to withhold that cloak and try to show this country up as a naked aggressor.

For almost the first time since the United Nations was founded, the United States is in danger of suffering a major setback in world opinion. Many of our friends—pro-Western and non-Communist nations—are withholding their support and are even highly critical of our Middle East intervention.

The maneuvering in the United Nations is worth review.

Lebanon appealed to the U. N. on May 22, asking help against external aggression which the Lebanese said came from the United Arab Republic—in effect, Nasser's Egypt. Sweden proposed a force of U. N. observers to determine whether aggression existed. The force went to Lebanon to study the situation.

The preliminary report of the observer force cited no massive intervention into Lebanon. But it did not, as it develops, rule out the possibility of intervention existing. It merely said that, at the time, the force had not been able to check all rebel positions along the border and had not found sizable intervention in places that it had checked.

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, after talks with Egypt's Nasser and a visit to Lebanon, said he believed that no massive intervention existed. He reportedly was hoping to give Nasser a way of pulling out of the Lebanon situation gracefully and at the same time giving the Lebanese time to solve their own problems.

But then came the Iraq revolt. The United States, at the request of Lebanon's President, landed marines in Lebanon. The United States then rushed to the U. N. and said, "Take over to stop aggression."

The answer, from Sweden, Japan, and other nations, was, "What aggression?" The fat was in the fire. The last several days have seen it sputter and flame in the Security Council.

Sweden immediately proposed withdrawal of the U. N. observer force so that the U. N. would not be associated with the United States effort in Lebanon. Only Sweden and Russia supported the plan.

Russia proposed that the U. N. condemn American intervention and order the United States troops out. Only Russia voted for that, but Sweden and Japan abstained, giving the United States no comfort.

The United States proposed expansion of the observer force, establishment of contact between United States and U. N. forces and possibly placing United States troops under U. N. direction. Britain, France, Nationalist China, the ousted regime of Iraq, Panama, Colombia, Canada, and Japan voted for the proposal. Sweden abstained. Russia said "No," thus vetoing the plan.

Japan urged that the U. N. observer force be increased to a size capable of handling the Lebanese situation so that the United States could withdraw. Russian amendments to condemn the United States and force United States withdrawal failed. Only Russia voted for the amendments. But, again, Sweden and Japan abstained. Russia then vetoed the Japanese plan. (Hammarskjold is planning to add to the observer force on his own initiative.)

Thus the Security Council is deadlocked. The one sure thing is that the United States has thus far been denied the moral cloak of the U. N. The devastating thing is that this country has also been denied the support of many of its firm friends. Even some of the nations that have given support have been sharply critical. And nations not on the Security Council, such as India, West Germany, Ghana, Morocco, Ceylon, and many Latin American states, have been condemnatory.

The pleas for the United Nations to do something have so far failed. Our moral position before the world has thus been weakened. Our belated attempt to cover up intervention with U. N. approval has not succeeded. Hammarskjold has pointed out that the U. N. is not an entity—like a nation. It can work only when nations in negotiation want it to. Russia, of course, does not want it to. But the dismally sad truth is that, in this case, many other nations who normally take our side won't give this country U. N. approval either.

An alternative to Security Council action is a meeting of the U. N. General Assembly. It at least doubtful that we can get the necessary two-thirds vote there. Even if we do, it would only be after bitter attacks on this country and its intervention—attacks such as India, for example, has already promised. These attacks would be broadcast to the world—and would be devastating to our reputation in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

Another alternative is a summit meeting—in the U. N. Security Council, as the United States and the British have proposed. But this poses problems, too. It would be an ideal forum for the Russians, if they agreed to it. With Security Council procedural restrictions it could be stalemated.

Hammarskjold apparently desires a formal meeting of heads of states sitting in the Security Council—with the leaders involved retiring to private sessions to negotiate and make proposals to the council.

The Russians seem to dislike the idea. They want to force a real summit conference outside the U. N.—the kind that has been called the wrong meeting, at the wrong time and place on the wrong subject. They want an open world forum at which Khrushchev could whiplash the western leaders and establish himself as the dominant advocate of world peace.

Either conference now would violate this country's principles that a summit meeting must be preceded by careful preparation, must discuss problems left unsolved at the last summit meeting, and must have some real chance of making progress.

Thus on all points, from all sides, the American position is besieged. From every standpoint this country is in a mess—and has lost the moral position upon which its leadership of the forces of freedom and peace absolutely depends.

We have lost the initiative. We stand bare of policy. The gravity of the situation cannot be minimized.

District Federal Judge Win G. Knoch Named for United States Appeals Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is to the honor of the bench and bar of Illinois that the distinguished jurist and active Legionnaire district judge of the seventh Federal district has been named by Senator DIRKSEN for appointment to the United States court of appeals. He has demonstrated on his record throughout his legal career, as assistant states attorney, and circuit court judge of Du Page County, Ill., as well as Federal district judge, a high capacity for judicial responsibility and proven integrity. In the American Legion he was ever at the service of his comrades—and has earned their respect and love. His deep devotion to patriotic principles of true Americanism have endeared him to the rank and file of the organization.

He is a patient, quiet, and honest servant of the people. He is a polished speaker and has appeared innumerable times before audiences to deliver interesting speeches on subjects of national and local import. He, no doubt, will be advanced to this high and important judicial position, wherein he must weigh the court procedures and law questions involved in the trials of the district court. He has always enjoyed a high reputation for being just and fair, together with a vast knowledge in all fields of law. A fearless judge with a kind heart and with a high sense of loyalty to his oath of office.

He is a great jurist and is recognized as a pillar of justice in any court that he honors by his acceptance to preside.

The Chicago Tribune does him merited honor and justice in these excerpts taken from an article written by the popular and seasoned political editor, George Tagge, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 23, 1958]

JUDGE KNOCH SLATED FOR UNITED STATES APPEALS COURT

(By George Tagge)

Judge Win G. Knoch, who in 1953 became the first Republican to be appointed to the Federal district court in Chicago in 22 years, is slated for appointment to fill a vacancy on the United States circuit court of appeals.

The tribune learned that Senator DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois) has recommended presidential appointment for Judge Knoch with the hope that Senate confirmation can be obtained before the 1958 session ends next month.

FBI BEGINS CHECK

Routine checking by the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been begun here. Although the FBI process often requires 6 weeks, the fact that Judge Knoch was cleared by the same agency in 1953 will lessen the time needed, Senator DIRKSEN believes.

Death early this year of Judge Walter C. Lindley created the vacancy on the appeals court at 1212 North Lake Shore Drive. Further delay in filling it might result in Indiana or Wisconsin, also in the appeals court territory, seeking to name the judge.

Judge Knoch, 63, was an assistant state's attorney and county judge of Du Page County before his first election to the circuit court in 1939. He often sat as a visiting judge in Chicago. His knowledge of both rural and urban problems was stressed by Republicans who sought to draft him as a candidate for governor in 1955.

HEADED JUDGES' GROUP

Before attaining a Federal judgeship, Knoch served as president of the Illinois Circuit and Superior Judges' association. His grandfather, Christopher Knoch, immigrated from Germany 100 years ago and settled in Naperville.

Communists Have Turned China From a Land of Warmth and Laughter Into a Desert of Unsmiling, Frightened Faces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on July 23, 1958. The article entitled "Communist China as I Saw It" was written for United Press International by Rev. Father Joseph Patrick McCormack, a Maryknoll missioner, who was released from 5 years in a Red Chinese prison and sent home.

Father McCormack was born in Roscommon, Ireland, August 6, 1893. After attending schools in his native land he came to the United States, entered Maryknoll, and was ordained for the priesthood. In 1925 he left for the mission of Fushun, Manchuria. During World War II he was interned by the Japanese but was repatriated to the United States in 1942. Early in 1943 he took up new work in the missions of Chile. After the war Father McCormack returned to Manchuria, but Communist Army advances forced him to withdraw into South China. He was arrested in Shanghai with seven other missioners in 1953 and placed in a Red prison.

Father McCormack's story on life in a Chinese prison follows:

COMMUNIST CHINA AS I SAW IT

(By Joseph P. McCormack, M. M.)

Since my release after 5 years in a Red prison, people are continually asking me about the Chinese Communists. My reply is that there are no Chinese Communists for all Communists are men without countries. Regardless of their nationality—whether they're Russian or Chinese, or even American—once they've been indoctrinated with the Communist idea, they're the same all over the world—shrewd, fanatical, capable of doing anything to get what they want.

But mostly they're cruel. The Communists that I mixed with during my trial and while in prison had lost not only their personal identities, but their national characteristics as well. They were too cruel to be called Chinese.

The ordinary people of China are frightened to death because of Red brutality. They are terrorized by a highly efficient secret police organization which has a finger on everyone. A jailed Communist told me that between October 1953 and October 1954 the Reds arrested 35 million Chinese from all walks of life, and on the slightest pretext.

It's unbelievable how the face of China has changed. What was once a land of warmth and laughter is now a desert of frightened, unsmiling faces. In Shanghai alone, over 1 million people have been put in prison. The jails are jammed with men and women whose only crime is that they're too poor to pay taxes.

I saw part of the picture during a propaganda campaign which the Communists launched last February, using nine of us from the prison. After assigning 14 secret police to guard us, they took us on a 30-day

conducted junket of new redevelopment projects.

The tour was a big thing let me tell you, with high-powered publicity and all kinds of official clearance. Even though we knew we were being used—with photos taken of us in clean white shirts, eating good food, and smoking cigarettes—I must say it was a nice switch from prison life. So we went along with the game.

I wasn't much impressed with their building program. Most of it was a sham, like a set for a Hollywood movie. The one exception was the big bridge at Hankow, which they've been working on for several years. It's quite an engineering feat in any man's book—especially for China. But the tragedy is that all this is being accomplished by slave labor. I saw thousands of workers at the bridge site—prisoners from the labor camps—their bodies thin and worn, carrying heavy loads that you wouldn't put on the backs of animals, much less human beings.

The whole judicial system, from what I saw of it, is terrifying. As soon as the police pick you up, you know you don't have a chance. Arrest is synonymous with guilt, and you never try to obtain leniency by defending yourself. When they grabbed me in 1953 they said that I could have a lawyer, but that I shouldn't fight the charges. Because the more you fight, they told me, the more severe the penalty. They kept reminding me that what I said to the court really wouldn't matter—I would be judged on my mental attitude.

I never did find out what they meant by mental attitude, but I suppose they marked me fairly high on it, because I only got a 5-year sentence.

It all started for me when the Reds came storming through Manchuria after World War II. I was up there then, as vicar capitular of the Maryknoll diocese of Fushun. The wind was blowing against us, and as the Communist movement grew stronger, the persecution of the church became more intense.

The crucial point, in my own mind, was the slaying of an elderly Chinese priest in January 1948. For 2 winter months he had been in an unheated prison, covered only by burlap rags, and half starved. Then, on a bitter cold morning that I will never forget, they dragged him out of his cell, shot him three times in the back of the head, and kicked his body into a drainage ditch.

From then on, it seemed, everything went against us, and in desperation, I decided to abandon the present and prepare for the future.

The future of the church in China, as in any country, depends upon priests—so, I made arrangements for our 30 Fushun seminarians to move south, to Peiping, where they could continue their studies for the priesthood. With the help of God and a great deal of courage, my lads walked the 550 miles of road from Fushun to Peiping, mostly by night, to avoid Communists and bandits; by Easter they were once more behind seminary walls.

But north of us, the Communist victories kept piling up and I knew it was only a question of time before all of China would fall. So early in 1949 I hurried down to Shanghai, to arrange for their departure from the mainland and obtain funds to support them. Eventually, nine of them made it to Hong Kong, where they were later ordained. The Communists caught the remainder and sent them back to their villages in Manchuria.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

United States Intervention in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, among the critical analyses of our recent moves in the Middle East, none have been clearer than Mr. C. L. Sulzberger's columns in the New York Times. Two of these in particular impressed me during recent days.

The first was an article entitled "Lessons of Logic and Its Lack," which was published on July 19, 1958, and the second is entitled "Dilemma Without Visible Solution," which was published in the July 21, 1958, issue.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 19, 1958]

LESSONS OF LOGIC AND ITS LACK

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

The only steady aspect of our Middle Eastern policy is confusion. During a decade that saw creation of Israel, Nasser's rise, the Suez war and a drumfire of coups and assassinations, the United States never managed to define its own fundamental attitudes. This observation applies to two American administrations. Our Levantine follies have been gloriously bipartisan.

Three dilemmas perplexed Washington from the start. We couldn't resolve our determination to sponsor Israel with our craving for Arab friendship. Therefore we wallowed in a trough of indecision. We found ourselves unable to reconcile prejudices against colonialism with a need to support our strongest ally, Britain. And we muddled our analysis of Arab nationalism by always regarding its development in rigid anti-Communist terms.

The consequences led to diplomatic chaos. We have ended up supporting outdated regimes and opposing history's trend. Of our principal friends concerned with the Middle East, Britain and Turkey are widely disliked because of imperialist memories, an equally detested France has been excluded from the area, Israel is hated and Iran is weak and uneasy.

AGAINST THE TIDE

Today we find ourselves backing the Chamouns, the Sauds, and the Husseins against the tide of Arab renaissance. And, by our military interposition side by side with Britain, we have sacrificed those pretensions to moral grandeur we had claimed in the United Nations.

Our elementary aspirations are plain. We sought to keep Soviet influence out of the Middle East, to devise an alliance there for this purpose, and behind such a shield to pacify the area. These aims failed.

By creating the Baghdad Pact we alienated Egypt, most influential nation in the Arab world, and India, most powerful non-Communist state in Asia. Yet we never had sufficient faith in that same pact to join it ourselves.

We distributed arms instead of wisdom. Some of those arms have now been used to assassinate our three best friends in Iraq. We backed Nasser. But we wouldn't give him all the weapons he demanded; so he turned to Russia.

THE SUEZ AFFAIR

Because we unnecessarily offended the Egyptian dictator we provoked him into seizing the Suez Canal Co. This event could have been foreseen in the cloudiest crystal ball. But we didn't have one single position paper prepared in advance.

When Britain and France, together with Israel, cooked up a war to defend vital interests similar to those we now help London protect, we scotched their plan. Thanks to us Nasser was rescued from disaster and built to hero's stature.

If our policy was correct in 1956 when we backed Cairo against Paris and London, it is incorrect today. And if our policy is now correct, in deciding to risk war for strategic grounds, it was incorrect 2 years ago. Anglo-American intervention comes at the wrong places, at the wrong time, for the wrong reasons. At least Eden and Mollet had reason on their side when they went for Suez.

WHY WE INTERVENED

We didn't fly troops to Lebanon because of a sudden turn in that country's operetta insurrection. Iraq is the explanation. And Jordan, again insured by Britain, isn't a nation at all. A mapmaker's dream, it was created by Churchill and T. E. Lawrence over brandy and cigars to pay a feudal debt.

Nasser was taking kindergarten lessons on Soviet imperialism from Tito when we landed in Lebanon. Just as he was becoming wary we drove him back to Khrushchev's arms.

The existing mishmash cannot possibly be stabilized where it now is. Having embarked on an audacious expedition, we have to follow through. One way or another a new and prowestern government must be installed in Iraq and Nasser must be shrunken to size.

Otherwise, no matter how long Lebanon and Jordan totter along, they will fall between the jaws of a hostile Baghdad-Cairo nutcracker when our troops are withdrawn. If we can't aright the balance in Iraq and eventually in Egypt, some day we must ignominiously retreat. But in order to aright that balance, we may have to gamble on still more risky adventures than those begun this week.

Such is the logic of the situation. But logic has rarely featured our Middle Eastern policy.

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1958]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—DILEMMA WITHOUT VISIBLE SOLUTION

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Our Government deludes itself if it thinks the Anglo-American expedition will not be regarded as aggression into the Middle East by Nasser and that he will not request Russian help to thwart it. The probability is that this help, at least in the beginning, will not be open. But, if the crisis continues, we must reckon on its delivery in just the amount deemed necessary to frustrate us.

Nasser is a politically naive but exceedingly clever man. We have consistently failed to recognize the force of his mass appeal. He is determined to extrude all foreign influence from the Levant. And, if one great power bloc comes in, he is prepared to accept assistance from the other great power bloc to aright the balance. This in his conception of nonalinement.

Cairo and Moscow have both been out to destroy the Baghdad Pact, that disastrous invention of the State Department. Their initial aims, therefore, coincide. And Nasser, who regards himself as the incarnate spirit of pan-Arabism, is prepared for desperate measures to uphold what he terms dignity.

Nobody can pretend to know what precise commitments were made last week when the Egyptian dictator talked with Khrushchev. But Nasser's previous thoughts are no secret. Less than 4 months ago he told me in Cairo:

"You Americans say [middle eastern] aggression will come from the Soviet Union. In such an aggression, of course, we will expect the West to assist us. But what about aggression from the West? We will ask for the Soviet Union's aid."

SOVIET MOVES

Since this asservation Nasser has twice visited the U. S. S. R. Russian troops are maneuvering with blatant menace upon the borders of Iran and Turkey. Communist agents and Communist propaganda are busily working on the aspirations of the Kurdish minority in those two countries and in Iraq.

To Secretary Dulles' mind, trained as it is in legal intricacies, the Anglo-American expedition to Jordan and Lebanon in no way appears as "intervention" or "foreign domination." And technically it certainly is not. But to Nasser and the Arab crowds who venerate him, such distinctions have no meaning.

Nasser regards his Syrian-Egyptian federation as the traditional defensive line against outside aggression that has applied since the days of Saladin. He considers the Baghdad Pact or any other military link between an Arab State and external powers as a new sort of colonialism.

"We simply will not accept any foreign domination," he said to me, pretending to speak for all Arabs. "You Americans have neglected an understanding of the characteristics of the area. We don't have planning committees and maps on the walls which say what is to be an Arab confederation and when. But there must be solidarity between Arab countries. All Arab countries must stand back of each other. They must face danger from anywhere."

NASSER'S STANDARDS

We, of course, disapprove of his methods. But we fail to recognize that these are indigenous to the region and accepted by its peculiar standards: conspiracy, assassination, bribery, and gunmanship, distortion of the truth.

Nasser claims he dislikes communism's materialist aspects. Nor does he fancy tying himself so closely to the Soviet economy, as is now the case. But these, to his adventurous spirit, are relatively minor matters. Like so many earlier statesmen he hopes to use Russia for his own ambitions without

succumbing to its pressures. This belief may soon be tested.

We have now committed our prestige totally. We cannot retreat without grave consequences. And the Russians have put their chips upon the table by recognizing an Iraqi regime we should have reckoned on unseating if our hazardous undertaking was to make future sense.

Nobody in his right mind wants war. But it is questionable how many people in their right minds direct the world's destiny. We are in a position from which it would be disastrous to withdraw. Indeed, abstract logic urges us further on. And Moscow, quite plainly, will oppose us.

Whether Khrushchev's suggestion of a summit meeting opens the way to compromise cannot yet be said. The only evident alternative for straightening out this cruel mess would seem to be U. N. and that neutral opinion both blocs too often ignore and affront.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the factors in our intervention in Lebanon which has most disturbed Members of Congress was the abrupt manner in which the decision was made. Mr. William V. Shannon has contributed an article to last Sunday's New York Post, July 20, 1958, entitled "Suddenly." His article has received considerable attention here in Washington, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUDDENLY

(By William V. Shannon)

President Eisenhower's decision to intervene in Lebanon, regardless of the objective merits of that decision, is the result of a most curious and unsatisfactory way to make high policy.

His dispatch of the marines to Lebanon followed the same pattern of abrupt action he has twice before displayed during the past year—once last September when he rushed paratroops to Little Rock and again in May when he ordered them to the Caribbean to protect Vice President NIXON.

The circumstances in each instance were roughly the same. There was a long-drawn-out crisis and buildup of tension. Although the specific igniting incident could not have been fully foreseen—Governor Faubus' doublecross, or the Caracas riot, or the Iraq coup—any observer could see that such an incident was likely to occur under the given circumstances. The direction and significance, if not the exact details, of the incident could be foreseen. Each time there was also the same lack of any warning that General Eisenhower planned drastic action. On the contrary, the President allowed events to drift and gave the distinct impression he would take no action of any kind.

The ineffable Governor of Arkansas, the complaisant Venezuelan Government, and the antiwestern plotters in the Middle East were successively allowed to believe their moves would go unchecked. When these moves produced their natural, foreseeable, and inevitable consequences, the President, belying all expectations, reacted swiftly and with force.

The show of force may be wise, as it was in Little Rock, or merely grotesque, as in the Venezuelan-Nixon incident, but, wise or not, is this the right way to run a railroad or a great country?

These harsh, precipitate actions are from the outset doubly damaged. Their effectiveness is damaged, first of all, because public opinion in this country and abroad is not properly prepared beforehand and, therefore, does not give the immediate and overwhelming support that is important in making the policy succeed. Second, the actions lose part of their effectiveness, because they are burdened from the beginning by dragging doubts about their necessity. For example, Faubus might not have been so bold if he had been clearly and sternly warned by the President during their Newport, R. I., conference. Pygmies do not ordinarily defy giants if they know the giant is going to retaliate.

The same principle holds true when the antagonists are of equal size. If the United States had made it unequivocally clear to Premier Khrushchev months ago that we regarded the oil of the Middle East as indispensable to the security of our European allies and that we therefore would use military force to crush any pro-Nasser subversion in an oil country, the Russian Government would have had no doubts on what would happen on the morning after a revolt in Iraq or Iran or Saudi Arabia. The Russians do have such doubts and feel free to bluff, bluster and maneuver.

General Eisenhower did not make his policy clear to Faubus or to Khrushchev because his policy was not clear to himself. And it was not clear to him because he had not paid enough hard, careful attention to these problems until the crises broke.

This is not say that the President had not been briefed about the Middle Eastern situation and had not thought about it prior to Monday's crisis. He just had not given it his patient, unrelenting, overmastering attention.

Since the Lebanese civil war did not seem critical or urgent, he merely approved Secretary Dulles' general recommendation not to intervene on behalf of President Chamoun, and with that decision made he left the actual execution of policy, the careful weighing of alternatives, the close scrutinizing of daily events to Dulles.

There is nothing new in this performance. It accords with the President's methods of staff delegation and the detached, complacent attitude which has characterized his administration since its inception.

What is new in the past year is that when General Eisenhower has intervened at the last minute he has come down on the side of bold measures. During the Korean armistice negotiations of 1953, the crisis over American intervention in Indochina at the time of the Dienbienphu catastrophe in 1954 and the Formosa offshore islands crisis of 1955, the President exercised his decisive influence on our policy very late, but he exercised it on behalf of doing nothing or taking the most cautious, prudent step. There was no trace then of the "call the Marines" attitude which he has evinced in the past year.

The reasons for this change in his governing attitude are mysterious. What is clear is that the intervention in Lebanon was a complete reversal of American policy.

Just before the Monday crisis broke, Lebanese Foreign Minister Malik had become so disliked at the State Department because of his importunate appeals for help that when he asked for yet another interview with Department officials, he was granted one—a week later. Malik was so discouraged he went back to New York, where he is his country's U. N. representative.

The British jump into Jordan was the Macmillan government's own notion, quite uncoordinated with our own. Nor does the President's 11th-hour show of toughness in Lebanon indicate he is going to adopt a consistently tough line in the Middle East; the abandonment of Iraq makes that clear. We seem, for whatever reason, to have reached a stage where the President makes tough gestures for which he does not prepare the ground and which he will not follow through to their logical end.

Inquiry Into Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Inquiry Into Our Foreign Policy," published in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of July 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INQUIRY INTO OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Challenges of the wisdom or the right of the American military entry in the Middle East are growing around the world. Some are born of nothing more than antiwesternism. Some are the fruits of neutralism at whatever the cost. Others take the form of stage-managed demonstrations. But some, at home as well as abroad, are reasoned, thoughtful.

What is the ultimate for the United States in the Middle East? Although not an exact parallel, our position recalls the tragedy of Korea. Will we again fight a war we can't afford to win? When and under what circumstances could we honorably disengage? What is our aim? Stability for the Middle East? Are we going to make the Arab world safe from the Arabs?

Our Middle Eastern misadventure imperils a large part if not all of the world. The consequences cannot be foreseen fully at this time. But, for the moment, the episode is more alarming in that it reflects the poverty of our diplomacy and the frightening misconceptions and invalidities of our foreign policy. If our policy could stumble us into conflict in the Middle East, it could force us into war elsewhere.

What are some of the misconceptions? The roots of our policy are imbedded in the concept of collective security, which history shows us is neither a collective nor a secure arrangement in all too many cases.

The fallacy of security through alliances has been demonstrated over and again. Napoleon III could give eloquent testimony by relating how his allies remained neutral or went over to the enemy in his bid to crush Bismarck's new Prussian army. The Hitler-Stalin agreement is a more recent example of collective inconstancy. And, of course, central to the situation at hand is the fact that another one of our collective security schemes collapsed when Baghdad, city for which it was named, fell to revolting forces. Ironically enough, it fell on the day that Baghdad pact leaders were to meet in Ankara to discuss aid to Lebanon.

How secure are we with the NATO collective? How constant would our western Europe allies be with an overwhelming land force on their borders and nuclear missiles over their heads? Didn't we almost lose one key post in the NATO system about three years ago? Suspiciously soon after concluding a fish barter deal with Russia, Iceland ordered American forces out of the air base as Keflavik. The order subsequently was reversed, but the example remains a sobering one.

Another misconcept is that we have friends all over the free world. Because a nation is outside the iron curtain doesn't necessarily mean it is behind the Stars and Stripes. Elmo Wilson's world poll in the New York Herald Tribune last year was jolting enough.

To the question of whether their nation should remain neutral in event of war between the United States and Russia, 94 percent of the Swedes responding replied in the affirmative. In Italy, 72 percent were for neutrality. In our own hemisphere, 61 percent of the respondents in Brazil replied "yes." We fared better in Britain, but even there 54 percent would stand by neutrality.

We would do well soberly to recall that in the Korean United Nations police action, outside the Koreans themselves, the United States supplied 450,000 troops, all the other U. N. members only 45,000.

In view of this, the number of trouble spots around the world in which we or our friends are involved in one way or another takes on more terrifying meaning. On Cyprus, there is a revolt against the British; in north Africa, rebellion against the French; in the Middle East, animosity against the three of us. Civil war is being fought in Indonesia, with an anti-West aspect.

Pakistan and India are at odds, with the United States bulwarking the former.

Fighting could break out in the Formosa Straits at any time, with the United States siding with the Chiang Kai-shek regime.

Renewed conflict in Korea always is a possibility, with Americans alined with Syngman Rhee.

Israel is in real danger from her neighbors, with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic on record as vowing that there never could be a State of Israel on what he called Arab land.

Our friends, the Turks, and the Syrians eye one another suspiciously across their borders.

The rollcall of trouble spots underlines other fallacies in our foreign policy—the determination in the name of collective security to prop up straw men and make believe that purely artificial lines have the true stability of natural boundaries.

Are we to fight for Chiang Kai-shek, or spill more blood for Syngman Rhee?

Are we to continue to believe that Jordan is more than a creature fashioned out of the map like a child toying with clay?

Are we to pretend that there is no Arab land and Arab nationalism, believing it will go away if we don't look?

Another source of outdated thinking is the geopolitical theory of a motherland which is a fountainhead for world dominance and must be ringed for the protection of the peripheral nations.

If there is a motherland, it is out in space, or on the moon or Mars. Containment, in any case, has not worked against the spread of communism any more than did the cordon sanitaire against nazism, nor lessed the number of trouble spots around the world in which the Communists have a hand.

Instead of containment or collective security we have arrived at something else.

Instead of the bold new approach to world problems, we have come up with an ancient and discredited one—the practice of the balance of power. And it isn't working now any more than it ever worked. Besides being a callous device in disregard for national rights and ordinary decency, the policy invites war—as witness the very situation we are in today.

It is easy to demand that we take a fresh new approach in our foreign policy, a glib and facile thing to say. What the new approach might be is more difficult to state.

It is easier to say what it should not be, and when this proposition is established, perhaps the way is shown.

Our policy should not deny or subvert that thesis so rightly beloved by Americans—that man is free; that there is dignity in human life, and that the right to govern themselves—and even to engage in revolution—is inalienable among the peoples of all nations. Our very form of government and all of our guaranteed rights were born of revolution. We should not create or support artificial or buffer states among a homogeneous people.

Our policy should not rely so heavily on the negative—against this and against that, and spelled out in such words as containment and massive retaliation and brinksmanship. We have been against suspension of nuclear tests—as if it were very important to the victim whether he was incinerated by a clean bomb or a dirty one.

Our policy should not be that of monitor of the world, with a father-knows-best approach to smaller nations on the one hand, while furnishing them with deadly weapons on the other. (Why in the world does a small nation, not as large as some of our smaller States, need the latest in heavy tanks, cannon, and jet planes?)

Our policy should not establish conditions under which free and easy world trade is hampered. World trade is a prerequisite to world peace. We could contribute immensely toward world peace by encouraging and helping in the establishment of common market areas—and the Arab lands would be an excellent spot for one such.

How much longer, in the name of collective security or peace seeking, could we afford to prohibit or discourage trade with hundreds of millions of people whose government we don't happen to like, while we furnish arms and otherwise transact with people whose government should be equally repugnant to ours?

Our policy should not close any doors toward international understanding on the assumption that opening them will be unproductive. We should be willing at all times to talk with any one or any group on the bare possibility of a profitable discussion. Why not—as former President Truman has suggested—invite President Nasser to Washington? Why not listen to his viewpoint? Why not try to reconcile differences, if it is not too late?

This does not ignore the facts of life today; that there is a cold war on with the Communist world. It is not a war of our making, and assuredly not one we would choose.

We must maintain a defense posture, to be sure. But have we moved with as much determination on positive lines for lessening the frictions and preventing Middle East flareups as we have on the negative theses?

That is the question sorely in need of profound study in Washington this day as the 6th Fleet and other military arms flirt with the conflagration.

Save Money Through Better Control of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most important pieces of unfinished business confronting the Congress is Federal budget reform. The two Houses are in agreement that the Congress should get control of unexpended balances and carry on the appropriation process on a year-to-year basis. It is necessary now to agree on a bill and get the job done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two excellent editorials dealing with this vital piece of legislation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. One is from the New York Times this morning, entitled "Federal Budget Reform." The other is from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 23, entitled "End Horse-and-Buggy Budgets."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1958]

FEDERAL BUDGET REFORM

Citing various features of the new Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs as an outstanding example of extravagance and inadequate planning, the House Appropriations Committee has sharply criticized the Defense Department for loose fiscal procedures in connection with construction policies and practices.

Sympathizing as we do with the committee's antagonism toward loose fiscal procedures in any branch of government, we cannot help but wonder why this same committee—or at least its most influential members—have fought tooth and nail against a measure that is designed solely to end one of the loosest fiscal procedures of all. This is the congressional practice of approving some kinds of appropriation bills in one year without retaining any real control as to how the funds may actually be spent in the next. To end this bad practice the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization long ago proposed a reform of Federal budgeting procedure to require, in effect, that Congress specifically approve all expenditures.

Under this procedure Congress would in reality retain control of the Federal purse-strings, which—to the tune of many millions of dollars in carryover expenditures—it has now lost. For example, 2 or 3 years after the truce ending the Korean war billions were still being spent by the Defense Department that had been originally appropriated by Congress for war purposes. The subsequent expenditures may or may not have been wise, but the important point is that Congress had no direct control over them, as it would have had under the annual review procedures proposed in the pending bill.

But complicated and unusual parliamentary maneuvers, apparently inspired by influential Members of Congress who seem to fear that the new legislation might infringe on their prerogatives, have thus far prevented final passage of the bill known as H. R. 8002. Though in varying forms it has actually passed both Houses, it is now back in the Senate and has been again reported favorably by the appropriate committee. Considering that the President, Secretary of the Treasury, Comptroller General and Budget Director have all given their endorsement, it ought to be able to go through Congress once again before adjournment—if the leadership so wishes. We should think that the leadership would so wish.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 23, 1958]

END HORSE-AND-BUGGY BUDGETS

With the crisis in the Middle East making greater and greater demands on the Federal Treasury, it is more important than ever that Congress modernize our budgeting procedures and get maximum value for every dollar. A bill pending in the Senate (H. R. 8002) is designed to do just that.

It is of vital importance that this bill be passed at the current session, which has about 3 more weeks to run. Action by both branches of Congress seems necessary, since changes have been made by each branch, and these must be reconciled.

Be it noted that the Senate passed the original measure—of which Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, was a sponsor—without a dissenting voice. Then the House

passed it by the overwhelming figure of 311 to 87, after making a few alterations which do not vitally affect the bill. It remains for the Senate to approve the measure in the form passed by the House, and for the House to ratify any slight differences remaining.

As reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the bill is endorsed by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, and others. As the Hoover Committee says:

"At a time like this we simply cannot afford to let wasteful, antiquated, horse-and-buggy business methods hamper a Government engaged in the space-age protection of our liberties and our very lives."

Certain Senators feared that the rules of the Senate would be adversely affected by the bill, as it came from the House, and 14 words were deleted by the Senate Appropriations Committee, to take care of this. Two other amendments were added, (1) to give the President flexibility, primarily in the Department of Defense, and (2) to provide that when liabilities are incurred within the annual limitation in a fiscal year, payment could be made in a subsequent fiscal year.

All these changes have been approved by the nonpartisan Hoover Committee, which is concerned solely with getting greater efficiency in our budgeting procedures. What is sought is to give Congress control over what the Federal Government will pay each year for goods and services received in that year, and give it an annual review of progress made with long-term spending programs.

Senator BYRD estimates that some $70 billion has been appropriated by Congress, but not spent, and he points out that this gigantic sum of money is now beyond the control of Congress. That can't happen again, if H. R. 8002 is passed. Its passage at the current session of Congress is vital.

Retirement of Dr. Gabriel Hauge, Presidential Assistant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from Time magazine of July 28, 1958, regarding the retirement of Dr. Gabriel Hauge, Presidential Assistant for Economic Affairs.

Let me say in this connection that I deplore the resignation of Dr. Hauge, who has been a stanch right arm for the President in connection with economic affairs during the past 6 years. He has been his constant adviser, and a very sound one indeed.

I believe that the fact that we shall not take a tremendous whack at our tax income this year can be attributed to Dr. Hauge's wisdom, courage, and determination, perhaps as much as to the influence of any other single individual. He has been a very wise adviser and a very capable assistant. I believe it is a source of regret to all of us that he feels compelled to retire from the White House staff. I wish him well in whatever his undertakings may be henceforth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GABRIEL HAUGE

One 40-below-zero Sunday forty-odd years ago, a Lutheran minister made his way across frozen snowdrifts in a horse and buggy to keep his preaching schedule at five different churches in and around Hawley, Minn. In the winter and spring of 1958, the minister's son, Presidential Assistant Gabriel Hauge, showed the same old-fashioned fortitude in the face of icy winds of another kind. With the United States economy slipping downward, panicky cries for drastic Federal intervention rang out in Washington and across the United States. But calm, articulate Gabriel Hauge, sometime economics teacher at Princeton and Harvard, economics assistant to the President of the United States since the start of Ike's first term, counseled his boss to resist the pressures of inflation breeding, damn-the-deficits programs. The downturn would halt during the year's second quarter, Hauge firmly predicted, and then an upturn would slowly set in.

The second quarter did, indeed, see the end of the downturn, and by last week signs of upturn were visible even through gray-colored glasses. With his predictions and counsel proved sound, Gabriel Hauge, 44, made a decision to return to private life. His new job: finance committee chairman of New York's Manufacturers Trust Co., fourth largest United States bank (after California's Bank of America, New York's Chase Manhattan, and First National City).

In his letter of resignation Hauge summed up the administration economic philosophy that he himself helped to mold over the past 6 years. "You have brought a badly needed reemphasis of some plain but oft-obscured truths," he wrote to Ike. "You have:

"Restated the traditional American belief in incentive and reward for individual effort and excellence;

"Stressed integrity of the currency;

"Reasserted America's vital interest in strengthening economic ties with other free nations;

"Remembered the rightful claims of tomorrow in the policy decisions of today;

"Shown how a firm floor over the pit of personal disaster can be built without disregard for our heritage of self-reliance;

"Reminded us that only sensible economics, not razzle-dazzle substitutes, can truly serve the ends of equity and social justice."

Church Services in Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the greatest cathedral or temple anywhere on earth is in the magnificent American outdoors. What more appropriate place could there be for worship than amidst the most sublime handiwork of our Creator? From my own memories of camping as a boy, I can still remember the profound spiritual impact upon me of church services held on the shores of Spirit Lake, beneath the great glacial cone of Mount St. Helens, at YMCA encampment. The National Council of the Churches of Christ has been encouraging the holding of church services, sermons, Bible classes, and similar meetings in the grandeur of such wonderful national parks as Yosemite, Grand Canyon, Crater Lake, Yellowstone, and elsewhere. I can think of no more appropriate way in which to inspire in people a feeling of true reverence for the Almighty, than to have the privilege of worshiping in such a setting as America's woods and templed hills.

So that Members of the Senate and House can become familiar with this splendid encouragement of worship in the outdoors, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 27, 1958, by Mr. Marvin Schwartz, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The appropriate title of this inspiring article is "Churches Under the Open Skies."

It is my hope that we of the Senate, and particularly those who serve on the Senate Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, continue every effort possible to facilitate these plans to hold regular worship in the national parks of the United States, which will be visited this year by 63,500,000 Americans, seeking the inspiration of recreation in the vast American outdoors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHES UNDER THE OPEN SKIES—MORE PARKLAND SERVICES IN NATURAL SETTINGS OFFERED THIS YEAR

(By Marvin Schwartz)

Every Sunday morning in national parks and at national monuments and memorial sites thousands of vacationing Americans pause in their holiday activities to participate in community religious services. This year it is expected that 125,000 tourists will take part in these interdenominational worship services, many of them held in outdoor settings of inspiring, majestic natural beauty.

The estimate, by the National Council of the Churches of Christ, an organization of many Protestant denominations, is based on the increasing number of vacationists to the Federal outdoor lands and to the growing facilities for worship. The services are held outdoors and in such chapels as those at Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks. This year a new chapel has been constructed at Mount Rushmore National Memorial.

The National Park Service expects that 63,500,000 vacationists will spend some time in Federal parklands in 1958.

FULL PROGRAM

Religious services in the parks have been held for many years. Yosemite Park Church was organized in 1925, Sequoia in the Thirties, Grand Canyon in 1948 and Yellowstone in 1950. But it was not until 1952 that a concerted effort was made to develop a full program of church activities in the parks on an interdenominational basis. This was done under the auspices of the National Council. Last winter its park project came into its own financially with a grant of $50,000 from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for its ministry program.

The National Council began its project of coordinating park church service, Bible classes, vacation church schools, and personal counseling in a small way in 1952 when it appointed a staff of 17 ministers and student ministers to serve in Yellowstone National Park. By 1954 the program had been expanded to 17 parks and a staff of 89, and this year 131 ministers and their assistants will be holding services in 25 of the Nation's federally administered outdoor lands from Big Bend, Tex., to Mount McKinley, Alaska.

IDEA FROM STUDENT

The national council program was initiated largely through the efforts of the Rev. Warren Ost, who conceived the idea of offering park personnel and vacationists a complete church program on a daily basis while he was a preministerial student in the winter and a bellhop during summers at Yellowstone. The Reverend Ost is now executive director of the national council park program.

The national council program covers a wide range of activities. In some parks there are several Sunday services held from sunrise to sunset, daily events such as services, Bible classes for vacationists of all ages, vacation church schools for children, campfire talks, hikes, impromptu shows, singsongs and counsel for park employees who come to the ministers for guidance.

The services held under the auspices of the national council are interdenominational. A minister may be of any denomination and he may include any or all denominations and sects. At present there are four full-time, year-round resident ministers, in Grand Canyon, Sequoia, Yellowstone, and Yosemite National Parks. In winter their parishes consist of forest rangers, park personnel, and others who live in the parks.

Roman Catholic masses are also held in some parks, including Yosemite National Park.

The resident ministers, as well as the vacationtime ministers and their assistants, are appointed by the council.

They are chosen by the council from a host of applicants, on the basis of health, education, and other qualifications. The assignment is described as "rugged," for not only do the student ministers carry on the religious program but some also have part-time jobs as bellhops, assistant managers in the hotels and park concessions, waiters, and truck drivers.

MILLION BY 1966

Mr. Ost predicts that, with the expected increase of vacationists to national parks, a million persons will attend park services by 1966. The National Park Service's early forecast of 80 million park vacationists by that year is expected to be realized much sooner, perhaps by 1960.

Two new areas have been added to the program this year: Devil's Tower National Monument in Wyoming, where a student minister conducts sunrise and evening services in the amphitheater, and Devil's Postpile National Monument in California, where services are being held by a guest minister on a regular basis.

Record and Achievements of 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two news articles on the record and achievements of the 85th Congress, one a very fine article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 25, 1958, by Marshall McNeill, and the other from the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, July 28, 1958, by Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World Telegram and Sun of July 25, 1958]

"TEXAS TWINS" AT HELMS, CONGRESS SETS ALL-ACTION RECORD

(By Marshall McNeill)

WASHINGTON, July 25.—The record of this session of Congress—now nearing its end, with 8 or 10 major bills yet to go—already stands out as one of the most productive in many years.

Important measures, kicked around for years and given only a ghost of a chance last January, have been enacted. Defense has been strengthened, and laws passed to beef up our free world alliances. Recession remedies have multiplied on the statute books.

The record was achieved in the face of the fact that the Senate is almost evenly divided along party lines. The House division is wider but it is dominated in the clinches by a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans.

This session convened in the shadow of the first Russian sputnik. A recession was in full swing. World troubles were immense. Election year problems engrossed every Member of the House and a third of the Senate.

Anyone would have guessed it would be a session of grumbling and political haymaking. But bipartisanship has been its hallmark.

The two major figures of the session have been the "Texas twins"—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

Under their leadership, and with important Republican assistance in the crucial moments, here are the top accomplishments of this session:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Defense reorganization, a proposal that generated a lot of heat and debate but was settled to the satisfaction of both Congress and the commander in chief, and which promises to streamline Pentagon and military command operations and perhaps eventually save money.

Creation of the new national space agency, an idea born in Congress itself and followed by House and Senate decisions to set up their own space committees.

Atomic facilities bill, with provisions for substantial increase in production of plutonium, and studies of new power reactor types.

Military pay increased, in the pattern suggested by the Cordiner report, intended to provide better inducements for military men and women to make careers in the armed services.

Authorizations for Navy construction, including atomic subs and a nuclear-powered destroyer, dispersal of Strategic Air Command bases money for missiles bases and accelerated missile research, development and production.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mutual security authorized again, with the problem of foreign aid appropriations still pending in the Senate. That body now has before it firm declarations by Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy and joint chiefs Chairman Gen. Nathan Twining that we'd buy better and more defense by restoring House cuts of about half a billion in aid, rather than adding that sum to our military spending.

Exchange of atomic weapons information with our allies.

Reciprocal trade agreements extension.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Admission of Alaska.

A new Federal agency to control and enhance the safety of civil aviation, yet to be OK'd in the House.

Budget reform, passed by both Houses with a compromise yet to be achieved.

Curb on the Supreme Court's rulings on the primacy of Federal laws over State laws, yet to be acted on in the Senate.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Increased the debt limit by $5 billion, with another $8 billion increase in the works.

Acceleration of Federal public works.

Extension of Korean War corporation and excise taxes.

Two housing bills and an extension of Federal Housing Authority's ability to insure mortgages.

Highway construction bill, with some measure of control over billboards.

Community facilities lending bill, yet to be acted on by the House.

Small business tax relief, pending in the Senate.

Subsidies for domestic metals, pending in the House.

Relief for railroads.

Increase of postage rates to put the Post Office nearer a paying basis, plus pay increases for postal workers and other Government civilian workers.

Authorization for two new superliners.

AGRICULTURE

Extension of authority to sell farm surpluses abroad, to be compromised in conference.

LABOR, WELFARE

Senate has passed bill regulating labor welfare funds, which is also expected to clear House.

Social security extension, out of House committee, with House approval sure and Senate action likely.

Extension of unemployment compensation to jobless who exhausted State benefits, financed by Federal funds.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 28, 1958]

CONGRESSIONAL AUDIT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

IT'S A DO-WELL SESSION

In some ways Congress is like a 6-day bicycle race; it never looks good until the last few laps.

Congress is now racing through its last lap for as early adjournment in August as possible, and its record is looking increasingly good.

If the Senate repairs the wreckage which the House wrought on the administration's mutual-security and foreign-aid program largely by Democratic vote—and there is a better than even chance that it will—the accomplishments of this Congress will in the end have proved to be considerable and constructive.

This will mean that the 85th Congress will have been a boon to President Eisenhower, since it will have granted him the substance of all his major legislation.

This will mean a boost to the Democratic Party—which doesn't seem to need much of a boost—since the record will show that this Democratically controlled Congress has responsibly supported the President at critical points and that LYNDON JOHNSON's leadership in the Senate has been the principal factor in making this possible.

The record, which seems to me to justify these judgments, shapes up as follows:

Defense mobilization

The Pentagon reorganization plan, which some said had a shroud around it the day the President sent it to Congress, is now law. The Eisenhower-McElroy requests were 90 percent approved. This is a victory for the White House. It springs from the military prestige of the President and it reflects the

high regard which the Congress has for Secretary McElroy. The new law streamlines the chain of military command, gives the Defense Secretary authority more nearly equal to his responsibilities, and doubles the combined planning staff of the Joint Chiefs.

Reciprocal trade

The best extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act since its passage in the early thirties is in prospect. The House overwhelmingly voted a clean, 5-year renewal. After the Senate Finance Committee tore it apart and turned it into a nonreciprocal, nontrade act, Senator JOHNSON and Senator KNOWLAND joined to repair most of the damage on the floor of the Senate. Further improvements will almost certainly be made in conference and a 4-year extension is probable.

Mutual security bill

At this stage the economic aid size of the mutual security program looks as though it had been written to please Nikita Khrushchev. Nothing could be more welcome to the Kremlin planners than to see the appropriation slashed and the development loan fund cut by more than 50 percent. Democratic votes did the most to bring this about in the House and it will certainly be Senator JOHNSON's goal to put the program back together again in the Senate. The real test will be the restoration of the development loan fund to at least $600 million for the next year, for here is the heart of wise economic assistance, providing loan capital for sound projects which do not qualify for loans on strict banking criteria. Here is the mechanism for shifting the maximum amount of gift aid on a loan basis.

Alaska

The 49th State with Hawaii in line in the next Congress.

Space agency

Coordinates outer space research and projects. Passed by both Houses.

Uncertain bills

Federal scholarship bill has much support but is not yet on the floor of either House. The labor reform bill to fight racketeers and safeguard pension funds, though it passed the Senate 88 to 1, faces energetic indifference in the House from extreme conservatives who want a tougher law or nothing, and extreme liberals who want nothing. An omnibus farm bill, carrying forward the gains already made toward a freer and more prosperous agriculture, is in the making.

It now looks as though the President will have fared exceedingly well—and the country also. This has turned out to be a do well Congress.

Wisconsin Welcomes the New Unity of Its Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the press dispatches from my State, I was pleased to note that the Wisconsin labor movement has now been unified.

After 21 years of division, the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor has united with the Wisconsin State CIO Council, in accordance with the decision, last Thursday, of a combined State convention.

Of course, both these State labor bodies have been part of the nationwide AFL–CIO since the two national federations merged in 1955.

Nevertheless, the knotty, detailed problems of unifying at State levels have continually engaged the attention of several of the State organizations, as in Wisconsin.

In Wisconsin, this process has now been completed—at least as regards the major policy decisions.

The new president of the AFL–CIO in Wisconsin is Mr. George A. Haberman, who has served as the longtime head of the State A. F. of L. George Haberman is a man of deep and forthright convictions, a man of integrity and courage.

The new vice president of the State AFL–CIO is Charles M. Schultz; and the new secretary treasurer of the combined organization is George W. Hall—both able spokesmen of organized labor.

State AFL–CIO board members from the State federation are:

Arvel W. Kinney, Joseph P. Maley, Clarence A. Seefeld and Gerald J. Enright, all Milwaukee area men, and Orla V. Coleman, Madison; John Grant, Racine; Leonard E. Peterson, Superior; Reno Plenge, Nekoosa; Lawrence C. Reno, Oshkosh; Giles A. Wierman, Kewaskum, and Paul Whiteside, Kenosha.

Board members from the State CIO are:

Walter J. Burke, Harvey Kitzman, John W. Schmitt and Peter Zagrodnick, all from the Milwaukee area, and Glen G. Kruger, Eau Claire.

I earnestly hope, as I am sure all friends of the Wisconsin labor movement do, that this will prove to be a most successful unity.

It represents, at the outset, well over one-quarter of a million union members, including 176,000 in former AFL unions, and 86,000 in former CIO unions.

Unity, in and of itself, will solve some problems, but it will bring up others.

A strong labor movement is, in any event, essential to a strong, healthy American economic system, especially in times of unemployment and inflation.

Labor provides part of the indispensable system of checks and balances which keeps our economy competitive and keeps us moving ahead.

At the same time, labor faces the obligation, along with management, agriculture, and other segments of America, always to recognize the public interest.

I wish the newly merged labor body success in serving that interest responsibly, along with the interests of the laboring men and women of my State.

Wisconsin's is a clean labor movement, an honest movement, and one which, fortunately, by and large has escaped many of the problems which have confronted the movements in other States—for instance, neighboring Illinois. But the Wisconsin labor movement faces political problems on which there are strong differences of opinion within and outside the Badger movement. I hope these and other problems will always be met in a free, democratic way.

I send to the desk excerpts from an article which includes biographical data on the three top officers of the Wisconsin AFL–CIO. The article was published last Thursday in the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD TIMES SHAPED UNION CHIEF CAREERS—HABERMAN, SCHULTZ, HALL WENT TO WORK AT EARLY AGE OWING TO FAMILY FINANCES

Here are biographies of the three top officers of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO:

PRESIDENT

George Arthur Haberman, 61, first president of the State's united labor movement, is constructed as ruggedly as the battleships on which he used to serve.

He is 6 feet tall, weighs 240 pounds and wears a size 18 collar. His constitution is cast iron and his endurance legendary. At labor conventions he can stay up half the night with his friends and still appear fresh as dew the next morning to preside.

Haberman's voice booms out of his barrel chest.

Born in Milwaukee, he was only 9 when he quit school because of family money problems (his mother and father had separated when he was 5) and got a job on a Sauk County farm.

Joined Navy, then Army

Haberman enlisted in the Navy at 13—one of the last of the boy apprentices. He was a coal passer, a fireman, and finally a chief petty officer.

His enlistment ended on March 1, 1917. On April 6, the United States declared war on Germany and 2 days later Haberman enlisted in the Army.

He was assigned to the field artillery, became an ammunition supply sergeant, was gassed and hit by shrapnel in France.

Haberman got out of the Army on May 1, 1920, because he wanted to get married and could not support a family on his $33 a month Army pay. He and his wife, Eleanor, have two married sons, Donald and George, Jr. They lost a third boy in World War II.

Haberman found work as a rigger on a construction job on Jones Island. In the fall of 1920, he went to work as a steel erector and joined local 8 of the Iron Workers' Union.

Appointment manipulated

He ultimately got into ornamental iron work and became a traveling field superintendent for a firm specializing in installing windows and elevator doors.

Haberman was elected treasurer of local 8 in 1922 and vice president of the Milwaukee Buildings and Construction Trades Council in 1926.

In 1929, Haberman was named city minimum wage supervisor, though he was seventh on the civil service list. By the time a circuit judge had ruled that Haberman's appointment involved "manipulation of the eligible list," he had been renamed and was in the clear.

By 1936, Haberman's duties of making sure that contractors doing city work adhered to union wage scales had become so limited by a depression-induced lack of construction work that he was given an additional job as field supervisor in the garbage department.

Haberman fills term

Meanwhile, in 1932, Haberman had become a part time special representative for the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor. He made speeches, negotiated and organized in his off hours.

When Herman Seide, the State federation's president, died in 1943, Haberman was

named by the executive board to fill out his term.

Haberman had formidable opposition when he sought election to the State federation's top spot in August of 1943. Opposing him with Rudolph Faupl, who since has become the International Association of Machinists specialist in international affairs, living in Washington, D. C.

Haberman, backed by the powerful building trades unions, defeated Faupl, 600 to 507.

Mounting pressure seen

The next year Haberman was opposed by Jacob F. Friedrick, now general secretary-treasurer of the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council. Haberman won, 722 to 579. He has not been opposed since. (State federation presidents have established an extraordinary tradition of survival. In 65 years there have been only four: Frank Weber, Henry Ohl, Jr., Seide and Haberman.)

At a point in life when many men are beginning to think of taking it easy, the pressures on Haberman are likely to increase. The first several years in the life of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO will be ones of trial and tension. All in all, it is likely that Haberman will earn his $15,000 a year salary—and then some.

VICE PRESIDENT

Charles M. Schultz, 42, vice president of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO, might have been a Lutheran minister.

He was planning to study for the ministry after graduating from Washington High School, but had to work instead. He got a job carrying coal off a truck, then as a cabinetmaker with a furniture firm, but was fired for union activity.

Schultz then went to work as a pick-and-shovel man with WPA. He led a strike of WPA workers and was fired.

Those were rough days for Schultz. He went on relief and finally became a refrigerator assembler. In 1940, he went to work at the West Allis works of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. as a punch press operator and eventually became a die setter.

Headed CIO council

Schultz became recording secretary of local 248 of the United Automobile Workers in 1948 and the local's president in 1949. He was president of the county CIO council for 1 year in 1950 and was elected State CIO president in 1952.

Schultz is a man of extraordinary energy. As State CIO president, he evolved some ambitious plans. Some years ago he threatened to call a citywide general strike if a Norwegian motorship carrying clay for the struck Kohler Co. was unloaded here. Local CIO leaders, most of whom had "no strike" clauses in their labor agreements, were upset by the threat and told Schultz so privately.

Schultz was born in Sheboygan, moved with his family first to Denver, Colo., then to Casper, Wyo. The family came to Milwaukee when he was 10.

Schultz and his wife, Verna, live at 5666 North 60th Street. They have 4 sons and a daughter. Schultz is 6 feet 1 inch tall, weighs 225.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

George W. Hall, the State AFL–CIO secretary-treasurer, was everything from a farm hand to a decorating contractor before he first became a full-time union official in 1936 at the age of 32.

The only things about Hall's life more varied than his past occupations are his present hobbies.

He dabbles with oil painting; collects guns, stamps and coins; plays a violin, takes motion pictures; is a home handy man and has missed only one deer hunting season since he was old enough to carry a gun and that only because he was sick.

Helps support family

Hall was born on a farm near Millston (Jackson County), Wis. Hall's father died about the time that young George finished the 8th grade, so the boy worked to help support his family. He was an itinerant farm hand and milk condensery worker for a number of years and moved to La Crosse when he was 21 to work in a tobacco plant. He later worked in an auto parts factory, rising to foreman.

Hall had always liked to paint, so he went to Chicago to study decorating and worked at a mail order house. In 1926, he returned to La Crosse and started a painting and decorating business. He joined local 374 of the Painters' Union.

Hall soon became recording secretary of the painters' local, then its treasurer and later president. He was elected a delegate to the La Crosse Trades and Labor Council, became its president and in 1936 was made its general organizer, his first full-time union post.

Subsequently, he was elected to the board of the State federation and in 1951 became the federation's secretary-treasurer and moved to Milwaukee. He and his wife, Violet, live at 3530 North 54th Boulevard. Hall has three children by a previous marriage.

Hall's job keeps him away from home a good part of the time. During legislative sessions, he spends most of the week at Madison lobbying.

Hall is 54, 5 feet 11½ inches and weighs 190 pounds.

Pressures on Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by the Junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] entitled "When Influence Is Good—and Bad" which appeared in the New York Times magazine of July 27 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article is especially timely in view of the current controversy concerning proper and improper influences of Government servants. The thoughts of Senator NEUBERGER on this subject, and his suggestions as to a code to help subdue and discourage the harmful and illegitimate use of influence in Government, deserve careful study.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN INFLUENCE IS GOOD—AND BAD

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

WASHINGTON.—At sporadic intervals throughout their history, Americans have become indignant and alarmed over a fear that their Government might be riddled with the improper exercise of that subtle leverage known as influence. This apprehension extends today to the symbolic citadel of ultimate Federal executive authority, the White House itself. The principal assistant to the President of the United States stands accused of having used his great influence to secure special favors for a wealthy friend who had conferred upon him valuable gifts and other financial benefactions.

The episode has been made all the more sensational by the fact that the leaders of the present National Administration frequently raised the issue, during the political campaigns of 1952 and 1956, of influence pedding within the previous Democratic regime.

What is influence? And is all influence in government, ipso facto, bad?

As the Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine story has unfolded—and as the Harry Vaughan and Lamar Caudle tales were disclosed when President Eisenhower's predecessor, Harry S. Truman, was in office—it seems increasingly evident that the average citizen regards influence in government as something that bodes no good for the public welfare. The very word influence has for him an ominous connotation. It implies backstairs deals, whispered orders and the furtive passing of quid pro quo.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary provides this definition:

"Influence, n. * * * The act or the power of producing an effect without apparent force or direct authority; as, influence by suggestion * * * in current use, it often suggests conscious and, sometimes, underhanded power used in affecting a person or in effecting a result."

There appears scant doubt that the description of influence as being sometimes underhanded most fits the prevailing concept. And yet, a government free of all influence is probably what Americans, in their hearts, want least. One of the proudest boasts of an American citizen is that his Government can be influenced by public opinion, whereas theirs—meaning that of the Russians—is immune to such an influence.

And how is public opinion brought to bear on democratic government except through a complicated series of pressures and contacts, which can be defined accurateley in the aggregate as "influence"?

If a letter or postcard is sent to me by a Union Pacific brakeman in the upland town of Pendleton, Oreg., telling me to vote for the Smathers bill for the relief of the railroads, has he not attempted to influence my decision?

The average person would insist that this was a wholly appropriate use of influence, and of course he would be right. Yet one of my Senate colleagues from the Pacific Northwest has protested vigoroulsy against the manner in which he claims the railroads have tried to manipulate and dominate a letter-writing campaign among their employees in behalf of the Smathers bill.

It is easy to recognize and to condemn the improper influence arising from a direct conflict between an official's public duty and his private self-interest—as, for example, the contract given by former Public Buildings Commissioner Peter J. Strobel to his own firm—or the improper influence of gifts, loans, or favors from persons with a financial stake in the official's conduct of his public duty. This was exemplified in the recent investigation of the Federal Communications Commission that led to the resignation under fire of Commissioner Richard A. Mack. When such improprieties are uncovered, the public's judgment is swift and sure, and it is usually put into execution without much doubt or soul-searching about the nature of influence.

As a Senator who is elected to represent a definite constituency, on the other hand, I am conscious of the different aspects of influence that confront an elective representative, whose very functions are to be receptive to the expressed wishes of his constituents and, in turn, to apply his best judgment to influence governmental actions.

Unless we are to assume that our Government ought to operate in a vast antiseptic vacuum, acts of influence will probably continue to be universal. As these words are written, I am attempting to influence a department of Government, the Corps of Army Engineers, to give a firm in my home

community of Portland a contract to repair a huge floating dredge. Portland is an area of labor surplus, with widespread unemployment due to distress in the lumber industry. It is supposed to qualify for preference in Federal procurement. If I did not make this effort I feel sure I would be subject to criticism back home by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Senators undertake such chores for constituents nearly 365 days a year. They spend much of their time trying to influence veterans' hospitals to treat cases which may be borderline, to persuade the Immigration Service to admit relatives of constituents, or to convince the Social Security Administration that a constituent has been unfairly denied his full old-age annuity. And, so long as all residents of a State have equal access to a Senator for such intercession, can it be said that these examples of influence are wrong?

In the atmosphere of the disclosures regarding Sherman Adams and his telephone calls to the Federal Trade Commission it is undoubtedly second nature for one to contend that no private interest should be pressed upon these commissions by a Senator. But must a Senator remain mute if he believes that the FCC has arbitrarily denied to a community of his State the privilege of having a television outlet? After all, if the television license eventually is granted, a private firm unquestionably will operate it and profit thereby.

Furthermore, I might emphasize that since I became a Member of the Senate in 1955 I have glimpsed relatively little about the personnel of Government boards and regulatory bodies to persuade me that these men should be encouraged to function entirely free of congressional or Executive influence. In a distressingly large number of instances, commissions have been made the sanctuaries for defeated politicians of the party in power or for favored satraps of men still in office. Confidence on Capitol Hill in such appointees is not very enthusiastic, although the system rarely gets disturbed. Who knows when he himself likewise may be in need of a well-paying refuge from the political storms?

It is obvious to me that, in a democracy, we actually do not want our Government to operate unfettered by influence. When the cherry growers in the fertile Willamette Valley demanded that I help to curtail the President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties, they are using their not inconsiderable influence upon my vote in the Senate. And, although I disagree with them, their action is thoroughly legitimate and proper.

When might it become improper? If a cherry grower offered me a contribution for a future campaign? If another cherry grower promised to establish a fund to pay for my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprints? If my wife and I were entertained at dinner by these people? If they took us to Florida for a vacation? If I were threatened by them with political defeat because of my support of the reciprocal trade program?

At first glance, the answers to these questions may seem evident. The threat of retaliation at the polls is certainly a rightful attempt at influence in American politics—perhaps the most rightful and traditional of all. Probably the invitation to dinner can be considered harmless. But what of the other circumstances? Are they in the underhanded category? After all, campaign contributions are completely legal in this country. Indeed, leading journalists have estimated that it takes a fund of $200,000 to elect a Senator in an average State and at least $1 million in a populous industrial State. Can it be said that cherry growers should be bared from making donations to senatorial campaigns?

But, then, it will be claimed that surely a special fund for Senators is wrong. Yet the Vice President of the United States, when a Member of the Senate, had an outside fund to take care of extra expenses. The fund came from people with an interest in specific legislation. In fairness, it must be added that a few Democratic Senators have had somewhat similar funds to pay for their stationery and reprints. Could it be claimed that cherry growers desiring to influence legislative issues cannot contribute to such funds, while others are at liberty to do so?

I cite these complex hypothetical situations merely to demonstrate that, while it may be virtually second nature to proclaim that all influence in government is per se bad, it nevertheless might tax the sagacity of a Jefferson to isolate illegitimate forms of influence—under our contradictory standards and mores—from influence that is acceptable or even necessary in the public interest.

Today, Sherman Adams is in disrepute and Bernard Goldfine has fared no better. Their trouble stems from the fact that Mr. Goldfine gave Mr. Adams certain gifts, such as a rug and an overcoat, and Mr. Adams allegedly telephoned Federal agencies in quest of information or of lenient treatment for his friend. But what if Bernard Goldfine and his family had contributed $26,500 to the Eisenhower election campaign and Sherman Adams had used his influence with the State Department to have Mr. Goldfine named as our Ambassador to a strategic nation overseas? Would this have aroused equal furor or, indeed, any furor at all?

The exercise of influence to secure governmental decisions that might augment the beneficiary's pocketbook is understood by the public—and deplored. Yet, a comparative complacency exists over influence that obtains ambassadorships for generous campaign donors to the party holding the White House—appointments that might put an unqualified person in charge of American diplomatic relations in an area of the world where a breakdown of our intelligence and diplomacy could lead even to that ultimate disaster, global war.

An old couplet from out of British antiquity runs like this:

"The law locks up both man and woman
Who steals the goose from off the common.
But lets the greater felon loose
Who steals the common from the goose."

Influence in the crucial matter of public policy appears to disturb us infinitely less than influence directed toward private favoritism. The whole Nation can bristle—as it should—when the son of an influential figure is believed to have escaped military service, or if influence is alleged in the placing of a contract for caps to be worn by the Armed Forces. But what of the possible influence of oil and gas campaign contributions on the disposal of the coastal tidelands, of utility contributions on the fate of the water power site at Hells Canyon, of labor contributions on legislation drafted to regulate union elections? This kind of potential influence touches off few sparks; in fact, it is only rarely discussed.

It may be that, in the general realm of influence on governmental policy, it is simpler to focus attention on relative minutiae than on matters of cosmic significance. A key ambassadorship in exchange for cash on the campaign barrelhead may be beyond the public ken, because few citizens think of themselves in these terms. The yearning to reign over an Embassy is hardly universal. Furthermore, both major parties so often have used diplomatic posts to reward lavish contributors that an uneasy truce seems to prevail whenever the question is raised.

Because we do not actually desire a government emancipated from influence we must decide specifically what kind of influence is desirable and what kind will jeopardize our democratic institutions. Elected officials, in particular, dwell in an all-pervasive atmosphere of constant, neverending efforts at persuasion.

Everybody wants to sell them a cause, a program or a bill. The process goes on around the clock. They are approached by groups as diverse as the League of Women Voters and the High Commissioner of Baseball. In the name of democracy—1 man, 1 vote—Senators and Representatives should equably and cheerfully subject themselves to these influences:

Letters, telegrams, petitions, newspaper editorials.

Radio and television commentators.

Demands and recommendations by the executive branch.

Buttonholing by constituents and fellow legislators.

Telephone calls at all hours of the day or night.

Even committee hearings and actual legislative debate.

Likewise, in the name of democracy, Senators and Representatives ought not to be susceptible to influence of this sort:

Old friendships (1 highball, 1 vote?).

Campaign contributions ($1,000, one vote?).

Offers of future favors, legal as well as illegal (one Federal judgeship, how many votes?).

Personal self-interest as part of the decision at stake (1 share of stock, 1 vote?).

Threats of political criticism or attacks based on grounds other than the point at issue.

In the tempestuous hurly-burly of American politics, elected officials know that they must, for better or for worse, work out their destiny with the tools of oratory and other channels of communication to the electorate. But protection against improper influence within Federal administrative and regulatory agencies is more complicated. The career official's dependence on fragile civil-service laws makes him vulnerable to outside attacks which often can find a voice in Congress.

In any case, when the phone rings from the White House the administration official must yield. But how do we know whether what he executes is a private favor or a bona fide policy of the President? And how do we know whether the policy was hammered out within the administration on the anvil of facts and thorough discussion, or whether it originated in an effort to placate some intimate friend or contributor to the party exchequer?

The simplest answer to the question of legitimate versus illegitimate influence on administrative decision-making, whether by the President's staff or by Members of Congress, is that it may best be judged by whether or not it is done on the record. By this I mean that every intervention in any decision must be in writing, or reduced to writing for the record. Unrecorded oral attempts at influence—whether on the telephone, at the golf course or over drinks at a cocktail party—are fertile breeding grounds for charges of favoritism.

If the Senator or Representative or other official has to state his recommendation for a public record his reasons of necessity must be expressed in terms of the particular criteria of the public interest under which the decision is supposed to be reached. Threats and cajolery would vanish, for they are incriminating beyond belief in cold, hard, typewritten words. Think of what benefit such a requirement might have been to Sherman Adams himself in the episode which has so grievously embarrassed the

President and imperiled Mr. Adams' public career.

To begin with, it could have acted as such a restraint that Sherman Adams never would have exercised his influence at all in behalf of his benefactor, Mr. Goldfine. The very act of putting down in writing his request, for all the world to see, undoubtedly would have held to the barest minimum the exemptions or lenience that a man reputed to be as circumspect as Mr. Adams might seek from a Federal regulatory agency. And there now would exist no doubt or uncertainty over precisely how extensive was the favor the President's assistant sought.

And so, in my list of five major recommendations for a code to help subdue and discourage the illegitimate and harmful use of influence in government, I will begin with one which seeks to eliminate the cloak-and-dagger element of skulking oral fiats and directives:

1. The personnel of Federal administrative and regulatory agencies need the protection of a firm rule that forbids them to receive or consider communications not intended for the public record. Inasmuch as agency officials and employees cannot prevent members of the President's staff or of Congress from telephoning or writing to them, they could simply refer to the rule that either the message is made of public record or it will be given no consideration in the disposition of the case at issue. The use of influence will be much more moderate if it is on-stage all the time.

2. Enforcement and applicability of the Federal Lobbying Act should be greatly tightened, so that Senators and Representatives have a clearer idea of whom they are dealing with when efforts are made to influence pending legislation. Entertainment and gifts as deductible business expenses under the Internal Revenue Code might be reviewed, so that their use in lobbying could be discouraged. Chief Justice Earl Warren himself has warned from the bench that, unless lobbying operates in full public view, "the voice of the people may be all too easily drowned out by the voice of special interest groups seeking favored treatment while masquerading as proponents of the public weal."

3. Cabinet officers and other Presidential appointments, as well as Members of Congress, should have to make public annually their outside sources of items of income in excess of $100, including speaking or writing fees, travel expense payments, or similar emoluments. This is included in a bill I introduced early in June, with Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., of Pennsylvania, as cosponsor. Bills along similar lines have been prepared by other Senators, such as CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, and my Oregon colleague, WAYNE MORSE, while a bill by New York's Senator JACOB K. JAVITS proposes the creation of an Advisory Committee on Ethical Standards to aid in the enforcement of a tighter code of conduct for public agencies. Such legislation could safeguard the public against officials trying to occupy a dual role, and it would in turn protect officials from unjust suspicions.

4. As nearly as possible the legislative and executive branches of Government should be under the same conflict-of-interest statutes. This has been a festering source of irritation and hypocrisy for many years. The bill introduced by Senator CLARK and me would provide that Members of Congress and appointees of the President obey identical rules with respect to corporate equities, outside holdings, and similar matters. I think this might assure more fairness and equity in congressional inquiries into the lapses and peccadilloes of administrative officials. When investigations like those concerning Harry Vaughan or Sherman Adams are underway, many Americans become cynical over the fact that Congress seems to take the attitude of "Don't do as I do, but do as I say."

5. Finally, and most important, the dominance of large sums of money over election at the polls must be ended. All other efforts to curtail improper influence are swatting flies, while this would be draining the swamp. Can we reasonably expect no more gifts of coats or kitchen appliances when the highest officials in the land are free to accept practically unlimited quantities of coin of the realm in the form of campaign contributions? Is it not hypocrisy for a rug to cause a national scandal when cautious estimates place at $200 million the total amount of cash invested in political campaigns during the 1956 elections in all 48 States?

Our existing system of financing campaigns is doubly undemocratic, because it works adversely in both directions. It exerts an undue influence on the candidate who often must seek campaign donations from special interests. At the same time, the system also exercises an undue influence on the choice that can be reached by the voter himself, when he is denied an equal opportunity to see and judge competing candidates and policies.

The frequent great inequality in campaign funds, reflecting the judgments of powerful economic groups as to their stake and self-interest in the outcome of an election, actually corrupts the very fountainhead of democracy by intruding the undue influence of money into the area of each voter's free and equal choice. Can the citizen know and appreciate the merits of a candidate with a campaign fund of $25,000 who is opposed by an adversary with a campaign fund of $250,000? How can the candidate with the lesser sum reach the people with his message? Just one statewide mailing of a political brochure in a State like California costs something over $300,000.

There is one further step that can be taken to subdue and control improper influence in government. That is to make public service more attractive to young men and women of idealism, education, and character. It is dismaying when a Gallup poll discloses that some 70 percent of American parents do not wish their sons and daughters to enter politics. Many families are skeptical of the motives of politicians.

Yet most of the politicians of my own acquaintance are honest, overworked, and sincere. They frequently are trapped by unwise institutions that, like Topsy, have just growed. This refers particularly to the astronomical expansion of campaign-fund requirements during recent years. But, basically, there is no real substitute for personal merit and integrity. That is why our young people must take to heart the advice spoken to them a good many years ago by a great statesman of New York State, Elihu Root:

"Politics is the practical exercise of self-government, and somebody must attend to it, if we are to have self-government. The principal ground of reproach against any American citizen should be that he is not a politician."

George Edward Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief tribute to George Edward Stringfellow, who recently has become the leader of an important organization in the United States.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD OF IMPERIAL SIR GEORGE EDWARD STRINGFELLOW, IMPERIAL POTENTATE, A. A. O. N. M. S., 1958–59

(By Dr. Edmund L. Tink,[1] 33°)

The finest historical traditions of Virginia—deep, religious conviction, sterling character, flaming independence, sacrificial patriotism, and gracious hospitality—constitute the heredity and form the background of the formative years of George Edward Stringfellow, who was born in Reva, Culpeper County, Va., son of James and Elizabeth F. (Bowers) Stringfellow.

The first George Stringfellow to arrive in Virginia came from England in the year 1720. He brought with him the family coat-of-arms which his American descendants valued highly.

Five of George E. Stringfellow's early forbears preached the gospel as it was taught in the theological seminaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Reverend Horace Stringfellow, who left Virginia to cope with the evils of Washington, D. C., as rector of Trinity Church, was described by Daniel Webster as "God Almighty's prosecuting attorney." Others were farmers, merchants, lawyers, physicians, and educators. Like many other early and courageous pioneering families the Stringfellows fought in their country's wars—from the Revolutionary through World War II. Many participated in various ways in the War Between the States; one being one of General Lee's most daring and dependable scouts, another being an educator during the days when Virginia was known as Military District No. 1.

Robert Stringfellow's retreat house, near Raccoon Ford on the Rapidan River in Culpeper County, Va., was, until it was burned in 1864, a gracious center of Stringfellow hospitality. Another ancestoral estate on the Rapidan has been in the family since it was built in 1832 by Thornton Stringfellow.

Our imperial potentate believes that the statement "Once a Virginian always a Virginian" is a true one, if not in geography, then certainly in terms of graciousness. To be his guest in New Jersey is to know Virginia hospitality at its best.

It was with this early background of historic patriotism and tradition that Noble Stringfellow began his productive years in New Jersey and built a modern noteworthy American career.

His outstanding achievements in business, his constructive independence in the affairs of government, his enduring contributions to civic life and to charitable and educational organizations, and his daily devotion to our fraternal activities constitute a record which is eloquent in its demonstration of his unusual qualities of leadership.

These qualities were recognized by Thomas Alva Edison, the wizard of Menlo Park, when he appointed George E. Stringfellow manager of his manufacturing firm's Washington office and 5 years later made him general manager of the corporation's largest business in West Orange, N. J. For more than a decade he was a daily business associate of Mr. Edison. He is now vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of the McGraw-Edison Co. and a

[1] Dr. Edmund L. Tink is superintendent of schools in Kerny, N. J. He is an executive member of the commission on higher education and a trustee of Syracuse University. He is active in professional, civic, service, and fraternal affairs. Dr. Tink was appointed by President Eisenhower a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board. He still serves on this Board, having been officially commended by the State Department for his activities in fighting communism.

director of a number of nationally known corporations.

Before coming to New Jersey Noble Stringfellow married Carrie M. Fearnow, a charming and vivacious young lady of Washington, D. C., who was born in Berkeley Springs, W. Va.

Noble Stringfellow is past president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association and first president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society; served 2 terms as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City; served 2 terms as president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; served 4 terms as president of the board of managers of the New Jersey Home for Disabled Soldiers; represented Kiwanis International at the United Nations; served on the board of trustees of the Central Brick Presbyterian Church, East Orange, and Elberon Memorial Church, Elberon; and was former chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party of New Jersey.

Noble Stringfellow is currently serving as a member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College and holds membership in a number of professional organizations. He finds time for a heavy speaking schedule. His speeches are often editorialized, receive wide circulation, and many have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Noble Stringfellow has been the recipient of honorary degrees from various colleges in recognition of his many accomplishments: Doctor of humanities, doctor of fine arts, doctor of laws.

He received the citizen award for outstanding achievement in industrial statesmanship from the New Jersey Society of Professional Engineers; was made an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society, and was the recipient of the American Cancer Society award for his leadership and work in founding and supporting the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society; and was cited by the Brotherhood Committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects.

During World War II he served as a member of several important committees of the War Production Board for which he received a Medal of Merit.

Our imperial potentate has received many honors from local communities, service clubs, and fraternal groups for his good fellowship and good works.

Noble Stringfellow was recently elected to honorary membership in the national chapter of Sigma Mu Sigma, an organization "dedicated to faith in the dignity of man and confidence in the integrity of youth."

In May 1958 he received the 1958 Academy of Medicine of New Jersey annual citizens award "for rendering extraordinary service to the health and welfare of the public."

While residing in Washington, Mr. Stringfellow was raised a Master Masion in Hiram Lodge No. 10, F. & A. M. He was exalted in Washington Chapter No. 2, R. A. M., and served as excellent high priest. He was knighted in Washington Commandery No. 1, K. T. He became a noble of the A. A. O. N. M. S. in Almas Temple.

He served Salaam Temple as potentate in 1947 and was unanimously reelected in 1948, the first potentate of Salaam to succeed himself in 43 years.

He is currently member of Hope Lodge No. 124, F. & A. M., East Orange, N. J.; the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite in the Valley of Trenton, Trenton, N. J.; Crescent Temple, Trenton; Washington Commandery, No. 1, K. T.; St. Quentin Conclave No. 75, Red Cross of Constantine; Crescent Court No. 65, Royal Order of Jesters, and is an active member, International Supreme Council, Order of DeMolay.

Noble Stringfellow was elected to the imperial divan in Chicago, Ill., in 1949. He is an honorary member of 148 temples.

Among the clubs in which he holds membership are the Railroad Club and Kiwanis Club of New York City, Advertising Club of New Jersey, Duquesne Club (Pittsburgh), Montclair Golf Club, Montclair, N. J.

Those who know George E. Stringfellow agree that he is well qualified and prepared in terms of enterprise, experience, and energy for the leadership, arduous duties, and challenging responsibilities of the office of imperial potentate.

The Crisis in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unlimited Dimension," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 28, 1958, dealing with the crisis in Lebanon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNLIMITED DIMENSION

Before the United States intervened in Lebanon it was already generally understood in the world that this country was prepared to fight to save any "free" country attacked by Communist troops.

This has long been clear with respect to Europe and much of Asia. It was made clear regarding the Middle East in the Eisenhower Doctrine proclaimed last year. That statement promised military help for any Middle Eastern government threatened by overt aggression from a country controlled by international communism.

Now a fateful new dimension has been added to this already large commitment. Or so it will be if the only explanation offered so far for our intervention in Lebanon is allowed to stand unchanged.

President Eisenhower has explained that the United States put troops in Lebanon because it felt that otherwise no small nation anywhere in the non-Communist world would feel secure against overthrow of its government from any source, external and internal, Communist or otherwise.

The plain implication of that reasoning, if that is the reason for our action in Lebanon, is that the United States may henceforth intervene in any country whose government feels itself threatened from whatever quarter. The threat no longer has to be that of a Communist attack.

We think Americans might do well to reflect on some of the things this new dimension could mean for the future.

The United States Government believes, not without justification, that President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, is busily trying to control many nations and areas of Africa—Libya, Morocco, Algeria, for example. Some people believe his ultimate ambitions may extend beyond the so-called Arab world and may embrace the whole continent of Africa.

Very well. Are we then to intervene every place a revolution allegedly instigated by Nasser threatens to succeed? If you perhaps think involvement in Lebanon—a country with complex internal political problems and a country not under direct attack from anyone—is messy, that is nothing to what it will be like if we start dropping troops into Ghana, for example, or Tanganyika. Sound fanciful? Perhaps; but it is also implied in our announced purpose in going into Lebanon.

Nor is that all. The threat to a legally constituted government need not be fomented by Nasser. If dissidents anywhere want to overthrow their government, that government can now appeal to us on the basis of Lenanon. And it might be noted that there are a lot of violent political dissidents in the world, especially in countries that have not yet developed political maturity.

But the picture is even broader than that; our succor is not confined to Africa and the Middle East. The potential expansion of our military involvement represented by Lebanon is, with the exception of the Communist empire, global. If called upon, are we to rush troops to the defense of any government anywhere that feels itself threatened from any source or for any reason?

This is, among other things, a curious position for a nation that came into being by armed uprising against a legally constituted government. It is one thing to try to grapple with the extremely difficult problem of Communist subversion, but it is quite another to try to protect any and all governments simply because they are governments.

There are something like a hundred nations in the world. Many of them are small, many have weak governments likely at any time to be toppled by revolutions. So make no mistake about it: We are going to have our hands full if we let the precedent of Lebanon establish the principle of unlimited intervention.

Need for a Thorough Discussion of United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have long felt that democratic government depends heavily on a public awareness of the problems facing the Nation. Indeed, such an awareness is often lacking in the field of foreign affairs, an important area of Government action which unfortunately tends to seem removed and overly complex.

Mr. President, it is of utmost importance that the public be offered a clear explanation and discussion of our foreign policy. Today, with our troops in Lebanon, and with the precarious world situation weighing so heavily on the minds of all of us, it is doubly imperative that the American people be given a full statement of policy by the administration.

A fine editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 23, entitled "The Pitfalls of Silence," has been brought to my attention by Mr. Charles Manson, of Wausau, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PITFALLS OF SILENCE

It is over a week since the United States Marines were dispatched to Lebanon and in the intervening days Washington has been wrapped in a strange silence.

There have, of course, been many announcements and comments on the rapidly changing developments. But there has been almost nothing by way of official explanation or debate on what is still the central issue, the basic decision to intervene in the Middle East.

Congress has received one brief message from the President and the public, at least in some areas, has heard an equally brief statement read by the President on filmed television. Both of these dealt with the immediate moves, explaining that the Marines were sent at the request of the President of Lebanon to protect American citizens and the Lebanese Government.

But the President has not followed his previous practice, notably in the Suez crisis, of giving the public a complete and carefully reasoned statement of what the Government intends and why. The Secretary of State, moreover, has hardly been heard from at all.

Those in Congress who have doubts about what we are doing have been equally silent. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, is one of the few Members of Congress to raise basic questions. The Democratic leaders in both Houses, for example, have used their influence to stifle questions; Speaker RAYBURN even went so far as to rebuke a Member of the House who started to make some criticisms of the Government's action.

Now it is possible to sympathize with the reasons for this silence. The President and his Secretary of State may feel themselves too busy dealing with rapid problems to have time for explanations; or they may feel it best not to explain. Those who have qualms about the action may feel under the necessity to rally around, to do or say nothing that might undermine confidence in the Government at a time when war threatens.

Still, it is a disturbing silence. Across the ocean, in the British Parliament, there were no such inhibitions. Prime Minister Macmillan, supporting the American action, went directly to the Parliament to explain in great detail why he did so. In fact, his presentation of the case for intervention is by far the best we have seen; it is calm, carefully reasoned and impressive.

Nor did Mr. Macmillan act as if questions about Government policy were improper. Mr. Gaitskell, the leader of the opposition, accepted his duty to ask questions. He made it quite clear that his party did not intend "to divide the House"; but he also made it clear that the policies of the Government were going to be thoroughly examined.

The result of that debate is that the members of the British Parliament and the British public are in a better position to understand all that is being done, and to judge it, than are Americans. And we cannot believe that the welfare of Britain is damaged by this kind of open debate.

On the contrary. In a country of freemen it is essential to real unity that those who lead explain to people carefully and thoughtfully the courses they pursue. People not only have a right to be told what is being done; they must understand why. And they cannot have that understanding if all questions, doubts, qualms and counterarguments are quashed out of fear that mere mention of them somehow constitutes an unpatriotic act.

There may be, as some would argue, some pitfalls in too much discussion of foreign policy moves. But there is a far more dangerous pitfall in silence when the United States is walking close to war.

Courage Has a Loud Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Courage Has a Loud Voice," written by Helen Virden and published in the July 1958 issue of National Business Woman, the magazine of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGE HAS A LOUD VOICE

(By Helen Virden)

Words throw long shadows and the militant echoes of brave men still echo down the years of history. But somehow through the years we have become suspicious of brave words. If we heard for the first time today the Gettysburg Address, the farewell words of Robert E. Lee or Patrick Henry's Liberty or Death speech, we would label them flag-waving. All of oratory seems glittering and sounding off if we do not look for the history behind the words. I strongly suspect that there were people in Patrick Henry's age who considered his flaming oratory as rabble-rousing and flag-waving because the listeners did not realize the words were making history.

Consider the Jeffersonian words of our Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." We mouth these words today as a part of our heritage, scarcely remembering their grandeur and all the heartache and the tears that went into making these words a part of our life. As George Washington once declared, "This liberty is going to look easy—when men no longer have to die for it."

America has always been the symbol of liberty and dared to raise her voice in defense of it. We have never kept silence before the crucible of the world's dictators.

These voices from our past are so recent our great-grandfathers could have heard them. We almost feel that we could ask "What would you do, Lincoln?"; "How would you vote, Jefferson?"

Words of men have triggered wars, toppled crowns, and bred revolutions.

Many weapons have been used to win battles. Many have been used in our perpetual war for freedom. The caveman had his homemade ax to protect the small cave that he set aside with a rock at the opening to call home. As mankind has become civilized he has used arrows and swords, daggers and muskets, bayonets and rifles, cannons and grenades, bombs and planes, guided missiles and rockets to fight wars. But the most potent weapon conceived by man is in the power of the pen, the words written and spoken by great men.

Perhaps the pen that gave the world the most courage was the pen of Tom Paine. It was Paine who gave George Washington the equivalent of the 10 regiments he so sorely needed.

Paine wrote when our Nation was at its lowest ebb. Later when armies had a taste of victory, setbacks were easier to bear but on that Christmas Day before Trenton, we had only defeat to remember. Washington's army had dwindled to 3,000 able men. Among his officers were defeatists and traitors. About one-third of this number were counter-revolutionists—fifth columnists we would call them today. Another third were ready to desert, happy to mind their own business and call an end to the bloody revolution. The remnant of brave men who remained true to their cause were faced with three enemies. They had their neighbors and Redcoats who had command of the sea, the Indians of the frontier, and the Hessians that were waiting like vultures across the river.

Even the courage of Washington flagged. He had to admit that it looked as if the game were up. Many of his men were deserting; he decided it had to be now or never, so he planned the attack. There was not even warm food or a glowing fire to bolster their spirits. All he had was the pen of Tom Paine, so he used what he had. In the bitter cold of that December Tom Paine had written "The Crisis" on a drum head by the light of the campfires of a retreating army. So he was in reality writing for those cold and hungry men; it was his answer to their often-asked question, "Can liberty be worth it?" Tom Paine was sure that freedom was worth fighting for. As he wrote, when a word struck him just right, when a thought came through strong and clear, he struck the drum with his fist and the sound went ringing through the December cold like the sound of the opening of a battle.

This hastily written pamphlet was rushed to the printer and then to the front ranks and George Washington caused the words to be read aloud to the soldiers waiting at Valley Forge on that cruel December night. These men were made of stern stuff and the words of Tom Paine were not flag-waving to them. They listened with brave hearts: "These are the times that try men's souls." Nat Griste read the words but every man could agree with them, "The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country." The men hearing these words felt a little steel running down their backbones.

To our ears the words of Tom Paine, "It would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as Freedom should not be highly rated," seem oratorically flowered and smack of triteness. But to the men listening at Valley Forge these words were a fire that warmed their hearts, and erased their fears.

Then the words of Tom Paine came to the ment in ringing tones from Nat Griste, "I love a man that can smile in trouble, that can gather strength from distress and grow brave by reflection. I thank God I fear not. I see no real cause for fear. I know our situation well and can see a way out of it." Here were brave words to flog the lagging courage and challenge the spirit of patriots. These soldiers took the words for their own. They, too, began to feel that they had no cause to fear and to see a flickering hope in a hopeless situation, and they won the battle that dawn.

Our history is crowded with valiant words. Fighting words that called out the best in men. Patrick Henry shouting "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!" Strong words screamed from a fighting deck, "Don't give up the ship!" that brought us victory. There have been fighting words of

promised vengeance, "Remember the Alamo"; "Remember Pearl Harbor"; "I shall return". Churchill's voice was the voice of the warrier calling men to battle; Roosevelt's voice was the voice of a liberator, Eisenhower's words the reassurance of the dignity of man as he declared, "Freedom has not failed us, let us not fail freedom."

Words carried the story of liberty to all men. Words of learning took men out of the labyrinth of fear into the sunlight of today.

The words of America have been courageous words and that story of courage is still borne on the winds blowing from yesterday. When we let words like "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America * * * with liberty and justice for all," slip over our tongue, we groove a little deeper this pathway to our remembrance.

Sometimes these words that made history are blown from Cumberland Gap and you can hear that first tree going down and the cry of Daniel Boone against the lone wilderness. Sometimes it is warm words sunned by love, "With malice toward none, with charity for all," and it has come to us from a weary wind that carries a soft, sad sound and the weight of sorrow, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion."

Sometimes it blows with short gusts and we catch only fragments of the words, "fired the shot heard 'round the world"; "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness", "My God! how little my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of." Often it blows strong and sure and we can hear the voice of the Father of Our Country above the bickerings of those men framing our Constitution, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair."

Perhaps we of this age fear being thought sentimentar or perhaps we have lost something of the burning patriotism that enables us to see behind the words the great ideas of man and, not knowing, we call it flagwaving, when in fact it is a kind of glory when great men speak strong words and brave men listen.

International Rose Test Gardens at Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my native city of Portland is justifiably proud of its famous International Rose Test Gardens. Portland, with its rich soil and cool nights, has proven ideal for the growing of magnificent roses of virtually all species and varieties. Under the vigilant care of R. C. Kalmbach, the able curator, the International Rose Test Gardens have become a legend to flower lovers all over the world.

In the New York Sunday Times of July 27, 1958, merited tribute was paid to Portland's International Rose Test Gardens in an article written by Miss Joan Lee Faust. So that Members of the Senate and the House may share in our appreciation of the oldest rose test gardens in the United States, which date back to 1917, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Faust's article, entitled "Portland's Pride," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND'S PRIDE—THE INTERNATIONAL ROSE TEST GARDEN MAINTAINS HIGHEST STANDARDS

(By Joan Lee Faust)

PORTLAND OREG.—This is wonderful country for growing roses, a rosarian's dream come true. Days are warm and sunny, nights are comfortably cool. The rainfall is plentiful and the soil deep and fertile. Rosebushes respond with tremendous vigor. The flower colors are clear and bright.

A beautiful exhibit of northwestern roses can be seen in Portland's International Rose Test Garden—one of the oldest test gardens in the country. This 4½-acre display is a fine bit of landscaping, of which the City of Roses can be proud.

The setting alone would be hard to match. The garden is part of Washington Park and rests on a high hillside that hems the western edge of the city. Four broad terraces are cut into the slope. A visitor standing on a terrace can look eastward across the city to snow-capped Mount Hood, 50 miles away.

The four terraces of the garden are connected by wide steps. The banks in between are a perfect foil for floribunda displays and corners are accented with graceful weeping standard roses. The formal beds run the length of the terrace joined by grass paths.

BEAUTIFUL BLOSSOMS

Although the International Rose Test Garden is at its height in June and August there always is a fine display from summer through late fall. Again, it's the climate that keeps them going. To point up the vigor these roses achieve, plants usually are spaced 3 feet apart. Even then some are crowded. Easterners will recall that 18 inches to 2 feet is ample spacing for their plants.

Ten thousand rosebushes are planted in the test garden. Many beds are lined with established named varieties, but a great portion of the beds are devoted to the trial roses. The responsibility for care and record keeping of this vast test garden falls on R. C. Kalmbach, curator. He is a devoted rosarian and oversees the garden with a professional's eye. Weeds are heresy; faded blooms are hard to find and the borders and lawns are kept in tiptop condition. It is remarkable that Mr. Kalmbach accomplishes this outsized task with a modest three-man crew.

Tracing the history of the garden, Mr. Kalmbach explained, "This garden was established as a test garden way back in 1917. It is one of the oldest test gardens in the country, also one of the largest." Elizabeth Park in Hartford, Conn., also a test garden, was the first municipal rose garden. It has 14,000 plants.

THE INSPIRATION

The garden was the inspiration of three eastern nurserymen who wanted to have a garden where they might show their plants as well as test their performances. The park was established with the blessings of Portland's Bureau of Parks, the mayor, and civic officials. Trial rose entries were sent from all over the world. While leafing through the early records of the trial grounds, Mr. Kalmbach cited entry records for roses sent from England, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Australia, Holland, France, Luxembourg, and this country.

Mr. Kalmbach went on to say that "today the rose hybridists of the world are striving to give home gardeners roses that are different, plants that will serve a multitude of purposes, so that gardeners may raise the kind of plants that pleases them most. With these needs in mind, hybridists are breeding for disease resistance, colorfast flowers, fragrance, and hardiness, so that rose growing will be practical for everyone."

Many of the foreign trial roses now come in through American hybridists who visit the European breeders and buy from them. These new varieties are sent to trial grounds to test their performance in this country. To some extent quarantine regulations have cut down direct imports. However, rosebushes still come to the test garden directly from France, Germany, Holland, England, and Canada.

The International Rose Test Garden in Portland is distinctive because it is the only rose test garden that issues its own awards. The plants are judged by six eminent rosarians in the Portland area. Their judging standards are rigid, considering the plant's vigor, floriferousness, disease resistance, bud form, foliage and flower color.

Any trial rose is eligible for the garden's certificate. Gardeners know that when a rose is selected for an award it will be especially suited for growing in the Northwest.

However, many roses of national garden fame have been honored with an International Rose Test Garden certificate. Among them are Chrysler Imperial, Ma Perkins, Independence, Carrousel, Peace, and Pink Favorite.

CERTIFICATES WON

This year three roses were given gold certificates: Kordes Perfecta, a hybrid tea; Little Darling, a floribunda, and an unnamed trial rose, 56–R–51. Silver certificates were presented to Governor Rosellini, a hybrid tea and Pinafore, a floribunda.

In 1938 the now famous All-American Rose Selections began testing rose introductions. This has been a great force to standardize the quality of roses. The Portland garden is one of 24 nationwide test gardens that screen the nurserymen's trials. These rose trials are watched over meticulously for an 18-month period and they are rated at 5 successive stages of growth. The scoring is set up on a point system and the totals are sent into the national board for tallying. A winning rosebush must excel on all 13 judging points.

HIGH SCORES

This means a lot of paper work for Mr. Kalmbach. When he sends in his scores usually they are higher than average—this climate again. Most of the trial roses perform very well.

There are some wrinkles to this, but they all smooth out in the final tallying scores. For instance, some roses are bred for hot, dry climates and these blooms fail to open or appear vigorous in the cool Northwest climate. Also, the winters are mild in this region. Tender roses come through successfully where they might be winter-killed if they were grown in colder climates. "But you know," Mr. Kalmbach reflected, "it's really the general public that is the judge of roses. They dictate what they want. The test gardens just screen the trials for quality, signified by the green AARS tag."

We Talk Big and Fly a Very Small Sputnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS.. Mr. Speaker, the accompanying article by columnist Drew Pear-

son is most challenging in thought. While all may not agree with Mr. Pearson in everything that he has to say, we must admit that he is a courageous and fearless news reporter and the things which he had to say in a recent article regarding American prestige sinking to a new low and suggested remedies to improve this condition is worthy of the thoughts of the Members of the Congress, officials of the State Department, and the Chief Executive and others.

The article follows:

PEARSON SAYS WE TALK BIG, AND FLY A VERY SMALL SPUTNIK—UNITED STATES PRESTIGE HAS SUNK TO A NEW LOW

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—The American public does not know it, but all last weekend and early this week there has been more diplomatic arm-twisting, more table-pounding, and more due bills collected by American diplomats at the United Nations than at any other time in American history.

The arm-twisting has been to drum up a two-thirds vote in the U. N. General Assembly to get a U. N. police force to take over for the Marines and thus get the United States off the hook and off the beaches in Lebanon.

The U. N. vote-getting has not been easy. Here is how some of the one-time friends and allies of the United States have reacted:

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, and Mexico have been cool. They argued privately that the good-neighbor policy has become a series of visits by American bigwigs and they are tired of smiling faces behind champagne glasses lifted to toast an empty policy. They point out that they are summoned by American-delegation office boys at the U. N. and told how to vote. They are telling American diplomats that they are tired of voting on instructions from the State Department.

EUROPE

West Germany, an anchor member of NATO, has been grumbling against American intervention in Lebanon. Norway, Denmark, and Belgium are irritated. The French, though for intervention, are most unhappy over the fact that some 1,800 of their troops have been anchored off Beirut for almost a week, anxious to get ashore, but unwanted.

ASIA AND AFRICA

Japan, which we have depended upon as our chief far-eastern ally, has been on the other side of the Lebanese fence. Saudi Arabia, which we have wooed and courted, sidestepped on O. K. for the use of the Air Force base in Dhahran, and refused to send oil to Jordan, even though King Saud, less than a year ago, had stationed his troops in Jordan to rescue King Hussein. Indonesia, India, and most African-Asiatic states are against the United States.

Remarked one Latin American ambassador: "How can I possibly explain to the people of my country why we should vote to take over for the United States Marines in a little country few of them have heard about and which they think is being occupied solely to protect American oil?"

In the last few days, some diplomats have been telling each other: "We've got to pitch in and save the United States. We can't allow her to lose face. It was bad enough to have Britain and France shown up as weak powers after Suez. We can't have the same thing happen to the United States."

All the above is not pleasant to contemplate. However, the American people would be guilty of keeping their heads in the sand if they did not wake up to the facts. And these unpleasant facts indicate how badly American prestige has slipped.

The question is—why? The answer, in brief, is that world leadership goes to—

1. The strong.
2. Him who leads.

On point 1, for the last 10 months it has been obvious that our onetime scientific and military supremacy has been going to the nation which was able to put a ton-and-a-half sputnik in the skies, and was able to test a long-range intercontinental missile as early as May 1957. In contrast, our ICBM, the Atlas, went pfffft at Cape Canaveral on July 19, the same day Khrushchev was demanding a summit meeting in brutal, bulldozing language.

On point 2, a nation which leads must not be a nation which waits. It must solve problems before they become acute. It must use imagination and inspiration. It cannot rely on bluster and talk. We have been talking big and carrying a little stick. We have been bragging about outer space, but beeping with a tiny sputnik.

We have been talking about massive retaliation and agonizing reappraisal when the world knew we weren't going to attack massively with the atomic bomb and the world has now come to realize that we have to undergo an agonizing reappraisal of our own policy of brinkmanship.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

One policy we may have to reappraise is that of policing the world on the other side of the world—the equivalent of Russia landing troops near our border in Nicaragua, Guatemala, or Mexico. There was a time when we could do it without too much fear of the consequences. But Russia's intermediate range missile has changed that. She has them in quantity. We haven't.

These are some of the agonizing reappraisals we have to make. They are also some of the reasons why so much arm-twisting has been necessary at the United Nations to rally our old friends for a vote in the U. N. assembly. They are not pleasant facts. But it's best for the American people to know them rather than keep our heads in the sand.

Hells Canyon: A Billion Dollar Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that a few political opportunists in Nebraska want to inject the controversial Hells Canyon issue into the coming election campaign. This is good, but Nebraskans are entitled to nothing less than the whole story and all of the facts about Hells Canyon which for the fifth time Congress has refused to authorize. The citizens of our State will not tolerate half-truths. Nor do they expect campaign issues to be discussed on that level by candidates hungry for votes.

I will attempt in the next several paragraphs to review this question in some detail and present what I know to be the hard cold facts about Hells Canyon.

Hells Canyon legislation calls for the construction of a Federal dam on the Snake River to provide power in the Northwest. In 1955, after Congress refused repeatedly to provide the money for a high dam at the expense of all the taxpayers, the privately owned Idaho Power Co. was granted, under Federal license from the Federal Power Commission, the rights to finance and construct in the Hells Canyon reach, 3 dams and to sell power from them for a 50-year period. Much-needed power will begin to flow very shortly from the first of these three units to be built and paid for by private enterprise.

The proponents of a Federal Dam still today want to drown out and destroy one dam which is nearly finished, the second which is in advanced stages of construction and the final unit expected to be started shortly. This would mean not only raiding the Treasury of over a half billion dollars for construction costs, but paying for some $80 million worth of work resulting from the stoppage of the contracts underway. It would mean that Congress would be responsible for the loss of over $500 million in potential tax revenues to our Government over the 50-year licensing period. It would mean endless litigation on a valid contract. It would foreclose an immediate power supply and cause disastrous shortages for this area. This all adds up to a billion dollar mistake.

Since Hells Canyon was to be built primarily for power, private enterprise consented to undertake and develop its power potential without cost to the taxpayers of America. A bipartisan Federal Power Commission, after exhaustive studies and hearings covering 5 years, licensed this private company and decided that the 3-dam plan was better than the plan proposed for a high Federal dam. It was a unanimous verdict by an expert body made up of Republicans and Democrats alike which since 1920 has had the responsibility to regulate and conserve the publics waterpower resources. This license has been held valid by the Nation's two highest courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States. Idaho Power is handling its own financing and surrendered voluntarily tax amortization certificates stating it would accept no concessions even though they were entitled to them under the law.

In comparing the licensed project with the proposed Federal dam, we find that the licensed project will produce about 5½ billion kilowatt-hours annually—slightly more than the Federal dam and will produce this power at a rate substantially lower than the cost of production in the Government proposed plant. Statements to the effect that the Idaho phosphate deposits are in the Hells Canyon area is about as true as saying Washington, D. C., is in the New York area or that Hastings, Nebr., is in the Kansas City area. The airline distance from the Hells Canyon site to Pocatello, which is the nearest phosphate bed and which city contains the nearest phosphate plant, is 274 miles. The large phosphate deposits are even farther away in the southeastern corner of Idaho. A new $5 million phosphate plant for the Farmers Co-op near Montpelier is 334 airline miles from the Hells Canyon site. Nowhere in the proposal to build the dam at Hells Canyon were any plans drawn for transmission lines

to carry electricity to the phosphate beds and the staggering cost of any such lines has never been estimated. The line loss alone would make such a proposal infeasible, but under no stretch of the imagination could the transmission be accomplished for less than 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. If you add 2 mills to the 4.3 million figure which the Bureau of Reclamation has given as the cost of producing a kilowatt-hour of electricity in the proposed Hells Canyon plant, you have a cost to the Government of at least 6.3 mills. This is substantially above the price being paid for electricity to operate the many electric furnaces treating phosphate rock in southeastern Idaho.

In discussing the interests of the farmers in a Federal dam in order to receive so-called cheap fertilizer, the public record shows that for 6 successive years the only 2 large farm organizations in the State of Idaho—the State Farm Bureau and the Grange—have each year gone on record as unalterably opposed to the building of the Federal project. Claims that by 1960 Nebraska farmers would be paying $750,000 more for fertilizer because the Federal project was not approved this year is hardly deserving of comment. Had Hells Canyon been authorized during this session of the Congress its building schedule as outlined by the Bureau of Reclamation called for completion at the end of the eighth year after start of construction, which would be 1967. This goal for completion was based on annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury at the height of construction in excess of $100 million per year.

Nebraskans should more properly have been reminded by these proponents that since the project has not been authorized the citizens of our State will save $3,364,000 as their pro rata share of the ultimate cost without considering the fantastic transmission lines probably closer to 400 miles in length because of the rugged terrain involved. Under a single Federal dam the generation of power would drop to a maximum of only 66,000 kilowatts for from 3 to 4 months every spring and summer while the reservoir is refilling. Just where the phosphate plants would get their electricity during this period is a mystery.

Nebraska's own Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, had this to say about Hells Canyon in a letter to Dr. A. L. MILLER, former chairman and ranking republican member of the House Interior Committee:

If S. 555 is enacted, appropriations for the next 6 years for reclamation projects will have to be 60 percent higher than those appropriated for the last 6 years. Ten years ago, and from time to time since then, the Congress had a choice between Federal construction of the Hells Canyon Dam and the alternative of permitting the Federal Power Commission to license non-Federal construction. During this 10-year period the theoretical benefits dramatized by proponents of the high dam have been repeatedly considered by the Congress. The Congress did not heed their pleadings and refused authorization for Federal construction. Today we are not faced with a theory. As a practical matter, it would be impossible to justify to the taxpayers of the Nation, overburdened as they are, the extravagant waste of authorization of Federal construction at this time.

It is significant to note, in conclusion, that Democrats joined with the Republicans in the Interior Committee this year to bury this monstrosity. I hope for good. Until this became a political matter the vote in the House Interior Committee was unanimous by Republicans and Democrats in rejecting this proposition. Certainly wherever private enterprise can do the job and here is an excellent example, there is no justification for the Government getting into business.

Evidently the proponents of this legislation do not wish to adhere to a basic policy of Government enunciated by Abraham Lincoln.

The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. But in all that people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere.

Making Cigarette Ads Tell the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Making Cigarette Ads Tell the Truth," which appears in Harper's magazine for August. During the recent extensive hearings and investigation conducted by the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations we found that many cigarette ads were—and still are—grossly misleading about the effectiveness of filter tips as a protection against lung cancer. In this article I have set forth some of the findings of the investigation as well as legislative recommendations which I will introduce this week to halt this deceptive advertising which attempts to lead the American people to believe they are receiving protection from the ill effects of smoking which in fact they are not receiving:

MAKING CIGARETTE ADS TELL THE TRUTH
(By Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK)

Most scientists now agree that cigarette smoking is related to both lung cancer and heart disease. The public is uncomfortably aware of this fact, but not sure what to do about it. Some people have stopped smoking altogether. In order to overcome this trend, much of the current cigarette advertising is misleading the public into thinking that it is getting a protection which really isn't there. And the principal device that is used is the filter tip.

I reached this conclusion after serving as chairman of a congressional subcommittee which recently investigated cigarette advertising. During the hearings I had a unique opportunity of listening to the testimony of some of the leading cancer experts and of examining cigarette advertising—particularly for filter-tip cigarettes. It struck me as significant that not one of the cigarette companies sent a witness to explain to our committee the value of filter tips, although they had representatives sitting in the audience during the hearings.

I was so alarmed by what I learned that I intend to introduce—at about the time this magazine reaches the newsstands—a bill to protect cigarette smokers from the misleading use of the word "filter" and from some of the other glaring misrepresentations in tobacco advertisements.

The whole problem started in 1953, when the first scientific reports on cigarette smoking and lung cancer were published. As a result, for the first time in 21 years, cigarette sales began to drop. The industry searched desperately for an answer and was not long in coming up with one: filter tips. About this time P. Lorillard had put on the market—and widely advertised—Kent, a king-size, filter-tip cigarette. Believing that the filter screened out the cancer-producing substances, smokers started the big switch. Sales of filter-tip Viceroys, long on the market, rose.

Other companies scrambled on the bandwagon. The American Tobacco Co., Liggett & Myers, Reynolds, and Philip Morris hastily introduced their own filter-tip models. And as competition between them increased and new scientific groups released new and more damaging findings on the connection between health and the nicotine and tar in cigarettes, tobacco advertising become more and more extreme in its claims.

Let us take, for example, the L & M campaign in the winter of 1954–55. Liggett & Myers ads declared: "No filter compares with L & M's pure, white, miracle tip * * * much more flavor, much less nicotine." The obvious question is, of course: Less than what? In 1955 tests showed that each regular-size L & M contained 1.5 milligrams of nicotine and 11 milligrams of tar.

Two years later, when the company was ballyhooing this miracle of the modern miracle tip, the new regular-size L & M's had an increase of 70 percent in nicotine and 33 percent in tar over the 1955 blend. This spring the company was advertising that you should "light into that live modern flavor and you get a more effective filter on today's L & M." But comparative tests made by Consumer Reports in April revealed that king-size L & M's had 17 milligrams of tar—scarcely different from L & M in March 1957, or in 1955, for that matter.

The ad is also misleading in another way. Most people who see the words less tars and buy the product do so in the belief that they are getting less tar than there is in other cigarettes. According to the same Consumer Reports tests, of 17 brands tested, 11 had less tar than king-size L & M. King Sano had 40 percent less; Kent, 30 percent less; Marlboro long filter, Old King king filter, Old Gold straight regular, and Parliament, 18 percent less; Philip Morris regular, Tareyton king filter, and Viceroy king filter, 12 percent less; Lucky Strike regular and Old Gold straight long, 6 percent less. To be fair, it must be noted that L & M—like many other cigarette firms—frequently changes both its filter and its tobacco blend. Tests published by the Reader's Digest in July (which are not comparable with the Consumer Reports tests, since a different method was used) showed that L & M contained substantially less tar than it had a year earlier—but that 15 other brands contained even less.

GIMMICKS AND FACTS

Right here I should perhaps make clear that I have no particular feeling about L & M's and that I am 100 percent for advertising, particularly in a Nation as large and heterogeneous as ours with its highly competitive economy. But I do believe that advertising should be honest, and as a Con-

gressman I intend to do whatever I can do to make it so.

As a matter of fact, some cigarette advertising is frank and to the point. A few months ago the Lorillard Co. advertised Old Gold straight (no filter) as "An all-tobacco blend of scientifically selected finest natural-leaf tobacco having a reduced tar and nicotine content under our previous tobacco." This is a perfectly straight-forward statement. The comparison is to itself, not its competitors, and it says in effect that, if you liked Old Gold in the past, you should like it even better now because it is milder.

I feel that if a cigarette has good points, like a relatively low or even moderate tar and nicotine content, it should stress them in its advertising, with the facts to prove them. This may seem a pretty self-evident proposition, but some companies seem to stress irrelevancies. Anyone glancing at the recent Philip Morris ads for Marlboro—the perpetual tattooed man's hand holding a cigarette—might think they were advertising tattooing. Anyone reading the copy would glean the information that "white smooth ash—the kind Marlboro has—is always a sign of good tobacco and a mild smoke." Marlboros have less tar and nicotine than some other brands. But the whiteness of the ash—which I have been told is due primarily to the composition of the paper, the physical form of the tobacco, and the method of construction of the cigarette—has nothing whatever to do with tar content.

Some advertising men would tell me, I suppose, that a gimmick sells more cigarettes than a flat statement of fact. My answer to them is that, in the present state of alarm about smoking, I would put my money on the flat statement.

Because it was not in our province, our committee did not go on record stating that there is a causal relationship between cigarette smoking, lung cancer, and coronary disturbances. But I and others who heard the testimony are convinced that there is. I am a habitual smoker, but since the hearings I have cut my smoking in half. More and more of the general public is becoming similarly convinced. This is what the cigarette companies are up against, and for their own good, as well as that of the public, I would urge them to remember it in their advertising.

THE SEAL OF APPROVAL

One series of ads that produced a storm of complaints, and resulted in the Federal Trade Commission's taking action, was the Parliament campaign featuring the United States Testing Co.'s seal of approval. Used in newspapers, magazines, and on TV, these ads were likely to mislead many smokers into thinking the cigarette had Government approval. Actually the United States Testing Co. is a private concern which does commercial testing for a fee.

Here, for instance, are the instruction to the cameraman for the filming of the TV commercial:

Zoom up pack. Lose bg. Crawl super: "The first filter cigarette in the world that meets the standards of the United States Testing Co."

Simultaneously Mike Wallace was saying: "From the Nation's leading independent research laboratory comes this important announcement: The first filter cigarette in the world that meets the standards of the United States Testing Co."

I submit that the use of the word "nation" is quite likely to make the listener think of the Nation's Capital, and the phrase "standards of the United States Testing Co." to confuse him into believing that Wallace was talking about the United States Bureau of Standards, a Government testing agency. And in addition to the very official-looking seal, the early ads also used a picture of the entrance to the United States Testing Co.—a facade that seemed almost as imposing as that of the United States Supreme Court. After protests, the picture was removed.

Complaints about the use of the words "United States Testing Co." and the seal have been brushed off with the retort that no one thinks the United States Steel Corp. is part of the Federal Government, so why should anybody be confused about the United States Testing Co.? The difference is obvious: The United States Government does not have a steel company, but it does have a testing agency.

THE HAMSTRUNG FTC

It is the responsibility of the Federal Trade Commission to protect consumers from false and misleading advertising, but it has been doing an inadequate job. In September 1955, it issued the FTC Cigarette Advertising Guide, a 7-point yardstick against which cigarette ads could be measured. Among other things it prohibited the use of medical approval of cigarette smoking and of phony testimonials.

For a time after the Guide appeared the companies limited their claims to tobacco taste, an apparently innocuous approach which turned out to have harmful effects. Taught that if a cigarette had a filter the smoker was therefore protected from harmful substances, many people decided that the only criterion for choice was taste.

But the Reader's Digest and Consumer Reports tests revealed that filter-tip cigarettes often contained more tar and more nicotine than the same companies' regular brands. After these were published, and after our committee hearings, which received widespread publicity, smokers began to worry again about the effectiveness of filters. The cigarette companies—apparently in a desperate countermove—began to make wilder and wilder claims in their advertising.

When complaints about the Parliament campaign decribed above reached the FTC, the Commission's specialists agreed that these advertisements were misleading. But 3 months later they were still appearing. FTC's excuse for its inaction was that the company had contract commitments, with magazines, newspapers, and TV programs for the ads; it apparently never considered that the copy could possibly be changed. These incidents—added to those revealed at our committee hearings—helped persuade me that legislation was necessary to safeguard the interests of consumers against the onslaught of a $5 billion industry.

I fully appreciate that the FTC at the present time is largely hamstrung. It does not have the right to obtain a court injunction against tobacco products, as it does against food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics. I shall, therefore, introduce a bill in Congress to include tobacco products under the injunctive powers of the FTC. This automatically will give the Commission the authority to apply to the courts for action against cigarette advertisers who refuse to cooperate. I shall, also, as I mentioned earlier, propose a bill regulating the use of the word "filter."

WHAT FILTER MEANS

The average smoker naturally believes that filters filter out injurious substances in cigarettes. Therefore he concludes that if a company puts out both a filter-tip and a regular cigarette, the filtered cigarette should contain less tar and nicotine than the regular. However, the April tests showed that, for instance, American Tobacco Co.'s filter tip—Hit Parade—contained 25 percent more tar and 29 percent more nicotine than its regular, Lucky Strike. The same company's king-size Pall Mall, which advertises that its greater length filters the smoke and makes it mild, has 25 percent more tar and 24 percent more nicotine than Lucky Strike. The Pall Mall ads which tell the reader that the end of the king-size cigarette filters while you smoke, don't mention that the more you smoke, the more tar and nicotine you get—particularly since Pall Mall had, as of last April, one of the highest tar and nicotine contents on the market. But American Tobacco Co. has recently been changing its product. According to the July Reader's Digest, Hit Parade now has one of the lowest tar and nicotine contents of any cigarette. However, Pall Mall still has very much more tar and nicotine than Lucky Strike.

How is the customer to know? As things stand now, he can't tell when a company changes its product. Even an effective filter can be made comparatively ineffective if the company uses a strong, heavy tobacco with a high tar and nicotine content. This is precisely what many companies have done with their filter cigarettes. But standards can be set up.

According to Dr. Ernst L. Wynder of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, who has spent years studying the subject, the regular-size cigarette using fairly mild tobacco normally yields 18 milligrams of tar in its smoke when tested by the chloroform-extraction method. If an effective filter tip is added, this is reduced about 40 percent, to 11 milligrams—a significant reduction in cancer risk, Dr. Wynder says.

In my bill I am therefore stipulating that the word "filter" be prohibited in advertisements and on cigarette containers, unless the filter screens out enough of the tar and nicotine and results in a product containing no more than 11 milligrams of tar when tested by the chloroform-extraction method. At present this presents a special problem because there are more than three different methods of measuring tar and nicotine and each uses a different scale. This is as if one company used Centigrade and another Fahrenheit to measure temperature and no standard conversion factors were available. But both Government and industry are aware of these differences, and on February 26, 1958, the FTC called a 2-day industry conference to try to establish standard methods of measuring tar and nicotine. I believe that if the industry does not quickly agree to this, the FTC or preferably the United States Bureau of Standards which has facilities should establish a single standard of measurement. And it should become obligatory.

I am also introducing legislation to require all tobacco companies to state in their advertisements and on the labels of their packages "Not more than — milligrams of tar, not more than—milligrams of nicotine." And since manufacturers change their mixtures or filters from time to time, the law should provide that they change their statements of contents at the same time. Think of the smoker's dilemma. In June 1958, six different cigarettes simultaneously were being advertised as having the lowest tar content of any on the market.

Something is wrong and the Government is not doing a thing to correct it or to inform smokers of the truth. Therefore I am asking Congress to appropriate funds for the United States Bureau of Standards to start testing cigarettes for tar and nicotine. This will enable the FTC to learn which companies are being factual and which are not and should result in its taking stronger action against companies using misleading ads of this type.

My labeling legislation would prevent a cigarette like Winston from advertising: "Fine, mild tobacco, expertly blended and specially refined for filter smoking." According to the April tests, Winston was one of the strongest cigarettes around. It had 36 percent more tar than Parliament, 58 percent more than Kent. If it had to specify its tar and nicotine content, every smoker would know that. According to the July Digest tests, Winston is still highest in tar of all filter tips.

And finally, I shall recommend that a program to educate school children on the cigarette-health problem be conducted by the United States Public Health Service and the United States Office of Education in cooperation with the proper authorities in the States. A great deal of cigarette advertising is slanted toward young people. The Boston Sunday Globe has been running a comic strip: "Philip Morris, the cigarette with the man's kind of mildness, presents 'Duke' Handy."

While many adults admittedly read comic strips, they are primarily designed for the young, and in this series Philip Morris obviously is putting its arguments before lots of young people.

Camel's TV commercial has a similar appeal when it shows Lew Burdette on the mound at the Yankee Stadium while the announcer intones, "He likes the rich tobacco flavor of Camels. The agreeable mildness, that makes this cigarette so easy to get along with." In other words, Camels don't affect Burdette's breathing or his athletic prowess, and what's good enough for him is good enough for you.

I believe it is the duty of the Federal Government to warn boys and girls of the dangers of smoking. The Surgeon General of the United States has issued two statements on the causal relationship between cigarette smoking and cancer of the lung. But neither he nor members of his staff have done a job in bringing the story to the people. The United States Public Health Service has not a single movie, slide film, or booklet on cigarette smoking. This is in contrast to England, where warnings are issued to the general public.

It's not that I don't like cigarettes. I smoke them. But I believe the American public thinks its Government protects it from false and misleading advertising. The fact is, up to now, the Government has followed a largely hands-off policy as far as cigarettes are concerned. It's time for a change.

Opinion at the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, people back home are really doing some thinking these days. They are frightened at the growing national debt, wondering if the dollar will continue to buy less, disappointed that taxes are not being reduced, alarmed over trends toward bigger and costlier Government.

They realize national defense must be supported, but seriously question the wisdom of Congress making appropriations for additional domestic programs when, in the face of international unrest, our Government is already obligated for annual mandatory outlays approaching $20 billion.

They just do not feel that the Congress is exercising good fiscal judgment.

Of course, they are praying that we avoid being dragged into another world war, but they say it is high time our Government demonstrates a show of strength in its dealings with the Kremlin. They approve sending marines to keep face with Chamoun and agree that we should act through the U. N. as long as that body is capable of performing world service.

Members of Congress should not forget that the money they are spending is the people's money and their votes are being watched as never before.

Hawaii—Resource for America's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions during the 85th Congress, I have drawn the attention of the Members of the Congress to the invaluable and irreplaceable resource the United States of America has in the people of Hawaii. I have pointed out, also, that the great Union of States that is America needs Hawaii as a State, for only under the conditions of statehood can the resource of Hawaii reach its maximum potential and make its fullest contribution.

On January 23, 1957, I included for printing in the RECORD an article entitled "Man of the Pacific." Today, I draw the attention of the Members of the Congress to an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Friday, July 25, 1958, which quotes that renowned and dedicated American military leader, Adm. Felix B. Stump, whose international undertakings in the civilian field have contributed so greatly to the stability of our position in Asia.

Admiral Stump's words reflect the previous expression of President Emeritus Gregg M. Sinclair, of the University of Hawaii, who said:

[Hawaii] is the path of the United States into a future world understanding.

The man of the Pacific, in the words of Raymond Coll, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser—

is a fine, upstanding man of unswerving loyalty to and high pride in this his country, the United States of America.

Contrary to some expressions, the people of Hawaii are a reason for the admission of Hawaii as a State, not a reason against.

HAWAII: PACIFIC CATALYST

Adm. Felix B. Stump has an apt description of Hawaii.

"Hawaii," he said as he received an honorary degree at the University of Hawaii this week, "is a catalytic agent, bringing together and promoting understanding between Asians and Americans; showing free Asian people the kind of people we are and our desire to help them stand fast against communism. Nowhere in the United States can this be done except in Hawaii."

Admiral Stump, soon to retire after more than 40 years of naval service, paid special tribute to the University of Hawaii. He said:

"I feel honored in accepting this degree because the University of Hawaii leads in the lines I am interested in. I am interested in Asia; and the University of Hawaii, more than any other university, can help us in Asia."

The university campus is a remarkably apt meeting place for people from the American Continents and from Asia. Here they readily develop the personal understanding and friendship that marked American stewardship in the Philippines before the granting of independence 12 years ago—and the strong bonds of friendship which prevail today between the American and the Filipino peoples.

Visitors from Asia at the university often ask Americans of Asian ancestry why we don't work for independence of Hawaii.

"We're Americans," is the emphatic reply. Thus is born a better appreciation of Americans—the strong loyalty which living in the United States creates in United States citizens.

Admiral Stump's brief remarks emphasized the importance of our university in the future of the Pacific.

Many in Hawaii underestimate that importance. Men of Admiral Stump's training, experience, and insight do not.

Most Latin Americans Feel Nixon Visit Improved Ties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, after the return of the Vice President from South America some weeks ago much was written in the newspaper about the tenor of the feeling in South America with reference to the United States.

Naturally, most opinions were formed as a result of some of the mobs which formed in two of the cities visited by the Nixon's. That kind of publicity is always spectacular and makes front-page news. The first real spadework that has been done to determine the sentiment of feeling about that trip is reported by Elmo C. Wilson, director, World Poll, as reported in the New York Herald Tribune of July 27. This report is based upon sentiment as reported interviews with people in those countries and the percentages of the people interviewed are set out. The number of people reporting more good than harm from that trip is indeed surprising—running as high as 72 percent in Bogota, Colombia, and Lima, Peru.

This report is most heartening to Americans who are of good will and had hoped that the people of South America felt the same toward them. I am happy to append the results of the poll in full. I am sure it will do much to correct some of the misrepresentations which have been made as to sentiment in South America toward the United States:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 27, 1958]

MOST LATIN AMERICANS FEEL NIXON VISIT IMPROVED TIES

(By Elmo C. Wilson, director, World Poll)

In all Latin American capitals recently surveyed, the number of people who regarded the Vice President's visit as a plus for relations between their country and the United States was greater than the number who say harmful effects from the visit.

NIXON SEEN EFFECTIVE

Despite the overt and organized actions against him, the Vice President's role as an ambassador of good will seems to have been effective in most of the countries he visited.

"The purpose of Mr. NIXON's trip was to serve as an ambassador of good will. In terms of creating a more favorable impression of the United States in this country, do you think his trip did more good than harm, or more harm than good?"

	Percent			
	More good than harm	More harm than good	Made no difference	No opinion, no answer
Bogotá, Colombia	72	9	11	8
Lima, Peru	72	15	7	6
Montevideo, Uruguay	63	20	11	6
Mexico City, Mexico	56	27	4	13
Caracas, Venezuela	47	36	11	6
Buenos Aires, Argentina	39	28	21	12

Surprisingly, since it was in Lima that the first eruptions of violence against him took place, the Peruvians range very high on the score of feeling that the trip was successful in creating a favorable impression of the United States. Many of the citizens of the Peruvian capital seem to have been impressed by his fortitude and his willingness to speak up to the hostile university students there.

VENEZUELA DUBIOUS

The Colombians also tended to be impressed by Mr. NIXON's ambassadorial achievements, while the strongest doubts in this regard came from the Venezuelans.

On this issue there were no important differences among the various age groups, although there were slight evidences that in some of the capital cities the higher income groups were more convinced of his effectiveness than were the poorer elements.

The following figures for Caracas and Montevideo are illustrative of this:

	Percent			
	More good than harm	More harm than good	Made no difference	No opinion, no answer
Among Venezuelans with—				
Higher incomes	54	30	11	5
Lower incomes	33	48	11	8
Among Uruguayans with—				
Higher incomes	71	15	10	4
Lower incomes	54	25	13	8

"The purpose of Mr. NIXON's trip was to serve as an ambassador of good will. In terms of creating a more favorable impression of the United States in this country, do you think his trip did more good than harm, or more harm than good?"

THE SECOND QUESTION

In five of the South American capitals visited by Mr. NIXON, and in Mexico City, which was not on his itinerary, World Poll interviewers asked cross sections of the population the same question. An Elmo Roper poll also asked a similar question of a representative sample of the United States population.

Of the countries visited by Mr. NIXON, the Colombians were least likely to believe their citizens shared the views of the rioters in the other capitals. And, indeed, there were no visible demonstrations against him in Bogota.

Asked in Latin America:

"While Mr. NIXON, who is Vice President of the United States, was on a recent visit to South America there were some violent demonstrations against him in Caracas and Lima. With regard to this country, do you think that those demonstrations reflect also the sentiment of most of the citizens of our country, of a sizable group, or of only a small number?"

Asked in the United States:

"On Vice President NIXON's recent trip to South America, do you think the demonstrations against him reflected the sentiments of most of the people there, of a sizable group, or of only a small number?"

	Percent				
	Most of the citizens	A sizable group	Only a small group	No one	No opinion, no answer
Mexico City, Mexico	4	17	39	29	11
Bogotá, Colombia	5	21	64	------	10
Montevideo, Uruguay	11	25	57	------	7
Buenos Aires, Argentina	11	30	48	------	11
Lima, Peru	14	18	64	------	4
Caracas, Venezuela	17	22	54	------	7
United States	6	23	58	------	13

Because the ringleaders of the demonstrations against NIXON appeared to have been drawn from university student groups, it is interesting to compare the attitudes of the various age groups in the six cities on this question:

"While Mr. NIXON, who is Vice President of the United States, was on a recent visit to South America, there were some violent demonstrations against him in Caracas and Lima. With regard to this country, do you think that those demonstrations reflect also the sentiments of most of the citizens of our country, of a sizable group, or of only a small number?"

	Percent				
	Most of the citizens	A sizable group	Only a small group	No one	No opinion, no answer
Among Mexicans—					
18 to 34 years	4	18	42	23	13
35 years and older	5	16	36	34	9
Among Colombians—					
18 to 34 years	5	30	54	------	11
35 years and older	6	14	71	------	9
Among Uruguayans—					
18 to 34 years	13	32	48	------	7
35 years and older	10	20	63	------	7
Among Argentines—					
18 to 34 years	12	25	49	------	14
35 years and older	11	33	46	------	10
Among Peruvians—					
18 to 34 years	14	18	63	------	5
35 years and older	14	19	65	------	2
Among Venezuelans—					
18 to 34 years	19	24	51	------	6
35 years and older	15	19	57	------	9

The younger Uruguayans, together with the Venezuelans under 35, were most willing to believe that most or at least a sizable group of their compatriots shared the feelings of the demonstrators.

TVA: Model for Democracy in Action Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the distinguished Representative from Minnesota, the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by one of his constituents, a distinguished economist, Mr. W. S. Woytinsky, who reported on the attitudes of South Americans toward the United States. Among the significant comments made by this distinguished reporter was one on the deep impression which our own Tennessee Valley Authority has made on the thinking and the planning of our neighbors to the south. He points out also that it is unfortunate that so many Americans, including those in high places who visit Latin America, do not appreciate the significance and importance of this influence.

Mr. Speaker, this is true not only of the Lation American nations, but also of other nations throughout the world. Especially to the underdeveloped nations who are attempting to better their way of life, the TVA has been a model of democracy in action. In view of this, and believing that my colleagues will find it interesting to review the influence of the TVA around the world, I insert in the Appendix, under unanimous consent, an article by Prof. Henry C. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, in a recent issue of the Progressive magazine, entitled, "TVA Around the World." The article follows:

TVA AROUND THE WORLD

(By Henry C. Hart)

"President Tito Visits 'French TVA,'" "A TVA for the Khuzestan Region," "Colombia's TVA Gets the Green Light"—these are among last year's headlines from the New York Times and Time which illustrate a semantic development Julian Huxley noted 15 years ago: "In almost every country, the initials TVA stand for the multiple use of a single river to meet all the needs of man."

That the initials of an American agency should be the word by which most men everywhere refer to intensive river development is itself something of an achievement. But has TVA given more than its name to foreign projects?

What we need to answer that question is the view of foreign political leaders themselves—the men who planned and legislated the projects. We can sample that view authentically in the case of India—a nation which is not underdeveloped in recording and publishing its political decisions. We need to go back 15 years to the genesis of India's TVA—the Damodar Valley Corp.

World War II was closing in on India in July 1943, when the Damodar River burst its levees. It is not a big river, but the flood struck at a crucial time, destroying 200,000 acres of rice, cutting the rails to Calcutta, and sharply intensifying the horrible Bengal

famine. The wartime British governor of Bengal was an action-minded Australian, R. G. Casey. To the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, he sent off a preliminary proposal to store the floods for hydroelectricity and irrigation. At one point, the proposal said flatly, "The nearest parallel to the Damodar is in the Tennessee Valley, United States of America." Lord Wavell's reaction broke directly away from the normal strategy of empire. Against the recorded opposition of British interests who would lose not only prestige but probably design and equipment contracts for the project, he cabled the British Ambassador in Washington to enlist a TVA engineer to come to this British colony, not on a flying consultant trip, but to stay and design the engineering harness for the Damodar.

The man who went was William L. Voorduin. In his 10 years at TVA he had had the opportunity to create for himself a then new profession—that of planning engineer. His skill was in the strategy, not merely the tactics, of using a river. In 6 months, as actual head of an Indian government agency, he had produced a plan for the unified development of the Damodar River. (That phrasing of the title is the hall mark of the TVA influence on river engineering around the world.)

Two years later Voorduin left India in the midst of the bloody Hindu-Muslim riots, afraid that his foresighted scheme was lost in the birthpangs of the new nation. Meanwhile, other men, sophisticated in Indian administration and politics, had taken up the cause. Dr. Sudhir Sen, sent from his post at the Indian Embassy in Moscow to Knoxville to observe the TVA model, went home to negotiate the agreement with the two Indian states through which the Damodar flows.

In 1948, when the bill creating the Damodar Valley Corporation reached the floor of the Indian legislature, shrewd minister N. V. Gadgil prepared for the job of steering it through by watching a TVA movie. He declared with pride, "The bill that is now before this House is modeled on the provisions of the Tennessee Valley bill which was passed by the Congress of the United States of America." The only criticism that argument drew was from an M. P. who thought a minor provision of the Indian bill departed needlessly from the language of the TVA act. Without making a search of the record of laws transplated among nations, I doubt whether there are many analogies to this situation. Dictators have imposed foreign models often enough, and former colonies have copied the mother country. But to search the world, and take from a country with which you have had no previous relations a pattern for an agency, an engineering plan, a form of intergovernmental relations, and a statute, is something else again.

The use India has made of the TVA example is, by now, greater still. Sudhir Sen, as general manager of the Damodar Valley Corporation, repeatedly used TVA experience in solving his agency's problems. Prime Minister Nehru consulted two former chairmen of TVA, Arthur Morgan and David E. Lilienthal. Andrew Komora, once construction engineer at Norris Dam, has now finished his sixth year, and sixth day, as chief engineer of the DVC. When he showed me around the half-finished Maithon Dam, speaking proudly of the young Indian engineers who had taken command, he chuckled over one curious TVA contribution. It was a large manganese-steel casting—the jaw of a heavy-duty rock crusher. After sizing the stone for Norris Dam's concrete, it was sold to Shasta in California. DVC had bought it at a bargain and it was still inexhaustible.

What are the sources of TVA's apparently limitless influence overseas? First, certainly its high visibility. In the first 10 years after the war, TVA had 12,000 visitors from 90 countries. Some were tourists. But others were men like the directors of the Corporacion Autonoma Regional del Cauca (Colombia); Ambassador Norman Makin of Australia, whose government had asked him to get information for the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority; President Aleman of Mexico and his Secretary for Hydraulic Resources; the chief civil engineer of Uruguay's Rio Negro Project; Abdullah Khan, president of the Helmand Valley Authority in Afghanistan.

What these hundreds of engineers, planners, and lawmakers saw in TVA was a demonstration of work their countries needed. They saw how it had been done, not only the concrete and the steel, but the wording of the law, and the relaxed, man-to-man way the TVA-paid assistant county agent talked phosphates with a Cumberland Mountain farmer. The confidence of accomplished results, as well as the techniques, equipped them to win support for a TVA counterpart back home. Of all the things that are done to develop a poor country, dams, canals, and transmission lines have the greatest power to catch the eye—and the imagination. But the dramatic look of TVA has been given a limitless reach and a profound as well as a sharply defined meaning by the articles, books, and speeches of David E. Lilienthal and Gordon Clapp, and the band of professionally competent crusaders who worked for TVA.

The TVA's alumni are, indeed, the second great source of its influence abroad. The roster, far too long and varied to list here, certainly begins with Lilienthal and Clapp. In 1955, after each had served as an international consultant on a highly delicate mission, Lilienthal on the Indus River which flows from India through Pakistan, and Clapp on the Jordan, they teamed up with an experienced international investment banking firm, Lazard Freres, to establish the Development & Resources Corp. The TVA's pioneers set up shop at 50 Broadway, not many doors off Wall Street. Lilienthal put the new firm to work advising the Government of Colombia how it could exploit the water and power of the Cauca River to open up for farming and industry a beautiful valley high on the western slopes of the Andes. The first dam is almost finished now; it will send 90,000 kilowatts into the booming city of Cali in the heart of the valley. Flood control, irrigation for sugarcane and rice, a new highway down to the Pacific, and new industries are coming with the dam.

The Lilienthal-Clapp firm is now deeply involved in another TVA-like enterprise in Iran. Director Abol Hassan Ebtehaj, of the Iranian plan organization, called on their corporation in 1956 to see what could be done with the barren southwest corner of his country, Khuzestan, one of the hottest places inhabited by men. When the Lilienthal-Clapp plan came in, the decisive Ebtehaj promptly commissioned their firm to build it. He released $38 million of Iran's oil money to get the project started. The Development & Resources Corp. had never before accepted construction responsibilities. But just about now dirt will begin to move on the first Khuzestan dam in a gorge of the Diz River 150 miles north of the Persian Gulf. By 1962 it ill be storing water to irrigate an eventual 250,000 acres and generate 80,000 kilowatts of power.

As in TVA, the river will be made to serve a complex of agricultural and industrial developments already authorized to be built halfway down from the dam to the Persian Gulf. A refinery will process sugar from the irrigated plantations. To this now desolate spot will come a sure water supply from the reservoirs above, electricity from the thermal plants at the Abadan refineries (even before the dam is complete), and an enormous supply of piped-in natural gas. The first industry will be a plant turning out 9 million pounds of plastics per year. "From the petrochemical point of view," said Lilienthal last October, "this area resembles the gulf coast 25 years ago, except its resources are greater."

Coordinator of the international planning, design, and construction group in Iran is another TVA alumnus—John B. Blanford, Jr., former general manager.

The variety of jobs being done on river valley development abroad by other former TVA people is suggested by even a small sample:

Carl A. Bock, chief engineer, and from 1953, head of the Water Resources Authority of Puerto Rico.

James B. Hayes, chief engineer of the 1948 Palestine Commission, and Van Court Hare, engineer for the 1953 U. N. Advisory Commission, to plan development of the Jordan Valley.

A. A. Meyer, chief design engineer, and William J. Hayes, technical adviser, of the Cauca Valley Corporation in Colombia.

John P. Ferris, in general charge, to 1957, of the work in southern Asia of the United States International Cooperation Administration.

What is it that commends men like these not just as consultants or contractors, but to carry some of the responsibility of the governments that hired them? I think it is the demonstration of their TVA performance that they can put fine technical skills to the service of public aims and economic transformations that reach way beyond engineering.

"If we are successful here," Franklin D. Roosevelt told Congress in calling for TVA, "we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders." What an ironic sequel this 25th anniversary of that eloquent message reveals. At least eight nations have "marched on" consciously to apply the lessons of TVA to their rivers; the United States Government, author of the experiment, has stood still.

I think it is possible, by examining the record of the export of the TVA idea, to come close to explaining this paradox. The TVA has been taken as a model, first, for rivers of middle size. Little watersheds are developed as features of agricultural or city water supply programs. The giants—the Indus, the Nile, the Rhine—like our own Ohio and Missouri, are too big to encompass with a unified development.

It is interesting, too, that the TVA idea has been most usable in semi-developed nations. To take the first steps from poverty and tradition a single-purpose development may stretch a nation's capacity—the old British Gezira irrigation scheme on the Sudanese Nile may seem a more appropriate model than TVA. It was a brutal aspect of the poverty of India when she attained independence that only in one small valley, the Damodar, could she afford a plan to stop floods. Her larger rivers had to be harnessed initially for irrigation and electricity, which would pay out in money, not lives. The highly developed countries of Western Europe, and even Japan, have found their river valleys already committed to earlier navigation, or hydroelectric development, or water supply, or irrigation, or transport, or industrial uses too far reaching to incorporate into a unified plan centered on the river. The TVA idea has fit best the hitherto slightly exploited river basins in nations (or even empires), having some means, some markets, and some qualified men, but wanting more.

So far, too, no country has built a second project of the TVA pattern. Perhaps the intensive development of a river, apace with the related development of forests, farms,

and minerals which can be tied in with it via hydroelectricity, or transport, or irrigation, or watershed protection, is inherently a pilot plant operation. Perhaps, as some entirely dispassionate American political scientists believe, the tie of the land and the minerals to the river that drains them is not made by nature, but by imaginative men. And once the value of the development of related resources has been demonstrated, nationwide programs tend to spring up—soil conservation, encouragement of small industries, rural electrification, adult education, and many more. The valley authority may have extended its lessons without extending its form.

Certainly there is one powerful force working for valley authorities abroad which is missing at home—the World Bank. The utterly pragmatic loan examiners sent out by bank chairman Eugene R. Black want irrigation, and kilowatts, and increased productive capacity for every dollar they invest. Projects for hydroelectricity, irrigation, and flood control, incidentally, have received more loans from the bank (close to $1 billion) than any other type of project. And so, as for the Damodar, the Cauca, the Ping River in Thailand, the Litani River in Lebanon, the bank itself has insisted on making its loan to a regional, businesslike agency—an agency like TVA. To quote Black's reasoning:

"The bank places particular stress upon the assurance of adequate management for the project. * * * In this connection, the bank has frequently insisted, in the case of Government projects, that their operation be entrusted to a quasiautonomous authority, or in some other fashion be insulated from political pressures and the rigidities of Government administrative procedures."

A satirist of contemporary ideologies would certainly find it amusing that these semideveloped countries, some of them addicted to a socialist ideal, have employed a businesslike, corporate organization for their new river development, while business-oriented America leans on the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. There may even be some wry humor in the profligate manner in which the House and Senate Appropriations Committees still finance domestic dams, as compared to the hard-boiled insistence on results of an international "giveaway" agency.

Now Russia, and soon China, will be pushing us hard as exemplars to the nations on how to use the water in their rivers to break loose from the immemorial circle of poverty, wasted resources, and human frustration. The dams they are building now are bigger than ours, much bigger. So far, I hope this report makes plain, our example, our people, our ideas have been influential abroad at the level of policy decisions, and not just engineering techniques. In that we have a precious advantage over the Russians in any free country. Only satellite countries will do what we, or the Communists, say is good for them. Independent countries will accept what we have demonstrated is good for us.

Beneath their propaganda, Russia and China appeal to underdeveloped nations as models because they can say, "you can do it, too." What we prosperous Americans are liable to overlook is that the power of TVA to inspire men abroad, now that we are turning our backs on it at home, comes from precisely the same identification, carried one vital step further. What the engineers and the lawmakers from poor countries hear when they drive out of Knoxville and stop at a hillside farmhouse is, at bottom, this: "We were poor, too, 25 years ago. We always had been. You can do what we did using your river and your soil. But you can do it and keep running your own government, too. In fact, with your demonstration farms and co-ops, and your unions, and your new schools, you can do it better that way."

Who will teach the world the lesson for the next round of development: how to organize the programs pioneered by the valley authorities on a national scale, how to reach the little watersheds, how to plan for the giant rivers; more important, how to select and plan and make use of the whole gamut of resource improvements?

Electricity plus Soviets equals communism, said Lenin. We once showed men from every country that we could add something to electricity to equal democracy. Can we add it still?

TVA'S AROUND THE WORLD

Projects expressly modeled in part on TVA include: Damodar Valley Corporation, India; Helmand Valley Authority, Afghanistan; Khuzestan project, Iran; Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, Puerto Rico; Corporacion Autonoma Regional Del Cauca, Colombia; Snowy Mountains Hydroelectric Authority, Australia; Papaloapan Commission, Mexico; Litani River Authority, Lebanon.

Threat of Global Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald.

This editorial is based on a very thought provoking book recently published by the National Planning Association. This book is entitled "1970 Without Arms Control" and it portrays graphically the growing danger of the nuclear arms race between the Soviets and the nuclear weapon owning nations in the free world.

THREAT OF GLOBAL WARFARE

The National Planning Association adds to our worries by reporting the dangers of global war are real and will continue as a menace for the next few years. The explanation of this gloomy outlook is that irresponsible parties may get hold of some nuclear bombs and accidentally set off the fireworks. The idea is not as far-fetched as it may sound; somebody will spill the beans so that anyone desirous of doing so may buy or build some deadly bombs.

Russia may have been playing fast and loose with realities when she charged the United States was flirting with war by sending bomb-carrying planes across the ice floes of the Arctic, but not alarmingly. Two may play at that game, and regardless of how skillfully the game is conducted, there always is danger that a trigger-happy individual may decide to risk the consequences just to see how much devilment a bomb explosion can create.

For some reason or other the Middle East seems ripe for a great upheaval. If we dare not trust the Soviets in a talk fest, how can we trust them to withhold bombs from the troublemakers huddled around the Mediterranean? A bomb released in any of the small nations could create a medley of wars that would challenge the rest of the world to extinguish. The only safe way to deal with nuclear bombs is to destroy them before it is too late, and the formulas for them.

The successful creation of A-bombs and H-bombs has created a new menace, one that posses the greatest destructive power in history. It is next to impossible to keep these instruments out of the hands of irresponsible persons, either the careless or the more willful who would carelessly, or with malice aforethought, shoot a few bombs just to see what would happen.

The outbreak in Labanon is characteristic of the thinking of the rebellions. The United States has granted several millions of dollars to aid Lebanon, on a matching basis, but that kind of aid is not enough. Lebanon demands more money and unrestricted management, under prospects of changing allegiance to Russia. Things are a little uncertain in the Middle East.

Cleaning Up Our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, water pollution control and water conservation in general is largely thought of in terms of health, recreation, and even economics. Another aspect, although seldom discussed, is legal in character.

Recognizing this fact, the Federal Bar Association in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., recently spnsored a briefing conference on water resources here in Washington. One of the most important papers presented at the cnference was delivered by Mr. Murray Stein, Chief, Interstate Enforcement Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Control program, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. For a concise and yet detailed explanation of the Federal water pollution control program and its importance to the future development of our Nation, I highly recommment that every Member of the House read Mr. Stein's paper entitled "Cleaning Up Our Water":

CLEANING UP OUR WATER

In the long run no civilization is stronger than its natural resources. Our unique heritage of personal and economic freedom, coupled with the preeminent position of the United States among nations, is due to a fortunate coalescence of enlightened political philosophy, temperate climate, and abundance of natural resources.

Not the least of these resources has been an ample supply of water of usable quality in large segments of the country. Ample up to now—but with our explosive population growth and industrial expansion, including amazing new chemical and nuclear technologies, even the humid parts of the country are beginning to be pinched for enough water of usable quality. Thus we may be at the dawn of an era where water of usable quality will be this country's most critical natural resource.

In recognition of the need for action to protect this vital resource, more definite water resource policies are being evolved by the Federal Government, the States, and regional and local groups. Conferences such as this one provide the synthesis of ideas necessary for the establishment of these policies. Out of such meetings has come the inexorable conclusion that a water resource policy must be based on hard scientific facts

concerning the quantity, location, and quality of water.

First, we must recognize the basic fact that pending a breakthrough which will permit economical conversion of salt water to usable water on a large scale, this country today has just about the same amount of water as was available the day Columbus arrived. If we rely on natural phenomena, and make allowances for dry and wet cycles, we can be reasonably certain that the total amount of water will not materially increase or decrease in the future. Demands on this relatively fixed supply will become increasingly acute as our population, agriculture, and industry expand.

A second consideration is the fact that surface and underground waters are confined by nature to the drainage basins and aquifers in which they are found. Like the wind, water is restless and moves from place to place. In so doing, it does not respect political boundaries—local, State, or Federal. Therefore, any comprehensive water resource policy must be based on or take into account the drainage basin concept with its interstate aspects. Water resource policies also must take into account hydrological information on the character of underground aquifers.

Third, we must come to the realization that the assimilative powers of the Nation's waters to absorb wastes are limited. In many areas of the country the polluted conditions of our waters make them unfit for a variety of legitimate water uses. And we are awakening to the realization that having polluted water is almost as bad as having no water at all.

Taking these basic precepts into account, the objectives of a water-resource policy may be stated as: (1) The equitable apportionment of water among competing demands; (2) stabilization of water flows and water supply; and (3) improving water quality.

The equitable apportionment of water among often conflicting interests may well be one of the major social-legal-political problem areas of our time. Any determination in this area, however, necessarily will be shaped and limited by the quantity and quality of water available.

More and more of our water courses are becoming regulated streams. Water is stored and judicially released so as to prevent floods and yet provide adequate stream flows to meet a variety of other uses.

Along with effective regulation of water quantity there is the need for astute, comprehensive, water quality management to insure that water is in a condition which meets the requirements of legitimate water uses. These uses are:

(1) Municipal and domestic water supply; (2) industrial; (3) agricultural; (4) fish and wildlife propagation; (5) recreation; (6) navigation; (7) power development; and (8) transportation of wastes.

In addition, most important watercourses must be managed so as to prevent floods and protect the public health. Aspects which are often apt to be overlooked are those concerned with use of water within the stream bed, i. e., dilution of water for carrying away effluents from waste treatment plants, and the needs of fish and wildlife, recreation, and navigation. Significant in this respect are the increased demands the American people are making for active and passive water recreation facilities.

In recognition of the emerging national character of the problem of improving the quality of the Nation's waters, bills to establish a Federal water pollution control program were introduced in every Congress since 1900 (except the war years). It was not until 1948 that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. This act was amended extensively by the 84th Congress, and the new Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 660, 84th Cong.) was approved by the President on July 9, 1956. This program is administered by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Federal act reaffirms the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. The Federal role is to support and aid technical research and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to States, interstate agencies, and municipalities.

The activities authorized by the Federal act to implement this policy include:

1. Development of comprehensive programs for control of water pollution in cooperation with other Federal agencies, States, interstate agencies, municipalities, and industries.

2. Encouragement of interstate compacts and improved State laws.

3. Conduct and support of research, investigations, and training, and dissemination of information.

4. Technical services to States.

5. Basic data collection and evaluation.

6. Program grants to States and interstate agencies.

7. Grants to municipalities for construction of sewage-treatment works.

8. Federal enforcement measures to abate pollution of interstate waters.

STATE LAWS

In order to carry out its statutory responsibility to encourage improved State laws, the Public Health Service in 1950 issued a suggested State Water Pollution Control Act. This suggested act was prepared after complete analysis of all existing State water pollution control laws of the States and Territories, and consultation with and comment from State water pollution control administrators, attorneys, municipal groups, industry, and others interested in the field. The principles of the suggested act have been used by 33 States in amending existing State water pollution control legislation or in enacting new legislation. This suggested act has become the basic document which is considered before State legislation is drafted. It should be emphasized that this is a suggested, not a model act. As water resources conditions and water pollution control problems vary from State to State, it is believed that the legislative approach to solving the problems must also vary. Further, use of these different approaches affords an opportunity to examine and test new techniques. The Public Health Service is now contemplating a second analysis covering all current State and Territorial water pollution control acts, which will be used as a basis for a revision of the suggested State act. We expect to have the revision ready for the 1959 State legislative sessions.

INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT

Under the Federal act, pollution of interstate waters which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is subject to abatement. Briefly, the interstate enforcement feature of the act may be considered in three major steps:

1. A conference with State and interstate agencies to determine the nature of an interstate pollution problem, the adequacy of treatment measures taken, and the nature of delays, if any. The conference may be called by the Surgeon General if he believes that pollution subject to abatement under the act is occurring; it must be called if the Surgeon General is requested to do so by a State water pollution control agency, or a governor of a State.

2. A public hearing, called by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when a reasonable time has been allowed, following the initial conference, for the abatement of the pollution.

3. If remedial action is not taken, following the hearing, the matter can be referred to the Attorney General for court action upon the request of a receiving State or the consent of the discharging State.

In only one case has it been necessary to go to the hearing stage. In all other cases satisfactory action seems to have been achieved around the conferenec table.

We find that getting the State water pollution control agencies around the conference table with the persons responsible for an interstate pollution situation is a most helpful mechanism for getting results. It is on this device that we are placing our present enforcement emphasis. The conference idea is not a new one. As long ago as 1921, the judge in the famous case of *New York* v. *New Jersey*, stated: "We cannot withhold the suggestion, inspired by the consideration of this case, that the grave problem of sewage disposal presented by the large and growing populations living on the shores of New York Bay is more likely to be wisely solved by cooperative study and by conference and mutual concession on the part of representatives of the States so vitally interested in it than by proceedings in any court, however constituted."

In addition, we are preparing dockets on about 150 actual and potential intertsate pollution areas. With this information kept current we can: (1) Provide accurate information on this problem when it is requested; (2) use the data to guide our actions when enforcement becomes necessary; and (3) use the data to encourage the adoption of programs to prevent relatively clean areas from becoming polluted.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The Public Health Service also encourages the formation of interstate compacts by participating in negotiations and giving technical advice and assistance when requested. The compacts now in existence having substantial water pollution control functions are:

1. Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware.

2. New England intertsate water pollution control compact: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.

3. Tristate Compact, interstate sanitation commission: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut.

4. Ohio River Valley water sanitation compact: Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia.

5. Bistate development agency: Missouri, Illinois.

6. Intertsate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, District of Columbia.

7. Klamath River Basin compact: California, Oregon.

In the process of negotiation or approval are the following:

1. Tennessee River Basin water pollution control compact: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia;

2. Columbia River Basin compact: Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

3. Arkansas River compact: Kansas, Oklahoma.

4. Red River compact: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.

5. Little Missouri River compact: Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming.

More and more water apportionment compacts are giving consideration to inclusion of pollution control features as the recognition of the need for quality as well as

quantity of water becomes increasingly evident.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Under the Water Pollution Control Act, construction grants are made for municipal waste treatment works in the amount of 30 percent of the cost of the project, or $250,000, whichever is less. An annual appropriation of $50 million is authorized for this purpose, up to an aggregate of $500 million. Grants are made to those projects which have been certified by the State water pollution control agencies as having priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs. Therefore, this grant program is a cooperative Federal-State program and not a Federal-municipal program as are many other similar construction programs, in which the States are bypassed.

The construction grants program has been in actual operation for about 18 months. Examination of construction award data indicates that substantial progress in pollution abatement is being afforded through the stimulus of these Federal grants. After a sharp decline in the first quarter of 1957, the seasonally adjusted anual rate of contract awards for sewage treatment works construction has maintained an almost steady upward trend. By the end of March 1958, the rate had reached the highest level on record. This steady increase, in contrast to the declining trend for collecting sewers and waterworks, indicates the stimulation afforded by the construction grants program.

PROGRAM GRANTS

Up to $3 million a year is authorized for grants to States and interstate agencies for the extension and improvement of their water pollution control programs. Here are some interesting examples of progress made in 1957 in expanding State and interstate water pollution control programs:

1. Total personnel employed increased from 604 to 709, an increase of 17.5 percent.

2. Twenty-one agencies increased activities involving stream surveys.

3. Forty-four agencies bought major items of field, laboratory, and office equipment.

4. Sixteen agencies initiated or expanded research programs.

5. Twenty-six agencies added radiological surveillance to water quality programs.

RESEARCH

The belief seems to be widespread that the pollution control problems of the country may be solved by the provision of money and construction engineering know-how. Nothing is more misleading. The gap between what we know about the increasingly complex water pollution problems and what we need to know is growing yearly. By and large the answers we must have will come from research. Unfortunately, the growth of research in water supply and water pollution control has been relatively slow. Since the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, the Public Health Service has been able to double its previous research program. The Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati is carrying on research in three major areas of water quality management interest—water supply, sewage treatment, and industrial waste treatment. Although most of this research is carried out by our own people, some is done on contract with outside organizations when this is more efficient or when such organizations can provide personnel, equipment, or competency in highly specialized areas. In addition to direct and contract research, the Service makes research grants for projects proposed by qualified individuals and organizations that meet high standards of potential significance and validity.

TECHNICAL SERVICES

A major element of the Federal program is the provision of technical services on request by Federal, State, interstate, municipal, and other agencies. These professional services are given by our staffs at the Sanitary Engineering Center and in our regional offices. Assistance has been extended to all the States and Territories for consultation, laboratory investigations, and field studies. Projects referred to our Cincinnati laboratories for technical assistance are carefully screened for research value.

Recently, many States have been able to increase their programs and staffs to a point where they are able to solve most of their own problems. This is permitting the Service to direct more and more of its technical assistance effort into problems of an interstate and regional nature rather than into special problems of an individual State. An example of such a regional problem, now being studied by the Service, is the problem of pollution by natural salt deposits and by oilfield brines in the Southwest. This creates a regional water-quality problem in an area of already limited water resources.

To study this regional problem, we have initiated in the Arkansas and Red River Basins a water-quality conservation project in cooperation with the States and local communities of the area. Its purpose is to find ways of preventing and controlling brine pollution. In many ways this project is a pioneering operation that we believe will demonstrate the values of both immediate and long-range water resources quality management planning. The engineering facts from this study will permit Federal, State, and local agencies to build water-resources projects with assurance as to the water quality that will be obtained. In addition, the study will provide a water-quality inventory of two of the Southwest's most important resources—the Arkansas and Red Rivers.

BASIC DATA

In recent years there has been growing concern over the lack of basic information on the Nation's water resources. As a consequence, the Congress inserted in this act authority for the Service to collect and disseminate basic data on water quality.

We have initiated a long-range basic data program in which State and local agencies are actively participating. We are also establishing a national network of water quality sampling stations to provide data on trends of improvement or deterioration of water across the country. To date, 44 stations have been placed in operation and a national total of 250 to 300 stations is planned.

We are also bringing up to date our inventories of water supply, sewerage, and industrial waste treatment facilities. These are soon to be printed along with more than 30 tables of evaluated data taken from them. Also, the 1957 issue of our annual publication of contract award data is now in press.

Working with State and Federal agencies, municipalities, industry, conservationists, and other groups interested in water resource problems, the Public Health Service, under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, is making a concerted effort to improve the quality of the Nation's waters. We believe that water quality management is an essential part of maintaining and preserving the water resources of this country for our people. And we believe that the adequacy of our future water supply will be assured when the American people have a full understanding of the relationship which this program of water quality management bears to the provision of adequate quantities of water.

Distinguished World Visitors Beat Path to TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the great influence of the TVA as a model of democracy in action has been pointed out by many observers of the world. TVA reports that it is receiving critical and intensive study by private and governmental organizations throughout the civilized world. Hundreds of persons are coming to the Tennessee Valley each year to see TVA in operation. More than half are from countries other than the United States. They come to see for themselves how this great American institution operates and to draw from it lessons for application to their own lands.

In this connection and under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix a tabulation and summary list of special distinguished foreign visitors and guests for the past 10 years to the TVA. The list follows:

These special visitors divide themselves roughly into two groups. The first and smaller one is composed of trainees, who come to TVA for varying periods, not infrequently months, and have opportunity for observation within the divisions in whose work they are particularly interested. The second, and numerically greater group, visits TVA for periods ranging from 1 day to about 2 weeks.

Almost every profession and interest is represented.

FOREIGN VISITORS TO TVA

Below is a tabulation of visits by noncitizens for the past 10 fiscal years:

Fiscal year	General study visitors	Trainees
1957	2,792	62
1956	2,071	59
1955	1,723	38
1954	1,756	35
1953	2,178	45
1952	2,068	26
1951	1,206	37
1950	1,006	57
1949	651	61
1948	686	57
1947	668	60

Some of the outstanding visitors include:

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan, Sardar Mohammed Doud, June 1958.

Ambassador Ben Aboud, of Morocco, March 1957.

The President of the General Assembly of Morocco, El Mahdi Ben Barka, March 1957.

The President of the Republic of Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, May 1957.

The Deputy Premier of Burma, U Ba Swe, and Madam Ba Swe, December 1957.

Prince Albert of Leige, brother of the King of Belgium, in November 1955.

Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma, in July 1955.

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, India, Ambassador to the United States, in May 1954.

Ambassador Eikichi Araki, Japan, Ambassador to the United States, in December 1953.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Qudrat-I-Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato de Almeida Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, Netherlands, in April 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor, of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enrico Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

Abdel Meguid Pasha Saleh, Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

Prince Seif Al-Islam, Abdullah Hamiduddin, of Yemen, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexco, in May 1947.

Tribute to Dr. Gabriel Hauge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, July 21. It very appropriately commends an able public official of the Eisenhower administration, who, after 6 years of devoted service, is now returning to private life. I have a very high regard for Dr. Gabriel Hauge. His counsel and guidance through a difficult period in our country's history have been of tremendous value to the American people.

I wish to join with his many friends in offering my congratulations and best wishes to Dr. Hauge.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1958]

DR. HAUGE'S SERVICE

This has not been the easiest imaginable period in which to serve as a Presidential special assistant for economic affairs. For one thing, it has become almost axiomatic in the public mind that the Government should, or at least can, manage the national economy in a way to assure a constant and lovely prosperity. When it became evident last year that the business turndown was going to be of more than a few months duration and probably more severe than most recent recessions the pressure inevitably grew for the Government to do something. Just as inevitably, from some quarters there was pressure to do nothing.

Dr. Gabriel Hauge was in the spot where his counsel to President Eisenhower was a major element in administration policymaking. In simplest terms, the policy was a middle of the road one—holding the line on taxes, refraining from gigantic public works, but accelerating the flow of expenditures which already were planned over a longer period. Dr. Hauge himself, attributing the course to the President's own judgment, referred to it as "sensible economics, not razzle-dazzle substitutes." In answer, Mr. Eisenhower called it "your own economic philosophy."

There is evidence, in any case, that the economy has turned back uphill and that the policies followed are entitled to some of the credit. In this circumstance, it seems fair to transfer a share of this credit to Dr. Hauge and to wish him well in the private banking career he has decided to undertake.

National Defense Education Bill To Come Before the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman CARL ELLIOTT and members of the House Subcommittee on Special Education for drafting the national-defense education bill which will soon come before the House for consideration.

This is the first time that legislation to provide scholarships and loans for well qualified but needy students has been reported out of committee in the House, although some of us have been pressing for such a bill for a long time. Shortly after taking my seat as a Member of the House in the 83d Congress, I filed a bill which would establish a Federal scholarship loan program. I filed the bill again in the 84th Congress and in the 85th Congress, the latest bill number being H. R. 95. I am very pleased to know that the House Education Committee has incorporated my scholarship loan feature into the National Defense Education bill.

Mr. Speaker, since I filed H. R. 95 in January 1957, the need for a broader Federal scholarship program has been sharply brought into focus by the scientific advances made by the Soviets with the launching of their first earth satellite. As I told the members of the Education Subcommittee in January, the problem of financing higher education for the vast number of exceptionally bright American high-school graduates transcends all of the other problems with which this Nation is faced because of the cold war.

I think that these young people should be given the opportunity to develop their intellectual potential, not only for their own benefit, but for the benefit of their growing country and the free world. If the United States is going to remain ahead of the Soviets in the present race for survival, it cannot afford to lose its vast reservoir of brainpower in the fields of engineering, science, and the humanities merely because these young Americans cannot pay for a college education.

To meet this emergency, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Federal Government has now got to establish some direct Federal scholarships and student loans for young Americans who have achieved brilliant records in private, parochial, and public high schools. However, as a permanent program, I am still in favor of a Federal scholarship revolving fund from which loans can be made to students sincerely desiring a college education in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the national defense education bill and will vote for it when it comes to the floor of the House. I certainly hope that the Rules Committee will grant a hearing on this legislation soon and clear the measure for House action.

The Crisis in the Middle East and Our Declining Influence in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a newsletter commenting on this Nation's declining influence in international relations. The newsletter follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND OUR DECLINING INFLUENCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The action of the President in sending American troops to Lebanon in the Near East is an action fraught with grave dangers and consequences. But the failure to act would have indicated weakness on our part and the President's decisiveness and forthrightness has undoubtedly won the support of a majority of our citizens.

Our Nation is committed both legally and morally to help our friends and allies maintain their independence and resist Communist aggression. The murder of the leaders and citizens of Iraq and the coup to take over the Government of that country were merely the latest and most extreme of a whole series of Communist-inspired moves to take over the Arab nations 1 by 1. To fail to prevent this movement from spreading would be to surrender and to yield to Communist aggression.

American troops were sent to Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government and following our country's promise to provide such assistance when needed and requested.

Our failure to live up to this commitment would in effect be telling the entire world—friends, neutrals and enemies alike—that our solemn pledges are empty words. The President's action, therefore, should reassure our allies and friends and strengthen their own determination to preserve their independence and to resist Communist infiltration.

In view of the current development in the Middle East it is appropriate to review briefly our international standing at this time. One of the most dismaying developments of recent years has been the steady loss of confidence and respect our Nation has suffered throughout the world.

As we know, the President has just returned from Canada on a mission of trying to restore the cordial friendship and understanding we once enjoyed with our neighbor to the north. A few months ago, the Vice President, on a neighborly good will mission, was jeered and stoned in several South American countries where once we enjoyed the greatest good will as the result of Judge Cordell Hull's good neighbor policy. In the East, about the same time, the Republic of Indonesia which was established with our help and encouragement, seems today to trust us far less than the Communist Chinese. In Africa our libraries have been destroyed. In the North Atlantic the Parliament of Iceland has formally requested us to recall our troops stationed there for mutual defense. England and France did not have enough confidence in us 2 years ago to consult with us or even to inform us when they landed troops in Egypt. Now we have witnessed the convulsions in the Near East where the Arabian peoples, who once looked to us with hope, are turning against the United States.

The President's action now in living up to our solemn commitments will not win the complete approval of all. But it evidences a return to positive leadership and can help us win back the respect and confidence of the free world providing America remains constant in our friendship and our devotion to democracy.

This has been the purpose of the mutual-security program. The mere spending of money under this program will not alone win us true friendship. Fewer dollars and more understanding of the needs and problems of other nations and people would do a far better job.

As a matter of fact, it can be said that the crisis in the Near East is the result of manipulating foreign-aid funds without real understanding. It will be recalled, that Egypt had a dream of lifting its economic conditions by building a TVA-like development on the Nile River. We encouraged them in this great plan and promised help in financing the building of the Aswan Dam. Then in a momentary spirit of anger our State Department withdrew our offer of help. Egypt then turned to Russia which encouraged the Egyptian leader Nasser to take over the Suez Canal and to stimulate the convulsions in the neighboring Arab States that led to the present crisis. Thus we lost the opportunity to lead the people of the Middle East to a better life and permitted them to be intoxicated by Russia with the heady wine of Pan-Arabic imperialism.

Our Nation will back the President in the present crisis and we all hope that his forthright action will calm the crisis. But we must realize that armed force and money alone will not bring back the confidence and respect of the world. We must prove our ideals and principles and spoken words by living up to them and backing them with action both at home and abroad.

Poles in the United States—The 350th Anniversary of Their Settling in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the earliest Polish settlers in this country arrived in October 1608 in Jamestown, Va., just 1 year after the founding of this historic town. That is the first landmark of Poles in America, and I am indeed glad that its 350th anniversary is being celebrated this year.

We do not know with certainly how many Poles were in that immigrant first group; probably they were not more than a handful. It is said that they were brought here "as experts and instructors in the manufacture of glass and pitch, tar and other products" which Poland exported to England in those days. Near Jamestown they built a glass furnace, and in a short time they were able to send to England the first samples of their work; these were the first products of American industry. Thus the earliest Polish settlers in America were artisans and technicians, and as such they contributed greatly to the birth and growth of certain industries here even in those early days.

The Poles also distinguished themselves as brave soldiers. Their descendants have turned out to be among the best and bravest fighters in defense of this country. It is stated that the first instance of their bravery in America is recorded in the year 1609. In that year when the Indians had set an ambush to kill Capt. John Smith, it was a group of Poles who saved his life. But the daring, bravery, and their devotion to the cause of freedom and independence was fully demonstrated in our Revolutionary War. It is hardly necessary to narrate in detail the deeds and accomplishment of Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, the bravest and most illustrious of Poles whose noble deeds are enshrined in the annals of this country. In a sense we can hardly do as much for Poland as these two Poles did for America during her fight for independence.

Thus long before the independence of this country, and ever since then, the Poles have been very active in their constructive work. Today many million Americans of Polish descent are among our most patriotic, public-spirited, and loyal citizens. They have, in the course of their long history here, contributed immensely, and in many instances with great distinction, to our civilization. I am extremely glad and proud to participate in this historic celebration, the 350th anniversary of the first Polish settlement in America.

Ashland, Oreg., Shakespearean Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the 1958 Oregon Shakespearean Festival opens tonight, July 28, in Ashland.

This is the 18th season for a cultural event that has gained international recognition for its authenticity and superior productions. The opening play is Much Ado About Nothing.

During the festival's season, playgoers will have opportunity to view three additional Shakespearean plays: King Lear, Merchant of Venice, and Troilus and Cressida. The theatrical season ends September 4, 1958.

Mr. Angus L. Bowmer is founder and producing director of the Ashland theater. This season he will play his seventh Shylock.

The 1958 company of 80 includes actors and actresses from 20 States and Canada and England. Many of them are in Southwestern Oregon for a return visit.

This year 35 Oregon post offices used a special cancellation to mark the 1958 event, following approval by the Postmaster General.

A good deal has been written about this event. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include The Bard at Ashland, an article appearing in the August 1958 Ford Times, and RX: Shakespeare, an editorial appearing in the July 18, 1958, Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune:

[From Ford Times of August 1958]

THE BARD AT ASHLAND

(By Marvin Rosenberg)

There are lots of places where Shakespeare's plays are acted out in the summertime. Any town named Stratford seems a likely candidate, and many a barn theater launches "Much Ado About Nothing" in a summery and beautiful setting.

But pretty as they may be, few are grander than the town of Ashland, in southern Oregon. When Portia says "The quality of mercy is not strained," she is saying it to a group of listeners who have just had a good look at the mighty Cascade Range.

For the most part, summer productions of Shakespeare are associated with our eastern seaboard, but the Oregon Shakespearean Festival, strangely enough, is America's oldest festival of works by the Bard of Avon. Throughout the month of August the green little town in the foothills of the Cascades and the Siskiyous, not far from the California border, blossoms out with holiday dress, the banners of Elizabethan heraldry, pennants on lampposts, and actors with beards.

The beginnings of the festival lay in the imagination of Angus Bowmer, the founder and producing director. In 1935 he looked at the ruin of an old Chautauqua auditorium and he saw in it the outline of an authentic Shakespearean theater. With WPA money

and a lot of local energy he built a facsimile of a 17th-century stage.

Next he drew directors and actors from the ranks of professionals and from universities. They arrive early in summer, rehearse, and present four plays. They have even developed a style of their own in which scene follows scene as fast as a motion picture. It is high-spirited and brightly colored, and it has no intermissions.

In the hundred-acre park where the plays are performed are a wooden camp and picnic ground where tourists may rent cottages or camp out. The beautifully landscaped Forest of Arden stretches past a bandstand and ponds for swans to a little zoo. Against these smaller pleasures are the magnificent ones—the mountains, Crater Lake, the Rogue River Valley, Oregon Caves National Monument.

The visitors love it. Shakespeare would have, too.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of July 18, 1958]

RX: SHAKESPEARE

The annual Shakespearean Festival, which opens in Ashland next Monday evening, affects different people in different ways.

There is a touch of midsummer madness involved for some—mostly the active participants, the actors, stage crews, and technicians—who find in the festival something more than simply an opportunity to improve their skills in the theater arts. They also find glamour, excitement, camaraderie, intellectual stimulation—the mystique of the stage and the magic music of applause.

Sensitive members of the audience, too, feel something of this aura. In the fresh air, under the stars, they can become captivated by the lights, music, color, action—and the timeless poetic insights of the world's greatest playwright.

In a more prosiac vein, the festival has other things to offer other people—to the hotel and motel proprietor, to the restaurant operator, to the merchant and service-station man.

For the festival has come to be one of Oregon's major tourist attractions, ranking only behind the Rose Festival, the Pendleton Roundup, Crater Lake, and the Oregon coast.

As such it draws thousands of people into the valley, and once here, they furnish the county's economy with its third-greatest stimulant, tourist dollars.

In cold cash, it is a major asset to the county, to all of Oregon. And, if for no other reason, thus deserves the support of all local people.

But it is something more than just a source of economic stability.

As man does not live by bread alone, neither is he wholly motivated by economic considerations. And the festival has gone far to give Jackson County, and specifically Ashland and Medford, something of a reputation as a cultural center.

The festival itself, of course, is the core of this, but as the reputation grows, other types of artiistic activity are attracted and stimulated.

For the arts and humanities—the things which make men a little something more than merely dull, workaday creatures—thrive and feed on each other, for all are related to man's instinctive desire for finer things.

Here is a suggestion to those in this county who have never attended a Shakespearean Festival play:

Try it, just once; give it a chance. And, who knows, maybe you will find something in it for you.

It may be the enchantment of what goes on on the colorful stage; it may be bemusement that a large number of highly intelligent people find it worthwhile to sit for hours in the night air to watch young people perform; it may be the simple pageantry to which the productions lend themselves.

You may find it's not your dish of tea. But, until you've tried it, you'll never know what you may be missing. (E. A.)

It's a Productive Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an article, It's a Productive Congress, written by Marshall McNeill and appearing in the Washington Daily News of July 25, 1958:

IT'S A PRODUCTIVE CONGRESS

(By Marshall McNeil)

The record of this session of Congress—now nearing its end, with 8 or 10 major bills yet to go—already stands out as one of the most productive in many years.

Important measures, kicked around for years and given only a ghost of a chance last January, have been enacted. Defense has been strengthened, and laws passed to beef up our free world alliances. Recession remedies have multiplied on the statute books.

This session convened in the shadow of the first Russian sputnik. A recession was in full swing. World troubles were immense, frustrating, and growing. Election year problems engrossed every Member of the House and a third of the Senate.

Anyone would have guessed it would be a session of grumbling and political haymaking. But bipartisanship has been its hallmark.

The two major figures of the session have been the Texas twins—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

Under their leadership, and with important Republican assistance in the crucial moments, here are the tip-top accomplishments of this session:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Defense reorganization, a proposal that generated a lot of heat and debate but finally was settled to the satisfaction of both Congress and the Commander in Chief.

Creation of the new National Space Agency, an idea born in Congress itself.

Atomic facilities bill, with provision for substantial increase in production of plutonium, and studies of new power reactor types.

Military pay increased, to provide better inducements for careers in the armed services.

Authorizations for Navy construction, including atomic subs and a nuclear-powered destroyer, dispersal of Strategic Air Command bases, money for missile bases and accelerated missile research, development, and production.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mutual security authorized again, with the problem of foreign-aid appropriations still pending in the Senate. That body now has before it firm declarations by Defense Secretary McElroy and Joint Chiefs Chairman General Twining that we'd buy better and more defense by restoring House cuts of about half a billion in aid rather than adding that sum to our own military spending.

Exchange of atomic weapons information with our allies.

Reciprocal trade agreements extension.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Admission of Alaska.

A new Federal agency to control and enhance the safety of civil aviation, yet to be O. K.'d in the House.

Budget reform, passed by both Houses with a compromise yet to be achieved.

Curb on the Supreme Court's rulings on the primacy of Federal laws over State laws, yet to be acted on in the Senate.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Increased the debt limit by $5 billion, with another $8 billion increase in the works.

Acceleration of Federal public works.

Extension of Korean war corporation and excise taxes.

Two housing bills and an extension of FHA's authority to insure mortgages.

Highway construction bill, with some measure of control over billboards.

Community facilities lending bill, yet to be acted on by the House.

Small-business tax relief, pending in the Senate.

Subsidies for domestic metals, pending in the House.

Relief for railroads.

Increase of postage rates to put the post office nearer a paying basis, plus pay increases for postal workers and other Government civilian workers.

Authorization for two new superliners.

AGRICULTURE

Extension of authority to sell farm surpluses abroad, to be compromised in conference.

LABOR, WELFARE, ETC.

Senate has passed bill regulating labor welfare funds, which is also expected to clear House.

Social-security extension, out of House committee, with House approval sure and Senate action likely.

Extension of unemployment compensation to jobless who exhausted State benefits, financed by Federal funds.

Nikita, Go Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I see where Nikita Khrushchev is finally about to get his wish fulfilled for a summit conference and we shall be "privileged" to have him in New York at the United Nations.

It is too bad that we fell for another trick of this demon of propaganda. We all know that Nikita Khrushchev is out to destroy us; he does not come to us with any serious or genuine proposals for world peace. For this reason, I say that he is unwelcome in any part of the United States, and he is most certainly unwelcome in New York City.

I would have preferred that, if we had to meet with him, such meeting take place in neutral territory. There, if he proved to be a bluff—which I believe he is—we could walk out on him. I ask you in all seriousness, however, how could we walk out on him when he is

in our own home? If we did that, he would score another propaganda victory and we would become the laughingstock of the world. What remains for us to do, therefore, is to follow a strict agenda prepared in advance, and when that is completed to get him out of our country as fast as he came here.

It would be well for our leaders to avoid much personal contact with him, other than what is absolutely necessary. There should be no posing for pictures with smiling Nikita. There should be no comradeship and elbow rubbing with him over an alcoholic drink or two or three. Inside the closed-door meeting with him, President Eisenhower should treat him with the proper respect due him as a visitor in our country, but, at the same time, the President should inform Mr. Khrushchev in no uncertain terms that we shall not allow him to chew up one small nation after another, piece by piece—spelled p-i-e-c-e—from one side of his mouth, while he talks peace—p-e-a-c-e—from the other side of his mouth.

In short, Mr. Khrushchev is not welcome here because he does not come as a friend.

Streamlined for Modern Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union on July 26 for my colleagues to read. It is entitled "Streamlined for Modern Warfare," and commends the Congress for enacting the Defense Department reorganization bill.

STREAMLINED FOR MODERN WARFARE

The President says the Pentagon revamping bill, which Congress passed on Thursday, "adequately meets every recommendation" on this subject. The plan was to bring the organization of the Defense Department in line with the needs of space-age warfare, and it faced severe and vested-interest opposition in Congress.

The arbitrary and nearly sovereign division of our armed services bears little relationship to reality today. It is outmoded and outdated by modern weapons which cut across all services. The need is for integrated commands, for greater unification in administration and budget.

But this goal also cut across the vested legislative interests in Congress where long-standing spokesmen for the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force wanted to preserve separateness rather than further needed integration. The separateness of the appropriation decisions in Congress, determining exactly what shall be spent by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, controls the strategic plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The three services tended to maintain the maximum separateness in the hope of retaining the largest military roles and getting the largest share of the budget. And Congress tended to maintain the same separateness in order to retain the maximum appropriation control.

The reorganization plan was needed because modern weapons cut across all services. There needs to be not only combined strategic planning, but combined strategic commands in which each service will play its role under a supreme commander. The three services must be collectively administered under the Secretary of Defense.

Since the appropriations are made 18 months ahead, it has to be decided that far ahead how every dollar is to be divided, and the Defense Department can't shift a penny of those appropriations, however desirable. It will now have real flexibility in reallocating the budget, though Congress will still control the total amount.

Congress has done well to give the President most of the broad powers he sought to streamline and reorganize the Defense Department.

Presidential Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a sound and well-written editorial entitled "Presidential Pensions," appearing in the Boston Herald of July 24, 1958:

PRESIDENTIAL PENSIONS

Minority members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Commission do themselves no credit by opposing a bill to provide pensions and other benefits for former Presidents.

The Senate has twice passed the measure, which would allow ex-Chiefs of State $25,000 a year plus office space, staff assistance, and free mailing privileges. House leaders are confident that this year the Lower Chamber will go along. But a small group in both parties continues to oppose.

The Government, they argue, would have no control over the proposed ex-Presidential establishments. Former Presidents could run up bills of more than $100,000 a year, send out as many as 4,000 pieces of mail a year, and even campaign for public office with Treasury funds. Ex-Presidents and their staffs might become "an entirely new and additional branch of the Federal Government."

So what? Would the Government or the public be hurt if all this came to pass? Do we owe our former Presidents so little that we cannot afford to risk a few thousand dollars on their restraint and good sense?

Neither of our two living ex-Presidents is in need of assistance. Mr. Hoover is independently wealthy and Mr. Truman appears to have ample income from writing and other sources. But not all of their predecessors have been so well fixed, and not all of their successors may be. No man who has served in the White House should have to scrabble for money.

Ex-Presidents continue to be public figures. As elder statesmen they are frequently called upon for advice and for special assignments. They are as much on call as retired Supreme Court Justices and military leaders, who are pensioned accordingly. Their position does not permit them to refuse.

To say that the honor of the Presidency puts that office in a different category answers nothing. Presidents need and accept pay while they are in office, and the need is just as real, or may be, when they are out of office.

The Presidential-pension bill is an overdue obligation the country should insist upon honoring this year. The pettifogging objections of a few Congressmen should not delay final action by the House another week or day.

Open Heart Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call special attention to a program recently telecast by television station KPIX, San Francisco, of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. entitled "Open Heart Surgery."

Because I believe this program, which featured a delicate heart operation on an 8-year-old boy, to have performed a unique public service, I include the following descriptive materials: An open heart surgery fact sheet prepared by the sponsor; an editorial from the June 25, 1958, issue of the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune and an editorial from the June 28, 1958, issue of the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times; and a resolution commending the sponsor:

OPEN HEART SURGERY FACT SHEET

The program, Open Heart Surgery, was telecast by KPIX on Monday, June 23, 1958, from 10 until approximately 11: 45 p. m. It was produced by KPIX in cooperation with the San Francisco Medical Society and the Stanford University Hospital. The program was telecast live from the hospital and from a specially constructed set in the studio as the events were happening.

The combination of surgery and television is not necessarily unique. The number of operations which have been performed for release over open circuit (i. e., over a commercial or educational channel for the lay public) is few, although closed circuit televised operations have and are being produced regularly for doctors and others interested in medicine.

Cardiac operations have been performed in Detroit and New York. These operations, however, were all blood vessels or arteries external to the heart.

The KPIX presentation marks the first time in history that an operation inside a live human heart has been televised on an open circuit basis. In this case the operation involved closing a hole between the two upper chambers of the heart. The procedure involved the substitution of an artificial heart-lung machine which was developed at the Stanford University Hospital by the team of operating surgeons who performed this surgery, for the patient's normal heart and lungs. The machine was connected for approximately 30 minutes during which time the blood was diverted from the normal heart to the machine and back to the patient. During this time the surgeons were free to operate on an essentially dry heart and complete the closure of the hole as predicted by the diagnosticians.

Because of the complex nature of the heart-lung machine and the whole surgical procedure, it was necessary to give the pub-

lic what one of them later characterized in a letter to KPIX as an "instant education" in cardiac surgery. This was undertaken with the help of diagrams, models, X-rays and photographs by KPIX and a group of doctors from Bay area hospitals. This portion of the program lasted approximately 30 minutes. Specially shot film sequences showing the operation of the heart-lung machine and the boy in his home environment were shown during this period.

The operational procedure at the hospital lasted the remaining 75 minutes. The operation was covered by 3 cameras: one located directly above the operating table, the second on the floor of the operating room, and the third in the gallery of the amphitheater. So as not to interfere with the operation in any way, a cardiac surgeon assigned to KPIX sat with the station's newsman in the amphitheater, and the two of them provided the necessary comment as background to the operation itself.

The program concluded after the operation was completed with films showing other Bay Area children who had undergone similar surgery and had now recovered, and a brief interview with the doctor who after leaving the operating table, explained the surgical procedure as he had seen it.

KPIX set up a special telephone number with automatic answering devices which handled somewhat in excess of 98,000 calls inquiring about the patient's condition during the succeeding 3 days. In all, they received some 300 letters from viewers commending KPIX, the Medical Society and the program sponsors for their foresight and imaginative use of the television medium for such an outstanding public service.

All of the San Francisco papers carried front page headlines, pictures and stories about the operation; one paper on the day of the program devoted nearly the entire front page of the second section of the paper to explanatory diagrams of the operation. Both United Press, International and Associated Press carried feature stories, as well as wire photo pictures, both preceding, during, and after the operation. In order to service the press, a special press bureau was set up at the hospital to supply picture stories and other required material.

[From the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune of June 25, 1958]

AN EXPERIENCE WE'LL NEVER FORGET

It was sheer drama from start to finish. The fact that everyone involved was so matter-of-fact about it simply served to heighten the drama.

Little Tommy Hunter was not excited about the operation he was to have on his heart. He had been told all about what was to happen, and he knew that he was in good hands.

The team of surgeons headed by Dr. Frank Gerbode of the Stanford School of Medicine was not excited either. The doctors were confident of their ability to cope with the task ahead.

The rest of us, however, looked forward to the live television broadcast with anticipation and apprehension. Anticipation, because we were to get a chance to view the vital organ that is almost synonymous with life itself; and apprehension because of the delicate operation ahead and its effect not only on little Tommy, but upon ourselves as well.

What we saw more than fulfilled our expectations. The team of surgeons deliberately and skillfully laid bare Tommy's heart, transferred the burden of maintaining life to a wonderful machine, and sewed up the hole that could have limited Tommy's life span to no more than 20 years.

To us laymen, the operation was an awesome demonstration of what medical science is doing for us. The fact that we got a chance to see how it is done—deliberately, skillfully, and without Hollywood flourishes—should serve to give us greater confidence in our doctors, and should take away much of the fear that most of us can't help feeling when faced with a major operation.

The public owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Gerbode and his team for letting us see them at their important work; to Tommy and his parents for permitting the televising of the operation; to station KPIX and to the pharmaceutical firm CIBA for taking us into the operating room.

The telecast, we believe, will do much to give greater awareness of the important role of the medical profession.

It also should do more. It should give all of us a greater appreciation of that wonderful machine, the human body.

This week we saw a boy's heart laid bare. We saw it quiet down as the surgeons performed their magic, then renew its task of pumping life.

We feel, too, that the case serves to disprove the fears of many doctors that putting themselves in the limelight is a questionable practice. What greater job of public relations could doctors do than that of Dr. Gerbode's team in performing that breathtaking operation? What act could better serve to show the public how exacting is the practice of surgery?

It was a never-to-be-forgotten experience, for which we are grateful and humble. Grateful for the doctors' skills, and humble for the gift of life that is given to Tommy and to all of us.

[From the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times of June 28, 1958]

THOUSANDS SEE HEART OPERATION ON TV

(By Jack Silvey)

In one of the most remarkable presentations since the advent of television, thousands of bay area viewers got a dramatic, surgeon's-eye view of a delicate heart operation on an 8-year-old boy.

A heart-lung machine took over circulation functions while doctors at Stanford Hospital in San Francisco mended a hole the size of a half dollar between the two upper chambers of the heart. In addition, two veins leading into the wrong chamber of the heart had to be rerouted.

Correction of the defects, which were overburdening the heart, gives Tommy Hunter, of Oakland, an excellent chance of leading a normal, active life, doctors say.

Hospital officials reported: "Everything is working out beautifully. Tommy is doing fine."

These tense developments emerged from the international scene:

Leaders of the rebellion in Lebanon increased their pressure against the prowestern government of President Chamoun and fierce battles broke out. Chamoun, expecting a full-scale assault at any time, asked for an armed U. N. emergency force to seal off his nation's frontier.

A milling, shouting crowd of more than 1,000 Russians demonstrated outside the United States Embassy in Moscow but inflicted no damage. The demonstration was organized in retaliation for western demonstrations protesting Russia's part in the execution of Imre Nagy, former Premier of Hungary and leader of the Soviet-crushed Hungarian revolt of 1956.

In a surprise turnabout, the Soviet Government told the United States it would not attend the July 1 conference at Geneva on nuclear test detection problems unless this country would see to it that the meeting led to a global ban on nuclear test explosions.

The United States contended the conference had been arranged to explore the problem of test detection, not to arrive at any political commitment on actually suspending nuclear tests. Western allies said they would proceed with the conference as agreed.

The Indochinese neighbors of Cambodia and South Vietnam became involved in a border dispute. Each charged invasion by the other.

United States District Judge Harry J. Lemley ruled that racial integration at Little Rock's Central High School could be suspended until 1961. His ruling bans seven Negro students still enrolled at the once embattled school at the end of the past school year.

John Fox, financier and owner of the now defunct Boston Post, quoted industrialist Bernard Goldfine as saying that he had bought a home for Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower's top aid.

Adams, who has admitted accepting some gifts from Goldfine, promptly denied the story about the house in a letter to congressional investigators.

The State highway commission allocated $1,017,704 to Palo Alto for construction of the South Palo Alto underpass. This, with funds from the city and Southern Pacific Co., assures full financing of the project. Work is expected to begin in late summer or early fall.

Santa Clara Valley's earlier-than-usual apricot harvest began. The crop was reported the smallest since 1921 and attracted a record grower's price—$147.50 a ton, plus $3.90 for hauling. In past seasons, the price has stayed near $100.

Whereas on June 23, 1958, television station KPIX, channel 5, of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. did telecast for the first time in history, a live program of cardiac surgery titled "Open Heart Surgery"; and

Whereas this program was seen by more than 1¼ million people in the San Francisco Bay area; and

Whereas this program was presented for the lay audience through the cooperation of Stanford University Hospital and the San Francisco Medical Society; and

Whereas the program was released as a public service by KPIX to television stations in Reno, Nev., and Sacramento, Calif.; and

Whereas in response to the public acclaim, interest, and demand, KPIX did subsequently release films of the original program to stations in Monterey-Salinas, San Diego, Bakersfield, San Luis Obispo, Calif., and Albuquerque, N. Mex.; and

Whereas the local and national press did bring this program to the attention of the bay area, the State, and the Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Open Heart Surgery program represented the optimum use of the television medium for the public interest, information, and education; be it further

Resolved, That KPIX and the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. receive the grateful thanks and commendation from the people of San Francisco for this outstanding public service.

To Repay a Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Navy Times of July 26, 1958:

TO REPAY A DEBT

As all men in uniform know, the highest honor the United States bestows on its defenders is the Medal of Honor. This honor is conferred in the name of Congress" and

therefore is commonly referred to as the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The some 320 living men who wear the light blue ribbon are the elite of the Nation. But the Nation as a whole, its Government, even the Services whose uniform these men wore have not really done right by these men.

The editor of Navy Times has been privileged to meet twice with these wearers of the Medal of Honor as a group. We have had long personal friendships with several individual holders of the honor. Thus we have some knowledge of what these men are and what they are willing to do, and can do, for the Nation.

Organization is the principal need. Once the medal wearers are organized properly they can both obtain recognition for themselves and—more importantly to the Nation—render new valuable services to the country for which they have done so much.

Organization of the medal wearers received an impetus after they, for the first time, were assembled as a group at Eisenhower's inauguration. The men were enabled to meet when they returned for Eisenhower's second inauguration and for the interment of the Unknowns of World War II and Korea this past Memorial Day. Following the breakfasts which the company which publishes Navy Times arranged for them on each occasion, the men moved en masse to nearby meeting halls to conduct business.

They could not have met had they not been summoned to Washington for other purposes. For one thing, they hadn't the resources. For another, how could they have contacted each other? We doubt any reader can conceive of the difficulties Defense and this company had in contacting these men to invite them to Washington.

The United States had little idea of which of its honored heroes were even alive, where they were living and what they were doing. Yet each is a potential shining example to the rest of the country, though the country and the services have neglected to exploit that opportunity.

The fledgling society wants to be so exploited.

Now Defense, particularly the Army, is bestirring itself. The trips to Washington are evidence of that. Incidentally, Army Secretary Brucker stretched a point and got $12 a day per diem for the men while they were here, a most helpful gesture though that amount doesn't cover hotel living in Washington. Official and private entertainment and some assistance from this company and other private organizations in transporting dependents took up the slack. And the Army also surprised the group by giving them a handsome seal at the May 31 meeting here—a seal designed, by the way, by the man who designed the tombs of the Unknowns.

These aids—and some more— are needed if the group's to continue to function and do a unique job for the Nation.

For the group is too small for complete self-support unless it engages in fund-raising schemes. And that it does not want to do, nor should the Nation allow such capitalization of its foremost award. Although some members have means, most are in modest circumstances; many are downright poor. Because of this, the group doesn't even want to charge dues. However low, dues might keep from being all-inclusive a group which above all must be all-inclusive.

So the society functions without dues; without pay (or even expense money) for any official; without any aid except contributions from some of the better-off members and aid for the occasion of the type rendered by Defense, this company and some other organizations.

Despite poverty of some members, the group also is opposed to seeking, as a group, any benefits for wearers of the Medal of Honor as such. They'll accept as their due the benefits payable as to any veteran, but they feel no price should be placed on the medal itself.

What do they want? Not much—and these things will benefit the Nation as much or more than the group:

1. Aid in organizing. They want to hold annual meetings on military bases near major cities to benefit from cheap housing and meals and rent-free meeting places. The services are sympathetic and this is likely to be done.

2. Recognition as individuals. Even the most modest know they are, indeed, something special. They'd like their parent service to have information about them current and on file, for release when appropriate. They'd particularly like to feel that, when their last day comes, their Government will remind the Nation that one of its heroes has died. Thirteen died last year; only 1 received any special notice in the press.

3. Recognition as a group. The Senate has passed a bill granting a congressional charter to the society. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee has unanimously approved the bill. The chairman of the full committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, has promised to bring the bill to a vote at its next meeting. But there is still the full House to face. And Members of the House are understandably frightened at the number of applicants for congressional charters and of the dubious uses to which some groups in the past have put the prestige inherent in their charters from Congress.

We think Mr. CELLER is wise enough to sell this bill to the House on its merits.

For one thing, this group is so special that chartering it sets precedent for no other charters. It's too small to be an effective lobby; in fact its charter, if granted, will forbid attempt to influence any legislation.

And it's particularly fitting that the 300 who alone among men wear an honor presented in the name of Congress should as a group hold their charter from Congress. Incorporate, the group must; and it is not fitting that the Nation should allow any State to do this service for a group whose service was to the Nation as a whole.

Behind the Black Robes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events of July 21, 1958:

BEHIND THE BLACK ROBES—HIGH COURT CLERKS: AMERICA'S HIDDEN LAWMAKERS

(By Rosalie M. Gordon)

When we visit the chamber of the Supreme Court of the United States, we see sitting before us, high above the audience and the disputing attorneys, nine imposing, black-robed Justices. But behind the Justices, in the inner reaches of the beautiful Supreme Court building, sit 18 young men through whose hands passes much of the work of the Court. They serve the Justices for only a year or two and then are replaced by others of their kind. During their service to the Court, we seldom see them or hear of them. But some of them have gone on to fame of a kind. Dean Acheson was one of them, and so was Alger Hiss. Another, who served Justice Frankfurter, later served a term in jail on a vote-fraud case in his native State. Many others, of course, have attained respected and useful places in the legal profession and in politics.

These bright young men are law clerks of the Justices of the Supreme Court. As of the 1957 session of the Court, 7 Justices had 2 clerks each, Justice Douglas had 1, and Chief Justice Warren had 3—18 in all. They are picked by the individual Justices for whom they will work, and are taken from among the top performers of the graduates of leading law schools, generally on the recommendation of the deans.

Quite naturally, this brings up the question of how much influence these young men exercise on the Justices and what part they have played in the type of decisions we have been getting from the Court these past two decades. First of all, it is beyond belief that a Justice would choose as his law clerk a young man diametrically opposed to the Justice's views. Second, these young men are the products of schools and universities which have been thoroughly infiltrated—in some cases saturated—with leftwing thinking. Six of the 18, for instance, serving the Justices in 1957 came from the law school of Harvard and 3 others from Yale. Yale and (more particularly) Harvard have been hotbeds of New Deal-collectivist-leftwing teaching in recent years.

Some scraps of evidence have begun to appear as to the nature and amount of influence wielded by the clerks. Justice Minton, after his retirement from the Court, was asked if his clerks helped in drafting opinions. He replied: "In my case, after an opinion was written I submitted it to the boys for their comments and criticisms. And if their criticisms were valid the opinion was rewritten." It is important to remember that the boys have just graduated from law school, that they have never practiced law, and that some of them are not yet even members of the bar.

Even more impressive evidence is supplied in a biography of Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone by Alpheus Thomas Mason.[1] Stone is quoted as saying at one time: "I am a good deal troubled by the dissenting opinion which Justice Black has just circulated. * * * He states a good deal which counsel did not take the trouble to present * * * I see in Justice Black's dissent the handiwork of someone other than the nominal author." And the same book points out that two paragraphs in a historic footnote to one of Justice Stone's own opinions were written by his law clerk. The clerk, Louis Lusky,[2] said Stone "adopted it almost as drafted, simply toning down a couple of overemphatic words."

It is in the selection of cases that will come before the Court for review and decision that these bright young men come into their own. Each year anywhere from 1,500 to 2,000 appeals are made to the Supreme Court to hear and decide cases which have been settled one way or another in the lower courts. The Supreme Court can hear and decide on fewer than 10 percent of the more than 1,000 cases that ask for hearing annually. But who is to decide what cases shall be heard? The rule is that when any 4 Justices agree to grant a petition for cer-

[1] Pillar of the Law, Viking Press.

[2] Lusky now serves as a volunteer lawyer for the leftwing American Civil Liberties Union, and helped to defend Carl Braden, a man convicted of sedition in Kentucky. (Braden's conviction was overturned by the Supreme Court's ruling in the Nelson case.)

tiorari—as these appeals for hearing are known in legal jargon—the Court will hear arguments in the case and decide it. But each of these petitions involves a brief asking the Court to hear the case, another brief asking the Court not to hear it, and, likely as not, a record of all the legal proceedings in the lower courts. That's where those 18 young law clerks come in. This mass of petitions is split up among them. Each clerk then writes a summary or memorandum for his Justice. This summary ostensibly states the facts of the case, the law on which the lower courts depended in deciding it, a short statement of previous cases on the same point, and, finally, a recommendation by the clerk that the case be heard or not heard by the Court.

It is then up to the Justice, of course, to decide whether he will accept or reject his clerk's recommendation. But we can see how easy it would be for a young law clerk, fresh from the groves of academe, where he was filled with a burning desire to remake America into the bright new Socialist mold, to let at least some of his zeal creep into his recommendation.

There is an indication of how potent this influence has been in the fact that, in late 1957, the Harvard Law Review found that the Warren Supreme Court was falling badly behind in its docket of cases. The thing that was causing the trouble was that the Court was agreeing to hear an unprecedented number of cases. In the 1956–57 term, for instance, it agreed to hear 208 cases. From 1948 to 1955, the figure ran from 88 to 162 cases per term. Legal experts familiar with the Court's work said it deserved no sympathy for the jam into which it had got itself. It was busy putting its liberal hand on a whole batch of lower court decisions on the assumption that these courts didn't know what they were doing. It would be interesting if we could have another survey of how much these bright young law clerks had to do with the High Court's determination to make the lower courts truly inferior.

Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has noted the influences under which these recent graduates had come in their college years. Congressman SCHERER said:

"Our committee hearings have disclosed a considerable amount of ill will, bordering in some cases on hatred, by many professors for congressional investigating committees. They have determined in one way or another to destroy these committees ever since some of their clique were subpenaed to tell about their Communist and Communist-front activities."

As a member of a congressional investigating committee, Congressman SCHERER was especially interested in reading carefully some of the Supreme Court's decisions affecting the rights of congressional committees. He said:

"I have read in some of the recent shocking Supreme Court decisions almost the exact words, phrases, and arguments that have been used by some of these professors in their attacks against the committees."

Congressman SCHERER suggested that these words and phrases very well might have crept into the decisions of the learned Justices via some of those professors' former pupils, now hidden behind the bench of the highest court in the land.

Thanks to the enterprise of the weekly news magazine, U. S. News & World Report, we have had an even more authoritative statement of the role of those bright young law clerks from one of their own number. U. S. News hunted up a former law clerk to Justice Jackson—William H. Rehnquist, now with a law firm in Phoenix, Ariz. In its issue of December 13, 1957, U. S. News & World Report printed the following words from Mr. Rehnquist:

"The bias of the clerks, in my opinion, is not a random or hit-and-miss bias. From my observations of two sets of Court clerks during the 1951 and 1952 terms, the political and legal prejudices of the clerks were by no means representative of the country as a whole nor of the Court which they served.

"After conceding a wide diversity of opinion among the clerks themselves, and further conceding the difficulties and possible inaccuracies inherent in political cataloging of people, it is nonetheless fair to say that the political cast of the clerks as a group was to the left of either the Nation or the Court.

"Some of the tenets of the liberal point of view which commanded the sympathy of a majority of the clerks I knew were: extreme solicitude for the claims of Communists and other criminal defendants, expansion of Federal power at the expense of State power, great sympathy toward any Government regulation of business—in short, the political philosophy now espoused by the Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren."

But, you say, what is the Court to do? The Justices have to have clerks and they naturally choose those they think will be in sympathy with their views. Perhaps. But bear this in mind. These clerks are Government employees—although, unlike most others, they are not subject to the regular Government security or loyalty checks. Their pay ranges from $5,500 to $6,500 a year—paid not by the Justices themselves, but by the American taxpayer.

What the Russian Generals Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the July 21, 1958, issue of Time magazine, entitled "What the Russian Generals Think."

Mr. Speaker, the article is in the nature of an analysis of the recent book Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age, by Raymond L. Garthoff, a Department of Defense analyst and specialist on Soviet military writings. Although the article is set out in its entirety below, I would like to draw specific attention to some of the main points made in the article.

Mr. Garthoff's study of Soviet military thinking leads him to believe that after the initial strategic strikes by jet bombers, intercontinental and intermediate-range and rocket missile, and submarine-launched missiles, the war will be won or lost by the ground forces. He says:

The heart of such a capability is the ground forces—trained for nuclear war, armed with nuclear weapons.

He points out also that—

They—

The Soviets—

have not allowed nuclear weapons to overshadow conventional arms, and have thus retained their enormous superiority to fight nonnuclear wars, big or little.

Most interestingly, Mr. Garthoff indicates that—

The flexibility of the Russian theory may be illustrated by this difference: many Western military men believe that nuclear weapons in the hands of the infantry reduce the need for manpower because they increase firepower per man. This belief leads toward nuclear-armed ground forces so small that they could fight only nuclear war. But Russian generals believe that nuclear infantry weapons increase the manpower requirements because more soldiers will be needed to replace the heavier casualties. This leaves the Russians with large numbers of soldiers who can fight either nuclear or nonnuclear war.

The article from Time magazine follows:

WHAT THE RUSSIAN GENERALS THINK—BEYOND ATOMIC HOLOCAUST THE REDS SEE VICTORY

The West's military leaders have long understood that their Soviet counterparts were thinking along lines quite different from postwar western military thought. This difference was condescendingly put down to a time lag on the part of the Russians; they were believed frozen in the experience of World War II, unable to face the implications of the new nuclear weapons. This week, in a coldly penetrating study of modern Soviet military doctrine, Russian-speaking Raymond L. Garthoff, 29, Defense Department analyst and specialist on Soviet military writings, enters a strong dissent. Since the death of Stalin, in 1953, says he, Soviet military doctrine "has made a quantum jump from the bayonet age to the thermonuclear age."

This jump has not brought the U. S. S. R.'s generals closer to current United States military doctrine. It has, in fact, taken them in an independent direction. Garthoff, whose book is authoritatively studded with hundreds of references to Soviet military periodicals, backed up by personal conversations with Soviet officers, sums up the "Soviet image of future war" thus:

"The initial strategic strikes by modern jet bombers, intercontinental and intermediate-range rockets and missiles, and submarine-launched missiles, will wreak devastation upon both the United States and the Soviet Union, and upon their chief allies." But does mutual devastation spell mutual defeat? The Soviets answer "No." The priority strikes will destroy the enemy's strategic air and missile bases, insofar as these are known. Major cities and industrial centers, on a lower level of priority, will also suffer heavily. Radiological and bacteriological weapons may be used. But this enormous mutual destruction will probably consume the major portion of the respective long-range air and missile forces. Thus, the efforts of these forces would in a sense cancel each other out.

"This is a crucial phase of the war, one which a weak or ill-prepared power could lose. But it is not the decisive stage of a war between well-prepared major powers; it does not determine the final outcome of the war between them.

"'Tactical' air power and rockets, those forces designated to attack the enemy's military forces up to roughly a 1,000-mile range from the starting borders would similarly engage in mutual nuclear strikes. But here the Soviets do not see a mutual stalemate. The heart of such a capability is the ground forces—trained for nuclear war, armed with nuclear weapons—and here the war would begin with a serious imbalance: a preponderance of Soviet forces.

"Moreover, in the Soviet view, their mobilization and dispatch of ground forces would be much less critically disrupted than would ours by the nuclear exchange, due to their larger force-in-being and to its deployment. The surviving Soviet land armies are thus expected to be capable of defeating the proportionately weakened enemy forces on the ground.

"Thus the Soviets would strive to achieve at least a favorable 'draw' by occupying the Eurasian continent, and exploiting such resources as might still be available to restore some of the Soviet Union's losses. The shrunken and devastated free world would be entirely relegated to the Western Hemisphere."

THE FIRST HURDLE

Predominant United States military imagination tends to stop at the point of reciprocal nuclear holocaust. Why does the Soviet imagination leap this hurdle? Through continued ignorance of the effects of thermonuclear weapons? This can hardly be the explanation, now that the Russians have had years in which to test and ponder their own weapons. Garthoff suggests two other explanations:

First. "The massive military loss undergone by the Soviet Union in 1941, in a relatively brief span of time, was more comparable to the loss from a nuclear assault than anything else experienced by a great power in modern times. The Soviets lost from their control 40 percent of their population, 40 percent of their grain production, approximately 60 percent of their coal, iron, steel, and aluminum output, and 95 percent or more of certain key military industries, such as ball-bearing production. They lost 4 million soldiers, dead, wounded, or prisoners, and over two-thirds of their tanks and aircraft." A nuclear holocaust might be worse, but Russia has survived a military disaster of the same order of magnitude—survived and won.

Second. The United States definition of military purpose is merely to "deter and defeat attack." Russian military objectives are shaped by a fundamental objective: "To advance the power of the Soviet Union in whatever ways are most expedient so long as the survival of the Soviet power itself is not endangered."

The Soviets do not see how they could occupy and/or control the United States. But they do see how their conquest of all Eurasia would leave them at the end of the war in a position vis-a-vis the United States better than their present position. It is this vision that gives confidence to Russian spokesmen and drive to Russian diplomacy.

THE BASIS OF FLEXIBILITY

Because the Russians see how they might fight a big war, it does not follow that a big war is what they want. There are other kinds of wars in which they might gain, with less risk to Soviet survival. They have not allowed nuclear weapons to overshadow conventional arms, and have thus retained their enormous superiority to fight nonnuclear wars, big or little. They say publicly that limited nuclear wars are impossible, but Garthoff believes they have, in theory and in practice, the capability of fighting these, too.

The flexibility of the Russian theory may be illustrated by this difference; many Western military men believe that nuclear weapons in the hands of the infantry reduce the need for manpower because they increase firepower per man. This belief leads toward nuclear-armed ground forces so small that they could fight only nuclear war. But Russian generals believe that nuclear infantry weapons increase the manpower requirements because more soldiers will be needed to replace the heavier casualties. This leaves the Russians with large numbers of soldiers who can fight either nuclear or nonnuclear war.

Another difference is in civil defense. The United States has not even got around to thinking seriously about a nuclear shelter program. Garthoff is convinced that the Russians are taking the far more radical step of decentralizing their industry to minimize damage of nuclear attack. He thinks Khrushchev's program of industrial management decentralization is accompanied by physical decentralization for military purposes.

Soviet military theory may turn out to be wrong. But on Garthoff's showing, it is not backward. The Soviet generals have examined carefully the new weapons in the light of the political objectives set by their leaders. They think they know how to survive and how to expand. This gives confidence to their diplomats—who are today expanding Soviet power with less cost and less risk than actual war.

Displaying the Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, some 3 weeks ago I addressed the House of Representatives on the subject of the flag of the United States. As stated then, I had previously urged President Eisenhower to name a nonsalaried board of distinguished citizens and heads of veterans and patriotic organizations to approve a new design in connection with admitting a new State.

Since I made that speech many colleagues have discussed this subject with me and it is obvious that there is widespread interest in the subject and also a lack of information. People are asking many questions and in particular, in the light of Alaska statehood, are inquiring what should be done with 48-star flags after a new State is added to the Union. Also flag etiquette and rules on proper display of the flag under various circumstances are matters of some confusion.

This current wave of public interest, Mr. Speaker, is at once healthy and gratifying. Also let me say it should be pointed out that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the other great national patriotic organizations as also many fraternal societies such as the Elks and the Eagles without question emphasize the flag code and ceremonial and consistently uphold flag etiquette and observance as a basic requirement of civic duty and practice of good citizenship, and I agree we must never fail as a Nation to render courtesy and respect to the flag, and always the flag ritual, individually or in a group, should be carried out in the approved manner.

One aspect of redesigning our flag was pointed up, here in Washington, a few days ago in a newspaper editorial which suggested to those not possessing a flag the purchase of one now—a 48-star flag—to be put away and treasured as an item which in time will become a priceless rarity and family heirloom. Imagine the value of a 13-star flag. However, as I stated in my previous discussion, once the design of a flag is officially recognized it is permissible to display it and anyone now possessing a 48-star flag may continue to use it until unserviceable even though Alaska or Hawaii become States.

A weekly paper in Seattle, the Capitol Hill Times, in conjunction with an annual community flag festival, recently ran an article on How To Display the Flag. I include this because the rules and approved practices regarding our national emblem should be known to all and especially so with the people of Alaska scheduled to vote on August 26, 1958, on the admission of Alaska as the 49th State of the Union:

The flag should be displayed from sunrise to sunset.

Unless there is some special reason for doing so, the flag should not be flown in rainy or stormy weather.

The flag should always be raised briskly and lowered slowly and ceremoniously.

When the flag is being raised or lowered, it must never be allowed to touch the ground.

In a procession with another flag, the flag of the United States is on the marching right.

In a procession with a line of other flags, the flag of the United States is in front of the center of the line.

When displayed either vertically or horizontally against a wall, or in a shop window, or elsewhere, the blue field is uppermost and to the flag's own right—that is, to the observer's left.

When used on a speaker's platform, if displayed flat, the flag is above and behind the speaker; if flown from a staff, the flag is in the position of honor, at the speaker's right, and preferably slightly in front.

When displayed with another flag against a wall, staffs crossed: the United States flag is on the observer's left, and its staff is in front of the staff of the other flag.

When the United States flag and flags of other nations, States, or cities, or pennants of societies, are flown from adjacent staffs: the United States flag is on the right of the line—that, on the observer's left.

When suspended over a sidewalk from a rope, extending from a building to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk: the flag is hoisted a part of the way out from the building, toward the pole, blue field first.

On a float in a parade: the flag is displayed from a staff.

When displayed on an automobile: the flag may be fastened to the car body, or clamped to the radiator cap. Under no circumstances should the flag ever be draped over the hood, top, or sides of an automobile.

The flag of the United States is an artistic, well-proportioned emblem whose beauty should not be marred by draping. Draping may be done with red, white, and blue bunting, but not with the flag.

Torn, soiled, or badly faded flags should not be displayed. When a flag is in such a condition that it is not longer a fitting emblem to display, it should be destroyed as a whole, privately, preferably by burning, or by some other method lacking in any suggestion of irreverence or disrespect.

Public Utility District Has Kept Benefits of Columbia River at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the July 21 issue of the Wenatchee Daily World, Wenatchee, Wash. This editorial relates to 10 years of progress and public service by the Chelan County Public Utility District.

I think this is an outstanding record of a local county and local communities going about the business of developing their own natural resources with an exact minimum of Federal assistance.

Much credit should go to the manager, Kirby Billingsley, and those who have been foremost in assisting him. These include Howard C. Elmore, assistant manager; E. C. Metcalf, chief engineer; Harley W. Bryant, commercial manager; Jack Shreve, distribution engineer; Gilbert Pyle, superintendent; Hale Tabor, research and information officer; Larry Wilcox, purchasing agent; Robert E. Crooks, auditor; Walt Woirol, Rocky Reach controller; and Dale S. Walker, supervisor of accounting.

This is indeed an outstanding celebration.

The editorial follows:

PUD HAS KEPT BENEFITS OF COLUMBIA RIVER AT HOME

This is a big day for the men and women of Chelan County Public Utility District and the communities it serves.

Ten years ago today the public utility district purchased the distribution system of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. and so actually entered the power business.

If the district had not taken that step then, what a different place our county would be now.

Without that step, the one great stroke that severed the chain which bound this area to an economic dependence on fruit alone would never have been delivered. That's the establishment of the Alcoa plant and payroll here, of course.

Without that step people of Chelan County might never have reaped one benefit from a kilowatt of power produced from the Columbia River within the borders of our county.

The progress of the public utility district in just 10 years is phenomenal. Acquisition of distribution facilities, completion of Rock Island Dam, purchase of Chelan Dam, Dryden Dam, Rock Island Dam, and start of construction of a $250 million dam at Rocky Reach.

A remarkable Decade of Progress.

Possibly the most significant development, however, was completion of Rock Island Dam.

This dam—first power dam across the Columbia River—was owned by Pudget Sound Power & Light Co.

At the outbreak of the Korean war, a study was immediately made to see where new power could be generated quickly to supply rapid expansion of the war-needed aluminum industry. Quickest project was Rock Island Dam, where six more generators could be added to an existing structure.

If any agency other than the public utility district had done the job, chances are almost certain that the power would have been supplied to Alcoa in Vancouver, where the company's existing aluminum plant would just have been expanded.

But Chelan County Public Utility District did the job, and kept the power home. By selling power to Alcoa here, kilowatts of the Columbia actually began to benefit the people in the area where the power was produced. It meant payrolls for Chelan County—the same philosophy that prompted the district to build the dam at Rocky Reach.

All successful and venturesome enterprises have their detractors. And as it advanced through its decade of progress, the public utility district was no exception. Some of its biggest detractors in the early years have benefited the most through the payrolls and stabilized economy that home-owned power has brought.

Public power as represented by the public utility district was a new concept that once was opposed in principle by some people. The results of the past decade of progress have caused most detractors to change their mind.

You can draw a simile between public and private power and the difference between owning your own home or renting.

The man making payments on a home he has bought will in time of his loan wind up owning a property for which no more purchase payments must be made. The renter keeps paying indefinitely and never winds up with a physical property his payments have purchased.

Private power is the renter. In public power our payments are going to pay for the dams and systems that produce and distribute the electricity we use. When those are paid for, the only cost of our power will be minor maintenance costs.

In the lingo it's called "debt-free equity." One of the first public utility district's to be formed in the State—Grays Harbor Public Utility District—now owes only 15 percent of the original cost of its system. (It's a distribution, not generation system, however.)

Twenty percent of every $1 paid into the public utility district goes toward "paying off the mortgage."

What of the next decade of progress? What will the public utility district have to report on July 21, 1968?

The Nation is approaching what economists predict will be the biggest decade of growth in the Nation's history. With Rocky Reach Dam, Chelan County Public Utility District will have the power to bring new payrolls to the county.

Already the Chelan County Public Utility District is one of the 10 largest hydro generating organizations in the United States.

In the next 10 years probably all possible dams on the Columbia will have been built, including Ben Franklin Dam. The river will be navigable to here and possibly beyond. Agreement with Canada over upstream storage may provide additional kilowatts from the river. Chelan Public Utility District may be a water system utility as well as a power utility, as specified in the public utility district enabling act. (Today 12 public utility districts in the State supply domestic and irrigation water, and one—Skagit Public Utilities District—is a water utility only.)

At any rate, the first Decade of Progress has laid the groundwork for the community's future. It has harnessed the resources—the basic raw materials of power on which to build a tremendous economy for Chelan County.

If the leadership of the public utility district for the next 10 years retains the vision of the last 10, we predict the county will utilize those resources to build an economic future under which this county will prosper even above its prosperity of the past.

Fair Trade Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an open letter to the Congress written by Mr. Lawrence Fontana, 3648 Keokuk, St. Louis, Mo., who urges Congress to enact a fair-trade law:

OPEN LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE 85TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 24, 1958.*

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE 85TH CONGRESS: Just dropping you a line to ask you to support the national fair trade bills now up for consideration. The Senate has a bill known as S. 3850, and the House has one called H. R. 10527.

I'm in the retail bicycle sales and service business. You know that the fair-trade laws have been wiped out in some States, and in many other States they have been cut down to where they are practically worthless. If this continues there will be no fair trade whatever in any of our States.

Pricecutters who operate discount houses are the headache of our business. They take a well-known product and cut the price to the bone just so they can use it to draw people into their stores. They can do this because they can make up the money they lose on other products. We in the bike business have only our bikes on which to make money, and if the discounters are allowed to football any product they want, it's a cinch we can't compete with them. The protection we would get from a national fair-trade law would give us a chance to compete on an equal basis.

The fair-trade bill is very important to me and every other retailer—practically a matter of life and death.

I hope you will do all you can to get this bill passed and I would like to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE J. FONTANA.

"Uncle Miltie" Hunts Facts in Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by George Dixon, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 21, 1958, which I think is probably the best explanation of Milton Eisenhower's trip to South America:

WASHINGTON SCENE
(By George Dixon)
"UNCLE MILTIE" HUNTS FACTS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

In this period of national anxiety it must be a source of consolation to many to know that Uncle Miltie is down in Central America finding facts. No official confirmation has yet been released as to whether he has found any, but I am betting on him upon his record. He is on a factfinding tour and has established quite a reputation as a factotum.

You need not be confused as to the identity of Uncle Miltie. This is Uncle Miltie Eisenhower, not Berle. It is not too difficult to tell them apart. One is more entertaining than the other.

The fact-finding Uncle Miltie has a wonderful opportunity to find a few facts on this expedition because he is comparatively unencumbered. He is not accompanied by Allen Dulles.

The head of our Central Intelligence Agency could not go along with Uncle Miltie

because he is too busy misevaluating facts for his brother, John, in the State Department. This has given Uncle Miltie, or Dr. Milton Eisenhower as he is sometimes known, a clear field in which to find facts without expert muddlification. It has paid off. Uncle Miltie has already found Panama, Honduras, and Costa Rica. Those are facts.

I don't know what other facts the brother of President Eisenhower expects to find, but if he doesn't unearth enough in Central America to suit him, he can always obtain a few upon his return. He can learn the facts of life from Sherman Adams.

I have faith that when Uncle Miltie comes back he will find Governor Adams still at his post of need. There seems to be no truth to rumors that while Uncle Miltie is hunting facts, Sherm is hunting a job. I am discounting utterly any gossip that Bernard Goldfine's White House telephonic correspondent wants to pose for those telephone company ads "Call Someone Today."

Parenthetically, there also is no truth to rumors that Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky has taken to signing himself "JOHN S. COOPER" as a result of the Adams-Goldfine case.

Apparently Ike's brother is not making the mistake of Vice President NIXON in trying to obtain facts from the people of the countries visited. So far as I can gather, Uncle Miltie is avoiding the populaces. At each capital he has himself whisked from the airport to the United States Embassy, after which he closets himself with the country's leaders. This saves him from being burdened down with petty details, such as what the people are thinking.

However, there must be some reason why Uncle Miltie is making this tour—don't you think? Possibly he wants advice from the chiefs of our sister republics on how to maintain prestige. Our prestige in the Middle East has sunk so low they're not even kidnaping Americans.

Another possible reason for Uncle Miltie pointing South at this time when our major problems are pointing East is that he may be searching for an out-of-the-way place to bury a speech that Republican National Chairman Meade Alcorn made in Des Moines a few weeks ago, in which that shrewd and far-seeing political soothsayer exhorted fellow Republicans:

"Don't be trapped by the Democrats into letting them choose the issues this year. Let us force our adversary into meeting us on the central issues of a world at peace and the Presidency restored to a symbol of respectability."

The Recent Decisions of the Supreme Court and the Crowded Court Dockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have closely observed the Supreme Court during the last two decades have seen strange and almost unbelievable decisions come from that tribunal. We have witnessed the transformation of that Court from one which had high respect for the law and the Constitution, to one which has disregarded both on innumerable occasions.

During this 20-year period, the Supreme Court has followed a pattern of divesting the sovereign States of their constitutional rights and functions. The force and effect of this pattern of continuously overruling previous decisions to the dismay of litigants and confusion of the legal profession, has been to throw into uncertainty principles of law which had long been settled and upon which the American people could rely as being stable.

Recently I received from Mr. George Washington Williams, of Baltimore, Md., a copy of a statement which concerns itself with one of the major causes of the confusion and chaos which the Supreme Court has engendered as a result of overturning settled principles of law.

Under unanimous consent I insert this statement herewith:

THE RECENT DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT AND THE CROWDED COURT DOCKETS

(Statement by George Washington Williams, Baltimore, Md.)

There is now a great deal being said by the Chief Justice, among others, about the overcrowded dockets. This complaint seems to be justified in many areas, (but I do not believe our Baltimore docket is subject to complaint). But he and they fail to put their fingers on one of the most basic of troubles, the one about which the late Justice Roberts gave due warning, namely, the failure of the Court to respect the rule of stare decisis to the extent that it should. That is the reason for the bringing of many cases, and is, in the opinion of the initiated one of the important keys to the problem.

It has been said, with truth, by high authority, that it is almost as important that the law be settled, as that it be settled right. If the law is settled then, at least, one can know with a reasonable degree of certainty what to expect from his actions, and, that is the essence of a stable and an orderly society.

My views are not to be taken as in any sense an attack upon the Court as an institution, and I resent any such inference, but as an effort, however feeble it may be, to do my part in trying to persuade the Court to confine itself to interpretation of the Constitution and law, and therefore to withdraw from the field of legislation and from that of politics, both national and international, certainly a legitimate function of the Bar.

Now, anyone who has kept a weather-eye out, in recent years, on the course of decisions of the Supreme Court has inevitably anticipated the development of overcrowded dockets, and the consequent criticism.

Justice Roberts, with Justice Frankfurter, dissenting, in *Mahnich* v. *Southern S. S. Co.* (321 U. S. 96, 112) warned the Court of this prospect, saying:

"The evil resulting from overruling earlier considered decisions must be evident. In the present case, the Court below naturally felt bound to follow and apply the law as clearly announced by this Court. If litigants and lower Federal Courts are not to do so the law becomes not a chart to govern conduct but a game of chance; instead of settling rights and liabilities it unsettled them. Counsel and parties will bring and prosecute actions in the teeth of the decisions that such actions are not maintainable on the improbable chance that the asserted rule will be thrown overboard. Defendants will not know whether to litigate or to settle for they will have no assurance that a declared rule will be followed. But the more deplorable consequences will inevitably be that the administration of justice will fall into disrepute."

He then made the obvious remark: "Respect for tribunals must fall when the bar and the public come to understand that nothing that has been said in prior adjudications has force in a current controversy. * * * the tendency to disregard precedent in the decision of cases like the present has become so strong in this court of late as, in my view, to shake confidence in the consistency of decisions, and leave the courts below in an uncharted sea of doubt and difficulty without any confidence that what was said yesterday will hold good tomorrow, unless indeed a modern instance grows into a custom of members of this court to make public announcement of a change of views on the same question when another case comes before the court. This might, to some extent, obviate the predicament in which the lower courts, the bar, and the public find themselves."

This warning was subsequently renewed by Justice Roberts in another case in the same volume, *Smith* v. *Arkwright* (pp. 649, 668), where he bitingly remarked: "The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling that announced about 9 years ago, tends to bring adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, good for this day and train only," and he continued in the general vein of his remarks in the Southern S. S. case, but that such warnings have been ignored subsequent cases will show.

A modern echo of these lamentations is found 'n the concluding statement of the present Justice Harlan in *U. S.* v. *Ohio Power Co.* (353 U. S. 98, 111): "For the reasons given I must dissent. I can think of nothing more unsettling to lawyers and litigants, and more disturbing to their confidence in the evenhandiness of the Court's processes, than to be left in the kind of uncertainty which today's action engenders, as to when their cases may be considered finally closed in this Court," and as to the Court's "free wheeling" see his and Justice Frankfurter's dissent in Sinkler in *Mo. Pac. R. R. Co., 356* v. *326.*

That this is true is now further attested by such eminent jurists as Judge Learned Hand, considered by many as the primus inter pares among sub-Supreme Court judges, when he declared that: "I cannot frame any definition that will explain when the Court will assume the role of a third legislative chamber and when it will limit its authority to keeping Congress and the States within their accredited authority."

The A. C. C. N. Agency reporting on the lecture of Judge Hand, inter alia, said: "The Supreme Court's 1953 segregation ruling was viewed by Judge Hand as an example of the Court overruling legislative judgments by making 'its own appraisal of the relative values at stake' of a judicial concept it opposed." As to the Court's legislative decisions, he remarked that: "This is disastrous because disunity cancels the impact of monolithic solidarity on which the authority of a bench of judges so largely depends."

And again: "Moreover, it certainly does not accord with the underlying presuppositions of popular government to vest a court, unaccountable to anyone but itself, the power to suppress social experiments which it does not approve."

And Professor Corwin, of Princeton, in a letter to the New York Times, declared that: "There can be no doubt that on June 17 last the Court went on a virtual binge and thrust its nose into matters beyond its competence, with the result that in my judgment, at least, it should have aforesaid nose well tweaked."[1]

Charles Warren in his classical "The Supreme Court in U. S. History" reminds us and the Court that: "However the Court may

[1] We have been told by the press that the Chief Justice is now studying Talmudic law—see New York Times, September 14, 1957—with "emphasis on moral law." Page, United States Constitution and those of the States.

interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decisions of the Court."[2]

The Court, we are told by the former Solicitor General, now chief judge of the fourth circuit, Sobeloff, always times its decisions and went on to illustrate that practice,[3] thus applying the homely wisdom of the Chinese proverb: "By taking one step after the other, one can reach the end of the earth." That this Fabian practice is alien to the thoughts of our Founding Fathers is apparent. That the Constitution is not so fluid is shown by two accepted constitutional authorities of another day; namely, Story and Cooley, along with the Court itself.

Justice Brewer, in *South Carolina* v. *U. S.* (199 U. S. 437), repeats the fundamental truth that "The Constitution is a written instrument, as such its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when adopted it means now. * * * Any other rule of constructions would abrogate the judicial character of this Court and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day." This was the accepted doctrine until the Roosevelt neo-Supreme Court, and is the only legitimate one today. As long as the Court continues to free wheel and usurp jurisdiction and ignores the doctrine of stare decisis, the dockets will always be crowded.

So, when the above-quoted well-known and respected authorities make such comments, we of the lesser breed cannot be fairly denominated demagoges or crackpots, and if we are, we certainly are in good company.

We think that what Margaret Halsey said in a review of The Affluent Society is all too true: "It is banal to mention that the turning points of history have a way of passing without the people involved in them being aware of it." The moral is all the worse, however, when the principal actors know but to serve the hour, blind spot the ultimate effect, and whichever alternative one accepts the cold fact is that form exists long after the substance has disappeared our dual system is no more. Its demise was involved in the late Justice McReynolds' solemn declaration from the bench, "The Constitution is dead." We hope to regalvanize it by constantly emphasizing the evil consequences of the present course of action.

---

[2] 11 vol. 748, and see Who's Who.
[3] Baltimore Sun, December 14, 1954.

Do We Realize What Guard Cut Means?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union on July 18, 1958:

DO WE REALIZE WHAT GUARD CUT MEANS?

No wonder the governors are protesting a plan to reduce the number and strength of National Guard units.

In May Defense Secretary McElroy assured the national governor's conference that in no instance would reduction in personnel in any State exceed 10 percent. Under the new plan, however, cuts range as high as 31.8 percent and Florida's Guard will be cut nearly 24 percent.

This time of world crisis is a strange time indeed for cuts in the guard. We have great need of ground strength to fight any brush-fire wars that may start in the Middle East; the Marine units aren't numerous enough to handle all the eventualities. If the crisis worsens guard units would have to serve as the framework of mobilization as they did in the crisis of 1940.

What is the reasoning behind these cuts in guard units and their strength? The assumption seems to be that atomic capabilities reduce the need for ground troops. That is, the idea of using atomic weapons on the battlefield is behind the redesign of the ground fighting unit.

Certainly we must be capable of using such weapons. But to make ourselves incapable of fighting without them also involves risk. If we are inadequately prepared to fight with conventional weapons, we have committed ourselves to battlefield atomics. Are we aware of the implications of that commitment?

For example, in the present crisis if sporadic fighting increases do we want to use atomic weapons on Arabs where conventional tactics would be sufficient?

Have we decided that tactical use of atomic weapons in other areas would not spread into strategic use of them by a foe? In other words, how can we be sure they would be limited to the battlefield?

A decision to cut the guard is a decision to commit ourselves to battlefield atomics. That in turn may be a decision to invite nuclear retaliation on civilian populations. Have we thought through these implications "of economy"?

It may cost money but ultimately it seems best to have both the capacity for fighting a limited war with conventional weapons and the atomic capability for unlimited war. Our real foe in this world struggle has both these capacities. An effective ground force cannot be preserved without preserving an adequate mobilization framework in the form of the National Guard.

Age Discrimination Is Getting Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, with the median age of the population rising steadily each year, we are faced with the responsibility of providing some means of subsistence for the older segment of our working force. It is clear that we cannot afford to cast these older members of our working population adrift, letting them survive as best they might. Industry certainly has a responsibility along these lines in providing employment for these competent and often skilled people who are discriminated against merely because of their age.

Sylvia Porter, in her column published in the San Francisco Chronicle of June 3, 1958, points out some of the difficulties faced by older persons seeking employment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGE DISCRIMINATION IS GETTING WORSE
(By Sylvia Porter)

Corporation employment barriers are going up again all over the country against the jobless man who is over 40 and the jobless woman who is over 35.

The age prejudice—senseless, cruel, wasteful, almost incredibly ironic though it is—appears in many areas to be worse than ever.

For the first time, resistance to hiring women, due solely to age, actually is showing up below 30. (A hag at 30?).

For a brief period during the boom-boom days, the discrimination against the "older" worker appeared to be lessening a bit. Or anyway, it went underground and companies which had rigid bars against the over-40 worker did not advertise the limits so blatantly.

But whatever feeble progress was made has been lost and now, the direction is backward.

"Our most recent survey of corporations employing almost 30,000 workers reveals that a man or woman over 30 is finding it increasingly difficult to get work—entirely due to age—and at 45, the resistance is very heavy," said George H. Gutekunst, Jr., spokesman for the Office Executives Association of New York, when I interviewed him by telephone at the national convention of the Office Management Association in Chicago.

"What we have found in New York reflects the national pattern. Prejudice in New York may even be less than in major manufacturing centers."

"Our inquiries across the country show that discrimination is much worse than it was a year ago—and it was bad enough then," added David D. Kiviat, president of the Forty Plus Club of New York, a nonprofit organization operated by unemployed executives to help find jobs for each other.

"Of the last 13 jobs that we unearthed, only one permitted a man over 45. The moment we mention a man is 45, the interest wanes."

"The unemployed who come in here blame us for the age barriers, but it is not our fault," remarked the head of one of the largest employment agencies in New York City.

"The age restrictions are imposed by two out of every three companies which give us openings. We can't budge them by a year."

And I confirmed the whole discouraging tale this past weekend when I plowed through thousands of want ads in the newspapers. In column after column, I found the words "25 to 32 years * * * not over 35 * * * not over 40 * * * to age 42."

The facts, as uncovered by the New York Office Executives Association's survey this spring are brutal. Read on and wince:

By the time a man reaches 50, a full 42.1 percent of the companies won't hire him because of his age.

When he hits 55, he'll be excluded from possible hiring by nearly 68 percent of the companies. Finding employment at 55 is almost impossible.

By the time a woman is 35, an astounding 10 percent of the companies think she is too old to hire, more than double the percentage which reported this age as their upper limit for hiring in 1957.

By the time she is 50, she will find the doors will be slammed in her face by 56 percent of the companies.

Yet, the same companies which have these arbitrary hiring rules admit that the absenteeism and turnover record of the older worker is no worse than that of the younger worker. They say frankly that older workers are just as reliable and productive, that they present no special problems of supervision, do not hurt morale. They just con-

tend—wrongly—that training of older workers poses a problem.

And the supreme irony is that these same companies place the most productive years for men between 25 and 55 and for women, between 25 and 50.

In other words, nearly 11 percent of the companies bar a man from employment before he has reached the halfway mark of his most productive years and 57 percent bar him during the second half as too old.

About 10 percent of the companies bar a woman before she has reached the halfway mark of her most productive years and another 48 percent turn her down in the second half as too old * * *.

There were some faintly heartening reports last fall that Congress might do something concrete to prod industry into curbing his discrimination. But since sputnik, there has been a deafening silence about this in Washington. What, then, can be done?

"Keep pounding at the stupidity of it," says Gutekunst. "Keep emphasizing it is a never-ending campaign," says Kiviat.

This is policy among industrialists who know they'll have to pay soaring taxes to support the older jobless—if the workers continue jobless. This is fact in a country in which the over-45 will constitute half our adult population by 1975. It doesn't seem credible.

The El Monte Herald Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking editorial was written and published in the El Monte (Calif.) Herald by Editor Neil R. Murray on July 18, 1958.

This editorial was of extreme interest to me because it expresses forcefully an American's view of an American event of tremendous magnitude.

I recommend that my colleagues read the following editorial from the El Monte Herald:

There seems to be considerable disagreement arising as to whether President Eisenhower was right in sending Marines to Lebanon. Regardless of the right or wrong of it, we got a bit of a thrill over the fact that at last we had done something besides writing protests. Not being in possession of all of the facts concerning the serious step taken, we can't approve or criticize.

But in today's world anything America does can involve serious consequences, for which the greatest country in the world should be prepared at all times.

One thing is certain, regardless of the right or wrong of Ike's action, we'd have been considerably prouder and and more thrilled had America sent the fleet to Cuba with the command: "Bring our American kidnapped citizens aboard alive, or we'll take Casto dead."

Likewise, we would have been considerably prouder and more thrilled had America sent to Communist China the command: "Return our 29 airmen unharmed at once or we'll come and get them after taking suitable military action."

Then everyone would have known, after these two wonderful things had happened, that America would go to any length to protect American citizens.

We have an idea that Teddy Roosevelt or Douglas MacArthur would have handled both situations that way and that it would have worked in both cases.

Indications are that America could wipe Russia and China off the map if the American people were as heartless as the Communists and probably both countries know it, but are pinning their hopes of gaining strength by bluffing.

Are we going to let our airmen imprisoned in Red China remain prisoners for life? The American people hope not. We have the greatest faith in the courage of the American people. If America were to be overpowered by the Communists tomorrow, most good Americans would wish to live the rest of their lives today.

We remember back a good many years when we were attending a baseball game at Wrigley Field. A cripple sat with his wife harmlessly watching and enjoying the game. A big ignorant drunk staggered by and chucked the wife under the chin. At least 20 men arose from their seats, but before they could get into action the cripple pulled himself erect and knocked the drunk down. That's what America is beneath the surface.

The American people want leadership like that of Teddy Roosevelt.

So we can't disapprove of any positive and courageous action by this Nation at home or abroad. But we would like it to be ready to protect American citizens everywhere and not just oil supplies or rulers of little nations.

We really would be vastly proud if the prisoners in Communist China and the kidnaped prisoners in Cuba were back home because America commanded they be returned and was prepared to back up the order. And we firmly believe that the leader who took such action would be backed up to a man by Americans, once again so proud of their country they could burst.

So, once again, America would be supreme in the respect of other countries over the world. And not because we're feeding them free millions of dollars, but because we had restored evidence of the courage for which America once was famous.

We wish the words, appeasement, negotiations, and protests could be removed from our political dictionary.

Vice President RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON, yes, and his wife, Pat, displayed the true American courage during their terrific ordeal in South American countries.

Christian Democratic Party of Italy Gains Strength in Recent Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Democratic Party gained strength in the recent elections in Italy due to the efficient organization developed by its aggressive party leader Amintore Fanfani.

The prowestern Christian Democrats increased their representation in both the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate but fell short of their goal of an absolute majority in both houses. Thus they had to depend upon the loyalties of the minor centrist parties to form a new coalition government. The Communists lost 3 seats in the Chamber while the left wing Socialists led by Pietro Nenni picked up 8. The extreme right Monarchist group and neo-Fascists suffered a crushing defeat. The Communists held their own, increasing the popular vote from 35.2 percent to 36.4, an increase of 1.2 percent from 1953. The Christian Democrats increased their vote from 40 percent to 42.4 percent, an increase of 2.4 percent over the last general election in 1953. It gave them 122 seats in the Senate, an increase of 12 over 1953 and 273 seats in the Chamber, an increase of 12 seats over 1953, but 23 short of a majority.

Although the election left the situation the same as far as placing complete control in the Christian Democratic Party, yet there was a strengthening of the center parties that are prowestern in their attitudes.

The leadership, having fallen to Fanfane, a dynamic statesman who believes in the coalition between the center and non-Communist left, has led to a formidable grouping of prowestern North Atlantic Atlantic Treaty Organization policy and acceptance of allied missile bases on Italian soil.

His conferences in Italy with the Ambassadors of Turkey, Egypt, and Western Germany and the Prime Minister of France will enable him to give the proposals not only of the Italian plan of its Mid East policy but also the viewpoints of these other nations as well and so, he comes well informed to Washington to discuss with President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles the Mid East-Orient situation relative to its effect on the Italian economy and the problems of the others. This is indicative of the high trust and complete confidence that the officials of the aforementioned governments placed in him. He certainly is a statesman of definitely an important stature. As a cofounder with the late Gaspari and others of the Christian Democratic Party he has always maintained a belief that Christian principles as a political platform can be worked toward the betterment of the national life; and on the whole the party has done a fine job. The party publicly has proclaimed separation of church and state, their critics maintain that the policies of the party are dictated by the Vatican. Of course in any nation where the predominance of one religious group makes up the very religious complexion of the body politic, the same accusations are made.

We are fortunate that the leader of the Christian Democratic Party visits our country, within which thousands of his comparees are its citizens and whose most fantastic dreams have been realized through the great opportunities toward their accomplishment.

He knows of and saw in his own Italy during World War II thousands upon thousands of Americans of Italian extraction, sons of these pioneers, march through Italy with bloody bayonets and hand-fired weapons at short range; at the landings, the bloody triangle at Casino and Anzio Beach—there is no hyphen here—but just a high respect and a fond regard for the homelands of our ancestry. America is strong because she

venerates in all her people the love and interest in the folklore, the customs, and the welfare of the homelands of the many nationalities that have contributed so much to the strength of the greatest Republic. A Republic that protects the freedom at birth and to the very grave.

In her role as the leader of freedom-loving nations, she has been very patient and at times the rich chump of satellite sweethearts. But in her spendthrift orgies she gives away only what she cares so little about if peace has a price. But once aroused to even a scarey threat of the loss of the sacred freedoms of her peoples or these peoples over which she has placed her protecting hand—God has unleashed the fury of the damned—to the last man—it will be the last war. The courage of America is not in the dollar but "in God we trust" and so we welcome our fighting friend the great Premier Amitre Fanfani of the Republic of Italy always a nation whose population was our friend—even though in this generation it was once betrayed by a dictatorship that was betrayed itself under its own tutilage. Italy passed through the reconstruction era after the war and made tremendous strides in its recovery, standing next to the great Republic of Western Germany as one of our most powerful allies in the Atlantic Pact.

We know that the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles will accord to him every advantage that is necessary to help maintain the independence and security of the great Italian Republic and its liberty-loving people. America is fortunate in having this great statesman on its side—Italy, as the most strategic spot in Europe, is of the greatest importance to the maintainance of our supremacy in Europe. God bless Premier Fanfani and may the gratitude of the United States protect and support him in his common stand with us for the freedom-loving nations of the world. He is our kind of statesman. At the present time he is already moving fast toward the implementation of his economic and social program for Italy, whose aim is to give each Italian an education, a home, and a job. This program he knows will insure the popular support of the democratic institutions and stability of the Italian Government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald and an article from the Chicago Sun-Times as follows:

[Editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 29, 1958]

GOOD NEWS FROM ITALY

Although the Italian elections leave the political configuration only slightly altered, their net effect is to strengthen the center and the non-Communist left. The middle-road Christian Democrats, who have constituted the strongest party since the end of the war, gained by more than a million and a half in the popular vote. This was reflected in their gain of 11 votes in the Chamber of Deputies and of 6 votes in the Senate; but they again fell well short of an absolute majority in the chamber. The Communists lost some ground in the chamber but gained four additional places in the Senate, and in the popular voting barely held their ground.

On the other hand the left-wing, or Nenni, Socialists emerged stronger than ever and the right-wing, or Saragat, Socialists also made substantial gains. The parties of the extreme right, such as the Monarchists and the Neo-Fascists have been so severely atrophied by the returns as to be no longer serious political factors.

From the point of view of international policy the Italian elections are a clear victory for the West, since the controlling power in the new Parliament will lie, and even more firmly than before, with the pro-Western parties of the center. On the question of internal policy the consequences are less clear. Much will depend upon the personal composition of the new Parliament, for under the Italian system of proportional representation the voters are permitted to state preferences among the individual candidates of a given party. This is especially important as concerns the Christian Democrats who include in themselves right, centrist, and radical wings.

The election, nevertheless, may be interpreted as a personal triumph for Signor Fanfani, leader of the Christian Democrats and also of their more radical faction. His assumption of the Premiership is now strongly indicated though as yet by no means assured. It is possible that Signor Fanfani, now that he has nothing to fear from the Right, may even seek to woo the Nenni Socialists even farther away from their former Communist allies in the hope of gaining their support for further economic and social reforms.

As for the Communists, the earlier returns by districts suggest that the party has suffered heavy defections to both Socialist parties in the industrial and now relatively prosperous north but that these were largely offset by gains in the agricultural and still misery-stricken south. If this proves to be correct, it will give further plausibility to the theory that Italian communism is much more a matter of the stomach than of ideological conviction.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of May 29, 1958]

FIND MILD SATISFACTION FOR UNITED STATES IN ITALY'S VOTE RESULTS

WASHINGTON.—United States officials drew mild satisfaction from results of Italy's general election.

Slight strengthening of the center parties offset the pro-Communist left's modest gains. It was the extreme right—Monarchists and Fascists—that suffered appreciable losses.

The voting Sunday and half of Monday elected a senate or upper house and a new Chamber of Deputies, in which the real power resides. State Department experts were suspending final judgment until they learned the balance of power inside the major parties.

FANFANI OR PELLA?

For instance, it remains to be seen whether the dominant man among the Christian Democrats, biggest party, is Amintore Fanfani or the present Foreign Minister, Giuseppe Pella. Both are potential Premiers of the next Government. Fanfani, a former Prime Minister, is more inclined to form a coalition between the Center and non-Communist left.

Pella leans toward the right wing of the Christian Democrats and would head a more conservative Government.

In the less important Senate, the Christian Democrats just missed winning a majority.

It is the lower house, or Chamber of Deputies, that experts are scrutininzing closely. There the 3 rightist parties together lost 21 seats out of their 69 in the recently dissolved Parliament. The 3 are the 2 Monarchist Parties and Italian social movement (Fascists).

On the left, the Communists increased their popular vote to 6,700,000: from 6,120,709 at the last election in 1953. But owing to the influx of new voters since 1953, it took more ballots to hold the same number of seats. So the Communists dropped from 143 to 140 seats. Their share of the total vote was almost identical with that 5 years ago—22.7 percent now, as against 22.6 then.

NENNI GAINS MORE SEATS

The Socialists under Pietro Nenni fared better than the extreme left. Nenni increased his party's seats from 76 to 84, its popular vote from 3,441,014 to 4,198,000, and its percentage of the entire poll from 12.7 to 14.2.

The Socialists have tended to crawl into bed with the Communists on major issues.

The Christian Democrats, while making a good showing, failed to win an absolute majority of the chamber. They gained 12 seats, now holding 273 as against 261 in the former Parliament. Their popular vote was 12,508,000, compared with 10,834,466 in the 1953 election. They increased their slice of the total vote from 40 percent to 42.2.

Bracketed with them in the moderate center are the Social Democrats, Liberals, and Republicans. The Social Democrats won 23 seats (formerly 19). Liberals 16 (14). Republicans 9 (5).

Since the Christian Democrats fell short of the strength needed to form a one-party government, these coalitions are possible:

1. Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, and Republicans, with 305 of the total 596 seats in the chamber.

2. Christian Democrats, Liberals, and (Guiseppe Lauro's) Monarchists with 302 seats.

3. Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, and Liberals with 312 seats.

All these groupings mean continuance of Italy's pro-Western, North Atlantic Treaty Organization policy and acceptance of Allied missile bases on Italian soil.

It appears that the rightists' losses were divided about equally between the center and left.

Can We Stop Slaughter on the River?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Detroit Free-Press:

CAN WE STOP SLAUGHTER ON THE RIVER?—CARELESSNESS, IGNORANCE OF BOATERS BLAMED

(By James Glynn)

On a lazy afternoon early this summer a high-powered motorboat with four occupants was cutting wide circles in the Detroit River pulling a water skier.

All four occupants were facing the stern of the boat watching the skier. None of them saw the approaching cruiser.

The motorboat struck the big pleasure craft amidship. The shattering impact hurled the 4 people in the motorboat against the side of the cruiser, maiming 2 of them for life.

The police report shows that the driver of the motorboat was 15. The oldest passenger was 13.

Now it's a Saturday morning last June.

The early morning weather report indicates scattered thunderstorms in the Detroit area. The wind is blowing in gusts from

19 to 23 miles per hour from the north. Small craft warnings are posted.

But a 21-foot kit boat puts out from a marina near Metropolitan Beach. Five persons are aboard.

Less than 3 hours later the Coast Guard has completed its tragic report. The boat was found listing badly in the choppy water. the gas tank had been smashed out of its moorings by heavy waves. The propeller blades were broken off.

The five bodies were fished out of the lake and sent to a morgue for identification.

Less than a week later a small outboard motor boat is preparing to enter the mouth of the Detroit River from Lake St. Clair.

There are 6 people aboard, including the owner, who knows that the boat's capacity is 4.

The traffic is heavy at the mouth of the river. The overloaded outboard gets caught in one backwash after another from heavier boats.

It takes too much water and sinks. One passenger drowned before help could arrive.

This is the kind of weekend mayhem that goes on every summer in spite of frantic efforts by the Coast Guard and the Detroit Harbor Police to stop it.

Just when we think things are getting better, said a veteran patrolman, some darn fool who doesn't know the first thing about boats in the first place goes out there and starts buzzing some kids who are in swimming.

The situation probably will get worse before it gets better.

Few people are aware that in the area along the lakes and rivers between Monroe and Tawas there are approximately 45,000 boats.

When they all get out there together on a Sunday afternoon, said a Coast Guardsman, it's every man for himself.

Trying to preserve order on the water in the Detroit area are 37 men assigned to the police Harbor Master's office on Belle Isle and a larger complement of Coast Guardsmen assigned to Lake St. Clair, Lake Huron and the St. Clair River.

Accidents resulting in injury or damage are investigated by the Coast Guard's Marine Inspection Bureau in the Federal Building.

This office is headed by Comdr. Benjamin Malloch, a veteran Coast Guardsman, who shudders at the sight of most of the reports crossing his desk.

Boating accidents, he claims, are caused primarily by three factors—poor seamanship, overloading and complete disregard of prevailing weather conditions.

"Anyone who has the money can buy a boat," says Malloch. "They buy what they want, launch it, and they're off to the races without knowing the first thing about regulations or seamanship."

But there are many cases, he adds, of accidents caused by downright recklessness.

His office is investigating the case of a hit-run driver who was piloting a high-powered motorboat on Lake St. Clair at high speed with no lights.

The motorboat glanced off the side of a cabin cruiser with a party of six aboard. One passenger was thrown to the deck and suffered a fractured skull. The cruiser was partially disabled and it was hours before the injured person could be taken to a hospital.

But reports of water accidents, for some reason, are slow in reaching investigative officers.

The hit-run accident occurred on a Sunday. The first details of the crash did not reach Malloch's office until the next Friday—probably giving the offender enough time to have the damage to his boat repaired.

If an accident is caused by criminal negligence, the case is referred to the United States Attorney for prosecution.

Reckless drivers on the Detroit River receive the same treatment as automobile drivers.

They are given citations ordering them to report to traffic court. Fines range from $5 to $100 depending upon the degree of the offense.

To flag down reckless drivers, the Detroit Police Department has a high-powered 30-foot patrol boat and two 26-footers.

They cruise on the river from 10 a. m. to 2 p. m. daily, watching for overt acts of recklessness and speeding.

The police claim that their biggest headache is the maniac who overpowers his boat.

"He gets himself a small, light boat," said an officer, "and a motor big enough for a tug. Then he goes out on the river and flies along the water."

Smart alecks who like to show off by buzzing the waterfront bars are another source of trouble.

Inspector Oliver Beresford, in charge of the river detail, says that "buzzers," operating too close to shore, cause considerable damage to boats moored along the river's edge.

So far this summer, about 55 accident cases involving damage or injury are under investigation.

That figure does not include the citations issued by the harbor police. Nor does it include cases of recklessness and speeding in which the driver got away before he was detected.

What to do about it?

Police officials have two suggestions—operator's licenses for boat drivers and a minimum age limit.

So far as they know, there is no legislation pending for either of these possible cures.

Some kind of parental supervision for juvenile boat operators would be helpful but too often it is conspicuously absent.

Commander Malloch tells the story about a mother who called him on the telephone to say that she was going to buy a boat for her son.

She wanted Malloch's advice on the kind of a boat she should buy.

"How old is he?" said Malloch.

"He's 14," said the mother.

"Then my advice," said Malloch, "is to buy something that he could float in the bathtub."

TWO CHILDREN DROWN AS BOAT FLIPS

Two children drowned Saturday when a 16-foot boat with a 40-horsepower motor turned at high speed and rolled over on an artificial lake 25 miles west of Cadillac.

Drowned were Carol Butler, 7, and her brother, Lee, 5, children of the Reverend Durell J. Butler, pastor of the Remus (Mich.) Church of God.

Two other Butler children, Judy, 8, and Floyd, 6, were rescued by an unidentified camper. William Lamb, Jr., 14, operator of the boat, got to shore himself.

State Police said the boat was both overpowered and overloaded and Lamb tried to turn it too quickly, causing it to roll over and pitch the children from it.

The four Butler youngsters had been vacationing with Lamb and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Lamb, at the Mesick Chamber of Commerce camp grounds near where the accident occurred.

Despite rescue attempts by Gail Reeb, 15, of Brighton, Ria Smith, 14, of Flint, drowned in Ore Lake, 4 miles southwest of Brighton, Livingston County.

The two girls were wading in 4 feet of water with Ria's sister, Mrs. Davina Lathrop, 22, of Hamburg Township, and Anita Audreini, 14, of Flint.

About 40 feet offshore, the group slipped from a dropoff into 40 feet of water. Anita made it back to shallow water and Gail, an excellent swimmer, aided Mrs. Lathrop.

Then Gail swam to help Ria but couldn't find her.

Hamburg Township firemen recovered the body.

A Trenton man, Harry Los, 33, drowned late Friday when he stepped into deep water while wading in the St. Clair River near Algonac. His body was recovered.

Vice President Nixon's Salute to the Bausch & Lomb Honorary Science Award Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure recently to participate in a program commemorating the 25th anniversary of the honorary science awards presented by the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. Each year, this company, which is located in Rochester, N. Y., presents bronze medals to leading scientists in graduating high school classes. This program has contributed much to encouraging science education in this country.

This year some 6,500 awards were presented, thus bringing the total number given out over the years to 125,000. The keen interest in these medals and the tremendous honor they represent make them highly coveted by our graduating seniors. They have stimulated literally thousands of young people to go into the vital fields of science upon which so much progress—and, indeed, our very survival, depends. They show the important role the private sector of our economy can play in the cold war science battle.

Attending the silver anniversary luncheon on June 17 were Dr. Norman H. Nachtrieb, one of the original 1933 award winners and now a distinguished physicist at the University of Chicago, and two of this year's winners, Miss Constance Sue Rose, of Charleston, W. Va., and Thomas Hodgson, of Moorestown, N. J. The principal address—a stirring and inspirational extemporaneous speech—was delivered by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. In his timely remarks the Vice President emphasized the importance of the Bausch & Lomb awards and of science teaching, in our never-ending struggle to preserve our freedoms.

Because his remarks are so sound and apt, they deserve the attention of every Member of this body. Under leave previously granted, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON AT THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAUSCH & LOMB HONORARY SCIENCE AWARD JUNE 17, 1958, SHERATON-CARLTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, if I might have the opportunity to speak to you informally for just a moment before this very fine occasion comes to an

end. I think that all of us (the people that I refer to make up this select audience today) must have many thoughts running through our minds, on an occasion like this. There is always a tendency for us, of course, to put these events in a personal context. I was speaking to Constance Sue Rose and to Dr. Nachtrieb before and during the luncheon today with regard to my own activities in this field when I was going to school. And I pointed out to them that, like many people who had some ability in the field of history, and literature and language, that I had no ability whatever in the field of science. Nevertheless, I recall when I was a jnior in high school, I had a very remarkable man in the year 1929 who was a teacher of chemistry. He was such an inspirational teacher (and incidentally both chemistry and physics were required for the high school degree in those years) so I had to take them even though I had no aptitude whatever. But I recall he was so inspirational that I many times would spend half the night in order to work out the problems prior to the examinations that might take place the next day.

This kind of inspiration is something that made an indelible impression on my mind. It taught me, as a person, as an individual, to learn something, at least to get some basic knowledge in the field of science. More than that, it also gave me at that time a picture of how much we owe to teachers in all fields. These people who teach in our grade schools and our high schools and our great colleges and universities inspire literally hundreds of thousands of young Americans to develop their creative ability, not only in the field of science represented at this luncheon today, but in all the other fields which, together, make up the American society we are trying to perpetuate.

I think that we are very fortunate that Dr. Nachtrieb is here today because he represents too, as do our two award winners, a group much larger than is here in this room.

It is a group of the literally thousands of teachers in all of the schools of this country, in the field of science and in the other fields as well. I asked him, just before the awards were presented, whether he had any regrets that he chose teaching as a career. "None at all," he said, "you know, there are many compensations in the field of teaching which far exceed any monetary gain that you might receive."

This is something that we often lose sight of. Not with the thought in mind that the teaching profession in many of our universities and colleges and certainly in our public schools is underpaid and sometimes unappreciated, but something we lose sight of when we consider the fact that the teaching profession is one of the noblest in a free society. It is one in which we have literally thousands of dedicated people, whose compensation in other walks of life could be much greater. But who, because they have a zeal, a mission, a passion for passing on the inspiration which they themselves have received from teachers; because they have this, they go into this profession, and they help to make the country in which we live a better place for all of us.

And so, I appreciate this opportunity to speak not only as an individual but as a Government official. For Dr. Nachtrieb, and all of those in the teaching profession, just as he himself present such a fine example, have gone into teaching not for the monetary rewards which are there, but primarily because they realize that there are other considerations which are important, and because they appreciate the opportunity of instructing the young people of this country, and of inspiring them to greater efforts.

Now, if I could turn for just a moment to our two award winners, I think as you have both noted and as I indicated in my remarks a few moments ago, these are all-around young people. I think too often, as Dr. Teller informed me recently after he had appeared before a congressional committee, too often in the United States we get the impression that anybody in the field of science, chemistry, physics, and all of the other very complicated subjects of higher mathematics, that anybody to be an expert in that field has to be what we call a square—somebody who is a little bit on the queer side. Now I think we all realize that, as Dr. Nachtrieb has suggested, we need a lot more good scientists and mathematicians in the United States than we have today. And I want to point out that we can be fortunate in the fact that we do have a great many. We must not ever get the impression that because of the deficit we have in this area, that we are not blessed with a great deal of talent throughout the country. But I think also we should bear in mind that these two young people are typical of the types of students that our schools are turning out today. People who have real ability as specialists in the field of science, but people who are well rounded. I don't mean that every science student must be a good college football player, or a baseball player. I do mean, however, that you will find more often than not that our young people who go into science and into mathematics and into these specialized subjects, are people who are specialists but who also have a broad interest in the problems of their schools and who later on, when they go into the society, will have a broad interest in other problems as well. And in this respect these two young people are certainly typical of the very best that American schools produce today.

I'd like to say just a word, too, about Carl Hallauer and Bausch & Lomb. As far as this particular award ceremony is concerned I can imagine that there are those cynics who would suggest that it is a pretty good advertising gimmick for Bausch & Lomb to make these awards to 125,000 over the period of 25 years. All that I can say, if it was planned as an advertising gimmick, we need more advertising gimmicks of this type. Also, the way in which it has been handled on this occasion, in the visit that was paid to the White House, it was certainly in the very best taste and in the very best tradition.

What I am really trying to convey is this: When the first sputnik was launched a few months ago, the people of the United States got excited about science. Justifiably so. Because for years, as a matter of fact, at least I remember from the time that I came into the administration in 1953, we had been hearing about the great gains that the Soviet Union was making in the field of science; about the training programs that they have. We had been hearing, not that they were ahead of us overall, but that they were concentrating more in this field than we were. That unless we proceeded to pay more attention to this area than we had, they would overtake us. This, in other words, was the essence of the problem. As I say, the sputnik merely brought that home to all of us, because this condition has been existing ever since World War II. And it exists not only in the field of science, but in many others.

Now, what we really then come to is this: when we were reminded by the sputnik that the Soviet Union was concentrating in the field of science, we had a number of suggestions as to how we were going to meet this problem. Most of those suggestions were with regard to Government action. Some of them were rather naive in a sense. Naive, to the effect that in order to produce scientists, all you had to do was to have a Government program which would simply turn them out somewhat as you would turn them out in an assembly line. It doesn't work that way. It certainly doesn't work that way in a free society where there is a choice among our young people as to what field they desire to devote their studies for the balance of their lives.

What I want to get across here is that today we have an example of the difference in the approach to this basic problem of a free society competing with a dictatorial society—of the difference that must characterize our approach as compared with theirs. In a dictatorial society, the State can say what the young people will do. The curriculum, everything else, is determined by the State. And people who have certain abilities in certain areas go into the areas in which they are needed. And in the short run, there isn't any question but what they can make very significant progress. And make no mistake about it, and I am sure we will not, the Soviet Union has made remarkable progress and will make more in the years ahead.

But, on the other hand, I think we must never forget that if we lose faith in our approach, the approach of what we term the free society, then we will certainly be lost. Because we need not assume that the only way you can inspire young people, the only way that you can get the scientists that you need is through a Government program which literally forces them into this area or that area where they may be needed. In other words, we see here today a typical example, one of many that could be expanded throughout our society, of how American private enterprise, working with the public school systems of this country and private school systems as well, has, over a period of 25 years, recognized the need and has contributed to the solution and the filling of that need. It has contributed to it not through a system which forces young people to do something which they do not want to do, but one which inspires them. It inspires them, not with a great deal of money, but with recognition—recognition in the form of a symbol, a very small one, but one which, as Dr. Nachtrieb has indicated, can mean even more than a monetary award.

So, I am very happy to be here today to pay a tribute and to express our thanks to Carl Hallauer, to Bausch & Lomb, and to him and his company, as they represent the other companies of this type throughout the country who have recognized this kind of need and who are engaging in this kind of program. Because this, in essence, is the most effective way to answer the challenge which is presented to the free nations. Once we recognize a problem; I have no doubt whatever that free peoples working voluntarily with encouragement from Government—not with the type of Government control which a dictatorial society must have—that a free people with the challenge with which we are presented, working under a free Government can, in the end, not only survive but will surpass materially as well as in more important areas on the spiritual side, a people who live under a system of slavery.

All of you probably noted what happened just yesterday in Hungary. We saw there the ultimate result of what can happen in a dictatorial society. I remember, immediately after sputnik, you heard quite a few people who very honestly would say, "maybe this system of dictatorship is one which in the long run can produce materially a more productive society and a richer life for people." In other words, we at least have to consider this. For the answer all we need do is look at the events of yesterday, to see the sad end of the Hungarian revolution; a revolution in which young people like this, by the thousands, in which workers by the thousands were shot down in the streets of Budapest, in which the Premier, Governor, and General Maleter and the others who led the revolution were then executed after they were promised safe conduct. We can see the real difference, the real difference between the system of freedom under which we live

and a system of slavery with which we are in competition.

This is neither the time nor the place to discuss in detail the basic issues involved from the diplomatic and foreign policy standpoint between the Communist bloc and the free nations. But I can say this, on the basis of my travels throughout the world, most of which have taken me to countries which are underdeveloped, countries in which there are literally millions of people, yes, a billion people, who want a better way of life, that I have found a fundamental truth evident every place.

Whether in South America, in Africa, in the Near East or in Asia, people do want a better way of life and they realize that the development of their resources, the development of industrialization, the training of scientists and engineers and the like, can lead to a better way of life. They see what has happened in the Soviet Union, the development that has taken place there during the past 40 years. They see what has happened in Communist China. The major difference is that the peoples in these countries, believe me, want a better way of life but they would prefer to have it with freedom. And that, therefore, is the advantage we have. On the other hand, if they cannot have a better life with a system of freedom, they are going to take it the other way. Because, above everything else, they want to get away from the terrible poverty and misery and disease that has plagued them for centuries.

So this, then, is the challenge that we face. A challenge which these young people will help us to meet. A challenge which Dr. Nachtrieb, through his own efforts and those of his colleagues, and through the students that they will train, will help us to meet. A challenge in which free peoples will prove that we can train the scientists and the engineers, all the other specialists that we need, to produce a better way of life for our people as well as other peoples in the world. But produce it in the climate of freedom rather than the climate of slavery. And so, may I say again that I am privileged to be here as a spokesman of the government and also as an individual, to express our thanks to Carl Hallauer, to Bausch & Lomb, and particularly our compliments and our congratulations to these fine young examples of our American schools and the products of our schools. At a time in which everybody is suggesting that our young people are going to the dogs, I can only say that if this is an example of it we can be very proud of the way they are going. Thank you very much.

School Tree Plantings in Memory of Theodore Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, when schools reopen in the fall many children will once again be engaged in the worthy ceremony of tree plantings. In this centennial year of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, the Natural Resources Council of America has made the fitting suggestion that these plantings be made in the memory of the great "T. R."

I commend the announcement that follows to the attention of my colleagues:

JULY 15, 1958.

We, the undersigned members of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Committee of the Natural Resources Council of America, urge the superintendents, principals, and teachers of the public schools to observe the memory of T. R., who was one of our foremost conservation leaders, by promoting tree planting by the youth of the Nation during 1958. There could be no more fitting tribute to this pioneer conservationist during the centennial year of his birth than such a program symbolizing the former President's varied personal interests in natural resources, forestry, wildlife, and youth.

We feel that tree-planting activities, conducted with appropriate ceremonies, would serve the dual purpose of inspiring the young people of America with the spirit and philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, under whose administration the first fully effective laws protecting our national resources were enacted, and dramatizing the ability of individuals to enhance the beauty, wealth, and future welfare of the Nation.

Tree planting in the fall, up to the first hard freeze in the Northern States, can be as successful as spring planting. Everyone retains memories of tree-planting projects in which they have engaged, and it is hoped that there will be widespread participation in this phase of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial program.

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Chairman; Vice President, Wildlife Management Institute.
JOHN A. BAKER,
President, National Aubudon Society.
FRED E. HORNADAY,
Vice President, American Forestry Association.
HARLEAN JAMES,
Secretary, American Planning and Civic Association.

A Special Report on the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in order that all of us can better understand the Mideast situation, I offer this special report without personal comment. I am presenting facts, statements, and comments of others, but I reserve my own opinion until a later report and after more details are known to Congress.

I believe we should have a short rundown on strife-torn Iraq:

In its stormy career as a nation since its independence was proclaimed in 1932, Iraq has witnessed five military coups d'etat in the course of being ruled by about 40 cabinets. Iraq was established by the British in 1921 out of the Ottoman Empire and became independent in 1932 when the mandate ended. It was ruled for its first 12 years by the Emir Feisal, who was placed on the throne by the British as a reward for his services during World War I. Feisal was succeeded by his son Ghazi, who was killed in an auto accident in 1939.

In 1941, a pro-Nazi coup overthrew the government, but was in turn driven out by a column of British troops rushed from Palestine. Ever since then, the country's allegiance to the West has been dubious. In 1948, for example, an uprising followed the signing of a 20-year treaty of alliance with Great Britain in which 70 were killed and 300 injured. The treaty was later repudiated and the Premier who signed it fled into exile. In May 1957 when Jordan was threatened by a Nasser coup, Iraq showed little eagerness to help. Later that year, Iraq was constrained to give moral support to Syria in the Moscow-inflated Syrian crisis.

The country was ruled until 1953 by Prince Abdul Ilah, who was the regent for King Feisal II. The Prince was assassinated in the current coup. The pro-West Nuri as-Said held the office of Premier at least 13 times, and rigidly controlled all organs of information. It was often said that Iraq stood with the West largely because of the influence and prestige of this one man.

Despite its great oil wealth and its fertile soil, Iraq has made slow economic progress. Its population of about 5 million is largely ignorant and untrained. The national per capita income is about $85. New hospitals and schools are handicapped by the lack of trained professional help. There are relatively few doctors and most of them are concentrated in Baghdad. Infant mortality remains high at 250 per 1,000 births.

Included in Iraq's population are about 90,000 Christians. Only 5,000 Jews are left out of a population of 130,000 in 1948, most of whom emigrated to Israel.

Political power is held by a group of feudal sheiks who name and control members of Parliament by gerrymandered districts. Only 15 percent of the registered voters went to the polls in 1953, and civil liberties have been rigidly controlled by the government in power.

Iraq is a member of the Baghdad Pact and has been receiving military supplies from the United States since 1954 under the mutual security program. Its army, now estimated at more than 50,000 men, has never been noted for its reliability or effectiveness.

On May 15, 1948 it invaded Israel with a force of 18,000 men and 100 armored vehicles but was unable to advance more than 3 miles. Previously, a number of Iraqi officers, however, entered Palestine and served with the Arab irregulars in the futile struggle to destroy Israel. Iraq never signed an armistice with Israel but withdrew its troops after turning over their positions to Jordanian forces. Iraq has poured out a constant flow of hatred and incitement against Israel down through the years.

These threats and the instability of the government led to strong criticism from friends of the mutual security program who contended that economic aid would better serve the Arab people than arms and jets.

A few comments, worthy of quoting:

History:

The United States Government [Eisenhower and Dulles, at time of the Suez crisis] denounced the attack on Sues by British, French and Israeli troops. Demanded cease fire and evacuation before U. N. intercession.

Walter Lippmann, in his column of July 1, said:

After the stand we took in the Suez affair, we are committed by our own acts and declarations to a policy of coexistence with Nasser.

Commenting on this statement, Ernest K. Lindley, in Newsweek of July 14, said:

With Nasser as ruler of Egypt and head of the United Arab Republic, yes. With Nasser's ambition to control the entire Arab world, no. Nasser seeks to destroy, or at least bring to heel, every Arab regime friendly to the West. His propaganda organs have gone even so far as openly to urge the assassination of chiefs and statesmen who stand in his way.

On July 8, a Cairo broadcast accused Nuri Pasha of plotting to bring Lebanon into the Baghdad Pact and charged:

When the imperialists failed to stir up the world against the heroic Lebanese people, they began to manipulate Nuri. He hastened to London to extend his poisonous fangs.

The broadcast concluded with a denunciation of the Iraq premier and imperialism. A few hours after the coup Nasser cabled the Iraq revolutionaries from his yacht: "God grant you success in the service of Arabism."

Our present position as we knew it on July 16, 1958:

THE CALL FOR AID

Then came the blow in Baghdad, with repercussions in Beirut. It was now clear that Lebanon could not quell the revolt. From the beginning, the United States had promised that it would respond to a call for assistance if it came. The failure of the Lebanese Army to deal sternly with the rebels and the disappointing U. N. report had created misgivings about the validity of intervention. But Baghdad changed that. The call came on July 14. President Eisenhower called congressional leaders primarily to discuss Lebanon appeal, for reports from Iraq were fragmentary. The President felt that there was no alternative but United States intervention and the landing of United States Marines.

The administration's position was supported by Republican leaders and by most of the Democrats, but Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democratic whip, argued strongly that the United States take the case first to the U. N. One Congressman recalled the missed opportunity when Israel launched its attack on Nasser in 1956.

Excerpts from editorials of Washington reporters:

The very serious situation facing the United States and the world in the Middle East is a part of the pattern of Soviet strategy in the economic field. The Russians seem fairly content to reduce the power of the West by the acquisition of areas which will embarrass Western Europe and the United States economically.

The Middle East is an ideal field for Russian operations. To begin with, it is extremely rich in oil, which has now become a necessity for heating and power in Western Europe, and to a great extent in the United States. This vast wealth, coupled with the incredible backwardness of the areas, give the Soviet strategist a rare opportunity.

It should be noted, as these events unroll, the alternate sources of oil supply to the Western World are also in danger, and it is not difficult to project a situation in which the pattern of revolution spreads from the Middle East into Indonesian and Malayan oil supplies, and also to Venezuela. The situation in Venezuela is much more serious than can be imagined. The left wing group which has taken command of the rich South American Republic, is moving rapidly toward the consolidation of their gains. The country has about 20,000 active Communists, which remained in the underground during the regime of Perez Jiminez. Since his overthrow, they have opened the borders to thousands of others, many of whom have been trained behind the Iron Curtain, ready to take command in the pattern used more than 20 years ago in Spain.

This technique has been found very successful by the Russians. They infiltrate the ranks of students, labor and anticlerical groups and select persons of energy and ability for indoctrination. These natives are transferred surreptitiously behind the Iron Curtain and are given intensive training in the fields of military, economics, sabotage and subversion. In Spain a humble fisherman, farmer, student or laborer disappeared in the early 1920's, only to reappear when the revolution broke out in 1936, as trained military officers ready to occupy positions in power in the armed revolution. This is exactly what is happening in Venezuela today. Persons not seen for many years are reappearing, full of fight and fire, and well-trained to take over the country and to use its wealth for purposes of subversion in Panama, Costa Rica, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

If the chain of events now taking place in the Middle East continues, Western Europe and the United States will be denied huge sources of cheap oil. This could result in over-expenditure of native resources and increase our hazards as a "have-not" country. The drift of Venezuela to the left is becoming more apparent and it can be readily seen that there is a tiein between the freely operating Communists of Venezuela and the Communistic operations of Fidel Castro in Cuba. Whereas the funds for propaganda for the Cuban revolution have formerly originated in Mexico, now they are pouring in from Venezuela. In addition, Venezuela radio is rebroadcasting the propaganda from the Castro radio in Cuba.

The hope of the present Middle Eastern situation probably lies in Israel. That country in the center, supported by Turkey on the north and Iran and Pakistan on the east, could very well be the basis for operations of the west against Russian revolutionary tactics. There is no question about the fact that we must risk a widespread war in the Middle East to bring the area back into our orbit. It may be that we will have to commit large numbers of troops and planes to these countries to reassert our determination to halt Communist conquest.

The foregoing is presented without prejudice or opinion and merely as information and background for our better understanding of the problems.

Report on Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include and commend to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the July 14 issue of the New York Times, reporting on the situation in Ceylon.

The article was written by Mr. Drew Middleton, and it has some interesting things to say about the administration of our aid program to Ceylon under the guiding hand of Mr. John L. Roach, the chief of the International Cooperation Administration mission in that country.

Ceylon is an important, and a strategically located nation. What happens there should be of considerable interest to all of us in the free world.

The article follows:

CEYLON ECONOMY FALTERING BADLY—AID FROM WEST AND RED BLOC MAY BE DECISIVE IN EFFORT TO WIN ISLE'S ALLEGIANCE

(By Drew Middleton)

LONDON, July 13.—The impact of United States and other Western-aid programs on Ceylon's faltering economy may prove a decisive factor in the coming struggle to hold the island nation within the West's sphere of influence.

In many respects what is happening in Ceylon typifies the economic and diplomatic conflict throughout free Asia between the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their allies.

An island about the size of West Virginia, Ceylon is strategically situated on the great trade route between the Middle East and the Far East. She has a Government veering to the left of center, a rising birth rate and a declining economy.

Unemployment has increased 31 percent, to 116,000, in a year. Export trade for the first quarter of 1958 was down by 11 percent, a favorable trade balance is beginning to wane and external assets are declining.

Ceylon's population of just in excess of 8 million is increasing by 2.6 percent a year. The island must import more than 40 percent of its food.

This correspondent found in Colombo and elsewhere in Ceylon that the economic decline had been caused in part by political trends.

STRIKES HARASSED PORT

A series of strikes in the port of Colombo, the Orient's third largest, crippled export trade. The government showed considerable tenderness toward the unions and strikers and the port's recovery has been slow.

While export trade has slumped, imports have risen in price. Foreign shippers have been so frightened by political trends and communal rioting that, though world freight and insurance rates are depressed, Ceylon pays inflated rates.

Another cause of the decline is uncertainty about the government's economic plans. Prime Minister S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike is committed to a program of nationalization.

Consequently, foreign investors are hesitant and are unimpressed by promises that new industries would not be nationalized for 10 years after their establishment. This promise, by a government official, is not regarded in government circles as a statement of policy.

The Sinhalese-Tamil riots in May and June disrupted internal trade, whose value has fallen by at least a third. The rioting, over the Tamils' demands that their language have parity with Sinhalese, took 158 lives, according to official figures, and left 12,000 persons homeless.

The deteriorating economy is a target for two sets of aid programs, Western and Eastern.

SIXTY-ONE MILLION SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM WEST

The West has put about $61,600,0000 into Ceylon since 1956. This includes aid under the Colombo plan, which aids Asian nations, and loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as well as the United States program, which has provided $36,550,000.

From the East Ceylon has obtained roughly $56 million in aid. A $30 million credit agreement extended by the Soviet Union runs for 12 years at 2.5 percent interest. The Chinese Communist Government has made a 5-year grant of $16 million for rehabilitation of Ceylon's rubber industry.

There is also a 5-year general trade agreement between Ceylon and Communist China under which 30,000 tons of rubber will be exchanged yearly for 200,000 tons of rice.

Most Ceylonese civil servants are more receptive to western than to eastern aid, and not soely because there has been more of it. Arrangements made by the Communists in establishing their programs have aroused doubts about the real altruism of Moscow and Peiping.

For instance, the 2.5 percent interest in the Soviet credit agreement is lower than the United States rate, which fluctuates between 3.5 and 4.5. But the Soviet interest is collected in goods or sterling, and Ceylon is short of both.

Similarly, in carrying out the trade agreement with China, Ceylon is finding it difficult to get what she needs.

SOVIET UNION SLOW

Finally, the Soviet Union has been surprisingly slow in implementing its trade pact. Agreement has been reached on only one project, the construction of a sugar refinery.

The United States program has two positive advantages. The first is that diversification brings home the fact of United States interest and help to a wide section of the urban population. The second is the enthusiasm bordering on dedication on the part of the men working under John L. Roach, chief of the International Cooperation Administration mission.

The principal disadvantage, it was conceded, is that the program's impact on the economy will not be fully registered for 5 years or more.

There are two exceptions to this. One is local railway service around Colombo, which will benefit from the introduction of 45 diesel-power coaches. The second is the program of CARE (Cooperative for American Remittances Everywhere, Inc.), which provides milk and buns for 1,250,000 schoolchildren every schoolday.

The most ambitious and expensive of all aid projects is the development of what is known as the dry zone, which lies in the eastern half of the island. Centuries ago it helped make Ceylon the granary of the East, but malaria and the breakdown of ancient irrigation systems turned it into a desert.

The Government approached the huge task of reclaiming the dry zone because it had to alleviate the problems of overpopulation, growing unemployment, and increasing dependence on imported foodstuffs.

OTHER AID PROGRAMS

Since 1956, the United tSates has contributed more than $4,500,000 to the project. This has gone mainly into irrigation, expansion of the repair shop of Ceylon's Irrigation Department, training of technicians in the use, maintenance, and repair of earth-moving and construction equipment, and repair of irrigation facilities damaged by floods last December.

United States funds and technicians will play a part in the development of water resources for irrigation and power in the basin of the Mahaweli Ganga River, in building roads across the dry zone and in the eradication of malaria.

United States financial and technical assistance also has been extended to agricultural research and education and industrial development and productivity. A survey of physical resources, hydroelectric power plans, a survey of Colombo's airport, the University of Ceylon, science education, and public health have all benefited.

Many Ceylonese, although grateful, also are conscious that a greater national effort is required.

"We have had enough of proposals, reports, experts, opinions, and protestations of intentions," said the Ceylon Daily News recently. "If the people have to wait for a full-scale development program, it looks as though the wait will be timeless. A few projects now are better than many projects at some uncertain future date."

Do the people know much about the size of the United States and other western aid?

In a general way officials, especially those of mature years who were trained by the British, are aware and grateful. But talks through interpreters in villages on the road to Kandy and in the hills beyond that city found little realization of United States help among the peasantry. Relief measures instituted after the disastrous floods had made some impression, but there was little recognition of more important long-term programs.

Need for a National Fuel Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the need for the Federal Government to formulate and announce a national fuel policy—a policy that will recognize the problems of the coal industry—has never been more apparent. Two developments emphasize this:

First. Congress, in passing reciprocal trade legislation, rebuffed the coal industry in its efforts to secure protection against a growing influx of foreign residual fuel oil or liquid coal.

Second. And just recently, the General Services Administration announced the award of construction contracts which included the conversion of the Chicago Post Office Building from coal to oil.

Mr. Speaker, these two separate developments indicate clearly that the Government has stacked the cards against the coal industry. Not only is it encouraging the imports of residual fuel oils, which take valuable industrial business away from coal, but it is also directing Federal installations to change from coal to oil.

The Chicago case is not an isolated example. All across the country Government buildings are being made dependent upon oil for heat. In Washington, eight schools are being converted to oil from coal and the Capitol Building itself will soon add four new oil-fired boilers, when existing coal-fired boilers could be expanded.

A person who had no knowledge of the coal industry would assume, from these Government actions, that coal is a disappearing fuel. The fact of the matter is coal supplies are sufficient to last into the indefinite future. But the industry is operating at about 22 percent below the 1957 level and thousands of miners are out of work.

The Federal Government apparently is placing its reliance and staking the future of the country upon oil and gas. Oil supplies of the Middle East, upon which this country is more dependent each year, are subject to the whims of Middle East politics. Growing Arab nationalism could, it is recognized officially, cut off this oil supply from the United States and the West.

As for gas, the supply is not inexhaustible. Should the day ever come when coal becomes unavailable because Government policies have made it uneconomical to mine, this country will face a bleak future indeed.

Mr. Speaker, coal can compete with other fuels if the Government permits it to compete on an equal basis. It cannot compete if Government policies deny it access to major markets.

I have been criticized in some quarters because of the emphasis I place upon the coal industry. Yet, I do not see how anyone representing the Fifth District of West Virginia can ignore the tremendous importance of coal to the economy of our district and to the entire State.

It is highly significant that the crisis in which the coal industry finds itself has brought about close cooperation between labor and management. This has been a healthy development. When the coal industry speaks with one voice, it is listened to more carefully in Washington. I congratulate both labor and management for this fine progressive attitude.

Bounty Proposed on Predatory Dogfish Shark To Lessen This Menace to Commercial and Sports Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that dogfish shark during recent years have multiplied so enormously as to become a great menace to the salmon and other commercial and sports fish and to the crabbing industry. Dogfish shark are predatory. They live upon salmon and other fish and crab, especially the small ones, and consume enormous numbers of these commercial and sports fish each year.

The menace of these predatory shark is especially great and growing in the waters of the North Pacific—the Columbia River, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Puget Sound—and also, I am told, in the waters along the New England coast. Also, these shark often foul and destroy fishing gear.

The great damage being done the commercial and sports fish by these predatory dogfish shark certainly suggests that

the menace be brought under control to preserve the commercial and sports fish in our North Pacific and New England waters.

I have introduced a bill which proposes that the Federal Government pay a $10 a ton bounty on dogfish shark.

In 1944 shark livers were in great demand as a source of vitamin A and fishermen sought them with great zeal. In that year 23,000 tons of these dogfish shark were taken in western waters. Since that time, however, synthetic sources for vitamin A have been discovered, and the demand for shark livers so lessened that it is scarcely profitable for fishermen to fish for these predatory dogfish shark. Since dogfish shark fishing has been largely abandoned, the annual take has greatly decreased and dogfish shark have multiplied enormously with the result that the menace of these predatory fish to the commercial and sport fish has multiplied manyfold.

If my bill is enacted into law and increases the dogfish shark take by fishermen to that of the highest year of record—23,000 tons in 1944—the total cost of the bill would be only $230,000.

Since each dogfish shark each year eats many times its own weight of commercial and sports fish, the saving of edible fish easily will have a value of many millions of dollars annually. The small sum paid out in bounties for the destruction of these predatory fish will prove a most profitable investment.

I hope legislation of this type will get, in these closing days of Congress, prompt attention from the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Gen. Robert E. Wood, the Giant on the Paths of Boyhood Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Robert Elkington Wood was born on June 13, 1879, in Kansas City, Mo., the son of Robert Whitney and Lillie nee Collins Wood. His father was one of the John Brown's raiders, a captain in the Union Army, a Kansas homesteader, a Colorado gold prospector, a coal and ice merchant. Young Wood went to West Point because he wanted an education and loved military life. He was graduated high in his class—13th—in 1900. He was careful in spending his money and left the Academy with a nest egg saved from his $45 monthly pay. He served in the Philippines for 2 years—Philippine Insurrection—and was promoted to 1st lieutenant in the 3d Cavalry. He was posted in Montana and for 2 years taught French and Spanish at West Point. In 1905 he was sent to Panama.

Only a great man who has a real knowledge of the boys' world's desires could do the things that Gen. Robert E. Wood has done and is doing for the youth of the city of Chicago; through his tremendous building and recreational programs for the Chicago boys' clubs. Even in his retirement he contemplates earning a million to leave as a permanent endowment to the clubs. And he certainly is not fooling.

Throughout his entire life he has been in the center of big operations. His 10 years spent, first, as assistant chief quartermaster, then chief and later director of the Panama Railroad Company during the construction of the Panama Canal he hired thousands of employees and distributed millions of dollars of supplies each year.

Before the United States entered the First World War, however, Wood retired from the Army. He spent 2 years, from 1915 to 1917, with Du Pont and as assistant to the president of General Asphalt Co., but in 1918 donned his uniform once more. A colonel and a brigadier general, he acted as Quartermaster General for the entire United States until 1919 buying and distributing food, clothing, and materiel for 4 million soldiers. Perhaps no one has ever had Army experience so helpful as General Wood's in the operation of a mail-order business.

His first mail-order house was Montgomery Ward, and until 1924 General Wood was vice president of that company. By the time he left to become vice president of Sears, Roebuck (Fortune has intimated that he was fired), Montgomery Ward was really beginning to show the other firm a contest. But not for long. Both Wood and President Kittle of Sears believed that the next great national growth would come from the South; they opened a string of southern mail-order houses, then a retail chain in the larger cities. When Kittle died in 1928, General Wood succeeded to his position, and he began the practice of establishing several medium-sized neighborhood department stores in big cities rather than one mammoth store downtown.

His expansion program of setting up retail stores in areas of expanding populations and activities as the vice president and president of Sears, Roebuck & Co. placed the concern in top position as the leader of mail order, retail, and department-store merchandising. The chainstore system grosses $200 million and the retail department stores $375 million annually. In 1938 Sears' gross income was $575 million. In 1939, under retirement rule, General Wood moved up from president to chairman of the board. He remains "in the driver's seat."

He is an individual with an enlightened philosophy on life's social problems. He once stated:

> I am a firm believer in the capitalistic system. Nevertheless, I do not see that the charge of socialism, communism, or regimentation should be hurled at every new proposal or reform. * * * A lot of businessmen will not look at facts. * * * Their reasoning is based on their dislikes. When you know the current income and trend for tenant farmers and sharecroppers in some States, for example, you cannot dismiss the problem by saying they are shiftless. Instead you know something has to be done to protect society against such a focus of trouble, and you lose your horror of the fellow who is willing to try to clean up the mess.

Until his disagreement on foreign policy, General Wood was friendly and cooperative with the Roosevelt administration—1932–36. He favored the AAA, SEC, social security, the housing program, and was called to Washington frequently for his advice, testimony, and service on committees. In 1939, Harry Hopkins appointed him to a temporary post as an official adviser on business relations. He was in disagreement on the domestic program. He advocated the desterilization of sterilized gold and described the modification of capital gains and undistributed profits taxes as burning the house down to get roast pig; begged for an end to hate talks. In 1940, he returned to the Republican fold.

A look at the Sears policy for its workers shows his attitude toward them. He believes that the Sears savings and profit-sharing pension plan helps to avoid strikes and labor unrest. It gives the employee greater security and unites him in the interest of the company's program. A feature of the plan treats with constant wage formula for seasonal workers and sickness and vacation allowances.

General Wood is a director in the Atlas Corp., the United Fruit Co., the Illinois Central Railroad, and the National Life Insurance Co.; he is department chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; and in September 1938 he become one of the three "public" governors of the New York Stock Exchange by appointment of President Martin. He resigned his post as chairman of the Economic Policy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers in July 1941.

The general's America First activities brought him under public fire more than once.

Secretary of Interior Ickes was most vitriolic in his attack. But many interventionists spared him while attacking other prominent isolationists, and although he never showed any signs of open disagreement with Colonel Lindbergh or others, it was frequently rumored that he planned to resign or dissolve the America First Committee if the international situation should grow so critical that disunity placed the country in actual danger. This he apparently did not consider necessary until the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. On December 1, 1941, he announced that America First would "go into the 1942 national elections" with support for candidates opposing the administration's foreign policy, which was condemned as a "trend toward Fascism in America." On December 8 he was quoted:

> We opposed participation in this war in good faith, but now that we are in it, we shall support it.

In April 1908 General Wood married Mary Butler Hardwick, of Augusta, Ga. He is a great believer in big families, and they have four daughters and a son. Grandchildren get 200 shares of Sears common stock when born. Wood is usually up at 6, full of "storming, gregarious

exuberance," and in bed before 11. Clothes do not matter to him; he is sometimes so impatient that he eats caramels with their paper on; he is a restrained doodler; his favorite expression is "let's charge," and his company has sometimes been called the old soldiers' home because there is more than one retired military man in it. He has a remarkable memory, even more for figures than for people, so inaccuracy makes him lose his temper more quickly than anything else. In Panama they say that he used to turn down parties in order to stay home and study census figures, and today the United States census reports and the Statistical Abstract still comprise his book of revelations. His life is not entirely a matter of statistics, however. He is a good horseman and dancer, a great reader of biography and history, an enthusiastic shot and fly fisherman.

REFERENCES

First. Current Biography, 1941.

Second. Business Week, page 17, March 11, 1939.

Third. Fortune, volume 17, pages 66–69, May 1938.

Fourth. Time, volume 31, page 56, January 17, 1938.

Fifth. Who's Who in America.

Sixth. Who's Who in Commerce and Industry.

These interesting excerpts from an article written by Eleanor Page, the celebrated society feature writer of the Chicago Daily Tribune, on June 16, 1958, accurately depicts the strong sense of family unity practiced and advocated by General Wood. Chicagoans admire and children revere this great American who lives to serve the youth of America that they may better prepare themselves for the patriotic and civic responsibilities of citizenship.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 16, 1958]

A COOL BREEZE FAILS TO CHILL WARMTH FOR GENERAL AND MRS. WOOD—YOUNG AND OLD OF FAMILY ATTEND GOLDEN FETE

(By Eleanor Page)

Noses, fingers, and toes were cold, but hearts were warm at the reception General and Mrs. Robert Elkington Wood held to celebrate their golden wedding anniversary Saturday in the Lake Forest home of their son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Fentress, Jr.

Unseasonably chilly weather kept those at the outdoor event on the move. A setting sun glistened on velvety lawns. Red carpeting protected the path from the rambling home, formerly General and Mrs. Wood's, across the terrace and down to a green and white striped tent which sheltered the buffet tables.

STROLLING VIOLINISTS PLAY

A dozen strolling violinists played as relatives and friends gathered to congratulate General Wood, war veteran and business and civic leader, and his wife on their 50 years of married life.

A devoted family man, General Wood delayed the celebration from April 30, the actual date of the marriage, until yesterday so that his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, some of whom would have been away at school, could be present. And they all were from David Gorter, born in March, to Mrs. James W. Kinnaer III, of Jamaica, the Woods' oldest grandchild, who arrived with her infant son, William Mitchell, in her arms.

All family members wore white rosettes with ribbons printed with the years 1908–1958. David's rosette was pinned to his perambulator. The Wood's oldest daughter, Mrs. William H. Mitchell, pinned hers to a blue print frock, in which she shivered bravely. The youngest daughter, Mrs. Hugo V. Neuhaus, Jr., of Houston, pinned hers to a mink jacket which she wisely brought north to wear with her yellow print frock.

FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS

Among early arrivals was the dean of Chicago bankers, bearded, 90-year-old Albert W. Harris, longtime friend of General Wood. Through the receiving line flocked neighbors, and former neighbors, General Wood's former associates at Sears, Roebuck & Co., of which he was chairman; coworkers on the board of the Chicago Boys Club, one of his favorite civic activities, and scores of other friends and admirers.

A large American flag was hung between trees at the entrance to the home. Mrs. Wood, clad in blue-gray lace, and General Wood, in striped trousers and cutaway, were aided in the receiving by children and grandchildren, who took turns greeting guests.

ADMIRE FAMILY TREE

A dramatic entrance was made by Mrs. George Enzinger, the former Irene Castle McLaughlin, who braved the breezes in an ankle-length, figure-molding gown of scarlet taffeta, a long overskirt of scarlet net trailing behind.

Everyone admired a Wood family tree mobile made for the occasion by Mrs. Charles F. Glore, a Lake Forest neighbor. It stood on the sun porch, and whenever anyone became confused about which child belonged to what parents and grandparents, the tree, with its family names dangling on fishlike shapes, was there to solve the problem.

General and Mrs. Wood were married in New York City while he was an instructor at West Point. He celebrated his 79th birthday at a dinner Friday night.

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 27, 1958]

BOYS CLUBS—BOON TO CITY YOUTH—HELP IN FIGHT ON DELINQUENCY

(By Jacquelin Southerland)

Once upon a time, a group of boys broke into a deserted old home in one of Chicago's transitional areas. They were caught and they were afraid. They thought they would be sent to jail.

They weren't. They were lucky. The man who caught them was a Chicago Boys Clubs official. The home they broke into was slated to become another boys' club.

He invited all the boys to come back to the scene of their break-in once they club was in operation. They did and became charter members. Most of the boys were helped, but not all. To show the extremes, one became an outstanding student leader. Another, sadly, eventually went to a reformatory.

NOT A CURE-ALL

"We're not a cure-all," pointed out the boys' club director who told this story to illustrate what the clubs can and cannot do. "We don't claim to be able to end all juvenile delinquency or to help everybody. But we try. And we think we have a pretty good batting average."

Once upon an earlier time, an underprivileged boy had to sweep floors at the Lincoln Boys' Club to earn his membership fee.

Years later the boy, Irving Rudolph, became executive vice president of the Chicago Boys' Clubs.

In case the reader thinks it was cruel for the club to make Rudolph work for his dues, listen to his comments.

MORE APPRECIATIVE

"We've found," he said, "that boys appreciate things more if they have to work for them. Something for nothing doesn't work. The clubs aren't charity."

Today many boys still work for their dues, ranging from 25 cents to $2 a year.

The first club was organized in 1902. The movement grew. Now there are 16,000 members in Chicago, ranging from 6 to 18. There are 13 clubs, 2 outposts, 7 camps, and 2 farms.

The newest completed club building is the General Robert E. Wood Club at 2950 25th street, built 3 years ago. Another new one is in the making. This is the Colonel Robert R. McCormick Club being built at 4835 Sheridan road.

The clubs are supported by the Community fund (19 percent) and contributions (81 percent). The Robert R. McCormick charitable trust has pledged $400,000 toward this newest club named after the Tribune's late editor and publisher, and a fund campaign now is in progress to match this amount.

The clubs range from cramped quarters in rundown neighborhoods to comparatively plush buildings in well kept, home owning communities.

A Tribune photographer and reporter recently visited four of these clubs. First stop, the Kiwanis, formerly the Sheffied club at 2742 Sheffield avenue, in the midst of a community of 12,000 school-age children served by only four agencies.

The Kiwanis Boys Club is above the Sheffield police station. It covers two floors. On its first, the gymnasium once was a cell block, the recreation room was a courtroom.

GIRLS ARE MEMBERS

Upstairs are a library, science room, and crafts area. In the library, a 14-year-old redheaded girl, Rosalie Cook, 2738 Fullerton Avenue, was reading to some youngsters. Some clubs take girls, although the national policy frowns on it since there also is a national girls clubs organization. However, these clubs have not reached Chicago and, therefore, the Chicago boys clubs have 3,500 girls in their membership.

Rosalie took the club's science classes last winter, showing a marked aptitude for chemistry. She wants to be a doctor, perhaps a surgeon.

The club quarters obviously are old, so is much of the equipment. But both are kept in tiptop shape.

The table tennis tops are waxed to make them last longer. There are no initials cut into the furniture, no scribbling on the walls, and the place is cleaned twice a week, said the director, A. O. Nicolette.

"I've been in boys club work for 35 years," said Nicolette proudly, "and I have never seen a nicer bunch of youngsters."

Despite Communist Persecution Christianity Will Survive in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the second of two articles written for United Press International by Rev. Father Joseph P. McCormack describing life in a Chinese prison. The story which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on July 24, 1958, follows:

COMMUNIST CHINA AS I SAW IT

(By Joseph P. McCormack, M. M.)

It was in June of 1953 that the Communists arrested me in Shanghai. For two

reasons: I was a Maryknoll priest, and I was an American.

My houseboy had tipped me off, so I sat there on my front porch one beautiful summer evening waiting for them. And sure enough, they came, and led me off to police headquarters.

They brought me into a large room which had been set up for a special tribunal, with 10 people in military uniform sitting along the left wall; in front of them, 5 women, and an interpreter. In the center of the room was a table, lined with my judges, and at the far doorway, a rather young looking girl holding a machine gun. I sat down in a low slung chair that was obviously meant for me. That was about 9:30 at night.

I was still sitting there at 5 o'clock the next morning. They kept firing questions at me, and I fired answers back at them as best I could. In a way this confused them, because the judges would frown at one another, then have a whispered conference, and make new charges. All of the accusations had something to do with illegal financing of espionage. Altogether, in that first session with them, they changed the charges against me 20 times. By the time they led me to my cell I was pretty tired, and I had the feeling that they weren't too sure why I was arrested.

Looking back on it all now, I still can't think of any reasons, within Chinese law for my imprisonment other than the fact that I was an "undesirable"—a priest and an American.

The prison conditions were rough. I had to lie flat on the floor of the cell, completely still and without uttering a single word. Armed guards stood over me to make sure I didn't make the slightest move with my hands or feet. The food, when I got it, was a soft mushy kind of something, and pretty strong smelling. But I was hungry. And I ate it—at times, with an appetite.

I had been in prison about 3 days, when the interrogations began. There were 72 of them altogether, each one lasting about 2½ hours It was hard at first, but I got used to them. Most of the interrogations, in the beginning, centered on the 30 seminarians, my bringing them to Peiping, and then shipping some of them to Hong Kong. I told the Communists the straight story about it all, but they weren't convinced.

Later, the line of questioning switched to the entire diocese of Fushun and the work of Maryknoll in Manchuria. They wanted to know statistics on converts, the number of mission out-stations, and the names of clergy, religious and seminarians. I gave them as many wrong answers as I could. But they kept pressing me for more.

So I finally took a week off, asked for pen and paper, and wrote in my most legible handwriting, a full confession. It was right off the top of my head and not a shred of truth to it. But I was quite proud of it when I handed it to the judge, and he gave me a big smile, as if to say, "Ah, McCormack—we always knew we could scrub your brains clean."

Ten days went by. Evidently they were studying my manuscript, because they left me to myself, and I was able to catch up on my sleep. But then I figured it was time to call it quits, so I told the guard I had another confession to make. He hopped upstairs and brought back one of the secretaries—a girl we had nicknamed "Pigtails" who had two long braids hanging from her temples to her knees.

I dictated for about 20 minutes, denying everything in my writen confession. "Pigtails" just sat there, stone-faced; when I had finished, she whisked upstairs. Another 10 days went by. Finally the judges summoned me, and when I appeared before them they asked: "McCormack, why did you write this bundle of lies? Why did you try to deceive us?"

I looked right at them and said, "Because you kept pressing me. Press, press, press—these last months—and I'm not one who can keep my mouth closed." Which was true. That was toward the end of 1955. About this time, the brainwash sessions tapered off. Then, after all those months, they filed formal charges of "espionage and sabotage for American imperialists" against me.

The trial itself lasted about 8 weeks. "We are not trying you as an imperialist or as a capitalist," they said. "We know that you are a son of a poor man, that you like the Chinese people, that since you were born in Ireland, you must be anti-British. And we thank you for that. But you have allowed yourself to be used by the capitalists, and for that reason you must be punished."

It was for this "crime" that I received my 5-year sentence.

A few months later, about the beginning of 1956, I asked for an interview with the prison officials. I explained to them that I was a sick, stupid old man. Which was partly true. I was, actually, very sick. My entire body was swollen and distended because of the prison diet. Lack of vitamins, I suppose.

They talked this over among themselves, and decided to send me to the prison hospital—we called it Ward Row—and that meant I'd sleep in a bed for the first time in 3 years. Of course, the big reason for allowing me to go to the hospital was obvious: too many priests had already died in the jails and prisons of China. They didn't want that to happen to me.

The treatment at the hospital was adequate. I received injections once a month, but the swelling of my body and limbs still continued. Even now, my stomach still expands about 6 or 7 inches every day.

In June 1956, my health improved considerably, so I was shown leniency, and they moved me into a small house on the other side of Shanghai, where I lived with several other American priest-prisoners. One of the priests there was Father Cyril Wagner, the Franciscan from Pittsburgh who had been framed on charges similar to mine. We were eventually released together.

The food was terrible there. We would have all died had it not been for Red Cross parcels, and the parcels from America that the Red Cross managed to get to us. So we lived, until the day of freedom came.

Since I've been back, nearly everyone has asked me about the church in China. Is Christianity surviving?

And I tell them this story. It's true—it happened not too long ago when the Communists launched a big campaign in Shanghai to kill all of the sparrows around the city. The people were mobilized and told to keep a constant racket going, by beating pans, blowing horns, and lighting firecrackers. The idea was to frighten and kill all the sparrows.

Well, the sparrows took it all in stride. They hid under the eaves, or flew to the highest trees; sometimes they moved their nests out into the suburbs. When they could not get worms, they ate insects. When the ponds and puddles of water were closed off, they survived on dew. After several days, the fanatical persecutors were worn out—and the noise and the fury died down.

The sparrows? Today in Shanghai, there are almost as many sparrows as before—stronger ones. The sick and the weak died. The healthy survived.

And that's the way it is with the church in China.

The Youth Camp Recreation Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, after an extended period of experience in the youth-camp program, I learned that the greatest influence for good was the placement of children in summer camps for at least a 2-week period.

One does not realize how much can be done in the way of morale and spiritual building of a child's life and character by concentrating on a well balanced 2-week program of recreational and instructional activity.

Poor children are ever anxious and ready to participate in any program that will give them a symbol. Crippled, blind, and physically handicapped children are most appreciative for any interest shown in them. It does not cost much money or effort to make a child happy. Youngsters are happiest when they feel that some adult or adult group is interested in them. And, of course, each youngster wants to belong to someone or some movement or club.

To build up a healthy program that will influence this type of activity, I introduced H. R. 12778 which establishes and initiates a program for the subsidizing of youth camp recreation programs and assists those organizations that have for their purpose the providing of healthful outdoor and camp training for indigent children.

The bill sets up a Youth Camp Recreation Commission composed of nine members—a representative from the Department of Health, as Chairman, Navy, Army, Air Force, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Soil Conservation Service. The member acts in a liaison capacity between the Commission and the agency he represents—working out agreements for the utilization of the resources, property and services under the jurisdiction of said agency which would be useful in the operation of camping programs under the act.

The Commission sets the standards to qualify for participation, including the camp facilities and eligibility of the group or organization sponsoring the program; i. e., an organization approved by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which is exempt from taxation.

The United States Government would give to sponsored camps 50 cents per day per camper and limited to 28 days, and not in excess of $50 per 2-week period in camps maintained and sponsored by the Government, in areas where charitable organizations are not existent or active in this work.

The average level cost of a camper is $2 per day throughout the country. So

that in sponsored camps the Government, by its 50-cent contribution, equals a 25-percent subsidy.

The laudable purpose of this act is that it will provide the opportunity for healthful training and recreational advantages for indigent children through programs of spiritual, patriotic, physical, and educational development, planned by the Director of the Youth Camp Recreation Commission with the assistance of the Commission; and second, to provide immediate camping opportunities for indigent children in areas which are congested and in which subnormal housing conditions contribute to the delinquency of the underprivileged.

(b) As a further purpose, this act is intended to stimulate and promote the public interest in establishing camps first for recreational, moral, patriotic, and educational purposes, second, for the training of indigent children, thus creating and activating human factors for the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and third, to create in youth a patriotic sense of devotion to this great Republic by teaching the citizens of tomorrow the true Americanism encompassed by the patriotic principles of freedom, justice, democracy, and love of God.

I realize that some doubters and ultraconservative individuals will question the expenditure of public moneys for these purposes. But the act is very restrictive and absolute in its control of any practices by dubious setups to divert these moneys to their dishonest gain.

All of us, I am certain, realize the terrific need of measures to correct and prevent the growing delinquency of the youth of America. I am sure that a program of this type will reward the citizens tenfold in curbing the present tendency of a boy to join in sinister activities of child gangs.

There are several of these types of camps in operation in the several States. One in Illinois, sponsored by the past commanders of the American Legion of that department, hosts 1,000 poor children—boys and girls in 5 separate periods—each summer.

This program also receives financial support from the State of Illinois, the Chicago American, a popular publication that has always promoted children's programs for the indigent, the Marine Corps League, Cook County Council of the American Legion and its auxiliary, and the Women's Auxiliary of the Department of Illinois, and the Past Presidents Club.

The appropriation of $750,000 as in this bill, will provide—at the average 2-week period—to charity-sponsored organizations, a sum of 50 cents per day per camper for approximately 100,000 children.

It may take time to impress the Congress to favor this type of legislation, but it is the excellent way of combating delinquency.

It costs far more to maintain our delinquents in homes and institutions. A small pittance could at least realine the predelinquent who wants someone to be interested in him, especially the paternalistic interest of an adult. Keeping him happy in a camp results in a cleaner reaction toward life, and a taste of real kindness that he will never forget. Yes, now he believes there is a God and that he was not abandoned. Let us take care of those whom nobody wants, those at the bottom of life's cycle. It will pay real dividends in the end. It is the new generation that must be jealously preserved to insure the future strength of the manpower of the Republic.

It affords the underprivileged and needy children of our Nation, many from teeming tenement and slum districts in metropolitan areas, the opportunity for a training which will instill a sense of devotion and duty toward God and our great Nation.

I feel that a program which appeals to the basic, and often times neglected, emotional desire for recognition of the indigent children, will be a major contributing factor toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

It is my sincere belief that the Youth Camp Recreation Act of 1958, through its program of spiritual, moral, patriotic, physical, and educational development, will help bring about responsible and patriotic citizens for the future.

The youth camp project is to be under the jurisdiction of a Commission, composed of nine members, established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from which Department, that member will sit as chairman. The remaining eight members are to be representatives from the various departments of Government, as listed in the bill; the purpose being to utilize facilities and services of the respective departments for the camp program.

The Commission is to be adviser to the Director, who is appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and who shall administer the program and receive therefor compensation in the amount of $18,000 per annum.

It is the duty of the Director to determine the need and sites of camps, select camp operators, determine eligible children, appoint necessary personnel, enter into agreements necessary for operation of the program, and otherwise prescribe rules and regulations consistent with and promoting the purposes of the program.

Eligible children are to be in the 7 to 16 age group, except for those with talents deemed useful to the camps, who may be over 16 years of age. Attendance during any one year is not to exceed 28 days.

The camp operators, whose eligibility is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, are to receive in addition to other assistance, 50 cents per day for each camper in attendance. Camp operators may be State or local government, or any eligible organization. The camp operators are directly responsible and accountable to the Director.

The Federal Government is to appropriate $750,000 for the first and suceeding 2 fiscal years commencing July 1, 1959, and such amount as Congress deems necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

We Have No Alternative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by Louis Nizer, attorney and author, which he delivered before the Bronx Bar Association on November 28, 1956, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, together with the preface by Stuart Levison, president of the Bronx Bar Association.

Mr. Nizer's remarks are not outdated but are extremely timely and appropriate. If we had followed his suggestions, we would not be in our present unfortunate position:

WE HAVE NO ALTERNATIVE

(By Louis Nizer, attorney and author of What To Do With Germany, Thinking on Your Feet, and other works)

FOREWORD

Chief Judge David W. Peck, of the appellate division, said about the speech which is here reprinted:

"To Louis Nizer, I would like to say what all of you did say by your ovation to him at the end of his remarks, that his address was one of the most thoughtful, penetrating, philosophical, and spiritual messages that has ever been delivered in any gathering."

Such an evaluation from one given to measured words may convey the emotional impact of the address upon all who heard it. The effect was not temporary. Upon reflection, it seemed to grow, and we reecived an unprecedented number of requests for copies, coupled with the concern that none would be available, since Mr. Nizer spoke without script. However, a court stenographer had recorded the address, and we now make it available not only to the members of the Bronx Bar Association, but to the members of other bar associations whose presidents heard it, and also asked for reprints.

As was suggested by various judges and distinguished members of the bar, we are also forwarding copies to President Eisenhower, the State Department, and leaders of Congress.

There are rare occasions when a speech may affect international policy. It is possible that this reprint may achieve such historic significance.

STUART LEVISON,
President, Bronx Bar Association.

Mr. Chairman, Chief Judge Peck, distinguished members of the judiciary, counsel, and ladies of counsel, ordinarily, I would deem it my first duty to disavow the general compliments, and the obituary, which have just been read about me. I shall not do so, however, because your chairman has such a fine reputation for accuracy that I would not insult him by suggesting that anything he said about me was not precisely true. Indeed, he also has a reputation for understatements. If I were hard pressed, I might confess to you that if it were not for that frality he would have done me more justice.

It is good, on an evening like this, to share the dias with so many judges. In France, the identity of the lawyer is preserved by his costume. The French lawyer wears a gown with a red velvet collar. In England, the barrister wears a wig. In this country, democracy has denuded us, and we do not

wear a gown or a wig, although we are sometimes permitted to wear our masks.

In any event, it is good on such an evening to catch the judges with their robes off; it gives us an external appearance of equality.

When you invited me to address you this evening, I had thought it was to be a meeting only of the members of the Bronx Bar Association and, therefore, I intended to address you on the subject of technical professional interest.

Then, I learned that this was to be a social gathering indeed, as I now know, preceded by a cocktail party designed, I suppose, to dull the razor-sharp brains of many counsel here. I also learned that it would be an occasion which was to be graced by beauty other than that which can be found in a legal syllogism.

Therefore, I decided it would be wrong to talk shop, just as if you had a lady speaker—it would be wrong for her to talk shopping.

Instead, I choose this opportunity to address you on a subject which has pressed upon my mind, and is very dear to my heart. I hope you will find it appropriate, because it does involve the subject of international law. I assure you, though, it is a subject of profound interest to every person alive today, for it involves nothing less than the survival or extinction of the human race.

I do not like suspense, except in stories. When an associate of mine comes from the law court, I implore him to tell me the conclusion first, and then he can sit back and tell me at gerat length, how he brilliantly bested his adversary. Therefore, I shall state my conclusion first.

President Eisenhower should address the United Nations and propose a new constitutional convention to amend the Charter of the United Nations. Such procedure is authorized (United Nations Charter sec. 109, Subdivision 3) at any time after 10 years existence of the United Nations.

The calling of such a convention to amend the charter need be passed by only a majority of the Assembly, and seven members of the Security Council.

The objective would be to create an effective instrumentality for the preservation of world peace.

In making this proposal, I do not share the view of those who think that the United Nations is an impotent, helpless organization, which might mercifully be put to death.

On the contrary, to have a shelter where all the nations of the world can gather and listen to each other, and pass resolutions which at least have the moral grandeur of an international assembly meeting in democratic process, is the hope of the world. It is because, in our desperation, we reach forward to that hope and find it a mirage, that we must take steps to make it real.

In discussing this proposal, I shall drink heavily from the fountain of our constitutional history. For there is a remarkably apt analogy of our own ineffective Constitution which was later revised to make it workable.

In 1776, when this country was founded, we drew the Articles of Confederation. They were so ineffectual that the Republic foundered. Eleven years later, in 1787, though there was no authority to do so, we called a Constitutional Convention. We transformed the Articles of Confederation into the Constitution as we know it today.

Notice even the similarity of the lapse of time—11 years between 1776 and 1787—and it is 11 years since the United Nations Charter was drawn in 1945.

Why did the Articles of Confederation turn out to be inadequate? Chiefly because each of the 13 States deemed itself to be an independent nation, and would not surrender its sovereignty to a Federal Government. Article II of the Articles of Confederation read: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence."

This meant that the Federal Army was subordinated in effectiveness, to the State Militia. Massachusetts and other States had their own armies, while the Federal Army constituted only a token force. Notice the new United Nations token Army we have just founded for the Mideast crises.

Under the Articles of Confederation, there was no effectual means to raise money. The Federal Government levied a tax of $8 million. Only $420,000 could be collected.

Congress consisted of 1 house, and each State had 1 vote, just as each country has 1 vote in the United Nations. Nine out of thirteen States had to assent to make possible a decision. This was equivalent to veto power.

Indeed, each State considered itself so much an independent sovereignty that it would not even yield to the Government the right to declare war or make peace. Georgia declared war on 2 Indian tribes, used its own Georgia army to win, and then made 2 peace treaties, ignoring the United States Government.

Four States, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, entered into treaties with each other, without the consent of Congress.

Many States taxed imports across their borders. New York, for example, imposed a tariff on wood and cabbage which came from Connecticut.

There was no Federal Judiciary. There was no Supreme Court until 1787. When there was a dispute between the States, Congress would appoint a committee to determine it and, sometimes, the States would not even subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the that congressional committee.

The result was that our Federal currency failed, our laws were unenforceable, and there was chaos in our Republic. This great and noble experiment in modern democracy almost collapsed during the first 10 years of its existence.

When John Shay, a hero of the Revolutionary War, led an army in revolt, due to the desperate condition of farmers and debtors, the time had come for some radical measures.

Alexander Hamilton, practicing deception, got together the representatives of the Thirteen States on the theory that they would made some minor amendments to the Articles of Confederation. Previously in 1785, he tried to convene them, but only five States agreed to attend.

Then it was that out of a cauldron of fierce debate, resistance, and compromise the Constitution of the United States emerged.

What were the changes of the Articles of Confederation which transformed it, 11 years later, into the Constitution? As we analyze them, keep an eye on the present situation in the United Nations, because the parallel is striking.

First, we made possible, through effective taxation, the maintenance of a Federal Army to enforce the edicts of the Federal Government.

We changed the voting, so that representation was based on population. But we created a bicameral legislature so that, in the Senate, each State would still have an equal vote with any other.

Finally, we created the United States Supreme Court over such protests as that of Mason, the delegate from Georgia, who said: "I will not permit a foreigner from New York to determine the rights of the sovereign State of Georgia."

We think of our Constitution as an inspired work designed by great minds. So it is, but those who drafted it had misgivings, for they were compelled, by fierce opposition, to compromise their convictions.

Patrick Henry is often quoted, approvingly, for "Give me liberty or give me death," but listen to him, as the delegate from Virginia, oppose the Constitution: "I would rather infinitely have a king, lords, and commons, than a government so replete with such insupportable edicts."

A Delaware delegate said: "We are told that although 3 large States form a majority of the people in the 13, yet these 3 States will never do any harm to the rest of the States. Gentlemen, I do not believe you."

Jefferson said about the Constitution: "There are, indeed, some faults which revolted me a good deal in the first moment, but we must be contented to travel on toward perfection step by step."

The delegate from South Carolina said: "What is liberty? The power of governing yourself. If you adopt this Constitution, have you this power? No. You give it into the hands of a set of men who live 1,000 miles distant from you."

There were also predictions that the Federal Capital "would be a walled or fortified town with an enormous standing army to sally forth and reduce the people to submission."

Yet the new Constitution was adopted and, from a faltering Republic, a steady and powerful Nation emerged.

How shall we now amend the United Nations Charter to transform an ineffectual symbol into the reality of international power?

First, the veto must be abolished.

Russia is guilty of many, many iniquities, and communism is the shortest distance between the cradle and the grave, but let us not blame the existence of the veto upon Russia. The truth is that the United States, as well as Russia, had to have the veto. Without it the Senate would not permit us to join the United Nations and "surrender our sovereignty" to foreign powers.

We did not join the League of Nations because of article XIII, which was deemed to impinge upon our sovereignty. President Roosevelt, mindful of that experience, took the precaution of designing the veto, so he could say to the United States Senate: "You are not surrendering your power; you can always veto a decision which you, in your sovereign powers, deem should not be made." Thus, we were lured into the United Nations. But the time has come to eliminate the veto, which immobilizes any effective action. How, for example, could any judicial system operate if the losing litigant could veto a decision rendered against him? We can no longer permit the paralysis which the veto imposes on international conduct.

We might realistically take a new look at the outmoded notion of sovereignty. Sovereignty means free and independent choice of action. Have we real sovereignty with respect to taxation, or is it determined by Russian policy, and the necessities for defense? Have we read sovereignty with respect to our domestic program, or is it determined by what happens in the world about us, over which we have no control? Is it not true that sovereignty can actually be enlarged by each nation diminishing the extreme concept of its sovereign rights, and pooling it for the common good? The greatest sovereignty of all is that of the human being. We speak of the rights of nations, but who speaks for man, and his self-preservation?

The Charter of the United Nations should be amended so as to excise the veto, and subject all nations to the will of the world assembly. Only in this way can sovereignty be preserved at all.

Second, we must amend the charter so that voting power will be more representative. Today, 20 South American nations, representing 7 percent of the population of the United States, control 40 percent of the votes in Assembly. Russian satellites carry an artificial voting power. In dealing with Mid-Eastern crises, 24 Afro-Asian votes, can defeat any resolution which requires a two-thirds assent.

I have no precise blueprint to submit on this difficult question, but let me suggest a few thoughts to stimulate a solution.

Would it not be wiser to have voting power which reflects four combined and weighted elements—populations, industrial output, food production, literacy and education?

Such a yardstick for voting would more realistically measure the size and power of each nation.

To those idealists who believe that raw power should not be afforded so much consideration, I would commend Churchill's statement: "Only if you make a political organization which has an alinement between the reality of power and politics can you achieve an ideal ultimately. * * * We may deplore, if we choose, that there is a difference between the strong and the weak in the world, but there is undoubtedly such a difference, and it would be foolish to upset such arrangements in order to try to attain immediately what is a hopeless ideal."

Third, we must create an International Supreme Court with power to enforce its edicts. The judges should be chosen as were those of the International Court of 1921; each country nominated 1 of its own nationals, and 2 from other countries. National partisanship was thus reduced to a minimum. This device had all the ingenuity which is attributed to the Greek generals who, after their victory over the Persians at Salamis, voted to select the best among them. Each general voted for himself, but each chose Themistocles as the second best. It was he who was declared the winner. It is possible to establish a tradition of impartiality, freed from national bias just as we have achieved such a tradition in the United States Supreme Court, notwithstanding the dire prediction of State prejudice.

Finally, we must create a United Nations military force to implement its decisions.

There have been many cogent proposals for a world army. I submit only one: That each nation give 20 percent of its military power to the United Nations, and the collective 20 percents would be greater than any country's individual army.

The byproducts of such an international military body would be to encourage genuine disarmament among the individual member states. We would not have to resort to such circuitous plans as air inspection—Russian planes flying over America, and American planes flying over Russia. On the contrary, United Nations representatives would have free access to all countries of the world, to every city, nook, and cranny of them.

Would Russia continue to belong to a United Nations which had been so revised? The probability is she would. Self-interest, rather than good faith, might compel her to. For Russia has always wished to be in contact with world opinion. She has always respected military and political power. Russia may want 1 world which is divided, but she does not want 2 worlds. I think she would fear to be outside the pale of international justice as organized in the United Nations.

However, let us suppose that Russia and her satellites chose to quit a vetoless United Nations. Would we be worse off?

Let us make a few comparisons of power:

The United States and the United Nations would have a production of 165 million tons of steel, as against 50 million tons of Russia and her satellites;

Six hundred and ninety billion dollars of gross national products, against $155 billion for Russia.

Three hundred and twenty-three million tons of oil production, against 68 million tons.

Fifty-eight percent of the world's total power consumption, against 19 percent.

Our farmers are five times as productive, per man, as Russia's and her satellites'.

Our rate of increase of surviving population is twice as great as Russia's and her satellites'.

Another advantage to the free world would be that our military position would be improved by the cooperation of all members in the United Nations against any nonmembers. No longer would it be necessary for us to implore distant countries to afford us bases or sell our soul for such privileges. The United Nations would have the right to call upon every nation to make available sites for United Nations bases.

Even if Russia and her satellites withdrew from the United Nations, the possibilities of peace would be better than they are today.

I come, then, to the final inquiry: Is it possible to achieve this utopian scheme, as many will call it? Shall we yield to the cynicism that one cannot hope to organize international society to stop war, because, by precedent, nations have always had war?

The answer—and I ask you to note it deeply in your hearts—is that we have no alternative. We have no alternative.

The peoples of the world are not fully informed concerning the power of annihilation which now exists. The bomb at Nagasaki had 20,000 tons of TNT power, and today there are hydrogen bombs of 10 million tons of TNT power. Indeed, we have had to coin the word megaton to measure a million tons of TNT power.

The fallout destruction of one such 10-megaton bomb could extend to 100,000 square miles—twice the area of the State of New York.

We have no alternative.

We have now learned how to make hydrogen bombs of limitless power because we case them in U-238, a uranium isotope easily created.

Scientists now tell us we can combine a hydrogen bomb with cobalt, a common ingredient available cheaply which has the characteristic of becoming radioactive, and floating for long periods in the air currents, until it descends to lay waste to vast areas. Indeed, it is no longer an imaginary concept that we could destroy not only all human life on this earth, but every insect, invisible microbe, and every blade of grass and vegetation.

We have no alternative.

Even hydrogen bombs give only a glimpse of the potential horror. It is now possible to wage biological or germ warfare. Without use of intercontinental missiles, an enemy can destroy, selectively, the complete cattle or wheat supply of another nation, not to talk of the human supply of any nation.

Even this is only the beginning of the obliterating power which now exists. There are the "G" gases, nerve gases, which can destroy anything they touch, in 45 seconds, and they are invisible and unstoppable. One of our allies shunned possession of these gases after the last war ended and sunk them in the middle of the Atlantic.

We have no alternative.

Perhaps the rules of physics which threaten our destruction may also teach us how to survive. In releasing the energy from atoms, we have progressed from fission to fusion. Atom bombs split the larger atoms. This process is fission.

Hydrogen bombs, which use the atom bomb as a detonator, force together the smaller atoms of hydrogen so that they join together to become larger and larger. This process is fusion.

Perhaps this foretells the destiny of the world. For centuries we have proceeded by fission, splitting the Adams of the world into different countries. The power released from this fission has been hatred and war.

Now, we must turn to fusion—the joining together of the Adams of the world, into a larger unity, into an international society. The power released from such fusion could be beneficial. If the United States could have rid itself of the burden of $300 million spent in the last 10 years for destructive and defensive armaments, and a current average expenditure of $35 billion each year for the same purposes, what glories could be achieved.

We could build medical centers, the size of cities, to eradicate the scourges of mankind: cancer, heart disease and high blood pressure.

We could organize psychiatric clinics in all the cities of the Nation, so that, instead of having 1 child psychologist for every 46,000 schoolchildren, as we have today in a few of our cities, we could provide adequate care for all emotionally disturbed children. We could wage war successfully against juvenile deliquency.

We could apply all the new techniques for healing the mind, so that we would no longer have 1 out of every 10 Americans at some time or other occupying a bed in a mental hospital.

We could build geriatric institutions to study the aging process, and provide dignified and serene surroundings for the aged, so that they would live out their lives, rather than die out their lives.

We could construct an adequate and completely new educational system, both in bricks and mortar and in teaching personnel, adequate to the needs of a new society.

We could offer subsidies to all gifted children, so that they could follow careers in the arts, whether music, painting or writing and thus develop to the full potential the genius of our youth.

We could give subsidies to scientifically inclined children, so as to create a new class of physicists and engineers to usher in the new era of atomic energy and automation and, similarly, a new and adequate group of doctors, nurses and psychiatrists.

We could construct new housing for all classifications of income, with installations of the new miracles of science to control light, temperature and entertainment facilities.

We could do all this, and have billions left over to balance our budget.

Yes, we could create a veritable paradise on earth.

We have no alternative.

I cannot believe that the destiny of mankind is international suicide.

If you will look at the map of the world, you will see that the bulge of Africa and the bulge of South America fit together. Apparently, they were once one continent. Perhaps what tore them apart millions of years ago was the same power which man has discovered today.

Shall nihilism be our unseen epitaph? Shall we look backward and say peace cannot be won because it has never been more than a temporary interlude? If we look backward, we will move backward. Nothing is inevitable that is resisted. Mankind faces the greatest of all dilemmas, the most fearful of all challenges, the most sublime of all choices. Will we end the story of man, in one final, suicidal holocaust which obliterates all living things and, perhaps, the planet itself? Or will we vindicate the evolution of reason and erect a peaceful society, blessed with the joys of noblest fulfillment?

It is a moment for religious evocation. Isaiah prophesied that "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Perhaps an allegory points the way:

The master of the library was asleep, and the books in the library took to quarreling with one another as to which was the most

important in the library. The dictionary argued that he was the king of the library for, without him, there would be no language. The book of science said that he was the king of the library, because without him man could not have progressed to the heights he now enjoys. The book of poetry said he was the king, because he gave peace and surcease to people who read him. The novels claimed that they were the masters, because they had the most expensive gold backing, and described the foibles and joys of mankind.

And so, the din rose, and the fury of argument grew greater and the shouts and noise were deafening.

Then, from an old worn book on a table in the center of the room, there came a thin voice which said: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want." All the noise and fury ceased. There was silence in the library, for everyone knew who the real king of the library was.

We have reached the stage in international affairs where, despite all the din, contentiousness, confusion, and threats, we must resort to the one hope that there is a true Master of the world, and that He has decreed for us a fate of peace and existence.

The Five Valleys Bookmobile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1959 includes $6 million, double the budget request, to carry out the provisions of the Library Services Act.

As a cosponsor of the authorizing legislation, sponsored also by the senior Senator from Montana [Senator MURRAY] and the junior Senator from Montana [Senator MANSFIELD], as a member of the subcommittee which held hearings and reported the bill, I have worked for this improvement in library services to rural areas.

So, an article in the current issue of Montana Libraries, published quarterly by the Montana State Library Extension Commission, caught my eye. Entitled "The Five Valleys Bookmobile," it is an account of the extension of library service, made possible by this act, to seven Montana counties, among them my home county of Ravalli. This account is neither dramatic nor exceptional. It is typical, and I want to share it with my colleagues. The article follows:

THE FIVE VALLEYS BOOKMOBILE
(By Elevelyn L. Swant, Coordinator)

The first bookmobile to serve the counties of Missoula, Sanders, Ravalli, Mineral, Granite, Powell, and Lake, was made possible through the Library Services Act (Public Law 597). It was delivered by the State Library Extension Commission to its headquarters at the Missoula Public and County Library on May 17, 1957, but 4 weeks elapsed before a sign was painted, a driver procured, and the shelves stacked.

The first trip was made on June 17, 1957, in Missoula County to the areas of Target Range, Green Acres, Cold Springs, Lolo, Woodman School, and Lolo Hot Springs. The driver, Joseph C. Thompson, was accompanied by Geraldine Adams of the Missoula County Library staff and Astrid Arnoldson, public relations assistant of the Five Valleys Federation of Libraries. That first day the bookmobile traveled 88 miles and circulated 128 books.

At the end of its first 3 trips, all in Missoula County, the bookmobile started branching out into the other counties, and by July 11, 1957, had visited all 7 counties and a total of 84 communities. On its first two rounds of visiting each of the counties, the trips were mainly to survey the communities and to compile information as to mileage and driving time required between stops, how much time to allow for each stop, the selection of a good place to park—going on the suggestion of the local people, talking to storekeepers, postmasters as to interest in the community, getting information on road conditions in winter, the summer demand versus the school year demand, the type of books to be carried, and the taking of special requests. (Books on Montana and by Montant writers have been consistently in demand.)

By the middle of September and close to the end of the second round of trips, each stop was evaluated and 53 of 84 were eliminated for the winter months ahead. Some communities were eliminated because they were being adequately served by established libraries or by nearby libraries and others because of insufficient community interest. The objective was to lengthen the time of the stops in the communities that wanted and needed library service, and make a schedule so that each community could be visited regularly every 4 weeks, a schedule which we have been able to maintain throughout this past winter. A summer schedule for the months of June through August, now in the planning stage, will attempt to reinstate some stops that had to be eliminated last fall. Also, next fall, we hope to be able to work out a revolving schedule so that each community will have some Saturday stops to give the children a chance to visit the bookmobile during the school year.

Having but one bookmobile, with a capacity of approximately 1300 volumes, one driver-librarian (the driver has been alone since his first four trips), and 32 communities to serve, with a population of about 12,572, adult and family reading has been stressed, and no school stops planned for the school year. In and near the communities visited, there are 54 elementary schools or 432 grades, with an enrollment of approximately 3,670 children that could use and should have some type of library service. However, to be fair, the bookmobile could not serve some schools and bypass others, so until another bookmobile is procured, or the area reduced, the pattern of bookmobile service has to be adult and family reading, with only community stops.

As of December 31, 1957, and with 6½ months in service, the bookmobile had traveled 12,510 miles, registered 1,179 borrowers, and recorded a circulation of 12,678 volumes, an average of 1,950 volumes per month. It has been on the road 3 days a week, and at headquarters 2 days for stocking, records, servicing, etc., and for a day off for the driver. Its trips vary from 68 miles for visits to communities in Missoula and Ravalli counties, to 361 miles for visits to communities in Sanders County. There are 3 trips a month with overnight stops at Polson, Garrison and Thompson Falls. The mileage on these trips is 304, 233, and 361 miles respectively, and the counties for Sanders, Lake, Granite, and Powell are visited.

The bookmobile has had two drivers—Mr. Thompson for the first 6½ months and Douglas Brown, since the first of the year. Mr. Thompson, a former principal in the Chicago school system, made all the survey trips, sometimes working a 13-hour day, leaving early in the morning and coming in late at night. His report on each stop was invaluable in evaluating it for later scheduling. He has worked out all of the bookmobile schedules and, when relieved of the driving, continued on the staff as the supervisor of the bookmobile service.

Every means of communication has been used to publicize our program, from 2-cent postal cards to television. The public relations assistant has prepared weekly releases to all of the daily and weekly newspapers in the area and the radio stations as far distant as Great Falls and Spokane. The cooperation of all mediums has been wonderful in promoting this program.

We feel that the bookmobile service is appreciated. We know that we are reaching people who like to read good literature and also people who look to books to provide them with helpful information. We are reaching busy people on farms and in small communities and also handicapped people, people in rest homes and people who have retired from the active work-a-day world. All have a need for library service. Nothing unique has been done except to introduce to southwestern Montana its first traveling library.

The Italian Situation and Its Relation to World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, there are several outstanding articles written on Italian affairs by distinguished members of the press, on the Italian situation in its relation to world affairs that are so interwoven with the future success of our Mideast crisis that I do not hesitate to place them in the RECORD.

Drew Pearson, who visited Italy previous to the Italian elections, in a special article covers the political problems confronting the Italian electorate and spells out the issues with expert analysis, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1958]

CHURCH-STATE ISSUE STIRS ITALY
(By Drew Pearson)

(Following is Drew Pearson's fifth dispatch from Rome in covering the forthcoming Italian election.)

ROME.—When the late Premier Alcide de Gasperi, Amitore Fanfani, and others organized the Christian Democratic Party in the dim postwar days when Italy was emerging from Mussolini rule and Nazi occupation, they endeavored to put Christian principles to work in practical politics. On the whole, the Christian Democrats have done a remarkable job.

But, though they have publicly proclaimed separation of church and state, their critics maintain the Christian Democrats are directed from the Vatican and this has become the biggest issue in the forthcoming vitally important Italian election. To some extent, the future of the American alliance with Italy depends on this delicate, passionately debated issue.

Most Italians want to be christened by the church, married in the church, and buried

by the church, but on election day they want the church to stay out of politics.

This church-state issue has become so fiercely debated by some that the newspaper Espresso, founded by Prince Carocciilo, whose mother came from New Orleans and grandmother from Cincinnati, has built up a profitable circulation by following an anticlerical editorial policy. Last year Espresso made a profit of 150 million lire.

The church-state issue came to a head when Mauro Bellandi, of Prato, a former Communist, published a civil notice of intent to marry. This meant that he would marry outside the church. Bellandi's priest, Rev. Danilo Aiazzi, then denounced him from the pulpit which is a routine procedure.

ANTICLERICAL WAVE

The Bishop of Prato, the Most Reverend Pietro Fiordelli, went further and wrote a letter to the priest accusing Bellandi of "concubinage."

This caused widespread anticlerical reaction. Bellandi brought a charge of criminal libel against the bishop. A three-judge court held that the bishop was guilty of criminal defamation of character.

The court's decision would have been an important aid to the Christian Democrats in refuting the charge of links between them and the Vatican had it not been for four additional developments.

1. The Vatican excommunicated the three judges, the public prosecutor, and everyone connected with the trial. This gave new ammunition to the anticlerics.

2. Espresso published details of how the Pope's three nephews received tax exemption on the excuse they are papal ambassadors. One nephew, Mark Antonio Pacelli, is extremely wealthy, owning one of Rome's water companies and having a reputed income of $750,000.

3. Roger Peyrefitte, French writer and former diplomat, wrote a series of articles in Paese Sera, a pro-Communist newspaper, attacking the Vatican. The Vatican then initiated charges against Peyrefitte through the Italian courts. He was indicted and now awaits trial.

4. At this point Guido Carli, Minister of Foreign Trade, wrote a strong letter supporting his friend Peyrefitte and simultaneously offering to resign from the cabinet. His resignation was not accepted.

To get the view of the most authoritative political leader in Italy on this question, I visited Fanfani, secretary of the Christian Democratic Party.

"Our goal is a Catholic party completely divorced from the Catholic Church," he said. "We are patterning our policies after Adenauer's West Germany—a great Catholic who has kept his government completely divorced from the church."

From other sources, I learned that Samuel Cardinal Stritch has given Fanfani vigorous support in his stand for division of church and state.

"Don't let the Vatican push you around," the American Cardinal told the Italian leader. "People in Chicago used to come and ask me for political advice. I had one reply: 'Do you wish to make a confession?' "

We turn to a splendid article by Leo Wolleborg reported in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 27, 1958, for an insight upon the important role played by Italy through its dynamic leader and prowestern Premier, Amintore Fanfani and his Italian Mideast plan:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herld of July 27, 1958]

EFFECTIVE ATLANTIC SOLIDARITY IS KEY POLICY, FANFANI SAYS

(By Leo Wollemborg)

ROME, July 26.—"Today, as yesterday, the guiding star of Italian foreign policy is the fullest and most effective Atlantic solidarity."

With these words Italian Premier and Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani on the eve of his departure for Washington opened a 60-minute interview with this reporter, the first interview he has granted since his government received a vote of confidence in Parliament last week.

Such solidarity does not rule out and in fact demands the frankest exchange of views within the alliance which will be all the more efficient as each of its members is both more capable and enabled to make its own positive contribution to the common policy with due regard, of course, to its strength, geographic position and specific interests in the problems under consideration.

In the Middle East, today's most pressingly important theater, Italy's special contribution according to Fanfani is the natural product of geographic, political and economic considerations. The Premier told me "First of all Italy occupies a frontline position in the Western alinment just behind those Middle East outposts which are today being subjected to the heaviest and most direct Soviet pressure.

"At the same time Italy has no colonies (this is one of the historical circumstances that bring our political position closest to that of the United States and of Western Germany) and therefore is in a better position to show interest in the national aspirations of other people without arousing distrust or suspicion. The Italians have gone through a colonial experience and while they do not disown the good things they may have done they are convinced by now that they would have done better to devote efforts and resources to the development of their national territory."

Last but not least the Middle East and Mediterranean basin are among the areas that lend themselves most naturally to the development of Italian trade relations.

Concerning the summit conference within the framework of the United Nations, the Italian Premier reaffirmed forcefully that in order to be really useful it must be prepared and have a precise agenda. As to the selection of the participating countries, Fanfani said "Italy does not intend to create difficulties. She is certain in any case that on the western side there will be previous consultation either bilateral or collective with those members of the alliance that for practical or organizational reasons may not directly attend the summit meeting now being contemplated. In the Middle East the American and British intervention has provided a tampon but it is not and cannot be the medicine to heal a dangerous situation."

The remedy, according to Premier Fanfani, must be sought in the course followed in the past by the colonial powers themselves in the wisest and most farsighted phases of their policy; there is no doubt, for instance, that British policy toward India prevented that country from becoming an open field for the maneuvers of international communism.

ECONOMIC PACT NEEDED

Fanfani went on to say "a few days ago Khrushchev proclaimed that he could collaborate with Nasser even though Nasser is a nationalist and not a Communist. How far can the western powers admit that they can work with people whose methods of internal policy or view of the international situation differ quite a lot from those of the West? Can the West beat on its own grounds Moscow's much vaunted realism which as proven by the Hungarian events can be hamstrung by ideological and strategic considerations that are part and parcel of the Communist system itself?"

In the past there has been talk about economic aid to the Middle East; now political agreements are contemplated. Fanfani told me that "a political agreement requires an economic agreement and the latter in turn is required to give substance to the eventual political agreement." This approach brought up a question concerning the oil deal just brought off in Morocco by the Italian state agency ENI. Fanfani replied that "the issue of Italian oil enterprises in the Middle East and in Africa like any other issue related to our sharing in the economic development of the underdeveloped countries can always be examined in a spirit of friendly cooperation. The need to coordinate the undertakings of the allied countries in this field appears especially urgent today since oil is now over and above its obvious industrial importance a key factor of security for all the free people."

CALLED LITTLE DYNAMO

Undoubtedly Fanfani is going to bring to his job as foreign minister the same drive that in domestic affairs has earned him the nickname of Little Dynamo. He is only 5 feet and 2 inches tall but does not appear to suffer from an inferiority complex and often is the first to joke about his size. He is already moving fast toward the implementation of his economic and social program whose aim is to give each Italian an education, a home, and a job. The Premier counts on this program to consolidate on a broader foundation of popular support of the democratic institutions of the country and the stability of his own government.

We hope first of all to change the wait-and-see attitude of the Republican Party into open collaboration with the present coalition of Christian Democrats and Social Democrats, this would give us a parliamentary margin slightly larger than that enjoyed by the coalition governments that were in power before the last election.

"We also rely on our program to bring about some changes of mind and perhaps some crises within the opposition parties that are less distant from the center. But above all and first of all we rely on the implementation of our program to attract voters who have cast their ballots for those parties. From this point of view we can say that we are not going either to the right or left, we are going ahead, that is to say, we are advancing to meet the legitimate aspirations of an ever-growing number of Italians."

All in all it appears that Fanfani, the Little Dynamo, is bound and determined to provide a more dynamic driving force to Italy's domestic and foreign policy.

FANFANI TO LEAVE FOR UNITED STATES ON MONDAY

ROME, July 26.—French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville arrived in Rome today for talks with Italian Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani before Fanfani leaves for Washington on Monday.

The only known item on the agenda here was the Mideast situation.

It seems likely that De Murville is seeking Italian support for France's policy on the Mideast, just as Fanfani is going to Washington to try to sell Italian policy to President Eisenhower.

But just what Fanfani's Mideast policy is, no one knows. Republican Party leader Randolfo Paccirdi said he was glad the United States considered Italian Mideast policy important enough for Fanfani to discuss it in Washington. But, added Paccirdi: "We would be glad to know what the policy is, too."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B Everett, *N. C.*
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*
Proxmire, William E., *Wis.*
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Church, Jordan, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Scholarships, Fellowships, and Other Assistance to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued yesterday, after the Senate Subcommittee on Education reported favorably a bill providing scholarships, fellowships, and other assistance to education. I ask to have printed with my statement an editorial, from the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday, July 26, 1958, which sets forth cogently the need for legislative action in this vital area.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

I am happy indeed that the Senate Subcommittee on Education has today reported favorably a bill providing scholarships, fellowships, and other assistance with emphasis on improving the teaching of the physical and social sciences, as well as languages. The next step is up to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I am hopeful that the committee will see fit to schedule this bill quickly so that fiqor action on this needed legislation proposed by the President last January will be taken before Congress adjourns.

The subcommittee still has before it legislation providing Federal assistance for school construction, as well as my own bill providing assistance for the construction of public community colleges. Now that the logjam has been broken in subcommittee, I am hopeful that some action will be taken on these bills also. As long as we have inadequate and overcrowded classrooms at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, American youngsters will be thwarted in their ambition to obtain a good education.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 26, 1958]

SCHOOL AID: INDEX OF CONCERN

Up to a year ago the great concern over American schools was about crowded classrooms. Congress readied legislation to aid States and local school districts in overcoming this shortage by a nationwide building program.

This effort was seriously hampered by endeavors to use it as a lever against local school segregation. Fears that Federal control might follow Federal aid were aroused by those who held them sincerely and by those having other axes to grind. The chamber of commerce campaigned against it and perhaps usefully showed that local ability and willingness to solve the problem had been somewhat underestimated.

In the face of all this Congress still would have passed Federal aid had it not been for failure of the White House staff to inform the President that Democratic leadership had swung over to support his insistence on a means-and-effort test in allocating funds among the States. His influence applied in time would have won back enough Republican votes to overcome the five-vote margin by which the measure lost.

Then came sputnik.

THE IMPACT OF SPUTNIK

Almost overnight one would have thought that artificial satellites and ICBM's were being designed and turned out by hordes of precocious youngsters currently ground out of the Soviet school system. Contrariwise, that American youngsters had been spending their school years in snap courses, athletics, and rock 'n' roll. Educators were blamed and both they and Congress were importuned to get academic assembly lines going fast.

Happily, one of America's greatest assets—free discussion—rolled into action. There have come informed and capable reports on Soviet education, and professionally calm assessments of the American. ICBM's and sputniks, it develops, are products of scientists and technicians educated mostly outside Soviet territory and a decade or more ago. However, both Soviet Government and people have turned to schooling with disciplined, deadly earnestness and, characteristically, have turned schooling en masse to serving the current ends of the state: production of researchers and technicians.

NOT ALL DARK

On the other hand, we are responsibly assured that in good American schools—and there are many of them—the sciences and mathematics are being taught as well as anywhere in the world. But that there are too many poor-to-mediocre schools. More high-school pupils, numerically, than ever before are taking these tougher subjects. But there should be much wider training in languages.

Languages, too, discipline the processes of thinking. And in this shrinking world Americans can no longer assume that people among whom they will find themselves a day's journey away will speak a tongue they understand. Businessmen and public servants need increasingly to communicate in more than one language.

Significant achievement in any of these three academic categories calls not only for conscientious effort; it calls for that and for those still little understood qualities called aptitudes and for the interest which usually accompanies them. Americans have not yet done enough to discover these talented youngsters systematically, and to help them develop their talents by financial aid where needed and by making advanced courses available.

THE SECOND LOOK

It boils down to the fact of one nation newly emerging from mass illiteracy and hungry for learning—a nation with a still austere standard of living, a nation which views its people collectively and as servants of the state. And to the fact of another nation which has come to take universal schooling much as a matter of course, a nation which suffers more from a surfeit of things than from the sharp spur of necessity, a nation which in education as in other areas listens to what the individual wishes (but has as yet arrived at no clear consensus on school curriculums which also serve best the common good).

The Soviet nation, on the one hand, having destroyed its aristocracy of birth, finds it not unnatural to exalt an aristocracy of learning; the other, the American, having conquered a wilderness and developed the resources of a subcontinent in a half-dozen generations finds it not unnatural to give preferred status to the doer in commerce and industry above that of the scholar and teacher.

One of the penalties of this imbalance in rewards has been to draw away into business and industry too many of those who should be teaching the businessmen, the industrialists, the researchers, and technicians of the future. This is like eating the seed corn.

THE SAVING TOCSIN

To this second nation—the United States—the advent of sputnik may prove to have been the saving tocsin. For it is only by rivaling the Soviet people's dedication to education, their respect for its practitioners, and the priority they give it in their public spending that Americans will bring their schooling to a standard befitting the world's wealthiest Nation and meeting the imperatives of the 20th century's grim competition.

Could we be sure that the impetus of sputnik would carry through to every school district in the land—and do so fast enough not to lose 4 or 5 school generations of talented youngsters, and lose, perhaps, for all Americans the world competition militarily, economically, and culturally—an American educational renaissance might be built more solidly from the grassroots up.

The fact of this uncertainty introduces the question of a national concern with the education of American youth. The whole history of American democracy says this concern cannot be implemented by any ukase from Washington. It must be expressed by incentives and aid.

MANY TRIES AT HELPING

There are hundreds of aid-to-education bills in this Congress. Of these, less than half-a-dozen are given the slightest chance either of being passed or of being incorporated in some comprehensive bill with a chance of passage this session. Federal aid to classroom construction is not among these few.

What has become of the overcrowded classrooms and the double session schools? Did they vanish between defeat of the latest bill to correct such conditions last July and the appearance of sputnik in the October skies? The chamber of commerce figures gave more reason to hope that States and local school districts could do more of the job than thought at first. But parents and classroom teachers in hundreds of localities can attest that there is quite a job to be done. And unless these local departments and boards accomplish enough within the coming year to alter the picture radically the Nation will likely be confronted with a situation sharpened by cumulative resentment against neglect.

MEASURES WITHIN REACH

The measures given the best prospects for passage are:

1. To make available perhaps 20,000 Federal scholarships a year (twice what the administration believes manageable) to enable talented youngsters to attend college for 4 years, these scholarships to be awarded by

State commissions with preference given to those studying science and mathematics and consideration given to financial need. Also Federal loans to students to be administered by the colleges, and aid to States in providing equipment for teaching science, mathematics, and languages. Also aid in training foreign-language teachers, for graduate students and graduate schools, and for testing and guiding high-school students.

2. To permit teachers in both public and private schools to deduct up to $600 a year for income-tax purposes for money spent for professional improvement by college and university study.

AN INDEX OF CONCERN

These measures are all in the right direction, whatever may be the differences in opinion on their details. But it should be said that their passage, of itself, would not answer the needs of American education. Nor should they fail of enactment would American education stop still. They are, however, indices—needles on a dial. And they will indicate by the seriousness with which Congress handles them how much importance Congressmen, and likely their constituents, are giving this matter of education in the Nation's future.

Conversely, a wisely framed program of national aids and incentives can carry inspiration to every town and crossroads by its solid evidence that some of the concern for educating American youth anywhere belongs to Americans everywhere.

Invitation to Khrushchev To Attend Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invite Khrushchev to the Midwest?" from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITE KHRUSHCHEV TO THE MIDWEST?

If Nikita Khrushchev comes to New York to attend a summit conference at the United Nations, wouldn't it be a good idea if he were invited to visit the upper Midwest?

We think it would be for a variety of reasons.

In the first place, he could see for himself the benefits that improved practices, mechanization and modern techniques have brought to farmers in the richest farming area in the United States. He could see that American farmers have housing, automobiles, television sets, educational opportunities, and a standard of living that compare favorably with—and often surpass—those of city people.

In the second place, exposing Khrushchev to the realities of American agriculture and to its accomplishments under our capitalistic system might even suggest to him that capitalism is not doomed—as Marx predicted—but that perhaps he and his people have more to learn from it.

In the third place, our Government and the U. S. S. R. already are exchanging experts in various fields in the hope—on our side, at least—that these exchanges will bring a little more light into the Soviet Union, ease the tensions between our two countries and perhaps even tell us more about what makes the Soviet Union tick. A visit by Khrushchev to the upper Midwest would be consistent with this policy.

We think that Khrushchev might be interested in accepting such an invitation because he could learn much from this great farming area. Russia still is predominantly an agricultural country and one of its major problems is to increase both the overall output and the productivity of the individual Russian farmer.

Khrushchev already has shown a great interest in American farming methods and techniques and has put into effect reforms in Russian agriculture inspired by and copied from the United States after the visit of Soviet farm specialists to the Midwest several years ago.

The Russian premier has been talking about a contest between Russian and American farmers in the production of butter, milk, and meat, and he could see here evidence of the tremendous productivity of American agriculture that has resulted in surpluses of these products as contrasted with the shortages that still plague Russia.

Some people argue that we should not help Russia increase its farm output. But our hope is that any such increase would in the long run enable more of the Russian people to enjoy a higher standard of living than they now do—and eventually appreciate the contribution of the United States toward this end.

So what have we to lose by inviting Khrushchev to come here?

Certainly any such invitation would not necessarily imply approval of anything that Khrushchev and his government do or have done.

And while such a visit would increase the security problem for our police, secret service, and FBI, we doubt that Khrushchev would be in as much danger out here as he would be in New York, regardless of the protection afforded him there.

Well, what do you readers think of the idea?

Speech of M. Louis Armand, President of the Commission of Euratom, Before the European Parliamentary Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by M. Louis Armand, President of the Commission of Euratom, before the European Parliamentary Assembly at Strasbourg, June 23, 1958:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in agreement with the Committee of Presidents, our President has kindly agreed that we should give you today a short account of the establishment of the Commission of the European Atomic Energy Community and of the tasks it has already accomplished.

The Euratom Commission is now almost 6 months old. At such an age, months still count; and it has therefore acquired a more definite character since the time when my colleague, M. Enrico Medi, Vice President of the Commission, described to you the main features of its work.

To give the Assembly a formal report, it would suffice to take up the treaty, and to try to establish how far we have come in the various fields which are entrusted to the community. This will be done completely and systematically in the statement which is to be made to you at the next session of the Assembly.

I would therefore refer you, for this purpose, to the detailed report which will be sent to you a month in advance of the session.

In order to profit from this opportunity of informing you, the Commission has requested me to describe our work, not so much in relation to the text of the treaty as in relation to the development of atomic energy. For we must have a clear picture of reality, and before we can judge the significance of the steps which we are taking along the road indicated by the treaty, we must define the domain which we are to explore and in which we are to work. It is this survey which I should like to make, very rapidly today.

Here, in fact, the Commission and the community have a very broad mission to fulfill. This mission is defined as follows by article I of the Euratom Treaty:

"It shall be the aim of the community to contribute to the raising of the standard of living in member states and to the development of commercial exchanges with other countries by the creation of conditions necessary for the speedy—and I should like to emphasize that word 'speedy'—the speedy establishment and growth of nuclear industries."

Every word of this article, which defines the role of our Atomic Energy Commission, face to face with Europe's problems, should be carefully weighed.

The words "nuclear industries," first of all, show that it is essentially an industrial development which we have to help bring about. On the other hand, Euratom also has a social and economic aim—the raising of the standard of living in member states. Finally, the treaty explicitly provides for the development of trade with other countries. The community must therefore be open and outward-looking.

THE DOMAIN OF NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

Let us first try to define the domain of nuclear industry that we have to develop. This is something which is spoken about every day, because it is fashionable, but usually in very vague terms. Not only vague about the scientific aspect of the problem, vague about neutrons or mesons, because it is polite to begin conversations about nuclear energy by saying: "Of course I am not an expert"; but also vague about its economic aspect, where many people are tempted to jump to conclusions. In fact, comparatively little is as yet known about the economic aspect of the nuclear industry. In this field we ought to behave like the pupils of Professor Oppenheimer, who when they come to join his seminar, have to learn to admit in all modesty that there are certain things of which they are ignorant.

But because one knows nothing, one might be tempted to do nothing and simply wait. If that were so, Europe would have to abandon all hope of taking her place in a field which, if today it is full of speculation, is nevertheless full of hope and certainty for the future. I should like to bring home to you this contrast—between the great uncertainty of the present day and the certainty for the future—a certainty shared by everyone throughout the world. Only a few years ago, atomic energy was wholly the affair of research specialists and military men; and those who then prophesied its industrial future can see today that they were right when they see the importance that the great countries of the world attach to the nuclear industry.

In the United Kingdom, Her Majesty the Queen opened Calder Hall. In the United States it was President Eisenhower who pressed the button to start the turbines at Shippingport. These ceremonies symbolize the importance, for a great country, of assuring its nuclear future.

NECESSARY ASSOCIATION

The optimists, then, were right, and they saw to it that Europe was given an industrial atomic community. To the word "industrial," the word "peaceful" should be added. These, indeed, give the two essential characteristics of Euratom. Of all the many international atomic organizations existing today, Euratom is the only one which has both these characteristics at the same time.

Let us see what this implies for the peaceful development of atomic energy. It certainly imposes on us the most difficult task in the whole atomic energy field. Cooperative efforts for the "scientific" development of atomic energy do not encounter particular difficulties: it is simply a question of setting up large-scale laboratories and the appropriate equipment.

The "military" development of atomic energy is also relatively simple, for two very different reasons. The first is, in a sense, a philosophic reason: That is, it is always easier to develop energy for destruction than for creative use. It was easier to use fire for burning the crops than for cooking, because for the latter it was necessary to invent cooking utensils. The same is true of atomic energy; it is much easier to produce military energy than peaceful energy. Thus, only uranium can be used today for making bombs and for operating generators to produce peaceful power; whereas plutonium, and energy produced by the fusion of light atoms, can, as yet, be used only for purely destructive purposes. This is certainly an important problem for those who seek to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The second difficulty results from the fact that in military affairs, questions of cost play only a minor role. The essential aim is technical success. On the other hand, the peaceful development of atomic energy can only take place in the light of economic necessities, and it can only contribute to the raising of the standard of living of which I spoke just now, if its cost is reasonable.

It is the difficulty of this task that makes necessary our efforts at cooperation and association.

I said just now that we were living in a period of the greatest uncertainty. I do not mean only the dreams which journalists built up around Zeta[1] and around the hopes, now more or less dashed, which it aroused. As a matter of fact, the industrialists and technicians concerned with the transformation into kilowatt-hours of the natural uranium extracted from the earth are faced with very diverse methods and possibilities. The exploration of these various methods and possibilities poses such technological problems that the effort involved looks rather intimidating. Those who have to choose must therefore act with the greatest prudence, for every experiment is costly: it may amount to some $50 million. It also involves a whole series of ancillary industries whose work might be wasted if finally some other method had to be chosen.

It might be thought sufficient to bring a number of experts round a table in order to choose the best solution: but this is not so. Experts cannot choose the best method until the technicians have built and operated the actual apparatus which will permit them to work out the cost price. What will therefore be decisive as between the various methods in question is the technological progress and experience achieved.

[1] Britain's code word for the controlled fusion experiment.

This shows the importance of what is being done now, not on the experimental, but on the industrial scale.

And that, gentlemen, is why Euratom came at the right moment. The six countries are joining together at a time when industry is, so to speak, joining battle to determine which of all these various methods will give us competitive cost prices.

THE NEED TO CATCH UP

We saw just now that Euratom is required to work for the speedy establishment of nuclear industries. Why is the matter so urgent? Not only because it is right always to push ahead as fast as possible, but also because Western Europe, as you know, is herself forced forward by her ever-growing energy deficit. For all of our six countries in 1957, energy imports cost $2,000 million. In another decade, they will cost $4,000 million. Our energy deficit is therefore an urgent matter. Moreover, we are lagging behind in nuclear affairs. In mathematical terms, the momentum of the forces which ought to drive us to develop atomic energy is the product of our deficit and our time lag; and the latter is especially large in comparison with the other great world powers. It is certainly the Europe of the Six which will now have to devote the most capital to the development of atomic energy, because it is now that its economic future hangs in the balance. Euratom has thus an essential and necessary role to play as a catalyst and accelerator of the efforts required. This is not the desire of a technician; it is the fear of an economist.

How do other countries stand in this respect? Let me briefly sketch the situation.

Russia, which is very rich in conventional power, in coal and oil, has nevertheless planed a vast program for the development of atomic energy. This is not only a production program, but a program of research in various directions. Research is in progress on some 10 types of reactors, and a capacity of 2 million to 2½ million kilowatts is forecast for 1960.

I am speaking of millions of kilowatts of installed capacity; for those who prefer to calculate in tons of coal, it is only necessary to multiply by three to obtain the number of million tons of coal annually saved by means of such nuclear electricity capacity.

The United States atomic program is that of a nation rich in energy and above all in cheap conventional energy. Nevertheless, by 1960, there will be an installed capacity of 600,000 kilowatts, quite apart from all the equipment designed for powering submarines, which is a magnificent technological achievement from which power production will benefit. But the United States has not undertaken a program for the large-scale production of atomic energy. The latter is considerably more expensive there than conventional energy, which is by no means lacking since the United States in fact exports coal.

Only Great Britain has embarked on large-scale nuclear energy production based on a single type of reactor, which has shown itself to be an incontestable technological success. Its target is for 6 million kilowatts by 1965; even if it takes slightly longer to reach this target, there will still be some 1.5 million kilowatts installed by 1962, corresponding to 4 large nuclear power stations of some 300 to 500 megawatts each, apart from Calder Hall.

If the six countries were to have made a comparable effort, their energy situation would have required the installation of 15 million kilowatts within a decade. That, indeed, was the target for Euratom set by Herr Etzel, Signor Giordani, and myself, last year, in response to the question our governments charged us to answer.

Euratom's action will enable the six countries to achieve a program which meets their economic needs more effectively than have the ordinary national projects embarked upon hitherto.

In England, the undertaking of a large-scale program has been facilitated by the fact that large-scale power stations have been directly financed by the authorities responsible for developing electric power production. In many of our countries, on the other hand, it is private industry which has to finance the power stations, and it is only interested in doing so if cost prices are low enough. This, then, is one of the difficulties which I mentioned just now: that is, the importance of cost prices.

It should be added that basic atomic science is less highly developed in the six countries than in Russia, in England, or in the United States; for in these other countries considerable sums have been spent on military programs.

The amount spent on atomic affairs in the United States since 1940 is in the region of $15 to $20 billion; in Great Britain, more than a billion dollars; and in Europe only about $500 million, most of it in France. Fortunately, these figures do not measure the time-lag in the development of peaceful atomic power, for part of the expenses in question have been devoted to military ends. Nevertheless, the general training of technicians and the equipment of certain branches of industry are closely related to the sums already spent. Each of the six countries must therefore make a considerable effort.

Let us make no mistake: Europe will not make up her time-lag in the energy and atomic fields simply by virtue of having signed a treaty in Rome. There is no built-in miracle in the treaty setting up the Euratom Commission. The time-lag can only be made up if each of the six countries to make a greater effort. It is necessary both to fill the gaps in our technical knowledge and to establish a program to put into practice the discoveries of which our scientists will certainly be capable if we give them the tools, but which they will not be able to bring to fruition if the tools are not there.

The Commission has the duty of seeing that the funds devoted to the development of atomic energy by the various community countries are used in full awareness of the facts. Euratom has to see to it that development is coordinated; it will avoid reduplication, and it will create a friendly rivalry without arousing wasteful competition.

The means for this are supplied by the treaty, but—I repeat—nothing can be done without the financial efforts which will have to be made by each of our six countries in the years to come. However great may be Euratom's ability to ensure the best use of men and capital, if a minimum of investment in atomic matters is not effected in the next few years, our countries will still lag behind the great powers, which nevertheless need this new source of energy less urgently than we do.

The solution to our problem does not lie simply in the creation of large industrial complexes or large atomic research centers, atomic energy in fact demands a very large range of equipment, stretching from uranium mines to electronics. It is necessary to set up an industry capable of producing fuel elements as well as reactors and kilowatt-hours.

A FORTUNATE CONSEQUENCE: STIMULUS TO INDUSTRY

It must not be forgotten that the necessary adaptation has a double aspect. If all that we could do were to buy reactors and make them work, we should be in the position of underdeveloped countries. On the other hand, if we can build reactors, we shall not only be able to export them, but we should also be able—and I insist upon this because it is seldom stressed—we should also be able to renovate our industries as a whole.

Indeed, all the industries which help in the development of atomic energy are already looking to the future, for this very

reason. This is the case, for instance, with the very highly developed metallurgical industry needed for nuclear energy: progress here will give good service in many other fields. There is also the example of electronics and telecommunications. As a result, making atomic energy means renovating industry.

This is worth pondering: the impulse which Euratom must give will serve as a catalyst to speed the modernization of our countries. In other words, to produce atomic energy will not only put our countries in a position to solve their energy problem; it will also give our industries the chance of thinking afresh.

When one compares this role of Euratom's with that of the other two European communities, one cannot avoid being struck by the difference of scale between them. The problems of the atomic community are in fact very limited, and even within the next 10 years will only represent a small part of the whole economy. There is in fact no common measure between the extent of problems facing the coal and steel community and the European economic community on the one hand and those facing Euratom on the other.

Nevertheless, Euratom may serve more rapidly to bring about a community spirit and thus to accelerate our thinking afresh.

THE FIRST MONTHS OF EURATOM

Ours will therefore be an advance-guard community. Let me now give you a rapid summary of what its tasks will be.

So far it has very little staff. I don't think there are as many as 150 people working for it at the Rue Belliard in Brussels.

It is determined to work in common with the other communities on all the problems which it shares with them. Professor Hallstein will shortly make to you a declaration on the subject of common services, on which the Euratom Commission is fully in agreement.

We shall have to handle expenses which will be greater than those of our administration itself. We have, in fact, to set up a common study center and to develop a research program, for both of which the treaty provides a sum of $215 million. This figure is large by comparison with the administrative budget of a community: but on the atomic scale it is small. This sum of $215 million for 5 years is roughly as much as the United Kingdom spends in this field in a single year.

As a result if Europeans think that they can relax merely because they have decided to set up a common study center, they are gravely mistaken. This center can only be complementary to the effort which everyone must make himself.

In order to set up this common research center, we need the support and advice of the widest possible range of experts. This will be given us on the European scale, by our Scientific and Technical Committee, which is already in being. Beginning on the 7th of July next, it will be consulted on the first research projects to be undertaken by the community.

Naturally, we shall include in this research some work on fusion. I said earlier that the first hopes of achieving fusion on the experimental scale had been disappointed. It is therefore necessary to start, in all modesty, from the beginning; and in this field, Europe has just as much chance as the others. We are going to try to start off on the right foot by bringing together all the necessary experts. But the hopes raised by fusion must not act as a tranquilizer, as one scientist put it, which lulls us into doing nothing in the field of uranium. The atomic power that we urgently need will have to come from uranium.

In order to collaborate in the field of fusion, on the widest European scale, we have made contact with CERN[2] in Geneva, and this very week we are to examine the conditions of our collaboration on this subject. That, I think, is an index of our will to cooperate with other international bodies. In the same spirit, we have already had numerous contacts with the Nuclear Agency of OEEC.

Within a year we should be able to give the Council of Ministers precise details of our research program and clear indications of the lines we intend to pursue.

Apart from research, we have to undertake a whole series of other activities resulting from application of the treaty. All have been begun—and even finished—within the time limits laid down. Alongside the research center, we have to organize a personnel training center.

More than this, the treaty requires us to present, within a year, proposals for a European university. In our view, this problem is too important not to be considered jointly by the three communities. The first meetings between their representatives have already taken place. The preparation of a European university is one example of the catalyzing role of Euratom in the most varied fields.

We are further required to set up a nuclear common market. This will really be the advance guard of the industrial common market, following that of the coal and steel community; since from the 1st of January 1959 onwards it will bring about the free circulation of a certain number of nuclear materials and goods.

To go beyond this first step, negotiations between the six countries are provided for by article 94b of the Euratom Treaty. The necessary measures have been taken in order to present, within the required time limits, practical proposals to this end.

As a further essential of the nuclear common market, a supply agency has to be set up. The Commission was given a time limit of 3 months to propose the statute of the agency to the Council of Ministers. This has been done, and it will be discussed at the meeting of the Council of Ministers on July 1.

Safety regulations likewise had to be proposed to the Council of Ministers within 6 months; this too has been done.

The problems of health protection are at present under study. Experts have been appointed, and are working to establish the basic rules which will be common to our six countries. Naturally, this work will be carried out in liaison with OEEC and with the IAEA in Vienna.

Another of our tasks is to draw up an inventory of all the industries contributing to nuclear energy. This inventory, in accordance with article 213 of the treaty, must be submitted to the Assembly within 6 months of the Commission's taking up its duties. Within 10 days from now, this inventory will be laid before the bureau of the Assembly, and my colleague Mr. Paul de Groote will have the opportunity to discuss it with you and to describe the conclusions to be drawn from it.

ENERGY POLICY AND RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

After this survey of the different tasks entrusted to us by the treaty, I should like to say a few words about the power program. In this vital domain we have to define our policy in concert with the other communities. We have therefore set up a liaison body with the European Coal and Steel Community and with the European Economic Community.

In fact, in this period of rapid evolution, we must have sufficiently detailed knowledge of the economic factors affecting costs. That is why we have to have a first-rate economic service.

In the effort to make up our timelag, we shall not be alone. Great Britain has appointed Sir William Meiklereid as its diplomatic representative to the European Atomic Energy Community, and last week Euratom representatives had preliminary talks with the British authorities. We hope that these talks will quickly lead to concrete results and to a closer and closer collaboration between Euratom and the United Kingdom.

With the United States, already represented vis-a-vis the community by Ambassador Butterworth, we held preparatory discussions even before the conclusion of the treaty, at the time of the mission of the "Three Wise Men." For this reason we have been able very quickly to establish close relations with the United States to the mutual advantage of the latter and of our six countries. My colleagues Messrs. Krekeler and Sassen, who have been especially charged to conduct the negotiations, will have the opportunity of discussing this subject with you at greater length when the negotiations are finally and definitely concluded.

What are the bases of this cooperation? They may be found in the survey which I have just made of the degree of progress in atomic energy in the various countries. The United States does not immediately need atomic energy, since it has abundant and cheap conventional energy. It has no incentive at present to embark on an industrial energy production program, and in fact they have at present only an experimental program. In this case, why not set up in Europe a large complex of industrial nuclear-power stations, making use of the experience already acquired in the United States? That is how there arose the idea of a joint United States-Euratom program for reactors of an electric power of 1 million kilowatts.

American participation in the execution of the program is as follows:

First, supplying the fuel. Thus, thanks to this joint program, we shall be able to try out enriched uranium reactors. For us, this is a new departure. The British operations, like the French, are so far only with natural uranium.

Secondly, financial aid. The total cost, corresponding to the installation of 1 million kilowatts, will be in the region of $350 million. The United States would grant a loan of $135 million to encourage atomic investments, which for the moment are more costly than investments in the same capacity of conventional power.

Furthermore, there is one characteristic of the agreement that is novel and fundamental: technological research on these reactors will be carried out jointly. Remember that even as little as a year ago, countries which could not build reactors could buy them from more advanced nations, but were, so to speak, forbidden to look at how the reactors were made. The United States Government has decided to devote to this research $50 million for the first 5 years; Euratom will contribute the same sum. We have already seen how important this technological research is, since it determines any lowering of cost prices.

Finally, the United States has agreed to buy back the plutonium produced by these reactors and not to use it for military purposes. This is even more important, since because Euratom's aims are exclusively peaceful, it would have been almost impossible for it to undertake such a program by itself, owing to its inability, for the moment at least, to find a use for the plutonium. This, then, is an action of the greatest political importance, a demonstration of confidence which will enable us to start off on a large scale.

[2] Organization for European Nuclear Research.

There remains the important question of the inspection and control of fissile materials. In agreements hitherto reached with other countries, the United States made a point of retaining the right to inspect and control the establishment of the reactor projects and the use of the fissile materials they supplied. In our agreement, the United States has consented to recognize inspection and control by Euratom.

Since the governments of the six countries have delegated to Euratom the ownership of fissile material, the community has been able to secure recognition of its own inspection and control. Is that not a striking example of the community's value? We regard this acceptance as something much more important than a satisfaction of prestige: we regard it as the germ of a world inspection and control of atomic energy. Our young community, endowed quite simply with the confidence of our governments, is in process of establishing inspection and control of a new type, and one which could serve as an example to all nations.

The agreement with the United States, therefore, embodies great hopes, ranging from technical subjects to high politics. As it happens, it has been signed just today by President Eisenhower; and if I have been somewhat leisurely in the course of my statement today, it was in order to wait for the precise moment when I could publicly announce it.

I should like to conclude this statement by saying that the Euratom Commission has sought to give the Members of Parliament of our six countries the completest possible information on our problems, without trying to conceal their difficulty. It has sought also to bring before you all the hopes which its work arouses and, in particular, those which may be realized in a few weeks' time, now that the agreement with the United States lies before Congress.

Congress Has Done Much This Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Independent, a Pasadena, Calif., daily, July 24 edition, entitled "Congress Has Done Much This Session":

CONGRESS HAS DONE MUCH THIS SESSION

The 85th Congress is nearing the end of a respectable road. Perhaps Congressmen haven't made many bold strokes this session, but they have passed a lot of good, solid legislation and they have kept party rancor at a minimum during an election year.

Both Houses have been energetic and efficient. In many cases they pushed something requested by President Eisenhower beyond where the President was willing to go.

Often the legislation reaching the President's desk has differed in some respects from what he asked for, but Congress has usually given him a bill he can live with, and he seldom found use of his veto power advisable.

It's worth noting that there has been considerable bipartisan cooperation, especially in the Senate between two veteran legislators who know its value, Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Republican Minority Leader WILLIAM KNOWLAND.

Both are strong characters, giving a measure of leadership which has unfortunately often been lacking of late from the White House.

It is a paradox of our Government today that President Eisenhower has gotten behind an excellent legislative program, but hasn't pushed.

Thanks in great measure to JOHNSON and KNOWLAND, and in the House to Democratic Majority Leader SAM RAYBURN and Republican Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, key bills have won the backing of the middle-of-the-road Republicans and Democrats, leaving a few die-hards on the extreme fringes in opposition.

By the time it adjourns, the 85th Congress will have chalked up more important legislation to its credit than any Congress in 25 years.

To accomplish this, leaders have had to use their utmost skill to maneuver critical bills around death-dealing amendments and through dust-catching committee pigeonholes. Our Congress deserves the Nation's thanks.

KNOWLAND is especially to be commended for remaining at the helm in Washington while his political future rides on his own campaign for governor of California.

Although his presence in the State would boost his chances against Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, KNOWLAND has chosen to put country before self.

Puts Cramps on Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I incorporate into the RECORD a newspaper editorial from the Newark Advocate, which was sent to me by one of my good friends, Fred C. Morrison, of Newark, Ohio.

This editorial was written, I am advised, by Frank Spencer, Jr., the son of a very close friend of mine, the owner and publisher of the Newark Advocate. To my way of thinking, it is an excellent piece of journalism, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of the Congress who still values the right of free speech and the principles of free private enterprise.

The questionable tactics brought to light by this editorial, if allowed to continue, will certainly destroy some of the liberties for which many of us have fought, and if the Government persists in such interference with private enterprise, it will not be long before our economy is completely Government-operated. By this latest maneuver, the New Dealers, after setting up a gigantic Government monopoly in the form of the TVA, have now denied private industry, which must compete for business with TVA, the right to criticize its activities without paying a completely unreasonable tax for the privilege of doing so. At the same time, all of us taxpayers are forced to subsidize not only the operations of TVA, but also we are expected to pay for the expense of promoting and advertising its operations.

I hope and trust that each Member of Congress will find time to read carefully this excellent editorial:

PUTS CRAMP ON FREEDOM

When freedom of the press is in any way jeopardized, or even mildly threatened, we feel we have the right to speak up. At this point we should like to defend the rights of our advertisers to speak their minds without intimidation. It has recently come to our attention that the rights of the private power companies to speak up freely in the press are being encroached upon through a devious, if not downright sneaky means. A recent ruling by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Russell C. Harrington, states, in effect, that private power companies using advertising to talk against Government-owned power are engaging in political propaganda, and, as such, those advertisements are not tax deductible. It is all too clear as to what the Government's getting at: it would like to strangle its opposition. Private power companies have spent millions of dollars to bring their point of view to the American people. Are they now to be penalized for voicing that opinion?

What the Internal Revenue Service has decreed is nothing more than a censorship of advertising. While it would not (as yet, at any rate) dare to outlaw advertising against Government power projects, it has put a serious cramp on the private power companies' ability to propagandize effectively. And in so doing, the Government is working on a double standard. At the same time the private companies are being penalized for publicly stating their case, the Government itself, upon the 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Anthority, issued a publicity kit, dispatched to 400 newspapers all over the country, extolling the virtues of the TVA. The expense of those kits was, in all probability, borne by the American taxpayer. In other words, the Government, each and every day, is given free newspaper space for its own power projects. Privately owned power companies, on the other hand, have to pay for their space through advertising.

Advertising has always been considered a legitimate business expense. As such, it has been deductible for tax purposes. Are we now entering an era in which the Government may decide what kind of advertising is good and what is bad? The Internal Revenue ruling stated that advertising "incurred primarily for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political purposes * * * or for the furtherance of matters in the area of political controversy" is disallowed for the purpose of tax deduction. It would seem clear that the Government is using a very clever and underhanded means to do away with its opposition within the open forums of the country's newspapers. The freedom of any group to advance its own point of view should never stand in jeopardy of disappearing through an encroachment on that freedom by the Government. However underhanded and indirect the means may be, the end result is clear: freedom of speech is in danger of being destroyed.

Dominican Republic Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there came to my attention an article by United Press International. I have spoken in behalf of the Government of the Dominican Republic on oc-

casion, and have been met with critics who speak of that Government as depressing for the individual. I submit this article to illustrate that the Dominican Government does concern itself with the welfare of the people, individually and collectively. For all of our economic assistance to the so-called backward countries, we have yet to inspire in any nation an announcement like this. I want to invite the attention of the House to the fact that it is done without economic assistance under the mutual security bill, and is done with the lowest assistance cost to the United States of any country even including any military assistance. I congratulate the Dominican Republic upon this forward step.

The article follows:

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC WILL CELEBRATE THE CENTURY OF THE RESTORATION OF ITS INDEPENDENCE BY GIVING THE FINAL TOUCHES TO A HUGE PLAN OF PUBLIC WORKS ALL AROUND THE COUNTRY

CIUDAD TRUJILLO, July 24.—The Dominican Republic, according to an announcement made today, is planning to celebrate in 1963 the century of its independence with the completion of a huge plan aimed to the betterment of the conditions of the Dominican people.

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, leading figure of the Dominican public life, has set the year 1963, year of the century of the restoration, as the Dominican called the war against Spain, for the completion of a program which includes the following goals:

1. Total literacy in the country.
2. Complete electrification of the rural regions of the country.
3. Erradication of malaria.
4. A program of colonization, within which there will not be a single peasant family who will not be the owner of land, and the teaching of the most modern methods of cultivation.
5. Intensive construction of suitable dwellings for the families living in the rural areas as well as in the cities.

To execute these programs the Government intends to utilize the technical assistance services of such international organizations as UNESCO, OAS, FAO, and others, but all expenditures will be met by the Dominican Government.

The Iraqi Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read to the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives two articles written by Col. Talbot Patrick, editor and publisher of the Rock Hill (S. C.) Evening Herald, who was on the scene in Baghdad during recent events. Colonel Patrick, who is a brilliant journalist and successful businessman, gives us firsthand information which might be of value to the Congress and the Nation in considering the true aspects of our Middle East problems. I hope the membership, the State Department, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency will take time to read these interesting stories:

AID TO LEBANON ISSUE SPARKED IRAQI REVOLT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Talbot Patrick, editor and publisher of the Rock Hill (S. C.) Evening Herald, has traveled in many countries. He arrived in Baghdad 2 days before the revolution. Now on his way home and free of the Iraqi censorship, Patrick gives here an authoritative report on the spark that set off the revolt.)

(By Talbot Patrick)

ROME.—The revolution in Iraq was executed by troops ordered to go by airlift to Lebanon to support the Government of that country.

"We were ordered to fight against our brother Arabs," commented one army officer who participated in the revolution. "Rather than that when our units were on the way from the base toward northern Iraq, we stopped in Baghdad and asked the King to abdicate and the prince regent to give up his power.

"They fired on us from the palace. We returned the fire. Finally, when they came out from the burning building, they were shot."

The troops came from the 20th Brigade base outside Baghdad. The brigade was commanded by Brig. Abdul Karim Kassem, who headed the revolt and has since become Premier.

It was after announcement of the successful revolution over the Iraqi Government radio, which is monitored in neighboring countries, that American marines were ordered to Lebanon.

The fact that orders to go to Lebanon were the spark that set off revolution was not a secret in Baghdad. But I would have hesitated to be so definite about something that Iraqi newspaper acquaintances as well as others told me if I had not been able to confirm them through an individual with unusual contacts.

For his own future protection in the Middle East, I must keep secret the identity of this man. But I can say that for years he has had intimate contact with members of the former government, as well as with leaders of the then opposition, which has supplied many officials of the new Iraqi Government. And in addition he has had close contact with foreign diplomatic sources, not only in Iraq but elsewhere.

He was absolutely definite about the order. He had talked with men who received it and then rebelled.

"I should not have been surprised," he said, "but I hadn't expected it so soon, even though there had been previous signs that it would come."

At the time that Iraq and Jordan were being joined together, he said, one division planned some sort of action against the Government. But levies of other troops and of tribesmen supporting the Government were sent to camp on either side of the division.

"The leaders in the division suspected that someone had gotten wind of their plot," my informant said, "so the day set for a revolt passed without any action."

On another occasion, he said, the King and the prince regent went to inspect army maneuvers. Two artillery shells landed near the royal tent, one quite close. A court-martial was told "It was all a mistake." But the King and prince regent hastily left the maneuver area for a return to Baghdad.

"Things had reached such a point," said my informant, "that most of my friends in the Government were trying to ease out—before something happened. Men who once were Government supporters had reached the point of themselves being disgusted with the way things ran.

"It was said in business and government circles that if you wanted to start a business of any size the prince regent had to be given 60 percent of the stock before you could start in business. A small clique ran everything for the members' personal benefit, and the nation and its people got very, very little."

At least at this time, in his opinion, the great mass of the Iraqi people, as well as an overwhelming majority of the educated and more advanced groups in the country, support the new Government and the ideas for which its spokesmen have said it stands.

IRAQ REVOLT DESCRIBED IN DETAIL BY SOUTH CAROLINA EDITOR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—An American editor happened into Baghdad 2 days before the world-shaking July 14. For more than a week he was eye and ear witness to the Iraqi upheaval. Talbot Patrick, editor-publisher of the Evening Herald of Rock Hill, S. C., now has arrived in Europe with the following detailed account.)

(By Talbot Patrick, editor-publisher, Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S. C.)

ROME.—The death list of the Iraq revolution totals several dozen instead of thousands—and perhaps I am alive to write these words—because of the remarkable control taken over Baghdad's million people by the army group which put through the revolution.

I believe one reason the army could maintain such control was because the mass of the people apparently welcomed the revolution.

At 7:30 the morning of the revolution I woke to hear coming from a distance the sound of rhythmic continued shouting. Then the sound died away in the morning noises of a big city. I began the routine of tea and rolls in my room, shaving, bathing.

At 8:30 a knock at my door. Half dressed, I cracked the door open. It was an Iraqi newspaper friend. Excitedly, he burst in.

"You got here the right time," he almost shouted. "There's been a revolution. It started at 4:30 this morning. It's all over now. A group of army officers did it. The King is dead. The crown prince, his uncle, is dead. You better stay here in the hotel. I'll come back later for you."

I had him repeat what he'd said. Just the afternoon before, my first day in Baghdad, I had had a long talk with the director general of the Information Ministry, a brigadier in the army. This same morning, he had told me, the King and various Ministers were to go to an international conference at Istanbul.

"He's out now," my friend said. "All the old government are out. I think some of the Ministers may be dead. People are crowding in the streets. I think you better stay inside until I come for you."

He left. Finishing dressing, I went to the lobby of the small hotel. Strangers, Americans and Europeans,were standing around as if they didn't know what to do. At the reception desk the clerk said, "Yes, there had been a revolution. It was announced over the Government radio. Everything in Baghdad was closed up. The telephone system was dead. Better stay in the hotel.

Little by little strangers began to speak to each other. A small gray-haired American woman said, "I woke up early and when I looked out I saw soldiers on the roof of the four-story building across the street from my end of the hotel. They seemed to be searching a couple of small penthouses on the roof. Then one of them came and looked over the side of the balcony of the floor below. But there wasn't anybody on any of the balconies below. Then the soldiers went away."

Hearing shouting, I looked out. Up about a quarter of a block the hotel street ended at what evidently was one of the city's main streets. A group of shouting men walked past. Later came a truck crowded with more shouting people, with others hanging onto the outside of it.

I ventured out onto the sidewalk. Of the few people on my street none seemed to pay any particular attention to me. So I drifted cautiously toward the corner. More people here, along the sidewalks on each side of the street; men, boys, a few women in the black shawls which cover them from head to foot with only part of their faces exposed.

Another crowded truck came by. Held high at the front of it was a big photograph of Egypt's Nasser. The shouting men in the truck mostly looked young. People along the street clapped as they went by.

None of the usually numerous white-uniformed police with white spike-topped helmets were in sight.

Along came a group on foot, young men, older boys. Again a picture of Nasser was carried. They stopped at the intersection as one of their number shouted a short talk to them and to the people on the sidewalk, then all waved their arms in the air, shouted and went on.

From time to time, on the sidewalk, I saw apparent friends meet each other. They beamed with smiles, sometimes embraced, kissed each other on the cheeks.

Up the street, horn blowing, came rushing a private car with women leaning out the windows from the back seat and the seat beside the driver. They were Iraqis, dressed in European clothes, their faces wild with delight, shrieking out to all who might hear. More hand clapping from the spectators for them.

One crowd, bigger than most, had been dragging something dark along the pavement. Not until the next day did I realize it may have been what was left of a human body.

Most of the groups on foot and in trucks were coming from the north, the direction of a number of government buildings. Just past my street intersection, on the other side of the street, was another government building. Set back about 100 feet from the sidewalk, its three stories were topped by a big crown set with electric-light bulbs. As one of the groups on foot came in front of this building, several rocks were thrown at it and the group started to slow down.

Then two men in khaki uniforms who had been toward the back of the group walked forward into it talking. One or 2 more rocks were thrown, but then the group moved on.

Several groups later, the same thing happened. Later on, another group started in off the street toward the building. "They're going to break in," I thought. But again a couple of men in uniform stepped forward, pointed back down the street where, from the way they had come, there was shouting. And the group turned back that way.

By this time, I realized, just as every truck and group had at least one picture of Nasser, every group of any size included a couple of men in khaki who walked inconspicuously toward the rear of the group until action by them was needed for protection of the government building. Their actions suggested some organization or control of what was going on.

After a while I went back to the hotel, and was there when my friend returned at noon.

"Everybody is going to have to get off the streets," he said "There is going to be what you call a curfew from 1 o'clock this afternoon until 5 o'clock tomorrow morning."

"Yes," he answered a question from me, "there is a whole new government. Maybe tomorrow I can take you to the Ministry of Information and you can get news to send to the Associated Press. But I must go now because of the curfew."

That afternoon the strangers who were cooped in as fellow guests began exchanging the reports and rumors they had heard: the British Embassy had been burned out; British, Americans, some other foreigners had been killed.

The big uncertainty was whether the army division which had taken control of Baghdad and begun the revolution would receive support or encounter opposition from the greater part of the army, most of it to the north. Some of us with experience in other countries realized only too well that a fight between different units of the army, or anything else which lifted army control from Baghdad, would result in the lowest elements of the city running wild in an orgy of looting, murder and destruction. Foreigners would be prime targets of such mobs.

The streets emptied gradually that afternoon. Individuals and small groups up to 3 or 4 were seen long after the 1 o'clock curfew. The radio announced that the next day everything was to be business as usual. But in the hotel the night was uneasy.

The next morning, the vacant lot across the street from my room was a tangle of parked cars. Many people were on the street. But the people stood talking together, often with excited gestures instead of moving about normally. About 9:30 my friend came in his automobile for me.

"We'll see if we can get to the Ministry of Information," he said. Several blocks along we came to a traffic circle, where a street coming from a bridge over the Tigris River intersected the one we were on. Two tanks were parked at the circle. Crew members, distinguished by blue berets, sat on top of the tanks and sprawled on the grass of the circle nursing submachineguns and rifles.

Up ahead of us, several men started running in the direction we were headed. In a moment, it seemed, the movement spread our way, so that not only was a crowd of runners forming ahead of us but more were coming from behind. Hastily, my friend turned up a narrow side street.

We got onto a street parallel with the first one, to try to continue in the direction we wanted. Once again something beyond our sight started the formation on the run of another crowd. Again my friend took to a narrow side street. Finding a place to squeeze in between other cars, he parked.

"I do not think we better try to go to the Ministry now," he said. "We will go to a newspaper office." I followed him into a winding lane so narrow that if I had spread my arms wide I would have touched the walls on each side at some places. From the corner of my eye I watched nervously the people we met. But, as they seemed to pay no particular attention to me, I relaxed.

"This is a part of the old city," my friend explained as we turned off into another lane in which overhanging enclosed balconies almost met at places.

The newspaper office was in small rooms on the second floor of an old building. My friend took me into one office where I met a couple of men who could speak a little English. One was a sports editor, another some sort of departmental editor. I was asked to sit down.

I was offered an American soft drink. The editors settled down to work, one writing Arabic with a pen from right to left on coarse copy paper. My friend said it would be all right if I just stayed there while he went off on an errand.

Interruptions came frequently for the working editors. Men who came in beamed, sometimes embraced those already there. The feeling between them seemed to be of intense jubilation.

Another round of soft drinks, this time a citrus-flavored carbonated drink. In pauses, various men talked to me about the government that had been overthrown, of corruption and thieves in high places, that the rulers of the Hashemite family had been imposed on Iraq by the British after World War II when Iraq supposedly was to be a free nation.

"It was a police state," they said again and again. "They had spies on the people. A report by even an unimportant policeman against you could mean a stop to your business; maybe you would be put in prison. Our written constitution has in it the same freedoms you have in America; but the people who controlled the government did not carry out what was in the constitution."

The radio had offered a 10,000 dinar ($28,000) reward for information leading to the capture of Nuri Said, former prime minister.

"I thought he was supposed to be an honest man," I said of this Iraqi, who has been the strong man of his country.

"Perhaps so," was the answer, "but he defended and kept in high places men he knew were crooks."

"Why?" I asked.

"Because he needed them to keep his power," was the answer.

I mentioned something about my getting a statement from the new government so the outside world might know something official other than what was gotten by monitoring the Iraqi government radio.

"The government is not going to make any statement," said one man who apparently was in close touch with some of the leaders, "until after the United States has issued a statement about what has happened in Iraq."

I tried to argue that the right sort of Iraqi statement might have some effect on what sort of position the United States Government would take.

My friend returned. There was more talk about the "thieves, spies, and robbers" of the former government. Coffee was passed to everybody.

"You said the group of army officers who accomplished the revolution are all young men, so junior that nobody knows them," I said to the man who seemed in such close touch with the new group. "What about the other divisions of the army in other parts of the country? Did the senior officers commanding fall in with and agree to what has been done?"

He shook his head. "They didn't. Before they knew what had happened, they were put under arrest." And, he declared, what later days apparently bore out as true, the whole army supported the new government.

Then, just before we left, and when I had tried again to sell the idea of the new government issuing a statement of its policies to the outside world, using me to get it to the Associated Press, one of the men told me the AP had an Iraqi part-time correspondent in Baghdad. So, a couple of days later when the cable office opened up and I heard from both Iraqi and American sources that the AP man had filed news reports, I dropped my own efforts to get news out.

It wasn't until a week and a day after the revolution that I learned from Stan Carter of the AP Rome bureau, first foreign correspondent to reach Baghdad after the revolution, that the Iraqi AP man had been put in jail after only a day or two of sending out news on the revolution. No word of that came to me from either Iraqi sources or official American ones in Baghdad.

Tension and worry among foreigners eased considerably after the third day of the new government. Iraqi people were still highly emotional, but settling. After the first day, curfew was from 6 p. m. to 5 a. m. Later it was 8 p. m. to 6 a. m.

A man from the American Embassy made a round of hotels where there were Americans. He said little more than not to worry, to stay in off the streets, that the embassy had no idea when the country would open its borders so that people might leave. He said the United States State Department

said all Americans in Iraq were safe and, in answer to a question, said no Americans had been killed. (Later it was learned that three Americans were killed.)

Then came the landing of American Marines in Lebanon, followed by landing of airborne British troops in Jordan. Reaction among Iraqi friends and acquaintances was immediate and strong. They demanded explanations of "Why, why, why?" and in almost every sentence was implied the question, "Are they going to attack us?"

Life grew more worrisome for us again.

A report that the airport would be opened two mornings each week somehow failed to be borne out in fact. But the American Embassy, followed by the British, did arrange for charter planes to get some pregnant women, sick people, children out. More such flights are in prospect for the future. But most Americans and other foreigners are still ringed in with uncertainty.

Will the Reds Also Withdraw?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 25 issue of the Flint Journal, Flint, Mich. This editorial very effectively exposes the hypocrisy of Russia in attempting to assume the position of champion of Arab nationalism in the Middle East:

WILL THE REDS ALSO WITHDRAW?

We are hearing a great deal about Arab nationalism these days.

It can be defined as the desire of the Arab peoples to be free from colonial domination and exploitation. And it is a very real, very dynamic force in the Middle East.

One of the self-professed champions of Arab nationalism is Premier Nikita Khrushchev of Soviet Russia. He sees in the presence of American Marines in Lebanon and of British troops in Jordan a threat to Arab nationalism and the self-determination of other Arab countries. He has expressed righteous indignation at this so-called aggression by British and American forces.

He chooses to ignore the fact that they were invited, and that officials of both the United States and Britain have promised the troops will be withdrawn as soon as the United Nations can provide protection against the kind of coup which occurred in Iraq.

This pose of righteous indignation on the part of Mr. Khrushchev is ludicrous. It would be downright funny were there not so many tragic overtones.

The role of protector of Moslem political rights ill befits Khrushchev or the Soviet Union. There are an estimated 15 to 20 million Moslems living within the boundaries of the Soviet Union. They include the Azerbaidzhanis, the Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tadzhiks, Kirgiz, and Kazakhs, among others. The racial and religious backgrounds of these people, their culture, and languages are more akin to Turkey, Iran, and other Moslem nations of the Middle East than to European Russia. The Russian czars conquered them, and the Communists have carried on the efforts to destroy their Moslem religion, culture, and traditions.

This question is asked by the New York Times: "If self-rule is good for Egyptians and Iraqis, why is it not good for Uzbeks and Azerbaidzhanis?"

And columnist David Lawrence points out that while it is well to sympathize with the aspirations of Arab nationalism, the hopes of any nationalism can be crushed by the tyranny of a new kind of colonialism, unless military forces are ready to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of smaller countries.

"Certainly," he writes, "if the United Nations acts wisely now in supporting preventive measures against indirect aggression this will be a long step toward emancipating the countries already held captive through acts of indirect aggression. One wonders why so little is heard today about the aspirations of Polish nationalism, Bulgarian nationalism, Hungarian nationalism, Rumanian nationalism, Czechoslovak nationalism, Lithuanian nationalism, Latvian nationalism, and Estonian nationalism."

He wants to know if, when the United States and Britain withdraw their troops from Lebanon and Jordan, the Soviets will withdraw their troops from all the countries they now occupy by force of arms?

There is only one answer to that question.

Statement by R. B. Wilson Before the House Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to extend the remarks of R. B. Wilson, the president of the Mississippi Power & Light Co., made before the Committee on Public Works this morning:

STATEMENT BY R. B. WILSON BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 29, 1958

My name is R. B. Wilson. I am president of the Mississippi Power & Light Co., an investor-owned taxpaying utility, which serves approximately 175,000 customers with electric service in 44 counties in western Mississippi. My company was organized in 1923 and has played an important part in the economic growth of this area for the past 35 years and represents an increase in investment of over 100 million in facilities during this time.

I am here today in opposition to Senate bill 1869 for all of the reasons that some of my colleagues have previously placed before you but specifically for the purpose of showing what this bill can do to my company.

I want to take a few minutes to show you how the TVA has expanded in Mississippi, a State that has only an infinitesimal area in the Tennessee Valley. This map [not printed in the RECORD] shows the service areas of the companies serving Mississippi prior to the advent of TVA. This next map [not printed in the RECORD] shows the initial area served by the TVA around 1934 having acquired the area indicated from our neighboring company by what amounted to coercion. Note also the 44-kilovolt line (but insulated for 110 kilovolts) running from Tupelo to Batesville. This line was build in 1938 to serve a flood-control project in my company's territory, although we were ready, willing and able to serve this project with its power requirements. Now look at the service area claimed by TVA in Mississippi today. The area indicated in yellow, having again been acquired from an investor-owned taxpaying electric company under threat of competition with the subsidized rates of TVA. Also, note the cross-hatched area where their claimed service area has been extended into and overlaps our service area. True, the suppliers of TVA electricity in our area are the REA co-ops, but the subsidized rates prevail and we are constantly threatened with the loss of customers to this manifestly unfair competition. As late as 1950, TVA through an arrangement with North Central Mississippi Electric Power Association, again expanded into De Soto, Tate, and Marshall Counties with the announced purpose of the co-op of serving not only the rural area, which was already adequately served by Mississippi Power & Light Co. with over 1,000 miles of rural line, but also the towns in these counties as well, as was evidenced by the public statements made by the co-ops in the press and elsewhere.

We do not have time to go into this now except to say that we are having a life-and-death struggle with this co-op, supplied by subsidized TVA power, to keep them from taking this entire area away from us. There are some 15 or 20 cases presently pending in the courts and before the Public Service Commission whereby we hope to protect this part of our service area from this unfair competition. If Senate bill 1869 is passed, not only could our service area which has been overlapped by TVA be taken over by the TVA-supplied co-ops or by TVA itself, but additional parts of 14 counties as well, as indicated by this map [not printed in the RECORD]. Included in the area that could immediately be served by TVA directly or through the REA co-ops supplied by TVA, under the most conservative interpretation of the bill, are 32,710 of our customers (19 percent), $4,401,000 in revenue (15 percent), and $17,994,000 of plant investment (14 percent), to say nothing of the tax loss to the various taxing authorities of over $1 million; and this does not include the additional area possible under the 5-mile extension provision. Too, under the bill, interconnections can be made with other systems. Presently there is pending before the Mississippi Public Service Commission an application from two G. & T. co-ops to build generating plants and transmission lines in south Mississippi and north Mississippi. The information on file with the Public Service Commission indicates that interconnections will be made with TVA. If these plants are built, it is obvious that with the passage of this bill TVA through REA could cover the entire State of Mississippi in a very short time.

In conclusion, I want to submit to this committee that at the present time the only reason there is an excuse for TVA power in the Mississippi Power & Light Co.'s service area is to serve certain REA co-ops. Our company has ample generating capacity and charges reasonable rates to the co-ops for serving the rural customer in our section of the State. We have advised REA officials of our willingness to enter into long-term contracts for the power supply to all the co-ops in our territory from multipoints of delivery on our transmission system, eliminating the necessity of building costly and duplicating transmission lines. The rate would of course be subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. It is my studied opinion that there is absolutely no necessity for the passage of Senate bill 1869 and the further extension of the service area already being subsidized by the electric customers all over the United States. Our company is ready, willing, and able to serve the co-ops and all others at reasonable rates under long-term contracts and thereby relieve the TVA of this load and the need for funds to build additional and unneeded generation.

Address by Hon. J. Dudley Digges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Charles County in the State of Maryland, which is located just south of Washington on the Potomac, is celebrating the 300th anniversary of its founding this year.

The people of that county have spent the past months arranging a celebration which terminates with a week of festivities during the week of September 13 through September 20 of this fall. Last week, I had the pleasure of attending a kick-off as a prelude to the final events of this year.

The Honorable J. Dudley Digges, judge of the Seventh Maryland Judicial Circuit, gave a very interesting address to the members of the press and guests who were at that press party. Since every Member of Congress has received an invitation to this celebration, I thought it would be of interest to them as well as all their constituents that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, even though it will exceed the usual cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF JUDGE J. DUDLEY DIGGES TO PRESS PARTY AT ROSE HILL, PORT TOBACCO, MD., JULY 19, 1958

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you to Charles County—God bless you. It is particularly pleasing to have you here at this time when we are celebrating our 300th anniversary as a political entity.

Three hundred years is a long time and many things happen and many changes are made. Perhaps the most dynamic of these changes is the capsuling of time and space. As members of the fourth estate you are undoubtedly better aware of this than most of us.

Think back to the days when this was virgin forest inhabited by Indians and later when the first settlements were hewn from these forests. Go back to the days of Colonial America when George Washington and other Revolutionary leaders visited here in Charles County.

Before telling you of some of its history, I should like to locate our county by reference to this map of the Potomac River-Chesapeake Bay area.

You will note that the Potomac River makes what is referred to as a "dogleg" bend, thus creating a river frontage on two sides of the county. On the third side there are two rivers, the Wicomico and the Patuxent. We are bounded on the north by Prince Georges County. Our county is across the river from such wellknown Virginia places as Mt. Vernon, Quantico, Wakefield and Stratford. In fact, it is the only political subdivision from which one may view George Washington's birthplace, his home and the place of his burial.

Charles County was established May 10, 1658. It was named "Charles" in honor of Charles Calvert, young son of Cecelius Calvert, the Second Lord Baltimore. Charles Calvert later became the Third Lord Baltimore.

The first white man known to have visited Charles County was Capt. John Smith who came to Port Tobacco in 1608 in the *Discovery*, one of his three famous ships. He explored the Potomac River and its many tributaries and traded with the Potopacos, Nanjemoys, Pomonkeys, Chiggamuxens, Wicomicos, and Piccawaxens, friendly Indian tribes whose names even now designate our beautiful tidal streams.

Port Tobacco was originally the settlement of the friendly Potopac Indians and early became an important seaport for vessels traveling to and from England, as well as a center of culture in Maryland. It was a thriving metropolis—economically and socially—when Washington was still on the planning boards.

We learn of the importance of this port from the extensive trading carried on, from the importance of the people who lived on the surrounding plantations in the prerevolutionary and revolutionary periods of our Nation's history. That it was important as a center of culture may be gleaned from the fact that the Beggar's Opera, when it first played in this country, was played at Port Tobacco immediately following its performance in Williamsburg. It is hard for us today to imagine that this village, now almost deserted, occupied such an important part in the colonial life of this section of the New World at a time when Washington was but a swamp and Baltimore had but a few crude buildings.

It might be interesting at this point to note that the first census taken in 1790 showed a population in Charles County of about 20,000, which figure was not again reached until the last census in 1950.

Port Tobacco, the original county seat, remained as such until the courthouse was burned in 1892. During its long history it was the scene of many interesting historical events, as well as folklore. It was here that the Potopac Indians were converted to Christianity by Father Andrew White when he baptized the Potopac Indian princess. The burning of the courthouse is said to have resulted from the defeat of a proposal to remove the county seat, based on the argument that it was too expensive to rebuild a courthouse elsewhere. Those who advocated keeping the courthouse in Port Tobacco were shortly relieved of this argument. One night after a poker game a group of men decided to remove the records from the building and set fire to it.

Charles County, lying just north of St. Mary's, cradle of religious freedom in the New World, can boast of many historical places of religious interest.

Old Durham Episcopal Church, the oldest in the county, was erected in 1732. George Washington frequently attended services there with his friend, General Smallwood, and on occasions when he visited his farm located a short distance therefrom.

St. Thomas Manor, overlooking the Port Tobacco and Potomac Rivers at Chapel Point, is one of the oldest Jesuit institutions in North America. The original chapel built prior to 1692, and the present manor house built in 1741, were used in colonial times as headquarters for Jesuit Fathers serving other colonies as well as Maryland. It has had an unbroken chain of pastors since 1662.

Not far up the valley from old Port Tobacco is Mount Carmel, oldest Carmelite monastery in the United States, founded in 1790.

From the date of its founding down to the present time the economy of Charles County and the livelihood of its farm population have depended primarily upon its fertile tobacco fields. Tobacco quickly became the medium of exchange. Our records at the courthouse are replete with references to fines being paid in pounds of tobacco, clergymen receiving their pay in tobacco, and property being transferred in consideration of payment in pounds of tobacco.

Charles County can boast of complete land records and will records, and a more complete series of court proceedings than any other Maryland county. One can learn much of interest from reviewing these records. Typical of which we learn that the most prevalent crime was hog stealing. Hog stealing was not the theft of a hog as one would think today from the use of that term, but resulted from the killing of a branded hog by huntsmen and therefore more comparable to the violation of our present-day game laws. One may see from these records that land was granted by a description which would state a distance in a given direction as far as a man may ride on horseback in a half day, or as far as an arrow would shoot from a bow.

Among these records is a drawing of the first courthouse built in 1674, with deed of conveyance from John Allen to Lord Baltimore in consideration of 20,000 pounds of tobacco, agreeing to construct the courthouse according to the plans attached and to "keep and cause to be kept the said courthouse and prison in good and sufficient repair forever, except their foundations shall happen to decay with rottenness."

Court proceedings show most of the prominent lawyers of their time such as Daniel Webster, William Pinkney, and Francis Scott Key trying cases here.

To speak of history is really to speak of the men and women and their achievements in building our Nation.

Charles County has provided a fair share of citizens whose names have found a place in the history of the founding days of the colony and the days which have followed.

To mention a few, John Hanson of Mulberry Grove, born in Charles County in 1714, was President of the United States in Congress assembled, during the year 1781–82. This should make him the first President of these United States. He was 1 of 2 Marylanders designated by his State when all States were invited to contribute for Statuary Hall in the Capitol at Washington.

Mulberry Grove is about 2 miles from where we are now seated and overlooks the Port Tobacco River and valley.

Thomas Stone, youngest signer of the Declaration of Independence, delegate to the Continental Congress and a member of the committee designated to draft the Articles of Confederation, lived at Habre de Venture which adjoins Rose Hill. It now stands in perfect condition and is of great architectural interest because it takes the form of a crescent at the rim of its gardens fragrant with boxwood and flowers.

Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, whose home was Retreat, just west of Port Tobacco, was a member of the Continental Congress and 1 of the 3 Marylanders who signed the Federal Constitution.

To my knowledge, Charles County is the only county which can boast of native sons signing the Declaration of Independence—and—the Federal Constitution.

We further have Daniel Jenifer, nephew of Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer. He was minister to Austria and later a Member of Congress. He has been described as a great entertainer and frequently had as his guests at his home, Charleston, Daniel Webster and Henry Clay for what has been described as card-playing, hard-drinking house parties. It is said he spoke of these larks as fishing trips. The term may have been a bit equivocal, but it was not wholly inept. They could depend on Jenifer for at least one catch. According to tradition, the party would sit up all night about the card tables. At dawn the host would invite his guests on the landing for a bit of fishing. There were no disappointments with the catch, for at the end

of each line was a large bottle of cool champagne.

William Smallwood, Colonel of the Maryland Line, the first regiment made up of Maryland troops raised in the Revolutionary War, was a close personal friend of General Washington. He rose to the rank of major general and is credited with saving the American Army from total destruction at the Battle of Long Island. Honored by his friends and neighbors, he was three times elected Governor of Maryland. The completion of the rebuilding of his home, Smallwood's Retreat, is at hand and will be dedicated as a park during our tercentenary celebration this year.

I also mention two illustrious men of the medical field in Revolutionary times—Dr. James Craik, of La Grange, and Dr. Gustavus Brown, of Rose Hill, both personal friends and physicians of George Washington, whom they treated on his deathbed. Dr. Craik was Surgeon General of the Revolutionary Army.

I will not further refer to the house at Rose Hill because you are here to see it for yourselves.

One interesting story about Rose Hill is the fact that it was the home during the Civil War period of Miss Olivia Floyd and her brother, Robert Floyd. They were well-known confederate sympathizers and their home was occupied by General Hooker as his headquarters. It is said that on one occasion during General Hooker's stay he was trying to intercept a message he believed Miss Floyd was to deliver across the Potomac. In order to prevent delivery of the message he spent the evening before the fireplace chatting with her. Little did he know that he toasted his feet by the message he wanted to intercept. It was well-hidden in the ball top of one of the fireplace andirons. These andirons are now in the Baltimore Museum of Art.

La Grange, the home of Dr. Craik, located just across the valley from here, is noted for its great outside chimneys and the house formed an appropriate setting for plantation life. Dr. Craik figured with General Washington in every Revolutionary battle fought until the war ended at Yorktown. Among the many prominent military figures he treated was Lafayette at Brandywine.

Most of you I am sure are familiar with the heroic medical services rendered by Dr. Samuel Mudd while in prison after his conviction as a co-conspirator in the Lincoln Assassination trial. His home still stands in Charles County and is occupied by his direct descendants.

Mt. Republic, built in 1792, apparently will last forever with its walls 2½ feet thick. It is another example of a home of gracious living in the Revolutionary period. It was owned by Franklin Weems, a great entertainer of whom it is said kept a poker game going in his home continuously for 40 years. Three times a week he entertained a party of young people and many mornings set out for a fox hunt without having been to bed at all for more than 24 hours. A pack of 100 fox hounds was maintained at Mt. Republic, and many of the best hunting dogs in Maryland have the blood of these hounds in their veins.

In mentioning promiment Charles Countians I should include Robert Hanson Harrison, aide and secretary on General Washington's staff and later chief justice of Maryland. He is said to have declined an appointment to the United States Supreme Court, tendered by his former commander when he became President.

Adm. Raphael Semmes, most famous of the Confederate naval heroes, was also a native son.

Today Charles County is a quiet rural community, whose principal economy is still based on our tobacco fields. Behind the modern front of Route 301 you will find that there still remains in our county much of the same way of life which served our fathers.

The few pictures you have seen are typical of the more than eighty houses built prior to 1800 and still lived in. This gracious manor of Rose Hill is one of these. They are wonderfully preserved as a present-day monument to our famous sons and a way of life which contributed to the foundation building and growth of our Nation.

On behalf of the owners of these homes, as well as the people of Charles County, I extend to each of you a cordial invitation to again visit us and see in more detail our many places of interest.

Conditions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials which appeared last week in the Boston Herald, regarding conditions in the Middle East.

These editorials state with great clarity the policy decisions which will have to be made in that area, and indicate some types of solutions which may allow us to develop a sturdier foreign policy in the Middle East.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of July 24, 1958]

MIDDLE EAST SOLUTION

At 3 p. m., on July 15 the United States liquidated a bankrupt policy in the Middle East. That was the moment when the first Marine set foot on the Lebanon shore.

We can now no longer expect to maintain our interests by military alliances propping up ailing governments. We can no longer mass sufficient influence to preserve the status quo against the machinations of ambitious leaders, backed with Russian diplomacy, Russian arms, and Russian money, and exploiting the ferment of nationalism.

Yet we have announced no new policy adapted to the realities in the Middle East. Until we do the future is dark and we must face the sad alternative of an ignominious withdrawal from Lebanon with inadequate guaranties or the even more dangerous prospect of an indefinite occupation.

There is a solution. There is a course which would bring the Middle East into clear step with the West and close that area to further incursions by Moscow.

But this new policy must be adopted at once, and it must be acclaimed again and again and again in clear, simple, and unmistakable terms until it becomes established without question as ours.

We cannot delay this while the United Nations searches out some expedient or while we debate summit conferences and exchange recriminatory notes with Khrushchev. The time is now.

The time is now because we have at last demonstrated that we cannot be cowed by Soviet bluster or diverted by Nasser's guile.

We failed to sink the freighters that brought Soviet bloc arms to Egypt in 1955 in outrageous defiance of the West. We failed even to take effective action in the United Nations against this threat to peace. We backed Nasser against our closest allies without requiring him in return to abide by the United Nations decisions he was flouting.

The implication of American impotence or appeasement fostered by such restraints is now happily shattered. We have proved we have the guts to act.

This must be the foundation of any policy, in the Middle East or anywhere, that we are ready to fight to maintain our vital concerns.

But upon that we can, and should, build a constructive policy which will, within the broad limits of conflicting necessities, merge Middle East objectives with ours. We can do so far better than the Soviet because we have no imperialist aims, and, despite the propaganda, the Soviet has. We have an interest in Middle East stability and the Soviet seeks constant upheaval there. We have a vast market for Middle East oil; the Soviet merely seeks to block that market. We and others in the West have the technical and financial capacity to assist the middle eastern peoples to a higher standard of living and a share in the good things of life; the Soviet, while gaining in such capacity, cannot match it.

The United States must broadcast these facts with more emphasis than we have ever employed before. We must proclaim over and over again that we are prepared to assist in all honest attempts of the Arab states to achieve a peaceful federation. We must announce that we stand ready in company with other nations to supply the wherewithal for the wise development of the resources of these countries.

For this, we must make clear that we require no military alliances, no retention of existing kinds or sheiks, no particular governmental regime. These are decisions we leave to the free choice of sovereign people.

But sovereignty is not absolute anywhere. We shall expect that the governments shall respect their international obligations. We shall not condone subversion by assassination. We shall insist on such safeguards of development funds that they do not support scurrilous attacks such as the Cairo radio has made against us with unremitting zeal. We shall expect those development funds to be expended in ways to advance the welfare of the people rather than the political ambitions of their leaders.

We shall insist on the preservation of the armistice boundaries of Israel and at settlement of the refugee problem.

This is a policy neither of appeasement nor intimidation. It answers the plea for bread with something more nourishing than the stone of military alliances. It brings the West into line with the legitimate aspirations of the Middle Eastern peoples.

It will not always be an easy policy to carry out—there will always be troublesome men like Nasser who prefer adventurism to sound construction. No policy will be easy. But such a policy as this is honest, honorable, and practicable. It is our one hope to circumvent Soviet expansionism in this area.

How such a policy should be instituted and how it might work will be discussed in another editorial.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of July 25, 1958]

MIDDLE EAST SOLUTION

These are the alinements of Arab nationalism today:

A bloody, military dictatorship, with little respect for treaties, using Soviet arms, assassination, subversion and the big-lie technique to strike down other regimes, often somewhat more liberal, which do honor their international obligations.

Therein is the dilemma that complicates the fashioning of an American policy in the

Middle East, the widespread identification of Nasserism with Arabism.

The United States must, as we undertook to explain here yesterday, adopt as part of a new Mideast policy the principle of supporting Arab nationalism. Does that mean we must support Nasser because he is the present representative of such nationalism? Some intelligent Americans are saying so.

If it does mean that, then we must abandon President Bourguiba, of Tunesia, to Nasser's United Arab Republic. Bourguiba has already reported that the Nasser machine is at work on his country.

An American policy that swapped Bourguiba for Nasser would be a self-defeating policy.

In the streets of Cairo are illuminated terrestrial globes showing the United Arab Republic stretching from Morocco to Iraq. There are clear signs that Nasser is also prepared to move on the non-Arab states of Sudan and Iran.

Yet Nasser's own people are no better off than they were under King Farouk—unless it is more comforting to a hungry fellah to have his ruler pour money into armaments than onto dancing girls.

The solution to this dilemma is not to attempt to do business with Nasser on Nasser's terms. We are not obliged to support anything that comes along that uses the slogans of pan-Arabism to whitewash international thievery.

We can support and should support any Arab nationalist move that will accept basic international obligations. And that could include Nasser if he changed his tactics.

The new American policy must abandon appeasement. We must make clear that we shall defend our legitimate ends, through the United Nations, if possible, but by arms, if necessary, as we did in Lebanon. But at the same time we must hold out the prospect of generous and friendly assistance for the stability and well-being of the area.

Only by such a course can the presently independent Arab States find a satisfying alternative to the Nasser type of nationalism.

It will take time to produce results. Our course would have been easier if we could have barred Nasser's intrigues in Iraq. But our course would have been much harder if we had not moved in to preserve Lebanon's power of decision.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, Former Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, at Jamestown, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the political observations of the Honorable James A. Farley are always of interest, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the address given by the former Postmaster General at the annual dinner of the Chautauqua County Democratic Committee at Jamestown, N. Y., on July 1, 1958.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE AND THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, ANNUAL DINNER, CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE, JAMESTOWN, N. Y., JULY 17, 1958

That great American President, Woodrow Wilson, once said that a man long in public affairs ought to withdraw and meditate for a year to find out what he has learned. In my years of public life, I have been fortunate to have witnessed and to have participated in American politics from Grassy Point to a Cabinet seat in the White House, with a considerable stopover at Albany, as chairman of the Democratic State Committee. Even more fortunately, I have had opportunity to follow the advice of Mr. Wilson. I have had time to weigh and consider the unfolding panorama of the changing American Government, during nearly a half century of what, by common consensus, are the most fateful decades of our history.

It would be strange, indeed, if after reflection, I had not reached some views of the fundamental structure of our body politic. With your permission, these I should like to present tonight. I have concerned myself with the larger methods and patterns of our history, because I believe that even the great personalities of our history are an expression of the great American people. I in no way demean the greatness of individuals, but I think their greatness is derived from expressing the underlying forces of their times. It always seemed to me that a battle of personalities dramatized but, at the same time, obscured the great issues. I have, therefore, avoided personalities. I cannot refrain from observing, however, that those who once, and only a short time ago, presumed to measure the Democratic Party by a deep freeze are now shivering in their vicuna overcoats.

When I started my political career the full impact of the 19th century's industrial revolution avalanched into the 20th century with tremendous pressure upon the then existing methods of government. From the Hudson to the Golden Gate, and from the headwaters of the Mississippi to the Florida Keys Americans knotted at the street corners to discuss the paths the country might take. The forces of national growth were beating like an angry surf on the constitutional foundations of the Republic. It was then, as a young man, that I first learned that that great document had not only a built-in resiliency but a magnificent capacity for expansion. Without affecting its basic construction of the 18th century, it permitted the expansion of government function to fit the incredibly greater forces of the 20th. I noted that not only was our Constitution pliable enough to react to emergency but that the provisional measures often became institutionalized through continuing necessity. I further noted that the two-party system was capable of encompassing that expansion. I conceived of my party as the party of growth, and the Republican Party as the party of stabilization, and for both I have the greatest respect. It is my conviction that their reciprocal action upon each other provides the actual evolutionary dynamics of our political society. I believe, with Mr. Justice Hughes, that a great virtue marks also a great limitation. Having identified the virtues of both parties it occurred to me, in my reflection, that I had also identified their limitations. Obviously, in an expanding age, the party of growth is the better but it must be deeply concerned with the method by which it fulfills its function. The reciprocal action of the great parties has unfailingly supplied the American people with alternates. I relied then, and I rely now, unreservedly, on the American electorate to make the proper choice. That is why I have always supported the two-party system because it, by its very nature, means that an intelligent choice is placed before the American people.

Further, I believe that thees two vehicles, by their competition, perform their function of conveying both the underlying force and the conscious intent of the American people. Now, if I am correct in my theory it will be perceived that my conclusions quite frequently vary from some of the theories accepted today. For example, in that great and exciting campaign of 1912 it was my theory that the forces of growth were raging for expression. The Republican Party refused to yield and the Bull Moose Party of Mr. Theodore Roosevelt was born. Now, if I am correct, please note the difference in conclusion. It is my contention that the Bul Moose Party split the Democratic Party and not the Republican Party. Had not the Bull Moose Party been in existence that vote would have expressed itself in the total for Mr. Wilson and not for Mr. Taft. The Republican Party could not even contain the Republican sources of growth within its own party, which also describes the condition of that party today. This, it seems to me, is a most important distinction which runs to the very nature of the anatomy of the body politic. It is a fundamental conviction of mine that the will of the American people will express itself, as certainly as the Hudson River finds the sea, and that it will instrument its will by that party which offers it best conduit for what it regards as the principal issue or problem. It, in times of decision, is always the Democratic Party.

Now, I have said, in effect, that I believe that the two-party system has the capacity of transmitting the force of the American people to their institutions and that those institutions have sufficient elasticity to give expression to the will of tht people by their own nature, or to create new institutions which will. It is upon this premise that I am deeply, very deeply, concerned about the future of our country. Indeed, it is for this reason that I am seeking the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate. It is because the separation of powers, the tripartite division of our Government is seriously out of balance. Far, far too much permanent power has been delegated to the Executive by the Congress and far, far too much of the legislative power is being exercised by the courts and the great administrative agencies. Let me here make this important distinction. There is nothing wrong with these bodies, as such. They perform great and necessary functions. But to the extent that they are not responsible to the Congress nor, indeed, to the Executive they are becoming a fourth branch of government, more powerful than both executive and legislative and far less responsive to the people.

Let me illustrate. Mr. Chief Justice Taft once urged the judiciary to be most careful in the handling of small matters. The reason, he stated, was that it was here that the average citizen came in most contact with his Government and hence it was here that his faith in that Government must be most upheld. At that time, his description of the facts was true. It no longer is. By contrast, now the average citizen's wages are fixed by Federal law; the food he eats is protected by Federal law; the radio channels which inform him are governed by Federal law; his savings are both insured and protected by Federal law—law administered by semijudicial bodies.

There has been a vast accretion of Federal power. But at the same time that the power was accruing to the Federal Government a further phenomenon was going on within the Federal Government itself. More particularly, the Congress was delegating that power to the executive, on a discretionary basis, which tends to become Government by whim of the deciding personality. Simultaneously, the courts are holding that the discretionary powers of the President are nonreviewable. To compound the problem, delegated powers were amplified into vast agencies responsible to neither. The Supreme Court itself has said that these regulating bodies float between Congress and the Executive, like Mohammed's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth and belonging to neither orbit. It is my belief that this is not ordered

elasticity; it is close to government by sputnik regulating bodies, revolving around the American body politic, yet completely beyond the reach of the American people. I further believe that the point of responsibility for the government of those bodies and for simultaneous and complete responsibility to the American people for the control of those bodies is that branch most responsive to the will of the people, the Congress and more particularly the United States Senate. Unlike Mr. Justice Taft's day, the Government is now a tremendous factor in the daily lives of the American people. For example, practically everybody has at least heard of the income tax. Accordingly, it is with grave alarm that I quote Mr. Justice Roberts that a Supreme Court decision is now like a railroad ticket—good for today and one passage only. If true, it is neither congressional law nor judicial decision. It describes a condition of disorder. If we add to this the warning of that very great jurist, Mr. Justice Learned Hand, a very serious problem is described. Now, can there be any more important task than bringing those new and great regulating institutions under the direct control of the American people? Can we continue to call ourselves a free people unless this is accomplished?

I have stated before, and I state again, that the solution of our problems is in the approach. When Mr. Wilson yielded power in the 1920 elections, it was because the American people believed they wished a stabilization program. Indeed, that was the issue—back to normalcy. No one knew then and no one knows now what normalcy is. But a great governor up at Albany knew even then what it was not. Most emphatically, Gov. Alfred E. Smith perceived that an expanding scientific civilization demanded as near as may be a scientific administration of government. He sought and obtained the assistance of the most dedicated and accomplished people of the community in the name of service to the people of New York. He asked only that they describe the subject, identify the problem, and suggest the solution, and he would do the rest. Can anyone deny the result? Are not the magnificent parkways both ornament and example to the Nation? There was no service he did not expand. For further example, did he not seize the terrible mental-health problem with both of his mighty hands and drag it into the light of day? On this alone, he substituted a community's understanding and care, for a vast area which black ignorance had labeled a family's private shame. In every way, from savings banks and insurance regulation to specialized high schools, the Democratic Governor of New York was pioneering forward to new fields, while the Nation was lulled into eating the Republican lotus bud of normalcy. The result is that New York is today the model State government of the Nation. But further, that bold imaginative approach is the hallmark of the Democratic Party. It, on a State level, was born under Alfred E. Smith, nurtured under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, promulgated under Herbert H. Lehman, and expanded by our present Gov. Averell Harriman.

Now, my point in reciting the method of Governor Smith is that on the fateful day of March 4, 1933, when President Roosevelt stepped into the White House as Chief of State, and I was summoned as chairman of the National Democratic Committee, we had more than a platform of promised result. We had a proven method of attacking the crisis. We brought the best of our forces to the worst point of the country's danger. Mr. Churchill has called the days following Dunkirk England's finest hour. In my opinion, the finest and one of the most courageous acts of any American President was the decision of President Roosevelt to close the banks. With one majestic sweep he both took the American people into his confidence and informed them of the enormity of the crisis. I say that those banks reopened and they have never been closed since. The depositors are insured, and their confidence, and rightfully, exceeds their insurance. He called himself quarterback on that fateful occasion but he was more like a surgeon, a physician to the state, performing a delicate operation on the heart of the Nation. And I was thrilled then, and I am proud now, that the great instrument he relied on was the Democratic Party, of which I was chief. We did not need the exalted statement of President Grover Cleveland that public office is a public trust. The hungry eyes of 17 million decent American men out of work, and their 45 million women and children, hanging on every move of the White House, reminded us. The fact is the party of stabilization had brought the Nation to a point where scarcely a productive wheel was turning.

If the most courageous hour was the closing of the banks the decision which followed is, in my opinion, the proudest hour of the Democratic Party. We decided to risk every dollar in the United States Treasury and all we could borrow on the average American citizen. From the farms to the hills, from the mines to the looms, from the ranches to the boiler rooms, the clarion call rang that the farm wouldn't be lost, that the mine wouldn't be closed, that the loom wouldn't be silent, because the United States Government believed that the best credit risk in the world is an American man ready to trade a pint of his sweat to prevent the tears of his hungry children. This was not hasty jury-rigged, makeshift policy. In fact, it was based on the very foundation of the Democratic Party; in the words of the late great Mr. Justice Brandeis, a basic conviction, that the single greatest asset of the United States is the American people who live in it. Since that time, I have noticed that Mr. Churchill has written that the greatest investment a nation can make is in a bottle of milk for a baby. I cannot refrain from remarking that we not only got the milk into the baby we lifted the mortgage from the cow. And, mind you, all this was done to a rising and ironic wail from the conservative stabilizers, that we were using very good American money to pay back their very bad loans. As the President said to me at the time, the signs of recovery are unmistakable; the financial community has recovered sufficiently enough to start beating its doctor over the head with its crutches. But I learned in hard experience, when the chips were down, what to me is an unfailing axiom, that a party should accept responsibility and then beget confidence by giving it. Indeed, it is true that there is nothing to fear but fear itself. It is the devil's own weapon. Now, it would be strange indeed if a great and good God did not give man a defense against it, and He did. As sure as there is nothing more paralizing than fear there is nothing more contagious and energizing than courage. In 48 years of campaigning, I still regard its power as greater than hydrogen bombs and its magic as greater than the miracle drugs; that mystic combination of heart and brain, by which God gave man his moral courage. Without it, there can be no just and lasting solution, because without it there cannot even be a start. The histories recount the hundred basic pieces of legislation which were placed upon the lawbooks, in those days, and the historians call them among the most significant in our history. At that time, they were called the most daring. But only recently Speaker BAYBURN has pointed out that not one was repealed. On the contrary, all have been augmented, even by the present administration. Again I point out that what was regarded as daring in those days, a dangerous fiscal experiment, is now regarded as a great safety factor in our economy. For example, the purchasing power of our millions of older people drawing social security is a very definite factor in sustaining purchasing power.

My purpose here, however, is not to examine solutions but to call attention to the method by which they were solved. The point is that that legislation was born of the leadership of the Democratic Party, which gave expression to the moral courage of the American people, a combination which was invincible then, and will be again.

Now, I ask your especial attention. You will note that I said I have much respect for the party of stability, the Republican Party. I said I believed it performed a great service. I do. I also believe that it is led by distinguished Americans. I simply disagree with them, and never more than at the present time, for these reasons. Nothing stabilized a ship like running before a storm. The following waves seem to propel the ship, and they do, but in the wrong direction. This is not the way of the Democratic Party. We not only face the storm we refuse to alter course. Our way is forward, and by facing angry waters we pass through them. I decry the Republican counsels of fear. No one can convince me that the best coordinated body in the world, 67 million Americans in a gigantic labor-management team, has any basis to doubt its ability. Its own adaptability speaks for itself. Over 50 percent of our people earn their livings in industries which did not exist in 1900. This represents not only an accomplishment of the past, it describes an expanding circumference of matchless opportunity for the future. The promise of our record is that, in our time, millions yet unborn will earn their livings in industries not yet conceived.

Why then the counsels of despair? Do you think the Hudson Valley of 1758 was any safer than ours of 1958? Why, two foreign armies on American soil fought at Lake George and Ticonderoga exactly 200 years ago, and 173 years ago the young Nation was saved at the Battle of Saratoga. The danger overhead today isn't any greater than the danger of the tomahawk and the rifle at the front door 200 years ago.

What is desperately needed now is some appreciation of the majesty of the soul of the American people, by those who now direct the policies of the American Government. How can they express fears about the fundamental financial structure of the Republic, whether they call it deflation or inflation, when the fact is that the American people have been strong enough to assist other nations in a sum equaling more than four times the national debt of 1932, and all paid in cash since 1945.

Of course I do not claim that the great decisions of the first two Roosevelt administrations were born of New York State alone. We had before us the knowledge that Jefferson was called a fool for buying the whole Mississippi Valley for $15 million; that Seward was deemed irrational for purchasing Alaska for $7,200,000; that in 1637 there were areas in which rebellion threatened because the introduction of the public school system was called socialism. We had all of this before us when we decided to fit our policy to an expanding Nation, and to cease trying to cramp a Nation into the confines of the Republican straitjacket, the traditional fiscal system. That was our position and it is mine. Mammon is not a god, though he is a giant and that giant must be put to work for the American people. Woodrow Wilson bridled him with the Federal Reserve, the 1932 administration harnessed him to the needs of the people and from 1958 onward he is going to pull his fair share of the load. It is always highly significant to note the instrument by which a party measures its obligations. From

time immemorial the Republican Party has used the tariff, the interest rate and the price of steel as its barometers. For the Democratic Party the measuring stick has always been, and I hope always will be, the price of a loaf of bread to the wife of the man who has to earn it to feed their children. The irony of it—the United States Government is paying nearly twice the interest rate today that it did in 1950 meaning, by the financial community's own measuring stock, a Republican administration is nearly twice the risk to the country as a Democratic one.

In that great play of several years ago, High Tor, a mountain in my own Hudson Valley, the wise old Chief advised his tribe that it was impossible to hold back an age with one's bare hands. That is the traditional, and unfortunately, the present policy of the Republican Party. It is why it invariably turns in such a dismal log as directors of the ship of state. The Democratic Party, I repeat, is about to be summoned to the bridge and, thank heaven, it has the tested blue-water captains to man the ship. Twenty-nine governors, led by our own Governor Averell Harriman; a majority of the House and Senate, led by such storm-tested captains as RAYBURN, JOHNSON, RUSSELL, and MCCORMACK.

The party, I believe, is to the Government what the engine room is to a ship, and this I know because of my experience as Chairman of the National Democratic Committee.

Our course is not only set by logic, it is set by both our history and the Nation's necessity. Our course is a 180° turn to face the storms and then full steam ahead.

Now, I have asked that you note the campaign of 1912, and my theory that Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party diverted the power of growth from the Democratic Party for a precise and present reason. That theory was validated in 1932 when the forces of growth found single expression in the Democratic Party. It was followed by an even greater expression in 1936, when 46 States of the Union endorsed the main causeway of history provided by the Democratic Party. I might say that it is my private opinion that Maine and Vermont did not join the cavalcade because they just couldn't believe it was true. However, my main point is this: Upon my observation in 1912 and my experience in 1932 I ventured to predict the result in 1936, which turned out to be almost mathematically correct. I now predict, based on the same appraisal I used in 1936, equally sweeping Democratic victories in 1958 and 1960. It is this simple. The only instrument of an overdue expansion of American might is the Democratic Party.

If I am correct, and I believe I am, it follows that these great forces of growth are again ready for mighty expansion, and they most certainly are going to choose that trusted instrument, the Democratic Party, as the means of their expression. There is good reason why. As Governor Smith repeatedly said, let's look at the record. Did our risk on the American people pay off? In 1939 the total national debt was only 40 billions. In 1958 the Government's income alone will be 70 billions. But was the secret of our fiscal policies the watching of the stock market? Not at all, as a doctor can take a pinpoint of blood from a finger and have an idea of the general health of a body, we took the smallest possible integer, the family budget. We believed that the average citizen's ability to make both ends meet was as good as a blood count of the health of a nation. We also believed that if that little cell, the family's budget, was healthy so was the Nation's. To switch metaphor, we believed in watering the tree from the roots and be believed that the roots of the Nation were its millions of working families. And again as Governor Smith said, look at the record. The American standard of living has doubled in that time and will continue to expand. I repeat, that is why the Democratic Party will be summoned to power because it alone is the instrument of expansion of the American people. I say to you that as certainly as the American people groped their way to the Democratic Party in 1932 and grasped it to themselves in 1936 they are triumphantly marching to it in 1958.

I mention 1932, in this year of our Lord 1958, became I am thinking of another 25 years hence—1983. I discovered, in my meditations, that it was no accident that providence had placed man's eyes in the front of his head, it was to look forward. From Jefferson and Jackson, through Cleveland, Wilson, and Roosevelt, our party has been the party of vision. Our faith is what has carried us through desperate experience, and our experience has taught us the lessons of adversity. Our vision, our faith, and our experience are about to receive the Nation's call. We have the course and we have the navigators. We must face the challenge of 1983, by answering the call of 1958.

I tell you again, the Democratic Party is about to come to power because the Nation is on the brink of its most majestic expansion. Your best will be enough because, as General Washington said, angels can do no more. In the coming hour of fateful responsibility to the Nation let us not do less.

Eastern Price System Hits Midwest Dairyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Eastern Price System Hits Midwest Dairymen," from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of July 25, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTERN PRICE SYSTEM HITS MIDWEST DAIRYMEN

A clash of interests between New York-New Jersey milk producers and certain eastern cheese manufacturers has produced significant testimony on efforts to keep Midwest dairymen from selling their products in the East.

The head of a New York company specializing in manufacture of Italian-type cheese said that Wisconsin can produce this same cheese at 4 to 5 cents a pound less than his costs. If a price increase on manufacturing milk sought by New York-New Jersey dairymen is granted, he declared, Midwest cheese will be sold there in larger quantities. This he opposes, and demands maintenance of present low prices on manufacturing grade milk.

The indication of this statement is that eastern dairy product manufacturers are enjoying a subsidy in the form of manufacturing milk prices kept low enough to offset the natural low-cost production advantages in Minnesota and Wisconsin. This is what Midwest dairymen have been saying for a long time.

Eastern milksheds, protected against outside competition, have been able to keep a consistently high price level on fluid milk for direct sale to consumers for table use. These prices promote excess production and at the same time tend to hold down consumption. The surplus milk backs up into outlets for manufactured dairy products, including cheese. The surplus has been sold to eastern manufacturers at prices arbitrarily established below Midwest levels, thus giving an unfair advantage to the eastern interests.

Now that some of the eastern milk producers want to get more money for their manufacturing milk, the situation is being brought out into the open. Midwest fluid milk and cream also are being kept out of eastern and southern markets by direct tariff barriers disguised as local sanitary regulations.

There is no more justice in the rigging of markets in other States against Minnesota and Wisconsin dairy products than there would be in this area's trying to keep out southern fruits, vegetables, and poultry or eastern manufactured goods.

The Middle East Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an excellent and extremely disturbing analysis of events immediately preceding the President's sending of troops into Lebanon and the effect of this action on our future relations with the Middle East is set forth in an editorial in the July 30 issue of the Christian Century, entitled "Middle East Disaster."

This magazine is widely recognized as a highly responsible religious journal with an excellent staff. The editor, Harold E. Fey, and the managing editor, Theodore A. Gill, are two of the outstanding leaders in religious journalism today.

The Christian Century is now celebrating its 50th year of publication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST DISASTER

Armed intervention in Lebanon because the revolution in Iraq threatened to throw the whole Middle East into the United Arab Republic can have no other consequences than further to alienate that part of the world from democratic influences. It is a disaster. It climaxes a dozen years of indecision, of lack of policy, of playing domestic politics with foreign affairs even when the peace of the world is at stake.

The order to the United States marines to land in Lebanon was not justified by the situation there. The United Nations observer corps in Lebanon was effectively doing the work it was sent there to do. The Christian Century has direct information that earlier on the very day the marines landed an agreement was reached in Lebanon with antigovernment forces to give United Nations observers full access to the whole length of the Lebanese border. We also have information that just before noon on that fateful day an agreement was reached in Beirut between all parties and religious groups that Gen. Fuad Shehab, the Lebanese Army chief, would be elected President when the Lebanese Parliament meets on July 24.

Lebanese President Chamoun was present and reluctantly accepted the agreement. He apparently did not disclose that he had appealed for the landing of United States forces. Perhaps he knew that it was already too late to prevent this unnecessary intervention in his country's affairs. But it is a fact that the two essential points making for peace in Lebanon had already been settled before the marines reached the beach.

This is what was behind U. N. Secretary General Hammarskjold's cold rejection of our action and of the reasons President Eisenhower gave for it. The U. N. Secretary had visited Lebanon and reported that what was in progress was essentially a civil war, that infiltrations from Egypt and Syria had been curbed. Each day's dispatches bore out this view of the situation. The war was dying down. It is the opinion of many men whom the world has made custodians of its peace that the conflict would have been peacefully settled if we had not intervened.

Our armed intervention for the reasons given by President Eisenhower has undermined our moral standing in the world. It has weakened our position in the United Nations, which is presented with a fait accompli and told what it must do to pick up the pieces of a worsened situation. We have so deeply compromised the status and work of the U. N. observer corps that Sweden files a request with the Security Council to suspend the activities of the corps until further notice. The loss to American prestige because of our action in Lebanon may and almost certainly will return to plague us in the future. The stature which we gained by our course during the Suez crisis has now shrunk catastrophically. We shall long rue the day it happened.

Third, our intervention threatens domestic tranquillity in Lebanon. When the presidential election takes place now, its outcome will be overshadowed by the presence of our troops. Whoever is elected will be placed under a cloud. If the new President is prowestern, it will be said that the Lebanese parliament was intimidated. If he is anti-Western, which is most likely, he will probably file an immediate demand that we end the occupation. That will embarrass our troops and our policy. When we withdraw, it will probably take a larger U. N. force to prevent violence and renewed strife.

Fourth, our return to the practice of "brinkmanship" threatens the peace of the world. It puts us on the defensive before the judgment bar of enlightened mankind. Now we can come before the summit conference for which Premier Khrushchev calls only as a defendant to be judged. Our best course is to meet in good faith and to try to live down what we have done. World peace is in too precarious a condition to have permitted us to change from a champion of law and order to an armed offender against that law if it could have been prevented. Peace may be lost before we can return to our former role. Getting out of Lebanon will certainly prove far more difficult than getting in. We may find Lebanon as difficult to leave as Korea was, and more costly to stay in.

The best course appears to be to accept Khrushchev's call for a summit conference, but to hold it at the United Nations. India may object, for India is not now a member of the Security Council. But the summit effort to seek an agreement can be held with India present, and then the Security Council can take action on its own account. If the general European settlement which has been proposed can also be reached, great good can come from what threatens to be irretrievable disaster. But the first claim on conference time must be a settlement of the crisis of the Middle East. The first step in that direction will have to be an agreement to secure withdrawal of British and American troops from countries where they are interlopers.

This editorial must go to press before momentous decisions are reached in the United Nations on the Japanese resolution for a stepped-up U. N. observer corps in Lebanon and in the capitals which are considering a hurried-up summit conference. It is written in one of those moments of history when faith in God is all that really counts. The way ahead is shrouded in darkness. We cannot know what lies ahead but we can reach out for the hand of the Lord of history and pray that men who must make decisions of life and death consequence for mankind may be similarly guided. For it is not God's will that one of his little ones shall perish. His will is life, not death. His will be done.

Price Supports for Ungraded Looseleaf Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the policy of the Department of Agriculture with regard to price supports for ungraded looseleaf tobacco has resulted in much dissatisfaction among the tobacco farmers and warehousemen in South Carolina. The Federal Government offers price supports for this kind of tobacco when it is sold in markets in Georgia and Florida, but it does not offer such supports for looseleaf tobacco brought to market in South Carolina. The farmers in South Carolina believe that this treatment is discriminatory.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the July 24 issue of the Pageland Journal, of Pageland, S. C., entitled "Congress Should Investigate Tobacco Marketing Dispute," which represents the general attitude of tobaccomen in South Carolina regarding the Department of Agriculture's marketing procedures.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE TOBACCO MARKETING DISPUTE

Although tobacco is not extensively grown locally, it is no stranger to this section and the problems of tobacco farmers are, in the final analysis, the problems of all farmers and the treatment accorded tobacco farmers either is, or may in time be, the same treatment all farmers can expect at the hands of an increasingly high-handed Government.

Failure of the Department of Agriculture to permit the sale of tobacco in the ungraded, untied state, as it is sold in Georgia and Florida, is as obvious a case of unfairness as one could ask and, despite all the windy equivocation the bureaucrats can generate, it does not and cannot make sense. Grading and tieing tobacco is an expensive, time-consuming process that accomplishes little or nothing, and in fact hurts the farmer, because the price differential allowed by buyers for graded and tied tobacco does not cover the cost the work entails. The tobacco industry wants the arrangement continued because through it, is is getting something for nothing. The Government makes the decision, and the Government acts exactly like it has been sold out to the tobacco industry, at the expense of the farmer.

This is but one of several recent decisions in the Department of Agriculture that have been flagrantly prejudicial to the interests of South Carolina farmers and specifically tobacco farmers. A congressional investigation into the rendering of decisions so lacking in reason and fairness would seem highly in order. If there is not dishonesty behind the situation, there is something that in high places in Government is almost as bad—gross stupidity.

Value of the Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article entitled "Heartbeat From India," which was published in Redbook magazine. The article is further evidence of a most persuasive kind of the effectiveness and value to this country of the exchange program. I hope all my colleagues will read this very interesting article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARTBEAT FROM INDIA

(By André Fontaine)

The boy's heart stopped at 6:10 p. m. He had been on the operating table in a Long Island hospital for 2 hours.

Instantly, Dr. Raj Mahajan, a tiny, dark, Hindu surgeon, took the boy's heart in his small hands and started to pump it. Gently he squeezed the heart, then let it expand, then squeezed again in a slow, steady rhythm.

Dr. Mahajan and another surgeon kept up this artificial pumping for nearly 3 more hours, while others of a team of 15 doctors and nurses completed the operation—an incredibly complicated, delicate one. Today the boy—6-year-old David Fleming of Queens Village, N. Y.—is alive and healthy.

And Dr. Raj Mahajan, an Indian exchange student, has kept an appointment made in a primitive hospital 25 years ago and 11,000 miles away.

His commitment began when he was still a boy in Dalhousie, in the northwest section of India (now Pakistan). One day his best friend, the son of one of his father's servants, did not come to play. Raj, seeking him out, learned that the boy's mother was desperately ill and thus would die; at that time doctors treated only the wealthy.

Raj rebelled. He persuaded his father to intercede and have the woman taken to the hospital. That night Raj sneaked out of bed, stole into the hospital and found the surgeon who had operated on the woman to ask about her condition. The surgeon, a man of rare understanding took the boy into his office, gave him a glass of milk and in the quiet hours of the early morning talked to him about the beauty of surgery, of India's great need for medical men. And he gave the boy a dream.

Raj went to King Edward Medical College at Lahore and interned at Irwin Hospital in New Delhi. While there he applied for a Fulbright fellowship without much hope of being selected, since there were only 14 for

India's total population of more than 300 million. But he made it, came to the United States and studied in Texas, Iowa, New York, and finally at St. Francis Hospital, in Roslyn, Long Island, the largest hospital in the world that is devoted entirely to heart ailments.

David Fleming owes his life to the skill and dedication that were born and nourished in the green and alien hills of northern India. After Raj Mahajan's return to those hills this summer, there will doubtless be Hindu youths who will owe their lives to the skill he perfected in the hospitals of America.

Here we have a glimpse of the real meaning cultural exchange programs. There are about 150,000 young men and women like Dr. Mahajan who travel abroad each year to partake of the educational wealth of another country. Thousands of them are helped by scholarships and fellowships—granted by universities, foundations and governments—that cover almost every field of human knowledge. (If you are interested, you can get more information about the programs from Study Abroad, a publication of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization available at libraries or for $2.50 from UNESCO Publications Center, 801 Third Avenue, New York City. The book includes a list of sources to which application should be made for specific scholarships.)

About 36,000 of the exchange students come to the United States. With them they bring the richness of their own cultures and their trained minds, and they leave a little of each with every person they meet while they are here. Dr. Mahajan expressed what he feels they take away:

"Each of them goes home with an understanding of the goodness and greatness of America. In 10 years America will begin to profit from this current exchange. For then these people will be the leaders of their countries, and when they are, the feeling they have for America will for you be worth a dozen sputniks."

Harnessing the Brute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Harnessing the Brute," which was published in the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia on Saturday, July 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARNESSING THE BRUTE

President Eisenhower's letter of yesterday has deftly thrown some stout harness on the wild horse of the Kremlin.

Nikita Khrushchev at the beginning of the week was clearly preparing to declare himself king of the prairie. His snap call for an immediate summit conference had won much support and he was already making up his own guest list, laying down the rules, and assuming the role of world prosecutor against the West.

This wild rampage, he must be surprised to discover, has now led him straight to the corral where, if he chooses to pass through the gate, his own country's behavior will be examined.

The President's insistence on the principle that the talks should be held within the framework of the United Nations was accepted by the Russians with, it appears, the thought that bluster and threats would be as effective there as elsewhere. President Eisenhower has now pointed out with cold logic that acceptance of the basic principle implies that the Security Council will make up the guest list and lay down the rules.

This is no mere debating point in a game of words. It goes to the heart of the difficulties. In the harness of the United Nations, Russia—if it accepts this meeting—must be prepared to defend its own role in endangering the peace of the Middle East, and the world, through the subversion of small nations. The chances improve that this meeting may have fruitful results.

Conditions in the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial having to do with conditions in the Mideast, from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MIDEAST NEED: NEW POLICIES, NEW CONCEPTS

(By Graham Hovey)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—Some of America's constant supporters in the United Nations and the cold war are insisting that Washington rethink and redefine its policies and objectives in the Middle East.

These diplomats warn that if this country clings to impractical policies and outdated diplomatic concepts, other and greater blows will follow Iraq's coup, which provoked our military move into Lebanon.

By impractical policies they mean the Baghdad pact and those pursued under the Eisenhower doctrine.

By outdated concepts they mean, for example, the notion that our side must never recognize publicly that Russia is a power factor in the Middle East or can have any legitimate interests in that area.

There was lively discussion of this latter point here after news dispatches from Washington purported to give the real reason why any summit meeting with Russia on the Middle East could take place only in the Security Council.

These dispatches explained that the Middle East is already on the council agenda. Any summit meeting on this subject outside the United Nations, they said, would constitute recognition by the West of Russia's "presence" in the Middle East.

Even some members of the United States delegation to the United Nations conceded privately that this kind of reasoning was unrealistic. Other pro-western diplomats used stronger language to describe it. In effect, they said this:

Russia is in the Middle East and everyone knows it and no one will any longer be impressed by western diplomatic maneuvers aimed at denying or ignoring the fact.

Russia would be in the Middle East for reasons of geography and power even if its government were not Communist and expansionist; even though its economic stake in the area, unlike that of the West, may be relatively unimportant.

Russia is in the Middle East with military and economic aid programs and, of course, with a political program.

The West must find ways to parry and counter some aspects of these programs but it cannot wish the programs out of existence.

"In fact," said one western diplomat, "the question is not whether Russia is in the Middle East but whether the West can find ways to remain in the Middle East."

Among the specific questions which many of America's friends with the Eisenhower administration would face squarely in the present circumstances are these:

Have the Baghdad pact and the Eisenhower doctrine proved to be effective instruments for parrying and countering Soviet influence in the Middle East?

In light of the recent events in Iraq and Jordan, will the United States continue its previous emphasis on military aid and military alliances in this area?

Many observers with experience in the Middle East believe that there would have been no major civil strife in Lebanon if President Chamoun had not embraced the Eisenhower doctrine; that Nuri Said would be alive and in power in Iraq had he not taken that Arab country into the Baghdad Pact.

Some go further and contend that it was the Baghdad Pact—and the pressures it represented for nations to stand up and be counted in the cold war—that gave Russia its best excuse and opportunity for penetration of the Middle East.

This is speculation, but by persons with some qualifications to speculate. It leads inevitably to another major question which many diplomats believe the West should confront at this time:

Can the West settle for a neutral Arab Middle East striving for political and economic unity?

There are experienced Middle East observers who believe this would afford the West its best chance—perhaps its last chance—of retaining influence in the area and of insuring the flow of the oil on which Britain and Europe so heavily depend.

Would Russia respect any formal agreement to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena? It would be unrealistic in the extreme to expect Moscow to cease all political activity in so promising an area.

The point that many of the our U. N. supporters make, however, is that our present policy is not working; that it may, by its military emphasis, its pressures on small nations to join formally the western camp, be making Russia's job easier in the Middle East.

If the Russians encroached on any agreement that the Middle East should be neutral at least the Arab resentment now directed at the West might refocus on them.

There was little joy at the United Nations over the news that Secretary Dulles would fly to Europe to shore up the Baghdad Pact. Some of our best friends believe his objective instead should be to liquidate it—as quietly and gracefully as possible.

Admission of Confessions in Evidence in Criminal Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's ruling in the Mal-

lory case, which rules out the validity of confessions obtained by Federal officers if there was a delay between arrest and arraignment, has caused widespread confusion throughout the country. There is great doubt among Federal law enforcement officers and Federal judges as to what confessions may be admitted as evidence in Federal criminal proceedings.

On Sunday, July 27, the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., carried a news story entitled "Mallory Rule Impact Wide," in which was recorded the results of a survey conducted by the Star. The survey showed a grave need for immediate legislation to clarify the Mallory rule.

I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding article, written by Miriam Ottenberg, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALLORY RULE IMPACT WIDE—EFFECT OF DECISION FELT OVER NATION

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Despite contentions that the District alone is affected by the Mallory decision, the impact of the Supreme Court's ruling is now being felt all over the country, a Star survey showed yesterday.

The disclosure was prompted by a recent proposal from Senator CARROLL, Democrat of Colorado, that any legislation clarifying the Mallory decision should apply only to the District and a statement from Senator LANGER, Republican of North Dakota, that when Congress considers Mallory legislation, it is acting largely in its capacity as the District's city counsel.

Their comments have come while a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, has been holding hearings on House-passed legislation to clarify the Mallory decision. The windup of these hearings has been set for Wednesday at 10:30 a. m.

WIDE REPERCUSSIONS

The Supreme Court's 1957 ruling that a confession must be excluded from a Federal trial if there was a delay between arrest and arraignment has produced these results outside the District, the Star survey showed:

In at least five cases, confessions have either been excluded because of the Mallory decision or convictions have been set aside because the confession should have been excluded.

Three appellate courts have joined the District in decisions stressing strict adherence to the Mallory ruling.

Several prosecutors have reported declining to prosecute cases because they knew the confessions would be excluded and they needed these admissions to bolster their cases.

A February poll of prosecutors made by the Justice Department at the request of a Senate Judiciary subcommittee showed that 14 prosecutors at that time either expressed fears about the impact of the decision in their areas or specifically recommended clarifying legislation. Three more prosecutors told the Star last week they now believe legislation is necessary.

CASES TELL STORY

These cases tell the story:

In a routine search of the French ship *Liberte*, customs inspectors discovered packages containing 600 watch movements under the floorboard of a locker in a ship musician's room. Customs agents were called and awaited the return of the musician.

When the musician came to his cabin, it developed that he spoke only French. The chief musician was then called to act as interpreter. The musician at first denied he was trying to smuggle the watch movements, but, according to the evidence, he admitted the smuggling plan after 30 minutes of questioning. Within 90 minutes, the judge was later told, the musician gave a written statement to the captain.

A New York Federal judge ruled in April that both the oral and written statements had to be withheld from the jury because of the Mallory decision.

In Jacksonville, Fla., a man was arrested and turned over to the Secret Service at 8:30 a. m. for questioning on a charge of forging a Government check. According to Secret Service agents, he orally admitted participating in the forgery and furnishing handwriting samples. At 10:30 a. m. he was turned over to the United States marshal to await a hearing before the United States commissioner.

DISMISSAL ORDERED

When the case went to trial in April, the defense moved to exclude the confession and the handwriting sample on grounds of the Mallory decision. The judge did exclude them. At the end of the Government's case without the key evidence, the judge granted a defense motion to dismiss the case.

In a Baltimore case, the court declined to admit a written statement but allowed the jury to hear an oral statement. Another Baltimore case involving the Mallory decision is pending.

In a Dayton (Ohio) case, the Federal judge set aside the conviction on the ground the confession should have been excluded under the Mallory decision. Although he made the decision at least 6 months ago, he has never set a date for the retrial. Court circles theorize that he is waiting either for clarifying legislation or a clarifying opinion.

In a Massachusetts court, the judge ruled that the Mallory decision was involved and set aside the jury's guilty verdict in an immigration case.

CONFESSIONS REJECTED

An appeal has been filed in a Chicago case. A man accused of stealing diamonds from an interstate shipment was arrested at 1 p. m. According to the evidence at the trial, he confessed in 45 minutes and thereafter agreed to a search of his apartment. He was brought before a committing magistrate the next morning.

At his trial, the defense cited the Mallory decision and argued there had been unnecessary delay between arrest and arraignment and the confession should therefore be excluded. The Government cited the opinion of District Court Judge Alexander Holtzoff here allowing a jury to hear a confession made within 30 to 45 minutes after arrest. The Chicago judge allowed the confession to be used but the appellate court is yet to rule.

The position of the fourth circuit was made clear in a decision handed down in May. A man was picked up by Norfolk police while trying to cash an altered postal money order. He was then questioned by postal inspectors from 5:15 p. m. to 10:30 p. m. when, according to the court review of the case, he confessed.

He pleaded guilty in May, 1957—a month before the Mallory decision was handed down. In November 1957, he moved to get the guilty plea set aside, arguing the Mallory decision.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

The appellate court ruled that the confession added nothing to what the court knew from other evidence. The court, however, made it clear that under the Mallory decision, the confession would not have been admissible if the case had gone to trial.

Appellate decisions in both the fifth and sixth circuits have stressed that the defendants—bank robbers and kidnapers—would have had their confessions excluded if they had been made to Federal instead of to State or local officers. In one case, the appellate court allowed a conviction to stand although the defendant was held 13 days before he was turned over to Federal agents.

An appellate decision in a Texas case, which made it clear that the confession would have been tainted if Federal officers had done what city police did, noted the disagreement over interpretation of the Mallory decision in these words:

"That there is not complete agreement by the courts as to the outer limits of the Mallory decision is apparent from the five different opinions of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia in *Trilling* v. *United States*."

In the Trilling case here, the opinions of the nine judges ranged from those who believed all of a series of admissions should have been barred to those who believed all the admissions should have gone to the jury. What became the majority opinion represented the thinking of only two of the judges—one of whom then recommended clarifying the question through a change in the rules or by legislation. Out of the 7 counts in 3 different cases, the appellate court majority agreed to affirm the conviction on 1 count.

Similar disagreement as to what the Mallory decision means has also shown up among the district court judges. In Washington, district court judges have barred written confessions in cases where prompt oral confessions have been admitted. In a Georgia case the court criticized the agents for not getting the defendants arraigned more quickly but the judge held that the written confession could become part of the evidence because the oral confessions had been made promptly after the arrest.

With appellate decisions making it clear in four circuits that the judges are expected to adhere closely to the Mallory decision and appeals pending in several other circuits, both prosecutors and Federal law-enforcement agents polled by the Star and earlier by the Justice Department expressed a variety of concerns with the effect of the decision on law enforcement. These were typical:

A West Virginia prosecutor: "Enforcement officers, particularly Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit officers, are seriously handicapped because there is no opportunity for questioning defendants between time of arrest and arraignment, especially in obtaining information about other participants in crime."

Asked about that statement, Thomas Bailey, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Units Chief of Enforcement, said the decision was being felt by his officers all over the country. The Unit averages between 11,000 and 12,000 arrests annually.

"The decision," he said, "prevents us from questioning defendants in order to ascertain their confederates and the degree of guilt or innocence."

A Colorado prosecutor said some arrests occur 8 hours' driving time away from the nearest United States Commissioner. He expressed fear that admissions made during that 8 hours would be excluded.

An Illinois prosecutor reported defense attorneys are now aware of the decision and he expects its use in every future case where a confession has been obtained. He feared the impact of appellate decisions from the District will influence judges to bar confessions.

An Indiana prosecutor said one way to get around the decision was to be sure confessions were completed before prisoners were turned over to Federal officers "but if Federal officers make the arrest, we're stuck." He added: "The worse the crime, the more we need the confession."

The Economic Situation in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Providence Bulletin regarding India's needs for economic assistance from the United States and other Western nations.

Also, I should like to have printed with this excellent editorial two recent commentaries on the economic situation in India. The first was published in the July issue of the Guaranty Survey, published by the Guaranty Trust Company of New York; the other is published in the July 12 issue of the Economist.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Bulletin of July 23, 1958]

A FAILURE TO HELP INDIA MAY CAUSE GRIEVOUS HARM

India's request for an emergency loan of $600 million within 6 months and a total of $1,200 million by the end of 1961 should be read in the light of the crisis that American policy faces today in the Mideast, where troops rather than a community of interest now insure the Western presence.

Although the sums requested are large and the request frank to the point of desperation, the situation confronting India warrants both the urgency and the increased estimate of foreign exchange needed.

India, like the nations of the Mideast and wherever peoples are seeking to lift primitive impoverished economies into the 20th century, is in the middle of a political economic revolt that the West can ignore only at its peril.

The West can haggle over the amount one society should be called upon to provide in order to pull another and, in the good sense, alien society from the trough of an historic depression. But both the times and the cold war make help on an adequate scale imperative if Soviet communism is not to undercut democracy in India as it is subverting the Mideast.

In the Mideast, the West failed to identify itself with the legitimate and inexorable surge to a better standard of living which science and technology could make possible for the Arab nations, if only the resources made made available.

The reasons for the West's failure are not by any means entirely attributable to parsimony. The fanatic Arab enmity toward Israel was perhaps a primary cause that led to America's withdrawal from the Aswan Dam project and to the collision course that followed.

But in India, where the average per capita income of its 360 million people is only $56 a year, false economy could lead to the failure of the democratic West, there, too. The Soviet Union is busy selling its brand of altruism to Indians on one hand, while the Indian Communist Party is trying earnestly to prove itself with a reform program in the Indian state of Kerala.

And India, whether the United States or Western Europe like it or not, is the moral leader and the bellwether for southeast Asia and Africa, the principal suppliers of raw materials without which the West could not live. As India goes, so will go Asia and Africa.

Humanity then is wedded to self-interest in assisting India to break the chains created by its population explosion and world inflation.

This breakthrough cannot be achieved at bargain prices, either for India or for the West, as Senators JOHN KENNEDY (Democrat, Massachusetts) and SHERMAN COOPER (Republican, Kentucky) showed they appreciated in their proposal for a billion-dollar Marshall plan for India to be financed cooperatively by the Free World nations.

India needs massive aid to prevent the revolution of rising expectations from turning into a Red revolution of frustrated hopes, and it is time the West acknowledged that fact. If the United States and the West fail the task in order to spite Indian neutralism or as a result of inertia, the West most certainly will lose a critical and perhaps the decisive battle of the cold war.

[From the Guaranty Survey of July 1958]

INDIA SECOND 5-YEAR PLAN SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED, BUT FOREIGN-EXCHANGE DEFICIT STILL LARGE—FOOD-GRAIN PRODUCTION INADEQUATE

Attention in Indian financial circles is focused on what might well be called an "agonizing reappraisal" of the Second 5-Year Plan. Debaters can be roughly divided into two camps, with the strength of each shifting continuously as the hand-to-mouth process of finding enough foreign exchange to cover the commitments of the months ahead looks more or less possible. No one denies that the plan is an ambitious one, but there are those whose sentiments about it may be characterized as "the least that is necessary to get over the hump" and, on the other hand, those who talk in terms of near bankruptcy and "fatal fascination with steel." India, though a poor country, has an economic potential which challenges the imagination, and it is in no way surprising that many different routes to a higher standard of living are being presented. The route which the Second 5-Year Plan represents is is no doubt the hard one, but the Indian Government is gambling on its also being the most effective one.

High taxes, deficit financing, depletion of the country's sterling reserves, and incurrence of heavy foreign debts are being used during the 5-year period for a complex of heavy industrial projects, mainly in the steel, mining, transport, power, and irrigation fields. The official aim is to develop "basic industries and industries which make machines to make the machines needed for further development," because such industries will save the country vast amounts of foreign exchange after they start production. At prices then prevailing, it was calculated that the foreign-exchange cost of importing 1 million tons of steel was not much lower than the foreign-exchange cost of a steel plant with an installed capacity of a million tons a year.

The great majority of these costly projects, however, provide no returns in the form of increased output for several years. This is the crux of India's present financial problems, as regards both domestic and foreign resources. One British economist recently noted, "nothing is so greedy of steel as work to make steel."

DEFENSE OF THE PLAN

During the budget debate of last March, Mr. Nehru gave his response to the critics of high taxes and mounting foreign debts. The Prime Minister described the problem of India as that of an underdeveloped country somehow breaking the barrier and crossing into the position of a dynamic and self-progressing economy. "We are making four steel plants, machine-forge foundry plants, and other things. It is only when these come into being and start functioning that your speed becomes faster and faster. So long as you have to rely on steel from abroad, you are helpless, as we are today. You may have steel—that is one big step forward—but if you have to rely on machines from abroad you are helpless. It is only when you are making your own machines, not petty machines but big machines like iron and steel plants, that you are well on the road to progress. It is hard work, but it brings results."

Almost from the start the second 5-year plan has been in trouble as costs, both in foreign exchange and rupees, have increasingly exceeded the original estimates. In addition, the plan made inadequate allowance for the growing imports of raw materials and spare parts required as general industrial production increased, and no account was taken of rising defense imports or the need for larger imports of food grains due to bad monsoons.

As the situation now stands, the plan has been cut back to only the hard core, which includes the three steel plants being built by the state, the expansion of the private Tata Iron & Steel Works, and a reduced number of mining, transport, and power projects. Even with this sharp pruning, the Government estimated its foreign-exchange deficit for the plan's remaining 3 years at $1.47 billion last December and further stated that, owing to a bunching of external commitments over the next 18 months, a large part of the deficit will arise during this period. The United States loan of $225 million and extra shipments of surplus wheat have improved the situation. But the country's sterling balances are now below $500 million (as compared with $1.5 billion at the end of 1955), the stringency of import licensing is hurting existing industry, which needs more raw materials, and the foreign-exchange crisis, a major topic in the press, is not being helped by the currently unfavorable markets for major Indian exports.

THE PROBLEM OF AGRICULTURE

During the first 5-year plan, the monsoons were favorable, but last year they were not, and widespread food shortages have again become the principal fact of life. The Government has acted quickly in arranging more imports, preventing speculative hoarding, and seeing to orderly distribution. But the general consensus is that the increases in output previously achieved with the help of good weather caused a certain amount of complacency. While the various large irrigation projects under construction and planned will make a big difference in the future, programs designed to teach better methods, introduce minor irrigation, and make other simple improvements must be intensified, as they can have a more immediate and widespread effect. In addition, it is felt that uncertainty surrounding land reform is holding down incentive and that this situation should be clarified faster.

Even if more large-scale foreign aid is forthcoming, the next few years will admittedly be difficult. Much will be heard of the phrases "behind schedule" and "below the target." It must be remembered, however, that whether three-fourths or only half of the 5-year plan is completed in 5 years, much will have been accomplished in setting up a basis for further development without relying so heavily upon huge imports of capital equipment.

[From the Economist, London, England, of July 12, 1958]

INDIA'S URGENT NEED

India's crisis of foreign exchange grows more desperate week by week. The exchange deficit in the remaining period of the second 5-year plan, that is, until April 1961, is estimated at some £420 million, after making

allowance for normal export proceeds (which, contrary to some suggestions, do not appear to have been adversely affected in the balance by price movements). Moreover, more than half this sum will be needed before next spring, to meet commitments for goods that have been ordered. India's sterling balances at the end of 1955 were well over £500 million, but they are now below £160 million, and falling at the rate of, roughly, £15 million a month. Under the present legislation some £64 million of the sterling assets, and also the £80 million of gold held by the Reserve Bank of India, must be provided as a cover for the note issue, though these limits may be encroached upon for a period of 6 months without new legislation. But a reduction of the cover requirement can now provide no significant further relief. The resources are not there, and unless India can find them, and find them quickly, its economy will face violent disruption.

India's high officials have, accordingly, undertaken a new world search for aid. Mr. B. K. Nehru, Secretary of the Economic Division of the Finance Ministry, has moved on from London to Washington, and the new Minister of Finance, Mr. Morarji Desai will come to London at the end of next month en route for the Commonwealth conference in Montreal. India will have further opportunity to press its demands at the subsequent meetings of the IMF and the World Bank in New Delhi. Thus far, India has succeeded in securing a certain amount of help from the United States and Germany, but this has been of limited use because it has not been in free currency. America's loans through the Export-Import Bank, as always, have been tied to purchases of United States goods (at prices substantially above the world market level) while Germany has simply postponed repayments. India is now making a new approach to London. The British Government is anxious to help, but after the strains of the past few years it is difficult to see how it could agree to make available any significant amount that would place a further burden on the dollar pool. Any concession will presumably be linked to British exports.

Americans, Have You Forgotten?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the July 1958 issue of the publication Hungarian Freedom Fighter and is entitled "Americans, Have You Forgotten?"

AMERICANS, HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN?

Your country, for generations a British colony, was set free at the end of the 18th century by your forefathers. Less than a hundred years later slavery was abolished in the States by upright citizens, many of whom gave their lives to eliminate an immoral remnant of the past, unworthy of a progressive country. Freedom is a household word in your country where many have died for it.

In 1956 a nation of 10 million back in old Europe, once more in the course of its history, revolted against its oppressors. Settled for over 1,000 years at the outpost of the western world, it has upheld many attacks of eastern conquerers, or Tartars and Turks. Many times has their country been ransacked, their men killed or maimed, their women raped and driven into slavery together with their children who were trained to become the enemies of their own kind. All the while, Europe was building her magnificent culture of thoughts and deeds, a culture which is yours, too, here in America. And civilization could develop and reach unparalleled heights in your country where its prerequisites: Political, economic, and personal freedom were given in fuller measure than anywhere else.

In the fall of 1956 you heard and read of another fight for freedom of the Hungarians. Your reaction was magnificent; you lavishly gave money, clothing, medical help for thousands of refugees all over Europe, for the sick, the wounded, the destitute back in Hungary. The gates of your rich and happy country were opened to many of those who had to leave their homes to save their lives, they were fed and clothed, housed and given work. Yes; you did all this and more, because you are good and warm-hearted, and have been taught to help those who need help.

But did you, or do you now, understand? No, you could not. Nor did we in Hungary when frightful things were said to be going on in Russia in the years between the two wars. All this could, of course not happen in a civilized world. We understand now. We have seen or suffered ourselves the incredible horrors of Nazi persecution—just another aspect of relentless dictatorship—we know all about destroyed homes, dispersed families, concentration camps, cruelty and tortures. Hungary suffered all the miseries of political and military warfare—and when the nightmare was over, when western Europe could, at last, dress her wounds and get a new lease of life, this unhappy country found itself enslaved, as never before for many centuries. It was all very cleverly done, slowly, by degrees, in the course of 3 years, by those well-trained Russians using the most dangerous of all hidden weapons: hypocrisy, lies and promises they never meant to keep, by efficient methods inherited from the czarist secret police.

In 1956 you helped the victims of a desperate bid for freedom of the Hungarian people. Many were saved, thanks to you, but Russian tanks again conquered the land. Thousands are dead, thousands have been deported to forced labor camps, to deadly mines in Siberia and elsewhere. Religion is heavily persecuted once more, free thought and speech mean loss of job, jail, perhaps death. This is the balance for Hungary.

And for you? You will realize that in 1956 one of the last opportunities of curing a steadily growing menace to the civilized world has been missed. Instead of taking decisive steps at a moment when Communist parties were collapsing all over the world, when the Trojan Horses, called Fifth Columns, were rapidly disintegrating, western leaders remained passive because western peoples, and above all, you Americans did not and could not understand. Your wars fought for liberty are too far back, your country has been involved in wars since, but has never experienced the horrors of total warfare in the hinterland.

Last fall a sputnik stunt was a hundred percent success for the Soviet propaganda—1 year after the massacres of Hungary. So are the social activities of elegant, well-groomed Mikhail Menshikhov, the smiling diplomat. Van Cliburn's outstanding talent had to be discovered in Moscow by those who consider themselves to be cultural leaders of the world. And who else but Russians could have a dance group like Moyseyev's?

All the while, secret trials were and are going on in Hungary, and the shocked world has now learned of the execution of leaders of the revolution. Once more facts are speaking for themselves. Are you Americans, who live in a free, democratic country, again going to disregard the sharp weapon of public opinion which is yours by right? Can you still not read the Mene Tekel Upharsim on the wall? We, Hungarians, are no more asking for help; we now warn you to save yourselves. A new tide of tyranny, a brute force is threatening the civilized world, the underdeveloped countries as well as rich and prosperous ones. This is an invasion which a handful of oppressed Hungarians can no more stop, as did their ancestors in former centuries.

War? No. We know what it means, perhaps better than you do. But the cold war we have been fighting now for over 10 years is not peace, and peace cannot be attained by peace conferences staged by those to whom this beautiful word means the death-like silence of a world conquered by them. There is no need to bring the horrors of atomic war on mankind. Just do this: live up to one of your slogans in a slightly different wording. Instead of saying "Trade, not aid" say: "Trade is aid, do not trade."

Do not trade with a country (and its satellites) which is bound to use your substantial credits for means to kill democracy. Do not sit down to talk with representatives of a system based on slavery, forced labor and other medieval methods. Do not negotiate with members of a government which ruthlessly murders all those who want to be free, whose minions arrested Imre Nagy and his group after they had been granted safe conduct on leaving their place of refuge. Which disregarded the age-old custom of never touching an envoy, by seizing Gen. Pal Maleter. See the flaming words on the wall. Think of the incidents of American airmen in Soviet Russia and East Germany. New alarming symptoms can daily be detected by those who know that the international political situation has gotten far beyond the scope of commissions and conferences.

Civilized society does not fraternize with burglars and murderers, it jails them and eventually sentences them to death. Why then try to be friendly with burglars and murderers, just because they were sly and strong enough to seize power over a steadily growing number of human beings. The only way to bring freedom to these unhappy victims, to avoid the worst of wars, is to remember that they cannot and will not start wholesale murder of mankind if they lack the machinery and raw materials they need for armaments. For God's sake: Do not give it to them.

One cannot but be horrified at the idea of Western powers now lifting embargoes on commodities which, very wisely, had been barred for many years from export to the Soviet bloc—you did not and could not understand. But try to understand now, before it is too late for all of us; let us start a natoinwide movement sponsored by all who have learned the bitter lesson: Trade is aid—do not trade.

The Friendly, the Courageous, the Miracle City: Johnstown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the official publication of the

Pennsylvania League of Cities contains an article entitled "Johnstown, the Friendly, the Courageous, the Miracle City." Because the history of Johnstown is an integral part of the history of the United States, I believe this article needs to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The story of Johnstown, written by Michael M. Chudy, city assessor and zoning administrator, points out the courage, determination, and industry of a stricken people rising above tragedy to build anew and keep pace with a growing and progressive America. It provides an incentive to individuals and communities alike. Today's Johnstown is a monument to the faith of a resolute and devoted populace, an inspiration to victims of catastrophe.

In asking that this material be inserted in the RECORD at this point, I urge my colleagues to read the tribute to a great city. I also invite you to visit Johnstown, the largest city in my district, during your travels. I am sure you will find its hospitality something that will make you return again and again.

BRIEF HISTORY OF JOHNSTOWN [1]

Johnstown was named after Joseph Johns (Josef Shantz), a native of Switzerland, who at the age of 19 came to this country in 1768. On September 13, 1793, he purchased 249 acres of land, for which he paid 435 pounds, 15 shillings. This parcel embraced what is now the central portion of the city. In 1800 he laid out the village, which then was known as Connumah or Conemaugh Old Town.

Prior to the invasion of the white man, the site of Johnstown was occupied principally by the Shawonese and Delaware Indian tribes.

Johnstown remained largely an agricultural community until the late 1820's, when the construction of the famous Pennsylvania Canal was undertaken and the city began to grow. The canal system of transportation extended from Pittsburgh to Johnstown. In 1852, the Pennsylvania Railroad purchased the canal from the State; and continued operations until 1863, when the canal was abandoned; and the system gave way to the more rapid means of transportation—the steam railway.

The town did not attain any considerable growth, however, until the Cambria Iron Co., the predecessor of the Bethlehem Steel Co., located in this area in 1840, attracted by the vast amount of available timber; and the presence of an iron-ore vein of commercial value in the surrounding hills. Later, augmenting the employment opportunities in this locality, another steel company located here. It is now the subsidiary of the United States Steel Co., known as the Carnegie Illinois Steel Co.

Since that time, the town had a consistent growth; that is, until May 31, 1889, when one of the most appalling disasters in all history befell Johnstown. This tragic flood, which comes to mind when Johnstown is mentioned in any civilized country in the world, cost more than 2,200 lives and a property loss of $17 million. With distinctive pluck and courage, the surviving inhabitants, with the aid of money from all over the world, soon rebuilt the town.

Aside from the great flood of 1889, the history of Johnstown has been for the most part devoid of world-startling events. After the rehabilitation of the town, more and more people moved here. Numerous industries settled here. New business blocks sprang up. More and more beautiful residential districts came into being.

Then came March 17, 1936. Again floodwaters placed Johnstown in the national limelight. When the waters receded 8 persons were dead and property damage stood at almost $41 million. Hardly had the waters subsided when again the Johnstown people began to demonstrate their perseverance and courage. Within a short period of time they had pulled themselves out of the muck and mire and were busily rebuilding the city into the fine modern community it is today. From the wreckage of two major floods, and frequent lesser ones, Johnstown has risen each time as a newer and brighter city.

The people here no longer live in dread of the heavy rains and rising rivers that plagued their valley for centuries. Today Johnstown is flood-free. On August 23, 1938, work was begun on the river channels of the Conemaugh and the Stonycreek Rivers, removing millions of tons of rock and dirt from the beds of the rivers; and thousands of tons of cement was poured to make river walls, rising above the natural river banks. The Federal Government financed this project. Over $8 million was spent in the widening, deepening, and paving of 9 miles of river channel.

Johnstown is principally a steel town. The Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Carnegie Illinois Steel Co. are the two major industries in the area. Within a 50-mile radius of Johnstown approximately 40 percent of the world's best bituminous coal is mined. In addition to these basic industies a goodly diversification exists and is being enlarged as time goes on.

JOHNSTOWN TODAY

Someone once remarked: "Anybody can tear down, but it takes craftsmen to build."

For several years Johnstown's city affairs were hampered by internal discord. Today city council is working diligently, harmoniously,and productively. Public confidence has been restored. The labor unions, the chamber of commerce, all business, service and fraternal groups are in full accord with the ambitious program of the administration.

At one time the city of Johnstown had a $5 million debt. By mid-June 1958, the city will entirely wipe out the last of its bonded debt. Now Johnstown is really ready to move forward—something that was not possible until the financial elements of the municipality were cleaned up.

City council recently let a contract for the preparation of a master plan for Johnstown. This master plan will cover such things as needed public improvements, streets and highways, downtown land use, zoning and land subdivision regulations.

The completion of the master plan is necessary before Federal aid can be gotten for the urban redevelopment program now under way.

Action also has already been taken to eliminate traffic bottle necks in the downtown area. Professional help has been hired to assist local engineers in making a traffic survey, to determine what factors are contributing to traffic snarls, and to recommend the proper remedies.

An authority is now being planned for the completion of the sanitary sewer system and the construction of a disposal plant. The disposal plant will be large enough to take care of the needs of adjoining boroughs and townships.

The administration is planning to purchase substantial parcels of substandard property in the area adjacent to the business section for public parking.

Low wages and long hours of city employees have been improved to bring them in line with private industry—a step that did much to improve the morale and services of city employees. It is further planned to give job stability to city employees, in order to insure employment on the basis of merit and ability, and not on the basis of political activity.

In recent years, personnel and equipment in the police department have been greatly expanded. Johnstown is well below the crime average for cities of her size.

Fire department personnel also has been considerably increased. New modern equipment was purchased. Establishment of a three-platoon system is being considered.

Comprehensive park and recreation programs have been developed.

Action already is being taken looking toward the annexation and consolidation of surrounding boroughs and townships.

Plans are underway for a new municipal garage.

A strong improvement policy has been undertaken for streets and alleys.

Other projects which are now on the drawing board include an addition to the city hall; the improvement of fire hall facilities both through remodeling and new construction.

Aside from these various municipal projects, civic accomplishments have also taken a remarkable spurt in Johnstown.

In 1950 the Cambria County War Memorial was erected at a cost of over $1,500,000. This new arena contains facilities for sports activities and banquet hall.

The Memorial Hospital in 1954 built a $2,500,000 addition to its property. In 1952 the Mercy Hospital erected a 9-story addition at a cost of $2,500,000. The Lee Hospital is now in the process of building a 6-story addition at a cost of $1,500,000.

In recent years a municipal music shell of fine native cut stone was built; conforming in design to the world's best shells.

Within 4 miles of city hall, Johnstown has an airport, which is the fifth largest in Pennsylvania. It is located on 330 acres, at an altitude of 2,280 feet above sea level. Allegheny Airways offers connections with all principal cities.

In 1954, after 5 years of construction, Johnstown's river channel flood-control project was completed. The Federal Government spent $8,670,000 on this project. According to Army engineers, this is the biggest and the best channel improvement undertaken anywhere in the United States.

Since 1926, 1,160 new homes have been erected within the corporate area of Johnstown. These new homes cost approximately $16 million.

During the same period new commercial buildings, and other nonresidential structures were erected to the tune of $25 million.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. in 1956 erected a new general office building costing about $2 million. The steel company also remodeled and renovated its other office buildings at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars.

The city owns a nine-hole golf course within easy reach of the central part of the city. A modern clubhouse was recently erected.

Johnstown has 511 low-income housing units. Recently plans were approved for the erection of 450 additional units at a cost of $6,740,000. All this valuable property will eventually revert to the city, free of all encumbrances.

Johnstown has a million-dollar stadium, which seats 17,000 people.

The elected Johnstown officials who direct the destiny of the city, all have a fine back-

[1] The Johnstown Story was written by Michael M. Chudy, Johnstown's city assessor and zoning administrator. He is also president of the Municipal Assessors' Association of Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania chairman of the National Association of Assessing Officers; and a member of the Advisory Council of the State Tax Equalization Board. He has written several articles on municipal affairs.

ground of civic performance; and well represent the people whom they serve.

Mayor Walter E. Rose is an attorney by profession. Only 5 years after graduating from law school, he was elected to the State house of representatives.. He was majority whip in Harrisburg when he interrupted his term to enter the Navy. He is the only Johnstown mayor ever to have been elected for three consecutive terms.

Daniel J. Shields, director of finance, has many years of municipal service to his credit. He was the youngest school board president in the history of Johnstown. He served as a member of the bicameral council before the adoption of the commission form of government. He served as mayor of the city during some of its most trying times—the depression, and the flood of 1936. He served as member of city city council for three different terms, including the present. He was director of highways, director of public safety, and now director of finance.

Raymond B. Johnson, director of streets and highways, is a newcomer to the Johnstown political scene. However, he brings with him a fine background of civic accomplishments, and business know-how. He is a graduate of Lebanon Valley College and did graduate work at the University of Maryland and the University of Pittsburgh. He was an instructor of history and social science at Cochranville High School. He was purchasing agent of United States Navy installations at Lukens Steel Co. He was also office and sales manager for the same company. At the present time he is owner of the Johnson heating and air-conditioning establishment.

Louis Saylor, who heads the department of parks and public property, is a member of many civic organizations. He has been an alderman for 34 years. For many years he served as city police magistrate. He was president of the Cambria County unit of the Pennsylvania Magistrates Association; and for 3 years he was director in the association of Pennsylvania Squires and Constables.

Raymond E. McDermit, director of public safety, is a retired employee of the United States Steel Co. He was president of the local political action committee; and head of the local United Steel Workers of America. He was a member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly. He had also served as a member of the Johnstown School Board.

James E. Parks, city treasurer, is a pharmacist by profession. He was a partner in a Johnstown meatpacking plant. He is active in many local as well as national civic and fraternal organizations.

Emil C. Schwing, city controller, is an accountant by profession. He was formerly an alderman. He was also a referee of the State workmen's compensation board; and is active in many civic organizations.

STATISTICAL REVIEW

Population (1950 United States Census): Johnstown (corporate limits), 63,232; Greater Johnstown (area within 3-mile radius of city hall), including 10 boroughs and 8 townships), 110,180; city and suburban area (metropolitan district set up by Bureau of the Census), 291,354; Johnstonw marketing area (territory within radius of 30 miles of Johnstown), 450,000.

Area: Johnstown, 5.76 square miles, 3,688.94 acres; Greater Johnstown, 13 square miles; Johnstown marketing area, 1,198 square miles.

Altitude: Business and industrial section, 1,162 feet above sea level; principal residential areas, 1,700 feet; municipal airport, 2,280 feet.

Parks: 15 sites, 598.22 acres; total valuation, $5 million.

Public recreation: Municipal stadium in heart of city, seating 17,000; municipal golf course, 9 holes; Roxbury Park, baseball diamonds, tennis courts, skiing and tobogganing courses, band shell; municipal swimming pool; 16 school basketball halls; $85,000 music pavilion; $1,500,000 War Memorial Arena.

Assessed valuation (corporate limits): Real estate, $74,693,230; tax rate, $15 per $1,000; tax duplicate, $1,053,409; bonded debt, $555,107; cost of government, $2,199,908.

Municipal services: Fire department, 7 stations, 12 piece of equipment, 105 men; police department, public safety building, 15 pieces of motor equipment, 80 men.

Streets: Total street mileage, 94.21; miles paved, 61.5; miles of sanitary sewers, 98.2; miles of storm sewers, 77.5; number of streetcar lines, 6; length of streetcar lines, 24.5 miles single-track, 38.5 miles double-track.

Education: University of Pittsburgh Junior College; Cambria Rowe Business College; Johnstown College of Music; 27 public schools, including Central High School and 3 junior high schools; 11 parochial schools, including Catholic High School; public-school teachers, 393; parochial school teachers, 110; assessed value of public school property, $73,232,115, parochial, $548,000; public school enrollment, 10,000; parochial, 4,500. Greater Johnstown public schools, 49, including 8 high schools; 11 school auditoriums, the 2 largest seating 1,300 and 2,000; total enrollment, 25,000.

Steel and coal: Steel and soft coal are the dominant industries of Johnstown. About 85 percent of the industrial workers of the geographic city are employed in mining and steel manufacture, in secondary iron and steel industries, and in the making of clay products. The greatest resource is low-volatile coal. In the marketing area of Johnstown are mined over 40 million tons of soft coal yearly. This represents about one-seventh of the bituminous coal output of Pennsylvania and one-twelfth of that in the United States. Approximately 35,000 miners are employed.

General information: The major employment for the 130,000 workers in the Johnstown area consists of farming, coal mining and steel making—3 groups which have consistently shown in national surveys as having gained most in income since 1940. The manufacturing and industrial payroll in 1947 was over $191,860,000. Gross farm income is in excess of $34,457,000. Added together, these amounts provide a well-rounded market, averaging yearly in Johnstown over $1,240 per capita in retail sales. Sales Management's 1953 Survey of Buying Power estimated the effective buying income of the Johnstown area to be $364,470,000.

Our Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting editorial dealing with the subject of the foreign aid program appeared on Monday, July 28, in the Chicago Daily News.

I particularly wish to call attention to the last paragraph of the editorial. It reads as follows:

Any country that wants American capital in developing its productive capacity need only offer honest protection against confiscation and harassment, and private money and skills will flock to the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this points up a problem that for al ong time has plagued efforts to encourage private capital to assume part of the burden of our enormous foreign aid program, and thus give some relief to the taxpayers. Industry cannot be expected to risk capital in countries in which the threat of confiscation, expropriation or nationalization exists.

The Government's foreign investment guaranty program falls short of providing the necessary protection. The answer lies in action among the nations of the world themselves.

An important step in this direction was taken last fall at the International Industrial Development Conference in San Francisco, at which the distinguished German banker, Hermann Abs, proposed a world Magna Charta for foreign investment that would seek to protect it against seizure and expropriation. The proposal would reinstitute the international rule of law in the field of foreign investment. It has been received with widespread interest throughout the world. A similar plan was advanced last February by Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, who called for "a world law to protect world investments."

Mr. Speaker, these proposals are worthy of most serious consideration if we desire to encourage private capital to play the dynamic role that it should be playing in the campaign to offset the Communist economic offensive abroad.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the editorial in the Chicago Daily News in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks:

WE SHOULD TAKE NEW LOOK AT OUR FOREIGN AID GOALS

The House is apparently fighting a losing battle to trim $872 million from President Eisenhower's vast foreign aid request of $3.5 billion. The Senate is solidly supporting the President's plea that the cut would weaken our fight against communism, although he is as completely unable to document this contention as he would be if he also argued that foreign aid would cure cancer.

Inevitably, the Middle East turmoil has been advanced as an additional argument for more aid. The purpose of previous aid to Arab countries, of course, was to prevent precisely such turmoil. But the spenders seem to regard foreign aid in the same way some people look at prayer—if it doesn't work it only shows you didn't pray hard enough, not that what you sought was unreasonable.

The Iraqi rebels used American arms to win their revolution. Our aid to Nasser has hardly turned him into an American firster. Even the Germans, whom we have assisted bountifully, are balking at support of our Middle Eastern adventure.

In brief, men and nations everywhere are acting in what they deem to be their own interest. Where their interest may happen to coincide with ours we are the gainers, but neither men nor nations sell their loyalty or their determination to seek their own advantage.

Foreign aid is undoubtedly being supported by many who are skeptical of its value in choking communism. Many shrewd individuals see great future advantage in developing backward countries to the point of becoming customers for American goods.

A hardheaded program of foreign aid for this latter purpose makes sense. Perhaps the House budget cutters would have more success if they candidly emphasized this purpose of economic assistance, and de-

manded that the aid program be brought into line with this goal.

Such a policy would block the government-to-government form of aid now being followed. It has been shown repeatedly that this folly, at the worst, leads to corruption, and at the best to unwise or wasteful use of the money.

The change in policy, furthermore, would check the use of American money to promote socialism, which—in addition to being an inefficient system for developing a nation—we properly regard as the heart of the Communist ideology.

No better illustration could be found than India, which has received upward of $200 million in direct help, plus large amounts of credit and gift-farm products. Socialism is the declared pattern of its society, and it has been implemented by the nationalization of much of the basic industry.

This can hardly be unrelated to the neutral position of India in the contest between communism and freedom. If this fence sitting so often seems to be neutrality on the side of communism, it is because, ideologically, socialism feels more kinship with the Soviets than with America.

A nation that is hostile to private capital is not going to become an admirer and defender of the American system, and any aid that we extend to give socialism a false appearance of accomplishment merely serves to weaken, rather than strengthen, our position.

Any country that wants American capital in developing its productive capacity need only offer honest protection against confiscation and harassment, and private money and skills will flock to the opportunity.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley, Former Chairman of the Democratic Committee, at Tupper Lake, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, given at the annual dinner of the Franklin County Democratic Committee at Tupper Lake, N. Y., on July 22, 1958:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, ANNUAL DINNER, FRANKLIN COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE, TUPPER LAKE, N. Y., JULY 22, 1958

It is somewhat surprising to me to witness the current rediscovery of the north country of New York State, occasioned by the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway. I say rediscovery because I was born and brought up in the Hudson River Valley which, with the Mohawk and Champlain Valleys, was the acknowledged key to the continent for 200 years. The two giants of Europe, Britain and France, battled for its control even before we were a nation, at fateful Ticonderoga. And in the Revolution, excepting that General Washington succeeding in holding the valleys from West Point to Saratoga, and by force of arms, the two invading British armies from Montreal and New York City, would have crushed out the life of our Nation before it began.

It has been said that the seaway opens what is called the fourth coast of our country. Actually, this so-called fourth coast for us who have lived by its shores is hardly second to the Atlantic coast in being the first coast of our country; a coast which had to be defended in two full-fledged naval battles, the Battle of Lake Champlain and Lake Erie. It was also pointed out, and correctly, that there were new products to be expected from New York's north country. But, though it wasn't mentioned, this region's oldest and most famous product is fiercely independent American men and women. As certainly as Virginia and North Carolina are the parents of Tennessee, the pioneering stock of New York is the forebear of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and the upper Middle West.

Now, I think you stand upon new and world frontiers. It is my firm conviction that your boundless energies are about to find new expression, because of the tremendous new tools in your capable hands. More particularly, I predict that the St. Lawrence Valley is on the threshold of becoming one of the historic valleys of the world. As the Nile measures ancient Egypt, as the Tiber the Christian era, as the Mississippi the 19th century, the St. Lawrence will measure the 21st century. Thomas Jefferson's purchase of the whole Mississippi Valley was considered a wild extravagance of fifteen millions. Yet that sum would not buy a city block of St. Louis, Minneapolis, or Des Moines—cities yet unborn. Great cities, great mines, great commerce, and great universities will crowd this valley to the sea. The north country is about to become a tremendous Gibraltar of western civilization.

I, as a United States Senator, would hope not only to accelerate this growth but to see that only one unchanging factor goes with it, the spirit of the people who have maintained it until now.

Now, in this forthcoming development many, many problems will arise and most of them will be of considerable Federal complexion. While it is axiomatic that special location attracts specialized capital, as for instance, oil investment to Texas, this area is of such widely diversified resources that the development will be broad and general. Its general pattern will follow that of the lower Mohawk Valley, from which the city of Schenectady emerged as an industrial giant, rather than that of our early western areas, such as Dodge City, where the principal specialization was cattle.

Permit me, if you will, to outline a few of the aspects. Firstly, the power developed is subject to four jurisdictions—the United States, Canada, Ontario, and New York State. Additionally, the general jurisdiction of New York State will be divided into the concurrent jurisdiction of the counties. This is a formidable array of sovereign powers, each with undeniable constitutional jurisdiction. It has been my experience that the balancing of these various rights exacts the highest brand of statesmanship. In less than expert hands, the duty to govern could easily become the power to paralyze. Accordingly, the problem must not only be estimated in its entirety, it must be so administered.

The problems arising will be not too dissimilar from those arising between the Federal Government, the ports authorities, and the several States. But these, I submit, are matters which in addition to vision in their conception require daily expert attention.

Since the Canadian power is already inadequate for the crying needs of Canada it may be assumed that the American side will feel the impact of tremendous acceleration almost immediately. Here again, the Federal jurisdiction will be almost beyond human comprehension.

Obviously, the seaway itself comes under the heading of navigable waters. Since that law has been widely extended by Supreme Court decision, it may be expected that the Federal interest will extend far inland. It seems to me that concurrent Federal jurisdiction connotes equal responsibility. Since the Federal Government will be a great beneficiary through this development, I think it only fair that Federal credit, through the various appropriate agencies, assist mightily in this development. In point of fact, it will be an enormously profitable venture for all parties; but broad lines of credit, varying from the building of port, river, and canal facilities to very low discount mortgage rates for home building will be some of the channels in which the Federal Government can assume its fair share of the expansion.

I might say that it has been my experience that this type of investment is almost without parallel in its success. The development of previously unproductive areas, aside from the self-liquidation features of the improvements, yields in income taxes alone, and independently, resulting from the general growth, in returns, many times the original investments.

The fact is that with an international waterway in the very center of such unparalleled natural resources a mushrooming of population may well be expected. In this connection, it is to be noted that the great natural gas reserves of both Canada and the United States are approaching the region in unprecedented volume. Further, north of the border, the American pattern is being revised; the fuel is being brought to the ore, not the ore to the fuel. Centers of great industrial energy invariably attract the human skills to guide them. If, then, we may expect a tremendous development of heavy industry, never was there greater premium upon careful planning. More than conservation of national resources, we must plan for the lives of the population to come. Industrial valleys, from the Saar to the Monongahela, can be ugly and uncomfortable places for human beings to live unless full and adequate precautions are taken. In this facet of the problem, as a Democrat I have always adhered to a fundamental principle, that the principal resources of any area are the people who live in it.

This new acceptance of challenge by the north country, and the many insistent problems which will arise, necessitates a definition of the role of United States Senator. A United States Senator has, of course, a national status. The Constitution places in that body, as a body, a great responsibility in the conduct of the Nation's affairs, particularly foreign affairs. But at the same time, the representative nature of the American Republic is unimpaired; if, indeed, we be the United States then a Senator is the ambassador of his State to the Federal Government. Now, it is a basic tenet of American foreign policy that there be a continuity of that unexampled testimony of mutual trust and friendship with our good neighbor to the north, Canada. Since you people of the north country are engaged in an unparalleled interstate and international enterprise, through New York State and the Province of Ontario on power, and the two nations on the seaway, it follows that few people in public life will have greater opportunity of serving both State, Nation, and the American people than the next United States Senator from New York. I believe that not only a mighty valley, almost beyond the comprehension of man, is about to be realized, but that a new and tremendous example of international cooperation by its extraordinary accomplishments, will set an example of cooperation which may well light the way to the permanent peace of the world. The Rhine, the Danube and the Nile may never again run blood when this noble interstate and international enterprise functions. In my opinion, its moral promise is even greater than its industrial potential. I confess that as a man who has lived by its streams and in the shadow of its mountains that the challenge of the north country is one of the important rea-

sons why I wish to represent it in the United States Senate.

I have never minced words. My reason for grateful acceptance of your invitation to speak to you is to advance for your consideration those reasons for which I hope you will wish me to represent you.

In over 45 years of public life I have seen and taken part in the prototypes of these tremendous developments before. Armed only with the validation, territorially, of Jefferson's expansion, I, as national chairman of the Democratic Party, was entrusted with the task of transmitting that expansion industrially through congressional legislation. I have had more experience than average in dealing with these vast projects—experience ranging from the Matanuska Valley in Alaska to the huge reclamation projects in the South and West. We dammed the rivers; we irrigated the lands; we ran cheap power into the farmers' homes, to an ear-splitting din that we were Socialists or Reds. History has already rendered its verdict. The irrigated lands alone have more than paid for the dams, aside from the money return of the power. That great and successful experiment, the TVA, has transformed the energy of lonely and isolated areas into the raised beat of the mighty pulse of the Nation. Ironically enough, if Oak Ridge and its atomic production be any index, it is the very bulwark of defense of the free-enterprise system, which was slandered by its shortsighted opponents as scheduled to destroy. I believe the Democratic Party has always stood for conservation by use. Having seen, as head of the party and as a Cabinet officer, the desert blossom and the hidden Appalachian valleys pour forth their undeveloped wealth, I should be less than human if I did not wish to see this translated to my own New York State.

A government in the final analysis is the chief means of expression of the will, character, and energies of its people in terms of the hopes they hold for a better world for their children. Great problems, as well as greater accomplishments, are on the threshold of the north country, and I hope to be a part of it as your United States Senator.

Coyness has never been part of my nature. I have held many public offices, but I never expected my fellow citizens to pine away if I showed indifference, nor did I engineer synthetic draft movements, as a means of compelling action I yearned for in the first place. The office of United States Senator is far too important to go begging to the door of any man. It is the strongest bulwark in the American system of government. From the time I was town clerk of Stony Point to my term as Postmaster General and chairman of the national committee, I never patronized the position I occupied or pretended that it was something I didn't want. I wanted the positions I held and I took off my coat and worked for them. I am of the opinion that it is a reflection on the common sense of the American people and the majesty of public office to do otherwise.

Neither General Washington, nor Presidents Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman ever apologized for their desire to serve the American people, nor do I now. I have always desired to serve my country in any position where I felt I could do so best. I believe that I can render real service to our State and country and to the free world by representing New York in the United States Senate. I hope I shall have your support toward that end.

Before I conclude my remarks, I should like to talk about the New York State situation. The fateful banks of the Hudson, where I was born, are woven deep into the fabric of our Nation. From that Hudson River Valley have come governors and Presidents. It affords me the deepest personal satisfaction that this tradition of the valley is unflagging and all of us who have lived there or live there now have much reason for additional pleasure and pride because that very area produced our great Governor, Averell Harriman. Governor Harriman has given the people of the State of New York an outstanding administration. His wise decisions and just conclusions, his sound and humane policies, have all followed in the tradition of Govs. Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman.

I have no doubt that Governor Harriman and his associates on the Democratic State ticket will be elected next November. But that is not enough. From now until the polls close on November 4 everyone here tonight and thousands like you in every county in the State must work continuously to the end that this victory for Democratic State candidates will be comparable to those of Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman.

As certainly as I reported to Governor Roosevelt in November 1930 I report to you tonight that the call to our party is coming again from the Nation. From your hearts must come your answer, as Democrats and as Americans.

Industry Is Providing Leadership for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, H. R. 13247, will impose new heavy financial obligations upon the Federal Government. All of us certainly are in favor of assisting worthy individuals who wish to embark on a scientific career. There can be no question but that America's greatest asset is trained and dedicated manpower. Our schools and colleges which train the engineers, scientists, and managers of tomorrow are in a sense the most important suppliers to both American industry and the Federal Government.

However, before we authorize a program of Federal scholarships 100 percent greater than President Eisenhower recommended, it is well to review some of the existing efforts to assist worthy students in the development of higher education which are now sponsored by private enterprise.

Recently I was gratified to learn of the support which has been given to the Nation's liberal arts colleges, science and engineering institutes, public and private universities, medical schools, other educational associations, and groups by the United States Steel Foundation, Inc. This foundation was established by the United States Steel Corp. It shows that industry is ready and willing to assist in training tomorrow's citizens. In fact, it has already taken on the job.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of the activities of the United States Steel Foundation, Inc.:

United States Steel Foundation, Inc., announced grants of $2 million to 655 of the Nation's privately supported liberal arts colleges, science and engineering institutes, public and private universities and medical schools, and to several educational associations and groups.

In announcing the foundation's 1958 program of aid-to-education, Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of trustees of the foundation, said: "The action of the trustees represents an effort to provide assistance to as many institutions as possible and to help maintain the vigor of the leading private institutions through substantial grants. The trustees also sought to allocate available resources so as to best serve the changing requirements of higher education and to provide, to the extent feasible, continuity of aid. Moreover, they hoped to encourage quality improvement of education and provide opportunity for individual development of scholars through fellowships."

In furtherance of these objectives, the foundation's seven-part program included:

I. OPERATING GRANTS, $630,000

Operating aid was afforded the 451 accredited 4-year institutional members of all the State, regional, and national liberal arts college fund-raising groups in the amount of $458,000. These fund-raising groups, Mr. Blough emphasized, have been supported since this foundation's initial program in 1954 and the trustees have been impressed with their continued growth. The sum of $88,000 additionally was provided for 80 selected nongroup colleges. Forty-two universities, science and engineering institutes received operating grants totaling $84,000. Although all of the operating grants were unrestricted, the trustees expect that most of the operating funds will be applied toward teaching improvement, faculty, and staff development and incentives.

II. CAPITAL GRANTS, $950,000

After designating $335,000 of the authorized total capital payments for prior commitments, new capital or major grants amounted to $615,000. Of the $615,000, the sum of $455,000 covered 28 grants, ranging in size from $5,000 to $20,000, for liberal arts colleges, women's colleges, regional universities and colleges, and engineering schools. The 28 institutions included were Dartmouth, Earlham, Wooster, Reed, Redlands, Colgate, Union (New York), Willams, Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Barnard, Sweet Briar, Smith, Mills, Clark, Massachusetts), Temple, Susquehanna, Assumption (Massachusetts), Athens (Alabama), Miles (Alabama), Worcester Polytechnic, Bucknell, Brooklyn Polytechnic, Pratt, Clarkson Technical, Bradley, Rose Polytechnic, and Norwich. Of the balance, the sum of $100,000 represented initial provision for new commitments to five private universities and science institutes, as part of a program of assistance begun in 1955.

Under a program of assistance to leading centers of learning which is subject to periodic review and approval, financial support for a number of such institutions is planned for a term of years on a sustained and substantial basis. This replaces, with respect to individual institutions, consideration of the separate needs of departments, divisions, and other units, or the need for capital as contrasted to the need for other purposes. The sums becoming available will be for the unrestricted use of recipients for major requirements as they deem most prudent and timely.

For a 5-year period, and payable in installments or otherwise as determined, a total of $100,000 each was committed for the following institutions: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Institute of Technology, Cornell, Johns Hopkins and Harvard Universities. These 5, together with 9 other universities—Chicago, Columbia, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, Stanford, Vanderbilt, New York, Princeton, and Yale—all of which

have been designees of major grants in recent periods, are among the influential leading private institutions which, thus far, have been recognized under the program.

In commenting on the foundation's major grants, Mr. Blough said: "Such aid, when provided by many sources, could well be the means of assuring for the future of America those intellectual conditions required to meet both our hopes and responsibilities. For the tasks ahead, we shall need both our great public and our great private institutions; and since the public universities have substantial regular sources of income to cover many of their needs, providing support for the leading private universities becomes in these times an urgent concern.

"The leading universities and science institutes are more than regional in their import. They provide national and international leadership; they are the pace setters for educational standards; they contribute heavily to the advance and use of knowledge; they are an abundant source of teachers and quality teaching; they train many for public affairs; they offer preparation for all the professions; they perform many other basic tasks for the Nation and the world. Since the leading private universities and institutes have outpaced, through extension of their services, their traditional sources of support, our times require that new corporate and other donors must come forward with reasonably sustained unrestricted aid in dollar volume generously designed to help close the gap between their resources and their needs."

III. TEACHING AID, MEDICINE, $110,000

Each year the trustees have authorized sums for the advancement of programs in one or more pioneering or especially difficult teaching areas. This year sums were provided for advances in medical teaching. In addition to $75,000 of sustaining aid for the member institutions of the National Fund for Medical Education, 2 institutional teaching aid projects were assisted. One was for the general teaching program of the new Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry in the amount of $25,000 and the other, for $10,000 as part of a matching grant program, was for teaching of industrial medicine to undergraduates at the Yale University School of Medicine.

IV. STUDENT AID (FELLOWSHIPS), $150,000

The foundation's graduate study program, generally at the doctoral level, was expanded by a total of 12 new fellowships, bringing to 42 the number of such 2-year study grants available through designated public and private institutions. Each foundation fellowship carries maximum benefit of $7,200, inclusive of a marital supplement allotment. Fellowships are available in the sciences and humanities at the following institutions: Social sciences—California, Chicago, Amos Tuck School of Dartmouth, Harvard, Indiana, M. I. T., Michigan, New York, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Purdue, Stanford; physical and other sciences—Alabama Polytechnic, Alabama, California Tech, Carnegie Tech, Cornell, Duke, Georgia Tech, Illinois Tech, Illinois, Iowa State, Johns Hopkins, Lehigh, Michigan State, Minnesota, Ohio State, Pennsylvania State, Southern California, Syracuse, Vanderbilt, Virginia Polytechnic, Yale; humanities—Colorado, Columbia, Fordham, Notre Dame, Princeton, Texas, Tulane, and Wisconsin.

V. PROJECTS AID GRANTS $50,000

Project aid was in three categories: (1) Assistance of $30,000 was again made available to about 100 college libraries, for collections and other requirements, via the Association of College and Reference Libraries which, through a jury system, makes the specific awards upon institutional application; (2) assistance in the orientation process for foreign students resident or traveling in America under reciprocal arrangements, via grants of $5,000 each to the Institute of International Education and the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program; and (3) assistance totaling $10,000 to other projects in specific areas. The latter includes grants to the American Council of Learned Societies to assist its publication of scholarly works activity, aid for the general program of the Humanities Center, headquartered at the University of Massachusetts, and support of the future scientists program of the National Science Teachers Association.

VI. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT GRANTS, $35,000

Grants were authorized for administration through the Association of American Colleges to those institutions affiliated with the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. These 60 colleges are not yet fully accredited but seek to provide improved quality of community service. Grants made under this program in earlier years have assisted certain colleges to become fully accredited regionally.

VII. ASSOCIATION SUPPORT, $55,000

Recognizing the important roles, as to both educational objectives and fund raising, performed by certain key associations and groups, the trustees this year increased the total of such support over the prior year. A second annual grant of $25,000 was made to the American Alumni Council for a plan of awarding monetary prizes to stimulate alumni giving as well as for its general activities. The value of the activities of the Association of American Colleges and the American Council on Education also was recognized in grants of $5,000 each for general or project use. The national headquarters of the 39 State and regional liberal arts college fund-raising groups (operating as the Commission on Colleges and Industry) also was granted $10,000. The important function of the 650 public and private junior or 2-year community colleges was recognized by the trustees with a grant of $10,000 for research by the American Association of Junior Colleges.

No additional general aid-to-education grants are scheduled by the foundation for 1958. Notification has been given to all participants in the program.

Retiring Secretary Folsom Calls Attention to Needs in Fields of Education

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement by the retiring, and much respected, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom. Mr. Folsom urged Congress to act now, in the closing weeks of this session, on the bill H. R. 13247. He called attention to the emergency needs in the field of education which underline the need for action, and urged all who really want to improve education to unite in vigorous support of action now.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to argue with these sentiments, and many of us hope that legislation can be enacted at this session. The need is pressing, and the opportunity for action still exists. Nonetheless, unless immediate steps are taken there will not be sufficient time for legislation to be enacted.

On July 2, almost 4 weeks ago, this bill, H. R. 13247, was approved overwhelmingly by the House Education and Labor Committee. Unfortunately no progress has been made since then. The Rules Committee late last week was reported as willing to hold hearings, but as of now no date has been set for hearings. Unless a rule is granted and the House can be given an opportunity to consider this legislation, nothing will materialize.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has just this week reported out a similar bill, but one containing provisions different from the House bill. Even if this body should pass the bill approved by our committee, the other body is likely to desire certain changes in the language. That obviously would necessitate a conference committee, with almost certain delay inevitable.

Time, therefore, is obviously of the essence, Mr. Speaker. The legislation involves a field of considerable complexity, and differences of opinion about suitable action are to be expected. For these reasons, if we hope to achieve enactment of legislation, we must take prompt steps to bring this about.

The Soviet's launching of their sputnik last October was followed by many demands for improvements in our own educational system. Surely the need for action is still imperative. If Soviet technological advances prove nothing else, they should make us aware that we cannot afford to ignore the inadequacies of our own educational system. There may be no cause for panic, but surely there can be no excuse for complacency about our educational deficiencies.

Views of Union Members on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include another series of comments which I have received from individual union members. I believe the Members of the House will find these comments on possible labor legislation to be of considerable interest and will serve to give the Members some indication as to the feelings of individual union members.

Our labor laws: A State without the right-to-work law is nothing but a Socialist State and is fast on the way to communism. In my opinion a good union member cannot be a good Christian and a good Christian cannot be a good union member. A good Christian is a good citizen but a good union member resorts to mob violence when it suits his purpose and that is anti-Christian and antilaw

and order, and is anti-Americanism. (Machine operator.)

We need unions but we need good, honest leaders with the right understanding of the businessman's problems.

Most union leaders try to instill hate of the men for management. (Patternmaker.)

Under labor legislation, I think something should be done to curb Walter Reuther and others of his like. In my estimation, he and the other labor leaders with their harebrained theory of economics are responsible for business conditions as they are today—a Lenin of the labor movement, one might say.

As to unions, I think all elections, great or small, should be balloted in secret with the Federal Government officiating over them to insure an honest vote of the working man, and that "we" vote on whether "we" want the unions to deduct money for strike funds and other assessments. This deal where a group of delegates whom we don't even know take a vote on whether we pay $10 a month out of our check for a strike fund, I am against. I personally am against such unconstitutional voting by a few in the unions.

We can vote for the President of the United States but we can't vote for the president of our labor union. (Lathe operator.)

I believe that unions should have a certain amount of control imposed on them just the same as management. I believe that as sure as management owes certain things to labor, labor owes as much or more to the company he works for, and the union owes more to its members. Unions should be made to account for the money they receive. In regard to unions in politics, I feel that a Republican shouldn't have to contribute to the Democratic Party. When I was a member of the CIO I had to contribute to the PAC and Mr. Hillman, with whom I disagreed. There was no way to get out of it because when we signed up for the union we had to agree to let them deduct our dues and any special assessments through the payroll department. Now I belong to the teamster union local, and, although I believe in unions, I do believe they should be restricted, that their power should not get out of hand. (Truckdriver.)

Vacant Beds in Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from Army Times, Vacant Beds and the VA, accurately sets forth the nature of the problem confronting the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The committee does not agree that the present law regarding the use of Veterans' Administration facilities for the care of eligible veterans is inadequate; nevertheless, it is our intention to seek enactment of such additional language as is necessary to bring an end to the outside interference which is now prohibiting Veterans' Administration from carrying out the policies set forth by Congress regarding care of veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

VACANT BEDS AND THE VA

Veterans' Administrator Sumner Whittier, in his several appearances before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to date, has failed in his attempt to shift the blame for the unavailability of some 5,000 VA hospital beds from the Budget Bureau to Congress.

In his opening remarks to the committee last week, the Administrator declared that the beds in question were not withdrawn at the direction of the Bureau "or at anyone else's direction."

He told the committee that "the beds were just not withdrawn at all," explaining that most of them have been in the system since certain hospitals were taken over from the Armed Forces, and have never been in use.

The Congressmen heard the agency chief tell how the vacant beds, which veterans' groups and lawmakers feel should be used to the maximum, "have been in standby status for many years, and their inclusion in VA rated bed capacity gives a distorted picture."

But sympathy for and acceptance of the Whittier thesis, based on his stated reasons why the beds aren't used, is decidedly lacking on the part of the committee members and other Congressmen who have come to the hearings to issue regional complaints and learn the facts.

The legislators have not challenged Whittier's contentions that in many hospitals it is difficult to recruit adequate medical help to handle increased patient loads, and that construction or maintenance developments force shutdowns and transfers. But his third point—that the vacant beds are not required to meet the current operating plan—has stirred up a veritable hornet's nest.

In an elaborately prepared statement, complete with charts and diagrams, the agency chief has sought to show the committee that the real bone of contention must be resolved through congressional action in writing more specific policy to guide VA in the future. The differences between rated bed capacity and operating bed capacity provide the proverbial fly in the ointment, Whittier contended.

Regardless of VA's documentary of why the controversial beds remain closed, and its attempt to alleviate the pressures by charging that misunderstanding is the key to the situation rather than differences of opinion, one fact remains outstanding, and it has yet to be denied.

That is that there are 25,144 veterans on the admittance waiting list, almost 5,000 beds gathering dust, and that a quarter of these ex-GIs could be accommodated if VA made a concerted effort to bring this about.

The House committee has listened patiently to VA's official explanations, and it has given the Administrator and his advisers every possible avenue for elaboration and recommendation. But the Committee obviously hasn't accepted the agency's statistical doubletalk as justification for keeping the beds empty; and the Budget Bureau, with its tight hold on the purse strings of appropriations, is more clearly than ever the real culprit.

In his effort to illustrate the general accord between the Budget Bureau and VA since he took over 7 months ago, Whittier said that if he were in disagreement with a policy of the Bureau "on a matter I considered vital, I would not hesitate to take my case beyond them."

The only possible conclusion to be drawn from this matter-of-fact statement is that he hasn't, up till now, considered the vacant beds as being sufficiently vital to warrant carrying the matter to the highest forum—the White House.

Committee members may well agree, once the hearings end, that in light of the projected rise in non-service-connected ailments among veterans, new legislation is most advisable so as to spell out in specific terms how far VA should be prepared to go in coping with the expected patient increase.

The wording of the law is indeed loose in this respect now, and Whittier's appeal for specific language to solve what will undoubtedly prove a headache to future administrators is a valid one that should be acted upon early in the next Congress if not in this one.

But for the present the issue revolves not around 1986, but 1958, and how to open beds which aren't doing anyone any good, and can't be allowed to grow rusty because someone's statistical analysis shows they're not needed.

VA's first responsibility is to solve the present problem so that 5,000 eligible veterans can receive the medical care they need and Congress intended them to have.

Charles Porter, Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have sought to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the press comments on the reception received—the good will generated—by Mr. Charles Porter's recent visit to Caracas, Venezuela.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal for Sunday, July 13, 1958, entitled "The Kind of Men the House Needs":

THE KIND OF MEN THE HOUSE NEEDS

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, an Oregon Democrat, has just made a trip—a triumphal trip—to Caracas, capital of Venezuela. The warmth of his welcome was in sharp contrast to Vice President NIXON's reception in the same place in May. The difference was no fault of Mr. NIXON's. It simply happened that upon his unfortunate and, in this case, blameless head were visited the longtime sins of United States official policy in dealing with South American dictatorships, including notably Venezuela's recent and hated Jimenez.

It happens, on the other hand, that Mr. PORTER personifies in the Latin American mind the strong feeling that exists in North America against any brand of political tyranny. As a member of the House, Mr. PORTER has busied himself in behalf of the liberties of peoples under the heels of such heels as—for a conspicuous current example—the Dominican Trujillo. The Oregon Congressman has won a hemispheric reputation as a friend of man, and thus in Venezuela one popular ovation after another.

When a member of Congress wins international celebrity, he is usually a Senator rather than a Representative. The Senate, which must ratify treaties, has a special international interest. But for many reasons the members of the House, whose powers profoundly affect all of our world relations, ought not to neglect the field. The good will Mr. PORTER has won for his country abroad is excellent evidence.

Thus we are glad that Chester A. Bowles will apparently be the Democratic nominee from a Connecticut district where, judging from history and current events, a Democrat ought to stand a good chance this year. Mr. Bowles, a former ambassador to India, has experience that would make him an ideal member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. At this distance we cannot be presumptuous enough to advise the voters of the Second Connecticut Congressional District. But we are free to hope, in the national interest, that so superbly qualified a man as Chester Bowles is elected.

The House needs more Porters—and more Bowleses.

Hon. Amintore Fanfani, Prime Minister of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Amintore Fanfani, Prime Minister of Italy, arrived in the United States yesterday on a state visit. The Prime Minister will be engaged in discussions with the President, Secretary Dulles, and other important representatives in our Government.

Last year it was my great privilege and pleasure to personally meet and visit with our distinguished visitor who represents a proud and a free people. Premier Fanfani has always manifested his stanch friendship for the United States and continues to do so. I realized after talking with this great statesman that his loyalty to the democratic ideals in which we so strongly believe is of the very highest. He truly represents a people who are determined to remain free. I am very pleased that he is making this visit to our country because I feel that he will make a great contribution in suggesting ideas to ease the social, economic, military, and political problems causing tension in the Middle East and throughout the world. His support of the United States was quick, unequivocal, and solid during the most recent flareup in that section of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston Herald published in their July 26 edition, an editorial which points out the importance of Premier Fanfani's visit to the United States. I agree wholeheartedly with this timely editorial and wish to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The editorial follows:

VISITOR FROM ITALY

The much ballyhooed visit of Soviet boss Nikita Khrushchev to the United Nations headquarters here has tended to overshadow another and more welcome international visit.

Premier Fanfani, of Italy, has accepted an invitation to confer with President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in Washington next Tuesday and Wednesday, and the visit is expected to draw the governments of the two countries even closer together than they now are.

Although Mr. Fanfani has been in office only a few days, he is the true heir of Alcide de Gasperi, the great Christian Democratic leader who brought Italy into the western alliance and established her firmly in the course she has followed ever since.

Opponents of the new Premier have been urging a more neutral line for Italy in the struggle between East and West. They have said that the great powers were taking Italy for granted and that a show of independence would strengthen her world position. Mr. Fanfani, however, has stood firm, and the Washington invitation on the eve of the summit talks has vindicated his position.

Washington is right to cultivate this spokesman of Italian liberalism, as it is right to cultivate Italy, a key partner in the Atlantic alliance. The Communists, who, with the left Socialists, control a third of the Italian Parliament, have not given up hope of subverting this western bastion. Mr. Fanfani, with his youthful energy and zeal for social reform, has a good chance of wooing the Socialists away from the Reds and providing real stability at last for a Rome government. This in turn would mean added strength for NATO and for the free world cause in general.

We should encourage the Christian Democratic leader in every way we can, and we should also listen to what he has to say about the Middle Eastern situation. He has been studying it closely and he may well have some ideas we could use.

Mr. Fanfani is a welcome visitor here, as his predecessor was. May his talks be fruitful.

Nedlog Co., of Chicago, Typifies Small Business Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 28, Mr. Abe Golden, president of the Nedlog Co., of Chicago, presented Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, with a gold bottle cap to commemorate the billionth bottle of fruit drink which his firm had just produced.

In his remarks to Congressman PATMAN, Mr. Golden stressed the idea that the Congress must expand its attention to small business.

Mr. Golden's remarks follow:

Congressman PATMAN, it is a great honor for me to meet you and be able to present you with this small token—the gold bottle cap from the billionth bottle of fruit drink which my firm has just produced.

It seems to me that while this achievement is minor when compared to the output of our industrial giants, this billionth anniversary for the Nedlog Co. is a symbol for all of us of what it means to be an American.

Mr. Congressman, let me tell you a little about how this anniversary came about and what it means to me, the son of a poor immigrant. This is a story that could not come true anywhere except in this great country of ours.

I was born, of Polish immigrant parents, on New York's East Side. As a child, I helped my father with his pushcart which earned our family its meager livelihood. When we moved to Chicago, it was still with the pushcart, but we found opportunity such as no other nation could ever offer.

Over the years, I was able to save up some $500, and in 1930—even though we were in the middle of a real depression—I was bold enough to start a small beverage firm, manufacturing a noncarbonated fruit drink.

We have been able to prosper over these past 28 years, and now have reached the point of production which this bottle cap represents. This is not so much my personal achievement as it is a symbol of how small business can develop in these United States. Although there have been many great lawmakers, you, Mr. PATMAN, have been the guardian angel, trying to protect the best interests of millions of small-business men who represent the backbone of our economy.

Spurred by such lawmakers as you, our Government for many years has focused its attention on the importance of small business to the Nation's welfare.

Certainly we hope that you and others like you will continue to be active in this work. For it seems to me that we will need more of your help in these days when the trend to bigness seems to have invaded every field: Our cities are getting bigger; giant shopping centers dot the countryside around them; in almost every industry a handful of leaders have all but blotted others out of the picture. Yet there is no doubt that the small town will always be a vital part of our national life, and the small-business man will continue to contribute his vital part to our national economy.

The Congress, I think, must expand its attention to small business. With leadership like yours, I hope it will consider some measures which seem to me, as a businessman, to be a vital, six-point program, needed if small business is to continue making its contribution to the Nation's overall welfare:

1. Concerted action by the appropriate Federal agencies, bolstered by whatever legislation is needed, to fight new attempts at evading long-standing statutes which bar monopolies and collusion. No matter how these combinations are concealed, they must be uncovered and dismantled before they swallow up their smaller, independent competitors.

2. To aid small firms which have occasion to seek financial aid, the machinery of the Small Business Administration should be geared, I believe, to provide speedier action. While my firm has never needed such assistance—and I don't foresee that we will—I understand that many firms which have needed financial assistance have been hurt by long delays.

3. Field offices of the Small Business Administration should be staffed with consultants and experts in management techniques, accounting, production methods and the like, who could actually go into a manufacturing plant which needed their advice and help to solve on-the-spot problems.

4. Formation of a pool from which small firms could draw the electronic calculators and other equipment which no one, small plant can afford to maintain, but which would be invaluable in a clearinghouse arrangement. Such physical assistance as this, incidentally, seems a natural extension of the thinking behind the Government's advisory program for small business, and it is needed to bolster that activity.

5. Tax relief, in the form of attention to small business lest it be lost in the shuffle of any tax realinement. Revisions are needed which will balance the small firm's tax contribution in comparison with that of large industry. As Americans, we are willing and anxious to support our Government, but we do not want to do so on the basis of a tax structure weighted in favor of the giants in the business world.

6. Continuation and expansion of Federal efforts to coordinate Goverment needs with the capabilities of small firms, many of which offer a flexibility in production which their larger counterparts cannot achieve. For this

reason, they can often fill Government contract requirements most expediently and economically if information continues to be available as to Government needs; certainly the cataloging of small business facilities is, also, a vital activity in terms of our national defense.

These are some of the things we hope for, Mr. Congressman. They would help insure that a man can start a business on a shoestring, as I did, and still hope to succeed to the point of being able to pay his employees adequately, to provide them with some type of future security, to send his youngsters through college and—if he's fortunate—to reach the kind of milestone which this billionth bottle represents to me.

Thank you for your time, sir, and your interest in our problems. You have been for years a real inspiration and hope to small-business men, and I sincerely hope you will be able to continue this important work for many years to come.

Congressman PATMAN responded to the presentation as follows:

Mr. Golden, I am deeply touched by your tribute. And I am honored to take part in celebrating your achievement—Nedlogs. I know that such an achievement does not come easy.

It proves again that individual initiative is the greatest resource this country has; and our future strength—both our economic strength and, I think, our moral strength depends upon what we do now to keep opportunity open for independent enterprise.

We have a great capitalistic system in our country and that is the system we want to keep. I, too, am disturbed by the trend toward giantism, because we all know that this trend stifles individual initiative and even shrinks our freedoms.

We have not always done everything we should to safeguard equality of opportunity for the independent businessman. But progress is being made in this direction, and there are signs of a growing recognition in Congress and on the part of the people that steps to preserve opportunity must be taken, and taken promptly.

For example, just in this past session, Congress has taken at least three important steps to help small business. It made revisions in the Federal tax laws to remove some of the important discriminations and hardships which these laws were placing on small firms. In this session, Congress also passed legislation to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, and gave it increased authority and money to assist small firms.

And, most important of all, Congress has taken a landmark step to assist in the creation of a new private financing system which will give small firms access to venture capital. This step is in the best tradition of our Federal Government in opening new frontiers to private enterprise. Certainly, we are not a capital-short Nation. Yet for a Nation that is determined that the capitalistic system will outperform and outlast all others, we have been badly remiss in allowing small business to become capital starved. Where is the market where small firms may obtain equity capital and long-term loans such as big business obtains in the control stock and bond markets? There is none. But Congress is now well on the way to correcting this, and this correction will be made in the free-enterprise way—which is to assure no one that he will succeed, but to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to succeed.

These steps do not go as far as they should, but they are long steps in the right direction. Together they make up the most substantial accomplishment for small business that any one Congress has made in my 30 years here. This is most encouraging. It shows that Congress wants to maintain an opportunity for small business, which means that the people at home want this.

Mr. Golden, I accept this gold cap symbolizing the achievement of your small-business firm with all humility. It is accepted as the symbol you present it to be, what opportunity for independent enterprise means to America.

Army Salutes Anniston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Army's high award to civilian groups has been presented to the Anniston, Ala., Chamber of Commerce's military affairs committee and to the Anniston Star.

Col. William T. Moore, commanding officer of Fort McClellan, at Anniston, presented special certificates of achievement to the two groups in behalf of Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, in ceremonies at the fort last week.

Receiving the awards were Col. Harry M. Ayers, publisher of the Star; Joe H. Rutledge, president of the chamber of commerce; and Marshall K. Hunter, Hunter, chairman of the military affairs committee.

These awards were kept secret until the time of presentation and they were received by a surprised body of men. However, it is no surprise to those of us who know these men that they should be singled out for this high honor.

In Anniston, there exists a close cooperative spirit between the civilian and the military communities. In this fine city there is exemplified how both civilian and military personnel can live and work in harmony and cooperation.

Of course, the outstanding daily newspaper and the active and alert chamber of commerce have had much to do with this, and it is fitting that they were saluted.

The Star and Publisher Ayers were cited for "outstanding and dedicated service to the United States Army and more particularly Fort McClellan, Ala., in a concerted effort to enhance the prestige of the military service and to further public understanding of the Army and its role as a member of the United States defense team."

EDITORIALS, REPORTING LAUDED

Through editorials and factual and fair news articles, the Anniston Star has aided the commanders of Fort McClellan in successfully accomplishing the mission of the installation and it has been a most effective instrument in furthering and maintaining a harmonious relationship among the citizens of Anniston, its industry and the military.

The citation also noted a special edition of the Star in 1955 upon the dedication of the Women's Army Corps Center and support of the Armed Forces Day celebration this year.

The Military Affairs Committee was cited for "its devoted interest in the progress and accomplishments of Fort McClellan and "invaluable assistance to commanders of that installation by its vitally important work of assisting in obtaining housing for military personnel, and enlisting the support of the local citizens in the current military housing construction program."

OTHER FACTORS NOTED

Also noted was the committee's work in sponsoring publication of the Serviceman's Guide to Fort McClellan and Anniston, a program that resulted in Calhoun County school bus facilities being extended to transport children of military personnel to Anniston schools, active liaison between military police and civilian law enforcement bodies and support of Armed Forces Day activities.

By taking such profound interest, the Military Affairs Committee has demonstrated its effectiveness as an instrument for rendering unusual service to the public and the United States Army—

Said the citation.

We Are International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements extension legislation which recently passed the Senate, as amended, has now gone to a Senate-House conference committee. One of the main differences between the Senate and House passed bills is the element of time, the Senate version calling for a 3-year extension while the House earlier provided for a 5-year extension in accordance with the request of President Eisenhower. Despite the differences in the legislation, the reciprocal trade agreements extension received overwhelming support in both bodies.

An editorial printed in the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram on June 11, 1958, points out that—

Any barriers that are erected ostensibly to protect us will hurt us in the long run by keeping the things we make from the people who want to buy them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this editorial entitled "We Are International" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WE ARE INTERNATIONAL

There are a good many familiar names in the impact study list of the Massachusetts firms that lead in exports. The administration, in its drive to push the reciprocal trade bill through Congress, emphasized that trade is a two-way affair, and that we should stop worrying about what comes into this country and start thinking about how much we send out, and how many jobs this means.

Statistics amassed to back up this argument show that Massachusetts derives $332.6 million annually from export trade, which represents jobs for at least 22,231 workers,

with what it does for our farmers coming in extra.

Among the leading Massachusetts exporters are listed General Electric, Worthington Pump, Westinghouse, Bosch, Hercules, Berkshire Hathaway, and Eaton Paper. Machinery is a big item in Massachusetts' contribution to foreign trade, but a lot of other locally made items figure in the picture, too.

This is a story that doesn't have to be told to Holyoke. Exporting Holyoke-made goods is nothing new. Holyoke firms have enjoyed a brisk foreign trade for several decades, and local working people know that many of their customers are south of the Equator or east of the Atlantic. Holyoke's business offices have always made stamp-collecting easy for local youngsters.

We have felt the rivalry of cheap foreign labor and we have been hurt by world slumps in things like textiles. Yet the figures show that we live on what we sell all over the world. We are not living off our own farm, and any barriers that are erected ostensibly to protect us will hurt us in the long run by keeping the things we make from the people who want to buy them. In this sense Holyoke has been international for a long time.

Panama Canal Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that the American people do not actually realize the true state of affairs in Central or South America.

There appeared a very enlightening editorial in the Hopewell News on Monday, July 21, 1958, pointing out the situation in Panama. Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., editor of the News, is an astute scholar of government and problems of today that confront our people.

In the hopes that this editorial will be read by a number of our people who do not realize the situation in Panama, I desire to include it with my remarks and I congratulate Mr. Robbins on his editorial.

The editorial quotes a portion of a letter written by Mr. William R. McCann, of Hopewell, Va., to Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. I commend Mr. McCann on his outstanding knowledge of the Canal Zone. He was an engineer during the construction of the canal. He has been a close and astute student of that section of the world for many years. He is intensely interested in this problem and I am sure his knowledge of the facts in the case will be of tremendous help to those of us who are interested in the welfare of this hemisphere.

PANAMA CANAL TROUBLE

Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has spoken several times recently on the dangers that confront us in Panama, where agitation is mounting to have the United States turn over the canal to Panama, or at least admit Panama to 50–50 ownership and control.

In a recent speech in the House, Mr. FLOOD pointed out there was an organized raid on May 2 to plant Panama flags in the Canal Zone and that more recently there had been public disorders in both Panama and Colon. He stated that the campaign to create anti-United States feeling has increased in volume.

In this speech Mr. FLOOD read a letter written by William R. McCann, of Hopewell, as typical of the many letters he had received. Mr. FLOOD said:

"This letter is from William R. McCann, of Hopewell, Va., whose long residence in the Canal Zone, where he was an engineer on Panama Canal construction, his record of subsequent achievement and lifetime interest in Isthmian problems enables him to speak with authority." The letter follows:

"DEAR MR. FLOOD: Before me lies CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1958, containing your address in the Congress, pointing out 'Panama Canal—Latest Developments.' Your masterful diagnosis and presentation of this most acute international situation commands my utmost admiration.

"Your address, coupled with others of your pen earlier this year, constitute adequate warning to the people of this country that the defeat of the British and the French at Suez 2 years ago, in history, will prove infinitesimal compared to the impending defeat of America at Panama.

"Ignored by press, columnists, the administration, and the Congress, the Panama cauldron merrily bubbles along, hotter and hotter each day, headed for an explosion that will shake the world. Meanwhile, like Nero and his fiddle while Rome burned, we dabble with an Adams and his hotel bills, for the headlines and leading editorials.

"Each day I meditate whither do we wander at Panama. No longer should the United States today delay taking a firm stand before the world. We should state plainly and decisively, even provocatively, that we will brook no interference whatsoever with the sovereign rights of America in its peaceful possession of the Canal Zone. And House Concurrent Resolution No. 205, introduced by you June 6, 1957, is unquestionably the first step in making clear our position.

"House Concurrent Resolution 205 should be approved—and promptly."

There can be little doubt but that Panama has become a storm center of hostile propaganda against the United States, as Mr. FLOOD pointed out in his speech. There can be little doubt but that we should take a firm stand, as Mr. McCann points out in his letter. The question is when will the Congress act?

The Financial Institutions Act Is Harmful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Financial Institutions Act is harmful to many segments of our economy. I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter, dated July 24, 1958, which I received from Joseph Pollack, president of Local 19, Insurance Agents' International Union, and in which Mr. Pollack points out that the act would be detrimental to insurance agents.

LOCAL 19, INSURANCE AGENTS' INTERNATIONAL UNION,
New York, N. Y., July 24, 1958.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: We are writing on behalf of our nearly 2,000 members of our local who are insurance agents and many of whom reside in your district.

We are writing to strongly urge that you vote against the financial institutions bill S. 1451 which has already passed in the Senate and is before the House. This bill was best described by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, in his speech on June 5 in the House of Representatives.

On the basis of that factual analysis and the threat that passage of this bill would be to our members and their families, we respectfully urge you, on behalf of our members who reside in your district, to vote against this special interest bill, which is obviously detrimental to public interest, organized labor and insurance agents.

We would appreciate any active participation on your part to help to prevent this harmful bill from passing.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH POLLACK,
President.

Middle East Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the State of Israel as an equalizing force in the troubled Middle East should not be underestimated and deserves special attention in the formulation of our policy in that area.

Recently Mr. Harry Groman, president of the Groman Mortuary of Los Angeles, Calif., and a prominent southern California civic leader, spent several months in Israel where he served as a business consultant to the Government of Israel and had an opportunity to observe the situation in the Middle East and to appraise at first hand the strategic and vital importance of the State of Israel to the free world.

Mr. Groman has made a concise and revealing survey of the important position of the State of Israel with relation to resolving the critical problems of the Middle East and protection of the territorial integrity of the nations in that area.

The following is Mr. Groman's analysis as reported in the B'nai B'rith Messenger which I feel deserves the attention of the Members of this Congress:

HARRY GROMAN SEES ISRAEL KEY TO WORLD PEACE

"It is prophetic that almost by Divine Providence tiny Israel is today in a strategic position to protect the territorial integrity of the Middle East and, perhaps, the peace of the world."

Having recently returned from Israel where he spent several months as a business consultant to that country's government, Harry Groman, president of the Groman Mortuary and prominent southern California civic leader, in the above words appraised the vital importance now in international affairs of this 10-year-old Jewish homeland.

Lebanon and Isarel, both friendly to the anti-Communist world, Groman pointed out, are the key, militarily and economically, to containing the major world crisis touched off by the present army revolt in Iraq.

"Bagdad, the Biblical site of the Garden of Eden, and cradle of civilization, can be

viewed as only part of the divine plan to save the peoples of the world against self-destruction," Groman says. "Israel, a strong and dynamic small nation as compared to equally small but weak Lebanon, emerges now as if the Lord meant it so, a military bulwark at the hub and center of the ideological conflict between Russia and the Western nations over world domination.

"Situated on the map as they are, Israel and Lebanon separate pro-Russia Egypt and Syria, isolating them from each other and forming a well-protected open corridor for the Western powers, the United States, England, and France, through which to pour troops and military supplies by way of the Mediterranean Sea which is now controlled by anti-Russian nations. It is plain to see on the map of this area that Russia could not if it desired, threaten Western control of the Middle East as she has no port of entry through the Dardanelles or over the hostile territories of Turkey, Iran, and Iraq to reach the potential Middle East theater of war. Therefore Israel upsets Russian military timing and mobility in any possible military showdown between the East and the West.

"But more important than the strategic geographic placement of Israel is the fiber of its people and the moral courage of its army. Israel is about the size of Rhode Island and has a population of approximately 2 million. Its army of 400,000 with a possible 60-percent draft of trained men and women from the civilian population is tough, seasoned, and feared by Nasser and his pan-Arab expansionists. Despite the seeming numerical weakness of Israel's fighting force, the fine, well-trained, and disciplined men in it demonstrated that the Egyptian forces were no match for them. While in Israel, I was impressed by the determination and attitude, similar to that of our frontier days pioneers to withstand aggressive attack in the face of great odds and little support or comfort from the rest of the world.

"Now it should be apparent to all the western world, and especially Europe, which stands to lose its vital middle eastern oil resources to the Russians, that tiny Israel is the real Little David standing between chaos and freedom and against the Russian Goliath."

Investigation of Red Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent letters to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and United Nations Delegate Henry Cabot Lodge, requesting that an investigation be made into the crimes and atrocities committed by the Communists against individuals.

In my letters I have pointed to the rising tide of communism as illustrated in the recent Middle East situation. We are quite aware that the agitation in the Middle East is being fostered and fomented by Communist elements, and, in particular, by Nasser of Egypt, a Communist-oriented and supported dictator. Let us not delude ourselves that Nasser is merely an Arab nationalist, for his career is closely paralleling that of Mao Tse-tung who at one time was looked upon as a mere agrarian reformer. The Soviet Union helped the Chinese Communist leader with arms, ammunition, military technicians and cash to take over the country. Similar aid has been sent to Egypt. As a result, not only does communistic rule extend to the Pacific but also, Russia has after centuries of diplomatic and military endeavors to reach the Mediterranean finally succeeded in doing so. We must, therefore, keep ever alert and act firmly as President Eisenhower did in the Middle East, and as President Truman did in Korea. Over and above such actions, we must engage in other activities which are designed to preserve and protect freedom and liberty.

I believe that one effective means by which we can stem the tide of communism and forestall any loss of freedom and liberty in the world is to show clearly to the nations of the world that freedom and liberty do not, and cannot, exist under Communist rule. To that end, I recommend that the United States through the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the United Nations institute an investigation into the reports of atrocities and crimes against the individuals who are so unfortunate as to live under Communist rule.

Two recent examples of Communist duplicity and viciousness emphasize the need for an investigation of this type.

In June of this year the entire world was shocked and revulsed upon learning of the execution of Imre Nagy and other leaders of the Hungarian revolt against the Russians in 1956. What, in the eyes of the Communists, was the unforgivable crime? Following the initial success of the revolt, Imre Nagy widened his government to include non-Communists, promised free elections, declared Hungary a neutral state, repudiated the Warsaw pact with Moscow, and placed Hungary under the protection of the United Nations. The Communists, knowing that their system of government cannot exist in the bright light of freedom and truth, hold those principles to be crimes. Congress has adopted a resolution urging that the President and United States delegate to the United Nations seek adoption of the report of the Committee on the Hungarian Revolution and work for measures to bring about freedom of captive nations, and I believe that the investigation I am proposing would carry out the intent of Congress as set forth in the resolution.

Let us provide a forum for such people as Father Cyril Wagner, a priest of the Franciscan order, who after long imprisonment by the Chinese Reds, recently arrived in this country. Upon arrival Father Wagner said that for 5 years he and other Catholic priests were not allowed to talk or even move their lips. The Reds charged they repeated rumors that Chinese Catholics were punished because they associated with Americans.

But I know they shot one Chinese priest who was over 70 years old—

He said.

The Reds turned our churches into courthouses and beat five people to death. So much for the rumors. I want them to know over there I am telling about it now.

I believe all those who have suffered at the hands of the Communists should be given an opportunity to tell the actual story of life under Communist rule, so that the lies and half-truths of the Communist propaganda machine will be shown in their true light and the cause of freedom will be served. If we do this, and expose the evils of communism, we will, I am sure, gain the support and gratitude of all freedom-loving people in the world.

The National Wool Act Is Essential To Survival of Sheep and Wool Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, those who have opposed a Government subsidy or a Government purchase program instead of tariff protection and a free market and free enterprise system in this country have argued that it is unsafe and unstable and too much of a risk for those engaged in the subsidy business because the value of their property and their business is dependent upon the will of Congress.

Proof of this is being demonstrated in the Congress today. The National Wool Act which expires early next year is absolutely essential to the survival of the sheep and wool industry unless tariff protection is provided.

The sheep and wool industry cannot survive, it cannot expand, it cannot grow without the extension of the National Wool Act.

If the act is allowed to expire, both the support program for wool, for lamb, and for the wool promotion program will die. This great industry cannot long survive under these conditions. Wool is entirely different from other agricultural commodities because it is in short supply rather than in surplus. We produce domestically only about one-third of the wool we actually use in this country. The wool program was established to support and increase production, not to decrease or control production.

Woolgrowers all over the Nation have placed their wholehearted trust in Congress to maintain an equitable and stable program for wool. Many of these people depend upon their sheep for a large part of their income. The woolgrower has a big investment in animals, special fencing, feed, and equipment. It is not possible for him to go out of the sheep business and switch to another crop without taking a tremendous loss.

The only excuse for not passing this extension of the National Wool Act is a political excuse. The law is effective, it is functioning extremely well.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a most glaring example of what can happen and what will happen when a great industry is forced to depend upon political whims

and when it is forced to depend upon the will of Congress.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Are we of the 85th Congress going to crucify the sheep and wool industry and the sheep and woolmen of America on the cross of petty politics?

Better Health Care Due for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the growing awareness that the unmet needs of our middle-aged and elderly pose serious and economic problems was attested to by the amount of testimony presented to the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of proposals to write health insurance into the Social Security Act.

The older we get, the more medical care we need—and the less the income with which to pay for it.

There are about 15 million Americans past the age of 65. It is estimated that by 1975, that number will rise to 22½ million. On the average, these people use more than double the amount of hospitalization required by the whole population. Their needs for other medical care are likewise greater. Most of them are living on small, fixed incomes. Only about one-third of them are covered by any kind of health insurance. Most companies do not sell individual health insurance to persons past 60. If they do, the premiums are very high and the benefits comparatively low. Some companies, which do continue policies on persons past the age of 65, chop the benefits when they are needed most.

Some of these older people get charitable or public care. Others neglect illness, at a greater cost later on. Others pay for needed medical care by sacrificing other essentials of healthful living—for example, they cut down on their food.

The mounting number of older persons being admitted to mental hospitals is one evidence of the effects of worry and lack of medical care. An expert in the field says many elderly persons are beset by fears of becoming ill, and not being able to pay for medical care.

Enactment of Congressman FOGARTY's H. R. 9822, to provide for a White House Conference on the Problems of the Aging, which cleared the House today, will point up these and other problems and develop solutions.

The current issue of Montana Health, bimonthly publication of the Public Health League of Montana, carries an excellent article on the subject by Dr. Thomas L. Hawkins, of Helena, liaison representative of the Montana Medical Association to the American Medical Association.

In that article, Dr. Hawkins, speaking for those charged with the guardianship of the Nation's health, accepts the challenge of providing better health for our older citizens.

I know my colleagues will be interested in Dr. Hawkins' excellent article on the purposes of the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. The article follows:

BETTER HEALTH CARE DUE FOR THE AGED

(By Thomas L. Hawkins, M. D.)

Because of recent advances in the control of diseases which shorten life, a greater number of Americans than ever before have survived into the retirement years.

There is no valid reason why old age should not be the best years of human existence. Instead, we find today that millions of our aged are being shelved as a surplus commodity. Their experience, wisdom, and know-how are a vast national resource which has largely gone to waste. Lack of meaningful activity has led to emotional frustration and physical breakdown. This crowds our hospitals and swells the cost of public and private support. Millions of our senior citizens have become burdens on themselves, on their families, and on the population as a whole.

While the medical sciences were busily concentrating on the more urgent problems of infectious diseases among the young and middle aged, the problem of our older citizens and their chronic illnesses has burgeoned in our midst. Today, it poses serious social and economic problems.

Since improved medical and hsopital care has increased life expectancy, those of us in the field of health care must accept the primary responsibility for enriching the lives of those people whom we have enabled to live longer.

While the population of our Nation has about doubled in the last quarter century, the number of senior citizens has increased fourfold, and may quadruple again in 25 years. The average man of 65 now has a 50–50 chance of reaching age 80; the average woman of 65 will survive to age 85. By 1975, 1 in 10 Americans will be 65 or over. Instead of 15 million citizens over 65 as today, we can expect an estimated 22.5 million.

Better health for this large segment of our population is a major challenge to those who have been charged with the guardianship of the Nation's health. We accept that challenge. We know that we possess the knowledge, the facilities, and the will to make a better, more healthful life possible for our 15 million citizens over 65.

For this purpose, the hospital administrators of America, the nursing home administrators and proprietors, the dentists and the physicians, through their respective associations, have pooled all their vast body of knowledge, talent and resources to form the Joint Council to Improve the Health Care of the Aged.

Through the council all of the organizations which speak with experience and authority in providing health services will combine their research and best ideas in the field. Behind this council is the full weight of the people who have the most intimate knowledge of the problem, through a lifetime of work and the availability of millions of cases for comparative study—the American Dental Association, American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, and American Nursing Home Association.

The joint council will work to bring into being more medical facilities with costs tailored to the limited means of the aged. It will counsel with the insurance industry and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield to make more and better health-insurance coverage available to oldsters. And it will be the clearing house for the research necessary to find solutions to the medical problems of aged persons and the aging process.

The council has adopted a broad program. Its primary goal must be to eliminate the handicaps that attend the elderly. Its efforts are aimed at bringing about a healthy, dignified, and useful old age for our senior population.

The joint council will depend heavily on local action, on community service agencies, and on the individual for its success. We need first to explore ways to bring better health care to our aged who are ill. Visiting nurse, homemaker, and home-care services at the community level are vitally needed so that the chronically ill aged can be properly cared for in surroundings best suited to their care—at home or in facilities near home and loved ones.

Second, we need to revise our thinking about the aged, whom a fast-paced and youth-oriented society has prematurely handed the rocking chair. The prevalence of this attitude, and the ill-considered acceptance of compulsory retirement during the productive years, probably are the chief underlying factors in a majority of the disabling illnesses of our senior citizens.

The joint council and its members have adopted a positive, optimistic approach to the problem. We refuse to accept the disabilities of senescence as inevitable and unavoidable.

We feel we should offer the aged hope for a better life, not a crutch. We should offer them a return to their rightful position in the family and the community. We should offer them a return to usefulness and self-respect, not a one-way trip to isolation and limbo.

The United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security has a number of studies which show that older people can maintain production standards, can meet physical requirements, and are often more efficient than the average younger worker.

We are beginning to learn that there is rarely such a thing as true senility—that senility is a condition of the mind and body that follows rejection by the family and community, loss of interest in daily activities and lack of specific motivation—such as a job, however small. When a person loses his job through an arbitrary retirement policy, he often enters a period when his life situation contributes to poor health, and eventually senility and total dependence on his family, his community, and the entire Nation. We can no longer afford, for the economic and physical welfare of our Nation, to follow the patterns of the past by shelving our aged.

Medical investigators have been tirelessly exploring the fundamental problems of the biology of aging. Thanks to some of their recent findings, the day is close at hand when physical and mental deterioration will no longer accompany the aging process. The joint council pledges its best efforts to spread knowledge, at the community level, of the known preventive measures that slow the aging process, of the beneficial use of regular exercise, proper diet, and periodic examinations to forestall serious illness. A greater emphasis on preventive medicine can do as much for the aging as it has done for the younger element in our society.

Reducing the cost of health care for the elderly is one of the major aims of the joint council. This has been done in some areas through concerted community effort, and it can be done elsewhere. We know, for example, that in various communities, successful efforts have been made to (1) shorten hospital stays for the elderly, (2) lower costs for the aged who require prolonged health care, and (3) bring the working potential of many retired people back into the community mainstream.

We now propose to study these experiments, among a great many others, so that we can benefit by the best of them and encourage other communities to take similar action.

Our past experience has taught us that more hospitalization for more aged people may not be the solution. There are many people in our general hospitals today who would be far better off, at one-third to one-half the cost, in nursing homes, domiciliary homes, or in their own homes, if community home care programs were available that were tailored to their needs.

In fact, it is probable that most aged patients could be cared for best at home during much of their illness, and would prefer care in that setting, under the supervision of their personal physician. In spite of this, there has been a marked lack of community planning in this direction.

Khrushchev at the U. N.—Propaganda Circus or Constructive Conference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the imminent visit of Prime Minister Khrushchev of the U. S. S. R., to the United Nations headquarters in New York to participate in a meeting of the Security Council for the principal purpose of easing Middle East tensions, has everybody in a quandary.

As a guest, he deserves every protection and courtesy. At the same time, he must expect that, in a free country people have a right to express their opinions, and we know that many of them will not be flattering to Nikita, because of the blood bath he engineered in Hungary, among his many other acts of political terrorism.

We know that he is in a hurry to exploit every propaganda advantage out of this forum, but there is also the possibility that his efforts will backfire. In any event, there is suspense. The Pilot, which speaks for the archdiocese of Boston, Mass., balances these and other unknown consequences that may flow from this summit meeting within the U. N. I call your attention to the editorial on this subject from the July 26, 1958, issue of the Pilot, under unanimous consent to reprint it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RED VISITOR

The possibility of an American visit by Khrushchev has already started a buzz of excitement on nearly every level of American life. In a sense, the Premier is not visiting the United States at all but merely the United Nations headquarters which happens to be in New York City. All the same, Americans will get their first view of the strange, harsh, changeable dictator who on one day approves the murder of Imre Nagy and on the next pinches playfully the cheeks of little children.

Between now and the time of his arrival we will be treated to many lectures, official and unofficial, on the appropriate manner of receiving the Premier and on our responsibilities in his regard. It is possible surely to distinguish between Khrushchev the Premier of the U. S. S. R. and Khrushchev the Communist Party boss. In the first capacity he is a head of a state which is recognized as a friendly power, in the second he is an international manipulator and conspirator, as well as a dictator with hands bathed in blood. It is possible for Americans, even when they make this distinction in their minds, to reflect it in their actions during his presence in this country?

On this point we must recall that Khrushchev is visiting America for the first time and we may hope that his personal view of the world's greatest democracy might have some effect on his attitudes and might even change notions long ingrained in his mind. There will be of course no immediate about-face—this is too much to hope, but we may be fortunate enough to provide certain new insights which could bring light into dark areas of the Premier's mentality. Any American mistakes in his regard, on the other hand, will only serve to bolster prejudices already held and will be magnificient propaganda for the Soviet machine. In this sense the American public—not to mention the officials of Government—is somewhat on the spot.

It would be effective if American etiquette during the Premier's visit were scrupulously polite—is not this required when even the greatest of barbarians is here at our request and so a guest in the country? But what of protests? What of all those who have felt the Khrushchev wickedness and whose families and friends still suffer under his bitter yoke? Surely these can appropriately express themselves. Violent demonstrations which would tax police efforts and embarrass our national hospitality would doubtless be out of place, but it would be an infringement on American liberty to suppress all demonstrations or make it appear that such expressions have been forcefully prohibited.

No one knows, of course, how much will be accomplished at this summit meeting, or, at this writing, indeed if the conditions set down by the Soviet will be met. It can be a portentous council which may set the direction of the history of many years to come and it may strengthen the U. N. in a manner that could not have been hoped for earlier. All of this will become clearer as the meeting itself comes into closer focus. It would be a great pity on the international scene if American intemperance toward Khrushchev (or indeed toward Nasser or any other visitor) marred the proceedings and distracted world attention from the large realities which will be discussed there.

We have time now to think over seriously the implications of the forthcoming meeting and we should do so with mature reflection and a consideration of all the issues involved. Our first thoughts may not be the best ones and our earliest reactions not the most prudent. War and peace, survival and destruction may be riding in this caravan and we must prepare its path with a care that matches the value of its burden. This is no easy task.

Should the Power To Tax Include the Right To Censor Advertising?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has promulgated rules barring tax deductions either for political contributions or for lobbying purposes.

This is an entirely proper function of the Internal Revenue Service. However, they must be administered impartially.

Frequently we find private enterprise is prevented from using its tax-free funds to present its story so that it can continue to exist and pay taxes to the Federal Treasury. I am disturbed when I see that no comparable effort is exerted to curb the flagrant use of tax-free funds by unions and many foundations who are constantly advancing positions on legislative issues.

This problem has been highlighted by the decision of the Internal Revenue Service with respect to advertising by the group of public utility companies which call themselves America's Independent Light and Power Companies. Recently the issue was well expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this provocative editorial:

SHOULD THE POWER TO TAX INCLUDE THE RIGHT TO CENSOR ADVERTISING?

Few taxpayers know the extent of the authority that has been conferred on the Internal Revenue Service and even less of the added authority which that bureau has assumed for itself by means of administrative rulings and regulations which Congress probably never thought of.

For example, it is hard to believe that the Nation's lawmakers meant to give tax collectors the right to decide that American business or industry should be penalized for stating its case and defending its right to exist, in the face of Government sponsored competition, by means of paid advertisements. But that is what the tax authorities are doing, acting under a new interpretation of one of their own regulations, which declares that money spent on advertising "for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation or for the development or exploitation of propaganda" cannot be considered "ordinary and reasonable expenses" deductible for tax purposes.

The victims of the most recent interpretation of this ruling are a group of public-utility companies which call themselves America's Independent Light and Power Companies. These companies have for many years sponsored "institutional advertisements"—mostly in magazines, including the Saturday Evening Post—which promote the wider use of electric power and occasionally indicate a preference for investor-owned utility companies as against Government owned plants supported by the taxpayers. Most of the advertisements indicate in some way the advantage of being served by an independent power company. If this is propaganda, it certainly represents an attitude acceptable to some millions of Americans.

Nevertheless, the companies participating in this advertising campaign are being informed that they may not deduct its cost from their taxable incomes. As Senator ESTES KEFAUVER put it, "They can continue to propagandize as much as they want in their advertisements. * * * They can no longer charge the taxpayers and the ratepayers for their own brainwashing."

Of course this does not mean that the taxpayers will be relieved of the cost of being brainwashed by TVA and public power generally. Inasmuch as public power pays little in taxes and indeed is supported out of taxes, deductibility is a small matter. The net of the IRS's ruling is that the private-utility industry, already forced to meet tax favoritism and vast public appropriations for public power, must jump over another hurdle.

Supposing that all the advertisements in the series dealt with the public-power issue, it is difficult to equate them wih an effort to influence legislation, or to lobby or, if propaganda is the charge, to do more than defend what has long been considered the normal way for Americans to do business. Surely if an electric power company may engage in propaganda against competitors who sell gas, or coal, or atomic energy; it ought not to be penalized for defending itself against competition which threatens its ability to stay in business at all.

This editorial will arouse the ire of public-power advocates who will be quick to point out that the Saturday Evening Post has a financial interest in the matter. This is true, although the amount received by the Post from these advertisements constitutes much too small an interest to justify courting the lambasting we shall probably get for intervening in the controversy.

But the principle involved requires a frank statement of what such rulings can mean to freedom, not merely for public-utility advertising, or even advertising in general, but for freedom to express any views which tax bureaucrats—perhaps stimulated by political demagogues—decide to penalize.

This is the crux of the situation. We have tax authorities, who are assumed to be raising money for public needs, undertaking to dictate to individuals and corporations how they shall carry on their businesses.

Nor is this threat confined to public-utility companies. Other types of business live in jeopardy from the same ukase, including one company which undertook to explain its side of a threatened strike by means of newspaper advertisements.

Like many other aspects of the income-tax law, this effort to censor free expression calls for clarification by Congress. If the people think American corporations and individuals require governmental supervision of the way they state their case in open advertisements, the way to accomplish that dubious objective is to pass a law—not to pass the buck to the Internal Revenue Service.

Constituents Ask for Liberalization of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, many people in my State of South Dakota have written me expressing their concern over pending legislation to liberalize the old-age and survivors insurance program. With considerable justification, they question the wisdom of making any changes at this time, and point out that Congress, in adopting the 1956 social-security amendments, provided for the creation of an Advisory Council to study the entire program and report back to Congress by January 1, 1959.

My constituents have raised some important questions. They ask, "Does it not seem a little premature for Congress to consider an increase without first considering the report of the Advisory Council?" Others inquire, "Does it not seem the social-security program is being made a political football, with election-year increases that could threaten the stability of the entire program?"

Typical of the letters I have received is one from Lloyd L. Harden, secretary-treasurer of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., District Life Underwriters Association. His letter is in part as follows:

Perhaps it would appear that we would be concerned for selfish reasons. This is perhaps true, since the stability of OASI, which is a vital part of any well-planned life insurance program, appears to be in danger. Thus, any life insurance program which uses social-security benefits as a foundation, whether it be benefits to a widow and children, or retirement for an old couple, is also subject to the stability or instability of OASI.

Under the present deficit program of OASI, the counsel of an underwriter is in jeopardy each time he must commit himself in planning an income program made up of both OASI benefits and life insurance benefits, since he is more aware of the current economic condition of OASI than the general public. Yet he is almost forced to combine these benefits because of their similarity in the welfare of every family.

If you do make a conscientious study, there is no doubt in our mind that you will understand why life underwriters are deeply concerned over any election-year giveaways via OASI, until the present program can be made financially sound. We simply cannot afford to jeopardize the financial security of American families, for a few votes.

Where We Stand Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 25, 1958:

WHERE WE STAND NOW
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—This is a moment when it is important to know just where we stand now; and for this purpose, it is essential to note the great gap at the very center of the picture. We have troops in Lebanon. The British have troops in Jordan. But the United States and Britain do not have a Middle Eastern policy.

That is the only way to sum up the unhappy results of widespread inquiry in authoritative quarters. You cannot get an answer to the question: "Where do we go from here?" or rather, you only get vaguely mumbled prayers that somehow or other, some day or other, the combination of the Marines and special Ambassador Robert Murphy will achieve a political compromise in Beirut.

A good many people seem to believe that this is a workable Middle Eastern policy, fit to compete with the cruelly shrewd, arrogantly bold policy of Nikita Khrushchev. But this widespread belief is only a testimonial to the administration's success in blurring or concealing all the facts that count.

It is hard to believe that President Eisenhower purposely misled the congressional leaders, at the July 14 meeting when he first revealed his intention to send troops into Lebanon. A President who leaves the entire day-to-day task of policy-making to his Secretary of State can quite easily misconceive the choice he has to make, when he must suddenly make a very hard choice with great speed. At any rate, the misrepresentation of the Middle Eastern situation was begun by the President himself, at this first moment of disclosure.

Three different kinds of false impression were conveyed to the Congressional leaders. The President first of all said that he had received an "ultimatum" from President Chamoun, threatening the effective abdication of the Lebanese Government if the Marines were not sent "within 48 hours."

In reality, President Eisenhower had long since promised President Chamoun to send troops to Lebanon, if the Lebanese Government desired him to do so. Now Chamoun had simply requested Eisenhower to keep his freely given promise. He had also warned that the seismic shock of the coup d'etat in Baghdad would quickly destroy the government in Beirut, unless the American promise were quickly kept. Being on the naked brink of immediate defeat, he had asked for the American answer within 2 days. This was the Chamoun ultimatum.

Secondly, both the President and Secretary of State briskly threw Allen Dulles to the wolves, by intimating that they had been taken by surprise by the coup in Iraq. Hence the Senate is now busily investigating the CIA.

But in reality the President and Secretary of State had long been warned that indecision about Lebanon would lead to a coup in Iraq. The warnings had come, not only from the CIA, but also from the murdered Iraqi leader, Nuri Pasha, from the Governments of Pakistan, Iran, and Turkey, and from many other sources. All the CIA failed to do was to say: "On this particular day, in this particular regiment, a military coup will be organized." This was the extent of the surprise, and this much surprise all governments must expect.

Finally, and perhaps worst of all, the President also indicated to the congressional leaders that the American problem centered in Lebanon, rather than in Iraq. It was true, of course, that he had to make an immediate choice between keeping his promise to Chamoun or dishonoring this country's word. That was the first part of the problem, which could only be solved as it was solved.

But the heart of the problem lay, and it still lies in Baghdad rather than in Beirut.

The British and American Governments jointly decided not to attack the heart of the problem in Baghdad. The consequences of this decision must be faced, therefore, before the two Governments can fill the great gap in the center of the picture, which is their present lack of any real Middle Eastern policy.

The first consequence concerns Lebanon and Jordan. No matter what compromise is reached in Beirut (and a successful compromise seems unlikely) it can only afford a pretext for the withdrawal of our troops. After Nasser's triumph in Iraq, no government in Lebanon can survive his pressure, once the marines go out. By the same token, King Hussein cannot survive in Jordan, if the British paratroops depart. And Saudi Arabia and the gulf coast sheikhdoms are also sitting birds for the next conspiracy Nasser chooses to hatch.

In these circumstances, only three courses of action deserve the name of a Middle Eastern policy. We can defy Khrushchev and deal sternly with Nasser himself. Or we can defy world opinion, and get ready to hang on by our toenails to the oil in the fairly easily defensible Persian Gulf area. Or we can take the bold and painful measures inside the Western alliance, which may protect the West against the worst effects of Nasser-nationalism's onward march. Those are the choices. Take your pick.

The 4–H Clubs of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials commenting on some recent statements of Mr. August Scholle, president of the Michigan AFL–CIO. Mr. Scholle has never hesitated to call any organization with which he disagrees, an organ of the Republican Party. Mr. Scholle is entitled to his opinions. However, it is difficult to understand how he formed this latest opinion. He has now accused the 4–H Clubs of Michigan of being an organ of the Republican Party. This charge is as absurd as it is untrue. It is my feeling that Mr. Scholle owes the farm youth of Michigan and their leaders an apology.

[From Clinton County, Mich., paper of July 17, 1958]

GUS SCHOLLE IS OFF BASE WITH HIS 4–H COMMENTS

Gus Scholle, the fiery labor zealot who is president of the Michigan AFL–CIO, wandered far off the reservation last week when he branded the 4–H Club program in Michigan as a "brainwashing" setup for youngsters sponsored by such rascals as members of the State and county extension services, the Farm Bureau, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Scholle links the 4–H program to political education—Republican Party political education. He says that 4–H youths are indoctrinated with Republican philosophy through the Farm Bureau.

This is just plain hogwash, and a well-informed guy like Scholle knows it.

If 4–H members are generally Republican in their views, it is largely because their parents think that way.

Kids brought up on the farm are usually members of a close-knit family circle. They hear politics discussed and form their own opinions, just as the children of Scholle's union members do.

We won't dignify Scholle's statements by further comment. How silly can you get, Gus?

[From the Gratiot County Herald (Ithaca, Mich.) of July 17, 1958]

BRAIN IMPROVEMENT, NOT BRAINWASHING, CARRIED ON BY GRATIOT 4–H LEADERS

Labor leaders in this country have been able to hoodwink thousands of their union members into doing their beck and call. They have used the workingman as a pawn with Walter Reuther and his cohorts calling the play. Jumping the rope so often whenever these leaders have spoken is slowly sapping out all the individuality from the rank and file members, leaving a vast majority of them with no personality of their own.

A snag might have been struck this week, however, when August (Gus) Scholle, president of the Michigan AFL–CIO started on the warpath against the 4–H youth program of this State. Claiming that they are dominated by political forces which he terms as "satellites," he hopes to disturb their orbits with verbal and written rockets until he either brings them under his control or crushes them altogether.

Scholle says, in effect, that they are being brainwashed against unions.

The 4–H program, he declares, is a satellite of the Farm Bureau. And, he adds, the Farm Bureau is a satellite of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Then, with extreme anguish he charges that the brainwashing is being done with taxpayers' money because the 4–H program is supported by taxes. Taxes pay for county agents who supervise the program. A State headquarters also is maintained at Michigan State University.

He links the 4–H program to political education—Republican Party political education.

The 4–H youngsters are indoctrinated through the Farm Bureau, says Scholle.

"The Farm Bureaus are political organizations. I think the primary function of Farm Bureau ever since its inception has been to aid the Republican Party," Scholle declares.

His charges immediately brought forth emphatic denials from both the Farm Bureau head and from Michigan State University officials.

Jack F. Yaeger, head of the Michigan Farm Bureau, calls Scholle's arguments ridiculous.

Yaeger declares "this absolutely isn't so." As far as 4–H clubs are concerned, they are a function of Michigan State University's cooperative extension service.

"We don't run Michigan State University and it doesn't run the Farm Bureau," says Yaeger.

The Farm Bureau leader, who has his offices in Lansing, says that his members have no interest in 4–H other than that which parents have in any of their sons' and daughters' activities.

"We are no more interested in 4–H than we are in Boy or Girl Scouts, and only as parents," Yaeger declares.

Yaeger also pointed out that in recent years 4–H clubs have expanded into the larger cities such as Detroit, heart of the union movement in Michigan.

D. B. (Woody) Varner, vice president of Michigan State University in charge of extension activities, also disagrees with the labor leader, pointing out where his accusations are just not true. Varner said, "The Farm Bureau has no connection with MSU cooperative extension other than the same help which the university offers all farm groups."

The Michigan Grange and the Michigan Farmers Union receive exactly the same treatment which the Farm Bureau receives, says Varner.

Varner says nothing presented to 4–H groups has political implications. "Oh, I suppose if you were looking for it you could find political meaning in almost anything that's said," he added, "but it's certainly not meant to be there."

Varner added that he never before had heard of any charges like Scholle's. "This is the first time I have ever heard that the 4–H program is politically oriented."

If Gus Scholle is really interested in the youth of America and wants to find out how wrong he is about its leaders he might come to Gratiot County and study the 4–H program. He will find that the leaders of these farm youths are coming from every walk of life, from both political parties, and from many religious faiths. Yes; he will even find many shop workers among them and members of his own union.

They are a cross-section of young adults and older men and women with a common interest—the youth of Gratiot County. They have no ax to grind, they are fostering no political party and no farm organization.

Perhaps, Mr. Scholle, you have been mixed up in fighting management for so long that your eyes have become blurred and your mind a bit foggy. A trip into Gratiot County where you can come into contact with people interested in giving service, for the good that it might do others rather than selfish personal gain, would clear your mind and erase some of the suspicion and mistrust.

For the past year we have been carrying a series of articles on the 4–H leaders of Gratiot County. We think we have become pretty well acquainted with their thoughts and ideas about the 4–H youth and their responsibilities in helping to train them.

They are not carrying on a "brainwashing" program but a brain-improvement program and one which the people of this county, regardless of their political affiliations, are proud of.

Proceedings Following a Luncheon Given by the National Historical Publications Commission in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, United States Capitol, June 17, 1958, the Honorable Franklin Floete, Administrator of General Services, Presiding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the luncheon given by the National Historical Publications Commission on June 17, in which a most distinguished list of guests participated.

Many members of the Supreme Court, the Senate, and House of Representatives in their presence indicated their interest with the work of the National Historical Publications Commission and its accomplishments.

The highly respected Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Hon. Earl Warren, and the lovable and distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN of Texas, were present.

I am privileged to make the proceedings following the luncheon part of these remarks:

PROCEEDINGS FOLLOWING A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION IN THE OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, JUNE 17, 1958, THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN FLOETE, ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, PRESIDING

Mr. FLOETE. Chief Justice Warren, Speaker Rayburn, Justice Frankfurter, members of the commission, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, may I extend personally on behalf of General Services Administration a most cordial welcome.

This luncheon and the conference are being held in honor of the sponsors, patrons, and editors working with the commission. When I was talking to Dr. Grover last week about what possible qualifications I had for addressing or presiding at so distinguished a meeting as this, he admitted he had no idea. "Since they are historians," I said, "maybe if I told them that a long time ago I had been a student of Prof. Frederick

Jackson Turner, that would explain my presence." He alleged that that was very good, but maybe not enough. So then I told him I had had the great pleasure of going to a tea at Professor Turner's house with his very delightful daughter. "Well," he said, "that fully qualifies you."

We in GSA are very grateful for the fact that we are participating in the splendid work of this historical commission. We fully support its activities and are very proud and happy that we are charged with the responsibility of preserving the important historical documents of our Government and of making them available for purposes such as this. We know that the support this commission's program has is very widespread. It has the strong support of the President, the Congress, and countless Americans in all walks of life. Its progress has been notably fast, far beyond what was expected at the time the commission was first organized. This sympathetic approach has been largely responsible for this progress.

I would like to digress a moment, for I feel that it is appropriate to do so. I am sure you have all been inspired when, in going to the great hall of Archives, you have been able to see our charters of freedom—the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. That opportunity, however, does not extend to the millions of Americans who do not come to Washington. Therefore, we thought it would be very appropriate if we installed in each of the new Federal office buildings we are building throughout the land a dignified type of case to display facsimiles of these three precious documents. We feel this will do much to make it possible for many, many more Americans to see these basic papers.

The purpose of the commission's program is to assemble, edit, and publish the important historical documents and papers of our Government and the writings and works of prominent Americans who have participated in public life. Its objective is to make these papers readily available to historians and the public generally, thus resulting in a broad comprehension of the basic philosophies and principles of our Government. Such comprehension is particularly important at this time when the United States has the difficult role as leader of the free world, of endeavoring to resolve the serious issues of peace and freedom. For this reason we are most grateful to all of those who have participated in this work, the editors, the sponsors, and all of the other organizations that are a part of it. You all deserve great credit.

It is impossible for me to introduce all of the distinguished people who are in this meeting. Therefore, I will confine myself to those at this table. First, I would like to introduce the editors who are the spearhead of this important work. Will you please rise as I call your name?

Dr. Julian Boyd, editor of the Jefferson Papers.

Dr. Lyman Butterfield, editor of the Adams Family Papers.

Dr. Leonard Labaree, editor of the Franklin Papers.

Dr. Harold Syrett, editor of the Hamilton Papers.

Dr. William Hutchinson, coeditor of the Madison Papers.

I am happy at this time to announce the start of a new project in this series—a project to publish a documentary history of the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, under the editorship of Dr. Robert Cushman. Dr. Cushman, who retired from the political science department of Cornell University in 1957, brings to his editorial position an exceptional knowledge and understanding of the Federal Constitution acquired over more than 40 years of study, teaching, and writing. His Leading Constitutional Decisions is considered a basic work in its field. He served as advisory editor of Cornell University's Studies in Civil Liberties from 1943 to his retirement. He was president of the American Political Science Association in 1943, and was a member of the board of editors of the American Political Science Review from 1923 to 1948. Dr. Robert Cushman.

Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter was one of the earliest members of this commission, and has given without stint to its many accomplishments. He has given of his energy and his brilliancy and has played a very important part in this program. Justice Frankfurter.

We would like to convey our very sincere thanks to the many organizations that have made this work possible, and these I will name: the Massachusetts Historical Society, the American Catholic Historical Association, the American Philosophical Society, the Tennessee Historical Commission, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the South Carolinian Society, Clemson College, and the Universities of South Carolina, Kentucky, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, Chicago and Virginia. Likewise the success of this program would hardly have been possible without generous gifts from donors. The sponsors actually rely, must rely, on gifts of this nature. Among these very public-minded organizations who have made such contributions are: The Old Dominion Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, Inc., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Time, Inc., and the New York Times. The commission is deeply indebted to each of these.

We are most fortunate today to have with us a representative of one of the great branches of our Government. This man has served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any man in our Nation's history. When Mr. RAYBURN first came to Congress, he was going home to Bonham, Tex., one day. On the train was Champ Clark, then Speaker of the House. Mr. Clark said to Mr. RAYBURN, "Young man, you can be a leader in these United States." Mr. RAYBURN asked how he might accomplish this high purpose, and Mr. Clark said, "I will give you a list of books to read." Whereupon he gave him the list, which included the biographies of all of the prominent people in public life at that time. Mr. RAYBURN had read some of these books, but he proceeded to read them again and reread them, until he became firmly familiar with them. It is said that he carried that list in his wallet for more than 30 years. I think this illustrates Mr. RAYBURN's basic philosophy—that essentially the development of organizations in the Government are based on humanistic factors and that actually the record of the accomplishments of our Government are, in effect, a study and a record of the people. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Floete, Mr. Chief Justice, members of the commission, and your guests here today, a while ago I looked over there and I saw a thing that looked like a television outfit, and I said, "They can't do that." Then somebody said, "This is the Senate end of the Capitol," and I said "Oh." So I had to give up, much to my regret.

I have lots of fun going about over the country to various places. I can walk into any hotel lobby in the country with my hat on and nobody recognizes me. But if I take it off, they say "I saw you at the convention."

I am happy to be here with you folks today and to say to you what a great work I think you are doing. George Miller of the House and Mr. Grover of the Archives, have kept me pretty well briefed upon what you are doing.

Now, about United States history and its founders and their writings. I am visited in my office by thousands of schoolchildren every year. I always tell them that they are smarter than I was because they have a better opportunity to be smart than I had. It is a long cry from the one-room country school down in Texas with a teacher with about a second grade certificate to the teachers they have now, the buildings that have been built for them, and the instruments inside of them, to demonstrate to them what their teachers are trying to make them understand. And I tell these children that they should study United States history and government in the grade school, in the high school, in college, and in university, and then the rest of their lives. I have been doing that all of my life, and I am frank to say to you that I feel like I have just touched the fringes of those great fundamentals and the great writings of the men who made this country great. And for you to preserve these things for the generations that are to come, with all of the explanations that you can get together for the actions of the early Congresses, is to me a work that is monumental and will serve this country and its citizenship and the citizens of the world, for that matter, for ages to come.

Nobody can know too much about the formation of this Union. To me it is most interesting that 59 men, most of them young men, by the way, gave us our Constitution. There was only one real old man in the Constitutional Convention, and that was Benjamin Franklin at 81. George Washington, full of his honors, who had led a life that seemed long, was only 55. James Madison, who wrote more of the Constitution than any other man, and who went to the Convention having read every constitution that had ever been written, so they tell me in history, was only 36 years of age. Alexander Hamilton was only 30, Pinckney of South Carolina came to the Convention a young man of 29 years of age, with a completed proposal for a constitution in his pocket. And to think that those people went into a room and locked themselves up. How much hell would be raised today if anybody, anywhere—even a committee of Congress—went off and locked themselves up and said we are not going to let anybody in here until we bring this bill out. But they locked themselves up, and in 4 short months they brought forth this document.

Now there are some people, when something is done by the Court, or by Congress, that they don't like, who say we have changed the form of government, that we are going to the bow-wows, and all this, that, and the other. In all of the amendments that have been adopted to the Constitution of the United States, not one of them touches the fundamental purpose that those people had in mind when they brought forth this Constitution, and that was to have a representative form of government. It was then, it has been, and it is now. Everybody in the United States has an opportunity to change their Representatives in the House of Representatives every 2 years, the Senators each 6 years, and their President every 4 years. You could not be freer than that. There couldn't be a more representative government in the world than that.

So I congratulate you on the wonderful work you are doing. In saying this, I stand with George Miller over there, who is a great historian, and Wayne Grover. And I could not leave out Karl Trever, because I have one of the greatest libraries in the world down in my home town of Bonham, and Karl Trever came down—Wayne Grover loaned him to me—and stayed 3 months, to set that library up. It has as complete a historical background of America in it as any library you can find, because I have all of the published records of the Congresses from 1789 down to now, and then I have the lives and the writings of everybody in those days who made this country great, and the lives and the writings of those who have helped to keep it great. So I congratulate you, I am

glad you are here. You are doing a great work, and from a grateful heart, I thank you.

Mr. FLOETE. We sit today in a room that is hallowed by the great events in our Nation's history which have transpired here. This room was occupied by the Senate from 1800 to 1860. During that period, the Louisiana Purchase Treaty was ratified in this room; the treaties ending the War of 1812 and the Mexican War were ratified here. Webster, Calhoun, and Clay debated and talked here; and Clay and Calhoun were buried from this room. From 1860 to 1935 the room was occupied by the Supreme Court. Many of its important decisions were rendered from this room. The framework and foundations of our form of government were continued and strengthened from such decisions; and as we look back upon it the names of these illustrious Chief Justices come immediately to our minds: Taney, Chase, Waite, Fuller, White, Taft, and Hughes. Under them the judicial branch of the Government continued to be strong and independent, and under them the basic concept of the separation of powers was further established. It continues to do so under the inspired guidance of the present Chief Justice of the United States, whose record of selfless public service is known to all of us—the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren:

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Mr. Floete, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, members of the Commission, distinguished editors of the historical projects, and ladies and gentlemen, it is always a thrilling experience for me to be in this room. I like to come here at times and sit on the side of the room and conjure about the things that have occurred here in days gone by. But this happens to be the second time that I have ever raised my voice in it in other than a conversational tone. So this is really a thrilling experience for me. The first time was about 28 years ago, when I was admitted to the Supreme Court of the United States and argued my first case before it. At that time the revered Oliver Wendell Holmes was on this Bench. I argued my case—I think it was the last case on Friday afternoon—and the next Monday morning, I am told, he laconically remarked to his secretary, "I won't be here tomorrow." When I got home, the word of the retirement of Mr. Justice Holmes had preceded me, and my associates met me with this kind of a greeting: "Now see what you have done. You have driven that dear old soul off the Supreme Court. For 50 years, 30 years of it on the bench of Massachusetts, 20 years of it here, he has seen all kinds of lawyers. He took one look at you and said, 'I quit.'"

I am glad to be able to participate today in activities designed to make better known to the American people the national program for the publication of historical documents that the National Historical Publications Commission is sponsoring. They have a very vital interest in its success. Two Presidents of the United States and the Congress of the United States have endorsed this program. It deserves our continuing support. The Commission is a relatively new agency on which are represented the three branches of the Government of the United States, and historical and other related organizations outside the Government. I am not a member of the Commission, but we have with us today my distinguished colleague, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who represents the Supreme Court on this Commission, and I think we have a majority of the Court here. There are six members of the Court present, and I think I need not labor the point that it is always a pleasure to have a majority of the Court with me.

The Commission's main purpose, I understand, is not itself to write history but rather to cooperate with and encourage other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions in collecting, preserving, editing, and publishing documentary materials, chiefly in manuscript, that are important for an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States. At its first meeting, a little more than 7 years ago, the Commission recommended strongly the preparation and publication of comprehensive and scholarly editions of the papers of the following 5 leaders in the early period of our national history: John and John Quincy Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison. The Commission had in mind as a model the edition of Thomas Jefferson's papers that was already in progress at Princeton University under the editorship of Julian Boyd, himself a member of the Commission. Within a very few years projects for the publication of the papers of these five men, under distinguished sponsorship and with able editors at their heads, were underway. (George Washington's papers were not included because there had recently been extensive publication of his letters by the Federal Government). The number of projects within the broad framework of the Commission's program has increased steadily over the past few years, as you may note by reference to the program before you.

To the extent that the program is now in operation it represents participation by the Federal Government, State governments, colleges and universities, historical societies and other learned institutions, foundations, business organizations and individuals in what may be looked upon as a common enterprise but operating with each project in the nature of an autonomous unit. This is as it should be.

The commission has planned for execution under its direct supervision two very important projects: One, a documentary history of the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and the other, a documentary history of the work of the first United States Congress. It is with respect to the first of these that I wish now chiefly to address my remarks.

It will be noted that the commission has concentrated much of its attention on the papers of great national leaders in the formative period of our Republic. After independence had been won, it was all too clearly evident that the weak government under the Articles of Confederation was inadequate for the infant United States and even more inadequate for the great leader of the free world that this infant was destined to become. A new and stronger government was clearly needed—one that could defend itself against foreign and domestic enemies and provide for the welfare of all its citizens while at the same time assuring the conduct of that government in accordance with the will of the people; reserving to the States certain governmental authority that might most properly be exercised by them, and protecting the individual against violation by either the National Government or the State governments of the basic rights of free men.

Out of recognition of this need grew the demand for a new constitution. After many days of debate and arduous labor and compromise, the Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia hammered out a constitution that it proposed for ratification by the several States. There then followed the great debate on the nature of government, the relationship of citizens to government, and, in particular, the advisability of ratifying or rejecting the proposed constitution. On the outcome of this debate hung the destiny of our country. As the editor of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson has so eloquently said: "We * * * demonstrated to the world the force of an idea in our philosophy of government, and we carried on * * * one of the most elevated public debates on the nature of free institutions that any country has ever produced."

As we all know now, victory went to the advocates of the new Constitution, but the margin of victory was not great. Much of the opposition was based on a belief that certain rights of individuals were inadequately protected. That was remedied when the First Congress proposed amendments and the States ratified 10 that are well known now as the Bill of Rights.

It is important to us and to the world that we know as completely as possible what was done, what was said, and what was thought in the course of that great debate. For information about the framing of the Constitution, we are fortunate to have Dr. Max Farrand's monumental four-volume work on the Records of the Federal Convention of 1787. I am sure it may be found, dog eared from use, in many law offices throughout the country. But for the contest over the ratification of the Constitution by the States and the addition to it of the first 10 amendments there is no comparable work. That is a situation which the commission proposes to remedy.

Information about the ratification exists in many different forms and is widely scattered. Much of it has never been published and much that has been published exists in such few issues of fugitive character that it is exceedingly difficult to find. There are the official records of the Continental Congress, in submitting the proposed Constitution to the States and in taking necessary steps to set up the new Government after the new Constitution had been ratified. There are the official journals and official and unofficial reports of debates of the State conventions that decided whether to ratify or not. There is much information in the many contemporary newspapers that were published from what is now Maine to Georgia and to the Far West that is now Kentucky.

There are many pamphlets resulting from the war of ideas, among them the well-known Federalist Papers, but others of importance, though of lesser note, and numerous broadsides that were used in the attempt to influence voters. There are letters by leaders of the opposing forces that provide information or a record of arguments that were used. There are entries in diaries, sermons, and other discourses that reveal attitudes and actions we need to know about and understand. The commission proposes to print, in some 6 or 8 volumes, all of these sources of information comprehensively and with careful attention to the exactness of reproduction and explanatory annotation. With the generous assistance of the Ford Foundation, the commission expects the publication will be completed within the next 5 years.

These volumes will be of very practical value to the Supreme Court of the United States and to other courts and to members of the bar appearing before the courts in cases involving matters of constitutional law. They will throw light upon what those who ratified the Constitution and the Bill of Rights understood those documents to mean. They will take us back to the climate of opinion and to the vocabulary in which the Founding Fathers thought and spoke. It is frequently necessary for the Supreme Court to take these matters into consideration when making decisions that affect the lives of many people. The need to do this has existed throughout the history of the Court and can perhaps be best illustrated by the case of *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* in 1793. That case involved the interpretation of article III of the Constitution as to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts where a State is a party. There was little information available then, although there is much now on what both the framers and the ratifiers of the Constitution intended. The decision sanctioning

Federal jurisdiction created a furor, and it required the adoption of the 11th amendment to clarify the atmosphere.

In many cases the Supreme Court finds it necessary to take into consideration the history of a particular clause of the Constitution, going back to contemporary sources in an attempt to determine what was meant by the framers and ratifiers who put a particular clause into the Constitution. The President's power to remove executive officers, for example, was involved in the case of *Myers* v. *United States* (1926). These very long opinions, both majority and dissenting, are devoted largely to a discussion of the history of the removal power. This involved extended analysis of what the framers meant by "executive power" in article II and whether it included the power of removal.

The question of separation of the church and state was involved in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, the School Bus case. The central issue in the case was what the framers of the first amendment meant by the term "no law respecting an establishment of religion". There are various ways in which the phrase could be interpreted. Did the framers mean no aid at all to religion, or did they mean no preference of one religion over another? The purpose of the documentary history would be to throw light on such nebulous issues.

This project will have even broader values, of course. It will be of inestimable benefit to students of constitutional history, constitutional law and other aspects of our national development, and the understanding that these persons obtain from their use of the records at first hand in these volumes will pass down in books that they and others write to an ever-broadening level of our reading public. There should thus result for the great majority of our citizens a better understanding of the principles upon which our Government today is fundamentally based.

What I have said about the value of this projected compilation of documents on the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights applies also to the commission's proposed documentary history of the work of the First Congress of the United States. It was this Congress that took the Constitution as it had been drafted and ratified and put it effectively into operation. It established the judiciary system, which the Constitution had authorized; it established the first executive departments; it provided money for the operation of the new Government; and it took much other action about which we need to have such complete information as the commission proposes to assemble and publish. And much the same can be said for the records of other early Congresses that are not now conveniently available for use.

With respect to the commission's whole program, let me say again that I think it highly desirable to press forward with it as energetically as possible, not solely on behalf of scholarship or of the needs of our Nation's bench and bar and legislative assemblies, but also out of consideration of the interests of all of our people and the protection of the democratic society in which we live against hostile ideologies. I am especially glad to note the cooperative character of this program and the extent to which some leading business organizations and foundations have given it support. This is one of the admirable characteristics of this free country in which we live. The costs are high in terms of the thousands of dollars that the various projects will require but we are a great and wealthy nation and the profits that we will receive from this program, tangible and intangible, will be many times worth their cost.

Mr. FLOETE. It is my great privilege and pleasure now to read a letter from President Eisenhower:

"DEAR MR. FLOETE: It is good to learn of the advancing work of the National Historical Publications Commission. This Commission has made splendid progress toward enlarging the basic stock of source materials of American history.

"Written history is as important to civilization as human memory to an individual. The free world must have histories written by men and women in search of the truth—not by those seeking to rewrite the records of the past to their own advantage. This underlines the essential need of a broad and incorruptible supply of our Nation's documentary resources.

"Incidentally, I have ask the Director of the United States Information Agency to consider placing in our overseas libraries the documentary publications resulting from the Commission's work. There is no better way to gain a true understanding of America's traditions and objectives than through a direct study of the writings of our national leaders and the records of our free institutions.

"Please give my congratulations and best wishes to the members of the Commission and to the historical editors assembled in conference here next week. At that time, I want you to give special thanks to the sponsors and donors who are helping in this program.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Irwin S. Rhodes, of Cincinnati, chairman of a special committee of the American Bar Association, has an important announcement to make. Mr. Rhodes, will you please come to the microphone?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen; Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association and the American Bar Foundation, has asked me to announce the sponsorship by the American Bar Foundation of the John Marshall papers project. Thank you.

Mr. FLOETE. Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our formal meeting. The conference of editors will resume in the Archives Building.

Win Freund's Great Reporting Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, most Americans were shocked by the story of the use of three United States Air Force airplanes to bring Dr. Milton Eisenhower and his daughter from Land O' Lakes, Wis., to Washington a short time ago.

The story was given to the public by the diligence of Win Freund, city editor of the Wausau, Wis., Daily Record-Herald. Mr. Freund got a tip that something was afoot at the Wausau Airport and he went there with his camera. Despite obstacles placed in his way by Air Force officials, he got the facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter which I wrote to Mr. Freund congratulating him upon his news story.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1958.

Mr. WIN FREUND,
City Editor, Wausau Record-Herald,
Wausau, Wis.

DEAR WIN: I want to congratulate you on the splendid job you did covering the story of Milton Eisenhower's trip from Land O' Lakes to Washington in Air Force airplanes. I had read the story, without knowing that you wrote it, and my immediate reaction was that this was exactly the way the story should be handled. It is a job of perfect objective reporting, which lets the facts speak for themselves. I don't see how you could have improved on it.

I have learned that you got the story in spite of real obstacles placed in your way by Air Force officials. I am glad that you persisted, like the first-rate reporter you are, and got the facts. There is no excuse for secrecy in the conduct of government. Every time you defeat secrecy in government you have performed a public service.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator.

Refugees From Communism Should Be Granted Asylum Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States, a traditional haven for those oppressed by tyranny and dictatorship, has closed her doors to a young seaman who sought asylum here. This is a strong indictment of the United States and a worse indictment of Gen. J. M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The seaman, Richard Eibel, is a Polish national, aged 24, who jumped his ship, the freighter *Fryderyk Szopen*, when she docked at New York a week ago yesterday. He stated that he did not wish to return to Poland and wanted asylum in the United States. He has made it clear that he faces persecution and heavy punishment for his attempt to flee Poland, and that because of his anti-Communist activities in Poland even his life might be at stake.

It would be well for Commissioner Swing to read the tablet inside the main entrance of the Statue of Liberty on which are engraved the words:

> Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

He might then have a better understanding of our policy of accepting all who seek asylum here. If we accept such unsavory persons as the former dictator of Venezuela, Perez Jimenez, certainly we can do the same for an honest refugee from communism.

The most serious indictment of Commissioner Swing and the Immigration and Naturalization Service is that no

hearing was accorded the young man before he was returned to his ship. Only one chance remains for America to redeem herself and that is to remove this young man from the ship, as the British authorities did in 1954 with Antoni Klimowicz, who was permitted to remain in Great Britain as a refugee. If England does this, surely we can do no less.

For Those Growing Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland has been one of the pioneers and one of the most aggressive communities in the Nation in attempting to provide adequate housing for its citizens. In 1934 the city of Cleveland began the first low income public housing projects. Some 21 years later, through the foresight and planning of Ernest J. Bohn, director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, we opened a 14-story, 156-unit apartment building for primarily elderly persons needing low income housing. A home atmosphere, rather than that of an institution, pervades this building since some young families with children are being placed on each floor with the thought that association with younger couples has a healthy psychological effect on the senior citizens.

Mr. Bohn recently announced that new golden-age projects will be undertaken. Nearly 400 of the 817 dwelling units on the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority's drawing boards will be for persons 65 years and older. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 24 entitled "For Those Growing Old":

FOR THOSE GROWING OLD

When considered against the age patterns of Cleveland's population and the trends forecase in the next 2 decades, the new golden age projects just announced by Ernest J. Bohn for the east side take on some additional significance.

Nearly 400 of the 817 dwelling units on the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority's drawing boards will be for persons 65 years and older. In view of the increasing numbers here of those in the above 65 year bracket and the best guesses of population experts that those numbers will ascend sharply, it's not a question of whether these 400 units will be needed, it's a question of how many more such dwellings will be required if the proper job is to be done.

The units which Bohn has announced for his CMHA, along Ansel Road at Hough and at Wade Park Avenue, will to a certain extent be patterned on his pioneer golden age center at Cedar Avenue and East 30th Street.

These quarters also will be specially designed for older tenants. There will be some suits for young families, so the older residents will benefit from the lift of watching children grow.

But in addition, the new units will take advantage of a change in the Federal law which permits them to be built specially for single persons (that is, unmarried persons and widows and widowers), and there will be space for a clinic so tenants' ailments may be diagnosed quickly without the harsh necessity of carting them off to a hospital.

A geriatrics study, with funds from the Ford Foundation, has been underway at the Golden Age Center with the help of Western Reserve University. The new projects with their special clinical facilities should be worth continuing research helpful to medicine and to other communities.

We naturally should like to see this type of project undertaken by private financing rather than with Federal help, but it's a job which must be done now to meet a growing condition, the fact that an increasing proportion of our population is living to 65, 70, and beyond. Perhaps at a propitious time private interests will get into the work, too. It appears that if rents are kept reasonable there will be plenty of prospective customers.

For Suspension of Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the urgency of suspending nuclear tests. Under leave previously granted, I am inserting in the RECORD two letters I have just received and which speak for themselves and all mankind:

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., July 28, 1958.
Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: We are happy to send you the enclosed copy of an appeal addressed to President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and John A. McCone. This appeal, signed by 145 Oregon clergymen, urges immediate efforts to end United States nuclear-weapons tests in the Pacific and to reach an agreement for their suspension with the other nuclear powers.

This project was initiated by the American Friends Service Committee with the cooperation of the following ministers: John L. Anderson, chaplain, Lewis and Clark College; Harold Glen Brown, First Christian Church, Portland; J. J. Clow, Mount Olivet Baptist Church, Portland; Albert F. King, Bethel Congregational Church, Beaverton; and George G. Roseberry, First Methodist Church, Medford. You are free to use this information in any way you wish, though we have agreed that there will be no general circulation or publication of the list of appeal signers.

Sincerely yours,
WILTON HARTZLER,
Executive Secretary.

JULY 23, 1958.
President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: We, the undersigned Christian ministers of the State of Oregon, are deeply concerned with the moral implications of continued testing of nuclear weapons by our country or any other country.

We are disturbed by the mounting evidence of radioactive fallout and by the widely held opinion of scientists that harmful effects will be visited upon unborn generations.

We deplore the perfecting of weapons capable of total and instant annihilation of millions of people in one blow.

We are saddened that the world believes it can sow the seeds of peace by using implements of destruction.

We direct this message to President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. We appeal to each of you to bring an end to the United States tests in the Pacific. We urge you to bend all possible efforts to secure an agreement with the other nuclear powers which will suspend all nuclear weapons tests.

Sincerely yours,
(145 Oregon Clergymen.)

In Defense of Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD shows that on Monday, July 21, 1958, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] addressed the House on the subject of Americans for Democratic Action. I have great respect for the gentleman with whom I have served for a number of years, but that respect does not blind me to the shortcomings of his remarks to which I must take exception. I offer these remarks in kindliness, yet with conviction. Among other people connected with ADA, he took issue with the policies and proposals advocated by ADA to bring a speedy end to the recession into which the Republican administration has plunged this country. While I do not necessarily agree with all of the recommendations in this program, I have the greatest respect for such people as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, David Dubinsky, James B. Carey, India Edwards, Thomas K. Finletter, and Robert R. Nathan, who are among the signers of this resolution. I know these dedicated citizens and I have worked with them and others, including former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, on legislation for the good of this country. I especially remember how they have given of their time and their energies in the fight for legislation to protect civil liberties and civil rights and for economic and social security. I have found them to be zealously devoted to the cause of democracy in our country and I am proud to have had the privilege of working with them.

The gentleman from New York has allowed himself to imagine that, as he said:

ADA'ers are morbidly fascinated by the U. S. S. R. and anything accomplished by the Communists is acclaimed by the ADA as superior to anything accomplished by the United States of America. They are saying, right now, that the Russian economy is superior to ours.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the opposite of what ADA is saying. For a long time Mr. Robert R. Nathan, who is the

national chairman of ADA, and other leaders of the organization have been trying to arouse the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States to the great threat posed to the United States by the rapidly increasing rate of production in the Soviet Union and in their increased emphasis on infiltration of neutral countries through technical and economic aid. Second only to our system of personal freedom and individual liberty, the American economy is our most important asset in the long-drawn international competition with communism. The ADA does this Nation a service in calling attention to the need to keep the American economy vigorous and growing in order to provide the vital means of meeting that competition. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] considers this activity is pro-Communist, then he must also consider it pro-Communist when the Columbia Broadcasting System devotes an hour of its program time, as it did a week ago, to probing in depth the increasing threat of Communist technical and economic assistance, under the title of "The Ruble War." It is a credit to the understanding of the leaders of the ADA and their devotion to the cause of democracy that in these activities they have placed such great emphasis on measures like mutual security and reciprocal trade designed to strengthen the position of the United States and of the free world. ADA's 11-year history of anticommunism, nationally and internationally, is a matter of record—from their support of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan to their support of NATO and mutual security.

It will be a sad day for the United States when recognition and awareness of the widening and deepening Soviet economic offensive and the peril it poses for the free world brings down cries of pro-Communist on those who recognize this and are aware of it. Surely nothing would help the Communists more than smothering this kind of awareness and discussion in the United States. In fact, anyone who closes his eyes and his mind to this Soviet threat is unwittingly helping the Communists. I believe that ADA and others deserve a vote of thanks for the work they have done in bringing these developments and their implications to the attention of the American public.

My esteemed colleague is absolutely right when he says that ADA is devoted to a program of full and steady employment and production and an expanded program of social security. I wonder if he wishes us to infer from his comment that he does not believe in these programs. I am sure he can find many Members of the House who would be pleased to debate with him the importance of such programs.

But the gentleman from New York is misinformed when he says that ADA has recommended economic aid to Communist China or its admission to the U. N. What ADA has recommended is that this Government initiate negotiations looking toward diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist government not, as the ADA says, "as a gesture of moral approval—which the Chinese Communist obviously do not merit—but as a means of establishing the normal channels of communication between the two nations." There can be wide differences of opinion on this question and these diferences can be the subject of reasonable debate among reasonable men. The ADA's position was taken because they felt that such a policy would be in the best interests of this country and for no other reason. I am sure that my colleague from New York agrees that this should be the governing criterion in any such question of foreign policy.

If he would take the trouble to examine the record, I think the gentleman from New York would find that the ADA is precisely what it says it is:

A nationwide, independent anti-Communist political organization dedicated to a program for making liberalism a more effective force in the United States.

I might say that if the gentleman from New York and the Republican Party would stop wasting their time berating the ADA and spend more time on the great issues confronting this country, they would do their country and their party a service.

Frankly, most of the projects and tenets of the ADA I personally espouse and am pleased to make this public acknowledgement thereof. It may be that some of its principles and actions I may not approve, but by and large it is a stimulating, wholesome organization and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] does not do himself proud, indeed, in attacking it.

Clarifying Law on United States Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 28, 1958, I introduced a bill, H. R. 13552, to clarify the law relating to the design and dimensions of the United States flag.

There is no Federal statute which fixes the proportionate dimensions of the flag, including the size and arrangement of the stars in the union of the flag. I have been advised that these matters have been regulated by custom. However, a study of past actions on the design of the flag each time a new State was admitted to the Union, discloses no established procedure. For example, in 1912 when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted, a joint board of Army and Navy officers recommended a plan of the union of the flag and thereafter President Taft, by executive order, approved its action. However, when Oklahoma was admitted in 1907, the arrangement of the stars in the flag was decided without Presidential Executive order. The Navy simply wrote the War Department, suggesting that officers meet to recommend a design. When these Departments approved a design, other agencies adopted it.

Prior to these last two changes in the flag, the military services arranged the stars without executive order or legislation, but followed, generally, the basic law of 1818 which required the addition of a star on the 4th of July next succeeding the admission of a new State. In 1947, when title 4 of the United States Code was enacted into positive law, the 1818 law—Third United States Statutes at Large, page 415—which was reenacted as sections 1791 and 1792 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, was repealed—act of July 30, 1947, section 2; Sixty-first United States Statutes at Large, page 646.

The 1947 act, however, contains a possible ambiguity. Section 1 expressly provides that there "shall be 48 stars" in the union of the flag. Section 2 of that act, though, provides that on the admission of a new State "one star shall be added" to the union of the flag. We have, then, an apparent conflict, one section limiting the number of stars to 48 and another section providing for additional stars on the admission of new States.

While I think these sections can be reconciled, I nonetheless feel that the law should be clarified. Certainly it will be necessary to amend the law after Alaska is admitted into the Union, in order that the provision providing for 48 States can be changed to 49 States.

Furthermore, there should be a Federal statute setting forth standards to guide those who are given the responsibility for rearranging the component parts of the flag. Today there is no set precedent for them to follow. My bill would place this important duty under the direction of the President of the United States.

There is an act authorizing the Army to design flags and other insignia for the military departments only and to advise other agencies on matters of heraldry—Public Law 85–263; title 10, United States Code, section 4595. However, this act gives no express authority for the Army to design or rearrange the flag of the United States—see Senate report 1115, 85th Congress.

My bill contains flexible provisions and is so drawn that it will require no change if and when additional States are admitted to the Union. At the same time, it establishes clear standards for the guidance of those who will be charged with the responsibility of providing additional stars as new States are admitted.

A bill providing for the design of the flag of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design.

"The flag of the United States shall have 13 horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions.

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union, the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He

shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the fourth day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

SEC. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

A True American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure last Thursday of renewing my friendship with a distinguished and patriotic American, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, of Chicago. The occasion was the appearance of General Klein as a witness before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which is considering the International Agreement between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community. General Klein, who recently returned from a 2-month series of conferences with prominent officials in Western Europe, made a very excellent statement. It is certainly one we can take into serious consideration, and I am happy to note that the complete text appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I knew General Klein in the South Pacific. I knew him as a lieutenant colonel, colonel, and a general. I have known on many occasions where he has served his country. One occasion that comes to my mind was when General Klein, at his own expense, conducted a study mission in Europe as a consultant to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. That was in 1954, and General Klein visited England, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, the Saar, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Spain, Luxembourg, Scandinavia, and the Vatican. He talked to literally hundreds of men and women in all walks of life, seeking information of value to his country. The report he later made to the Senate committee was hailed by Democrats and Republicans alike as of outstanding importance in the study of our Military Establishments and needs abroad.

A man of General Klein's caliber and ability is certainly well qualified to speak to us of the vital place that Euratom occupies in the efforts of the free world to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

We all have a right to be proud of the long and distinguished record of General Klein's service to our country. Army officer, leader of veterans' organizations, war correspondent, editor, public-relations counsel, motion-picture executive, investigator of subversive activities in the United States, adviser to both executive and legislative branches of government, General Klein has, indeed, given many lives to his country.

He was the youngest American war correspondent in World War I, after which he enlisted in the Army. In 1933 while the country was at peace, General Klein joined the Illinois National Guard, where he headed the investigation of subversive activities in the Middle West in 1933 and 1934. He again entered active Army service in 1941, and spent most of World War II in the south Pacific as a colonel under General MacArthur. He was twice decorated for heroism. He was separated from the Army in 1946 after serving as special assistant to the Secretary of War. Not satisfied with a well-earned period of leisure, General Klein became the commanding officer of an important unit of the Illinois National Guard. He achieved the rank of major general for his dedicated and valuable work in the National Guard since 1946. Included in his many postwar activities is his participation in the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and Jewish War Veterans (national commander).

It is no exaggeration to say that the future welfare of this country depends upon our ability to produce leaders of the caliber, integrity, and dedication to public duty of Gen. Julius Klein.

Conqueror of Gaillard Cut, Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Army engineer who was one of the key men in the construction of the Panama Canal was born in Sumter County, S. C., the county in which I now live. His family is distinguished throughout the history of the United States for its contributions to the development of America. David DuBose Gaillard gave his life in carrying out his assignment in the construction of the Panama Canal. I beg to insert herein a history of this distinguished South Carolinian:

DAVID DUBOSE GAILLARD, CONQUEROR OF CULEBRA CUT, PANAMA CANAL

(By Kathleen Lewis)

This August 8, 45 years ago, Col. David DuBose Gaillard, conqueror of Culebra Cut in the Panama Canal, sailed for the United States, never to return, and never to learn that he had accomplished one of the gigantic engineering tasks of all time.

With his wife, his son, Pierre, and Dr. Charles Mason, he landed in New York August 16, and shortly thereafter was admitted to Johns Hopkins. Following the diagnosis of an intercranial growth, Colonel Gaillard was operated on at Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston, where he was admitted September 1. The operation by Dr. Harvey Cushing produced no beneficial results, and he was returned to Johns Hopkins October 1.

For 3 months he was totally unconscious, dying December 5.

The Nation was stung with pity and sympathy for Colonel Gaillard as the story of his work was unfolded by the press following his departure from Panama. The climax was reached in October as President Woodrow Wilson pushed a button in Washington, applying the spark to blow up the rock and earth embankment of the dam at Gamboa, letting the waters of Gatun Lake rush into Culebra Cut.

After this event the press clamored that Culebra Cut must be renamed, and that it should bear the name of the man whose battle against slides, floods, tropical heat had cost him his life.

Now passengers of ships passing through the canal may notice a plaque 100 feet above the water, overlooking the cut. It says, "In Memory of D. DuB. Gaillard, Builder of Gaillard Cut, 1907–1913." The memorial, which is located on Contractor's Hill, is the work of James Earle Fraser, and was erected by his family and the Third United States Volunteer Engineers, of which he was the regimental commander during the Spanish-American War.

April 28, 1915, at the White House, President Wilson signed the Executive order renaming the cut, stating that "the portion of the Panama Canal through the Continental Divide heretofore known as 'Culebra Cut' shall hereafter be named 'Gaillard Cut' in honor of the late Lt. Col. D. D. Gaillard, Corps of Engineers, United States Army * * * I deem it a fitting recognition of Lieutenant Colonel Gaillard's services to the country to rename in his honor, the scene of his life's triumph."

Though digging the cut was a task of immense magnitude, probably Colonel Gaillard's most difficult work was in learning how to control the slides. According to his wife, he spent many sleepless nights figuring out new methods to counteract the capricious layers of mud and rock bed which rose from the depths of the canal during the night to undo a whole day's work.

During the early stages of the work, slides gave little trouble; but in later years, it was the factor which threatened successful competition of the canal.

The first slides were caused by slipping of the top layer of clay or earth upon a sloping surface. These varied in thicknesses from 10 to 40 feet.

The largest of this type was the Cucaracha slide on the east bank, below Gold Hill. Its movement was like that of a mud glacier, moving completely across the canal, its toe advancing for the first 10 days at a uniform rate of 14 feet in 24 hours.

Later, as the depth of the cut increased, so did the trouble with the slides, bringing out all Colonel Gaillard's ingenuity devising ways to prevent recurrences.

The largest slide covered an area of 75 acres. Up to October 1, 1912, over 7,500,000 cubic yards of the slide material had been removed, with 2 million more to be removed. They were an ever-present source of annoyance and expense. They covered up railroad tracks, demolished roads, broke drainage and water mains, all of which had to be restored or repaired as quickly as possible. The slides too, accounted for about 22 million cubic yards of extraneous material that had to be excavated.

From 1907 to June 1, 1913, total material excavated under Colonel Gaillard's direction was 104,800,873 cubic yards. About half that was necessary for the total excavation (212,504,138 yards). Eighty-eight million cubic yards came from Culebra Cut.

In addition, 5,419,751 cubic yards of rock were supplied and hauled over 30 miles to build the Gatun Dam. The relocated Panama Canal was furnished over 4 million cubic yards of material which had to be hauled over 8 miles. Over 151,000 cubic yards of hard rock were transported from the cut to the mole at Colon, 35 miles away.

The dike from the mainland to Naos Island across a part of the Panama Bay was furnished 1,121,233 cubic yards of rock. The dam at Miraflores and the back fill for the Pedro Miguel lock were also supplied with over 175,000 cubic yards of material.

Cost of excavation to the Government for Colonel Gaillard's work, after he took over the division April 12, 1907, were as follows: 1908, 72 cents; 1909, 55 cents; 1910, 54 cents; 1911, 49 cents; 1912, 47 cents. The annual excavation had been roughly 17 million cubic yards; thus a saving of 1 cent per cubic yard for a year meant a saving to the Government of $170,000.

The spectacle of 6,000 men working at first in Culebra Cut attracted engineering experts from Europe and Japan; geologists from many countries came to see the section. It was the world's greatest curiosity.

Maj. David Gaillard was appointed a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, March 22, 1907, following service in Cuba as Assistant to the Chief of Staff, and Chief of Military Information Division, Army of Cuban Pacification, Marianao.

After it had become pretty evident that civilian engineers would never finish the task of cutting the Panama Canal, President Theodore Roosevelt decided to turn the job over to the Army engineers. He conceived the idea of appointing a trio, instead of one head, so the work would not be interrupted should one be removed for any cause.

The control was vested in Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, Major Gaillard, and Maj. W. L. Sibert, a giant of a man, former classmate of Gaillard's at West Point. Sibert and Gaillard were known at the Point as David and Goliath and spent many pleasant hours together as roommates and later as coworkers on the canal. Colonel Goethals remained as Chairman of the Commission to the completion.

The three men set to work immediately to tackle the job that had baffled engineers for too long a time.

Gaillard, who made the cut through Culebra Mountain, was peculiarly fitted for this work. Before the Spanish-American War he had assisted in determining two international boundaries, the Mexican and Alaskan. And, after the war, he had been engaged extensively in river and harbor work, most noteworthy those at Jacksonville and St. Augustine, Fla.; the Great Lakes; the Washington Aqueduct; and the Portland Channel (Canal), Alaska, the latter said to be a mission of international significance.

In addition, he was a competent leader, having served as the regimental commander of the Third United States Volunteers, helping in the regeneration of Cuba in 1899.

Gaillard had made great and lengthy studies of water, waves, and tides, and had compiled numerous articles on these subjects. One, Wave Action Upon Engineering Structures, brought him considerable fame.

All this experience brought the right man to the most difficult task in the construction of the Canal; conquering Culebra Cut.

The main construction work had been divided into two departments by Col. Goethals. Major Sibert took over locks and dams.

Gaillard was assigned the Department of Dredging and Excavation, which was composed of two dredging divisions, and one dry excavation division. The Pacific Dredging Division handled the work at the south end of the Canal from the Pacific locks to the Pacific Ocean; the Colon, from the Gatun locks to the Atlantic Ocean; and the Culebra Division, the dry excavation work through 9 miles of solid mountain, the backbone of the continent.

Major Gaillard—later made lieutenant colonel on April 11, 1909—was described by those who knew him, as being of high character, ability, indefatigable industry, genial disposition, uncannily accurate observation and intuition, and good humor—a good teller of stories.

When he arrived on the scene, he was appalled at the high costs of excavation—one of his very first observations—and immediately set the machinery (and his brains) in motion to reduce them.

Many wanted to discard the expensive French machinery, and advised him lengthily on the subject. But Major Gaillard was hardheaded, too, and pointed out their former usefulness by Frenchmen in having excavated 24 million cubic yards of material in Culebra Cut. So, he transferred the machines to the Chagres River division, where he thought their utilization would be more beneficial. This proved to be true.

He put to use a dozen new American steam shovels; but kept the 46 old French locomotives and cars to do most of the hauling. These were supplemented by three, modern locomotives, all he could obtain at the time.

July 1, 1908, under a reorganization plan put into effect by Goethals, he became head of the central division, which amounted to all the excavation work between the Atlantic and Pacific locks. Now—it was Gaillard's job to perform the marriage of the oceans.

This new division extended from Pedro Miguel locks to Gatun dam and locks, 33 miles, and embraced the entire summit level of the Panama Canal. The Culebra Cut was the greater part of the dry excavation. Of the 9 miles, over 7½ had a bottom width of 300 feet and a depth of 45 feet. The remainder of the canal had a width in excess of 300 feet.

Over 1,000 loaded and empty trains were handled in the division during the 9-hour workday, and an average of 2 miles of water and air pipe were laid and 2 miles taken up for every working day in a year.

Before Colonel Gaillard assumed command, the maximum monthly output in the division was 815,270 cubic yards. His increase was 152 percent, as evidenced by the figures for March 1909 when 2,054,088 cubic yards were removed. The greatest number of shovels in use at one time was only 43.

Transportation of this material required 115 locomotives and 2,000 cars. Although the cut was just 9 miles in length, the track required for the operation of the trains was about 100 miles, or an average of nine, parallel tracks.

The maximum number of drills in use was 337, of which 221 were tripod, and 156, well drills. About 90 miles of holes were drilled in a month.

To reduce deaths and injuries from dynamiting, Col. Gaillard had all holes wired in parallel in contrast to the in series method formerly used. Over 20 million pounds of dynamite were fired in 3¼ years under his direction, with the loss of 8 men. Three of the men failed to remove themselves to a safe distance; two miscounted the shots, returning too quickly.

When Colonel Gaillard filed his last annual report in July 1913, he did it as he had done the work on Culebra Cut; methodically, painstakingly, and accurately. There was very little left for anyone else to do: Culebra Cut was conquered, and all needed now was for the explosives to be laid, the mine drilling made, and a button to be pushed, blowing into destruction the last barrier which traversed the Isthmian waterway from bank to bank.

The building of the canal had been David Gaillard's cherished dream, and his constant concentration of mind and body to that task had finished both his job and himself.

On December 8, 1913, following services at St. John's Episcopal Church in Washington, he was entombed at Arlington at services befitting a soldier and a great engineer.

For 5 minutes during this solemn service, miles away at the site of his former labors, 20,000 men still working in the cut stood in tribute to their coworker.

As the final words of the ritual were pronounced by the Reverend E. S. Dunlap, three volleys were fired by the engineer battalion and taps were sounded by Chief Musician Frank J. Weber, who was band leader of Gaillard's regiment, the 3d Engineers.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

David DuBose Gaillard, son of Samuel Isaac Gaillard and Susan Richardson DuBose Gaillard, of Huguenot and English ancestry, was born September 4, 1859, at the summer home of his parents, Fulton Postoffice, Sumter County. His early childhood was spent at Pinola, the plantation home of his maternal grandfather, David St. Pierre DuBose. This home, in Clarendon County, was burned. Later, the family lived at The Rocks in Eutawville, in the home which is still standing.

Because the schools of that day were rather poor, David Gaillard in 1872 left Clarendon County and went to Winnsboro, where for 3 years he was a student at the "Light on the Hill," Mount Zion Academy. In Winnsboro, he lived with his grandmother, Mrs. David Gaillard, and worked as a clerk in the general store of Fleming McMaster.

Under the tutelage of Prof. Means Davis, who had accepted the principalship of Mount Zion, young David explored all avenues of knowledge. Later Professor Davis was to become his brother-in-law.

He received appointment to West Point through a vacancy in the congressional district of Hon. J. S. Richardson, Sumter County, following the competitive examination. After preparatory school at Highland Falls, he entered West Point as a cadet in September 1880, the fifth of his name to enroll there. He graduated in the fifth position in a class of 31, said to be among the more brilliant classes to come from the Army school. He was commissioned second lieutenant of engineers September 15, 1884.

In 1887, Gaillard, at the age of 28, married Miss Katherine Ross Davis, Prof. Means Davis' sister. Their only child, David St. Pierre who was born January 25, 1890, is an electrical engineer, now lives at The Rocks (named for the ancestral home), in Washington.

Mrs. Gaillard died at her home, 1661 Crescent Place, Washington, December 30, 1937, and was buried beside her husband at Arlington.

Colonel Gaillard has two living grandchildren: David DuBose Gaillard, of Washington; and Monica Gaillard who is married to Frederick Taylor Peck, now attaché at the United States Embassy, Guatemala, and formerly attaché in Peru and Colombia.

One grandson, David St. Pierre (Peter) Gaillard, who attended The Citadel, died some years ago.

S. 1869 Should Not Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to

insert a copy of the statement which I made earlier today before the House Committee on Public Works in opposition to S. 1869, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. The statement includes a newspaper item which tells the story of how West Virginia recently lost a $75 million industrial plant to the TVA region. The newspaper article was included as a part of my testimony before the House committee. The statement and newspaper story follow:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BYRD IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1869

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to S. 1869 for a number of reasons, which I shall very briefly state:

1. The bill removes the Tennessee Valley Authority from the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

That act states that the TVA, as a wholly-owned Government corporation, shall cause to be prepared annually a budget program which shall be submitted to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. The act also provides that the budget program be transmitted by the President to the Congress, and that it shall be considered and, if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine.

Under this bill, therefore, there would be no annual budget program submitted to the President through the Bureau of the Budget nor would there be any budget program transmitted to the Congress by the President as a part of the annual budget required by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

2. This is not the only statutory congressional control over TVA that would be eliminated by S. 1869. The bill would also remove the TVA from the scope of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948. That act states: "None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by an act of Congress." So, here we find that this bill removes the requirement for approval by the Congress of new projects as stipulated in the portion of the act that I have just read. On the other hand, inaction by the Congress is to be taken as implied approval, under this bill, of any new power-producing projects for TVA, and any disapproving action is restricted to a 90-day period. I think we all recognize that many things can happen through inaction that would certainly not be consummated if action of an affirmative and positive nature were required.

Both statutory bases for congressional control of the Tennessee Valley Authority are thusly removed by this act.

3. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object to this bill because it tacitly invites, or encourages, an expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority into areas that are now being adequately served by investor-owned power companies. It is my understanding that there are about 11 power companies, privately owned, now servicing the areas which would be encompassed by the expansion permitted under the provisions of this proposed legislation. Three of the 11 power companies are wholly operating within the new territory that could be added. This, I submit, is an unwarranted excursion into the realms of private and free enterprise. Some individuals take the position that inasmuch as there is now no statutory limitation upon the amount of territory that can be serviced by TVA it could be presently expanded to include an area of 200,000 square miles, whereas it is only serving an area of 80,000 square miles. I wish to respectfully make this observation however, Mr. Chairman: Under the present law and the existing provisions for congressional control of appropriations Congress would be advised of any such expansion and would have the opportunity to determine whether the financing necessary for such expansion would be approved. Therefore, while TVA might now theoretically expand, from a practical standpoint it must still subject itself to the review provided by budgetary and legislative processes. Under S. 1869 no such congressional approval would be necessary to permit TVA growth beyond its present service area. This would obviously run counter to the opinion of the Budget Bureau as expressed yesterday, it being the position of that agency that the TVA should be restricted to the territory now served.

4. My fourth objection to this bill lies in the fact that the present 40-year period of amortization is extended to 120 years by setting the repayment sum at $10 million annually. Yesterday we heard the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the representative of the Budget Bureau express opposition to this feature of the bill. Each of the agencies went on record, I believe, as stating that 120 years would be too lengthy a period of amortization, that the power revenues of the TVA are such that a much shorter period of time would be both feasible and advisable, and that a higher figure than $10 million as repayment on the appropriation investment is well within the earning capabilities of the Authority.

5. A fifth objection which I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, is that the interests of the taxpayers of the country are being subordinated to the interests of the bondholders. Before any payment or return can be made on the appropriation investment, the operating costs plus the payments to the bondholders must be made. It is possible, then, that the taxpayers of the country would not receive any return on the appropriation investment in a given year, and, as a matter of fact, the bill provides for payments to be deferred for as much as 2 years when, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, such payment cannot feasibly be made because of certain conditions set forth in the act. One might add at this point that there is no provision for adding the unpaid interest to the debt for subjection to interest in later years. Also, there is no provision for repayment or interest on an additional $470 million of retained earnings which have been reinvested in power facilities, a sum which is, in my judgment, a part of the taxpayers' investment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask permission to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register on February 20, 1956. The article bears the caption, "$75 Million Plant Lost by West Virginia to TVA Region":

"[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register of February 20, 1956]

"VALLEY TAXPAYERS 'GIVE' INDUSTRY TO ALABAMA—$75 MILLION PLANT LOST BY WEST VIRGINIA TO TVA REGION

"(By Naze Cochran, News-Register staff writer)

"Ohio Valley residents help pay to keep a new $75 million aluminum industry from locating in West Virginia.

"They didn't realize it—but, even if they had, they couldn't have done anything about it.

"The decision was made in Washington.

"It's the age-old story of Government subsidy versus free enterprise and fair competition.

"The News-Register learned today that the Reynolds Metal Co., the second largest aluminum company in the United States, decided to locate a huge aluminum plant in TVA territory rather than along the Ohio River, south of Point Pleasant, probably because of the cheaper Government-subsidized power available at Lister Hill, Ala.

"Philip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Service Corp., told the News-Register his firm was working on locating the new industry in West Virginia.

" 'We were not successful. Reynolds told us that our power rate was too high. I can't say that is the real basis but it was one given.'

"Sporn said the AGE gave Reynolds a good rate, the same rate we offered to Kaiser Aluminum and Olin Mathieson. 'But,' he added, 'there was a large tax component in the AGE rate.

" 'They (the Reynolds officials) told me the TVA rate was lower.'

"Further evidence of the manner in which the Reynolds plant was lost to West Virginia because of a Government-subsidized power project is found in a letter sent West Virginia Senators Matthew M. Neely and Harley M. Kilgore by M. C. Funk, vice president of the Applachian Electric Power Co., a member firm of AGE.

"In his letter, Funk points out that 'I feel sure you will be interested in knowing about the latest instance of the putting of industries into TVA territory. This case greatly concerns West Virginia.'

"According to Funk, the Appalachian Co. has been approached by Reynolds Metal Co., now the second largest aluminum company in the United States, with regard to a proposed aluminum plant in the Ohio Valley.

" 'The required 225,000 kilowatts of electric power was to be furnished by our company. Of course, power is a principal element in aluminum cost.'

"Funk pointed out that the site of the Reynolds Aluminum plant was to be at Apple Grove, W. Va., some 10 miles below Point Pleasant.

" 'In the meantime, however,' Funk told the Senators, 'the Reynolds Co. was negotiating with TVA. We know this and did our utmost to land the business for our system and West Virginia.

" 'In fact,' he stated, 'our quoted price for power exceeded the TVA price by only one-third of the difference between the taxes which we have to pay and the grant tax contribution which TVA makes.

" 'Nevertheless,' Funk's letters to NEELY and KILGORE continue, 'the Reynolds Co. has announced that it will locate in Alabama, with power to be supplied by TVA. It is reported that this new Reynolds plant will cost about $75 million.'

"In concluding his letters to the Senators the power firm official notes that as a consequence, TVA will now somehow have to get the money for and to build more steam electric power—which, of course, will enable it to do more of the same sort of thing.

"And the same sort of thing will mean that tax dollars, from residents of the Ohio Valley, West Virginia and Ohio, as well as the rest of the Nation, will aid the TVA cause.

" 'Competition in which a substantial portion of the tax component is eliminated can be very deadly,' Sporn commented.

"The AGE president pointed out that 20 cents out of every dollar private electric firms receive for power service goes to the Government.

" 'Excluding the tax component, we can give them (industry) a better rate than TVA or any of the public power installations. The people are being asked to develop the power in TVA.

" 'When it comes right to the point,' the head of AGE stated, 'West Virginia is going to have to fight for industry.'

" 'But the State shouldn't have to fight an agency which has the weapons.'

"He explained that the TVA, through Government subsidy, has the weapons to attract

industry in the area around such installations.

"'Why should the Government so equip other States?' he asked.

"Sporn pointed out that West Virginians should naturally be against Government power projects. They are in the disinterest of the State.

"The power official pointed out that West Virginia today is in wonderful shape to attract new industry with its abundant availability of coal and manpower but it is going to have a tough time meeting Government subsidy.

"There has been other instances of new industry being lost to the Ohio Valley and West Virginia because of Government-subsidized power projects. The Reynolds plant is merely most recent.

"In an address delivered as part of the Cooper Foundation Series at Swarthmore College in 1954—but which is as valid today as on the day it was made—Sporn pointed out that a basic difficulty with public power is that it is subsidized power and that cannot be in the public interest.

"'The most common form of subsidy of public power is the tax route. Interestingly enough, it is now being claimed that public power operation is more desirable because it can be carried out without paying taxes.

"'It is quite clear that tax savings as such do not exist.

"'So-called savings, by going to a Governmental setup, merely result in the general taxpayers, rather than those benefitting from the project, paying in additional taxes the subsidy granted the tax-free power project. A general application of the tax-free subsidy principle would result in complete disorganization of all Government.'

"Sporn labeled the tax differential an irresistible magnet which draws industries requiring particularly heavy quantities of electric energy from other locations that but for taxes are equally as well situated and might perhaps otherwise be even more favorably situated."

Editorials From Newspapers of the Fifth District of Kansas Concerning the Mideast Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the following editorials concerning the Mideast situation; which were published in some of the leading newspapers of my district. I feel that these editorials are an excellent example of a cross-section of the thinking on the foreign situation.

I am proud to present these editorials from the following newspapers of the Fifth District, Kansas: The Wellington Daily News, Wellington, Kans.; Pratt Daily Tribune, Pratt, Kans.; the Southwest Daily Times, Liberal, Kans.; the Dodge City Daily Globe, Dodge City, Kans.; the Tiller and Toiler, Larned, Kans.; the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans.:

[From the Wellington (Kans.) Daily News of July 16, 1958]

EAST VERSUS WEST

As United States frustration and indecision in the Middle East finally ends and action takes over, one gets the sense of relief that is expressed by "at last we're doing something."

But, while we are still in an emotional state in which we can look at things objectively, we should consider some of the broader and more foreboding aspects of the entire situation.

This immediate crisis would seem to be part of a larger crisis which goes beyond any conflict between capitalism and communism—it seems to fit, rather, into that gloomy and titanic pattern of East versus West, painted by the German historian, Oswald Spengler.

The Arab World denounces us for intervention—they claim that they would never embrace communism, that all they seek is independence and nationalism. But, every move they have made, for whatever reason they assign to it, has strengthened the hand of Russia and weakened the military and economic position of the West.

With the balance of power becoming so clearly and rapidly in favor of Russia, the United States—after a long and futile display of patience and fumbling—had to move, if it was ever going to move short of total war.

But now the lines are more sharply drawn between West and East, and they are likely to be more and more bitterly opposed as time and events march on. A tragic showdown may be approaching.

One alarming and unhappy factor of the larger picture is the geographical and racial position of Russia. Poised between East and West, Russia can turn either way. It is such a half-world mixture that it has been able to cast its lot successfully either with the Western World or the Eastern.

Russia now casts its lot with the East, giving thrust and hope to the ambitions and hates of people who feel that they have been pawns long enough. In the excitement of their fight for independence, they have closed their eyes to the reality of the ruthless Russian bear, waiting to crush them when the time is right into a condition of abject servitude far more bitter and complete than any they have yet experienced.

But emotion is in the saddle now, and the frightful possibility of a mighty stuggle between West and East looms over all of us.

[From the Pratt (Kans.) Daily Tribune of July 17, 1958]

"DRIZZLING" REVOLUTIONS

In the old days, rebellions were like downpours. A big storm came up fast and then it was over. Lately, however, some seem to be more like drizzles.

Run through the list. In Indonesia, anti-government forces in the scattered islands have been pecking away for months and months. The sharp phase of the revolt, in Sumatra, may have been curbed, but the harassment goes on.

In Algeria, it is now years since the Algerian rebels began their campaign for independence. As the French mow them down, others spring up to carry on.

In Cuba, all the efforts President Batista has made have failed to suppress Fidel Castro's sustained assaults. The bold seizure of many Americans is merely the latest evidence of Batista's inability to halt the annoying drizzle.

The revolt in Lebanon is still relatively new. But if it should be fed steadily by Nasser of Egypt, further emboldened by the Iraq revolt, it too, could drag on endlessly, even in the face of a United Nations police force.

One of the remarkable things about most of these uprisings is the way a quite small minority of dissidents can go on jabbing a government's sides for month after month without being snuffed out.

Some governments, it appears, have lost the capacity to crush even the smallest uprising. In each case, the circumstances differ, but the overall result makes a pattern.

In all these instances, the unending assaults have had a terribly wearing effect upon the governments under siege. There is the drain of men and money, and the diversion from other vital tasks.

The rebels seem to be operating on the theory that what they cannot accomplish by great numbers in a major explosion they may achieve by an unbroken series of modest attacks, with time as their principal ally.

The probability that they may bring it off is real. Already the Algerian revolt has produced reactions that toppled the Fourth Republic. Earlier this year the Indonesian Government was on the brink. Batista today faces the bitter truth that his countering moves are a failure.

The nuisance value of the tireless troublemaker never seemed higher.

[The Southwest Daily Times of Liberal, Kans., July 18, 1958]

HOLD THAT POWER

Up to a late hour last night the U. N. was hearing speeches on the result of events since the call had been made to the United States to help stop the riot that had been created which threatened the rights, privileges of a free government of the people of Lebanon. President Eisenhower first sent 5,000 Marines and later, when Russia moved in troops close to the borderline, more American troops were sent over and a few warships went to the Middle East.

Moscow has told the United States to remove the American troops or take the consequences. The demand is not heeded. It is known that the Middle East has been tagged a vital region for many years. Germany had designs on it in both World Wars and was denied possession after a great cost. Today Communist Russia has the same design. It desires more territory, in fact it would control the world.

At present the United States and its allies hold the balance of power and so long as that power remains, there will be some free people, some free enterprise, and the right to serve God and this country without the aid of communism.

So we must continue to hold the balance of power.

[From the Dodge City (Kans.) Daily Globe of July 17, 1958]

HELP FOR LEBANON

The marines have landed in the little Near East nation of Lebanon, and what it will lead to—if anything much—remains to be seen. Some persons have been comparing the landing with that which the British and French made nearly 2 years ago in the Suez Canal region to keep the Egyptians from taking the waterway.

Linking of the two landings incidentally raises the question of whether it might have been advisable at that time to have found some justifiable reason for letting the British and French go ahead with their project. The United States was instrumental in getting them to call the thing off and there is no sign that our high-minded action at that time won any friends among the Arabs.

However, the Suez episode is ended and most persons want to know what will happen in Lebanon. The landing is different from others of its kind in that the Government of Lebanon asked the United States for help. This help should be enough to enable the Government to stand.

The landing may also further alienate Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egyptian dictator and leader of the Arab nationalist movement. Nasser operates with the encouragement of international communism, although he claims to be opposed to communism. Some observers think he wants to be a "neutral" and accept what handouts he can get from

Communist Russia without delivering anything in return. Others, and they are more numerous, think the further expansion of Nasser power will lead to domination of the Near East by the Reds.

One thing seems sure for the time being. Because there are no Soviet forces in the area, the United States troops are not likely to become engaged in a police action similar to that in Korea. This situattion could be changed if the Russians decide they are ready for world war III and move their forces into nearby nations which are more or less friendly to Russia. The consensus of opinion is that such a move is unlikely.

[From the Larned (Kans.) Tiller and Toiler of July 17, 1958]

WHY MIDDLE EAST OIL IS IMPORTANT

Not only had the Eisenhower doctrine committed the United States to intervention in the Middle East if Arab nationalists and their pro-Communist leaders threatened to gain control of the area, but it was also a practical necessity, as has been pointed out by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, the military analyst. Major Eliot sums it up in the following language:

"There are three arsenals in the world: The United States, Europe, and Soviet Russia. In the case of the United States and Russia, the fuel for the arsenals comes from within the country.

"But the fuel for the arsenal of Europe is oil from the Middle East. Without this fuel the arsenal of Europe becomes negligible. And without the arsenal of Europe, the West loses its thin edge of superiority over the Communist bloc."

Iraq itself is the sixth largest producer of oil in the free world. The loss of its field to the West will be a heavy blow in itself.

But of far graver import is the threat Iraq's fall raises against the fabulous sheikdom of Kuwait on the Persian Gulf, third largest producer of oil in the free world; to Saudi Arabia, fourth largest; and Iran, fifth-ranking free-world producer; as well as the lesser sheikdoms of Qatar and Bahrein.

Not only from that but most of the pipelines from these fields cross Syria and Lebanon. So far Nasser has allowed the oil to flow unchecked through Syria. But if his movements should control the sources of supply as well as these arteries, they could choke off the lifeblood to Europe at any time.

Of course the United States could get along without Middle Eastern oil, but Europe can't. This country cannot afford to have an ally rendered powerless. Losing the fuel for the middle arsenal, as Eliot calls it, would tip the balance of power in favor of the Soviets.

That's why the United States has troops in Lebanon and the British are landing in Jordan.

When we had the opportunity it would have been far better to have permitted little Israel to do a job for which that nation was ready and was eager.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of July 16, 1958]

INTERVENTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The marines have landed and the situation is well in hand. Temporarily. The fact changes none of the validity of the following argument, written minutes before the announcement of the direct involvement in Lebanon.)

At the moment our country seems on the verge of armed intervention in the Middle East, either directly or through the United Nations. If it takes this action, it will have made one of its gravest mistakes ever.

Should our country send its forces into Iraq, Lebanon, or Jordan, it would not be fighting communism, as it was in Korea. It would be fighting history.

It would not be supporting democracy, but the opposite. The governments it would endeavor to maintain or restore are doomed to fall despite whatever the United States might do. Its armed aid in the Middle East would only invite the outbreak of world war III.

Primarily two forces are stirring this area today. Arab nationalism plus the determination of the Arab masses to rise above the state of semistarvation in which their past and present governments have kept them for centuries. No expeditionary army can keep those forces from ultimately reaching their goal.

Egypt's Nasser is the person around whom these forces are rallying. Rather than resisting at every point as this country has been, it would be wiser to encourage them to rally. The expansion of his United Arab Republic to include all the other Arab States offers the only hope of stability in our time.

It will be said that Nasser is incapable of making such a grouping function as a nation. Perhaps he is. But 2 years ago the West was convinced that he was incapable of maintaining even the Suez in operation.

Such an Arab nation naturally would be anti-Western. Not to such a strong degree, however, that it would become a Communist satellite. More likely it would drift into a neutralism of an Indian sort, taking all the economic aid it could obtain from both sides.

Despite all this, the Western alliance may send its troops into these internally torn nations anyhow. If it does so, while its pretenses will be otherwise, its real motivation will be oil. It will have convinced itself that access to these rich reserves which underlie the Middle East is essential to the maintenance of its present economy.

Perhaps that is true. But it doesn't follow that the success of Nasser and Arab nationalism would deprive the West, more than temporarily, of this oil.

The West, and Europe in particular, must have this oil. But revenues from the sale of this oil are even more vital to the success of a new, united rule in this area. And the West is the only possible purchaser for this oil.

The spirit of crisis, however, again fills the air. The mood in Washington, London, Paris, and even the United Nations is not for calm reasoning. The attitude is that something must be done before it is too late. The painful fact is it was to late at least 10 years ago.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of July 17, 1958]

THE GAMBLE

Last week United Nations observers on the scene reported they could find no evidence to support the charge of the United States that the United Arab Republic was guilty of a "massive infiltration" of Lebanon with men and arms.

On Sunday the New York Times in its Review of the Week stated: "The possibility of action by the UN or the United States of America and Britain on the Beirut government's behalf has virtually disappeared. The feeling grows that it is up to the Lebanese themselves to end the turmoil in their country."

On Monday the Associated Press declared, under a Beirut dateline: "Both President Camille Chamoun and the rebels warring against him are reported in agreement today on the man to take over the Lebanese government and attempt to end this nation's 66-day-old rebellion."

On Tuesday out of the blue and without prior warning, the American marines landed on the Lebanese shores, not far from Tripoli.

To put it mildly, on the basis of the record presently available, the justification for the action is somewhat less than complete, so far as Lebanon itself is concerned.

But on Monday a so-far successful revolution in nearby Iraq also broke out of the blue. It was led by those who boast of being pro-Nasser. So it can only be surmised it was Washington's calculated gamble that the physical presence of the Marines would prevent the entire area from falling into the arms of the United Arab Republic, past the point of separation.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of July 18, 1958]

MEETING THE SITAUTION; WHATEVER THE CONSEQUENCES

Marines from the 6th Fleet continue to pour into Lebanon. Other marines have been flown to Europe to backstop them. Additional amphibious task forces are being readied for deployment to the Mediterranean.

The Strategic Air Force has increased its alert posture on its bases strewn around the world. A striking force of the Tactical Air Command has departed for an undisclosed overseas destination. Army and Navy leaves have been canceled. The alert has spread to our forces throughout the Pacific on the other side of the world.

This at least quasi-mobilization is the implementation of President Eisenhower's statement to the people on Tuesday evening: "We must be prepared to meet the situation, whatever be the consequences."

To put it in the bluntest possible manner, the United States has taken an action which has in it the calculated risk of precipitating world war III, and is immediately preparing itself as best it can to meet the possibility.

But in complete contrast to the American actions, so far as the outside world knows, Soviet Russia up to this point hasn't turned a single military hair. Should this latest Middle East crisis blow itself bloodlessly out, consequently, to the nonwhite world inevitably it will appear that the United States is the warmonger.

The Crucial Near and Far East—An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues, once again the ruthless leaders of the Kremlin have sponsored a holocaust in international affairs that has thrown the entire world into a state of profound fear. In my judgment the President of the United States has acted wisely and forthrightly in calling the Soviet bluff by his speedy action in dispatching United States marines to Lebanon in response to the urgent request of President Chamaun.

I would like to briefly outline several reasons why the Near East and the Far East are explosive areas at the present moment, and why the Kremlin is conducting a relentless crusade to spread international communism into those areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Near East crisis has been far more serious than the average American, Briton, Frenchman, or even Russian would like to admit.

In the Near East, oil has telescoped a thousand years into 20, and the entire area—from the Arabian Sea to the Black Sea—from the Caspian Sea to the Red Sea—has become the most explosive powder keg in the entire Eastern Hemisphere. However, the overshadowing factor of oil is not the only reason for this.

For generations, czarist Russia and more recently, Soviet Russia, have trained their sights on two principal objectives that nature itself has denied the Soviet Union. One objective is an ice-free port south of the Soviet Union; the other is adequate supplies of oil for industrial and military purposes. A glance at the world map will indicate that Russia's only suitable outlet to the Mediterranean Sea is through the Bosporous-Dardanelle Straits which are controlled by Turkey. Passage through that outlet is as expensive as the Turkish Government wishes to make it, and shipping through the straits can also be subject to censorship and restrictions by the Turkish Government. Thus Turkey has been an important target of the Communist world revolution, and its importance ranks with that of the Near East and its oil.

Now Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the Near East is the lifeline of the British and French Empires, and there is much truth in that observation. Throughout the years, Great Britain and the United States have applied their capital and engineering talents toward developing Near East oil. The Arab States lacked both the engineering ability and the necessary capital for such development. The result has been huge outlays of British and American funds in the form of foreign investments. This has assured Western Europe of adequate sources of oil and, in turn, has greatly enhanced the standard of living throughout the entire Arab world, just as the standard of living has been raised immensely in Venezuela because of American investments in oil in that South American country.

So important has the Near East become to British economy, that loss of the area to the Soviet bloc would very likely destroy the British Empire and the French Empire as well. This is one reason that the Kremlin has infiltrated the Arab world with Soviet agents since the end of World War II. These Soviet agitators have proved effective as was demonstrated by the recent revolt in Iraq which touched off the present crisis.

In its far-reaching goal of completely engulfing the Near East into the Soviet bloc, the Kremlin has used Egyptian President Nasser as a stooge. Nasser's goal is to form a so-called United Arab Republic and this strange alliance, as has been proven, would eventually become completely subservient to the Kremlin, even though Nasser refuses to admit this. If this goal could be achieved, the entire Arab world would then be under Soviet domination, just as the satellite states of East and Central Europe are today. It was for this reason, among others, that President Eisenhower responded to the Lebanese President's urgent plea for American troops to preserve Lebanon's independence. There can be no doubt that, without American assistance, Lebanon and perhaps Jordan and others would have soon met the same fate as Iraq, and the Kremlin would have made another gigantic step in its ultimate goal of Near East domination.

In the relentless struggle between Western and Soviet ideologies—particularly since the end of World War II—the United States has exerted every possible effort to preserve world peace and avoid the use of war as an instrument of policy in settling international disputes. At the same time we have worked unceasingly for the independence and national self-determination of all members of the United Nations. The friendly hand of America has been extended in all directions in the hope that military conflict with the Soviet Union could be avoided.

But it was because we believe in the integirty of free men and nations, in world peace, and because we are dedicated to the Charter of the U. N. which supposedly seeks to assure men and nations of those rights which are cardinal in the vast whirlpool of international affairs.

At the same time we earnestly hoped and even prayed that Kremlin leaders would cooperate with the Western World and join us in a sincere and genuine crusade that would assure the world of everlasting tranquillity and international economic stability. Instead, the Kremlin forced its domination over nine East European nations, communized the Chinese Mainland, and sponsored a war in Korea. In addition, Moscow has conducted a ceaseless campaign designed to impose communism in every quarter of the free world, thus undermining Western nations with the ultimate goal of dominating the entire earth.

And then, finally in July 1958 came the Kremlin-inspired all-out attempt to engulf the Near East into an orbit alien to the Western World and its security. At the same time, the Western World recognized the urgent necessity for taking instant action that would check this Soviet infiltration in the Near East. In a sense, the time arrived to call the Soviet bluff, and that was precisely what President Eisenhower did when he dispatched American troops to Lebanon.

The President's action immediately placed the Kremlin in the most embarrassing position that it has been in since the end of World War II, and here are several reasons why:

First. Moscow leaders, to whom Arab Nationalists such as Nasser have looked for guidance, are faced with the ugly problem of saving face in the present crisis. The so-called United Arab Republic must naturally expect Soviet military intervention if the situation grows much worse—for example, if an effort is made to liberate Iraq from the revolutionary junta which recently seized control of the country. Yet, Moscow knows that Soviet military intervention in the Near East could very well touch off world war III. In addition, geographic factors make it impossible for Soviet forces to enter the Near East without crossing a country that is friendly to the West. Soviet intervention, therefore, would constitute an invasion and thus a direct act of aggression.

Second. Soviet Russia does not want to engage in world war III at this time, because she is not ready industrially or militarily for an all-out conflict with the West. One reason for this is that 40 percent of total Soviet production comes from the satellite and Baltic States, and in those captive nations the Kremlin has not yet achieved the proper stability that is desired, as was evidenced by the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 and the Poznan revolts in Poland. Moreover, if Russia should now engage in all-out war, there is a strong possibility that full-scale revolts against the Kremlin would occur in every captive nation under Soviet domain, and these would obviously cause Moscow to lose 40 percent of her total industrial production.

Third. President Eisenhower's action in dispatching troops to Lebanon could well prove to be a great and unprecedented source of encouragement and confidence to people behind the Iron Curtain, and Moscow knows that this could have far-reaching implications in the satellite states where there is great unrest and indignation among the populations over the miserable conditions imposed by Communist regimes. Competent experts have thought all along that a concrete show of force by the United States and Britain against Soviet infiltration in the Eastern Hemisphere could very well touch off revolts behind the Iron Curtain of a magnitude equal to the Hungarian revolution. The perpetual unrest in the satellite and Baltic States is a source of constant worry to the Kremlin during normal times, and is naturally intensified during the current crisis.

Thus Mr. Speaker, the President's action in dispatching troops into Lebanon could very well prove to be the very factor that saved the Middle East from Soviet domination. Moreover, it might well turn the tide of world opinion against the international Communist movement, and halt its rapid progress in the Eastern Hemisphere. Under any circumstances, it now appears that the Kremlin will suffer a tremendous loss of prestige both in the Arab world and within the Soviet Union proper and satellite lands.

And now Mr. Speaker, turning to the Far East, let me warn of the dangers of complacency at this time, and also of Soviet designs in the Far East.

While world diplomatic attention is sharply focused on the Middle East, astute Western statesmen should not take their eyes off the Far East, particularly the Korean and Formosan areas. The Kremlin is noted for its ability to divert world diplomatic attention from one area and then strike at another area that is not under observation. This happened in 1949 when Soviet leaders managed to focus diplomatic attention on the notorious Berlin blockade, and in what the Western World thought was a major engagement in the cold war.

While this was happening, the Kremlin struck in another highly strategic area. The area was Red China—the result was that some 400 million Chinese fell under Communist domination.

Another example occurred in 1947–48, when diplomatic attention was keenly focused on China while General Wedemeyer was there conducting a hectic inspection tour. High-pressure Soviet propaganda placed the country in the center of world diplomatic attention. Precisely at that moment the Kremlin struck in another area that was concealed from the attention of the free world. The area was Czechoslovakia which was added to the Soviet domain in early 1948 an another satellite.

Thus the Western World should keep the Far East under close observation and pay careful attention to each Communist maneuver in that area. For example, North Korea has increased its army by 100,000 men during the past several years, and has built up its air force to tremendous proportions—all in violation, of course, of the so-called armistice agreement signed between the U. N. forces and the Reds in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, the Far East, particularly Korea and Formosa, are of utmost importance to the Kremlin in its far-reaching goal of world domination. From a geographic standpoint, Korea points like a dagger toward the heart of the Japanese Islands, and Japan is presently a target of Red China. Thus full control of the Korean Peninsula and adjacent islands would place the Reds in the best possible position for a military assault on the Japanese Islands. That was one underlying reason why the Korean war was fought.

Geographically, the Japanese Islands and Formosa form important links in a somewhat circular chain that extends from the Philippine Islands on up to the Kamchatka Peninsula. This chain is what strategists call America's Southwest Pacific Defense Screen. Since 1949 the Reds have been trying to break this screen, and thus make the North American Continent vulnerable to a military assault that would emanate from Far East origin. Contained also in the Pacific Defense Screen are the Pescadores Islands, the Ryukyu Islands, and even the Marianna and Caroline Islands. These islands are what is known as "stepping stones" throughout the Southwest Pacific. Their importance was well demonstrated during World War II. The Kuril Islands, which should also be a part of this screen are, unfortunately, under Soviet domination.

Formosa itself is perhaps the most strategic link in our Pacific defense screen. Red forces could use Formosa as a jumping off point in either of two directions—toward the Philippines or the Ryukyu Islands. Occupation of the Philippines by Red forces would place in mortal danger all of Indonesia, including New Guinea, Sumatra, Borneo, and this in turn would pose a serious threat to the security of Australia. Or from Formosa, the Reds could use the adjacent islands groups as stepping stones to the Japanese Islands, perhaps with a coordinated attack from South Korea. For these and other reasons, Korea and Formosa are both extremely vital to the United States in our outer Pacific defense screen.

Thus the tremendous military buildup in North Korea and in Red China is an alarming signal and the West should watch this very carefully. The far-reaching and long-range strategy involved is actually nothing new.

For example, during World War II Hitler alined himself with the Japanese warlords and took Western Europe while the Japanese occupied practically all of the Far East and southeast Asia. The long-range goal was total domination of the entire Eastern Hemisphere with dictatorial control from Berlin. The same pattern has been and is being followed by Soviet leaders in Moscow. However, the idea of making China the "villian of the Far East" is nothing new and was not copied after Hitler's strategy of making Japan the dominating force in southeast Asia during World War II.

For example, Mr. Speaker, as early as 1923 Moscow had opened schools of revolution for the "Toilers from the East" for the express purpose of eventually Sovietizing China and other Far East areas. And true enough, the very Communist leaders of Red China that are in power at this moment were trained in Moscow as early as 1923.

This is not unusual, however. For the most prominent Communist leaders of every country on earth received revolutionary training in Moscow at some time or another, including Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, who have spent years and years undermining the United States Government. So far as China was concerned, the rewards to Moscow were immeasurable—in 1949 the Moscow-trained students seized control of China and imposed the yoke of international communism on 400 million more victims.

Thus it was that at an early date the Kremlin designated China as the "revolutionary key to Asia"—a key that would some day unlock vast areas of the Far East and southeast Asia that are rich in raw materials and strategic geographical advantages.

Included in these areas and slated for doom, of course, is the Malayan Peninsula—the world's only commercial source of natural rubber, and the world's largest source of the element tin. Indonesia with its multitude of important islands contains many important natural resources over which Moscow some day hopes to gain control. Immediately after the end of World War II, vast amounts of Communist propaganda began circulating in the Philippine Islands, indicating the Kremlin's interest in that strategic Pacific outpost. At the present moment there is great unrest throughout all of Indonesia, which is well known to be Communist-inspired, and which is creating upheaval in the comparatively young Government of President Sukarno. In Bangkok, Thailand there is presently an enormous number of Soviet personnel, far in excess of legitimate diplomatic needs.

Because of these and other reasons, then, Red China with its growing military strength is posing an ever-greater threat to the Western World, particularly to the United States. It is from Red China that vast hordes poured into North Korea during the recent war in that country. It is Red China that has been constantly harassing the Island of Formosa and adjacent areas including Quemoy and Matsu. And it is Red China that intends to some day break the Southwest Pacific defense screen of the United States. There can be no question about this, whatsoever.

Therefore, the United States must remain militarily strong in the Far East. We must continue to assist Japan, militarily. Because Japan, with its tremendous population—approximately 100 million—can play an important role in combatting the ever-growing menace of direct and indirect aggression of Red China in the Far East.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

High Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on July 28 there appeared in the Wall Street Journal an article entitled "Riches on the Range: High Cattle Prices Bring Boom to a Cow Town." The article was written at Valentine, Nebr., which is the county seat of Cherry County, in one of the very splendid cattle-raising areas in the sand hills. The article reads, in part:

The cattlemen are only one of the more prosperous segments of a generally booming farm economy, of course. Federal farm men expect hefty harvests, as well as handsome livestock receipts, to push farm income to $12.4 billion this year, the loftiest level since 1953 and 15 percent above last year's postwar low.

That figure has been raised to the figure of $13.3 billion to which I adverted a little while ago in my report on farm income.

On the theory that we should like to be informed about things that are happening in agriculture, and also on the theory that the American people like to hear something factually cheerful and something that shows progress rather than a constant repetition of gloom and pessimism, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 28, 1958]

RICHES ON THE RANGE: HIGH CATTLE PRICES BRING BOOM TO A COW TOWN—RANCHERS SPLURGE ON PLANES, CADILLACS, DIAMOND RINGS; BOOST SIZE OF THEIR HERDS—BUT PRICES MAY DROP IN 1959

VALENTINE, NEBR.—"That is one of our prosperous cattlemen up there," says local Airport Manager Clayton Ellington as he points to a red-winged Piper Cub circling the asphalt runway for a landing. It is not unusual for ranchers around here to commute to town via air.

High cattle prices have brought prosperity to cattlemen throughout the Great Plains. Prosperity is particularly pronounced here in western Nebraska and southern South Dakota. This area escaped the lengthy drought that withered grazing grass through most of the Plains States.

Unable to feed their stock during the drought, many ranchers in other areas began breaking up their herds, shipping huge quantities of underfed steers to market—pushing prices sharply lower. Although ranchers around here felt the general price decline, their cattle, fattened on the still-lush grasses of this area, brought better prices than most. So few ranchers here saw any need for distress selling.

The drought ended in mid-1957, and ranchers generally started rebuilding their herds. Rebuilding, of course, meant cutting the flow of cattle to market; this, in turn, brought rising prices that more than offset the drop in volume. The result: Higher incomes for cattlemen.

As herds are rebuilt, ranchers will begin to step up marketing of cattle. Sooner or later, this is likely to lead to lower meat prices: Farm men expect cattle prices next year to be below this year's levels. Until then, however, consumers will be paying more for steaks, roasts, and even hamburger than they did a year ago.

The cattlemen are only one of the more prosperous segments of a generally booming farm economy, of course. Federal farm men expect hefty harvests, as well as handsome livestock receipts, to push farm income to $12.4 billion this year, the loftiest level since 1953 and 15 percent above last year's postwar low.

SPREADING AFFLUENCE

As the cattlemen prosper, so do they spend, spreading their affluence to others.

White-faced Herefords grazing in lush, knee-high grass on the edge of town are the key to Valentine's prosperity. This western town, founded by trail-riding Texans in 1883, has never outlived its dependence on cattle. Lean cowmen with straw sombreros and riding boots stroll along the town's wide streets, or talk about high cattle prices in the lobbies of the Jordan or Marian hotels. Before heading home via plane, pickup truck, or Cadillac, they usually leave some of their money with local merchants.

"Our volume this year is up 75 percent over 1957," says Stan Jordan, owner of Jordan Jewelry, as he stirs a cup of coffee in a leather upholstered booth of the Marian Hotel coffee shop. A serious, heavy-set fellow, he grins as he explains: "We're in a luxury business so I'm the first to feel effects of any changes up or down in cattle prices. One rancher came in not long ago and bought a $5,600 diamond engagement ring. Another bought a $175 Hamilton electric wrist watch for a high school graduation gift."

"When cattle prices are off ranchers won't spend anything on lightning insurance for their cattle," says Ray Ballard, operator of a real estate-insurance agency under his own name here. "Last year, I had to sell hard to interest ranchers in insurance," he says, "but this year they're coming in to my office and asking about it."

Arch Mullins, owner of the local International Harvester and Pontiac dealerships, can be found in the shop on his establishment wiping greasy hands on a rag. He leads the way into his air-conditioned office, checks figures in a ledger and says: "Our farm implement sales this year are nearly double what we did in the same period last year. We sold 45 cars and trucks this year too, and that's nearly double what we did in the same period of 1957."

DUNNING DELINQUENTS

Further down the street, Lawrence J. Clements proudly leads the way through his 32,000 square foot Midwest Furniture Store. Stopping beside a display of modernistic furniture he says: "Our sales so far this year are up 24 percent over last year, and our net profit is up 19 percent." With everybody doing so well, he says, "we started a program 2 months ago to bring all our delinquent accounts up to date, and we've already put 50 percent of them on a current basis."

"People in this community don't even know there's a recession," says Richard L. Davenport, president of the Nebraska State Bank on Valentine's main street. "Our deposits at the end of June were up $500,000, or nearly 18 percent, over the year earlier level," he notes.

Good weather, lush grazing grass, record feed grain supplies and favorable cattle prices all are responsible for the cattlemen's prosperity, and their good fortune looks as if it will continue for some time to come.

"I've never seen prospects for feed crops and grass as good as they are this year," says Herman C. Aaberg, livestock expert with the American Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago. "Ranchers everywhere seem to be trying to buy calves from each other to put out to grass."

"When you have a lot of feed the only way you can get any good out of it is to feed it to cattle," says Harold Fisher, proprietor of the J. W. Yeast & Son hardware store in Valentine, and a cattle buyer during the height of the fall shipping season.

Claude V. Lamoureaux, a tanned, bespectacled rancher who went broke in the 1930's, drives his gray, 1958 Cadillac sedan through a field of yellow clover on his 12,000-acre Antelope Ranch, 27 miles north of Valentine, points to stacks of alfalfa in an adjacent field, and says: "I got 1.5 tons to the acre on the first cutting, and a ton to the acre is considered very good here." Easing by some of his 1,300 head of Herefords, he reports he has so much feed on hand that he isn't even going to bother taking the usual second cut of alfalfa. "I'll let it go to seed," he says.

The Arnold Cattle Co., which has nearly 4,000 head of cattle on 80,000 acres northeast of town, has a carry-over of 4,000 tons of hay from 1957. This year it will cut another 5,000 tons, but anticipates only 3,000 tons to 5,000 tons of that 9,000 tons of feed will be needed this winter for the present cattle herd.

The same story of abundant feed is reported in practically every segment of the cattle-raising industry, from the western range country to midwestern farms where critters are fattened on corn and other grains. Production of feed grains, including corn, probably will slip below 1957, but when added to the carryover from past years, the supply for 1958–59 livestock fattening seems likely to reach a record 198 million tons, up 5 million tons from a year earlier.

"In Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, California, Texas, and just about everywhere else where cattle are raised, conditions are just about right this year," says Homer R. Davison, president of the American Meat Institute.

Cattlemen find prices to their liking, too, when selling animals.

FIVE CENTS MORE PER POUND

"I can't understand what keeps cattle prices so high," says Olin Ravenscroft, owner

of the Ravenscroft Cattle Co. in Valentine, which has 60,000 acres of land and nearly 6,000 head of cattle at three locations. He reports recently selling 300 head for fall delivery at 27.5 cents and 28 cents per pound, 5 cents a pound more than he would have received for the same type of animals only 6 months ago.

Sitting in the grandstand of the home baseball park as the Valentine Hearts thump the Rapid City Chiefs under the lights, one hefty rancher says: "I just sold a hundred short yearling steers for $29 per 100 pounds, or $5 a hundred pounds more than what I got last year for similar steers." After glancing around at the boisterous crowd in the stands he whispers: "Please don't mention my name. I also do some buying for feedlots back East, and I don't want anybody throwing that price back at me when I try to convince them they should sell for less than that."

On the drive through his ranch, Mr. Lamoureaux points to some whitefaced calves browsing in tall grass. "I sold 93 of these calves for October delivery at $27 per 100, 60 heifers for the same price, and 100 yearling steers for $29 per 100. That's $4.50 to $5 a 100 better than what I got last year," he avers.

In the headquarters of the Sand Hills Cattle Association, Frank J. Sibert, the group's chunky, 29-year-old manager, says: "Generally, prices are running about $3 to $4 per 100 pounds higher than last year at this time. The yearling steer that brought $23 a 100 last year brings $26 to $27 now, with top-quality animals bringing a little more."

Quite a few ranchers who are not presently running cattle at close to capacity on their spreads are planning to boost the sizes of their herds to take advantage of higher prices.

"We'll probably add 1,000 head this fall," says W. B. Quigley, a local attorney who has 1,400 head of cattle out on shares with different ranchers, or on his own place. He expresses confidence that the cattle market will be good for the next several years, then explains how his pasture is being expanded through planting of corn, rye and grasses. "For $10 an acre," he says, "I'll be able to double the weight of the cattle I raise."

RISING COW DEMAND

The impact of the overall cattle buildup is clearly felt here in rising demand for cows. Average cows which can be used for breeding are bringing $200 today, up from $80 to $100 a year earlier for the same type of animal.

Cattle markets around the country note this demand for cows through declines in the number being offered for slaughter. Cattlemen are holding onto their cows and turning them out to pasture with the bulls. Heifers also are being withheld from market so they can be raised for breeding purposes, while calves are being retained and fattened up on the abundant feed.

The number of calves slaughtered this May totaled 716,000 head, 11 percent below April and 24 percent less than in May 1957, the United States Department of Agriculture reports. The 1958 commercial calf slaughter in January through May totaled 4,059,900, down sharply from the 4,937,700 killed a year earlier.

When cattlemen are rebuilding their herds, it shows up through a decline in cow slaughtering and in the supply of lower-grade meat used for hamburger, stewing and the like. In May, for the 10th consecutive month, the number of cows killed for market ran under the figures for a year earlier. In that month, there were 374,000 cows slaughtered versus 450,000 in May 1957.

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] at a dinner held at the Cosmos Club, in this city, on Tuesday evening, July 29, 1958, honoring Secretary Marion B. Folsom, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The address by the Senator from Alabama was an eloquent tribute to the qualities and achievements of Secretary Folsom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL AT DINNER HONORING SECRETARY MARION FOLSOM, OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, COSMOS CLUB, JULY 29, 1958

Mr. Chairman and friends of Marion Folsom, during my years in Congress, and more recently as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have had the privilege of working for the accomplishment of common objectives with many men and women from private business, from the professions, from the executive branch of Government. During these years I have found Marion Folsom unequaled in his capacity and his will to work in harness with the legislative branch for the solution of a common problem. Always he has brought to the executive-legislative relationship the love of fact, the sincere desire for a constructive solution, the devotion to the public interest that has been so productive and so fruitful for the American people.

I like to think that one reason for this human approach to governmental problems lies in Marion Folsom's birthright—in his beginnings in the South. For so many of our problems in social security, in health and education and public welfare, are still more urgent in the South than in some other sections of the Nation. We recall that Marion Folsom was born in McRae, Ga., the birthplace of that renowned Georgian, Eugene Talmadge, famous for his red galluses. Now, I do not know whether Marion Folsom wears red galluses. But he is so human that I have often felt that our honored guest still has a little of that red Georgia clay between his toes. Need I say that it's a long road from that little Georgia village to a place in the Nation's Capital as the head of a great Department of our Government and a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Long ago, it was written, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Marion Folsom is a man of vision. For more than 30 years—in service to forward-looking American business, in service to his Government and to the people of the Nation—he has looked to the far horizons, he has been a man ahead of his time.

He has seen emerging social needs before the needs have been generally apparent. And he has been a pioneer in the development of social programs to meet those needs.

He was one of the chief architects of the original Social Security Act in 1934, as a member of President Roosevelt's Advisory Council on Economic Security. But even then he was already a veteran in social programs. For he had developed in 1928 the trail-blazing plan of life insurance, retirement and disability benefits for employees of Eastman Kodak Co.

Here is a man who divines coming events and steps forward to serve before the time of need. Even before World War II he had become a member of the National Advisory Defense Commission, and during the war he served as a manpower executive. He was a leader in preparing the Nation for the postwar period—as organizer of the Committee for Economic Development, the business group concerned with a dynamic national economy. He served in this period as the adviser to the House Committee on Postwar Economic Planning and Policy, and as the adviser to the Senate Finance Committee on postwar need for changes in social legislation.

When the Communist world moved from cold war to hot far in Korea, he was already laying out the plans and the stratagems of the National Advisory Board for Mobilization Policy.

Later, as Under Secretary of the Treasury, although deeply involved in complete revision of the tax laws for the first time in 79 years, Marion Folsom looked again to the future. He saw the rising United States population among the aged. He brought his experience, his knowledge, and his vision to the aid of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in developing a program of extended coverage and liberalization of benefits in old-age and survivors insurance.

I have worked closely with Marion Folsom in recent years, since he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and we know of his splendid efforts for improving the health of our people, advancing the cause of education, and strengthening the programs for crippled children and maternal care, for vocational rehabilitation and the blind, for the great programs for social welfare.

I do not doubt that as America looks to new social problems, to new areas of human needs and human concerns among our people, we shall again find Marion Folsom in the vanguard.

When we consider the great needs in international health and medicine—the need for assistance, care, and guidance to the peoples of the underdeveloped nations, the need for a vigorous new thrust forward in international medical research—I am convinced that America in furtherance of our foreign policy and in fulfillment of our Christian ideals and obligations must play her part. When the time comes I shall be looking forward, Marion, to your return among us here in Washington. I shall be looking forward to your advice and guidance, your humane sympathy and understanding, your informed and tested wisdom.

Throughout your years of devoted service, you have been ahead of the trend. You have foreseen the changing times. You have anticipated the people's need. And done much to shape the pattern for fulfillment of their need and to build the strength of our Nation.

You have been ever the man of vision, with the courage to move promptly, the wisdom to act constructively, the humanity and the patriotism to serve without partisan ties. This is the peculiar setting of your genius. We pay tribute to you—the builder, the patriot, the prophet, the great American.

The Economy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO expressing its analysis and observations on the state of the American economy. The views and conclusions expressed in this statement represent challenging and constructive thinking on the current economic situation. I find myself in substantial agreement, and wish to commend the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO for this clear, thoughtful, and sound examination of our economy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE ECONOMY

For the past year, the United States has been afflicted with a serious economic recession. Despite the official optimism of the Eisenhower administration and the rose-tinted viewpoint of most of the press, the recession still continues and there is small indication of any sustained upsurge in the immediate future. At best, there is a flattening out of the economy at levels substantially below the peak of economic activity that the Nation must achieve to assure employment opportunities for our growing workforce.

Industrial output has fallen sharply and despite a recent feeble upturn is still 12 percent below peak levels. Steel production, after turning upward in response to an anticipated price increase, is once more in the doldrums. Auto output is far below last year and full recovery in the industry seems to be far off. The capital goods industries are seriously affected and even the most optimistic see no return to high levels of capital goods production for a year or more.

Billions of dollars of output have already been lost forever. Once again the Nation is confronted with the paradox of idle manpower, idle plant, and lost wealth, all of which could be used to build the living standards of the people at home and throughout the free world.

Unemployment now is almost 5.5 million and there is no reason to expect substantial improvement in the months to come. Predictions of 5 million or more jobless workers during the coming winter are commonplace. Unemployment has brought with it needless privation which will grow worse if the slump is permitted to endure.

Joblessness will remain high even when past peaks of economic activity are again achieved. Such levels can no longer sustain full employment because of the growth of the labor force and because of the impact of improved technology.

There is a need to restore economic expansion in keeping with our growing labor force and the promise of our new technology. Past experience has shown that the Nation can achieve a growth rate of at least 4 percent annually, although such expansion has not been achieved throughout the term of the present administration.

While the Soviet Union has a long distance to go before catching up with the United States, its economy has been growing at a rate of at least 7 percent annually, while ours has been stagnating. Restoration of maximum economic growth, therefore, is imperative if the Soviet challenge is to be met and overcome.

The Eisenhower administration has temporized with the recession and has substituted soothing syrup for action. While it has called upon the consumer to buy, the administration has led a battle against tax cuts that would have put billions of high velocity dollars into the purchasing power stream. It has also rejected wealth-creating public works projects, although the manpower and material have been readily at hand. It has substituted a balanced budget for a balanced economy and achieved neither. Nor has the Eisenhower policies halted inflation which today is accompanied by an oversupply of goods and by idle manpower.

While the prime leadership responsibility for meeting the recession rests in the executive branch of Government, Congress cannot escape its responsibility. To date, unfortunately, the Congress has not lived up to its responsibility and has too willingly on important issues followed the administration lead on the economic front.

The problems of ending the present recession, of restoring adequate economic growth and of preventing further recessions still confront the Nation, as does that of an inflation caused largely by monopolistic price administration. These problems will not go away simply because of administration wishes. They will still be with the Nation when the next Congress goes into session. They must be met and the sooner they are met the better for all.

The Employment Act of 1946 mandates Government to play a positive role in sustaining economic progress. This law is being neglected and misinterpreted although its intent is clear.

Failure of Government to utilize its power for the welfare of the Nation cannot long be tolerated. It is time to recognize that taxes are as much a weapon for economic progress as for governmental income. It is time to recognize that an expanded, long-term public works program is essential to prosperity and the national well-being. It is time to recognize that the one deficit the Nation cannot afford is a deficit in employment opportunity.

It is obvious that the Soviet Union is shifting increasing emphasis on programs of economic penetration followed by political subversion and that this is the area in which America must meet the increasing Soviet challenge. A strong America as a part of a strong free world alliance will be equal to meeting the Communist challenge on both the military and economic fronts only if we fully mobilize the economic resources of the productive power of the American economy. Getting America back to work and getting the American economy in high gear on a full employment, full production basis is the most important and top priority job that needs to be done. This will require bold and adequate leadership and action from both the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

Federal Reserve System To Undertake Study of Existing Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, more than 4 decades have passed since boundaries of the 12 districts of the Federal Reserve System were fixed. Since that time many shifts have occurred in population, industrial expansion, and economic needs of the various districts. At present, the 12th Federal Reserve district encompasses a vast area of the West—from Texas to the Canadian border, north of the States of Washington and Idaho. With the addition of Alaska as the 49th State, this district becomes all the more unwieldy as an integrated economic unit.

Because of this situation, I have conferred with William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System about undertaking a survey of the feasibility and soundness of existing boundaries of the 12 districts. I have been assured by Mr. Martin that such a study will be accomplished in the near future in connection with approval of statehood by Alaska. In connection with my remarks, I ask consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Oregonian of July 24, 1958, entitled "Federal Reserve Study."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE STUDY

The rapid growth of population and the shifting tides of residence have brought realization in several sections of the United States that the boundaries of the 12 Federal Reserve Bank districts established 44 years ago are no longer realistic.

In fact, it is contended, sound management of the fiscal and credit resources of the country is being hampered by the distorted composition of the districts.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has joined his voice to those seeking immediate study of Federal Reserve boundaries. In a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson he questioned, specifically, the boundaries of district 12, which extends from the border of Texas to Seattle and has headquarters in San Francisco.

The impending addition of the new State of Alaska, plus growth in the Northwest, should justify creation of a new Federal Reserve district embracing the four Northwest States (Montana now is allied with the Midwest in district 9) plus Alaska, with headquarters in Portland or Seattle, Senator NEUBERGER reasons. Certainly, consideration of Federal Reserve boundaries is long overdue.

Conditions in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Boston Herald. The Herald's editorial page has vigorously and perceptively commented on Indian and Asian affairs for many years. This editorial is another excellent analysis of current problems in India.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of July 29, 1958]

CASHLESS INDIA

Vast, inefficient, underdeveloped India has been making astonishing progress in her race toward industrialization and great power status. Between 1951 and 1957 her industrial production index rose by 37 percent, a more rapid rise than even the United States could boast. And this has been accomplished without interrupting an equally determined drive to improve health, literacy, and living conditions generally for the Indian masses.

But there have been hitches. India's second 5-year plan has had to be cut back not once but several times because of overambitious quotas. And right now India is facing a major exchange crisis.

B. K. Nehru, a cousin of the Prime Minister, is in Washington trying to raise $300 million urgently needed to pay for goods which both the public and the private sectors of India's economy require from abroad. The imports are needed to maintain the pace of industrial expansion, and there just aren't enough exports at the moment to pay for them.

Doubtless this sum will be made up either by us or by the International Monetary Fund or by some combination of lenders, and India will move on again. The danger is, however, that this crisis will be followed by another, and by a third after that, and that some one of them will eventually prove too much, bringing the whole effort down around India's ears.

We cannot let this happen. The free world has a stake in seeing India's growth program succeed. If India fails in her democratic, capitalistic approach to industrialization, other underdeveloped nations will look to Red Russia and China as their models.

A new United States policy is called for. It is no longer enough that we supply emergency aid when the program falters. We should be thinking in terms of a major and continuing infusion. Senators KENNEDY and COOPER almost won congressional approval for such action earlier this summer. Our State Department should now take up the challenge.

Mr. Nehru should get what he needs immediately. But the United States should send a team of experts to India to find out what the country's long-term needs are. Ideally it should persuade other lending countries to join in the survey. And when the facts have been canvassed a consortium of Western nations should be set up to underwrite India's heroic and exciting effort.

Indian aid will cost us less this way, because it will be planned aid, aid that is calculated to get the maximum possible return. And for such an approach we will almost certainly get the enthusiastic cooperation and assistance of our major allies.

India has the potential of a great and self-supporting industrial nation. Here is an investment opportunity which can bring not only great financial returns, but also great political and human ones. We dare not pass it up.

United States Congressman From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting stories that I have been privileged to read for a long time will be published in this week's Saturday Evening Post and is entitled "United States Congressman From Asia."

Milton MacKaye has done an outstanding job in writing about our colleague, Judge DALIP SAUND of the 29th District of California.

Judge SAUND's presence in this House testifies to the world that the people of America are interested in sincere, intelligent, and loyal service on the part of their elected officials rather than their antecedents.

I am happy to have the privilege of serving on the California delegation with DALIP SAUND and serving in the Congress of the United States at a period when, in keeping with its ancient precedent, it opened its door to him.

Judge SAUND's acceptance by the people in his district is best indicated by the very heavy vote given him recently in the California primary, where he was a candidate for reelection.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN FROM ASIA

(By Milton Mackaye)

One of the most colorful personalities in the 85th Congress is a stocky, swarthy, bushy-haired Californian whose very presence in Washington is a practical demonstration of the workability of the American dream. Not too many years ago his neighbors in the Imperial Valley—if called to sit in sober judgment—would have had to vote DALIP SINGH SAUND the politician most unlikely to succeed. His career handicaps seemed insurmountable.

First of all, SAUND was not a citizen and, under then existing law, could not become one. A farmer by profession with a living to make for his family, he was forbidden by the same law to own or lease property. Although a graduate of two great universities, he was a member of an unpopular—and sometimes despised—minority group; a later political opponent was to describe him, perhaps ungenerously, but fairly accurately, as an "immigrant Hindu."

DALIP SAUND was, indeed, born near the city of Amritsar, India, 58 years ago, and today is the only Member of Congress of Asian origin. He came to this country as a student in 1920 and did not return to his native land until 37 years later. Last autumn, accompanied by his American-born wife and one of his two daughters, he made a 6,000-mile tour of Asia that was not only a personal triumph but a solid contribution to improved relations between East and West.

SAUND, a realist by necessity, painted no pretty pictures for the multitudes who crowded schools and public squares to hear him speak. He did not deny that prejudice and discrimination against Japanese, Chinese and East Indians had existed in California when he chose to make his life there; the Alien Exclusion Act effectively barred them from any real participation in public affairs. As a matter of fact, SAUND helped write the law which, passed in 1946, permitted East Indians to qualify for citizenship. He became a citizen himself in 1949.

"I told my audiences," SAUND said recently, "that prejudice thrives in all countries and all climates; parochialism has no flag. But in a democracy things can change and people do change; I explained that things had changed greatly in the United States since World War II. As an example of the new winds blowing, I cited my own election. The fact that I had been an outcast, that I had fought my way up, worked for me rather than against me. The proof of change was the fact that in a district traditionally ultraconservative I somehow made the grade."

The Congressman's graceful statement, however, gave the people of Calcutta and Delhi and Amritsar no hint of the high drama of the campaign 2 years ago in California's sweltering 29th district. This district, 200 miles long by 100 miles wide, is composed of Riverside and Imperial Counties and stretches from the Mexican border to the outskirts of Los Angeles. Temperatures reach astronomical heights in summer and early fall, and one weary eastern reporter who followed SAUND in the desert for 48 hours paraphrased Gen. Philip Sheridan's remarks about Texas when he (the reporter) finally holed up in an air-conditioned motel.

"If I owned both hell and the Imperial Valley," said the reporter, "I'd rent out the Imperial Valley and cool off in hell."

There were many reporters; no congressional campaign in recent years has received so much national publicity. And for obvious reasons, SAUND's opponent, personally endorsed by President Eisenhower, was a world figure—the dynamic and glamorous aviatrix, Jacqueline Cochran Odlum. Jackie, a truly great flier who still holds many national records, organized the WASPS in World War II, served her country in many ways, was and is the friend of admirals and generals and industrial titans. Yet Jackie fought her way up too; at the age of 12 she was a barefoot orphan in a Georgia cotton mill. She ended as the owner of her own cosmetics business. Her husband, who spends his winters on their 1,000-acre ranch at Indio, is well known in the world of finance; he is Floyd B. Odlum, one of America's richest men.

The contrast in candidates provided the drama. SAUND, the educated but obscure Sikh from the rawboned small town of Westmorland, was running as a Democrat in a district which had never failed to send a Republican to Congress. For a time the odds against him seemed overwhelming; one observer described the rivalry as that of the lioness and the mouse.

SAUND kept calm; he shared the limelight created by the prominence of his adversary, and he campaigned shrewdly and to good effect. He knew that the rancors of a bitter primary battle had disaffected many Republicans who ordinarily would have been in Jackie's camp. On election day, Eisenhower carried the district overwhelmingly, but SAUND achieved a major upset. When the last ballots were counted, he had defeated Jackie by a few thousand votes.

Many Californians still regard SAUND's victory as a political accident; that controversy will be resolved when he comes up for reelection this fall. Recently I toured Imperial and Riverside Counties and I can report that he is running strongly and that he is not running scared. The victory was a quick and spectacular one, but the real story behind it began in the village of Chhajalwadi, a good many years ago and miles away.

DALIP SAUND is often described by his friends as completely American in appearance, manner and thought. He is outgoing, indefatigable, and his background is in our pioneer tradition. It is significant that his family were Sikhs, a religious group which separated 500 years ago from the Hindus, who predominate in India.

SAUND's grandfather was a village blacksmith who, in the Congressman's words, "had no assets but five husky boys." The boys left home to better themselves, and SAUND's father and two of his uncles became well-to-do government contractors, builders of canals and railroads, owners of big houses and large tracts of land.

"Neither my father nor my mother could read or write," SAUND told me, "but they were passionately interested in education for their children and the children of our village. They furnished the quarters for the local primary school and they paid the salary of the teacher. It is a western delusion that women occupy an inferior position in India; actually my mother was always the boss of

the family. My father died when I was 10, and this long afterward my mother's admonitions are compulsions. 'Always wash your hands before eating.' Today I find myself sneaking down to the men's room before a banquet at the Waldorf-Astoria. 'Make friends everywhere and no enemies.' I have tried all my life, but have not always been successful. 'Respect religious men.' I still am incapable of entering a room ahead of a minister or a priest."

SAUND attended grammar school and high school in Amritsar and was graduated with honors from the University of Punjab in 1919. A normal next step for a bright Sikh was a position in Britain's Indian civil service. But SAUND was already a follower of Mahatma Gandhi and an enthusiastic Indian nationalist; the newspapers had introduced him to Woodrow Wilson, who wanted to make the world safe for democracy, and Wilson's speeches had introduced him to the writings of Abraham Lincoln. He was America-inclined. At about this time Gandhi and Nehru went to prison, and SAUND's elder brother decided DALIP would be safer at the University of California than in Amritsar. DALIP had expansive ideas—he would study the canning industry in the United States and return to set up a profitable business in his homeland.

A few months later he found himself in Berkeley, domiciled at the residence clubhouse of the Hindu Students' Association with about 80 other Indian students. (One of them, Pratap Singh, he met again last year; Pratap Singh is now chief minister of the province of Punjab.) SAUND enrolled for several agricultural subjects, and also learned that if he took a few mathematical courses it would be comparatively easy to get a master's degree. He went on, during the next 4 years, to win his doctorate in mathematics. The title of his thesis, he remembers, was, On Functions Associated With the Elliptic Cylinder in Harmonic Analysis.

By that time his British-accented English had absorbed both American idiom and campus slang, and he frequently spoke before student and church groups to eulogize Gandhi—whom he never knew or met—and to lambaste British rule in India. His family warned him that the authorities back there had a complete dossier on his anti-British tirades. SAUND was confused about his future. After his elder brother died, there were no more checks from home and he was strictly on his own.

"Like Stephen Leacock's hero," he told me, "I was riding off in all directions. I wanted to write a history of India, be a teacher, return to India as a political fighter, make a fortune. I was adrift in a country where I could not become a citizen, and my first job after earning a doctor of philosophy degree was as foreman of the sirup department in a fruit cannery. I never used my math again."

SAUND had abandoned the traditional Sikh turban, cut his hair, and begun shaving early in his Berkeley years. But he still went to the Sikh temple at Stockton, in the San Joaquin Valley, to celebrate religious days. There he met Hindus, many of them illiterate, who drove big motorcars; they were farmers in the rich, irrigated Imperial Valley. He decided to go there too. So the second job of the doctor of philosophy from Berkeley was that of foreman of a cottonpicking gang near Holtville. He made good money, saved it, planted a good celery crop by sharecropping—and lost his shirt.

The Imperial Valley is like that. There are certainties there; two crops can be harvested annually, sunshine is inevitable, and irrigation water from the Colorado River will wander down your own cared-for ditch. But the market is unpredictable. Farmers make a fortune on onions or watermelons one year, and go in debt the next. SAUND was to place his bets on this agricultural roulette wheel for a good many years, but he also had to get a book out of his system. It was an answer to Katherine Mayo's best seller, Mother India, which Indians considered an outrageous and ill-reported picture of India's backwardness.

Bachelor SAUND went up to Los Angeles to complete his research and there met his future wife. Actually, although they did not remember it, they had met before; Marian Kosa, then 10 or 11, and her mother had been passengers on the vessel which brought SAUND to the United States. One night in Los Angales, Emil Kosa, Jr., a young artist who had heard SAUND speak at the First Unitarian Society of Hollywood, brought him home to dinner and introduced the Indian to his sister. Marian, born in Cape Cod to parents of Czech origin, was then a freshman at University of California at Los Angeles. The SAUNDS were married in 1928. His book and their son, Dalip, Jr., appeared in 1930. The book, My Mother India, was close to Marian's heart because she had typed it so many times, but it was not a financial success.

So it was back to the Imperial Valley and farming and some rather rigorous pioneering. Neither SAUND nor his wife was afraid of manual labor; like their neighbors, they lived in a shack because they could afford nothing better. And in the 1930's the Valley was visited by pestilences. One year it was crickets, the next year mildew. Then it was blackbirds. Mrs. Saund recalls a crop season when they planted maize; it was her duty to stand in the corner of a field and fire a .22 rifle under the clouds of blackbirds as they descended on the ripening corn. It worked too. The blackbirds did not get the corn.

The future Congressman did most of his farming around Westmorland, a once-thriving but now sleepy town which boasts that its geographic location is 180 feet below sea level. He tried everything in his time—alfalfa, melons, onions, celery, cotton; he was one of the first to grow sugar beets and Punjab flax, now important crops in the Valley. Because he could not own or lease land, he often took leases in his wife's name; she, of course, was an American citizen. Or he sharecropped by oral agreement or some other subterfuge. Also he knew what it was like to line up outside a bank for a $50 loan and not get it.

The Saunds prospered enough to buy a new car every year, to take July-August trips to the coolness of Yosemite with their 3 children; they played tennis and hiked, and Marian was active in the Parent-Teacher Association. In the midthirties SAUND hit the jackpot one year with alfalfa. Optimistic—a Valley farmer has to be optimistic—he sank his $8,000 profit in bigger holdings, borrowed $10,000 more, and the next season the bottom fell out of the hay market. SAUND did not take bankruptcy. ("In India," he told me, "a man who takes bankruptcy must keep a coal-oil lamp burning in his window as a symbol of his shame.") But it took him a number of years to pay off his debts.

In the congressional primaries in 1956 a Democratic opponent put into the record the fact that seven judgment suits had been filed against SAUND by creditors. As campaign material it backfired. "What the hell," an El Centro supporter said to me a few weeks ago. "Everybody goes broke in the Imperial Valley sooner or later. Doc SAUND, for all his education, was a dirt farmer like me and he knows what we are up against. He's been broke like the rest of us and he paid what he owed."

Aubrey Lee, a Westmoreland grocer, believes that the Congressman got his first propulsion toward public life in a Current Events Club organized by a group of thirty-odd businessmen in Westmoreland and nearby Brawley. Their monthly meetings were serious affairs; members, turnabout, were required to research and present a paper on one phase of world happenings. "Why, we had it figured out how the war would be fought before it even began," said Lee. SAUND was a stanch supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt and an articulate one. At the Current Events Club he strove to improve his platform manner, and succeeded. He joined the Toastmasters' Club, eventually won its regional speechmaking competition and became the district governor.

Like many another Congressman, SAUND has had a long romance with his larynx—which incidentally needs no amplifier. Even in a private conversation the effect is oratorical, and his rather high voice reverberates from one office wall to the other like the roar of breakers by the sounding sea. Long before he became a political campaigner he was a frequent speaker before service clubs and civic groups, usually with India as his subject. "It wasn't so much that those sunburned men wanted to hear about Gandhi," said a friend. "Some of them didn't even like Hindus or Democrats. It was more that SAUND was always available."

In 1942, physicians made family life more difficult. They told Marian Saund that she could no longer live in the Imperial Valley; her allergy to Bermuda grass made her battle with asthma insupportable. She moved back to Los Angeles and returned to college. She was graduated in 1945 and since that time has been a teacher in the elementary schools of the Fairfax District. It was a curious, divided life. War years were prosperous years in the valley; SAUND batched it and farmed, and drove up to Los Angeles weekends to see his wife and children. On Mondays he took off at 3 a. m. for the desert to make sure the irrigation ditches were properly opened in the early dawn.

It could have been a lonely life, but SAUND filled his odd hours and his evenings with activity. For one thing, he helped to organize the India Association of America, which pushed for legislation to make his 3,000 fellow countrymen eligible for citizenship. He went to Washington, and Clare Boothe Luce, a Republican, and Emanuel Celler, a Democrat, sponsored the bill; in 1946, when President Truman signed it, the bill became law. SAUND got his final papers 3 years later. Books—SAUND still reads himself to sleep every night—were also hedges against loneliness. The political worker who will really work, who is always on call, means money in the bank for any party. When SAUND became a citizen, he was appointed immediately to the central committee of the Democratic Party in Imperial County and later became chairman.

When he decided to run for town judge, however, several of his close associates thought he was unwise. "Doc," said one of them, "a lot of people here came originally from Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. I'm afraid your skin is too dark." But some of those people, prosperous after earlier hardships, felt they, too, had met with discrimination when they came to the valley as penniless Okies and Arkies. SAUND passed the examination required by the State—although he was not a lawyer—and won the election. Immediately five Westmorland citizens petitioned for his disqualification because he had not been a citizen for a year. He did not oppose the petition.

The county board of supervisors had to appoint a judge. Hundreds of Imperial County residents signed a round-robin asking that SAUND get the January appointment; his year as a citizen would then have been completed. The supervisors instead appointed Frank Lyall, long-time Westmorland resident. SAUND defeated Lyall in the following year's election and went on the bench.

Actually this judicial post was similar to that of justice of the peace in many com-

munities, and when his congressional campaign literature referred to him as "D. S. (Judge) SAUND," some of his opponents remarked that he was getting rather handsome mileage out of a position which didn't require a legal education or a great amount of his time. Nevertheless, two Imperial County district attorneys, Arthur Lockie and Don C. Bitler, have described him as an able, alert, conscientious judge who cooperated fully with the law-enforcement agencies. They refer to the cleanup of Westmorland's now ghostlike Fifth Street, which was then one neon-lighted honky-tonk after another; prostitution, narcotics vending, and gambling prospered on the wages of itinerant fieldworkers who, brought in from Mexico, were literally men without women.

For several years SAUND had been doing only part-time farming. He handled farm contracts for the American Fruit Growers, a packing firm, and also was a fertilizer salesman for the Agro Phosphate Company. Then he set up his own chemical-fertilizer business. Thirty-odd tanks labeled "SAUND" currently supply valley farms; the business grosses about $250,000 a year. A. C. Faubion, who was once SAUND's boss at American Fruit Growers, supervises the SAUND business operations in his absence.

There was one thing obvious about the 1956 congressional campaign. The Democrats were united and the Republicans were divided. True enough, SAUND had a rival in the Democratic primary, but he beat him handsomely; five Republicans sought office, and they lashed one another. John S. Phillips, in Congress for 14 years, did not run; he supported Jackie Cochran Odlum. Fred Eldridge, a former newspaperman and president of the Farm Bureau in Riverside County, was her principal rival; he was also a World Federalist. Fur flew. An Indio editor described the campaign as the most literary bloodletting in history; three candidates had made the mistake of writing books. Jackie had written her autobiography; Eldridge, who had served with distinction under Gen. Joe Stilwell in Burma, had written a defense of Stilwell's China policy. Even SAUND's book, remaindered a quarter of a century before, was resurrected to establish him as a dangerous radical because the British Government in India had barred its importation.

Mrs. Odlum beat Eldridge in the primary by a close vote; there seems litle doubt that some of his supporters, indignant over what they felt to be unjust atacks on their candidate, voted Democratic in the fall. And just to prove that anything can happen in California, Fred Eldridge, who refused to endorse Mrs. Odlum, who was personally endorsed by Eisenhower, became the Eisenhower manager in Riverside County. Is that confusing enough?

Sober Republicans this long after are not sure that party division was solely responsible for the Democratic victory; they have done their own intensive researches. Riverside and Imperial Counties, once almost feudally controlled, are changing. Riverside County in particular has grown enormously in population; the rich smell of citrus groves is giving way to housing developments. Democratic workers in 1956 set themselves a goal of registering 10,000 new voters, and probably made it. Impartial observers say the Saund family deserves a hefty share of the credit. Mrs. Saund and her younger daughter, Ellie, moved into an apartment in the city of Riverside, where the candidate was not well known, and began ringing doorbells as fulltime campaigners. Other family members and in-laws were available on weekends.

Mrs. Saund said recently she had spent a lifetime trying to dominate her children and had never succeeded. Dal, Jr., a combat lieutenant in Korea, won a couple of Bronze Stars and was wounded in action. He was graduated this year in mechanical engineering at the California Institute of Technology; he has a pretty wife and a 6-month-old son. Julie, the elder daughter, was president of the YWCA at UCLA, went to work for the engineering department of Convair Aircraft. She met and married Dr. Fred Fisher, a young physicist who specializes in underwater sonics; they now live in Cambridge, Mass., where Fisher is doing research work at Harvard. Ellie will be a senior at University of California at Los Angeles this fall and expects to become, like her mother, a schoolteacher.

The Congressman got heavy support among his district's minority groups—Mexican-Americans, Negroes, and a few East Indians—but there are not enough of these voters to swing an election. He won the farm vote and also did well in the cities. One observer described his achievement as the "skilled selling of a pleasing personality." Another said, "His background as a dirt farmer and his civic activities made the people in the district feel closer to him, despite his foreign origin, than they did to the brilliant Mrs. Odlum."

"I believe," SAUND himself said the other day, "that many, many people just thought it was an opportunity to demonstrate that they believe in democracy and fair play."

When the Congressman brought his bright nimbus of publicity to Washington, the Democrats promptly placed him on the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee. It was as a one-man subcommittee that he made his extraordinary expedition to the Orient—technically to investigate the mutual security program, actually to improve relations between the United States and Asia. The trip began last October 22 and ended January 3. Everywhere, as telecasts and films revealed, the SAUNDS were met by tremendous crowds—in Japan, in Hong Hong, in the Philippines and Burma and, of course, in India.

In Calcutta, in New Delhi, in his native Punjab, they were garlanded with marigolds, mobbed by schoolchildren, lionized at meetings. SAUND's American wife and daughter were of particular interest to the crowds; in one city, when he appeared at a reception without the tired ladies, he was hustled back to his hotel by car to recruit them. In New Delhi he addressed the Parliament for 2 hours, and Prime Minister Nehru—whom he had met the year before in Washington—was host at a private family luncheon. In the Punjab the SAUNDS traveled in a private railroad car provided by his brother Karnail, a graduate engineer who is a member of the five-man board which controls India's railroads. Just the summer before, SAUND had attended a traditional Sikh wedding in Ottawa when Karnail's son married the daughter of the Indonesian Ambassador to Canada.

The Congressman spoke either in Punjabi or English, asking his audiences to choose. Even after an absence of almost four decades, his Punjabi was fluent, but his daughter was told guardedly that he spoke with an American accent. He talked frankly and vigorously about America's position in the postwar world vis-a-vis communism; he willingly discussed such sore issues as Little Rock, Goa, Kashmir, and Pakistan, often using Indian stories and parables to make his point. Returning to his native village was perhaps his most affecting experience. There the 30 trees he had planted as a youngster—in India an act of virtue—were full grown and provided pools of shade. Under the trees a Sikh poet sang elegiac verses which—and here the Congressman found himself in tears—included SAUND's mother's dying words.

SAUND's opponents have accused him of a certain ineptness as a working Congressman, but he showed no ineptness as a goodwill ambassador. When I toured his district, I discovered that the Indian expedition had made him new friends, particularly among women voters interested in peace and good international relations. But he still is a controversial figure; those who like him like him very much, and those who dislike him are eloquent about it.

SAUND has done some floundering as a Congressman, but most freshmen in Washington do. His colleagues have given him friendly help in matters concerning his district and probably will give him more before election time. A great many of the large growers in the valley oppose him, but, on the other hand, he has in the past had the support of such men as Jack H. Benson, one of the largest farm operators; wealthy rancher John J. Elmore; and James Simons, president of the Imperial Valley Beet Growers Association. "In another term or two," Benson predicted recently at his office in Brawley, "he will be one of the outstanding men in Congress. He has education, energy, and brain power."

Personally, SAUND is spirited, well informed and engaging. Of necessity, he early learned to get along with people. "Even in the first days, when things were harder," he told me, "I never had a fist fight or cussed back a man who cussed me. That's what Gandhi taught, and it was the way my mother raised me." His own son has described him as the most patient man he ever knew; in a lifetime, he said, he has never seen his father lose his temper. At 58, SAUND looks 10 years younger; his blue-black hair is only faintly graying; he is well dressed in a public calling where wrinkle and rumple are often a trademark. He does not drink or smoke, but is unstuffy about people who do. As a onetime New Dealer, he supports most so-called liberal causes and last year won an Urban League award for bettering race relations. Yet he is an odd combination of meditative idealist and shrewd crossroads politician. He makes political errors, but rarely repeats them. A generous man himself, he is as rapacious for his district as any string-tie Claghorn from the peanut-growing belt. Like most Congressmen—where their homefolks are concerned—he regards the Budget Bureau as the sworn enemy of man's highest hopes.

Mrs. Saund took a sabbatical year from schoolteaching when her husband went to Congress and now makes frequent trips east. But she still pursues her chosen schoolteaching career. The Saund home in Los Angeles is on a steep slope in the Hollywood hills; Mrs. Saund bought the lot because of the view. Her husband and son in 1950 built the 3-bedroom modest white house with a minimum of professional help and a maximum of effort; most of the building materials had to be hoisted aloft by cables. A celery crop, which had proved so disastrous when SAUND first went to the valley, this time paid the bills. The roulette wheel always turns. In Washington the Saunds make their home in a Connecticut Avenue apartment.

The Republicans in the 29th District this time have taken careful aim at the man from Chhajalwadi. Party lesions have been salved and wounds bandaged. All substantial factions of the party are supporting John Babbage, a 42-year-old lawyer from Riverside who has made his mark in many ways. Born in New York, he worked his way through the University of Southern California and won a scholarship to the Columbia University Law School. For 6 years he was a special agent for the FBI, spending 3 of the war years in South America. After coming to Riverside as a deputy district attorney, he went into private law practice. He was elected to the California Legislature in 1948 after receiving both Republican and Democratic nominations in a primary (remember, California is that State which allows crossfiling in a primary) and spent two terms there. In an evening interview at the famous old Mission

Inn at Riverside, I found him an affable, ambitious, and intelligent young man.

But for all the self-examination of Republicans in Imperial and Riverside Counties, DALIP SINGH SAUND may not be an easy man to beat. Let his wife have the last word.

"DALIP is the optimist in our family. I am the worrier and brooder. He is optimistic about things turning out well and, astonishingly enough, they often do."

The St. Lawrence Seaway: How It Stimulates Wisconsin's Industrial and Commercial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the June 1958 issue of the magazine Torch, published by the Milwaukee Advertising Club, an excellent article devoted to the constructive impact of the St. Lawrence seaway on the State of Wisconsin.

A great many articles have appeared on this general subject, as might be expected.

But the unique features of Torch magazine, with its graphic presentation of maps and photos, makes this, like other articles in Torch, particularly impressive.

The fact that the article's author is Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee, an expert Badger who probably knows from firsthand experience the meaning of the seaway in terms of Wisconsin as much as or better than any other single man in my State, further contributes to the article's great value.

I may say that Torch magazine in its own right represents one of the most brilliant printing jobs which it is my pleasure to see. I know of few publications anywhere in the United States in the graphic arts-advertising field which do a better job, in black and white and in full color, than does this outstanding monthly magazine, representative of an outstanding ad club. It is no accident that it appears in Milwaukee—one of America's greatest graphic arts centers.

I send to the desk the text of the article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, preceded by a list of the editorial staff of Torch, and the officers of the Ad Club, because I believe that they are to be congratulated for their contribution to the progress of the advertising profession.

There being no objection, the list and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICERS OF MILWAUKEE ADVERTISING CLUB, 1957–58

Officers: President, James W. Murphy, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; vice president, Burton E. Hotvedt, Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap, Inc.; secretary, Peter W. Olsen, Olsen Publishing Co.; treasurer, Homer J. Bendinger, the Milwaukee Journal.

Board of governors: Carl N. Becker, Becker Electrotype Co.; Franklin G. Beezley, Bert S. Gittins Advertising, Inc.; Frank V. Birch, Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap, Inc.; Walter G. Cruice, Pohlman Studios, Inc.; Walter J. Kessler, Pabst Brewing Co.; Joel Kursel, Hoffman & York, Inc.; H. Ellis Saxton, Saxton Agency; Robert C. Slater, Slater-Rost Studios, Inc.

STAFF OF THE TORCH

Editor, Winston C. Williams, Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap, Inc.; art editor, Robert C. Slater, Slater-Rost Studios, Inc.; industries feature editor, Robert F. Buntrock, Milwaukee Association of Commerce; graphic arts feature editor, Carl N. Becker, Becker Electrotype Co.; graphic arts news editor, Edward O. Goetz, Olsen Publishing Co.; Torch-Lite Parade editor, Robert W. Maercklein, Maercklein Advertising; meetings editor, Kenneth W. Gredler, Andrews Agency, Inc.; social events editor, H. Kendig Eaton, Mathisson & Associates, Inc.; business manager, Robert E. Schulz, Nordberg Manufacturing Co.; associate business manager, Earl J. Holsen, Frank H. Bercker Studios, Ltd.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: HOW IT WILL STIMULATE WISCONSIN'S INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL GROWTH

A new $85 million integrated aluminum processing plant, first of its kind, built by Reynolds Aluminum Co., on the banks of the St. Lawrence River near Massena, N. Y. Next door, a gigantic new aluminum foundry for General Motors. Ready for launching at Detroit, the largest bulk freighter in the entire history of the Great Lakes, built by Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company of Milwaukee. At Bay City, Mich., a shipyard humming with the building of 4 guided-missile destroyers for the United States Navy, with a contract value of $70 million. Along the Ohio shore of Lake Erie an impressive array of new chemical, petrochemical, electronics, rubber, food, and metal processing industrial plants. In the Indiana sand dunes at the south end of Lake Michigan, Bethlehem Steel's acquisition of 3,500 acres of lake shore which Mr. Eugene Grace said was not being acquired for a "bird sanctuary."

In business papers, the New York Central Railroad, arch enemy of the seaway project, inviting industrial development in the valley of the St. Lawrence to take advantage of a development which the New York Central bitterly fought for 40 years. One thousand and five hundred miles west, the State of Nebraska advertising the advantages of new industry in Nebraska, served by the seaway.

In Milwaukee and all major lake ports, the ringing sound of piledrivers and the clatter of dredges, and bustling activity on the waterfront as industrial brokers and real estate agents survey the opportunities for industrial sites served by deep water. Along Milwaukee's river and lake channels new manufacturing plants, ship repair enterprises, warehouses, truck terminals, and a huge new electrical power installation to serve the rising demand for electrical energy in the harbor area.

SEAWAY ALREADY BENEFITING STATE

These are some of the already visible industrial impacts of the St. Lawrence seaway. In Wisconsin, industry has already benefited tremendously from this great project which our State so long and vigorously advocated. Wisconsin asserted its political leadership throughout the long fight for the seaway, and it was singularly appropriate that the seaway bill finally passed by Congress after 35 years of debate carries the distinguished name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY.

Wisconsin also made its contribution to the building of the seaway. Lou Perini, a giant in the contracting industry, and one of the principal builders of the seaway, estimates that Wisconsin-built equipment to the value of $50 million, has gone into the building of the seaway. The great power dam at the International Rapids, the second largest power producer in the world, will have Milwaukee-built turbines and transformers and Wausau-built gate lifters. The great names of Wisconsin's industry are to be seen everywhere in the earth moving, construction, and electronic phases of the seaway.

HUGE PROJECT NEARS COMPLETION

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project, the subject of national controversy for 30 years, is moving rapidly toward completion. The turbines in the great new power stations at the International Rapids are scheduled to start spinning in August of 1958, adding 13 billion kilowatt hours to the annual power output of New York State and the Province of Ontario.

In April of 1959, the great new locks of the St. Lawrence project will open to lake and ocean ships. For the first time in history, the largest lake vessels will be able to move from the Great Lakes to tide water, and some 80 percent to 90 percent of the world's shipping will be able to sail past Montreal, the former head of salt water navigation, and to make lake ports into sea ports. The benefits of low-cost water transportation will apply for the movement of industrial raw materials, farm produce, and finished goods of all kinds.

ECONOMIC IMPACT TO BE TREMENDOUS

It has been said that the North American continent is not likely ever to see again an engineering project as huge in scope and in cost as the building of the seaway. As this monumental engineering task nears completion, industrialists, transportation experts, writers, economists, and Government officials, all the way from the Atlantic seaboard to the Rocky Mountains, are busily analyzing and projecting the economic impact of the St. Lawrence seaway upon ways of life and methods of business throughout the Middle West. Canadian public opinion is unanimous that the seaway will prove to be the greatest single force in the development of Canada and her resources. Shipping executives throughout Europe and South America are forecasting and planning for the seaway.

The seaway may well prove to be a decisive factor in future patterns of industry and commerce in Wisconsin, and throughout the Great Lakes area generally. Healthier population growth curves, and the indices of manufacturing production, show clearly that the Great Lakes region has emerged from the economic doldrums which retarded the area throughout the 1930's and 1940's. The Great Lakes area has much to offer in the way of natural resources, climatic advantages, skilled populations, and the world's largest regional concentration of industrial and agricultural development. The Great Lakes themselves have been a great unifying force, offering an almost inexhaustible supply of fresh water, and the lowest-cost mass transportation found anywhere in the world. The natural highway offered by the Great Lakes brought together the region's rich resources of coal, iron ore, and limestone. This union developed the greatest concentration of steel production and manufacturing enterprise found anywhere in the world.

WHAT SEAWAY MEANS TO WISCONSIN

How will the seaway affect industry in Wisconsin and the foreign and domestic commerce of this State?

A flourishing ocean trade is already developing on the Great Lakes, in spite of the limitations of the present 14-foot seaway route, soon to blossom out as a 27-foot system of navigation from tidewater at Montreal all the way to Chicago, Milwaukee, and

Duluth-Superior. For example, 25 regular lines of ocean steamers are now serving the port of Milwaukee with perhaps 250 ocean sailings chalked up for the port in 1958. In 10 years ocean traffic at Milwaukee multiplied 40 times in volume. Cargoes have moved directly from Milwaukee to a hundred overseas ports on 4 continents since 1946.

The west bank of Lake Michigan is undoubtedly the most strategic single area in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway, because of the deep and rich hinterland served by west bank Lake Michigan ports. It is a striking and favorable omen that the 3 ports of Chicago, Milwaukee, and Green Bay handle 60 percent of the ocean commerce of all Great Lakes ports combined. No better evidence could be developed to show how favorably Wisconsin is situated to take advantage of the seaway; to serve the trade territory between Lake Michigan and the Rockies; and to prosper from freight rate savings which already range from $5 to $30 per ton of cargo by use of direct ocean shipping as compared to the rail-ocean combination through seaboard ports. An infinite variety of raw materials, manufactured goods, and farm produce are already utilizing the seaway route to link Wisconsin with overseas markets. Impressive shipments of Wisconsin-built machinery, engines, automobiles, manufactured goods of many categories; and hides, meats, lard, grain, and dairy products from Wisconsin farms are much in evidence on the docks of Milwaukee's outer harbor.

TONNAGE OF SHIPPING TO SKYROCKET

The United States Department of Commerce and the Dominion of Canada estimate that the St. Lawrence route, fully developed and utilized, will serve from 50 to 80 million tons of new commerce each year. From 50 to 60 million tons will consist of iron ore, grain, petroleum, and other bulk traffic. Estimates indicate that up to 10 million tons per year of the traffic moving on the seaway will consist of high-grade, high-value general cargo. This valuable general cargo traffic will be attracted to large commercial and industrial centers, and to the best developed ports of the Great Lakes region.

Wisconsin ports should be prime beneficiaries of the seaway project. A substantial new commerce in general cargo will move through our lake ports with added business for railroads, truck lines, stevedores, warehousemen, brokers, banks, ship repair and supply firms, and all of the colorful and varied enterprises associated with maritime activity and world trade.

NEW INDUSTRY EXPECTED

The seaway should act as a magnet to bring new industry to the Wisconsin area, because exporters shipping to foreign markets, or importers seeking raw material from abroad, will desire the most advantageous locations. Water front sites, both for industrial and terminal purposes, will be in demand.

The construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects has been in itself a considerable stimulant to Milwaukee industry. It is noteworthy that the first contract awarded for railroad construction in connection with the St. Lawrence power project was awarded to a Milwaukee firm. Heavy machinery and earth-moving equipment, for which Milwaukee is famous, is being used in great quantities on the work, and Milwaukee equipment is making a major contribution to one of the world's great construction projects. Milwaukee and Wisconsin firms are participating in the equipping of the great power stations which will harness the rushing waters of the St. Lawrence River, and put them to the service of mankind.

The project will open a new chapter in Wisconsin banking history, with great expansion of foreign trade financing in Milwaukee and throughout the Middle West. The seaway will mean new foreign trade opportunities for Milwaukee and Wisconsin industry, and new markets for the grain, dairy goods, and produce of Wisconsin farms.

MILWAUKEE'S PORT TO BE IMPORTANT ASSET

With a well-established port development, and with ample room for growth, Milwaukee will become a gateway, through which will flow much of the foreign commerce of the Midwest. Milwaukee is recognized in shipping circles as having the most modern port facilities and handling equipment in the entire Great Lakes area. Steamship lines and shippers will utilize this well-equipped gateway. Milwaukee will be one of the principal ports to serve the territory between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains, as far north as the Canadian border and as far south as Denver, Omaha, and Kansas City. The port of Milwaukee serves import and export traffic of 120 cities in 18 western States between Wisconsin and the Rocky Mountains. Since 1946, Milwaukee, by direct ocean shipping, has served 98 major overseas ports, all the way from Rio de Janeiro on the south to Kirkenes, Norway, which hugs the Arctic Circle.

Milwaukee's modern harbor terminals on the lake front and in the Kinnickinnic Basin are especially designed to accommodate vessels of the class that will serve world trade and the Great Lakes, when the St. Lawrence route is in operation. The Milwaukee municipal outer harbor docks are accessible to the largest ships. They are provided with modern handling equipment, and excellent rail and highway connections. The 25 feet of water now available at Milwaukee's outer harbor treminals will be readily deepened, at nominal cost, to the 27-foot draft required to accommodate maximum draft seaway vessels. Milwaukee and other Wisconsin ports are currently making recommendations to the United States Corps of Engineers and are seeking congressional approval for deepening of harbor channels to meet the future needs of deep draft seaway shipping.

In brief, the St. Lawrence seaway will mean for Milwaukee, and probably for other Wisconsin ports, the expansion of port facilities; the growth of rail, water, and truck traffic; greatly increased waterfront activity of all types; vital growth as a trade and banking center. There will be a proportionate expansion of payrolls and community income. The seaway in 1959 will open the door to new economic activity and a new era of prosperity and growth, with Wisconsin strategically situated on America's fourth seacoast.

It should be understood that a maximum development of the type outlined may not occur immediately following the opening of the seaway in 1959, but is certain to develop as shipping, trade, and industry orient themselves to take advanatge of one of the most dramatic shipping developments in the history of the world.

MILWAUKEE ALREADY IMPROVING PORT FACILITIES

To assist industry and business in taking advantage of the new trade facilities which the seaway will stimulate, the city of Milwaukee through its board of harbor commissioners is carrying out an $11 million municipal port improvement program which will significantly enlarge Milwaukee's already excellent public port facilities. Some of the port communities of the Great Lakes have been paralyzed by indecision, unwilling to build too far in advance and yet reluctant to pass up the trade opportunities of the seaway route. No such indecision has cramped Milwaukee's style. Having been confidently building its outer harbor for lake and ocean shipping for the past 30 years, Milwaukee has learned that it can serve industry, and at the same time stimulate job opportunity and community income, by intelligent port planning and building. Two major new outer harbor piers; a large land reclamation project; new highway and railroad facilities; all offer assurance that Milwaukee not only will be ready to dock the seaway ships but to move cargo efficiently to and from inland trade zones. As Milwaukee's port facilities grow physically, so has there been a healthy growth of port service agencies, headquartered in Milwaukee, to serve the special needs of a great foreign-trade center and international shipping port.

Realistic studies indicate that not all of Wisconsin's port cities will become ocean-terminal ports. The smaller port cities do not have the concentration of manufacturing and population to attract ocean-liner services. In many instances, the smaller ports will lack adequate channels and port facilities for the handling of ocean ships and cargo, and it may not be possible for such communities to finance major new port facilities. However, the outports may legitimately hope for substantial benefits from the seaway development in the form of industrial plants seeking port locations; by shipbuilding and ship-repair opportunities; and other fringe benefits which the seaway will bring to our area generally in the way of economic stimulus.

Utopia will not automatically arrive for Wisconsin with the opening of the seaway in 1959. However, practically every economist in Canada and the United States, and many in Europe, are convinced that the opening of a fourth seacoast along the boundary waters between the United States and Canada will signal a new era bright with promise for the Great Lakes region.

It seems indisputable that the opening of the seaway will strongly stimulate waterborne commerce, port activity, shipbuilding, and maritime enterprise throughout the Great Lakes; that it will encourage healthy growth of steel production and allied metal manufacture; that it will open new and productive markets for Midwest agriculture. Opportunity both for the individual and for new commercial enterprise will be larger and more diversified in the Great Lakes region than ever before because of the many new fields of endeavor which the seaway will generate, and the new openings for specialized services as industrial lake ports become metropolitan seaports.

Industrial expansion should logically march hand in hand with commercial expansion. With its reputation for fine industrial craftsmanship, clean government, and good productivity, Wisconsin, westerly terminus of the seaway route, will have a powerful new selling point for the attraction of industry and for continued healthy growth and expansion of Wisconsin factories and farms which have already made for this State a tremendous impact in world-trade circles.

Challenging Study of Outdoor Recreation Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the establishment of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has been greeted with understandable enthusiasm in my home State of Oregon where outdoor values are held in high regard. As a member of the

newly appointed Commission I am highly pleased by the reception given to the work soon to be undertaken, and also that our able Member of the House from the Second District, AL ULLMAN, is to be on the Commission, too.

Outdoor recreation means different things to different individuals and the cataloging of various outdoor resources and developing recommendations to meet the requirements for their future use is both a challenge and responsibility. I am sure that all members of the Commission recognize the grave impact which results of the study will have on future generations of Americans. It offers an excellent vehicle for making the United States a better place to live. Some of the possibilities for preserving our outdoor resources for maximum benefit of the Nation were outlined recently in an excellent editorial in the Mail-Tribune of Medford, Oreg., written by Mr. Eric Allen. I ask consent to include with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial of July 21, 1958, entitled "Outdoor Recreation Survey."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of July 21, 1958]

OUTDOOR RECREATION SURVEY

The outdoor recreational resources of the United States are in for a searching survey. And high time, too.

The Congress recently completed action on a bill providing for such a study, the President signed it, and some of the members of the Commission who will do the job have been appointed.

Among them, appropriately, is Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, one of the Senate's stanchest supporters of conservation and the values of the outdoors.

The Eugene Register-Guard, in commenting on NEUBERGER's appointment by Vice President RICHARD NIXON, said it showed "good judgment," and that "the Senator, who has been deeply interested in conservation for many years, will be a trenchant spokesman for those who fear the day that the recreational potential of America's great outdoors is exhausted."

The 15-man Commission—including 4 Senators and 4 Representatives, plus 7 non-Congressmen to be named by the President—will have a big job, and 3 years in which to do it. They will have up to $2,500,000 to conduct the survey, and will be assisted by an advisory committee of the head of each of the Federal agencies dealing with recreation, plus 25 persons appointed to represent geographical areas and citizen interest groups.

What's the purpose?

Basically, it is to find out, authoritatively and for the first time, just what the United States has in the way of outdoor recreational resources, whether they are sufficient, and what will be needed in the years to come.

Anyone who is at all interested in some form of outdoor recreation (and who isn't?) knows there is increasing pressure on the rivers, streams, lakes, beaches, forests, and mountains which so many of us use these days to revive ourselves from the strains of everyday life.

Consider what it is now, with 174 million population. Then consider what will happen in 1976 (population estimate, 225 million), in 2000 (population estimate 300 million), and so on. Consider what it will be as the 4-day week succeeds the 5-day week, and the 3- or even 4-week vacation succeeds the 2-week vacation. And consider what will be the effect of the vast new network of good roads now abuilding, which will make the outdoors more accessible than ever before.

For example:

In 1926, 6 million visitors went into the national forests. In 1962—only 3½ years away—some 66 million visitors are expected. The National Park System was designed to handle 25 million visitors annually, but it had 59 million last year, and expects 80 million by 1966—the date for the completion of Mission 66 program to bring it up to a point to meet the demand.

But the forests and national parks are not enough. They must be expanded, added to, and supplemented if Americans are not to be as crowded in the outdoors as they are in the cities.

(Oregon is fortunate in that the State owns all its ocean beaches. But of the 3,700 miles of the United States coastline along the Atlantic, only 240 miles are open to the general public.)

Meanwhile, there are many things that must be done before it is too late.

The States must expand their systems of parks and recreational areas. So must the counties and cities, before the land best suited to that purpose is gone beyond retrieving. The areas we have now must be protected and preserved for future as well as present use.

Anything less will be a betrayal of the people these local governments serve.

The Federal agencies, generally, are aware of the demands, and are doing what they can to meet them. Both the National Park Service and the United States Forest Service have increased funds for recreation, and are using them to good advantage. But the appropriations are not, even now, adequate to meet the need.

If progress is continued for the next 3 years and the Commission comes up with a sound, feasible program, there is hope that the Nation's outdoor recreational needs will be met—at least insofar as they can be in a land which already has lost forever much of the land most admirably suited to the need.

Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Senate Public Works Committee is holding hearings on the very serious matter of diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Chicago Drainage Canal.

Under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks a statement I made before the Senate committee on Monday, July 28, 1958. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN VICTOR A. KNOX, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN, SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, JULY 28, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Senate Public Works Committee this morning in order that I may express my views relative to water-diversion legislation.

I am opposed to this legislation. Our Government has a treaty with the Canadian Government which sets up an International Joint Commission with full authority to control the water levels of the Great Lakes. These controls are determined by a series of gages in Lake Superior. When water falls below a certain level known as the curved rule, the flow is cut back in order to maintain proper levels for shipping purposes.

The 11th Congressional District of Michigan, which I represent, alone has approximately 1,000 miles of shore line. My people are greatly concerned over this legislation and what it would do if it were enacted into law.

In March of 1957 the curbstone rule used to determine the water level of Lake Superior, and which may I stress is the natural area of feeding the lower lakes, had gone to a point where it was necessary for the International Joint Commission to cut off 10,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Superior into the St. Marys River and then on down to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. This disrupted the industry in my district. In Sault Ste. Marie, my hometown, the Union Carbide Co. has a contract with the Federal Government for 28,000 cubic feet per second of water for the turning of their turbines in order to furnish the necessary power for company operations.

This cut off also affected the Federal power plant at the Soo Rapids. They had to discontinue what they call No. 10 unit because of the low water levels in Lake Superior and this powerplant furnishes the power for the operation of the Soo Locks.

To me it would be disastrous at this time to enact legislation that would divert water from the Great Lakes area into the Chicago drainage canal. As far as the Chicago drainage canal is concerned, it has been said that they are going to use it for flushing purposes. That may be true to some degree; but—if we are going to be consistent in legislation which we have passed whereby we have appropriated millions of dollars to assist in the construction of sewage-disposal plants—for what purpose? To clean up our streams, our lakes and our rivers. So why should we start to divert water for flushing purposes? In my opinion, I think it is about time that all of the States along the Great Lakes and connecting waters should take advantage of the legislation that Congress has enacted, and get their houses in order and stop the pollution of the streams, rivers, and lakes of our Nation.

Lake Michigan, as are the other lakes, is part of a complicated drainage basin which affects the welfare of 7 States and 2 nations. No change should be made in the operation of the basin without due and careful consideration of the interests of all parties concerned.

I have been going back to my district much this session of Congress, and have seen the low levels especially of Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron. All the levels of the lakes have dropped in the last 4 years, and I am told there has been a 3-foot drop alone in Lake Michigan. A diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan to the Chicago drainage canal would directly affect this already drop of 3 feet.

The effect of this legislation also brings up some other very serious problems, and I refer especially to the question of the St. Lawrence seaway. Any diversion of water would have a tendency to lower the water levels in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, which would require additional dredging at a great cost to the Federal Government in order to have the 27 feet that is required under the law.

Many cities in my district have contacted me opposing the diversion of Great Lakes water into the Chicago drainage canal. I can see why the people of the Chicago drainage canal area are greatly interested in the diversion because of the sanitation question that is involved. But to take an additional 2,000, 3,000, or 5,000 cubic feet per second

from the Great Lakes would greatly aggravate the grave conditions that already exist.

Do we want to continue to divert these waters so we will have to appropriate additional funds in order that we may be able to maintain the 27-foot depth of the seaway?

In addition, I have many harbors in my district, and we are having difficulty in all the harbors along the shores of the lakes. There once again we would be called upon to appropriate funds for the deepening of these harbors so the ships may be able to get into the harbors to load or unload.

I must oppose the legislation and ask that you give serious thought and consideration to the many additional problems that will face us if we divert the waters of Lake Michigan to the advantage of a single community, and without regard to the interests of all others concerned.

Thank you.

Resolution of Sheboygan (Wis.) Typographical Union, No. 710

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Sheboygan Typographical Union, No. 710, has adopted a resolution in regard to the handling of the case of the Mobile, Ala., Typographical Union by the National Labor Relations Board. I believe that one of the functions of a representative is to present the views of his constituents in the national forum.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Sheboygan Typographical Union, No. 710, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

SHEBOYGAN TYPOGRAPHICAL
UNION, No. 710,
Sheboygan, Wis.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the NLRB and its agents while pretending to administer the Labor-Management Act of 1947, is engaging in activities contrary to the provisions of said act and the intentions of Congress when it was adopted; and

"Whereas the Board, its General Counsel, and its agents, who are paid public servants, have interpreted the act in such a manner as to amend the law adopted by Congress; and

"Whereas agents of the NLRB have gone to an extent previously unheard of except in totalitarian countries, having questioned and intimidated certain members of the Mobile Typographical Union, Mobile, Ala., by invading their places of employment and their homes: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Sheboygan Typographical Union 710, meeting this 3d day of July, 1958, wishes to protest this invasion of the sacred rights of the American people, guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States; and further protests this use of methods which are contrary to the American way of life; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a protest be made to the Congress of the United States with an offer to prove by sworn affidavits that the administrators of the infamous Taft-Hartley law have committed such acts without reason or legal authority; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we protest the unwarranted persecution of the International Typographical Union by the NLRB; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of the Congress, and to the International Typographical Union."

Very truly yours,

SHEBOYGAN
TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, No. 710.

David B. G. Rose: A Splendid Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st of June, 1958, in Louisville, Ky., there occurred the death of David B. G. Rose, one of the most outstanding business and civic leaders the City has ever known.

Mr. Rose was 84 years old and for more than a half century had been widely connected with the business and civic affairs of Louisville and the Louisville region—including the other so-called Falls Cities, of New Albany and Jeffersonville, Ind.—and he was also interested and influential in the public affairs of the entire State of Kentucky. During all of his long period of activity, as a business man and civic leader, Mr. Rose evinced the finest character of public spirit and vision. He was always in the forefront of all movements to develop the Louisville region, and the memory of his services will always endure.

In fraternal circles—especially those of Masonic character—Mr. Rose rose to the highest eminence. He was a Mason for 64 years, and for 50 years a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason and a member of the Louisville Kosair Shrine Temple. Indeed, in the great, beneficient and patriotic field of Masonry, he was truly a master of the craft.

Further, Mr. Rose, during his career, had been active in newspaper and business activities, achieving fine success in these fields. A few years ago he wrote an essay on Henry Clay, which won for him a substantial cash prize in a radio contest. That essay, which constitutes a splendid condensed history of the life of the Great Commoner, found its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In keeping with his expressed wishes, his remains were cremated and the ashes cast into the air above the Ohio River, from the Clark Memorial Bridge, which connects Louisville, Ky. with Jeffersonville, Ind. In life he had done much to aid in the movement to improve the Ohio River and the Ohio River valley region, and the services in this connection doubtless led him to decide to request that his ashes be scattered over this great river.

Under leave accorded me, I include as a part of these remarks a news story which appeared in the Courier-Journal of Louisville of June 22 concerning the life, activities, and the death of this eminent citizen and public benefactor, who was indeed a friend to all:

DAVID B. G. ROSE, BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADER IN LOUISVILLE FOR MANY YEARS, IS DEAD AT 84—ONCE CONNECTED WITH 26 FIRMS, HEADED SEVERAL

David B. G. Rose, whose meteoric career in business, community, and political affairs spanned more than 50 years, died at 12:38 p. m. yesterday at Norton Memorial Infirmary.

The 84-year-old former owner of Standard Printing Co. suffered a stroke Monday.

He retired 11 years ago. He lived at 2002 Murray.

At one time he was connected with 26 corporations here. Besides Standard Printing, firms he headed included Bradley & Gilbert Co. and Standard Gravure Corp.

HEADED STATE PRINTING

For 25 years he was circulation manager of the old Louisville Post. For a time, he was State superintendent of public printing. He was chairman of the old Louisville Board of Public Works.

One of his ventures was the development in the 1920's of Rose Island, an Ohio River picnicking and resort spot near Prospect.

He had an interest in the Falls Cities Ferry & Transportation Co., which operated ferries between Louisville and Jeffersonville before the opening of Clark Memorial Bridge in 1929.

Rose, a Mason since 1894, was almoner of the Scottish Rite's Grand Consistory of Kentucky. He had been a 33d-degree Mason and a member of Kosair Shrine Temple for 50 years. He once edited the Masonic Home Journal.

NICHOLASVILLE NATIVE

Rose was born in Nicholasville, where his first business venture was an 8-year-old newspaper vendor. Three years later he had saved enough money to buy a newspaper agency for Louisville, Cincinnati, and eastern papers and managed it until he was 13. He worked as a clerk in stores at Nicholasville and moved to Louisville when 17.

He worked in the Louisville post office and was secretary to Postmaster John Barret. Then in 1893 he became circulation manager of the Post, and in his 25 years built its circulation to equal that of any paper in the State.

HELPED FOUND NEWSBOYS HOME

He helped found a newsboys home on Third near Walnut in the 1890's to provide recreational facilities for newsboys here. He also helped found the International Circulation Managers Association and was its president twice.

Rose founded Standard Printing Co. in 1901, beginning with $75 in cash. In 20 years he expanded it to a million-dollar concern, the largest in the South.

After resigning from the Louisville Post, he served as public-works chairman of the city for 18 months. He caused establishment of Riverside Park at 33d and River, the first public swimming pool (opened in Shelby Park), and was known as the father of daylight-saving time here.

APPOINTED BY QUIN

He was a member of the first disbursing committee of the Louisville Foundation, appointed by the late Mayor Huston Quin. Quin established the foundation 36 years ago so contributions could be made by citizens to a fund for benefit of the city. Years

later, Rose published a booklet of the foundation's history to revive interest in it.

Rose founded the Southeastern School of Printing in Nashville. Among his other business connections were Falls City Tin Tag & Lithograph Co., Inland Miller Publishing Co., Louisville Linotyping Co., Frankfort Elevator Coal Co., and the National Laundry Company of Atlanta.

OFTEN CALLED CAPTAIN

He was a Kentucky colonel, but friends often referred to him as Captain Rose when he commanded a boat on the Ohio named the *Henry Watterson* in honor of the editor he admired.

Once he offered Louisville electric lights for 10 city blocks, hoping to set an example for others of wealth to create a white way of street lights for the city.

He helped organize the Recreation League, forerunner of the city parks system. He was an authority on waterways improvement and campaigned for canalization of the Ohio so the river's inland ports could have access to all parts of the world by water.

WAS IN NUMEROUS CLUBS

He was a member of the Loyal Order of Moose, High Twelve Club, Lincoln Club, Elks Lodge, Kentucky Historical Society, and Douglass Boulevard Christian Church.

In the first campaign of Grover Cleveland for President, Rose was president of the Young Men's Democratic Club. Later he voted as a Republican in elections of George Weissinger Smith as Mayor of Louisville and E. P. Morrow as Governor of Kentucky. He remained active in the GOP afterward.

In 1896, he married Miss Esther Goldnamer, Springfield, Tenn., and for many years before she died in 1947 they lived at 2301 Boulevard Napoleon.

SISTER, BROTHER SURVIVE

Surviving Rose are a sister, Mrs. Belle Drabble, Springfield, Mass., and a brother Charles Mann Rose, Westfield, N. J.

The family requested that expressions of sympathy take the form of donations to the Kosair Crippled Children Hospital.

Rose's body will lie in state at the Scottish Rite Temple, Brook and Gray, after noon tomorrow. The Roscroix Service will be held there at 7:30 p. m. tomorrow, after which the Rev. Thomas M. Giltner will conduct the church service. Cremation will follow.

Honorary pallbearers are Albert Sales, Louis Mayer, Morris Jones, Richard B. Crawford, Goslee Geiger, Circuit Judge L. S. Grauman, D. P. Jones, Sam Gold, and G. Harry Kunzman.

Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on a very fine statement. Also I would like to congratulate the authors of this bill, and on behalf of the professional and self-employed people of my district I should like to express our appreciation to the committee and to the leadership for bringing this bill to the floor. I think it is a good bill and I hope it will pass unanimously.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Philippine Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, state visitors come and go, but it is important that we record in this House what I consider a good example of gratitude from one of our recent visiting dignitaries.

When President Carlos P. Garcia, of the Philippines, returned to his homeland, upon his arrival at the Manila Airport where he was greeted by thousands of his fellow countrymen as a returning hero, he made a speech in which he expressed his deep appreciation and that of his people for the warm welcome that we gave him here.

Under leave of the House, I include his address in my remarks:

My fellow countrymen, my heart is full and words cannot adequately express my appreciation and that of Mrs. Garcia for this warm welcome. I return to you today from a strenuous 2 weeks in the United States where I scarcely had a minute to myself. I am happy to report to you that I carried out my hour-to-hour schedule without a hitch and that the American people showered us with kindnesses and tendered us hospitality that have moved me deeply. I do not have to tell you that the cordiality of their welcome was not so much for me as a person as it was for our people for whom they have real affection.

I understand I am in tomorrow's program for an address in which I expect to make my Fourth of July speech and report on the result of my mission. Suffice it for me to say now that our people have every reason to rejoice that we have a true friend in the United States and that there is respect and gratitude in the American heart for our contributions to the cause of freedom and democracy. President Eisenhower made patent to me his sincere friendship for me and a sympathetic understanding of our problems. The leaders of the United States Congress of both parties are true and tested friends of our people. The Congress itself heard my appeal with sincere sympathy and hearty regard. The manifestations of love and affection on the part of the American people towards us are more than I can describe in words.

The words Home Sweet Home are never more meaningful than when you go abroad and upon returning you are greeted as we are greeted today with this demonstration of your regard and affection. With gratitude in my heart to America and with a greater determination to dedicate myself to the service to our people, I return to our beloved Philippines happy to report to you: mission accomplished. To you all, our heartfelt thanks—Mrs. Garcia and mine—for this very warm and enthusiastic reception.

It is not always that we get such sincere expression of gratitude from those who visit us. It seems to be typical of the Filipino people that they should be so thoughtful and considerate and that they never fail in showing their courtesy and gentility. We Americans appreciate such thoughtfulness and courtesy and it makes us all the prouder to have the Filipinos as our friends and allies.

President Garcia left the United States after having rendered American-Philippine friendship a real service. His public pronouncements here were all well received by the American people. His was, indeed, a successful mission. We are happy he came and his people and ours are really the richer for his having visited us.

The communique that President Eisenhower signed jointly with President Garcia shows unequivocally the eminent position that the Philippines occupies in American official evaluation. Because it is an important document bearing on the relations between our two countries and because it is a state paper of far-reaching significance in our foreign relations, I include it in my remarks.

Following is the full text of a joint statement issued by President Garcia and President Eisenhower at 7:30 a. m., Friday, June 20, at the conclusion of the Philippine Chief Executive's 3-day visit in Washington, D. C.:

The President of the United States and the President of the Republic of the Philippines today concluded the valuable discussions they have held over the past few days on matters of interest to both countries. These talks centered chiefly on United States-Philippines relations, but they also included an exchange of views on matters of international significance to both countries with special emphasis on Asia.

During his 3-day visit President Garcia addressed a joint meeting of both Houses of the Congress, and he and members of his party conferred with the Vice President, the Secretary of State, individual Members of Congress, and other United States Government officials. After leaving Washington, President Garcia will visit other parts of the United States and will meet governmental, cultural, and business leaders.

I

The two Presidents reviewed the long history of friendship and cooperation between their countries and they expressed confidence that their respective people will continue to benefit from this close association in the future. Moreover, they recognized that similar cooperation among the nations of the free world had been effective in recent years, in preventing overt aggression in the Far East and elsewhere in the world. The two Presidents pledged themselves to maintain the unity of strength and purpose between their countries and the other countries of the western Pacific in order to meet any threats to peace and security that may arise.

The two Presidents reaffirmed their adherence to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. They recognized that through dedication to that Charter the nations of the world can progress toward the attainment of the universal ideal of peace with justice based on the dignity of the individual. With this objective they will continue to support and encourage the activities of the United Nations organization.

They noted that great progress has been achieved under SEATO in the strengthening of the free world's defenses against Communist imperialism in Southeast Asia. They concurred that in the light of the continued threat of Communist military power in Asia, SEATO's defensive capability must be carefully maintained. Toward this end the United States will continue to assist in the development of the Armed

Forces of the Philippines, in accordance with mutual-security programs jointly approved with the Republic of the Philippines.

They reviewed, in this connection, the important role played by the Mutual Defense Pact between the Philippines and the United States. They agreed that the aggressive intention and activities of communism in the Far East and in Southeast Asia render the maintenance and strengthening of these defensive arrangements an absolute necessity. President Eisenhower made clear that, in accordance with these existing alliances and the deployments and dispositions thereunder, any armed attack against the Philippines would involve an attack against United States forces stationed there and against the United States and would instantly be repelled.

In the spirit of these alliances, and with particular reference to the problems affecting the military bases operated by the United States in the Philippines, they expressed mutual confidence that these questions would be resolved to the satisfaction of the two countries, having regard to the principle of sovereign equality and the vital requirements of an effective common defense.

II

The two presidents reviewed progress toward economic development made in the Philippines over the past several years and examined the current economic problems with which that nation is faced. Economic discussions were also held between Philippine officials and representatives of the State and Treasury Departments, the Export-Import bank and the International Cooperation Administration. The Philippine officials outlined a long-term program for economic development. In view of the inability of the United States to anticipate accurately financial availabilities and relative requirements beyond the next 12 months, immediate emphasis was placed on meeting the initial requirements of the Philippine program.

For these initial requirements the Export-Import bank informed the Philippine Government that it will establish a new line of credit of $75 million for financing private and public development projects in the Philippines.

The Philippine Government was also informed that, subject to congressional action on the additional appropriations being requested, the Development Loan Fund would examine specific projects submitted to it to determine whether they would merit Development Loan Fund financing in an amount not to exceed $50 million.

III

In the course of their talks, the two presidents were deeply aware of the special significance of their meeting as the heads of state of two countries, one of which through the revolutionary process and by mutual agreement obtained its independence from the other. They realized that, in the context of present events, their meeting would provide a valuable object lesson on the relations of mutual respect and equal justice most appropriate to two countries, great or small, which share a common faith in freedom and democracy.

IV

President Eisenhower and President Garcia concluded that the understanding reached, as well as the personal relationships established during this visit, will contribute significantly to the mutual good will and friendship which traditionally support Philippines-United States relations.

C. P. GARCIA.
D. D. EISENHOWER.

Aside from the reference to the development loan which he succeeded in getting, despite the many demands upon our Government, the communique stands out from similar documents in that it underscores the unique and special relationship obtaining between the United States and the Philippines.

Two important statements have impressed me as revealing in a new way our close attachment to the Filipino people. The first one is the statement that "any armed attack against the Philippines would involve an attack against the United States and would instantly be repelled."

The other statement is more significant in that it shows that the American people are not willing to deny to others what they claim for themselves. This statement, in referring to "the problems affecting the military bases operated in the Philippines," expressed the mutual confidence of the 2 signatories that such questions would be resolved to the satisfaction of the 2 countries "having regard to the sovereign equality" of the United States and the Philippines. "Sovereign equality" are key words that the American people respect and hold as vital in their relationship with the Philippines.

Life magazine was correct when it headlined the fact that President Garcia had charmed the American people. He achieved this by his forthright utterances, his dignified mien, his statesmanlike approach to world problems. He certainly projected to the American people with his winning personality the best in Philippine life and in achieving this he showed that the expectations of the Philippine electorate in electing him as their national leader were fully justified.

In continuing Gen. Carlos P. Romulo as Philippine Ambassador to the United States, he has shown that he is not swayed by partisan politics but only by what he believes will best serve Philippine welfare, and this is another reason why he made such a favorable impression in Washington. For those of us who know Ambassador Romulo have seen the dedication and loyalty with which he has served his people, the effective leadership that he has exercised as the head of Philippine representation in this country, the persistence and determination with which he has espoused the cause of the Philippine guerrillas and veterans—and nobody knows this better than we do in Congress—and that is why he has won our admiration and respect. We who have heard his well reasoned and convincing pleas for the Philippines appreciate his effectiveness and value as Philippine spokesman in Washington and cannot but congratulate the Filipinos and President Garcia for having such an able and worthy ambassador. No country is better represented here than the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, the United States faces grave problems in its international relations. We are confronted today by a crisis in the Middle East. There will be others in the future. Our actions will be misrepresented and our national purposes misunderstood by those bent on misrepresenting and misunderstanding us. But while we can evoke sentiments of gratitude such as that so eloquently expressed by President Garcia and while we can articulate feelings as noble as those epitomized in the communique signed by our President and the President of the Philippines, we can look to the future with calm confidence, assured that our Republic will continue to have the good will and friendship of a free and decent world.

The Pros and Cons of Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the anti-tobacco fanatic, because of the justified national fear of cancer, has been seeking to place tobacco as the cause. This charge has never been proved, and it would be well for us to ponder the merits of both sides of the controversy before helping to destroy an industry that pays $2,500,000,000 into the tax coffers of the United States, supplies the livelihood, in whole or in part, to 17 million people, and brings comfort, relaxation and enjoyment to many.

The pros and cons of tobacco being very much in the public eye right now, I thought it would be interesting to include in my remarks the following news items and editorial viewpoints:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 10, 1958]

NEW CIGARETTE REPORT

A new report from the National Institutes of Health has added statistical corroboration to previous warnings about the association between heavy cigarette smoking and high death rates.

Its major finding, from a study of 200,000 veterans, was that the death rate of cigarette smokers during a 2½-year period was 50 percent higher than the rate among nonsmokers. The more cigarettes smoked a day, the higher the rate. Among former smokers, fatality rates were lower than those for heavy smokers, but still greater than the nonsmoker rates. In lung-cancer deaths, as previous studies also have found, victims who had been cigarette smokers outnumbered nonsmokers 10 to 1.

These are impressive figures. The trouble, however, is that they are nothing more than figures. As a purely statistical study, the NIH project added no new medical proof of the alleged pathological dangers of cigarettes. Still missing is positive clinical substantiation of the degree to which smoking might have caused, or even contributed to, any of these deaths. And until this substantiation is provided, there is not likely to be any final resolution of the cigarette controversy.

The great need, therefore, is unremitting research, both public and private. Virtually every cigarette company has instituted ambitious projects, aimed mainly at the development of more effective filters to remove tars and nicotine, and some of these are producing dramatic results. But once again, there is no unanimity on whether there actually are carcinogenic or other harmful agents in the tars and nicotine. The true answer to the cigarette question may come only from basic research into the causes of cancer; heart disease, and other ailments in

which the cigarette is pictured as a villainous ally.

Where does all this leave the smoker? It leaves him with one more reason for concern about his smoking, but still with no firm basis for deciding whether to continue, to taper off, or to quit entirely. It is encouraging, therefore, that Surgeon General Burney is aware of the need for further public explanation and education by the Public Health Service which should help the smoker interpret the existing facts.

[From the Daily News of New York July 9, 1958]

Cigarette smoking on the strength of another of those allegedly scientific reports asserted to show that cigarettes cause lung cancer.

The Health Service concedes that this belief is backed up by statistics only, not by laboratory experiments.

Thus, a Government agency will use taxpayers' money to propagandize for a proposition it cannot prove, in an attempt to injure or destroy a great industry.

Maybe, though, the tobacco people should be grateful for this planned attack on them. In the last 3 years, with fanatics screaming on all sides that cigarettes will murder you, cigarette sales have been going up, up, and up.

[From the New York Journal-American of July 8, 1958]

UNITED STATES AID FIGHTS CIGARETTE SCARE

(By Don Oberdorfer)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—While the Surgeon General was announcing a Government campaign against heavy smoking yesterday, another Government official was urging citizens to "sit back, relax, and smoke a cigarette."

He is Joe R. Williams, Chief of the Tobacco Division of the Agriculture Department's marketing services. He helps tobacco farmers sell their leaf.

Williams said a study of 300 years of antismoking crusades shows the attacks on tobacco usually end up by stimulating consumption.

The current antismoking campaign, touched off by a new Government medical report on high death rates among heavy smokers, will add another few pounds to tobacco consumption, Williams predicted.

AFFECTED HIS WIFE

"My wife is so disturbed over the current health scare that she is now smoking twice as many cigarettes as she did a year ago," Williams said.

He traced the first attacks on tobacco to King James I of England, who wrote a book titled "A Counter-Blaste to Tobacco" after the weed was popularized by Sir Walter Raleigh in 1604.

The King wrote that since Indians used tobacco smoke to cure venereal disease, no English gentleman would risk the implication by indulging in the same remedy.

In 1830, Williams recalls, educators, physicians, clergymen—and P. T. Barnum—launched a campaign on tobacco which lasted 30 years.

Horace Mann, Henry Ward Beecher, and Horace Greeley crusaded against smoking.

Tobacco was held responsible for many diseases—including cancer and insanity.

The advent of the cigarette in the 1890's brought a new antismoking crusade. Between 1895 and 1921 a total of 14 States banned the sale of cigarettes. By 1927, all of these laws were repealed.

The Agriculture Department official calls the tobacco health crusade a big smokescreen.

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun of June 25, 1958]

A PROPHET IN THE SMOKE

For about 5 years now the American Cancer Society has been at the forefront of the anticigarette chorus, howling away mightily. All that time cigarette manufacture has been growing steadily—from 369 billion units a year to 410 billion, and an estimated 425 billion for 1958.

One can appreciate, therefore, a certain sense of frustration in the cancer society. It isn't altogether a matter of a prophet's being without honor in his own country; it's also a matter of prophecies being sharply disputed by other prophets, equally respectable. The statistical relationship between lung cancer and cigarette smoking is provocative, but it is a statistical relationship only and there are many statisticians as well as medical authorities who question the deduction of a pathological relationship therefrom. The cancer society's own researchers and pathologists seem as far today as ever from establishing even experimental proof that cigarettes cause cancer.

That may explain the more-than-slight trace of asperity that creeps into the public utterances of some cancer society spokesmen. The other day, for instance, the society's Dallas outpost was listening to a talk by a Dr. Robert J. Samp of the cancer research staff at the University of Wisconsin center. As the speaker addressed his audience he became more and more peeved at the clouds of tobacco smoke drifting up from the auditorium. Finally, unable (like Jeremiah) to contain himself, he burst out:

"Nothing makes me angrier than to watch a person take a puff, and smile and say, 'Well, if I'm gonna go, it's a wonderful way to go.' He will go all right, and there's an excellent possibility the way will not be wonderful."

If an annoyed prophet, Dr. Samp was at least too much the scientist to make his prophecy any more explicit. As it stands none can disagree, for we all have to go sooner or later and the way is not usually wonderful no matter what ailment carries us off. But we were reminded once again of the strong Puritan influence in so much of the anticigarette preachments. Dr. Samp, for example, leaves himself wide open to the suspicion that what he resented as much as anything was the spectacle of so many of his listeners enjoying themselves with the weed he pronounces to be noxious.

Who can blame him? Prophets are human, too. But this incident in its turn reminded us of the stand taken by 17th-century Puritans against the cruel sport of bear-beating. The Puritans opposed it (they opposed everything, of course, but notably this) not because it caused distress to animals but because it gave pleasure to human beings.

It would be nice to think that Dr. Samp, relenting of his severity, has gone back to his laboratory to devise some means of eliminating the carcinogenic (cancermaking) ingredient in tobacco. But that could hardly be, for nobody has as yet conclusively demonstrated the existence of such an ingredient in tobacco. As that old English recipe for rabbit pie has it: "First, catch a rabbit."

[From the New York Journal-American of July 7, 1958]

NEED MORE PROOF OF CIGARETTE CANCER

LONDON, July 7.—The United States Government needs more evidence on the relationship between smoking and lung cancer before deciding whether to warn against cigarettes as the British Government has done, world cancer experts were told today.

Dr. John R. Heller, director of the National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, made the point in an address prepared for delivery before the Seventh International Cancer Congress here.

Heller said investigations now under way are expected to provide the additional facts.

"In fact, a review of new epidemiological data will be presented to Congress on Wednesday by Dr. Harold F. Dorn of the National Institute of Health," he said.

RESEARCH NEEDED

Heller said the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and the American Cancer Society have taken the position that "excessive cigarette smoking is one of the factors in lung cancer causation." He continued:

"We believe that more research is needed to identify, isolate and eliminate the various factors in excessive cigarette smoking that can cause cancer, as well as on the role of air pollution and other factors that may cause cancer of the lung in man."

Heller said a "decisive blow" will be dealt cancer in the United States if exfoliative cytology—which has been used successfully in the detection of uterine cancer—can be applied to the early diagnosis of cancer in other sites.

The cytology technique involves taking a sample of material from the suspected cancer site and then studying it for the presence of cancer cells.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 8, 1958]

UNITED STATES BACKS DOWN ON CANCER CAUSE

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The United States Public Health Service says it is obvious heavy smoking is not the sole cause of lung cancer, but it said last night a new study adds further to the growing weight of evidence that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking.

The Service issued the statement in connection with a report made public over the weekend that a study of the deaths of 7,382 veterans found a much higher death rate among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers.

The report, compiled by Dr. Harold F. Dorn, chief statistician of the National Institutes of Health, also said the lung-cancer death rate among regular cigarette smokers was about 10 times that of nonsmokers.

This was challenged by Timothy V. Hartnett, chairman of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee. He said Mr. Dorn's study ignored all factors except tobacco smoking and admittedly included no clinical or laboratory research.

Without directly referring to Mr. Hartnett's statement, the Health Service acknowledged in last night's statement that lung cancer, of course, also occurs among those who do not smoke.

And it added that the factors in heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking which may cause lung cancer have not been demonstrated by clinical or laboratory research.

Long Way To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, July 28, 1958:

LONG WAY TO GO

It is good news that the Army's Jupiter-C missile has put another earth satellite into orbit—the fourth and heaviest (38.43 pounds) to be launched successfully by our country thus far. Named Explorer IV, it is equipped to send back information about a mysterious band of intense radiation in space, and that is what it is doing now as it travels around with 3 of its predecessors still up there—Explorer I (30.8 pounds), Vanguard I (3.25 pounds), and Russia's Sputnik III (2,925 pounds).

These comparative weight figures are worth keeping in mind. They mean, of course, that the United States, even while it takes proper satisfaction in the progress represented by its latest manmade moon, has no reason whatever to feel complacent. On the contrary, the difference between Explorer IV's 38.43 pounds and Sputnik III's 2,925 pounds is so great as to leave no room for doubt that we still lag far behind the Soviet Union in spatial rocket power and technology. In fact, as experts like the Army's Dr. Wernher von Braun have warned, we will need to carry on at least another year or year and a half of developmental effort before we can hope to match what the Russians have already achieved in this field. Meanwhile, they can be counted upon to do their best to keep ahead of us.

All this speaks pretty much for itself. Since it bears directly upon our country's position vis-a-vis Russia, militarily as well as scientifically, it plainly indicates that we should do everything possible, as fast as possible, to catch up. As far as space is concerned, the new legislation enacted by Congress promises to be a big help to that end. But perhaps what is needed in addition, as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has declared, is a greater sense of urgency among Americans everywhere, in and out of Government.

Conservation Leaders Oppose Change in Apportionment of Revenues From Tax on Sporting Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, officials of the State of Wisconsin Conservation Department, as well as of many other States, are seriously concerned about a change in the method of apportioning revenues derived from the excise taxes levied on hunting and fishing equipment which are proposed by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the United States Department of the Interior.

For 20 years a method of apportionment has been used which gave recognition to the special problems and needs of States which contain big game hunting areas. My own State of Wisconsin is one of these; our deer hunting is among the best offered in all the States in the Union. Management of big game is a special and separate problem from that of managing small game. It increases the costs of managing a given area above what the cost would be to maintain small game alone on the same area.

At a meeting earlier this month of the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, held in Bismarck, N. Dak., the problems arising from the proposed change were discussed thoroughly. Continuation of the present method for the time being was recommended, to permit time for working out a more satisfactory improvement which would be equitable to all the States, yet give due recognition to the needs of States which must deal with the special problems arising from big game management.

I feel strongly, Mr. President, that the proposed change should be postponed to allow time for the adjustments requested by the Midwestern Association.

I hope that Congress will give close attention to this problem, and that in doing so the recommendations of the commissioners—who are particularly well qualified to evaluate the questions which it poses—will be considered thoroughly.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the resolution adopted by the Midwest commissioners printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS, MEETING AT BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Whereas Public Law 415, better known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, was passed in 1937 and provided that the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition be distributed to the various States by the Department of the Interior on the basis of a formula which included equal weight to land area of each State and to the number of paid hunting license holders as certified to the Secretary of the Interior by the State Fish and Game Departments; and

Whereas for the past 20 years "the number of paid license holders" has been interpreted to mean "the number of hunting licenses sold" and apportionment of Pittman-Robertson funds has been based on this assumption with the full knowledge and approval of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas many people purchase both big game and small game, resident, and nonresident hunting licenses, and it is a well-recognized fact that a certain number of people in every State in the Union possess more than one hunting license—such duplication can be determined only by a most comprehensive and costly statistical survey; and

Whereas it is now determined by the Department of Interior that the method of certification of hunters by the various State fish and game departments is no longer considered valid and, therefore, large sums of State fish and game management funds must be expended for statistical surveys to determine the actual number of hunters in each State, such survey may cost up to $35,000 annually per State, which money will be forever lost to game management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Midwest Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners meeting in Bismarck, N. Dak., on July 11, 1958, respectfully request the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to continue for the time being the method which has been in effect for 20 years for computing the Pittman-Robertson apportionment; be it further

Resolved, That the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife be requested to study the feasibility of amending the Pittman-Robertson Act to use as a basis for the license computation for any State, a maximum of one big game license and one small game license for any one individual. After such study the Bureau shall submit the results along with their recommendation to the respective States for their review and if approved by a majority of the states the Bureau recommend suitable legislation to amend the act; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Members of Congress of the member States of this association.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a similar resolution was adopted by the Western Association of State Fish and Game Commissioners, representing 11 Western States, at their meeting June 25, 1958, at Sun Valley, Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution also be printed at this point in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING CHANGES IN FEDERAL AID ACTS

Whereas the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, more commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, has since its enactment in 1939 been a tremendous asset to the wildlife conservation programs of the States; and

Whereas the formula for the apportionment of these Federal aid funds to the States had the unqualified endorsement of all 48 States; and

Whereas this basis for apportionment has been successfully accomplished these past 19 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners goes on record as being unalterably opposed to any change in the present apportionment formula; and be it further

Resolved, That the Western Association goes on record as being opposed to spending any of the sportsmen's funds for determining the number of duplicate licenses sold and being in favor of continuing the present method of certifying license sales.

Adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, 29th annual conference, Sun Valley, Idaho, June 25, 1958.

Huron, S. Dak., Editor Objects to Bipartisanship in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for several years the editor of the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., has offered cogent objections to the notion that American foreign policy should always be considered a bipartisan matter. Mr. Robert Lusk, the Huron editor, is himself an independent-minded, vigorous critic of conformity and soft thinking. He has consistently tried to stimulate public debate and discussion of conflicting viewpoints relating to both foreign and domestic issues.

I personally believe that Mr. Lusk's position is well taken. It is true that the national interest should always take priority over partisan expediency. But the notion that there is no room for vigorous political differences in the formulation of American foreign policy is a dangerous one. As a matter of fact the chief difference between policy in a democracy and a dictatorship is that the former stems from open and honest discussion of differing points of view, while the latter is an official line not subject to criticism.

In an editorial of July 13, 1958, in the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak., which includes a reprint from the British magazine, Punch, Mr. Lusk underscores the weaknesses in carrying bipartisanship to extremes. I believe that the Members of Congress will find the following editorial comment of interest:

THE PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Bob Lusk)

SHOWING

For years the Daily Plainsman has fought an almost lone war against bipartisanship in America's foreign policy, as well as bipartisanship in numerous domestic fields.

Whether bipartisanship is the cause or the effect of the decrease to virtual nothingness of legitimate and effective debate on public policy in this country, at any rate, in the opinion of this newspaper, unless the trend is reversed, and soon, democracy will shortly be hanging on the ropes in these United States.

There have been small encouraging signs that some others than this newspaper are awakening to the danger. To date, however, they are still afraid to risk doing anything so controversial as to oppose bipartisanship openly.

However, Americans, so sensitive to foreign opinion, might be pushed to running the risk of being branded as opponents to togetherness were they to realize the fact that abroad people are beginning to lump the United States in a class with Russia as far as the effectiveness of their democratic processes are concerned.

PUNCH

At any rate, in the latest issue of Punch magazine of London to arrive on these shores, the United States and Russia are listed side by side in the matter of conformism.

What Punch is worried about is that England may be following suit.

Punch's interesting discussion of the whole question of public togetherness appears in the form of a book review. Because of its timeliness, it is being reprinted herewith in its entirety:

"I doubt whether today there are three papers that would pay good money for articles cutting Mr. Macmillan or Mr. Gaitskell into little bits. It would be even harder to sell a slashing attack on the poet laureate or the Pope or the president of the Royal Society or the various patriarchs. I am not talking about personal abuse; there has been no hope of getting away with that since the press began insuring against libel. I am talking about criticism of opinions pressed home ruthlessly, with every evasion and hesitancy and logical flaw exposed with relish.

"If we follow America and Russia into conformism we are going to sacrifice our inventiveness, our only national asset with rarity value. Apparently in America, the man who wins approval and promotion is the man who gently contributes to steering a committee in the direction the majority of its members want. To the middle-aged Briton Truth emerges from argument; but increasingly the young seem to be feeling that truth will emerge from guessing the way the decision is likely to go. In the past, vigor in controversy and vigor in action have generally gone together; but now compare the genteel disputation of the distinguished men and women on the brains trust with the gusto of the debates that Mr. Vincent Brome describes in his recent book "Six Studies in Quarreling" (Cresset, 21/–). Shaw and Wells and Belloc and Chesterton argued in print and on the platform, and while they argued they entertained, and while they entertained they taught. They may have written too much, but they provided a large public with a far more closely reasoned controversial prose than you find in any present-day newspaper. And things happened as a result of the influence of their arguments on public opinion.

"DULL

"Today, apart from the very rare television program like Free Speech, there is hardly any war of ideas. Politicians' speeches are so dull and apologetic that very few papers bother to report them at all. Parliamentary debates have ceased to have any relevance to the content of legislation. (The only public argument for years that has come anywhere near the classic argument on free trade and protection in the days of Chamberlain and Asquith was about capital punishment, perhaps because the suppression of healthy vituperation has encouraged the growth of fantasies of murder). The theater is slightly livelier than politics; but the plays that have stirred up audiences have generally been expressions of moods rather than beliefs. Look Back in Anger spoke for a generation but it did not really stimulate anything but assertion and counterassertion: 'Jimmy Porter is a special case. He is suffering from a psychological illness' against 'Jimmy Porter is representative of youth today. He expresses its bitter frustration.' Ask, as once a pamphlet asked, What then shall we do? and neither side gives much of an answer. They merely sit back and wait, and you cannot make a political policy or a literature out of waiting.

"Mr. Brome's examples include Coulton versus Belloc on the Medieval Church, Wells versus James on the Nature of the Novel, Belloc versus Wells on Natural Selection, and Shaw versus Chesterton on Socialism and Distributism, and his interest in the controversialist as a human type leads him to include Henry Arthur Jones in his entertaining miscellany. The chief impression from his quotations is that nobody talked down and nobody pulled a punch out of politeness. There are literary controversies today, but they are carried on almost entirely in magazines with very small and specialized sales. Only the New Statesman's John Berger on painting and the Observer's Kenneth Tynan on plays treat particular criticisms as battles in a war. Whether you accept or reject their point of view at least they have one and are always prepared to fight for it. Religious controversy is dead, except, presumably, in theological journals. Nobody criticizes bishops or judges in the press, a new and dangerous silence.

"DETAILS

"The controversies in newspaper correspondence columns are about little factual details. How long is it since capitalism and socialism or Catholicism and Protestantism or, if you like, optimism and pessimism argued it out day after day in print? Now it is old fashioned to suggest that politics ought to be about policy. The public-relations boys in the backroom fit the policy to the possible vote. It may well be that at this very moment Mr. Strachey and Mr. Crosland and Mr. Crossman are molding the next Labor Government's queen speech. What widely read Conservative is publicly cross-examining them, making them reveal their differences in approach to questions of equality or nationalization? What Conservative is in Shaw's position of being able to demand an answer? One of the weaknesses of 'Butskellism,' much as the electorate seem to like it, is that it devitalizes public life. Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Bevan have raised far more people's blood pressure than Mr. Butler and Mr. Gaitskell, but they have made politics dramatic and electors active. If the ordinary political parties are not colorful a bored public will turn to parties that are. The unexpected revival of fascism may be partly due to the fact that it is no longer done to give Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Gaitskell hell.

"R. G. G. PRICE."

Federal Controls of Education—Words of the Past and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor to serve in the Congress for 14 years. During much of that time, I have watched with growing apprehension an increasing tendency by many of our people to unload on the Federal doorstep what should be the responsibilities of the family, the local, or the State government.

One of those responsibilities is education.

For the past several years, the halls of Congress have swarmed with advocates of Federal appropriations for school construction, teachers' salaries, vocational education, guidance, scholarships, and fellowships, and student loans.

Each idea for Federal direction of education is couched in terms of an emergency. Each one is inevitably adorned in the trappings of a special situation. The pattern is consistent. We are almost literally asked to believe that the United States will decay in the likeness of ancient Rome unless a Washington bureaucracy assumes command of education.

Up to date, the Congress has resisted these flamboyant appeals in the critical field of education. It has managed to keep its head above water in a veritable flood of unthinking, unreasoning emotion.

But now, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, there is talk and proposed legislation—H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958—for a new Federal venture in education. Obviously a new scarecrow, another tune on that old saw, national defense.

We are deafened by variations of stale and musty arguments in behalf of this outrageous scheme.

Last year, we were asked to intrude the Federal Government into education on the grounds that there was a crisis in school construction. That was a dud. There never was such a boom in schoolroom construction. This year, we are besieged by a clamor for Federal direction of education on the grounds it is vital to national defense.

What about next year? What will be the emergency in the 86th Congress? We may be sure that the 25-year-old lobby for Federal aid will drum one up.

I shall not be with you. My stay in this Chamber nears its end. I shall watch the next Congress from the viewpoint of an average citizen and taxpayer. But I can foresee, at this moment, that the struggle to keep education free is far from ended, and now is the time to prepare for the assault against freedom that is bound to come in 1959.

The possibility of Federal control of education cannot escape us when we see how many Federal programs incubate and seldom die. It is not enough to insert a line or paragraph in any bill which states that the Federal Government shall not control education, regardless of the Federal funds allotted to the purpose. No such inclusion is a guaranty. We must bear in mind the blunt fact that wherever there is Federal appropriation, there must be Federal control.

Do we want a central education agency? May God forbid. It is the future and not alone the present we must think about. What assurance can we have against the possibility of some future administration that would seek to conform our youth to its particular way of thinking? There is an old saying that powers lodged in some hands will be respected, but if the same powers are inherited by other hands, they can be destructive.

I have brought together for your files and for your possible guidance in the years ahead a number of quotations on the subject of Federal intervention in education. Some of the statements were made several years ago—and the authors today are in sharp variance with their expressed viewpoints of the past. Other statements are as new as last week.

These quotations may be ammunition for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are determined that education shall not suffer from bondage to the Federal Government. The classroom must remain a lasting evidence of our devotion to the principle of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, the following quotations require no further explanation. They tell their own story.

QUOTES OF THE PAST AND PRESENT ON FEDERAL AID

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1949: "I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues." (Quoted by Ross Roy in Vital Speeches).

President Eisenhower, 1956: "Geographical balance of power is essential to our form of free society. If you take the centralizing shortcut every time something is to be done, you will perhaps sometimes get quick action. But there is no perhaps about the price you will pay for your impatience; the growth of a swollen bureaucratic monster government in Washington, in whose shadow our State and local governments will ultimately wither and die."

President's [Eisenhower] Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958: "The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

John Foster Dulles, December 28, 1949: "The Federal Government is no independent source of funds. It has to get what it gives. Whatever money it spends for education must be taken away from local communities—from individuals. Why not leave the responsibility with them, where the money is and where the responsibility is normally the deepest and most conscientious?

"We can be confident that educational responsibilities will generally be discharged at the local level if Federal taxes permit and if we get over the illusion that Federal aid is a financially painless operation. Then our children will get education that is guided by parental and religious care rather than by remote control. And they will be kept beyond the grasp of any who, in the future, might win national power and feel that education ought to conform our youth to their particular way of thinking."

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1957: "The training of young minds is one of the most powerful forces known to civilization. In the wrong hands—in the hands of ruthless men bent on world domination—education can become a dangerous thing."

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, June 1957: "More elementary and secondary school bonds were sold than in any 9-month period in our history. * * * In the past 4 years $8.8 billion has been spent for school construction—more than had been spent in the preceding 20 years."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, majority leader, United States Senate, 1958: "The primary direction of education should be in the hands of local government.

"On anything as highly personal as education, our people are entitled to determine the future of their children.

"This means that the school system should be handled by that branch of government which is closest to our people."

The Supreme Court of the United States, 1942, *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111–113). "It is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Senator HARRY C. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, United States Senate, 1957: "We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of free government."

John M. Stalnaker, president, March 20, 1958, National Merit Scholarship Corp.: "A large Federal program of say 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped."

Commission on Financing Higher Education Association of American Universities, 1952: "The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom, for without that freedom, its attraction to intelligence, its capacity to stimulate investigation and originality, its power to produce freemen who will guide our country wisely, and serve it well, will wither. It is this freedom that must be protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government * * *. In these fields (social sciences and humanities) public opinion is notoriously given to snap judgment and in them centralized control could be used to do great damage * * *. Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance."

Enoch R. Needles, president, the Engineers Joint Council, January 1958: "To ascribe the Russian rocket and satellite lead to weakness in American technology is misleading and erroneous."

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president, Wheaton College, 1958: "We believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people."

Henry M. Wriston, president, American Assembly and a State Department consultant, March 1958:

"The bill will smother science and education by making private support unnecessary.

"Whatever you do, my brethren, don't get a built-in dependence of science on war. When fear ends, support will evaporate."

The American Legion, policy approved in national convention, September 16–19, 1957: "The National Government should avoid interference, control or direction in educational processes of programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly or by grants-in-aid, school construction, appropriation, curriculum or program control, or by action of any agency, branch or department of the United States Government."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 1957: "I think this is a responsibility the States and local governments can and should bear."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "We should preserve as much of our Government as possible as close as possible to the people * * * no nation worth its salt, was ever built from the top down * * * we need more effective work done at the State level, with enough nerve to levy the taxes to get needed work done."

Governor Clyde, of Utah, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Only in those cases where State lines interfere with effective accomplishment should we look to the the Great White Father in Washington for assistance."

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 1957: "Once you establish this principle, you will have sounded the death knell of independent State and local systems."

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Here's my definition of Federal aid: It means we raise our taxes to send some money to Washington, then we raise more money in order to provide the matching funds. Then we raise more again to pay the brokerage tax, in order to get a fraction of the money back."

Governor Foss, of South Dakota, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "No government at any level has anything to offer free."

Gov. William P. Stratton, of Illinois, 1957: "Many people feel—as I do—that there is great danger, no matter how high sounding the program may be made to appeal to the public, that our system would be damaged, perhaps beyond recovery, by having the Federal Government move into the field of education.

"We do not need Federal aid for schools in Illinois."

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "The unity that is our Federal system relies on the strength of our States * * * in some areas of functions and services, the States can perform more effectively and better and must accept that responsibility."

Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, 50th Annual Governors' Conference, May 1958: "There is no

magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money. It must come from the taxpayers * * * now is the time to take action to resolve the unemployment problems in our own State. * * * I am opposed to borrowing from the Federal Government because it will lead to Federal interference, furthermore, our States can do the job more economically and much better * * * in the highway program we can cut Federal red-tape to permit the program to move faster."

Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, of Mississippi, 1957: "All districts can meet needs with State aid * * * Federal aid not needed."

Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, 50th Annual Governors' Conference, May 1958: "There are many sins being committed in the name of education. * * * I recommend a complete overhaul of the tax structure of the Federal Government, with a view of returning some of the sources to the States."

George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, 1957: "No one on the national level is endowed with sufficient knowledge to predetermine accurately the future needs of the whole country. The problem of public school construction is too intricate to be handled by long distance. Too many variable factors are involved in intelligent planning. These factors multiply as we move from the district level to the community level and then to the local school level. It is farcical to think that a program can be developed in Washington to meet the needs of the Nation."

Gov. Harold Handley, of Indiana, 1957: "We are providing these new classrooms twice as fast as the advocates of federalized education say we should be building them."

Governor Handley, of Indiana, July 22, 1958:

"Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

"Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually."

Governor Handley wrote me last week that a statewide survey showed that all the high standing students needing financial help had been provided for.

Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, 1957: "Federal school aid would mean they'd try to control our schools."

Gov. Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, 1957: "I am vigorously opposed to any Federal aid program in this field under whatever guise it may be offered. The States and localities are capable of meeting their needs at much greater economy to the taxpayer without Federal aid or intervention in building and operating their public schools."

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, 1957: "The Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which money would be appropriated and made available to the States, through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise, and cotnrol the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes."

South Carolina Legislature, 1957: "The people of South Carolina are now, always have been and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably opposed to and Federal invasion, encroachment, or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or State governments."

John C. Lynn, legislative director, the American Farm Bureau Federation, March 13, 1958: Counties and communities throughout the Nation are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction, and efforts are being made to increase teachers' salaries and to improve the overall conditions of our schools. Local people understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation without Federal assistance and without Federal controls."

Mrs. William S. Shary, president, New York Federation of Women's Clubs, April 5, 1958: "The New York State Federation of Women's Clubs * * * affirms its belief in our traditional American principles and policies of State and local support and control of, and responsibility for, education, and urges the Congress to reject provisions for Federal Aid to Education."

Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1956: "Federal aid means Federal control. You cannot get away from the fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune."

Daughters of the American Revolution, 1957: "The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution has continuously opposed Federal aid to education, believing such aid could lead to Government control of all public schools, thereby removing State and local control."

Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, president, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., April 2, 1958: "Make no mistake about it, 'one shot' Federal aid is as fantastically unrealistic as only one shot for the dope addict. And there is a mountain of evidence to prove it."

Gordon L. Calvert, July 1958, Investment Bankers Association of America: "The great success with which the needed classrooms rapidly are being provided without Federal aid, the decreasing rate of growth in public school enrollment, the large classroom construction programs presently under way and financed for the next several years (demonstrated by record sales of school bonds and approval of a high percentage of school bonds at recent bond elections) lead us to conclude that State and local educational agencies can and will provide the needed classrooms without Federal aid."

Southern States Industrial Council: "The council opposes Federal aid to education, including Federal aid to school construction."

National Association of Manufacturers: "The heart of the matter is whether the financing, direction and control of the public school system shall remain in State and local hands, close to the people and responsive to their wishes and needs, or shall eventually be transferred to a central government authority."

Dr. Brantley Watson, March 1958 Education Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"When our entrance into the space age was dramatized last fall, State and local reaction was immediate and is still mounting. State and local boards of education are reviewing the curriculums, the methods, and the standards of their schools. In community after community, we are finding an aroused leadership insisting on higher standards both for general achievement and for graduation. Local and State legislative leaders, who are constitutionally responsible for public education, are likewise being pressed to provide ways and means to maintain effective schools.

"On the other hand, there are no studies showing that local and State leaders believe that any space age emergency in education exists, which requires Federal intervention in science education, or in guidance, or in scholarships."

The Lemley Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, among the recent commentary on Judge Lemley's Little Rock order is that of the American Veterans Committee which appeared in the July-August issue of the AVC Bulletin.

Consistent with its position that its concern is for the citizen first, the veteran second, the AVC has traditionally been in the forefront of progressive action to protect civil rights.

The following editorial, which I include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, is a succinct appraisal of the issues involved in the Little Rock court order:

Judge Lemley sought to justify his order for restoration of segregation at Little Rock by pointing to the overt acts of vandalism and the deep-seated popular opposition in Little Rock to the principle of integration, which, as is known, runs counter to the pattern of southern life which has existed for over 300 years.

His reasoning is, of course, flatly contrary to the Supreme Court's explicit ruling in 1955 that "the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

But his order is especially notable for two reasons: (1) It subordinates law to anarchy and mob rule; (2) it furnishes a new shibboleth to the segregationists for subverting the Constitution into a program of neverism.

Although Judge Lemley candidly admitted that the rioting, vandalism, anonymous phone calls, and other disorderly conduct were perpetrated by segregationists, not by the Negroes, yet his order punishes the wrong persons. It bows to the larrikinalian scoffaws and the instigators of violence, and denies the constitutional rights of the Negro children who have done no wrong.

Judge Lemley's ruling sanctions commotion and violence as the means whereby segregation may be maintained and the Constitution evaded. Even if his order for resegregation could lessen the number of racial incidents in Little Rock, its inevitable effect would be to encourage them at dozens of other places. Nor will Little Rock itself be aided by this judicial kneeling to hoodlumism, for neither that community, nor any community, can long evade the ultimate choice between mob rule and compliance with law. The mob knows no limits or barriers. And no matter how bad a mob may be, it is infinitely worse when a court recognizes it as a legal basis for subverting the law.

Equally shocking is the new technique which the Lemley ruling propagates for destroying the constitutional guaranty of equal protection of the laws. Just as the 1896 Plessy decision gave lip service to the constitutional command of equality, but destroyed it under the guise of "but separate,"

so the Lemley order acknowledges the Supreme Court's desegregation decision but subverts it by asserting that "the time for the enjoyment of that right has not yet come."

Judge Lemley's order is clearly cut from the same cloak that the Southern diehards have woven to smother the Constitution in the fog of dawdling, delay, and defiance. The true purpose of Southern gradualism is revealed in the comment of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News that integration at Little Rock should be set aside "for, oh say, 66½ generations." by basing his order on "300 years" of "southern life," and tailoring it to fit the 2½ years that Governor Faubus is expected to hold his office, Judge Lemley was reflecting the same sort of attitude.

The 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1868. It was supposed to have settled the question of first-class citizenship for all. In the 90 years that have gone by, only 1 Negro boy has graduated from Little Rock's Central High School. How much longer must it be before the promise of "equal protection of the laws" becomes something more than a promise to the ear that is broken to the hope?

In this great struggle between constitutional morality and law, on the one hand, and blind prejudice and civil disorder on the other, AVC must not falter from its historic and traditional insistence that the Constitution means what it says and means it now. We reject the slogan of gradualism. We are not against orderly progress, but we shall not condone or acquiesce in the distortion of "deliberate speed" into a program of neverism. AVC will continue in the vanguard of those who work for full enjoyment of constitutional rights for all, now and in the future.

Impressions of Brussels Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from a friend who visited the Brussels Fair and whom I asked for some comments on the fair:

HEIDELBERG, *July 14, 1958.*

Immediately after returning from the Brussels Fair on June 14, I set down some notes intending to record my immediate impressions, but it's now a month since I was there so my feelings are no longer quite so vivid.

Generally, I feel it is a beautiful show. The landscaping is most effective, particularly in the use of water and trees. I have no impression of the high price of food since my appetite is small and I'm better off stopping for frequent snacks. For 20 cents you can get a nice crisp roll filled with ham or some other meat or cheese. Bars for fruit and milk drinks are strategically placed too and the drinks don't cost much. Most people buy these picnic things and find a nice cool place to sit. Coca-cola is probably the most popular drink at the fair. In our pavilion the best seller is soft ice cream in cones for 20 cents. On the 2 days I went to the fair, I saw people waiting in lines to buy the ice cream. I felt the ice cream counter could be played up a bit more and quicker and more efficient service could be given. The cream is to be had in a soda fountain setup in the gallery of the United States pavilion.

It is obvious that the Belgians around Brussels will make a big profit on the fair. Hundreds of temporary jobs have been provided and many families with guest rooms have a bonanza. I believe the family in whose house I stayed in a brand new section not yet complete called Avenue des Constellations, will make a modest fortune this summer. They are sleeping in the living room in order to rent their two bedrooms. Nearly all the homes in this area have garages and the car I saw most frequently parked in them was the Mercedes. Incidentally, although there was a bath in the house, no hot water was provided for washing. I got a very poor impression of the Brussels streetcar conductors who are brusque and ill-informed about directions. They are a poor advertisement for Belgium.

The much discussed fashion show in our pavilion left me quite cold. To begin with there are 22 mannequins of whom I understand only 2 are Americans. The clothes I saw were mostly bathing suits and ugly sack dresses with even uglier hats.

From the outside, the United States pavilion is the most beautiful at the fair, especially at night. I heard people stopping and saying, "c'est magnifique." Inside, one has the impression of airy spaciousness. The round floor plans from the point of view of propaganda is poor. True, nobody feels trapped, but the casual observer may not see much of significance. I found the early Americana very good and am one of those who does not like the contemporary United States art on display. I observed that the European hoi poloi was like me in either not taking it seriously or being frankly amused. The Russian pavilion is also light and airy but not beautiful. They built it so they can take it apart and lug it back to Holy Mother Russia. Their center display is most effective and always swarming with people. Sputnik makes our bathing beauty centerpiece seem pretty frivolous. The Russians also have booths selling all sorts of souvenirs you cannot buy in Russia. I have two accounts on my desk of Easter trips to Russia by United States teachers here, and they both mention the lack of souvenirs. Russian officials questioned them closely on what they would like as souvenirs. Russia has a wonderful opportunity at the fair. Their book display and sales booth is outstanding. Good books printed in all important languages by the Soviet Press. I bought five books, 2 paperbacks and 3 hard covers for $2. Perhaps this book business is to try to convince us of their superior culture. All these books are in excellent English. There is the Three Bears by Tolstoi, The Fisherman and the Goldfish by Pushkin, Gogol's Evenings Near the Village of Dikanka, Vera Chaplina's charming Zoo Babies, and an effort to make the Russian schoolboy a good little Russian citizen by one N. Nosov. I could find not one speck of Communist propaganda in any of these, but, one of our teachers who knows Russian, in translating the publisher's notes at the back of the Three Bears discovered that what had cost me about 15 cents at the fair could be bought in Russia for about 75 cents. The best-selling souvenir at the fair, if I did not make a mistake, is a wooden Russian doll which comes in two sizes. These dolls fit one inside the other like Chinese lacquer boxes. There are 12 dolls in one for $2.40 and 5 in a smaller one for $1.50. In an exhibit of antique toys in a special case this doll is represented and it seems like genuine folk craft.

Our souvenir is a map for ten cents showing racial origins in the United States. I believe a genuine effort should have been made to have a good United States souvenir for maybe a dollar. On thinking it over, though, we'd probably end up with 49 and why not? An effort might have been made to have each State produce a souvenir for the fair. People at this sort of show have a yen for cheap souvenirs.

Our pavilion is notable for the soft sell that everyone talks about nowadays. I'm not sure Europeans of limited education understand the point we're trying to make. I can listen in three languages and eavesdropped on some bewilderment, especially in the modern art. The Vatican has the best example of western propaganda. The exhibit goes from room to room in an orderly fashion. The same can be said of the British cultural room which features the Queen as a symbol. The room is hot and stuffy, though. The achievements of Britons are well done. Canada's pavilion is also very nice and modern and not pretentious.

The Czechs are the masters of display at the fair. Their show is hands down the most artistic one at the fair. It's a stunning display and the fact that it isn't representative of communism doesn't bother them one bit. One whole room is devoted to Comenius and religion!

The American industrial exhibits complement our national exhibit. IBM, General Motors, Bell Telephone, and others have very effective displays too technical for me to understand. The Russians have nothing to compare with these, except sputnik. American autos are not on display but they don't have to be as so many Americans are running about Europe in them. The Russ have put a couple of their autos on display but they wouldn't impress anyone but an ignoramus. Around their pavilion they have all sorts of farm machinery which gets quite a lot of attention from people who look like farmers. We have a balcony outside with free chairs. Very welcome for tired bones. Also our free washrooms like those in our large movies at home are a star attraction as everyone expects to pay washroom fees in Europe. I understand our free movie is also excellent but couldn't spare the time and effort to wait in the crowd to see it. The Russ display enormous quantities of bottled and canned goods, breads and baked products, frumpy clothing, lovely fur, some rather attractive painted peasant furniture, photomontages of classical Russian authors, the Bolshoi Theater, the Russian ballet, Russian explorers, and Russian musicians in the midst of whom and in a place of honor is Van Cliburn from America's second largest State.

The French exhibit is a jumble—just like French politics before De Gaulle. Farm machines are next to clothing displays. What a sad commentary. I especially enjoyed the Belgian tile and glass displays and in the luxury pavilion the beautiful show of Val St. Lambert glass and the fabulous jewels.

I cannot go along with people who say we should not be bothered trying to sell our point of view. Propaganda is something all too few Americans understand. I guess it's because we're advertised to death over TV and radio that we don't like the idea of propaganda. What we have to show coupled with the Vatican's methods of display would make an interesting combination. Incidentally, the Vatican is right next door to the United States.

The Belgian Congo exhibit is unusual and impressive and the Israeli one very well done. The Protestant pavilion is small and unassuming. Monaco has a tiny pavilion with a painting of Ranier over a fireplace facing a very romantic portrait of Princess Grace. Spain was showing flamenco dancers as their central attraction the day I was there. They were really packing them in too. The Scandinavian exhibits are architecturally what we've come to expect from that part of the world. Since I'm rather familiar with a good deal of Scandinavia, I walked through rather quickly and got a generally good impression although the buildings were hot and

rather airless. There were so many places I didn't get to but you'd have to have at least 5 days to get everywhere.

To truly appreciate the beauty of the fair one must spend a couple of hours after dark looking at the illuminations. Tree, shrub, and fountain arrangements are so beautifully lighted as to be breathtaking. The star which with the sparkling Atomium is the symbol of the fair shines, along an elevated avenue running along one side of our show, which lighted with a golden light and reflected in its own pool is the most beautiful single thing at this World's Fair to me.

Sioux Falls Publisher John A. Kennedy Sees Changes in Soviet Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's best informed men on developments in Soviet education is Mr. John A. Kennedy, publisher and editor of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader. Two years ago Mr. Kennedy and his wife and daughter, Pat, made an exhaustive firsthand report on Russian education. At the present time Mr. Kennedy and his son, Davis, are making a study tour of the Soviet Union. They have interviewed Deputy Minister of Education Zimin and numerous other Russian officials, educators, and private citizens on recent developments in the Russian schools.

Last year during the hearings before the House Education Subcommittee, Mr. Kennedy submitted extremely valuable testimony relating to advances in Russian education.

I am certain that Mr. Kennedy's observations on this vital subject will be of interest to the Congress, and I therefore include his article as printed in the Argus-Leader for July 27, 1958:

KENNEDY SEES CHANGES IN SOVIET EDUCATION—JOB PERIOD INSERTED

(By John A. Kennedy)

A somewhat severe reorganization of education in the Soviet Union is now in progress.

Beginning in September 1958 when universities, colleges, and institutes reconvene in all of the 15 Russian republics, only 20 percent of the entering freshman class students will come directly from the secondary schools.

This means that less than 10 percent of those students who passed every subject in the Russian 10-year school will be able to go to college immediately.

From now on, in order to qualify for matriculation in an institution of higher learning, 80 percent of the successful secondary-school graduates must work on farms, in factories, in industry, or government for at least 2 years.

This is somewhat similar to the type of training first inaugurated by fabulous inventor, Charles Franklin Kettering, at the University of Cincinnati in 1906 and which Antioch College in Ohio has been using for some time by combining college classroom theories with on-the-job training in industry. Using this method, students go to school for 6 months then work in factories, offices, or plants for 6 months.

This somewhat drastic change has been caused in part by the growing awareness of the Kremlin that in their previous educational program they were creating a middle class of educated individuals who seek to shun all type of work except that which we would consider white-collar jobs.

Deputy Minister of Education Zimin gave us the story and some of the reasons why this and other changes are being put into effect.

We were given additional causes for the change in a 3-hour meeting of a specially called conference with the executive committee of the Siberian Affiliate of the Moscow Academy of Sciences in Irkutsk in eastern Siberia.

After being told the story, I commented to Zimin that I didn't think such a system would work in the United States if less than 10 percent of our high-school graduates could immediately enter college.

Many other changes are being made.

A new 11th grade has been experimentally added for the coming September to the 10-year schools where they will decrease slightly the number of lessons in science, mathematics and the humanities.

During the last 3 years in this "11-year" school, students will spend 3 days in school and 3 days in agricultural and industrial work.

The purpose of this change is to produce more skilled workers to take over the shortages in industry, Zimin explained.

A few months ago Khrushchev complained that the tendency on the part of the youth who attend colleges and universities is an unwillingness to work on farms or in factories.

The Soviets already have undertaken another radical step in their drive to master foreign languages.

They have set up special foreign language 10-year schools, attended by selected students where, in addition to the study of languages, other subjects, such as geography, history and foreign literature will be taught in English, French or German.

And not only will the teaching be done in the specified language of the school, but examinations, quizzes and tests will be made in the foreign language also.

Homework, likewise will be completed in the foreign language.

Davis and I visited one of the schools in Moscow where literature and other subjects are being taught in English.

As explained by Vlantina Shipova, the school's director, they hoped to thus train students to have a free command of English when they graduate which would eliminate the necessity of attending foreign language institutes.

Of course, the regular 10-year school will continue to require at least one foreign language—French, English or German.

FORTY-FIVE PERCENT STUDY ENGLISH

When we made our study of Soviet education in 1956, about 35 percent of the students studied English, 35 percent studied German and 30 percent studied French.

The emphasis now is on English and the average for all of Russia for the 1957–58 school year was 45 percent studied English, 35 percent German and 20 percent French.

The Moscow English School graduated 50 pupils in June when we were there on the last day of school and there were 760 students in the 10 grades. Generally there are 30 in each classroom.

The geography and history courses have the same syllabus as the other schools except the books are translated into English.

In the case of English and American literature, they have special books issued from the school library.

Among they American authors they read are: Cooper, Irving, Steinbeck, Longfellow, Jack London, Whitman and Cronin.

Books like Longfellow's Hiawatha, Crolin's The Citadel, and Coopers The Last of the Mohicans are read and studied.

Another departure in the drive for better foreign language education has been the establishment in Tashkent, capital of Uzbekistan, close to the border of India, China and Afghanistan, or thirty 10-year schools where a third language beginning in the fifth grade (our seventh) is taught. The youngsters study Hindi, Chinese, or Arabic, but they still have to fulfill the requirements of English, French, or German, and, of course, the mother Russian language.

"Many students will go to institutes and universities after they work for 2 years," Mr. Zimin said, "but they will also continue in night and correspondence work which will be broadened in curriculum while they are working."

Last year 27 percent of students entering higher educational institutions had worked 2 years before starting their college work.

Zimin said in the future at least 80 percent of those who have worked 2 years or who are veterans will be given first opportunity to enter college but of course they will have to pass the rigorous examinations.

There are approximately 2 million students in Soviet higher educational institutions now, Zimin explained, and Russia does not plan to expand that number. Entrance examinations are becoming more difficult.

When we visited the 34 Russian secondary schools in 1956 and 1957, the gold and silver medal winners who earned top grades were automatically admitted to the college or university of their choice. That now has been abandoned.

Now all students must pass the entrance examinations before they get to college.

Another new departure in education in Russia has taken place during the past year. It is the addition of boarding schools which have the same curriculum as the regular 10-year schools for youths between 7 and 17 years.

There are 14 of these institutions in Moscow and approximately 68,000 pupils attend this type of school in the Russian Republic alone. He did not have the figures for the other 14 Republics.

Zimin explained that the boarding schools were established to help families in which both parents are working, to take care of the children of divorced parents, orphans, and also children of parents whose scientific work takes them to far-off places.

We asked whether there was still complaint about too much homework being given the children in the regular 10-year schools. When we visited the schools in 1956 we found that as much as 6 hours of homework a day w as given the students and the school week was 6 days.

"Now we recommend a maximum of 3 hours a day," Zimin said, "but it still depends on the teacher, student and parents."

Television, about which teachers and some parents complain in America, England and other places, is making its inroads in Russia too.

Of course the Russians do not have the continuous programs we have. Their television is only on from 5 to 6 hours a day except on Sunday when the children's programs are on in the afternoon.

There are only 2,000,000 television sets in Russia according to the reports given us by the head of the television committee.

Zimin explained that it is a very difficult situation because with families of 3 and 4 people crowded into 1 room or at most into 2 rooms in the newer apartments, it is very hard to keep the youngsters interested in schoolwork when a television set is in operation in the same room or the next room.

He said they are relying on the strict discipline of parents to eliminate the troubles connected with children spending too much time viewing television programs.

In Russia television is not used for teaching. Zimin was amazed at some of the successful educational programs that have been produced in the United States, such as those used in Hagerstown, Md., where the school system is enjoying much success using television as a medium for classroom instruction to help combat the teacher shortage.

Zimin pointed out that the Russians do not have a teacher shortage because, of course, their teachers are paid salaries comparable to or higher than those paid doctors, lawyers and scientists and in addition, their teachers enjoy the highest of social prestige in their so-called classless society.

TEXTBOOKS REFLECT RED LINE

As a sample of the propaganda in Soviet education, Publisher John A. Kennedy of the Argus-Leader has taken these excerpts from the textbooks in the 10-year English school in Moscow. In this particular school, as in many others in the Soviet Union, they teach various subjects in English, French, and German.

"We are happy children,
Strong and full of fun,
Look at our banner
In the bright, bright sun.
We are Soviet children,
High our flags we raise
Thank you, Soviet country,
For our happy days."

Story about the Red tie of the pioneers—like our Boy and Girl Scouts:

Mike's father is a Communist. Mike's mother is a Communist too. Mikes goes to school. He is a pioneer. He is a good pupil. He keeps all his things clean and tidy.

Story of two young pioneers, Victor Pavlenko and Nick Chernenko who live in a village near the border.

They are young pioneers who walk along the railway line to get to school. They see someone who does not work on the railroad walking along the road. When he sees the boys he runs away. Victor sends Nick to the railroad man and he, Victor, takes his Red pioneer tie and tries to stop the train. He does. Everybody thanks Victor.

But Victor says, "Don't thank me. I'm a Soviet boy and a pioneer. It's my duty to help the Soviet people. I'm happy when I can do it."

A pioneer's letter:

"I want to write a letter
To tell each Soviet boy
That I am very grateful
For our life of joy.
I go to school, and daily
Put on my pioneer tie.
I want to be a soldier,
Or a flier in the sky,
Or learn to be a captain
And sail across the sea,
But I shall serve my country,
Whatever I may be."

V. I. Lenin:

"There is a well-known portrait
Upon the classroom wall;
We see the face of Lenin,
So dearly loved by all.
His eyes are kind and smiling,
With wisdom deep they burn,
They seem to tell us children
The way to live and learn.
And all the Soviet children,
While studying day by day,
Must always try to follow
Great Lenin's noble way."

The Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the crying problems of the world today is the problem of refugees. In Europe alone there are tens and tens of thousands of unsettled refugees—families away from their homes, without a place to live, without a place to work, and with only half a chance to live a dignified life.

These people risked their lives to flee from the Communist terror in their homelands. They left their homes, many even left their families, in search of freedom. Men and women of such dedication and courage deserve a fair break, they deserve a place to live, they deserve whatever assistance we can give.

The problem of resettling these refugees is a great and difficult one. The people of Europe have done what they could, and are continuing to resettle the refugees as rapidly as possible. We here in the United States have been able to settle hundreds of thousands of refugees. The American people have always responded warmly to situations such as this when the facts were fully apparent. But the problem still remains. The refugee camps of Europe are still swelling.

The Zellerbach Commission on the European Refugee Situation has done a fine job of presenting the problem to the people of the world. Their thorough, comprehensive booklet, Refugees in Europe, 1957–58, is a fine work which should be read by every person interested in the question of the resettling of refugees.

Mr. President, because I feel that it is of greatest importance that the American people know the facts of the refugee problem, I ask unanimous consent that the study prepared by the Zellerbach Commission entitled "The Refugee Situation in Europe, Basic Statistics and Estimates," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

The refugee situation in Europe, basic statistics and estimates, July 1958

I. Stateless [1] refugees in Europe:	
1. Number of nonsettled refugees in countries covered by UNHCR survey (Germany, Austria, Italy, France, Greece, Turkey)	[2] 140,000
2. Number of nonsettled refugees in West European countries outside UNHCR survey (United Kingdom, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Luxembourg)	[3] 20,000
Total nonsettled refugees in Europe	160,000

The refugee situation in Europe, basic statistics and estimates, July 1958—Con.

I. Stateless [1] refugees in Europe—Continued	
The total of 160,000 includes:	
A. Refugees in camps	48,000
B. Handicapped or difficult to resettle	47,000
II. Continuing influx from Communist countries:	
1. Influx to Western Europe, 1957 (non-Hungarian)	[4] 30,000
2. Influx to Western Europe, January–June 1958	[4] 10,000
III. Ethnic refugees and expellees:	
German expellees	9,004,000
East German refugees	3,030,000
Ethnic Italian refugees	400,000
Ethnic Greek refugees	4,000
IV. Resettlement:	
1. Absorbed by Western Europe since end of war:	
A. UNHCR survey countries	[5] 438,000
B. Nonsurvey countries	[6] 343,000
Total	881,000
Total refugee intake, USA	[7] 437,000
Total refugee intake, other overseas countries (excluding Israel)	[8] 557,000

[1] Not all refugees under the IRO and UNHCR mandates can be considered stateless in a strictly legal sense—that is, their countries of origin have not specifically deprived them of nationality. But they are all stateless de facto in the sense that they cannot or are unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the government in power in their country and they have not yet received alternate nationality. In this respect they differ from the German ethnic refugees, for example, who are automatically considered German nationals.

[2] This estimate reflects the situation as of mid-1958. UNHCR survey figure for mid-1957 was 178,000.

[3] In the absence of any statistical sampling, this is necessarily a very rough estimate. In the case of the survey countries, the ratio of non-settled to settled refugees is approximately 1 to 3 (see sec. IV above). In the case of the non-survey countries, there would be a much lower proportion of non-settled refugees. The figure of 20,000 is, if anything, an underestimate, since it would imply a ratio of 1 non-settled refugee to 17 settled.

[4] These rough estimates do not include East German refugees (see sec. III above).

[5] Source, UNHCR survey.

[6] This estimate is arrived at as follows: As of January 1, 1957, the total number of refugees in the European countries not covered by the UNHCR survey was 316,500 (UNCHR Statistical Bulletin No. 8). Since January 1, 1957, the non-survey countries admitted a total of 45,000 Hungarian refugees (ICEM figures, November 12, 1957). This would make a total of 363,000. Deducting 20,000 estimated non-settled from this figure (see Section I), we arrive at the estimate of 343,000 settled refugees in the non-survey countries.

[7] These figures are arrived at by adding the IRO figures for refugees resettled from 1947 to 1951, the ICEM figures for refugees resettled 1952 to 1956, and the figures for Hungarians resettled 1956 to 1957—e. g., the United States received 328,851 in refugees, 70,503 UNHCR refugees moved by ICEM, and 37,944 Hungarians. Refugee statistics, however, are sometimes very perplexing because they vary according to origin and definition. Using ICEM figures for refugees in the broad sense—i. e., including ethnic refugees, etc.

the total would be approximately 50,000 greater for the United States and also 50,000 greater in the case of the other countries of overseas reception. (This largely accounts for the discrepancy between the figures in the table above and those in annex XI of the report.) To make our table consistent, we have confined our figures to IRO—UNHCR refugees. The total number of admissions under the President's directive, the Displaced Persons Act, and the Refugee Relief Act was 634,000. If we add to this approximately 32,000 Hungarians who were admitted as parollees, this would make a total of 666,000. However, this total includes German expellees, Italian ethnic refugees, native Greeks and ethnic Greek refugees, orphans, a limited number of Dutch immigrants, and several other minor categories. The figures in table IV above relate only to refugees under the UNHCR—IRO mandate. For this reason, total figures for the United States and other areas are lower in the above table than they would be if all refugees, expellees, and special immigrants had been counted.

Israel has taken almost 160,000 refugees from Europe since 1947. Israel has, however, not been included in the composite figure above, on the one hand because there are next to no Jewish refugees left in Europe, on the other hand, because it cannot be considered a general refugee haven.

The salient fact that emerges from the statistics given above is that of a total of 1,875,000 nonethnic refugees resettled since the end of the war, Europe has taken 881,000, or approximately 48 percent (this in addition to massive numbers of ethnic refugees and expellees); the United States has taken 437,000, or just under 23 percent; and the other countries of overseas reception have between them taken 557,000, or approximately 29 percent. This pattern of the postwar period, in the opinion of the Commission, would be a logical guide for the allocation of future responsibilities—needless to say, on a voluntary and flexible basis.

Death of Dr. R. T. Wells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, Murray State College, the State of Kentucky, and the Nation lost a great citizen when Dr. Rainey Thornton Wells passed away. I had the good fortune to attend Murray State College while Dr. Wells was president, during the years of the great depression. I know that today there are many alumni of Murray, such as myself, who would never have remained in college during those trying times had it not been for the leadership, enthusiasm, spirit, courage, and inspiration of Dr. Wells. As an outstanding politician of the Blue Grass State, Dr. Wells was responsible for the location of the college at Murray; as an outstanding citizen he headed a drive to raise $100,000 to meet the city's end of the bargain and as an outstanding educator he was second president of the college from 1926 to 1933. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I request that my remarks of deep feeling of gratitude and friendship for Dr. Wells be made a part of the RECORD.

Man's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial on man's best friend written by Harry M. Schlacht for the East Side News:

FAITHFUL FRIEND FOREVER

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

This is a tribute to man's best friend—his dog. The dog is the only thing on earth that loves man more than he loves himself. The dog is the only thing on earth that believes in man more than he believes in himself.

The dog is a symbol of faith, hope and love. He is our first friend. He is our truest friend. He is our faithful friend. He is our friend forever.

With eye upraised, his master's look to scan. The joy, the solace, and the aid of man. Down through the ages the dog has proved to be one of man's greatest conquests in the march of civilization.

He serves as a guide for the blind. He serves as a protector for children and the aged. He serves as a guardian of the home. He serves as a scout for the lost and injured.

He is loyal and intelligent. He is a staunch and grateful companion. He is a comforter in time of distress.

He has been cited for valor on flaming, fighting fronts. He has been cited in warfare since Cambyses, King of Persia, used him in his campaign in Egypt in 525 B. C.

None is more faithful found. None yields more pastime in house, plain, or woods. Nor keeps his master's person and his goods with greater care than doth the dog or hound.

His cheerful greeting in the morning starts your day aright. His wagging tail is his way of wishing you good night. He is the first to welcome you. He is the first to defend you.

The dog labors, loves, fights, and breathes for his master alone. In summer's heat he follows you. In winter's cold he never leaves you. When you laugh or when you cry, he is your pal.

Whatever the world may think of you—to your faithful friend—your dog—you are the wisest and most splendid of things. To him you are as wise as Socrates and as mighty as Napoleon. To him you are to be worshipped as the best of men.

He knows no deceit or pretense. With what reverence he crouches at your feet. With what dependence he looks up to you. With what cheerful joy he obeys you.

He has a share of man's intelligence, but he has no share of man's falsehood. There is a general comfort in his companionship. There is an ever ready touching humility.

He loves your friends. He watches you faithfully by night that you in peace may sleep. When your best friend leaves you, when your closest friend betrays you, your dog is ever at your side.

In health and in sickness, he will stand by you. He will sleep on the ground when the winds of winter blow, if only he could remain with his master. He will accept the food that is offered, be it much or little, and be ever so grateful. He will lick the hand that has no food to offer.

He is the one dependable friend in all the world. He is not a fair-weather friend. And when the master is laid to rest in the cold ground his dog will be found at the grave, with his head between his paws, his eyes sad but open in alert watchfulness.

The Wild Greenback Yonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, and also a letter received in connection with land acquisition for the United States Air Force Academy:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar of July 24, 1958]

THE WILD GREENBACK YONDER

Military successes of the ancient Spartans were largely credited to the way they trained their soldiers. Emphasis was on discipline, obedience, endurance.

This became a guiding principle of all great armies. "Spartan" has come to mean "Hardy, undaunted, severe and frugal." Frugal, according to Webster, means "economical in the use or expenditure of resources." O. K.

Now let us consider the United States Air Force and its fancy new Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo. Our Scripps-Howard reporter, Jack Steele and our columnist, Fred Othman, have explored such items as medicine cabinets at $75 each, $6,199 for coffee tables and $300,000 for gardens and reflecting pools. These are details which characterize this whole project. For instance:

The Academy was supposed to cost $125 million but will now cost more than $300 million.

It started as a 10,000-acre project and grew to 17,000—a tract half the size of the District of Columbia.

A sum of $132,184 was spent merely to cook up a cadet uniform. Cecil B. DeMille sketched this uniform free, but the money went anyhow, to a costume outfit in Hollywood for "design and development."

The administration building alone will cost $3 million, more than double the original estimate.

The dining hall will cost $4.1 million, almost $1.5 million more than expected. Part of this goes for a fancy ceiling, designed to absorb the noise of 3,000 cadets eating.

The superintendent's house was to cost $75,000 but it hasn't been built. The superintendent said it wasn't good enough.

Taxpayers are indebted to Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD, (Democrat, of California), and his subcommittee on Defense Department appropriations, for bringing to light this scendalous spendoggle.

A Mr. Pietro Beluschi, described as an eminent architect, testified.

Question. "But you had no limitation moneywise, insofar as the questions submitted to you, insofar as any finding you made?"

Mr. BELUSCHI. "No, sir."

Question. "So far as you know, the whole Treasury was available to those people?"

Mr. BELUSCHI. "So far as we knew. We were employed as architects and engineering consultants."

In summing up, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, termed the Academy "a shrine to a shoddy way of handling Government money." He added, "I have never seen a public agency or department run as laxly or as wastefully, in all my

years in Congress, as the Department of the Air Force."

That says it.

DENVER, COLO., *July 27, 1958.*

The Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your statements relative to land-cost at the Air Force Academy were carried in today's Denver Post, as sent them by Associated Press.

There have been rumors in the Colorado Springs and the Denver areas relative to the cost of the land selected by the Academy. It should be borne in mind that the land is not farmland and is not grazing land, being covered mostly by rock, scrub oak, and pine. The same sort of land is leased by the Forest Service to ranchers for grazing purposes at approximately 50 cents per animal per year.

It is possible that the Air Force had decided on the site before the Site Selection Committee had investigated alternate sites in Texas, Wisconsin, etc. It would be interesting to know who owned the land selected 5 years ago, and who had acquired it immediately prior to its sale to the Government.

The Colorado State Highway Department carried out the transactions for land acquisition, and they may have interesting facts in their files.

Sincerely,

Our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Construction, created only this year, has done a good job in bringing these facts to light. They present a sad state of affairs. We have taken such remedial action as was in our power.

I have urged the appropriate legislative committees to follow up this matter with a full and public investigation, for the good of the country, and am asking the same action by the Department of Justice.

Election Returns From Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans rejoiced at the election returns from Arkansas. These returns were a resounding victory for those of us who believe in constitutional government. It demonstrates once again that all Americans believe in and are willing to stand up for the rights and privileges of our people and the sovereignty of our States. It further demonstrates that the American people, when they realize what is at stake, resent the encroachment on their rights by any arm of the Federal Government. It is also a clear substantiation that in Arkansas the people realize what is about to happen to them unless they take the necessary action to prevent their being gobbled up by an all-powerful Federal Government.

I am convinced that the people of Virginia would react the same way under the same circumstances. I believe the election results in Arkansas are a fair indication of the feeling of the vast majority of the people of the Nation. Certainly all of those who believe in constitutional government. It is a repudiation of the Little Rock episode when the Chief Executive usurped and abrogated unto himself the power and authority that never was delegated to him under the Constitution or by the Congress.

American Advantages in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S. C., of July 24, 1958:

AMERICAN ADVANTAGES IN MIDDLE EAST

Last week we said that America and the West suffered two handicaps in its relations with Middle East nations that Russia didn't have: recognition and support of Israel and a history of colonialism and exploitation in the area.

The West, however, enjoys two great advantages which Russia does not. In the first place, Western Europe offers natural markets for Middle East oil. Russia doesn't need the oil and will not buy it. If the Arab lands want to sell oil and our allies want to buy it, then surely its to their mutual advantage to get along.

Second, Russian imperialism and communism are inherently aggressive and expansionist. A bloc of Arab nations, 70 million strong, would tend to block her imperialistic ambitions.

Arab nationalism and Russian communism should mix little better than oil and water. Russia believes in bending other peoples to her own will. A united Arab State would stand in the path of Russian drives toward the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean. Arab nationalism is not likely to prove very popular with Russian communism which believes all the tunes must be called from Moscow and that all nationalism is antagonistic to true Marxist doctrine.

If we pursue a realistic, open minded, yet firm and consistent policy in the Middle East, we ought to be able to shape Arab nationalism into a western asset rather than a liability. The Arab-Israeli dispute is open to negotiation and settlement around the conference table. Arab leaders, whether rebel generals or kings, want to keep on receiving oil royalties from the West. Western oil companies, with their technicians, experience, and capital, are essential to help develop oil resources.

In view of these facts, it would appear that the western democracies have just as good a chance as Russia to work with the Middle East. During this period of upheaval and intrigue, however, we must anchor much of our policy on armed strength. Until it is clear that reliable, level-headed patriots are in charge of the nationalist movement, American and allied force must remain near the major oil-producing centers to make certain that this vital resource remains available to the West.

In the meantime the United States should make it clear that we have no sympathy for colonialism and that all vestiges of imperialism have disappeared. We should help the people realize the wholesome aspirations of Arab nationalism, national unity, independence, neutrality, economic development, and social reform. We must not, furthermore, confuse legitimate Arab neutrality with Soviet domination.

Depreciation of Production Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. DENNISON, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 13592, providing that production machinery acquired during 1958 and 1959 and used in a trade or business may be depreciated over a 5-year period. The bill itself does not need a great deal of explanation. It is an attempt to encourage increased use and investment in new production machinery at a time when there has been a decline in spending for capital goods. Greater than this, it attempts to meet the key problem of obsolescence in our rapidly changing technological era. Today many production machines depreciate through obsolescence created by new technological developments at a much greater rate than the regulations of the Internal Revenue Department permit and in many cases arbitrary and unrealistic depreciation schedules prevent the legitimate growth of business and the resulting expansion of job opportunities for many people.

This bill gives the option to the owner of machinery purchased in 1958 and 1959 to decide the rate of depreciation to be applied to such machinery. If shops are given the privilege of using a realistic depreciation schedule they can plan their replacement needs. The result will be to encourage the purchase of new equipment as soon as the old becomes obsolete.

Similar provisions as those contained in my bill were adopted in 1940 and 1950 for the express purpose of encouraging production. The results are well known. Production was encouraged, income increased and job opportunities became more available.

The ever present threat of inflation is very likely to be with us in the years to come. In any successful business, the cost of old machinery must be recovered before the replacement price becomes prohibitive. If this cannot be done, no business can reasonably be expected to hold its own, to say nothing of progressing. This bill attempts to meet the threat of inflation without depriving the Government of needed revenues. The taxpayer is always permitted to deduct the cost of capital equipment. The only problem is over what period of time. This period should by all means be a realistic one.

I strongly urge that the Ways and Means Committee, to which this bill has been referred, give this measure immediate consideration.

Mending Our Fences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 29, 1958, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

MENDING OUR FENCES
(By Walter Lippmann)

Just what went wrong as between London, Paris, and Washington is not quite clear. But something did go wrong, in that we find ourselves committed to a spectacular summit meeting in New York, which we do not want, and unable to support Gen. de Gaulle's proposal for a quiet meeting in Europe later on, which is what we ought to want. If a New York meeting is unavoidable, the question is how to manage the encounter between Eisenhower and Khrushchev with the least damage.

A way must be found to avoid a public debate. For the President has neither the training and knowledge nor the vitality for such an ordeal. Beyond that, it is highly desirable, indeed necessary, to mend our fences in the Middle East so that when the meeting takes place we shall not be the defendants in a public trial.

This can be done if two things, now in the works, can be achieved before the summit meeting. One would be an agreement in Lebanon which leads us to withdraw the Marines or at least to fix a definite date for their withdrawal. The other would be to extend diplomatic recognition to the new Iraqi Government, as Dr. Adenauer and others are advising us to do. These two actions together would refute completely the charge that we are engaged in a military adventure in the Middle East and we would no longer be on the defensive.

There is no use pretending, however, that there will be any glory or profit in this. It will be recognized by all the world as a forced retreat from an untenable position in Lebanon and in Iraq. The question then will be whether the three Western governments can produce proposals which open up the prospects of better days in the Middle East. It has been proved first at Suez and now again in Lebanon and Jordan that the Western governments have not the power, even if they had the resolution, to restore the supremacy which Britain possessed before the Second World War. What has still to be proved is whether the Western governments have the imagination and the brains to play a leading part in the liquidation of the old privileges and in the construction of a new order.

When we say that the New York summit meeting is to be held without adequate preparation, we generally mean that there has been no adequate diplomatic negotiation with the Russians. This is true. But there is a much more critical sense in which the meeting is unprepared. It is that we ourselves are unprepared. We do not have as yet more than the dim intimations of what might be the shape of a new Middle Eastern order. If we had it, we could face Khrushchev with buoyant confidence.

In my view, the paramount issue in the Middle East is not oil, which the Arabs must sell to the West. It is not Israel, which is on the sidelines in the present crisis. It is not the revolutionary force of Nasserism. The paramount issue is Russia's determination not to have United States military power stationed on her southern flank.

We can never, I think, understand the inwardness of the Middle Eastern crisis unless we recognize that what we consider the military containment of the Soviet Union, Moscow is bound to regard as a military menace to the Soviet Union. Our forces are in Turkey, of which the equivalent would be that the Red forces were in Mexico. We have the NATO alliance and the Baghdad pact, of which the equivalent would be an anti-American Soviet military alliance consisting of Mexico, Cuba, and Central America.

What we are seeing is a campaign by the Soviet Union to disrupt the containing alliance on her frontiers, and with the explosion in Iraq, this campaign has had a great success. It has not only knocked out the only Arab State in the alliance, but it has isolated Turkey. The Russian support of Nasserism has been the main strategical device in this campaign. The immediate objective of a campaign is to deny to the West, and particularly to the United States, the strategic control of the Middle East.

It is important to understand your adversary, and if this analysis is the primary truth about Soviet policy, there are important conclusions to be drawn from it. The first is that a settlement cannot be achieved with Nasser alone. An accommodation with him is most desirable. But appeasement of Nasser is quite unnecessary. The basic settlement must be reached with Moscow, and the subject of the settlement must be the strategic control of the Middle East.

There are three conceivable possibilities. One would be to restore the Middle East as a sphere of influence for Britain, France, and the United States of America, with Russia excluded. This cannot be done. It is too late. We are not strong enough to do it. A second would be to let the Middle East become a Russian sphere of influence. This would be an unnecessarily abject surrender. We are not so weak that we must accept it.

The third possibility would be to neutralize the Middle East as between the two great military alliances, and to build upon this overall neutralization, specific agreements about the oil business, about the security of Iran, Lebanon, and Israel. This will not be easy, and it requires a higher order of statesmanship than we are now accustomed to. But it is not impossible. For it does not run contrary to the vital interests of any of the nations concerned.

Are You Better Than a Politician?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., of July 28, 1958:

ARE YOU BETTER THAN A POLITICIAN?
(By Sidney J. Harris)

A friend of mine, who retired from politics a few years ago because he needed more money to put his three children through college, thinks the public is all wrong in its attitude toward politicians.

"The public," he is fond of saying, "bemoans the fact that we have so few decent political figures; I, on the other hand, am constantly surprised that we have as many decent ones as we do."

"Why do you say that?" I asked.

"Well, just consider what we require for a politician in this country," he began to enumerate on his fingers.

"First, he must have the stamina of a bull to endure the rigors of campaigning. If he doesn't have the physique for it, he'll collapse.

"Second, he must have the temperament—friendly and outgoing, willing to listen to people, and thick-skinned enough not to be hurt by false criticism.

"Third, he has to be, if not intelligent himself, at least bright enough to pick intelligent men as advisers and supporters. This is not as common a talent as we think it is.

"Fourth, he has to be able to live on his salary, unless he has inherited or married money, or made his pile before entering politics. These economic pressures cut drastically into the people we can recruit for political office.

"Fifth, he has to live a private life that's above reproach—or, at any rate, he has to be discreet and can't afford to indulge in any of the excesses we condone in others.

"Sixth, he can't be too obviously intelligent or too highly educated, or he runs the risk of alienating a lot of voters who are suspicious of thinkers—and this includes precinct workers, who want a reliable candidate, which means one who is responsive to party needs and doesn't try to put principles above partisanship.

"Seventh, he must be willing to sacrifice his family life and leisure pursuits in order to attend a lot of silly functions he doesn't give a hoot about, and mingle with a lot of people he may have nothing in common with.

"I've still got three more fingers," he concluded, "and could use them up." But perhaps by now you understand why I say that, demanding as much as we do, I'm surprised that even 1 politician out of 10 comes up to our minimum requirements. Could you fit them yourself?"

Toward Farm Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the farm bill recently passed in the Senate—S. 4071—now in the Committee on Agriculture of the House, has so much good in it that one cannot but hope that the committee will send it to the floor in time for passage before adjournment.

A brief but illuminating editorial in the Cleveland Press of July 28, 1958, points out that this is the first major change in basic farm-price-support methods in 25 years and represents the first real effort to free agriculture to produce for the market rather than for the Govenment storage bins.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial above mentioned.

TOWARD FARM FREEDOM

The significance of the farm bill just passed by the Senate is that it marks a retreat from managed economy in agriculture. It provides the first major change in basic farm price support methods in the 25 years since this destructive plan was adopted.

The bill retains the wasteful parity system, but gives the administration authority to lower price supports and loosen planting

controls. It ends all effort to control planting and marketing of corn and other feed grains.

The changes are not large. It may be said they are less than Agriculture Secretary Benson hoped for but more than he actually expected. When he says that the bill is a "long step in the direction of greater freedom for farmers," he thus voices the enthusiasm of a man who feared a stone but at least got a crust. He's right when he says it "represents a victory for sound principles."

Actually the Senate's measure is but a start in the timid process of weaning the country from one of the more extravagant economic whims of the New Deal. Even the severest critics would not want the system abandoned abruptly, fearing violent economic dislocations. Further gradual steps will be necessary to restore the freedom of agriculture to produce for the market, rather than for the Government's storage bins.

But the bill is a start and should be passed by the House. Happily large sections of the farm community now are supporting it, encouraging hope that the House will act in these closing days of the congressional session.

Recovery and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S. C., of July 23, 1958:

RECOVERY AND INFLATION

The people whose business it is to survey the American economy and to forecast its future course now find that the plus signs, so to speak, outnumber and outweigh the minus. With virtual unanimity, they say the bottom of the recession has been reached and recovery has now begun. About the only differences of opinion have to do with how far and how fast the upswing will go.

Fortune magazine, for example, forecasts that new records in total output and industrial production will be established inside a year's time. It anticipates a rise of $20 billion in the gross national product in the next 6 months, followed by a further $30 billion rise in 1959. If that happens, we will be producing goods and services at an annual rate of $470 billion by the end of next year. Specific factors mentioned by Fortune include increased defense and public works spending; an improvement in new and used-car sales; a rise in employment during May, and the fact that twice as many industries increased production in May as reduced it.

J. A. Livingston, the syndicated business analyst recently asked 60 leading economists—representing banking, industry, labor, investment, Government and educational institutions—what they see ahead. The consensus adds up to steady, though not spectacular, improvement in business activity generally. According to them, reports Mr. Livingston, "a year from now, business indexes will be straining to break through the old highs."

So much for specific forecasts. But, in the minds of many people, there is another element in the economic picture that is far from bright. Jack Mabley, of the Chicago Daily News, sees matters grimly: "It is generally agreed that the recession has run its course and we are in an upturn. What is coming may be worse than the recession."

That view is based on a fear that can be explained in a very few words, more and greater inflation.) Today's dollar is worth a trifle less than half of its value of 20 years ago. If the decline continues at the same rate, to say nothing of the possibility of an accelerating rate, the dollar will be worth only a quarter in terms of buying power 10 years from now. "After that comes chaos," Mr. Mabley writes. "Life insurance, social security and savings may become almost worthless." And he thinks, "that will happen unless we, through our Government, take drastic action to stop it."

The Government is certainly not doing that now, as Mr. Mabley goes on to show. A huge deficit is looming. The debt limit is likely to be raised to something like $300 billion. And it is an historical fact that circumstances such as these have brought disaster after disaster to once great nations. The classic example of modern times is the German inflation that followed World War I. Utimately, a loaf of bread cost millions upon millions of marks.

What is the primary cause of inflation and what is the cure? Mr. Mabley answers these questions tersely: "Inflation comes from oversized Government. The way to stop inflation is to reduce the size of the Government." But: "We are not reducing. We are increasing."

And it is clear, though he does not say it in so many words, that he is convinced Government won't act until public opinion and demand force it to.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 26, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)
JULY 26, 1958.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, is labeled "An act to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes." Under the program, since 1954 we have disposed of $3.9 billion surplus farm products abroad. Under this extension, an additional $1.5 billion in farm products may be sold for foreign currency; $800 million in food to be donated to friendly nations as emergency assistance; and we'll expand our donation of agricultural products abroad through nonprofit agencies and intergovernmental organizations, and here in the United States to schools, charitable institutions, and such. Here is how it works: 35 nations have received wheat, flour, feed grains, rice, cotton, tobacco, dairy products, fats, and oils. The local currencies paid us are banked on the spot abroad, in our name. We give these funds back to be used only within the country, on local projects, for purchase of military equipment from the United States, and in other incidental programs. So it is that India has received loans amounting to $545 million; Poland, $202 million; and Yugoslavia, $432 million. Yugoslavia, for example, used most of this to buy military equipment.

Criticisms aimed at the bill included (1) great extension of the purposes for which these funds may be spent abroad—as, for example, aid to educational institutions, which we'll not permit in our own country; (2) the primary purpose, that of aiding our foreign policy, is now shifted with accent on disposal of surpluses. Unwise disposal (dumping) may disrupt, not strengthen, our foreign relations; (3) the Secretary of Agriculture should be permitted to barter for strategic materials with our agricultural surpluses but not directed to do so as he is in this bill; (4) the subsidy of religious schools violates our traditional separation of church and state. To which I added: (1) Hasty consideration—Members were called upon to vote before copies of the bill and committee reports were even available; (2) this program should properly be included, and correlated with our foreign-aid program, for that is what it really is; (3) in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, we may well be feeding and arming sworn enemies.

The Small Business Tax Relief Act of 1958 brought protests from some Members too. Aimed at helping small business by more liberal tax treatment of losses, inheritance-tax payments, and other items, the bill is open to legitimate criticism on several counts: (1) It deals altogether with corporate business when 85 percent of all small businesses are not incorporated; (2) the emphasis is on manufacturing when 80 percent of small businesses are in the service and distribution fields. It seems to me that tax revision is needed so that barriers to economic growth are removed, resulting in greater, rather than lower tax revenues. There is no such aim here. No tax cuts should be made while our Federal Government is operating at a deficit. If we're to have tax relief, it should be equitably distributed among all our citizens. This bill involves a $260-million loss in revenue. In this case, too, only 40 minutes consideration was allowed and no amendments permitted.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 provided the final blow in a disappointing legislative week. Should this measure become law, the Federal Government will be in the business of providing capital for businessmen. Twenty-year risk capital loans made by privately owned State chartered investment companies would be Government insured through the Small Business Administration. Even SBA head, Wendell Barnes, protested such action, stating: "This is a function for which Government is ill-conceived." My own objections include (1) insuring business loans is not the function of Federal Government; (2) Government is assuming an unbusinesslike risk, since the SBA will help only if a bank won't (thus subsidizing poor business operation); (3) who gets loans, who doesn't, and who makes the decisions. Unless everyone can get one, your competitor may be Government subsidized with your tax money. It seems to me that what businessmen, large and small, really need is a tax cut—this first requires less Government aid and spending, not more.

Correction of last week's newsletter (re H. R. 3): On the rule, of the 114 who voted against, 93 were Democrats and 21 Republicans (rather than 105 and 9, as reported). On final passage, 109 Democrats were opposed, as against 46 Republicans (not 132 and 23). Haste in counting caused this error, and I apologize. However, the argument pointed up remains unchanged.

An omnibus judgeship bill, which I supported in testimony before a judiciary subcommittee, was reported out favorably on the same day I appeared. This bill would

provide three additional Federal judges in Texas, one of them in our northern district. This week, too, the independent offices appropriation passed (including funds for Dallas' Federal building site). The military construction bill included funds for the White Rock National Guard Armory, and for construction at the naval air station, and at Hensley Field.

Senate Heaps Praise on Senator Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the column of John M. Cummings, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on July 29, 1958. Senator MARTIN is most deserving of the praise and admiration evidenced by his colleagues in the United States Senate.

SENATE HEAPS PRAISE ON SENATOR MARTIN
(By John M. Cummings)

It is easy enough to understand why Pennsylvania's 48th United States Senator and its 97th Governor ducked a session of the world's most exclusive club in Washington the other day. There is one thing Senator ED MARTIN hesitates to face—praise of his record and his career.

Nevertheless, the praise poured forth until it covered nearly six pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It came from the Republican and the Democratic sides of the aisle, proving once again that in a worthy enterprise our Senators are capable of rising above narrow political considerations.

From precinct worker to the United States Senate, from private to major general, ED MARTIN, over a long career, has unflinchingly faced the fire of the opposition, and there were times when he would have been justified in crying out, "Lord, save me from my friends."

The bipartisan praise heaped on Senator MARTIN was neither extravagant nor fulsome. It came from the hearts of those who uttered it and it was meant, every word of it.

Tall, spare and ramrod straight from his years of military service, Senator MARTIN is a quiet-spoken, even tempered guy until—and when that "until" takes place you had better head for the hills. He is the kind of bloke who would have twisted and squirmed had he been in the Senate the day his colleagues broke through the political barrier and traced his career from Washington County to the Philippines, to Harrisburg, to the battlefields of Europe; his return to the State capitol and on to Washington, where his second term in the Senate is drawing to a close.

It was this that brought on the testimonial session. Senator MARTIN having served his State and his country honorably and well, and approaching 80 is about to retire from public life. Indeed he let it be known shortly after his second election to the Senate he would not seek a third term. His successor is to be chosen this coming November. Voters will decide between the Republican nominee, Representative HUGH SCOTT, and Gov. George Leader on the Democratic side.

Senator CASE, a North Dakota Republican, led off in the Senate's laudation of the Pennsylvania soldier-Statesman. CHAVEZ, New Mexico Democrat; KERR, of Oklahoma, in 1950 a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination; CARLSON, Kansas Republican; KNOWLAND, of California, Senate minority leader; SMITH, New Jersey Republican; WILEY, Wisconsin Republican; THURMOND, South Carolina Democrat; CURTIS, Nebraska Republican; and BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, each in turn paid personal respects to Senator MARTIN and his remarkable political and military career.

Nor was his business life neglected. The Pennsylvania Senator has been over the years active in banking, in manufacturing, mining, and other enterprises.

It was in the nature of the Senate's farewell to the Senator from Pennsylvania who soon will hang up his toga and reach for—well, it is difficult to conceive of ED MARTIN reaching for his bedroom slippers. Certainly he has not lost his zest for public service. As an old comrade in the wars we join his colleagues in wishing him well.

"America, We're on Your Side"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished leaders of the free world, an outstanding statesman, humanitarian, and a devoted servant of the people of the Philippine Republic is the Honorable Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Republic of the Philippines.

He is also a fearless friend of the United States, completely without hesitancy in speaking boldly on behalf of America and on behalf of the common ideals which his fine nation and ours share together. He takes the side of the United States at a time when we were never more sorely in need of friends in Asia.

Some remarks by that splendid President of a freedom loving people appeared in Parade magazine as an open letter to Americans under the heading "America We're on Your Side."

Pursuant to permission granted I insert those remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the feeling of contentment that the Philippine Republic should have such a splendid leader and that we Americans should have such a stanch friend and ally.

"AMERICA, WE'RE ON YOUR SIDE"—ON THE EVE OF A VISIT HERE, AN ASIAN LEADER TELLS WHY HIS PEOPLE SPEAK UP FOR DEMOCRACY
(By Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines)

Several thousand miles and the blue waters of the Pacific separate the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States. We are of the East, you are the West. But for once the twain have met.

One reason why friendships sometimes erode and even founder is that partners take each other for granted. Many are the nations which have reason to be grateful to the United States. In all history it would be difficult to find a people who have displayed more generosity than Americans. That such generosity has not received full recognition is a matter for the conscience of the recipients. I intend that my conscience—and the conscience of my countrymen—shall be clear.

I think it is important to reaffirm our common interests, our common ideals, our common destiny. We, the people of the Philippines, want you to know here and now that you, the people of the United States, have a great credit balance in your favor.

We want you to know that should an occasion arise when your friends have to stand and declare themselves, you will not find the Filipinos on the sidelines.

As I have said, we Filipinos are of Asia. There are some 22 million of us, living on 7,000 islands that form a bridge and a bulwark across the South China Sea. Although we are Asians, we are nevertheless the third largest English-speaking nation in the world.

Our neighbors in Asia are sensitive about colonialism. We understand their feelings, for we have been a colonial people ourselves. But we have been able to discard old resentments, to fix our eyes upon the future.

You were our rulers for 50 years. But you were wise rulers. You made it known, from the start, that you did not intend to stay forever, and that your purpose was to prepare us for self-government.

You gave us education, modern medicine, new skills. You coached us in your own form of democracy. Our government and constitution now are replicas of yours, controlled by free elections, spurred by a free press, and dedicated to liberty.

But even such tutoring might have failed to win our full respect if you had not backed your ideas and your ideals with your blood, sweat, and tears in a savage war.

We learned that when your statesmen said "the Philippines for the Filipinos," they were speaking nothing less than the truth. We learned that you had no desire to exploit us, as other Asian nations had been exploited. Among ourselves we had always known the meaning of fair play. Now we discovered that the same principle could operate between nations.

Then we were plunged into the crucible of conflict. After Pearl Harbor we realized that it was no small decision for the United States to fight on for the Philippines to the last. Many excellent reasons could have been found for you not to have done so. But fight on you did with us, and how we honor you.

Friendship is sharing.

East and West joined hands for freedom at Corregidor and Bataan.

We were among the first to help you stem the Red tide in Korea.

We have stood with you in the debates in the United Nations.

We are partners with you in SEATO, the shield of free Asia.

We are fully aware of our common enemy, communism.

Almost alone in Asia, we have no fear of the West, no chips on our shoulders, no sense of inferiority.

Our land and our people are dedicated to freedom and our soil will always be available to the free world's forces.

If we have differences, you may be sure that they will not be differences in principle. And they will be resolved in the give-and-take of honest debate.

You have put us on our feet and we want to stand on them. We ask no charity. We have much to do to develop our economy, retarded and ravaged by war. But we seek to achieve our progress, not from handouts but through the normal channels of trade and industry.

We are a sovereign nation now. But we still seek your help, your guidance, your skills, your know-how. We can prove to the millions of our fellow Asians that they, too, can achieve a good life, as freemen, marching with dignity and justice.

To the American people I would says this. You have exported many things. You have poured out your wealth and inventiveness. But your greatest export of all has been

one word and all it embraces—democracy, the divine thought that "men are created equal."

Effective Date of Compensation Increases to Wage Board Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and obtained leave to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 25, as reported to the House, is the result of over 4 months of hearings, consultations, and deliberations on the part of the committee. Immediately following the 2 days of open hearing on the bill, the executive branch of the Government interested itself in administratively improving policies and procedures which had been fundamentally responsible for the 6 to 7 months' delay in the granting of increases to the wage board employees of the Federal Government.

After numerous conferences with the departments and agencies, the employee groups, and other interested individuals, tentative procedures and policies were agreed to which would reduce the 7 months' lag to approximately 12 weeks. This period of 12 weeks or 60 working days was still considered by the committee to be excessive. The Senate, in acting on this bill, established a period of 30 days. The bill, as reported today, establishes a period of 45 days in which the departments and agencies are to conduct their surveys, analyze their data, and issue the new wage scales. I believe that this 45-day period is within reason and that if all parties concerned make every effort to improve on the relationships and activities involved, no retroactive pay will result.

In considering the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate, it was found that the two types of wage-board activities were not recognized. These two types involve different time periods and different procedures and methods. One type is where the agency conducts its own wage survey for the establishment of the salaries of its employees. The second type is where a department or agency uses the results of a survey conducted by another department or agency. So as to recognize and provide for these two systems, it was necessary that the Senate language be struck from the bill and new language substituted.

With the exception of the 45 days provided in the House bill and the 30 days provided in the Senate bill, there is very little difference in the overall provisions of the two bills. The House bill does establish an effective date on which the provisions of this act shall be applicable. The committee, in its consideration of the administrative problems involved, determined that the 45-day limitation should not apply to wage-board surveys which had begun prior to September 1 of this year. This action was to eliminate any undue and unjustifiable administrative difficulties involved.

I sincerely believe that the 7 to 8 months' lag in receiving pay increases experienced by our some 650,000 wage-board employees is unjustifiable, unnecessary, and a distinct hardship on the employee. I feel that the provisions of this bill are workable and that they will bring the salaries of our wage-board employees more quickly into alinement with the salaries being paid in private industry. The sole principle on which the wage-board system is based is that the Federal salaries shall be equivalent to salaries being paid to private employees in the local area. I feel that for the first time this principle will be met with the enactment of this bill.

The Central Problem in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, William S. White in his column of July 25, which appeared in the Cleveland Press and other leading newspapers across the country, reminds us that salvation of the entire Middle East lay behind our action in Lebanon. As this veteran reporter so properly indicates, the central problem is whether the free world will be intimidated by the violent overthrow of established governments under the guise of Nasser "nationalism."

Believing that Mr. White's article commends itself to wide reading, under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DON'T FORGET THE BODIES IN IRAQ'S PALACE
(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The courage and decency—and harsh necessity—of the allied intervention in Lebanon and Jordan is being submerged in a sea of collateral arguments and valid complaints that the future is far from bright.

It is plain that legitimate questions—but secondary questions all the same—are causing many to lose sight of the central problem. This problem was, and is, simply the salvation of the Middle East from an ugly chaos that would lead in time to the enfeeblement, if not the destruction, of the free world.

The problem is not whether intervention will settle everything; nobody ever supposed it would. It is, regrettably, not even whether the uninvolved world likes what we have done. And it is not of controlling significance whether the chaos was being prepared on direct Moscow orders or by what is called by the curiously soft term of Nasser nationalism.

Whoever was preparing it, it was demonstrably just what President Eisenhower said the other day it was—"violence, murder, and terrorism as instruments of international policy."

This may be the new nationalism—that movement so attractive to so many in their recoil from colonialism. But in a less sophisticated time it would have been called in plain truth by another name. That name is gangsterism.

Even those who have most ably opposed the landings in Lebanon and Jordan have not offered much alternative apart from one form or another of diplomatic negotiation.

The dead bodies in the little palace of Iraq might well have been followed by dead bodies elsewhere if President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan had not sent troops rather than notes.

But the heavy pressures on Macmillan by the British Labor Party and the undoubtedly strong and high-minded public pressures on Eisenhower here are clearly weakening western will. Many—including this correspondent in a small way—had long criticized Eisenhower for not acting in the world drift.

Most of these critics now upbraid him for the action he has taken. This does not prove that they are wrong now. But it puts a burden upon them to face up to the real, the central, issue, and not to speak as though there had been all the time in the world to make a tidy response in the Middle East.

Quick Adjournment Could Save Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the greatest service the Democrat leadership of the House and Senate could render to our people would be to adjourn the House and Senate as quickly as possible.

By a quick adjournment we could save the taxpayers, who are the Government, probably $6½ billion in bills now pending, none of which are necessary and much of it will be wasted, and, a constant burden on the taxpayers.

The Democrat leaders have it within their power to bring about an early adjournment and to prevent passing this spendthrift proposed legislation because they have a majority in both the House and the Senate.

On July 11, the Senate passed a second housing bill authorizing the additional expenditure of $2.4 billion of Federal funds.

Taking these two housing bills together, $1.8 billion in the earlier bill and $2.4 billion in this bill, the Senate has authorized $4.2 billion for housing this year, or almost $3 billion more than requested by the President.

In addition, the House has now pending another bill known as the Community Facilities Act, which would provide that we appropriate $2 billion to be loaned up to 50 years at 2⅝-percent interest, for the building of sewers, disposal plants, recreational facilities, parking lots—bowling alleys, and so forth—to any community or municipality in the United States. This at a time when every municipality is more able to finance their own improvements than is the Federal Government which would have to borrow this money by selling bonds to the taxpayers. There is an abundance of funds throughout the Nation that could be borrowed from private lending market at around 4 percent. This proposed legislation would

entice the borrowers to come to the Government because of the low interest rate, and refuse to borrow from private sources.

In addition, Democrat leaders in the Senate are insisting upon increasing the Defense appropriation by $1.6 billion more than the President and the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel is necessary, which would increase the Defense budget to over $40 billion.

It would seem that with the great increase in the maximum defense budget that the President and his expert leaders in the military ought to be better judges of the amount of funds needed than the Democrat armchair strategists in the Senate.

There are 2 or 3 other bills proposed for political purposes for this election year that would also increase the budget expenditures by at least a billion and a half dollars this year, and some of this legislation, none of it needed, would fasten the Government with a program or socialistic spending that would run into billions of dollars in the years ahead.

This adds up to a neat sum of $6 billion extra burden of expense annually throughout the years ahead to the taxpayers of the Nation, and much of it will be passed if Congress remains in session.

Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole has blasted as spendthrift the housing bill to which I refer, and indicated that President Eisenhower would veto this bill if it is finally enacted. He ought to know whether such legislation is necessary. Mr. Cole said, "No more housing legislation is needed this year."

Cole called the housing bill a Christmas tree loaded for the benefit of everyone in sight except the taxpayer. The same liberal spenders behind this waste in billions of funds are the ones who have backed socialistic Federal housing throughout the years until our loss today on public housing alone will run over $5 billion, with a committed loss on the part of the Government of nearly $2 billion for urban renewal.

All of the farmers, the laborers, the little businessmen and all taxpayers in the Nation, nine-tenths of whom never receive any benefits, are taxed each year to pay the above-named losses.

I think it is unfair to the people in my district and likewise to the people in other districts who sustain their own homes and pay their own rent and high taxes to have to help pay a part of the rentals of tose who occupy modern public housing in the big cities.

And it is unfair to the same taxpayers to have to help facelift and rebuild and improve the big cities hundreds of miles away with billions of dollars that should be improved by taxes from the citizens where they are located.

It is to be hoped that a quick adjournment might save a part of this proposed useless waste.

Death of Dr. R. T. Wells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOBLE J. GREGORY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, recently the city of Murray, Ky., located in my district, lost a great citizen, politician, and educator. He was Dr. Rainey Thornton Wells, who passed away June 15. Dr. Wells was a close and personal friend of mine. He was responsible for the location of Murray State College at Murray, Ky.; was the leader in raising funds to build the college and served as the second president of that institution from 1926 until 1933. One of the best loved figures in the State of Kentucky, Dr. Wells was celebrated as a political, civic, educational, and religious leader. Since his death, many tributes to him have been printed, among them articles in the College News, student publication at Murray, the Paducah Sun-Democrat, the Murray Democrat, and the Louisville Courier-Journal. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I offer these articles for publication to the RECORD:

DR. R. T. WELLS, 82, MURRAY STATE COLLEGE FOUNDER, DIES—LEADER OF DRIVE TO BRING COLLEGE TO MURRAY, WAS SECOND PRESIDENT

Dr. Rainey T. Wells, founder and former president of Murray State College, died Sunday, June 15, at his home in Murray.

Funeral services were held Tuesday, June 17, at the First Methodist Church. Dr. Wells was 82 years old.

As a politician, Dr. Wells was responsible for locating Murray State College in Murray; as a civic leader, he headed the drive to raise $100,000 to meet the city's end of the bargain; and as an educator, he was the second president of the college, serving from 1926 to 1932.

Wells taught in the public schools of Jackson's Purchase for 6 years. He was a trustee of Murray city schools for 10 years and a member of the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky for 12 years.

SET MURRAY STATE PATTERN

He was city attorney of Murray, a member of the house of representatives three terms, and chairman of the State tax commission. He achieved a national reputation in the field of fraternal insurance as general counsel for Woodmen of the World, Omaha, Nebr. He served in this capacity from 1932 to 1949. He retired in 1949 and returned to Murray to live the remainder of his life.

Under the guidance of Dr. Wells, Murray State College assumed its present pattern. During his presidency it became a 4-year college and was admitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The enrollment grew from 400 to 1,000 and the plant expanded from 1 to 8 buildings.

ENTHUSIASM CONTAGIOUS

Wells named the football team the Thoroughbreds. Under him Murray was admitted to the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Wells Hall, a dormitory on campus, was named for him.

But above all, Wells was an energetic bundle of contagious action. His personality dominated, whether the scene was a camp of hunters or fishermen, a meeting of the Rotary club, prayer meeting at the Methodist church, a political convention, or chapel exercises at the college.

On the campus, Wells had the knack of leading songs at chapel, making freshmen forget their homesickness, shouting an athletic team to victory, and inspiring his student body to frenzied heights of school spirit.

BORN ON CHRISTMAS DAY

His was always the heartiest laughter, the sharpest conversation, the most contagious enthusiasm. This was so even when he and Mrs. Wells returned to their beautiful colonial home south of Murray in 1949.

Rainey Thornton Wells was born Christmas Day 1875, at Murray. He received his bachelor of science, bachelor of arts, and master of arts degrees at Southern Normal University, Bowling Green. He obtained his doctor of laws from the University of Kentucky in 1927.

He is survived by his wife, the former Tennie Daniel of Murray, whom he married in 1896; 2 daughters, Mrs. Joe T. Lovett, Washington, and Mrs. Gordon Banks, Fort Wayne, Ind., and a son, O. S. Wells, Omaha. He is also survievd by 6 grandchildren and 7 great-grandchildren.

DR. RAINEY WELLS, MURRAY STATE FOUNDER, DIES AT 82

MURRAY, KY., June 16.—Dr. Rainey T. Wells, founder of Murray State College, died Sunday at Edgewood, his estate near here. He was 82 years old and had been ill the past 2 years.

One of the best-loved figures in the State, it was Dr. Wells who almost single-handedly established the college in his home town. He served as the second president of the college from 1926 to 1933.

He also is credited with locating the State capitol and governor's mansion at their present sites in Frankfort.

Dr. Wells' long career embraced the professions of educator, politician, civic and religious leader.

Without Dr. Wells, Murray State College never would have existed.

LED VIGOROUS BATTLE

When people began talking about establishing a college in the Purchase area, Dr. Wells acted. He led the fight that created the college and located it in Murray. His townspeople, at his urging, contributed $100,000 to put the college where it is today.

The 2-year Murray Normal School opened its doors on September 24, 1923.

When the Normal needed money, Dr. Wells got it, not only for Murray's school but for all schools in Kentucky. He wrote the bills and fought the foes who wanted to replace the college with a hospital or even destroy it altogether.

While in the legislature, where he served three terms, he helped pass a bill clarifying the State allocation of funds to colleges. The bill since has been replaced by one similar in nature.

Before Dr. Wells' time, State colleges had to go to the legislature and lobby for funds. He set the appropriations at a uniform level.

From 1906 to 1920 he was a member of the Kentucky Tax Commission.

SELECTED FACULTY

Dr. Wells even planned the campus and the buildings, giving the college the basic features it displays today as one of the most beautiful campuses in the South. He personally selected the faculty and directed the policy.

From a 2-year normal school it became a teachers' college and finally a full-fledged college.

It was typical of Dr. Wells to act while others talked.

When he was a member of the general assembly in 1904, discussion began about allocation of funds for building the capitol.

In a special session called early in 1905 Dr. Wells announced to the assembly that he had bought options on and for both the capitol and the executive mansion and had drawn up a bill allocating funds for their construction.

The legislature passed the bill, and the governor signed it into law.

Dr. Wells was born on Christmas Day in 1875. He attended Huntington Normal College and the University of Kentucky. He was admitted to the Kentucky bar on August 8, 1901. He retired from the profession in 1947. He was admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court in 1933.

For 8 years he was a trustee of the University of Kentucky and served for a time as trustee of Nebraska Wesleyan College and a girls' school in Omaha.

It was Dr. Wells who gave the Murray athletic teams their distinctive nickname, "Thoroughbreds."

When he resigned the presidency of Murray on January 1, 1933, he did so to become general counsel of the Woodmen of the World, moving to Omaha to fill that position. He won cases of national significance while employed by that fraternal group.

Even while in Omaha he helped his friends back in Kentucky. His counsel was helpful to members of the Lower Tennessee Valley Association in their long fight for Kentucky Dam.

Besides his legal and educational activities, Dr. Wells was an active leader in his church. He was a Methodist.

Dr. Wells is survived by his widow, the former Miss Tennie Daniel of Calloway County; a son, O. Stum Wells of Murray; 2 daughters, Mrs. Joe T. Lovett of Washington and Mrs. Gordon Banks of Ft. Wayne, Ind.; and 5 sisters, Mrs. Anna Lassiter, Mrs. Betty Lassiter, Mrs. Helen Lassiter, Mrs. Frankie Meadow and Mrs. Houston Strader, all of Murray.

The body was taken to the home at 9 p. m. Monday, where it will remain until 1 p. m. Tuesday. It will then be taken to the college auditorium and lie there until 2:15 p. m.

It will be taken then to the First Methodist Church, where funeral services will begin at 3 p. m. Burial will be in Murray city cemetery.

MURRAY FOUNDER, DR. WELLS, DIES—WAS LAWYER, PUBLIC OFFICIAL, AND EDUCATOR

MURRAY, KY., June 15.—Rainey T. Wells, founder of Murray State College, died Sunday at his home here. He was 82.

Perhaps no man of his times made a greater impact than Wells upon the cultural, political, and civic affairs of this part of Kentucky west of the Tennessee River known as Jackson's Purchase.

As a democratic politician, he maneuvered the location of the State college at Murray in 1922–23. As a civic leader, he headed the local drive for $100,000 to meet Murray's end of the bargain. As an educator, he was second president of the school, serving from 1926 to 1932.

A LAWYER OF DISTINCTION

He was a lawyer of distinction. As general counsel for Woodmen of the World, Omaha, Nebr., from 1932 to 1949, he achieved a national reputation in the field of fraternal insurance.

He was a candidate for governor at the 1931 nominating convention of the Democratic Party at Lexington. He was city attorney of Murray as a young man, a member of the House of Representatives three terms, beginning in 1902, and chairman of the State Tax Commission during the Fields administration, 1923–27.

As a youth, Wells taught in the public schools of Jackson's Purchase for 6 years. He was a trustee of Murray city schools for 10 years, a member of the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky for 12 years.

Wells not only witnessed, but was a participant, in the radio demonstrations of Nathan B. Stubblefield in the early 1890's at about where the Murray State College campus now is located.

Later, as an attorney, he represented Stubblefield in his legal fight for recognition as the Nation's first inventor of workable radio. A monument to Stubblefield now stands on the Murray campus.

But, above all, Wells was an energetic bundle of contagious action. His personality dominated, whether the scene was a camp of hunters or fishermen, a meeting of the Rotary Club, prayer meeting at the Methodist church, a political convention, or chapel exercises at his college.

On the campus, Wells had the knack of leading songs at chapel, making freshmen forget their homesickness, shouting an athletic team to victory, and inspiring his student body to frenzied heights of school spirit.

His was always the heartiest laughter, the sharpest conversation, the most contagious enthusiasm. This was so even after his retirement in 1946, when he and Mrs. Wells returned to their beautiful colonial home south of Murray.

It was during the presidency of Wells that Murray State College assumed its present pattern. At first, it was only a 2-year normal school. Under him, it went to a 4-year college and was admitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The student body grew from 400 to 1,100, and the plant was expanded from 1 to 8 buildings.

GAVE TEAM ITS NAME

The general design of the campus is his. He laid the foundations of the strong music department now featured, and imparted especially strong zeal to athletics. Murray was admitted to the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association under him. He dubbed the football team the Thoroughbreds. A women's dormitory, Rainey T. Wells Hall, was named for him.

Rainey Thornton Wells was born Christmas Day, 1875, at Murray, the son of J. K. P. Wells and the former Fannie A. Thornton. He was educated at old Southern Normal University, Bowling Green, acquiring there the B. S., A. B., and M. A. degrees. His LL. D. was obtained at the University of Kentucky in 1927.

Wells continued his interest in education during his long residence at Omaha. There, he was a trustee of Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr., and of Brownell Hall, Omaha, as well as a member of the leading civic organizations of Omaha.

He is survived by his wife, the former Tennie Daniel, of Murray, whom he married in 1896; two daughters, Mrs. Joe T. Lovett, Washington, and Mrs. Gordon Banks, Fort Wayne, Ind., and a son, O. S. Wells, Omaha. He is also survived by 6 grandchildren and 7 great-grandchildren.

DR. R. T. WELLS, MURRAY STATE FOUNDER DIES

Dr. Rainey T. Wells, founder of Murray State College, died at his home, south of Murray, Sunday afternoon at 1 o'clock, following an illness of over 2½ years. He was 82 years of age.

His death marked the end of the most notable character in the community and one who contributed more to the well-being of Murray than any single individual.

Not only was Dr. Wells interested in the location of Murray State College at its present location, he was also a guiding influence in the permanency and national influence of the Woodmen of the World as a mutual insurance organization.

Dr. Wells was selected as president of Murray State College from the years 1926 to 1933. During his tenure as director of Murray State Normal School, he developed the institution from a mediocre State-supported school of higher learning to one of the most influential colleges of the State. He not only is personally credited with the establishment of the school that has contributed so much to the well-being of the city, but he gave to it the drive and forcefulness that marks it today as a first-class college in the Commonwealth.

The Murray State Normal School was originally designed as a 2-year institution in 1923. Never once did Mr. Wells lose sight of the importance and the potential of the college as a community asset and his untiring efforts resulted in the institution of high respect that it is today.

As a member of the Kentucky Tax Commission he conceived of the possibility of locating a school at Murray and exercised his influence as a member of the commission to effect its location in this community.

Dr. Wells served as a member of the Kentucky Legislature for 3 terms and during this time he laid the strategic groundwork that culminated in the selection of his home community as a place for a State institution of higher learning. Not only his influence as a State legislator in the location of a State college at Murray manifested itself, for he had a tremendous influence in the location of the present State capitol and the mansion. He is credited with authoring measures that made possible the two structures.

Dr. Wells attended Huntington Normal College, Tenn., and the University of Kentucky in attaining his teaching and legal training. He was admitted to the bar to practice law in 1901 and formally retired from practice in 1947.

Dr. Wells has been the inspiration of many news articles authored by Prof. Joe Hortin of Ohio State University and formerly of Murray State College. He has contributed most toward publicizing the fact of Dr. Wells' contribution to the educational world. Each year Professor Hortin offers articles for publication on his birth date, Christmas, 1875.

For 8 years Dr. Wells was trustee of the University of Kentucky and in that capacity he served with distinction in the development of Kentucky's central educational unit. In addition he also served as trustee for Nebraska Wesleyan College and a college for girls in Omaha, Nebr. Until the very end Dr. Wells was personally interested in the educational advancement of American youth.

Despite the handicap of ill health, Murray State College each year paid him noble tribute as a special honored guest at homecoming games; and, upon every occasion that he was able to attend, Dr. Wells was a center of admiration. Dr. Wells gave to the athletic teams the nomenclature of Murray State "Thoroughbreds."

Dr. Wells has always been interested in the well-being of the Murray Methodist Church where he held membership for many years. He served in the capacity of Sunday school superintendent and youth leader for many years as a young citizen of the community. He personally led the drive to build the annex on the old church building many years ago.

Surviving members of the family include his wife Mrs. Tennie Wells; a son Stum Wells of Omaha, Nebr.; two daughters, Mrs. Gordon Banks of Fort Wayne, Ind., and Mrs. Joe Lovett of Washington, D. C.

Funeral services were held this afternoon at 3 o'clock at the First Methodist Church with the Rev. Paul Lyles in charge. Burial was in the City Cemetery.

The city of Murray, through the mayor, Holmes Ellis, has proclaimed an hour of mourning from 3 to 4 p. m. in honor and respect to the departed leader.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Sleepy little towns in the Southland are pleasant places in which to live and die, rear children and be modestly happy. Murray was such a typical community for some 50 years with the population fluctuating between 2,000 and 3,000 persons. For the first 20 years of this century, our little town hovered over the 2,900 mark with the deaths and the births reasonably well in balance.

Just such a sample town could have been ours for the next 100 years had it not been for the good fortune of having been born in the county one son of Mr. and Mrs. J. K. P. Wells. No single person has contributed more toward the development and full bloom of our community than has been accomplished by our late and most honored Rainey T. Wells. It would be difficult for any one to create another even in our imagination who would be competent to meet his accomplishments.

Thus in our Calloway County Hall of Fame a new figure takes his place alongside any others who have made vast contributions to the betterment of our way of life. To category Dr. Wells and to classify him one and apart from the several distinguished citizens would be difficult for many people, but not to the thousands of young men and women who have been influenced by his acquaintanceship.

To classify our illustrious leader as a statesman scarcely fills the description most acceptable. An educator, yes; on the other hand his diverse life many times took him far afield of the realm of education. A lawyer? Of course, but it was only a means to an end and a partial source of livelihood. His knowledge and his vibrancy took him far afield in a successful career as an executive of the Woodmen of the World. His accomplishments as a politician were remarkable and he ranks high with our most courageous and most dependable, however the title is not acceptable to those who have known him through the many years. A church layman? Certainly, but that is not all.

How can a compensating title be lifted from this multitude of accomplishments without grasping a single denominator that sparked each manifestation of Mr. Rainey's life. Without hesitation, we give title to our departed neighbor as "Mr. Organizer." Also without hesitation we are of the opinion that he fired more young boys' hearts to loftier ambitions than any single man living in this county.

Possibly his greatest contribution to Calloway County in this opinion is one that has not been entertained by many people, however we do believe that the lovely little companion, "Miss Tennie," will agree with us it was one of his first, one of his noblest, of human manifestations. He organized a common goal of human interest among a population torn asunder with politics, civil war, religion, and factions. He found an acceptable course of community development with his, and his alone, Murray State Normal School. All differences melted away in the new adventure spearheaded by a human dynamo of enthusiasm. Not a man, woman, or child hesitated to accept his leadership and for the first time since the founding of Calloway County, the shelter of human understanding roofed our coexistence.

Where is that leadership today that could weld together our diverse views toward a common objective and mutual understanding that by the hour worsens with each precinct recount? Where is that guiding hand that would be as welcome in one Democratic faction as in another? Scant hope can ever be held out for the phenominal growth, prosperity, and happiness of our county until once again we rediscover another Rainy T. Wells in whom we can maintain comparable faith through the years.

The reminder is made of the Woodmen of the World encampment out at the old fairgrounds. Drill teams across the Nation competed with axes used as sidearms. The guiding hand behind the scene that brought the big event was you know who, but he did not have the slightest idea that at some day he would be one of its guiding hands. The event was spectacular and became legendary in the memory of Calloway County folks.

The big stroke of Mr. Rainey's life occurred while he was a member of the Kentucky Tax Commission. As a member he was in a vulnerable position to exact his toll for the common welfare of the city of Murray, and he placed Murray in a competing position for the location of a State college in this section of the State. He executed the coup with finesse of the master.

To place Murray in a favorable position he prompted the college stipend of a hundred thousand dollars well in advance before Mayfield or Paducah could get in the running. The investment was well calculated and paid off according to advanced odds. He was named the second president for the school and his invaluable service spelled the difference between success and failure. He gave Murray State the needed punch to make it a fighting and growing institution of learning.

After a tenureship as director of Murray State Doctor Wells turned to the advancement and welfare of the Woodmen of the World. He resigned his position at Murray State and became chief counsel of the Woodmen of the World. His directorship of the latter was of national significance and his organization he directed prospered.

Upon attaining retirement he returned to his native home and once again became one of our respected and beloved citizens. Although handicapped by age and declining health, he was once more a prime target of advice for the most talented politician. To the last he was vitally interested in the well-being of his community. Only 2 nights ago he asked for the latest occurrences of the political front and was transmitted the information and offered his suggestions.

Thus ends a life worth his weight in gold to Murray and we will always be grateful to the mayor of the city who has proclaimed the hours of 3 to 4 p. m. Tuesday as an hour of mourning to the man who has given more and taken less in return than any human being ever to live in our community. To Mrs. Wells, Laurine, Geneive, and Stum we share the vacuum that is yours when you turn for the sympathetic understanding of your one and only dad. From experience we can say in advance there will be no one who can match his wisdom and understanding.

What Sort of Praise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S. C., of July 21, 1958.

WHAT SORT OF PRAISE?

The Arkansas Gazette, the newspaper that won applause in the North for its editorial policy of approving bayonet rule in Little Rock, has published a handsome self-congratulatory brochure.

The foreword to the brochure states that the Arkansas Gazette takes pride in recording its Pulitzer Prize citations "together with a handful of the hundreds of gratifying editorials these awards occasioned in the United States press."

It is a very interesting collection of editorials. These are editorials of praise from the leading pro-integration newspapers, including the Washington Post, the New York Times, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Chicago Daily News.

Strangely absent are editorials from the South, the region affected by the race-mixing policies of the integrationists. To be sure, there is an editorial of praise from the Tampa Morning Tribune. The editorials of praise from the Atlanta Constitution, and the Charlotte Observer shouldn't be considered as reflecting the southern views. Both newspapers are controlled by financial interests outside the South.

It is nice for a newspaper to be admired by journals published in faraway places. Frankly, we think it is nicer to be respected by the people in one's home community and region. They are likely to be better judges of the facts on which editorial comment is made.

The self-congratulatory brochure fails to mention the fact that the Arkansas Gazette has lost circulation in its territory and that the overwhelming majority of southern newspapers spoke out against the bayonet rule in Little Rock that the Gazette endorsed. (News and Courier.)

Self-Employment Security

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend our able distinguished friend and colleague, Mr. KEOGH, and his capable associates for the long-sustained, successful work, which has resulted in the pending measure, H. R. 10, to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans for self-employed individuals.

The merits of this measure have long been obvious to me and I have been privileged to join in efforts being made to bring it to the floor of the House for passage.

It is felicitous that this question has been considered on its merits and it is untouched by even a suggestion of critical partisanism. In complimenting those who worked so hard and ably on the measure, I realize that it would not be appropriate for me at this time to enter into any lengthy analysis or exposition of the bill. Its purpose and its intent is manifest. It seeks to remove certain discriminations against self-employed persons by entitling them to qualify like other employees for certain contributory pensions.

In its operation, it would remove the present tax disadvantage for self-employed proprietors and partners and to that extent provides a measure of relief

for the small-business man that will be very welcome in these days when small business as a whole is not receiving its due share of the national product.

The bill applies to persons, who are subject to the tax on self-employment income, as well as doctors and ministers. It allows these individuals to deduct up to 10 percent of their earnings from self-employment, but not over $2,500 a year, for amounts paid into restricted retirement insurance policies or restricted retirement trust funds. It will be applicable to persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959, who would, under its terms, be permitted higher annual deductions.

It contains a lifetime ceiling of total deductions of $50,000 per taxpayer reducible in the case of individuals, who have previously withdrawn employer contributions under a qualified pension plan or have received nonforfeitable rights to employer contributions. There are several technical provisions in the bill, which imposes various limitations on its retirement program provisions.

Before the bill takes effect, insurance companies must make available insurance policies that meet the specific requirements of the bill and banks will be in a position to establish trust funds meeting its requirements. These steps cannot be taken until the Treasury issues detailed regulations, outlining the rights and responsibilities of the banks and the insurance companies.

I realize the administration has raised certain objections to the bill, which the committee has endeavored to meet, but on the whole I think that the bill is a step in the right direction and believe it will be of considerable help to self-employed persons without costing the Treasury much money.

Every time the Congress moves to reduce taxes objections are raised that the reduction will cost the Treasury too much money. It is my opinion, however, that these objections are not valid in every instance and neither are they true in some instances. I have felt right along that a general tax reduction bill, instead of costing the Treasury money, in the long run would bring in new revenue. I think that there are many authoritative economists who take the same view, and while I highly approve of this bill, I regret that the Congress did not move during this session to put into effect some long overdue tax reductions. I think that such reductions would do more to eliminate present depressed economic conditions in some parts of the country more effectively than any other method that has been tried to date.

Grassroots Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that Indiana and especially the Fifth Congressional District was chosen as typically American by the Wall Street Journal. There are 10 counties in this district that I am privileged to represent and all of us who live in that area feel that we are a wholesome cross section of agriculture, industry, and culture and good, honest living.

One of these counties was visited by Mr. John F. Bridge recently and he has given a thoughtful analysis of his observations. Under unanimous consent, I include this article from the July 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GRASSROOTS POLITICS—THE WORLD CHURNS BUT A LOCAL LEADER MUST TEND OWN BACKYARD

(By John F. Bridge)

HUNTINGTON, IND.—As President Eisenhower maneuvers his precarious Middle Eastern course, Thomas M. Watts is holding his breath more than most Americans.

A student of history and a thoughtful young man, he is of course concerned for his country. But also he has a certain position in the American political structure which makes him peculiarly sensitive to what will happen in the Middle East. Mr. Watts is a county chairman, specifically of the Republican Party in Huntington County, Ind. And he wonders: Just what are the voters here really thinking about that Lebanese intervention? And more importantly, what will they be thinking by the time of this fall's elections?

It is Mr. Watts' job to get out the vote in his county, and to see that it is a Republican vote. As part of that job he organizes the local campaign that is supposed to accomplish those objectives. And as part of that, in turn, he also dispenses patronage to good and deserving Republican Party workers—some 50 to 60 jobs under his direct control, as well as some right of review on all State and Federal appointments to Republicans in his county.

DRAWS NO PAY

For this he draws no pay; in fact he perhaps loses because of time taken off from the concrete block business he operates with his father. But there are other compensations and, in the case of Mr. Watts, a possibility that his political activities may in time yield him financial benefit—wholly legal and acceptable under the United States political system as practiced on the county level. But that is contingent on a number of things including continued success as a politico, and in part that hangs on such things out of his control—like what Khrushchev or Nasser or another Middle Eastern street mob may suddenly do.

Right now, in his area, he finds his own party members divided on the Middle Eastern intervention. One group believes that the United States had the commitment and so it was right to honor it. Another group believes there should have been no involvement in the first place, but isn't sure what to do now. He believes most Democrats in his area favor the move.

As to the effect on his party's prospects, he says, "that still depends on what happens, how bad things get." He adds: "If the situation there worsens—well, that would not have a good effect. If the situation resolves itself relatively peacefully within a week or two, it probably will have no appreciable impact." And he adds: "Of course, the alternative to Republicans is Democrats—and they aren't noted for staying out of trouble abroad."

Meanwhile, in Huntington, as most places, there are many issues that are bigger than the intervention of the United States in Lebanon, short of war. There is the business recession, which seems to be lessening—and in this town of 15,000 there is less grumbling than might be expected. There are crop prospects which are good, and farm prices which are higher than they have been. These are the issues of daily life here and Mr. Watts counts voter sentiment toward them as on his side.

Then there are national issues which strike closer to home, or are more understandable. Sherman Adams, for example. The President may not have made up his mind, but Mr. Watts has. "Most people around here think he's just about got to go. If he's still in office in the fall, that will do quite a bit of harm to the Republicans here. If he goes pretty soon, we'll hear a lot about it in the fall campaign, but I think we'll do all right."

NEGLIGIBLE IMPACT

The sputnik and education crises didn't hit Huntington overly hard. There has long been a feeling that education was becoming too frilly, but the political impact has been negligible. People were irritated at the failure of the Vanguards, but, in Mr. Watts' opinion, not overly upset because the Russians had gotten off first in the race into space. There is still a feeling that United States technology generally is ahead, and that this will prove more important in the end.

The youthful politico is of course not out to knock his party. But there are areas where he does not hesitate to note voter unhappiness. His State has a reputation for conservatism; Republicans hold both Senate seats, 9 of the 11 congressional districts, the governorship and both houses of the legislature. By and large there are conservative Republicans; and the Democratic party has its most success with nonliberal candidates.

So Chairman Watts is hardly a maverick when he ticks off Federal spending, high Federal taxes, Federal intervention in State and local affairs, Federal interference with farm and business, and foreign aid as things that excite ire among Republicans in his county.

On foreign aid the feeling is that it is not doing much good, if any good; any aid ought to be military aid to some allies who might be of use. The voters often write to him as well as their Congressmen along this line. As to the big Federal budgets, Mr. Watts feels the voter ire "particularly when we go after campaign contributions. People writing out a check sometimes stop for a minute—and we get it," he says wryly.

About half of Huntington County's 30,000 people are farmers and the vote from those areas is more strongly Republican than in the town of Huntington. "There is a definite feeling among these farmers"—and Mr. Watts carefully separates his farmers from those elsewhere in the Nation—"that there has to be a withdrawal of Federal interference. The farmers are confused by the controls; it is hard to get Republican farmers very enthused over new ones. The various stabilization programs find mostly Democrats on the boards."

Getting Federal Government out of local and State affairs strikes Mr. Watts as the great basic national issue of the times. He thinks most Republicans in his county agree with that idea. And he says that basic belief "and the desire to try to put it into action where I could" is a main reason he went into politics.

To the visitor, who grew up in a time when politically minded bright young men were rushing off to Washington to help put more Federal Government into local affairs, this seems something of an indicator of the times. Certainly young Mr. Watts, if starry-eyed, is getting his stars from a different quadrant.

But one can doubt that this particular young man has much of the starry-eyed in him. He is quiet-spoken but large—about 6 feet tall. One senses that there is quite a bit of toughness beneath the exterior of

this pleasant and rather handsome young fellow who might just as well be an up-and-coming junior executive for some giant corporation—indeed, for the first 2 years after he graduated from Albion College in Michigan he was with General Electric as a trainee.

KNEW HE WAS BOSS

"Some of the old courthouse hands thought they would push Tom around a bit, when he first took over," a long-time Huntington Republican recalls. "But before they were through, Tom had the resignation of one and the rest knew he was boss in fact."

Mr. Watts came to Huntington 6 years ago to join his father in operation of Huntington Concrete Products.

He had never taken part in politics, even in high school near Detroit or at Albion. But in 1954 a precinct committeeship fell open in the precinct in which he lived. He was interested, partly as a hobby but also because it does not do anybody any good just to sit on the outside and complain. He ran for the post and won. A year later he moved to another precinct and became a committeeman there, too. The following year he became city Republican chairman in a hot mayoralty campaign, elected his man, and in 1956 became the youngest county chairman in the State.

In Indiana a precinct committeeman is a very key figure, in either party. He (or she) usually serves without pay, but is required to make an annual poll—personally contacting every voter in the precinct and reporting to the county chairman. The poll's purpose, of course, is to keep the voters in the party camp and win new voters for the party. In the course of the visits the committeeman is bound to hear what voters don't like about their party, and bound to tell the county chairman. In Huntington County there is one precinct in the town that has 1,000 voters. One in the county has only 200, but it is no simple matter for the rural committeeman to poll even that number.

There are in Huntington County some 600 to 900 active party workers. And, says Mr. Watts, there are always plenty of applicants for the jobs and generally speaking it is no problem to find among them someone who is both competent and politically acceptable.

Mr. Watts believes this system is altogether right and so do most of the people in the county. "To the victor belongs the spoils" bears no overtones of the opprobrium one finds in political-science textbooks. It is a simple statement of fact to Mr. Watts, and a viable part of the American political system. "Administration of policy set by elected officials ought to be by people loyal to the policy—else it won't get across," he declares.

Some examples of local patronage? A former Republican county chairman of Huntington County had also been county sheriff; now he is the State inspector of jails. A former Huntington chief of police is now employed as an arson inspector. Mr. Watts has supplied State drivers license examiners for three counties from his loyal Republicans. One of these was a precinct committeeman who had served many years, but who at 50 was unemployed when a local factory closed. "It was an opportunity to supply a good man who was a loyal party worker," Mr. Watts states.

THE FARMERS WATCH

He also supplies maintenance personnel for the State highways in the county—the only patronage available for many rural areas. These workers get about $1.45 an hour driving trucks, painting the white lines on the highways and the like. These appointments are among the more difficult ones. "Roads are very important in rural areas, and it requires much care in selecting these personnel. The rural folks are very quick to criticize a shabby job done by these appointees."

The vice chairman of the GOP in the county is a woman, and she operates the county office for automobile registrations. What will Mrs. Watts' reward be for this unpaid service? That remains to be seen, but already his father has a good State job as a claims adjuster and some have been quick to note that perhaps Tom Watts' share of the profits of the concrete block business they operate together is now larger. Mr. Watts says no not yet, most of the profits are being plowed back into the business—but eventually he certainly hopes to benefit from the plowback.

Does he want to advance further in the party? "Right now I don't think so—but then it never would have occurred to me to want the county chairmanship until suddenly one day I did."

The Watts tenure has not been an easy one. While his party holds the county courthouse beside the Erie Railroad tracks, and the mayorship of Huntington, the Huntington City Council is Democratic. And the mayorship was decided not only in an election but finally by the State supreme court. The Republican and Democratic candidates alternated in office for over a year as there were a series of recounts, court actions, and appeals.

But the Watts regime has been noted for better organization and more GOP social functions—chili and pancake suppers which draw as many as 800 people when Mr. Watts is able to get a top speaker like Republican Senator WILLIAM JENNER. All this takes some 8 to 10 hours of Mr. Watts' time every week, not counting appearances at the junior chamber of commerce, the Kiwanis Club, and the Toastmasters Club plus service on the local industrial development board and on the Governor's traffic committee.

Helping him with his voluminous correspondence is his pretty young wife, Polly, also an Albion graduate and now an instructor in English and art at Huntington College. Much of this work is done in the big old house, built around 1860, on Jefferson Street where the Watts live.

THINKING AND PLANNING

It is in these surroundings that Mr. Watts does most of his thinking and planning, though there is downtown an office with desks, filing cabinets, and an adjoining room for meetings. Here are the voter lists, and the committeeman reports, all of it geared to election day, when volunteers will roll around town and country in their cars, getting the Republicans to the polls. When the voters get there they are met by a checker, who keeps tabs on who has voted and keeps in touch with a telephone committee which needles the desultory. In the last county-wide and presidential election these tactics brought out 95 percent of the established Republican voters.

And that, in Mr. Watts' view, is what a county chairman is for. What goes on in the Middle East will have its impact on what goes on in the Middle West. But that is something Mr. Watts can't do much about. He can get out his party's voters, and that is what he intends to go right on doing.

They Teach Citizenship to People Who Prize It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the following interesting article from the Orange Transcript of July 17 concerning a most worthwhile project carried on by the Americanization Council of the Oranges and Maplewood sponsored by the Orange Central YMCA. My good friend, Mr. Frank Jay Morris, the director of the council, is widely known and admired for his selfless devotion to the public welfare and his tireless efforts to promote democracy and brotherhood among his fellow men. He has devoted his energies, time, and efforts unstintingly for the good of the community and the country, and the help and hospitality he and his fellow volunteers on the council have extended to the foreign-born residents deserve the highest praise.

Mr. Frank Koch, who is director of the citizenship class, rendered distinguished service in World War II and was severely injured. His deep patriotism is surely an inspiration to the newcomers to our great country. The article follows:

THEY TEACH CITIZENSHIP TO PEOPLE WHO PRIZE IT

(By Richard Fadem)

Retired reporters are apt to be found anywhere. Thank Jay Morris—once a correspondent for the Newark Morning Ledger, the Star Eagle, the New York World, and the Herald Tribune—is now and has been for the past 5 years the director of the Americanization Council of the Oranges and Maplewood, a project sponsored by the Orange Central YMCA.

Morris, who chews on a stogie and talks the way a good news story should be written, takes a very personal interest in his voluntary job and a great deal of pride in the service his small group of volunteers is doing.

The Americanization Council began receiving immigrants some 39 years ago, the object of the project being to help the newcomers, through special classes, to pass their citizenship exams and become citizens of this country. In more precise terms its purposes is, "to act as a clearing house for the dissemination of information regarding legislation and activities on Americanization, to teach correct conversational English and to aid in the assimilation of newly naturalized citizens in the Oranges and Maplewood by endeavoring to inculcate in them the true spirit of America."

Since the program's establishment in 1919 it has helped over 12,000 persons of foreign birth to become citizens of this country. The program of the Council represents "the only evening adult school activity in suburban Essex County offering this particular type of study for foreign born residents who desire to become American citizens." In addition to its "special, beginner, intermediate and advanced classes" which primarily teach English and citizenship, the program offers individual assistance in handling problems of immigration, legal entry, naturalization and preparation of required applications and affidavits.

Morris began sitting (last week) in a corner office of the Orange Y receiving applicants and will continue to do so every Tuesday night from 8 to 9:30 until September 23. Last year 185 students enrolled in the project, coming from over 2 dozen different countries, including Italy, Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, France and China. (There were two that claimed no nationality.) Morris expects as many or more this year, and makes a plea to all prospective applicants that they apply as soon as possible so that they may be assured of acceptance. Facilities and teachers cannot permit more than this number.

DANCING, TOO

The registration fee of $10 includes books, 4 annual parties which take place during the 32-week course, and sundry special activities. According to Morris, one of the favorite pastimes of the newcomers is dancing. There are about 10 teachers, all voluntary. They are required to have a college degree and 1 year of professional teaching.

One of these teachers is Frank G. Koch, of 101 Gates Avenue, Montclair, a graduate of Princeton and now a lawyer for the Prudential Life Insurance Co. He is director of the citizenship class. Recently they had a French woman who made such progress as a pupil that she later became a volunteer teacher.

ORAL REPORT

The classes, which number 8 or 9, begin September 23. They meet once a week from 8 until 10 every Tuesday night. Grades are given and homework, too. The citizenship class begins with a pledge of allegiance to the flag. Any students who have taken the Board of Immigration exams gives an oral report to the class, and then the teacher takes over, stressing American history and the responsibilities and privileges of American citizenship. The English classes emphasize conversation. They also begin with a pledge of allegiance and then turn to the more practical, studying reading, writing, spelling, and letter writing.

According to Morris, the students, who range in age from 16 to 88, are talented, gay-hearted, and appreciative folk. The average age is between 45 and 50, so you see you don't have to be young to go to school. Morris tells the story of a woman named Mary who studied at the project 4 years ago. After 23 years in this country she succeeded in getting her papers.

"There was no more happy person in the world," Morris said. In gratitude for what the school had done for her, she gave a contribution. Shortly after she contracted pneumonia. A side effect of the sickness caused her to lose her sight. She was so proud of her rights as an American citizen, though, that she insisted she still be allowed to vote. After her lawyer told her she wouldn't be able to, she went to Morris one night, finding the "Y" by herself, and explained her situation. Now, although blind, she goes to the polls for every election.

These people are faced with difficult immigration exams. Questions like, "Who was the 16th President of the United States? How many branches are there in the Federal Government and what do they do? Who is your mayor and governor? What is the name of your State capital? How many stripes are there in the flag, and what do they stand for?" These questions may seem easy, but if you were to go to a foreign country with no knowledge of the language, it would be a difficult task for you to answer.

In the 5 years, however, that Morris has been director, not one of his pupils has failed the exam.

Miss Carolyn Melton, Cheraw Beauty, Named Miss Queen of the Sea Islands III at Beaufort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S. C., of July 24, 1958. This salutes another South Carolina beauty of whom I am justly proud as she is from my district. This young lady has exhibited the finest character and leadership, and her life, even at this early age, has been an inspiration to many, many people.

MISS CAROLYN MELTON, CHERAW BEAUTY, NAMED MISS QUEEN OF THE SEA ISLANDS III AT BEAUFORT

Miss Carolyn Melton, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Melton, Jr., was crowned Miss Queen of the Sea Islands III, Saturday, at the water festival ball. The silver crown was placed on her head by the reigning queen, Barbara Mishoe, of Conway.

Miss Melton won the coveted title over 19 other lovely misses, all from South Carolina towns. She was a runner-up in bathing-suit competition Friday night. Judy Austin of Sumter, who won the swimsuit contest, was runner-up for queen, and Patricia Ann Furr of Hartsville was second runner-up.

Miss Melton received a large Sheffield silver engraved bowl, a bracelet and her silver crown. She was sponsored by the Cheraw Jaycees.

She left Wednesday for Greenville to represent this county in the Miss South Carolina contest, the winner to compete in the Miss America pageant in Atlantic City in September.

Among other beauty honors bestowed upon Miss Melton during the past 2 years were: Cheraw High homecoming queen, 1956; 1956 Christmas festival queen; 1957 queen of hearts, and one of finalists in the 1958 Pageland watermelon carnival. She is studying dramatics at RPI, William & Mary College, Richmond, Va.

America's Cultural Strength a Great Asset in Dealing With Africans and Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress will be interested in a most thoughtful lecture on American policies in Asia and Africa given at the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University to an institute of workers in the United States point 4 program.

The lecturer is Philleo Nash, Wisconsin political leader, anthropologist, student of government, teacher, and former White House staff assistant who participated in the development of the point 4 concept under President Harry S. Truman.

The summary text of Mr. Nash's remarks follows:

REMARKS BY PHILLEO NASH OF WISCONSIN ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the institute, the future of our children's children rests with the peoples of Africa and Asia. They are farmers, herdsmen and merchants who are on the fringe of the expanding wave that began with the industrial revolution. During most of their history they have been dependent peoples under colonial rule. Their leaders attended the Asian-African conference at Bandung. There it was made clear to the world that these countries regard their own future status as independent nations as considerably more important than who wins the cold war.

The values that we take for granted—political representation and the equal rights of women—seem remote to them. And when we project America we must project Little Rock as well as Ralph Bunche; and this is not remote to them.

Technical know-how, better methods of agriculture, medicine, education and engineering are not the exclusive property of the Western World. Anyone who still thinks so has not looked up into the sky lately.

If these peoples want the benefits of industrialization they can get their technology as well from the Russians as from ourselves. And if they do, they will get with it the inhuman values of communism, the philosophy of supremacy of the state over the individual.

But if they get their technology from us, it is possible to share it with them in a way that will advance the philosophy of democracy—belief in the equal worth and dignity of every human being.

Point 4—the program of technical cooperation initiated by President Truman in 1948—was and is America's answer to colonialism. We must make certain that it remains what it was originally intended to be—a program of shared knowledge. Let it become a series of trade missions, or an adjunct of our military stockpiling program, and we will have lost our chief, perhaps our only advantage, in this phase of the cold war.

We must make the most of our strength in dealing with Africans and Asians—not our overpowering military strength or our wealth, for we are dealing with nations that, comparatively speaking, are weak and poor.

I am referring to our cultural strength, which is a great asset.

First: Our history. Countries that are small, weak, and were formerly colonies and today have a burning desire for national recognition, have a natural identification with us, for we too brought forth a nation under these conditions.

Second: Our idealism. We are known the world over for our buoyant optimism and our cheerful confidence in progress. This is a commodity that is always in demand by struggling humanity and we have unlimited quantities of it.

Third. Our desire to do good. There is scarcely a country in the world that has not received help from our bounty at one time or another. American business, American labor organizations, American foundations have cured disease, built schools, and staved off famine all over the world. We cannot expect to buy friends with money, but we can expect to win and hold friends by the exercise of our normal generous impulses toward people.

Fourth. Our record. We have not been a harsh or oppressive landlord. The Philippines are an independent nation today because we worked jointly with their people for independence. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a model of cooperative searching for economic and political solutions. Alaska is a State, and Hawaii will soon be one. Guam and American Samoa will compare favorably with nearby islands. The Trust Territory of the Pacific was voluntarily placed by us under United Nations trusteeship.

Fifth. Our own struggle. America is struggling painfully to solve a most difficult problem of race relations. If we could approach our friends throughout the world in a spirit of humble learning in racial matters, we might obtain a sympathetic hearing. But if we are boastful, defiant, defensive, silent, or apologetic, we have little reason to expect friendship. We have far to go and much to

learn in matters of race. Let us learn from others; if we do, they may become our friends.

Finally, let us never forget that the Arab soldier with his rifle trained on an American boy is the same fellow who was known throughout World War II as a "gook." This is a lesson we have never learned, and it is a weakness we cannot afford. We must conduct ourselves in Africa and Asia like the minority we really are. Most of the peoples of the world are not either very black or very white, but in between. In such a world white supremacy is a losing proposition. It is not too late to abandon it, but it is a stumbling block on which costly programs have failed and will fail again if we do not abandon it.

Point IV workers are in a delicate and difficult position. We cannot and must not abandon our allies who are holding the line against Soviet expansion in Western Europe. But these same nations are the former colonial masters of the very peoples we are trying to help. We cannot reasonably expect to have the firm friendship of both simultaneously. But short-run failures will be forgotten and the long-run gains are the greatest in the world—eventual realization of the ancient dream of equal justice under law for all mankind.

Wildlife Associations Request Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife To Retain Present System of Allocating Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter and resolutions which I have received from L. P. Voigt, conservation director, State of Wisconsin Conservation Department, regarding a proposed change in procedure of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in allocating funds to the various States under the Pittman-Robertson Act. The resolutions urge the Bureau to continue the system of apportionments under the same procedure which has been in effect for the past 20 years. The letter and resolutions follow:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, July 23, 1958.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: Thank you for your letter of June 16, 1958, regarding Pittman-Robertson apportionments.

I would like to bring to your attention the most recent action on the matter of changing the method of calculating the Pittman-Robertson apportionments to the States for wildlife-conservation programs.

As you may recall, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife plans to institute a method of sampling license holders to determine the number of individuals, in place of using license-sales data which the States have in the past certified to the Secretary of the Interior. At the recent meeting of the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, held in Bismarck, N. Dak., representatives of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife indicated that the new sampling system would probably be put into effect this coming fall. We are, therefore, at this time very much concerned on the effect such action will have on our program.

At the Bismarck meeting a resolution regarding this problem was passed by the commissioners from the 14-State association. A copy of this resolution is attached. You will note that it specifically requests the Bureau to continue the system which has been in effect for the past 20 years. It, furthermore, endorses a method of apportionment which would use as its basis one big-game and one small-game license for any one individual in any one State. In the event the proposal as outlined by this resolution is put into effect, it will definitely be in the best interest of Wisconsin's program. I am also attaching a resolution passed by the 11 States comprising the Western Association of Fish and Game Commissioners which endorses the established method of computing the apportionment.

Your assistance in seeing that these resolutions reach the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and other interested Congressmen will be sincerely appreciated. Similar letters are also being sent to the other Members of the Wisconsin delegation. In the meantime, I will appreciate being advised of any new developments on this matter in Washington.

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

RESOLUTION 14, OPPOSING CHANGES IN FEDERAL AID ACTS

Whereas the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, more commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, has since its enactment in 1939 been a tremendous asset to the wildlife conservation programs of the States; and

Whereas the formula for the apportionment of these Federal aid funds to the States had the unqualified endorsement of all 48 States; and

Whereas this basis for apportionment has been successfully accomplished these past 19 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners goes on record as being unalterably opposed to any change in the present apportionment formula; and be it further

Resolved, That the Western Association goes on record as being opposed to spending any of the sportsmen's funds for determining the number of duplicate licenses sold and being in favor of continuing the present method of certifying license sales.

Adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, 38th annual conference, Sun Valley, Idaho, June 25, 1958.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Public Law 415, better known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, was passed in 1937 and provided that the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition be distributed to the various States by the Department of the Interior on the basis of a formula which included equal weight to land area of each State and to the number of paid hunting license holders as certified to the Secretary of the Interior by the State fish and game departments; and

Whereas for the past 20 years the number of paid license holders has been interpreted to mean the number of hunting licenses sold and apportionment of Pittman-Robertson funds has been based on this assumption with the full knowledge and approval of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas many people purchase both big game and small game, resident and nonresident hunting licenses, and it is a well-recognized fact that a certain number of people in every State in the Union possess more than one hunting license—such duplication can be determined only by a most comprehensive and costly statistical survey; and

Whereas it is now determined by the Department of Interior that the method of certification of hunters by the various State fish and game departments is no longer considered valid and, therefore, large sums of State fish and game management funds must be expended for statistical surveys to determine the actual number of hunters in each State, such survey may cost up to $35,000 annually per State, which money will be forever lost in game management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Midwest Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners meeting in Bismarck, N. Dak., on July 11, 1958, respectfully request the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife to continue for the time being the method which has been in effect for 20 years for computing the Pittman-Robertson apportionment; be it further

Resolved, That the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife be requested to study the feasibility of amending the Pittman-Robertson Act to use as a basis for the license computation for any State, a maximum of 1 big game license and 1 small game license for any one individual. After such study the Bureau shall submit the results along with their recommendation to the respective States for their review and if approved by a majority of the States the Bureau recommend suitable legislation amending the act; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife and Members of Congress of the member States of this association.

A Grim Warning to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News of July 29, 1958, in its column entitled "Capital Circus," by Jerry Greene, refers to a report compiled some 3 years ago which contains a grim warning to the American people—but nothing has ever been done in the matter. It is a report of the Civil Defense Foods Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council in which our people are warned against the possibility of the poisoning of our food supplies by saboteurs.

Just about a year ago, on July 17, 1957, the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be the chairman—Consumers Study Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture—issued a brief report on studies conducted by our subcommittee in which similar warnings are contained. This is a very serious matter and it is time we deal with it in a very serious manner. Our negligence now may mean tremendous loss of life and property in the future.

In the hope of reviving interest in this matter, I am inserting Mr. Greene's article into the RECORD, as well as the report of my subcommittee entitled "Food for

Civilian Survival in the Event of War," and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Daily News of July 29, 1958]

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, JULY 28.—For 3 years now the Government has kept from the American people through negligence a vital report which says that one saboteur could kill off 500,000 of us in 1 day's work.

Maj. Gen. William M. Creasy, Army chief chemical officer, has been warning the taxpayers of such perils for some time, but nobody seems to listen, outside of a handful of technical experts.

The report was compiled by the Civil Defense Foods Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council and was issued in November 1955.

This committee was headed by Roy C. Newton of Swift & Co. and included a list of top-flight executives and scientists. They worked long and hard and they turned out a handsomely bound 167-page volume. It spells out how most of the United States population could be killed by homemade poison in the hands of about 100 spies.

Unlike the suppressed Gaither Report about Russian and United States armaments—which scared a lot of people by indirection—there was nothing at all classified about the Newton committee findings.

The simple truth is that nobody paid any attention. The Government was not even sufficiently impressed to announce publication of the document, despite its frightful warnings. Nor was there a single press agent handout describing these matters.

The report contained some very pointed conclusions and recommendations. They were directed to the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We called the FDA today, after a careful study of this document, and asked what had been done about it in these 3 years, in view of the importance of the matter and the prominence of the people involved.

"Nothing," the spokesman said. "We just haven't had any money."

Here's one sample of how the businessmen and scientists tried 3 years ago to warn of what might be expected:

"During the past 15 years many new toxic chemical substances have been discovered. Some display such extreme toxic potency as to render them likely agents for sabotage usage.

SABOTEUR COULD MAKE THE STUFF AT HOME

"It must be considered possible for a saboteur to make enough of such poison in his home to do great damage in a food in which it is compatible.

"If he had access to a food plant with wide distribution, he could easily conceal a sufficient quantity of the toxic material on his person and poison enough food in one day's activity to provide a lethal dose to 500,000 people."

The report indicated the Committee felt greatest fears over the handling of dairy products, processed meats, such as hot dogs, and beverages, including beer:

The highly unpublicized report offered this grim warning to the American public:

"As few as 100 saboteurs established previously in food plants and acting in unison could so seriously demoralize the American population that confidence in our foods would be lost. Unless some proper organization is set up in advance to handle this type of emergency, the effect on morale could be devastating."

These are very grim words, and there are worse in the report.

REMEMBER HOOVER'S WARNING

Take a deep breath and remember the J. Edgar Hoover statement that there are 25,000 hard-core commies abroad in the United States. Match that up with the statement of this wholly nonpolitical committee that the Reds need only 100 selected agents to put us all out of action for keeps, with no need of nuclear weapons.

The Committee disclosed top-secret intelligence without meaning to do so when it announced that the basement operator is now able to come up with the equivalent of the dread nerve gases by spending a few hours around his kitchen sink.

There was a warning against attack "with toxic chemicals which can be manufactured readily in 1-to-10 pound batches with a minimum of laboratory equipment and with easily obtainable starting materials."

Study the report and it adds up to this: Pour a few drops of bug juice into the salami and hotdog mixing vats and, brother, have the proletarians had it.

Everybody in the food and drug business has been thinking about the problem, the report says, but "very little work has been done nationally to set up a defense against the threat of CBR (chemical-bacteriological-radiological) attack and we find that adequate plans for such a defense are lacking."

SEE OVEREMPHASIS ON H-BOMB THREAT

There has been, the Committee said, an overemphasis on the part of the Government on the "horrors of the H-bomb, leading to a feeling of hopelessness in developing an adequate defense."

There, in black and white, in an official report, is the answer. Pompous Harold Stassen, even today closeted with a busy President, didn't get anybody to agree to disarm. But in all of his disarmament talks, long and loud and costly to taxpayers, we heard no mention of germs and gas.

And if, as this worthy commission notes officially, one rat coming out of a basement can kill off 500,000 people in a day's work, such matters should be worthy of consideration. Even at the summit.

FOOD FOR CIVILIAN SURVIVAL IN EVENT OF WAR

(Interim report of the Consumers Study Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 1st session, July 17, 1957)

In the event of nuclear war the United States is utterly without a plan to immediately feed its civilian population, including its Territories and possessions. Moreover, there is no design in being for immediate availability of food for our allies.

This constitutes perhaps the weakest link in the chain of defense planning, within America's boundaries, and in concert with other nations of the free world.

The subcommittee is aware of the many important civil-defense studies and programs which are in process or have been completed. It recognizes that at the Federal level very good work has been done in developing civilian-defense programs, and these have been carried out in cooperation with the State and Federal agencies. These programs have included emergency feeding of people evacuated from military installations and urban communities. Valuable experiences also were gained in the national alerts in 1956 and in 1957. Yet the subcommittee is forced to conclude that if war should strike tomorrow the United States would find itself without an adequate emergency food-reserve program.

The Federal Civil Defense Act, known as Public Law 920, was enacted by the Congress in 1950. It was designed to protect "life and property in the United States from attack." It was foreseen that the attack could be "in any manner by sabotage or by the use of bombs, shellfire or atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological, or biological means, or other weapons or processes" (sec. 3). The act is to be administered by an administrator known as the Federal Civil Defense Administrator with power to delegate responsibility for preparing "national plans and programs" and to delegate any of these responsibilities "to the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government." There is nothing in Public Law 920 designed to sustain or protect the civilian population in any foreign country where the United States now has, or in the future will be required to have, military forces.

The Consumers Study Subcommittee was created on March 14, 1957, by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. One of its functions is to study and investigate the stockpiling of food for national emergencies.

REPORTS AND VIEWS ON STOCKPILING PRESENTED

On June 12 and 13, 1957, the subcommittee held hearings on food stockpiling. Witnesses appeared from the Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the National Grange, and the National Farmers Union. A representative of the Office of Civil Defense also attended these hearings.

The subcommittee finds that 7 years after the enactment of Public Law 920 there is not in being a comprehensive or otherwise adequate overall food program aimed at maintaining sufficient emergency food supplies for the civilian population in the United States, its Territories and possessions. Of deep concern to the subcommittee also is the fact that there is no plan in being to protect civilian populations in foreign territories which are part of the defense orbit of allied military operations.

The Department of Defense reported to the subcommittee that it maintains only minimum stocks of foods for the Armed Forces. Large additional quantities of food would be required for the military in the event of an attack. The Department of Defense depends upon the Department of Agriculture for assurance that the needed food supplies will be available when and where needed. Yet no plan for strategically located civilian food stocks has been developed.

The Department of Interior reported that United States Territories and possessions import from 20 to 90 percent of their food supplies from the mainland. Interruptions in ocean shipping would cut off normal food imports. For example, two of our most strategic areas, Guam and Alaska, import 90 and 80 percent, respectively, of their food supplies. Another and perhaps even more serious example is Hawaii, where the people are dependent on food imports from the United States mainland. In the event of war enemy submarines or other type of warships could isolate the islands and force the people thereon to capitulate for lack of food. Yet no plans have been developed for emergency feeding in our Territories and possessions.

The Department of State reported that our foreign policy embraces assistance to friendly countries who wish to build up reserves or strategic stockpiles of food. In some cases a part of the purchases of surplus foods under title I of Public Law 480 have been used to build more adequate food reserves, notably in India and Poland. Yet no plans have been formulated for United States cooperation with other countries in building strategic food reserves to buttress our NATO and other military alliances.

The Department of Agriculture presented to the subcommittee a detailed statement embracing explanations of what it has done in the way of formulating an overall program of food preparedness. The Department concluded its statement as follows:

"The need for stockpiling must be critically examined, and it must be clear that there is a justifiable need, and that there is no satisfactory and less costly alternative for the safety of our people, before undertaking this difficult and expensive task."

FARMERS WANT CITY POPULATIONS PROTECTED

The subcommittee was impressed by the position of the National Grange, a major farm organization, on the stockpiling of food near major centers of population. The Grange presented a statement saying in part:

"The National Grange is particularly pleased that this subcommittee is holding hearings on food stockpiling for defense. It is a subject of tremendous importance. The welfare of millions of Americans is involved and perhaps even the survival of our country in time of war.

"The National Grange favors the establishment of food reserves at strategic locations throughout the country. We consider such reserves as a matter of fundamental prudence and a basic part of national preparedness.

"As well as we have been able to learn, there is no emergency food plan in existence today. If there is one, it's a well-kept secret. * * *

"If Baltimore (as an example) were hit by an enemy missile or bomb today, several hundred thousand people from Washington—along with survivors of the Baltimore attack—would be roaming the hills and valleys of Virginia west of here by tonight or tomorrow. The Virginia counties west of here are not prepared to feed and take care of several hundred thousand refugees from Washington and Baltimore. The food isn't there. Without food and without a plan, there would be extreme disorder, to say the least."

(Conditions would even be more chaotic in cities like New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the rural areas surrounding them.)

"There could be wheat in Minnesota, corn in Illinois, and beef in Nebraska, but it might as well be a million miles away unless there is an orderly and practical plan for getting it to the hills of Virginia in time to be used. * * *

"If there ever is an attack—or even the imminent possibility of an attack—it will be the farm countryside that will bear the burden of feeding and caring for the millions of our fellow Americans who come out from the cities to stay with us during the emergency. The farmlands would become the support areas—the place where a great many Americans would catch their breath and organize for the next step in fighting back. We hope against hope that all this may never happen, but if it ever does, we think food stockpiles will be vital—and cheap at any price."

FINDINGS

The survival and safety of the civilian population are the basic responsibility of Government in times of enemy attack. This is not to say the States, private organizations, and individuals can abdicate their responsibilities.

In this respect it must be noted that in any major war the first enemy blow may be expected to fall upon concentrated civilian populations, to cripple industrial potential and in the expectation of destroying a people's will to resist.

Food is the one indispensable element in survival and morale. Its presence would be likely to lessen fear and prevent panic and terror in an evacuating population of a city.

The subcommittee finds (1) that such plans as have been devised under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 are by no means sufficient in the event of an attack to take care of our American civilian population within the continental limits of the United States, its Territories and possessions; (2) that there is absolutely no plan in being to sustain or protect civilian populations of foreign countries having allied military operations or bases; and (3) that there is too much delegation of responsibility under Public Law 920.

Insufficient urgency has been attached to the planning of emergency food supplies.

We recommend that the Government move swiftly to formulate plans and gather facts to assure that emergency stocks of food commodities will be available at accessible locations as reserves against possible disaster.

We have heard testimony regarding the vital importance of adequate food supplies in strategic locations in case of military operations. We consider an adequate emergency food program both within the United States and in friendly countries a vital part of our program of national and international defense. We consider the cost of such a program as much a part of the general cost of defense as the payments made for aircraft, bombs, missiles, ships, and tanks.

This subcommittee recognizes that an emergency food program involves a number of problems, such as rotation of stocks, not encountered in other defense supply programs. None of the peculiar problems are insurmountable, however, if the technical staffs of the executive agencies are given instructions to develop remedies.

We believe there should be a relocation of food storage facilities throughout the country so that each major city will have strategic reserves in the accessible rural areas. We believe that these facilities can be planned, constructed, and operated in such a way that the food stocks can be rotated into normal trade channels and that the facilities can contribute to our ever-growing civilian needs for additional food storage.

We recommend that consideration be given to the utilization of existing underground facilities in the large metropolitan areas and the development of such new facilities which, while serving a peacetime purpose, can be used to stockpile essential food, water, and other necessities as a part of our national-defense program.

We are convinced that the departments of Government mentioned in this report recognize the necessity for an overall food program attuned to possibilities of war or other national emergency and that each department wishes to cooperate in the solution of this problem. However, we believe that this matter of strategic food stockpiling is too important and too complex to be handled entirely by any single department of Government, and that the authority created under Public Law 920 is insufficient to provide for all of the emergencies contemplated by this report.

CONCLUSION

The subcommittee finally recommends in the light of the above findings that the President give this important problem his immediate attention, that he create a new coordinating board or council from personnel of existing agencies of Government, and that he delegate to it the specific authority and responsibility of devising plans for national and international food programs deisgned (1) to protect the civilian populations in the event of attack, and (2) that this subcommittee be kept informed of the planning of said board or council in order to propose such legislation as may be necessary to make the work of said board or council more effective.

Our Universe as a Propagating Flame in the Cosmos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following hypothesis by a constituent of mine, William Stanton Foulks, Jr., of East Liverpool, Ohio:

THE COSMOS AS AN EXPLOSIVE MIXTURE OF INFINITE EXTENT—OUR UNIVERSE AS A PROPAGATING FLAME IN THE COSMOS

(By William Stanton Foulks, Jr.)

This hypothesis gives an answer to the question of why the galaxies in our universe are receding from each other at velocities which are directly proportional to the distances of separation. The word "cosmos" is used to mean the sum total of everything of a physical nature. The word "universe" is used to mean everything of a physical nature from which we could ever hope to receive radiation—even under the most idealized circumstances.

Several points that must be stated: (a) Antimatter—consisting at least of antiprotons and positrons—appears to exist; (b) collisions of antimatter with normal matter result in instantaneous annihilation of both types of atoms with the release of energy; and (c) no evidence has been found to demonstrate that antimatter would repel normal matter.

The writer's hypothesis:

1. The cosmos is infinite. It is composed of gas at absolute zero. There is no kinetic energy, and there is no radiant energy. (Our universe is an exception—a small disturbance.)

2. The gas atoms are distributed with exact uniformity throughout the cosmos. The number of atoms per unit volume of cosmos is exactly the same at any place in the cosmos. All atoms are separated from their nearest neighbors by precisely the same interatomic distance. With an infinite gas and this degree of order, the suggestion is that there is no net force existing in the cosmos even on an interatomic scale. Nothing is ionized, and there is electrical neutrality. There is no movement, and there is no radiation.

3. Of these absolutely motionless gas atoms, some percentage is antimatter relative to the others. Perhaps the lightest isotopes of hydrogen and antihydrogen would serve. Other elements and combinations of elements in the anti and normal forms might be suitable, but they must be entirely stable. Some nuclear particle and its antithesis might serve, if stable.

4. Such is the initial state which may have existed always. With no beginning, the initial state found it proper and easy to exist with this symmetry and precision of atomic spacing.

5. The introduction of radiation, mechanical energy, or some "disturbance" at any part of the cosmos will produce a collision of a normal atom with an antiatom. One hopes that one quantum of radiation would suffice. After such a collision, the radiation released by the annihilation of the atom and antiatom will go out in all directions

at the speed of light—causing more annihilation collisions. This effect is self-propagating at the speed of light through the infinite cosmos. Our universe is such a propagating flame—expanding at the speed of light through the limitless explosive mixture.

6. The annihilation reaction is a very rapid reaction. After the annihilation flame front moves beyond a point, one species of atom—either matter or antimatter—has been almost eliminated at that point. Which survives depends on which was the major constituent at that point. The surviving atoms now have kinetic and radiant energies. Local forces can begin to operate—so the condensation into clouds, galaxies, and stars is initiated.

7. The radiation pressure from the highly intense and very rapid annihilation reaction forces the surviving matter to fly outward radially in this propagating spherical explosion. (The early stages are surely spherical.) With a uniform cosmos, the latent annihilation energy per unit volume of unexploded cosmos is the same at all points. Thus, the total annihilation energy release increases directly with the cube of the radius (as does the volume) while the area of the spherical surface increases directly with only the square of the radius. Per unit area on the surface of the sphere, the total amount of annihilation radiation passing radially outward is thus directly proportional to the radius of the sphere. So the radial velocity of matter surviving the annihilation reaction is also directly proportional to the radius. Hence, we have the galaxies in our universe receding from each other at velocities which are directly proportional to the distances of separation.

8. It is possible that there are many expanding flame universes such as ours. Some could be vastly more ancient than our universe. We and they are expanding toward each other very rapidly through the infinite, primordial explosive mixture. Since there is no radiation in the primordial explosive mixture, it would seem impossible to know directly of it or of other flame universes by radiation-receiving techniques. (Perhaps the contacting of two flame universes could produce the intense compression needed in Gamow's cosmology.) Also, the annihilation flame front and the brink's galaxies are expanding away from our galaxy at the speed of light at least. Thus, our galaxy is not receiving intense annihilation radiation. Annihilation radiation from the explosion's earlier stages has passed away from our galaxy long ago in the elapsed billions of years. The writer offers no reason for the original disturbing of the explosive mixture.

Is Nasser Another Mao Tze-Tung?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Constantine Brown:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 24, 1958]

NASSER ANOTHER MAO TSE-TUNG—WEST CRITICIZED FOR NOT RECOGNIZING EGYPT'S DICTATOR AS FOIL FOR MOSCOW

(By Constantine Brown)

Is Prime Minister Nasser of the UAR just a liberal-nationalist, just as Mao Tse-tung was a mere agrarian reformer in the eyes of many western diplomats?

The answer is yes—exactly the same.

The Soviet Union helped the Chinese Communist leader with arms, ammunition, military technicians and cash to take over China. We let down the Nationalist regime headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, our ally then as now, because so many of our pious leaders discovered suddenly that the Kuomintang was corrupt and inefficient. By western standards this may have been so, but not by oriental standards. Anyhow, we lost the Chinese mainland to the Soviet Union. One of its many consequences was the war in Korea which cost America 147,000 battle casualties, upwards of $22 billion and a continued explosive situation in the Far East which may blow up in our face any day Moscow and Peiping decide to pull the trigger.

Even when it became more than obvious that the Chinese Communists had lined themselves up irretrievably with the men in the Kremlin, public figures in this country who are still practicing political Coueism believed that every day, in every way, things would be getting better. At the height of the crisis in the Middle East last week, Peiping announced not only that it was ready to send volunteers to the Middle East, but also intimated that it intended to take Hong Kong. Britain's only remaining prize colony in the Far East.

Wishful thinking continues to be the basis of our policies. You can hear on and off the floor of the Senate, among business leaders and more rarely in the State Department, the opinion that Nasser ought to be cultivated. If we don't oppose him, and if we show a conciliatory attitude backed by substantial economic and financial aid, he will desert Moscow and become truly neutral.

The same thing is now said about the junta in Baghdad. Has it not announced that it intends to maintain its obligations toward the West? The fact that the Iraqi Minister of Education who participated in the Tuesday demonstration in Cairo, where Colonel Nasser threatened to throw our forces into the sea, stated that his government was ready to follow the Egyptian caravan to the bitter end, and obey the wagonmaster does not appear to have shown the Iraqi trend to our perennial Coueists.

The blunt fact is that Russia, after more than two centuries of diplomatic and military endeavors to reach the Mediterranean, has finally succeeded in doing so. Where the czars and even Stalin failed, Khrushchev has succeeded. We had a chance last week to put a stop to Soviet domination of that vital area by supporting the Turks and the Jordanians to restore the Iraqi-Jordanian confederation. We did not do it, not because of lack of ability, but because we (or some of the American and British leaders) seemed to believe that Colonel Nasser could eventually be appeased.

Let's make no mistake. He is as much—and possibly more so because he is fundamentally weak—in the pocket of the Kremlin as are Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. Unless something totally unexpected occurs, he likely will control before the year is out not only the pipelines of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon, but also the oil resources of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait.

Colonel Nasser will nationalize the oil industries, with the usual compensations to the stockholders, just as he did with the Suez Canal. The financial aspect of oil—the loss of profits by the American, British, French, and Dutch companies—is unimportant and immaterial. What is important, from the economic and strategic point of view, is that the Soviet Union, through its Egyptian proxy, will control the production and syphoning of oil.

Europe is dependent on Middle East oil for its industrial and military needs. Russia, once it has completed its plan to control the wells, the refineries, and the pipelines through Colonel Nasser, will be in a position to impose on Europe its own political forms. The penalty for a refusal will be oil starvation. It will be able in this manner to force the dissolution of the NATO, which is more a symbol of Western unity than an effective weapon against a Soviet aggression. These are the real implications of Colonel Nasser's unopposed drive in the Middle East.

New Reason for U. N. Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to my colleagues' attention the following thoughtful editorial appearing in the Maplewood-South Orange News Record of July 24. The editorial points out the need for a standing U. N. force with which to exert pressure for peace. I introduced a resolution on February 6, 1957, requesting the President to take such steps, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, as may be necessary to establish such a military force within the framework of the United Nations. As the editorial states, the Middle East situation underscores the need for a U. N. peace force. The editorial reads as follows:

NEW REASON FOR U. N. FORCE

I can't help but be greatly disturbed by the events in the Middle East. The world is sitting on a powder keg, that's for sure, and one misplaced spark could blow the world to bits. No country, no leader of any country, wants that to happen but it could happen without premeditation.

It seems to me that the situation in Lebanon and Jordan and Iraq points up once again the basic weakness—and the great need—of the United Nations. I mean the U. N.'s lack of power to step in and prevent conflict and, on the other hand, its need for a standing force with which to exert pressure for peace.

I've talked about this many times before. It just so happens I read a piece a couple of nights ago in the AAUN (American Association for the United Nations) News by Clark M. Eichelberger, the AAUN executive director. Listen:

"The need of a permanent United Nations force is once again dramatized, this time by the situation in Lebanon. And that such a force can be highly successful is demonstrated by the results of the present UNEF in the Gaza Strip and Sharm el Sheikh.

"No one is advocating today a large United Nations force capable of waging war against an aggressor. A permanent United Nations army can scarcely be realized until there is drastic disarmament.

"What is contemplated is really what Ambassador Warren Austin called a peace force—which dispatched to the scene of difficulty in time might prevent the difficulty from becoming serious.

"If such a force were in being and if it were understood that the Secretary-General (of the U. N.) had the authority to dispatch this force into any troubled area at the request of the party or parties concerned, the

force might arrive in time to prevent difficulties from developing into full-scale conflict.

"Now the situation in Lebanon is very difficult. Undoubtedly a civil war exists, with overtones of religious differences. The United Nations cannot concern itself in a purely internal revolutionary situation.

"However, it is the concern of the United Nations that a member state not be destroyed because of a supply of arms and men coming across an unprotected border. Such a destruction is Nasser's aim.

"It would seem that to support the establishment of such a force would be one of the first acts of our Government in strengthening the United Nations."

Yes; and I feel we should urge our Government to do so.

Prime Minister Fanfani's Address at National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the luncheon today at the National Press Club and to hear a most interesting and forceful address by the Prime Minister of Italy, His Excellency Amintore Fanfani. In it he discussed the current international crisis in the Middle East and United States-Italian relations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the full text of the Prime Minister's address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AMINTORE FANFANI AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, JULY 30, 1958

Ladies and gentlemen, before all, let me tell you how happy and how flattered I am to have been invited to your Press Club, whose resonance is worldwide. Talking in general, I love to meet journalists. I have faith in them, and I must say that this faith has been very rarely contradicted by facts. Naturally, I talk mainly of the Italian journalists, but I have the impression that journalists are very much alike in all parts of the world. Sometimes, after a rather long series of questions, and a lot of picture taking, you feel you have given reporters all that you had to give, and wait for them to retire; but much more often, when they are not there you miss them badly. Such are the contradictions in human nature and in political life.

I know that many prominent people have had the pleasure of receptions such as this and have talked into this microphone, and they were always received with respect and understanding. I am, therefore, really happy to join them in your highly honorable company.

Naturally, the first question which you might like to ask could be: What was your purpose in coming to Washington? If I told you that I came here to talk, I fear your curiosity would go so far as to ask to what purpose and on what subjects I came to talk.

I shall tell you frankly that a first theme of our conversations has been that of the mutual friendship and the constant collaboration between the United States and Italy, then that of the solidarity among the people of the Atlantic Alliance, and, finally, the Middle East. And I would qualify the Middle East according to a traditional definition which includes neither Africa nor central Asia, but only the countries of the Asiatic eastern shores of the Mediterranean. Our ancient Italians named those lands the Levant.

Of course Italy is deeply interested in anything that happens in that area. We have there countrymen, trade relations, investments and good friends. This does not necessarily mean that I came to Washington to outline any special program by my country regarding that region. Indeed we tend to bring a contribution of ideas, and the intention to participate in a possible work of assistance, rather than to make any plans.

Since the Suez crisis, the Italian point of view on Middle Eastern questions has been at once peaceful and realistic. We have always followed with serene understanding the changes and developments of the Arabian peoples. We have always held that the explosions of nationalism in that area were not exclusively a consequence of well known foreign influences. At the same time we have always believed that such unwarranted interventions could not be ocunterbalanced by opposite maneuvers unwelcome to the people concerned. Now, the events of the last months and especially those of Iraq however tragic and deplorable they may be considered in terms of bloodshed and the sacrifice of human lives have confirmed some of our points of view. There are historical movements which must be promptly evaluated without letting them be mortgaged by Communist propaganda and action. Some situations should not be allowed toward chaos; we should rather guarantee the orderly evolution toward a stabler equilibrium. Therefore we could not fail to appreciate in its right value the acceptance, on the part of our allies, of invitations to assistance coming from Lebanon and Jordan; the more so since President Eisenhower and Premier Macmillan promptly and decidedly declared their will to subordinate the presence of their contingents to the decisions of the United Nations.

There has been on this occasion an exchange of messages between President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, and your present guest. These documents are not public and I am very sorry not to be in a position to offer you today a firsthand bit of news, something I know all journalists appreciate whether they are ladies or gentlemen. But I can assure you the spirit of those messages is one of mutual trust and cooperation for the purposes of peace.

We can say that the danger of a conflict is passed, at least for the moment. We are now confronted with problems of a wider order, starting with the complications of international procedure, and proceeding toward the settlement of political and economic difficulties of a wide range. We can only greet with satisfaction this transition from the days of tension to the days of negotiations. We approve of efforts directed toward maintaining the conversations within the framework of United Nations rules; these offer the most solid ground for orderly procedure. On the other hand we do not reject either adjustments or a certain measure of flexibility; nor do we hold that the border line between a meeting of the Security Council and a less formal encounter at high level is necessarily sharply defined as to make the one incompatible with the other. Italy is prepared to take part in these efforts toward a settlement, thinking that her part in such efforts is not so much her right as it is her duty; it is in the order of nature and of history. A glance at the map of the Mediterranean is sufficient to show that among great nations of Europe, Italy is the closest to the routes and the centers of the Near East. But, I repeat, we do not request any special form of participation which may make the problems of procedure more difficult: We are convinced that our opinion in this field can be useful and that consulting us will be both a duty and a pleasure for our allies. For that matter this is clearly shown by the present visit in Washington and by the invitation for next Friday to London and Saturday to Bonn.

We know, ladies and gentlemen, that the situation in the Near East cannot be solved only by insuring the independence of Lebanon and Jordan. A score of other political questions in that territory are still pending; the question of Israel evidently exists, as well as the great problem of Arab refugees. And then, apart from all political questions, there are in the Near East economic and social necessities which should not be underestimated. The ancient social structures are being questioned under the pressure of new needs and new aspirations. From this point of view, the question of Near East is one of economic development, and of a better use and a more equitable distribution of existing resources. Whatever the political developments, the problem of economic and social progress in that area should be faced, and, also in this case, as soon as possible.

In this connection I have been much flattered by the remarks in the American press, which has kindly related my visit to a supposed Italian initiative for a new and comprehensive plan for the Near East. This can only be very flattering and very risky at the same time. In all candor, I believe it is very difficult to devise anything like a decisive plan for the Near East, or for any other region, on the part of a country which cannot then sustain it as the principal agent. The Italian nation and Government are ready to contribute to the study and implementation of any development plan for the Middle East. We are well aware of the importance of the progress of the Arab people, to the ultimate end of progress and peace in the world.

As you see, ladies and gentlemen, much can be said in the Near East, and much can be done in a spirit of mutual cooperation.

But, of course, there are other subjects of great importance. The developments of European integration and of Atlantic solidarities must be examined in the light of the most recent events and experiences. Our ties with Germany, France, and Benelux must continue to be inspired by the final objectives of European unity. At the same time we must make more effective the common action of the peoples of the Atlantic Alliance, to increase the security of the free world. With President Eisenhower and with the Secretary of State we have exchanged and will continue to exchange information and impressions also concerning the political and economic situations of our respective countries. These exchanges of ideas are useful because they are made in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding. But I wish to say a few words about this to you too.

The Italian Government which I have the honor to direct and represent, is not only a new government, it is also a new type of government. During the 13 years between 1945 and 1958 Italy has been governed by three different forms of government: the first were general coalition governments, including also parties of the extreme left. Then from 1947 there were center coalition government, including, besides the Christian Democrats, also parties of the democratic left and of the liberal right. They alternated for short periods of time with some so-called one-color governments, that is to say minority governments fromed by the Christian Democratic Party alone.

Now, for the first time, we have put together a new formula, called the center left: it marks the Government alliance of the Christian Democrats and the Democratic Socialist Party. It has affirmed itself against the votes of the Communist-Socialists, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the rightists, with the abstention of the Republican Party. This new experience of the Italian democracy made in a spirit of wide social policy but of firm democratic defense. Progress without adventures has been the slogan of the Christian Democratic Party in its electoral campaign and may well remain the slogan of the new Government in its practical activity. We are convinced that the influence of totalitarian parties can be counterbalanced not only by insuring the firm respect of order and democratic legality, but also and mainly by raising the working classes to a better life and to a higher awareness of their civic duties in a free society. To achieve these aims we have long-range plans in view, in the fields of education and professional instruction, of agriculture, and of public housing. At the same time we intend to maintain a high production rhythm and to increase productivity, following the aspirations of our friend, the late Minister Vanoni.

We think and we hope that the new Government, recently approved by Parliament, will be able to insure Italy's further progress, real economic stability, and full guaranty of freedom. Every man entertains particular hopes for his creatures. The head of the recently constituted Cabinet is confident that the Government now approved by Parliament will work effectively carrying out its program. I have been speaking to you of this anticipation. I thank you now for your kind attention, wishing for myself that Italian and international press may from time to time record that speaking as I did, I have not deceived myself.

A Call to Self-Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous approval granted by the House, I am including herewith a sermon delivered to the graduating class of the George Washington University on June 1, 1958, by the Reverend Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo. Dr. Sizoo is a nationally known scholar, preacher, and teacher. Members, I am sure, will be interested in the views expressed in this sermon:

A CALL TO SELF-DISCIPLINE

Mr. President, members of the graduating class, a person's value to society is determined not by the things he begins but by the things he ends, not by the forces he sets in motion but by the forces he brings to a successful conclusion. Anybody can begin a thing but to bring it to a successful end reveals the earmarks of a worthwhile life in the eyes of God and history. What a satisfaction therefore these days must bring to you. What you have begun you have ended, and the forces you have set in motion you have brought to a successful conclusion. I join your friends therefore in extending you greetings and congratulations.

We live today in a period of history marked by distinctive and disturbing characteristics. No one can call himself a discerning student of contemporary life unless he lives with an awareness of them. We speak of this as the unpredictable age: anything can happen, nothing is impossible, nothing stays put. We refer to it as the atomic age. Words like satellite, intercontinental missile, electric charges, space ships, and atomic fission are breathing down our necks. Forces never before known have become commonplace; techniques and disciplines never available to any man have suddenly become available to all men. Some refer to this as the age of the ulcer: a devasting neurosis is biting into the life of modern man. But perhaps the most sobering characteristic of our time and surely its greatest peril is the lost sense of discipline. A blatant unrestraint has taken hold of people.

This is an era when people are swerving from high purpose, accommodating themselves to what is expedient and convenient. They follow the line of least resistance. They never take sides, they never put a trumpet to their lips, they never unfurl a flag, they never commit themselves to anything, they never respond to a call. They have a way of pigeonholing an inconvenient conscience. They gyrate from one side of the street to the other, depending upon where the sun is shining. They send up a trial balloon to find out which way the wind is blowing before they give an expression to an opinion. They are afraid of the black mark of public disapproval. * * * They are terrorized by a shower of postcards and a wheelbarrow of telegrams.

This is the most devastating threat to modern society. Thoreau once wrote: "Youth gets together his material to build a bridge to the moon or, perchance, a temple and palace on the earth. And middle-aged man concludes to build a woodshed with them." That middle-age mind and spread has taken hold of many today. They want what they want as they want it and when they want it. They throw all discretion to the wind and are utterly unconcerned about the consequences of their deeds upon others. Step by step, gradually and perhaps unwittingly, they accept and acquiesce in elements which involve compromise. All around us one sees cynical indifference, tolerance of lies, decay of honesty coupled with whining self-pity.

If imagination, daring, and courage are necessary for the building of a new world, surely these cannot be developed in men who are soft, indulgent, flabby, and pampered by circumstances. We shall never build a better tomorrow until we have a baptism of self-discipline.

Let me point to some areas in modern life in which all this is relevant:

I

You must help your age recover the sense of self-discipline on the national level. The desire for freedom goes deep with us. We take rather seriously the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created free and equal." We have a passion for freedom in this country. But the blunt fact is that freedom is having a hard time to survive. It seems like a lonely island in a sea of hate and suspicion. We are no longer first in scientific genius, and no longer first in the hearts of men. The high regard which people of the world have always had for us is rapidly fading into the mists of suspicion and misgivings. How can you account for that and what explains it? Can it be that the principles which have always undergirded and sustained freedom: service, responsibility, mutual respect, religious tolerance, racial good will, and economic justice, have been brushed aside and pushed against the wall while we have substituted for them other principles: demanding rights, self-interest, pressure grups, political doubletalk, Little Rock, indifference to education. And can it be that when once again we have disciplined our freedom-restoring economic, social, religious, and racial tolerance and good will that freedom's holy light will once again shine across the earth?

Freedom is like a coin. It has the word "privilege" on one side and "responsibility" on the other. It does not have "privilege" on both sides. There are too many today who want everything involved in privilege but refuse to accept anything that approaches the sense of responsibility.. A modern novelist in one of the recent books has a character called Edith. The novelist describes Edith in this fashion: "Edith is a little country bounded on the north and on the south, on the east and the west by Edith." The signs multiply that we are becoming crass and banal and undisciplined, coupled with an epidemic of unreason. Walls always buckle when foundations crumble. It is still true that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. If freedom is to survive in the world of tomorrow, we shall need to cleanse and purify it. Perhaps that is your first assignment with destiny.

II

You must help your age recover the sense of self-discipline on the intellectual level. In the area of learning there is so much contentment today with mediocrity and the superficial. Our generation has no desire to go deep in knowledge. Scholarship, which requires hard study and long hours, is frowned upon by those who want to stand well with the group. Bookishness is twisted to mean freakishness and to make a fast buck is more important than learning history.

You stand at opposite poles from all that. Your university has fixed standards which never compromise with mediocrity. Your very presence here bears witness to your intellectual competence. You may go out in the world unashamed and unafraid. But there is so little of that in modern life.

Because many refuse to live with the discipline of the mind they have developed all manner of short cuts in learning. We have dehydrated Shakespeare; we have Karl Marx for children; we have history in pictures; we have the Bible in comic strips. Learn a foreign language in six lessons or your money back. It is the age of the short poem, the one-act play, and digest form of novels. Our thinking has bogged down since Fulton, Edison, Brassiere, and Steinmetz led the Nation to inventive genius. It is said that more than one-fourth of the high schools in the United States do not have courses in science. When you try to find out why that is, the answer is always, "It is too hard."

We have developed a hit-and-run concept of education. The school has become a sort of intellectual hotdog stand where no one tarries very long, except to get a quick bite, gulped down with breeze courses and academic hoopla as they rush off to the next attraction. This is the age of butterfly learning; we flutter everywhere, sipping a little here and sipping a little there, but settling nowhere. We string poles and wires from coast to coast; we have vastly improved the techniques and mechanics of communication, but we have so little to communicate. Believe me, there is no short cut to learning for everything has its price. If we are to give leadership and direction to the world of tomorrow we must restore the discipline of learning. This, too, is your assignment with destiny.

III

There is a third area in which all this is relevant. You must restore self-discipline in the moral order. This whole business of evading unpleasant assignments, sidestepping responsibilities, and dodging issues bears witness to the blatant unrestraint of modern man. There is so much accommodation to what is comfortable, convenient, and expedient. When issues arise, they hold aloof and like the Pharisees of old pass by on the other side. When some cause solicits their interest, they wrap themselves up in dry ice. When some crusade is launched, they let the armies march by. On the stage

of the world they refuse to be actors; they are content to sit in the balcony eating peanuts, shrugging their shoulders with, "What is the use; if I don't do it somebody else will; we are a long time dead, and a hundred years from now nobody will know the difference."

I asked a group not long ago involved in a dreadful delinquency, "Why did you do this?" Their answer was, "Frankly we do not care for things like that; we have no heart for them." I asked them, "Why then did you do it?" They answered, "We do not want to stand out like a sore thumb." When the philosophy, "They all do it," takes root and man resigns his moral control to the crowd, the inevitable next step is anarchy.

Here is a teacher who frankly permits cheating to go unchallenged. He suggests that if he taught honesty it would not prepare the student for life. Indeed, "to teach honestly would give him a false orientation. Honesty is not realistic." Here is a popular tragic personality involved in a tragic death, under even more tragic circumstances, assured that all this is no cause for either regret or embarrassment; it will increase the box-office returns.

The want of moral fiber is leaving its marks on life today. The signs multiply of a soggy moral standard. It is popular to disclaim all moral responsibility for everything. We blame criminal behavior on heredity, neighborhood conditions, family maladjustments, sex, libido, or some other hokus pokus; everywhere, except where it belongs, personal moral responsibility. James Barrie in his Dear Brutus portrays a group of uphappy disillusioned people in an English home. If only the setting of their lives had been different, if only they had had other talents and other work to do, then indeed they would have known serenity and happiness. The butler was sure he would be happy if he had been a financier; the sculptor is positive he would have had great joy in life if only he had been a painter. So the hostess arranges for them to change to the status in which they believed they would find happiness. The sculptor becomes a painter, and the butler becomes a financier, and so on. The fact, however, is that the sculptor on becoming a painter lost all sense of genius and inspiration. The butler had become rich, but his great riches had made him coarse and crude. In the end they all revert to the same status of unhappiness and disillusionment with which they had come to the English home. So James Barrie, with an innate genius, concludes the play with, "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves."

It is significant that an era which refuses to accept the disciplines of life is in such desperate search for serenity and strength. An age which seeks to find serenity by tranquilizing pills, sleeping on foam mattresses, counting sheep, and buying peace of mind books written by this or that swami with or without turbans, has yet to learn that the sooner we stop fooling with the Ten Commandments and the arithmetic table will we experience those inner resources of peace which come alone through obedience to the will and the law of God. The greatest single need of our time is to reassert and reaffirm those basic realities which have disciplined men in the past. A distinguished American has indeed spoken wisely, "We have grasped the mystery of the atom, but we have rejected the Sermon on the Mount. We have achieved brilliance without wisdom, and power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants." We have become spiritual albinos whose mortal clay has been bleached but in which there has not yet been breathed the breath of life. We need people in education, in legislation, in business who believe in a moral order that is centered in God. The moment a civilization loses touch with God life becomes so complex and complicated men do not know how to handle it or what to make of it.

If ever we fall apart and lose our freedom and leadership, it will not be because we lack political technique, social patterns, and economic regulations, but because we refused to discipline ourselves. When the roots wither, the tree perishes. You cannot build a new world by stringing together a great number of bad people.

If the need of our time does not turn on programs but on people with self-respect enough to be servants of eternal purpose rather than straws in the wind of circumstance, if our difficulties are not so much political and economic as moral and spiritual, then only by a fresh awareness of God can we stop this modern social and political decay and place life on the basis of soundness and decency.

We have changed from sailing ships to jet airliners, from hieroglyphics to electric typewriters, from clay tablets to Oxford editions, from mud huts to penthouses, but to what end? What is the good of a civilization whose art ends in comic strips, whose music ends in rock and roll, whose learning ends in red-back-magazine stories of smutted lives and soiled tempers coated over with psychoanalysis and tossed off as literature; whose science ends in the capacity of self-destruction. Education may rationalize life, government may nationalize life, business may mechanize life, but only religion can spiritualize life. Vachael Lindsey wrote it for us in these words:

"Not that they starve, but starve so drearily,
Not that they sow, but that they never reap,
Not that they serve, but have no Gods to serve,
Not that they die, but that they die like sheep."

Across the lonely centuries there comes once again the voice of the Son of Man, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and its righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."

This is your world; it is the only world you will ever know. If you ever expect to do anything for it, it will have to be in that kind of a setting. You did not make that world, but you have the chance to do something about it. Whether this fills you with fear or with adventure, whether that makes your blood run cold or your nerves tingle, depends entirely on the stuff of which you are made.

In a few days you will leave this intellectual home in which you have lived these happy years. It is quite possible that you will feel like the little bear who ran away from his mother determined to live his own life at his own convenience. When he got to the top of a nearby hill and saw peak after peak and valley after valley stretch on and on and on to the far off horizons, he rushed back to his mother and said, "The world is so large; take me back, I am afraid."

Surely you will not run back. As a matter of fact, they won't take you back. You are starting the journey, and you will go on and on. It is an entrancing and difficult journey. It is entrancing because it will bring you glorious opportunities, high romance, great adventure, independence, and joy unspeakable. It will also be difficult because the grandeur will often be corroded by cruelty and stupidity and evil. The world will try to take away your happiness, rob you or your integrity, break your heart, and hang a cross on your back. Richard Watson Gilder in his Ode to Grover Cleveland wrote a solemn warning, "Lonely is the life that listens to no voice save that of duty." You can either stand up to that world and pay the price or you can yield to that world and let it bend you. If you do the latter, you will never again be able to look yourself in your university in the face. But that is your choice. Some of you will fail, some of you will triumph, but all of you must struggle in this battle where character is made.

The eyes of those who hope for a better world are turned to people like you. God forbid you should trail in the dust their golden hopes.

Members of the graduating class of 1958 I salute you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B Everett, *N. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Church, Jordan, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4972 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3007 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4621 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, on July 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1958

As an old soldier who looks back with pride and pleasure to a half century of military work, I am happy to salute my comrades of the American Legion.

One of the greatest honors that have come to me during the years has been your invitation to speak at the annual convention of the department of Pennsylvania.

I have stated many times that the various veterans' organizations and the other patriotic societies deserve the gratitude of the American people.

First, because they are strong and steadfast in support of the ideals of Americanism, and second, because they always have the courage to point out and to fight any danger confronting us as a Nation.

Here in our blessed land of freedom, we have more precious rights and privileges than any other people of the earth. Paramount among our blessings is freedom of the individual which we cherish as the gift of God to mankind. The American form of government was established to protect and sustain our scarced right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." However, we must keep in mind always that in payment for these rights we must be prepared and willing to bear an equal share of responsibility.

Individual responsibility as the strongest support of the American system of government. Therefore, the dangers that confront us should be of deep concern to everyone with love in his heart for American freedom and the American way of life.

If the Founding Fathers who created this Government here in Philadelphia could come back to this city they would be proud of our magnificent achievements. We have expanded from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have grown in material and spiritual strength until we are the most powerful Nation on earth.

We have developed such political stability that the depressed areas of the world look to us for leadership and help.

The Founding Fathers, however, might well be worried over some of the things that government now does. In the Declaration of Independence they did not mention the things they wanted from government, but they did list the burdens that government had laid upon them.

The Founding Fathers probably would be worried because of the widespread lack of interest in our Government. They would wonder why so many of our people do not even take the trouble to vote.

I am sure they would be disturbed over the vast increase in the size of our Government and the many functions which have been added beyond the powers and duties clearly set forth in the Constitution.

Big government is best illustrated by the tremendous payroll expansion. Many do not realize that 1 American out of 8 works for government, with a total payroll, local, State, and Federal, of more than $30 billion a year.

The Founding Fathers would surely find cause for alarm in the debt of the three branches of Government which has now reached the staggering total of more than $354 billion.

A great American President, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, warned against the dangers that could destroy America in terms that apply with equal force today.

"The things that will destroy America," he said, and I quote, "are prosperity-at-any price; peace-at-any price; safety-first instead of duty first; the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

The dangers to which Colonel Roosevelt pointed so clearly are still with us today.

How can we overcome these threats to the future of our country?

We will continue to be the greatest Nation of all history if we carry out with loyalty, determination and courage the principles supporting the American system of government.

These United States will remain great if we have proper education of our people, if we have a strong national defense supported by all our citizens, if we maintain a strong, stable, dynamic economy, if we are clean and constructive in our politics, if we are honorable in our international relations, and if we are faithful to the principles of our religious belief.

Let us discuss briefly these vital elements of our national strength.

Education, after the family and the church, is the bulwark of our country's greatness. Our free educational system must be directed and controlled by local authorities. The higher echelons of Government must never be permitted to influence it.

When the Soviet's launched a satellite, many of our people urged that science become the number one thing in our colleges and universities. It would be unfortunate if emphasis on science would lead us away from the American tradition that the moral teachings of the humanities are basic in our country. If science is placed above all else, there is danger that eventually we will all conform to a pattern. That means mechanization and probably the loss of individual effort which is interwoven with individual freedom. We must never forget that real progress is made when we have the quest for freedom.

National defense of the United States may determine the freedom of the world. Our forefathers were self-reliant and fought their own battles. Their weapons were the rifle, the ax, and the Bible, symbolizing the three fronts on which we must prepare today in order to keep our land strong, free, and at peace. The rifle is the symbol of military defense; the ax, of work, sweat, and industry; the Bible, of spiritual strength and unity, without which no nation can permanently endure. In planning our defense we must never forget the part of industry, agriculture, and our skilled workmen. As far as practical, we must keep critical defense items within our own borders.

Only by the strictest Government economy can we provide the necessary funds to insure ourselves against tyranny and aggression. The Communists would like to see us in financial collapse, debt-ridden, and bankrupt. That is the soil in which the seed of communism thrives. Those who advocate unlimited Government spending are unwittingly giving aid and comfort to the forces that would destroy our freedom.

A sound and progressive economy in America is supported by the legs of a tripod consisting of agriculture, labor, and industry. If one leg of the tripod is damaged, the whole may collapse. Let us keep our finances in good shape, not only as individuals but as a government. Let us never fail to appreciate that deficit financing is dangerous, as it is the greatest reason for creeping inflation. Free enterprise, without too much governmental interference, will keep us strong. God gave us pure air, clean water, good soil, and an abundance of natural resources, and it is our duty to preserve them.

Politics, after the home, the church, and the school, should be the first consideration of every American. Since the first administration of President Washington, the two-party system has had much to do with the strength of our Government. Fortunately, there have been few times in our history when there were more than two strong political parties. Minority parties have soon gone out of existence. Tenure in office has helped strengthen the two-party system. For that reason I have always opposed the referendum and recall.

Political parties are strengthened when they stand for ideals, decency, and good government. Our political system, regardless of many shortcomings, approves the right of a man to say what he likes, to think what he likes and, under the law, to do what he likes. This means that the state is the servant and not the master of the people. It means that public officials have power only as trustees for the people. We must keep it that way.

In these days of unrest and confusion in world affairs, we are all deeply concerned with international relations and the supreme desire of all God-fearing people for freedom from the threat of war.

In the pages of history we find that dictators, kings, armies and navies, statesmen, diplomats, and educators all have failed to establish true and lasting peace. Our remaining hope—the hope that springs eternal in the human breast—is hope inspired by faith in the omnipotent power and goodness of God.

In a world divided by conflicting ideologies, each striving to influence the hearts and minds of men, the United States has been called to leadership for peace, freedom,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and justice. If we are to measure up to that tremendous responsibility, we must turn with deeper devotion to the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destiny of men and nations.

We must set forth to the world an example of honor, justice and loyalty in public affairs and in our private lives. We must live in obedience to the ideals of peace and good will ordained by the Prince of Peace 2,000 years ago.

In our dealings with other nations, we must be sincere and humble, placing emphasis upon our moral and spiritual strength rather than the power of our material resources. To the people of lands less fortunate than ourselves, we must hold out the hand of fellowship and helpfulness.

As individuals and as a nation, we must seek the path that leads to better international understanding, mutual respect and greater cooperation for a better world of peace and justice for all mankind.

In meetings such as this it is appropriate to recall that our Republic was established on the sacred principles of religious faith.

The courageous men and women who built the foundation of American freedom believed that each human being was created in the image and likeness of God. America has attained its high place among the family of nations because of our deep religious convictions.

Supporting our background of devotion to the teachings of the Holy Bible, we have the great legal pronouncement of the Supreme Court of the United States in which it was stated: "This is a religious Nation."

That opinion, delivered by Mr. Justice Brewer, marks a great milestone in the judicial and religious history of the United States. More than anything else it points out one of the great elements of American strength—the spirit of tolerance and good will under which many faiths and creeds live together in peace and harmony, rspecting the right of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

In accordance with the plan of the Almighty, some men gain leadership in industry, science, education, government or religion. Others became outstanding in the development of our natural resources. Others have superion skills as craftsmen in the production of articles of beauty and utility.

We have been industrious, tolerant, thrifty, considerate of the less fortunate and God-fearing. In the some, schools and the church, we have taught self-reliance.

While we have invented many labor-saving devices used in peace and war, we have never forgotten that we must have skilled men to operate them.

In armed conflict, for example, we will never have a "pushbutton" war. It will always be necessary to have brave men to fly combat planes, man fighting ships, carry the bayonet, fight the guerrilla warfare, and go under fire to carry food and munitions to the frontlines.

Let us remember that as long as we support the power of the church, truth and moral values will prevail.

Let us all fight for these great ideals. They represent our highest hope for the stability of our Nation and peace in the world.

A Declaration of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in my home city newspaper, the July 29, 1958, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor of Concord, N. H.

It has reference to my speech on the Senate floor on July 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES' SPEECH

Senator BRIDGES is convinced the only way to deal with the Russians is to end uncertainty over where this country stands in international relations.

The Senator voiced his views in a speech in the Senate in which he urged the United States to "smoke the Soviet Union out of its entrenched position in which it avoids risk to itself while it instigates indirect aggression."

This can be done, the Senator says, by a "forceful, dramatic declaration of policy directed straight at the Soviet Union." Such a declaration is needed, he points out, to tell the Kremlin that it cannot continue to try to force its political system on independent nations.

Senator BRIDGES has pulled no punches in an analysis of America's foreign relations policy. He is convinced this is the time to put the chips down for a showing of the cards. He is opposed to weakness, fuzzy declarations, and platitudes.

He wants a cold, realistic clarification of where we stand, what we propose to do, and what we can expect the Soviet Union to do. The Senator's speech was concerned primarily with the Middle East, but what he says applies equally to other parts of the globe. He warns the United States cannot stand idly by while the Soviet Union chips away at countries which are still not under the domination of the Kremlin.

It has taken a high degree of courage for BRIDGES to call for decisive action at a time when the administration is under strong pressure from allies of this country to move cautiously, to avoid any move that might annoy the Russians. And this pressure is constantly reinforced by warnings of the perils in a global war.

What Senator BRIDGES is calling attention to is the need for a reassessment of the western policy toward Russia. For a variety of reasons, there has been an unwillingness for commitment to a single line against Soviet nibbling. There is an equal unwillingness to treat Russia as an irreconcilable enemy.

As a result there has been employment of a series of half measures in dealing with a crisis. At a time when the need for firmness is obvious, there is an attempt to justify a mild and ineffective policy on the ground that Washintgon must leave no avenue to peace unexplored.

But as Senator BRIDGES has pointed out in his speech, a clearly defined and firm international relations policy could be the best assurance of peace.

The Late Dr. Umphrey Lee, Former President of Southern Methodist University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently a very distinguished educator in Texas passed away—Dr. Umphrey Lee, of Dallas, Tex., the beloved and esteemed former president of Southern Methodist University.

The Dallas Times-Herald, in an editorial of July 12, 1958, has made a fitting suggestion to memorialize the name of this great humanitarian. The editorial recommends that an elementary school be named after Dr. Lee.

It has long been an American tradition to name institutions of learning after our outstanding leaders, and I join wholeheartedly in supporting this suggestion. With the need for better education so plainly evident, we can take example from some of our outstanding educators in the knowledge that their achievement may serve as an inspiration for our own actions.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FITTING MEMORIAL TO DR. LEE

Members of the Dallas Board of Education are to be commended for moving promptly to name a school after Dr. Umphrey Lee, beloved and esteemed former president of Southern Methodist University who died recently. The structure to memorialize this great educator and humanitarian is scheduled to be built in Southwest Oak Cliff.

The list of Dallas public school names is a partial honor roll of Americans who have made outstanding contributions to their nation. It includes many tall Dallasites of the past. The addition of Dr. Umphrey Lee's name is a most worthy one, for by ably guiding Southern Methodist University during its critical years as a young university, Dr. Lee bequeathed much to posterity.

It may not be too much to hope that many of the students of Dr. Umphrey Lee Elementary School will take the trouble to find out who he was and what he stood for. Those who do so will find inspiration. They will come to know more about reverence for God, stanch patriotism, respect for their fellow beings, intellectual diligence, kindness, community responsibility and many other virtues that combined to make Dr. Lee an outstanding leader of his era.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Return to a Sound Principle," which appeared in the Roanoke Times of July 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETURN TO A SOUND PRINCIPLE

The new farm bill passed by the Senate retains the parity principle but at the same time it is a step toward lower price supports and less Government control of the farmer's business. In the form in which it went to the House, the measure is acceptable to President Eisenhower, who earlier this year vetoed a bill which would have maintained

price supports on all farm commodities at not less than 1967 levels.

The Senate bill provides a new formula for cotton, corn, and rice supports based on the open market price. Farmers would be guaranteed 90 percent of the average market price for a preceding 3-year period. An amendment preserved in part the old formula by providing a floor at 60 percent of parity for price supports. A third provision fixes specific price minimums—$1.30 for corn, 30 cents for cotton, and $4 for rice. Thus a choice of three different support floors is provided, the bill requiring that the farmer receive support prices at whichever level is highest.

In most cases the formula of 90 percent of market price would be applicable. For 25 years the Government has attempted to maintain farm prices by a complicated system of parity which ignored all the laws of economics. A vestige of the system remains in the 60-percent-of-parity floor, but the topheavy Senate vote for the bill, 62 to 11, is a welcome indication that even the farm politicians in Congress realize that a program of high guaranteed Government prices and controls will not work.

The bill represents an important step toward helping farmers adjust their production to market demands instead of depending upon Government subsidies. In the House there will probably be loud demand by many Members for retention of the old parity formula. The Senate bill is sensible legislation and the heavy majority in favor of it indicates that an alternative program could not be passed this late in the session. Whether there is farm legislation this year is up to the House.

Ethics in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there continue to be widespread expressions of interest in the press in some of the issues raised by the current public review of the role of favors and influence in the Government and its administrative and regulatory agencies.

In the current issue of the Sign, a national Catholic monthly, for August 1958, the editorial page is devoted to the subject of Congressmen and Conflict of Interest. Under this heading the editor, the Rev. Ralph Gorman, discusses some of the proposals which I made in the Senate on June 11, for the establishment of uniform rules with respect to conflict of interest applying both to executive officials and to Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that Rev. Gorman's informative and thoughtful editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, followed by an earlier excellent editorial on the same subject which appeared in the Honolulu (Hawaii) Sunday Advertiser for June 15, 1958, and which, I am also glad to say, commented favorably on my proposals in the field of conflicts of inteerst, and called for extending them to local government.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sign of August 1958]

CONGRESSMEN AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By Father Ralph Gorman, C. P.)

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, proposes that his fellow Congressmen try their own medicine. He has introduced a bill in the Senate which would extend to the Members of that august body the conflict-of-interest laws which apply to the executive branch.

The idea sounds good to us.

Here are some of Senator NEUBERGER's questions on the matter:

"If Federal commissioners are to be pilloried for accepting hacienda suites at Palm Springs or airplane tickets to Palm Beach, how can Senators and Representatives continue profitable associations with law firms retained by banks, railroads, labor unions, and utility companies?

"Is Sherman Adams any more indebted to Mr. Goldfine for gifts than a man who sits in the Senate or in a governor's chair is indebted to those who collected $100,000 from big-business men or from trade-union political-education funds for his campaign expenses?

"Is Sherman Adams, with his $2,400 rug and $700 vicuna-cloth coat, more obligated to render unethical favors than is a Member of Congress who is dependent every few years on 20 times that amount from bankers, natural gas and private utility owners, and distillery executives to finance his billboards and radio and TV shows?

"Is it morality for a Senator to collect $500 or $1,000 speaking fees from many labor unions or liberal groups and then to oppose a Federal right-to-work law, but immorality for Harry Vaughn at the White House to be given a deep freeze or Mr. Adams a coat?"

There are plenty of cases where there can be a conflict of interest for Congressmen. Here are a few:

A Congressman's wife or other member of the family can be engaged in a business for which he legislates. A Congressman can own radio or TV stock and vote legislation affecting these industries. Congressmen may be authors and publishers and legislate second-class mailing privileges and mail rates for books. Congressmen may be farmers and vote farm subsidies, own stock in oil companies and help determine special tax provisions for the oil industry. A Congressman may accept generous legal fees from a railroad and legislate for railroads.

Senator NEUBERGER's idea is that what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Congress has been zealous in legislating propriety and honesty for the executive branch and in investigating lapses. It doesn't show any willingness so far to take a dose of its own medicine.

Senator NEUBERGER's bill would require Congressmen to file with the Comptroller General a report (available to the public) including the following:

1. The amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift (other than gifts received from members of his immediate family) received by him during the preceding calendar year which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by any individual for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, travel, and other facilities received by any individual in kind;

2. The value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of the close of the preceding year; and

3. All dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the calendar year.

Other Congressmen are proposing similar legislation, but those in the know don't think any will be passed. If it isn't it will be obvious that congressional zeal for honesty and virtue applies only to the executive branch and not to Senators and Representatives.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Sunday Advertiser of June 15, 1958]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon Democrat, wants the Congress to pass laws prohibiting conflict of interest among Senators and Representatives. His views are outlined in a column on this page today by Roscoe Drummond, the Washington commentator for the New York Herald Tribune.

The result of his move will be watched with interest all over America, for the situation in the Congress is repeated in every State and Territorial legislature, in boards of supervisors and commissions everywhere. The cold fact is that men and women, elected and appointed, hold positions in which their daily official actions can affect their own businesses for better or worse. Who will say they will vote for the worse?

Lawyers and liquor distributors, real estate men and manufacturers, ranchers and restaurant owners; these are among those called upon to judge legislation affecting their own livelihood. The nature of our society may make it impossible to avoid such incongruities entirely, but the adoption of codes of ethics by lawmaking and regulatory bodies would be a show of faith. In the case of appointive bodies, such as our own city planning commission, the appointing authority can fulfill his responsibility to the public by putting justice and the commonweal ahead of political considerations and plain expediency.

Senator NEUBERGER has placed a finger squarely upon one of the most sensitive spots in American Government. If the Congress heeds his counsel it will have set an example that cannot be ignored by State and municipal governments.

This does not excuse local governments, however, for failing to establish standards of civic virtue on their own.

Profiles in Love—The Famous Five Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Columnist Holmes Alexander, who lives in Baltimore and is a constituent of mine, is author of a new book, The Famous Five. This book is about the five outstanding Senators of all time who were picked by a subcommittee, the chairman of which is the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and having as its other members the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The famous five Senators are Clay, Webster, Calhoun, LaFollette, and our late distinguished Republican leader, Robert A. Taft of Ohio.

Mr. Alexander's book has received some very fine reviews and promises to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

become a best seller. In a column titled "Profiles in Love," Holmes Alexander, whose column is syndicated in upward of 100 American dailies, has some kindly and interesting things to say about the critics of his book and about the famous five Senators themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column Profiles in Love, by Holmes Alexander be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFILES IN LOVE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 31, 1958.—"Statesmanship is not a cliché," Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY was good enough to write in his foreword to my book The Famous Five, "but a quality within the reach of politicians with the vision and courage of the five Senators included in this fine volume."

"Vision and courage," KENNEDY went on to say, "are qualities which Senators Clay, Webster, Calhoun, La Follette and Taft had in common." Reviewers of my book have added some other qualities shared by these greatest of Senators—courtesy, intelligence, pride in the Senate, integrity of purpose.

Some reviewers have chided the author for raising the question: "What makes greatness in these famous five?" without supplying the answer, if there is one. "If we Americans are living," as Adlai Stevenson has said, "in a time for greatness," maybe it is a question which needs answering.

Funny thing—there is an answer, and a useful one, in the lives of these five men. It seemed so obvious to me when I wrote the book that I left it for the individual reader to find for himself. What did each of the famous five have in abundance? Each had love. As simple as that—love.

Henry Clay, heaven knows, was not great because he legislated for a protective tariff, a national bank, and the War of 1812. But whole acres of people would come to hear him speak. More people, as a friend said, would run after him and fewer would vote for him in presidential races than any man in history. The voting is not the thing. It's the old story of why the lamb followed Mary to school. Mary loved the lamb, and the lamb loved Mary. Clay, who suffered more than his share of family tragedies in death and insanity, was drawn to humanity for this very reason—the brotherhood of sorrow. His surviving son at Clay's deathbed wrote the Senator's best epitaph: "Was there ever a man had such friends?"

Daniel Webster, as a number of critics have noted in the light of the Sherman Adams story, was always getting his purse refilled by businessmen whom he assisted. But this habit did not prevent 150 professors of history and all living Senators from selecting Webster for membership in the famous five. What was the overriding virtue in Webster? I think it was his enormous gift of affection. He bestowed it upon his father, his brother, his wife, his chosen friends. Today, love is a sex-oriented word. But several years ago, novelist Somerset Maugham in his philosophic autobiography, the Summing Up, used the one-word expression "lovingkindness" to name the greatest of all human qualities. Webster had it in abundance. No wonder men called him great.

We all know who was the femme fatale in the life of John C. Calhoun. He died crying out her name: "The South. The poor South. God knows what will become of her." We are taught to be suspicious nowadays of nationalism, and to regard internationalism as better because it's bigger. But there was a time in American history when men's hearts throbbed for their Nation and their State, else we would never have become a country at all. No group of all-star selectors could pass over a man who loved the principle of State sovereignty as passionately as Calhoun.

That leaves us La Follette and Taft. Well, the greatest lovers in song and story are the men who fell in love and stayed that way throughout their lifetimes. The romantic legend that 1 man can love 1 woman exclusively and forever is written in the marriages of Bob La Follette and Bob Taft. I have never read anything in biography more touching than Fola La Follette's description of the parting in death of her father and mother. I doubt if any two human beings ever lived a finer love story than Bob and Martha Taft. Nothing in books or on the stage can touch that parting in New York hospital of the doomed Senator and his stroke-crippled lady.

So, if we want greatness in our time, we had better stop and remember what makes it. To be great a man must first be capable of great feeling for persons and causes outside himself. He must be capable of loving and of being loved. Anything else he has is so much garnish to this central trait.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial by the distinguished writer, Mr. Arthur Krock.

Mr. Krock makes a keen analysis of the possible effects which Gov. Orville Faubus' overwhelming reelection victory will have on attempts by the Federal Government to force racial integration in our State public schools. The editorial is entitled "In the Nation," and it appeared in the July 31, 1958, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE PREFACE TO THE GRAVE ISSUE OF SEPTEMBER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The protest, implicit in the large majority vote cast for the renomination of Governor Faubus in the Arkansas Democratic primary, against federally decreed and enforced racial integration in the public schools of States with segregation laws was anticipated by the executive department. But the consequences of something which is likely to happen have an unrealistic quality, and it requires the event before the consequences are weighed on the scales of reality.

This has been the effect here of Governor Faubus' overwhelming nomination for the third term he seeks against the hard political tradition of Arkansas. If the issue on which the voting turned had not so distinctly been Federal enforcement by military means of the pro-integration decrees of the Federal judiciary, the President's use of this method would not stand directly repudiated in the one State where it was employed. If the race between Faubus and his two opponents had been close, its challenge to the Federal Government would not have been so serious. And if there were a longer period between the Arkansas primary and the opening of the school terms in centers of southern resistance to integration, the Exectuive would not have been obliged to decide its September policy in the atmosphere of an immediate crisis.

But the issue, the size of Faubus' vote in the Arkansas primary, and the imminence of September, compel an emergency approach to the enforcement problem by the President. His choices, which are hard and few, have been rendered harder and fewer by the prospect that the event in Arkansas will stiffen southern resistance to racial integration in the public schools. This prospect is evaluated as a certainty by southerners, with differing views on resistance, who agree that not a lustrum but generations will be required if this radical social evolution is to come.

Without the factor of the heavy protest in Arkansas, the problem of enforcement in the South would soon have reached a new critical peak anyhow. In six States—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Virginia—there has been no racial school integration at all. And all the powers of these States, supported overwhelmingly by public opinion, are in readiness to maintain public school segregation in September and indefinitely thereafter. The situation in Virginia, the historic leader of southern thought and action, sufficiently illustrates the problem of Federal enforcement.

In Prince Edward County the litigation began that led to the Supreme Court's 1954 holding that statutory racial segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, to its 1955 decree which directed the inferior Federal courts to eliminate it "with all deliberate speed," to the President's dispatch of the Federal paratroopers to Little Rock and to the Arkansas primary. In this county a private school system for whites already has been financed against the day when all judicial process to avert racial integration has been exhausted. Then the Negro schools will be closed with the white; other communities are prepared to follow Prince Edward County's example; and the Governor of Virginia is required by State law to close any integrated school, regardless of whether there is local financing of substitute facilities for primary and secondary school education.

This means that, unless some Federal judicial process in the interim postpones or removes the occasion for the showdown, a climax of the President's enforcement problem will come in the cultural and traditional center of the South. No leadership could be more encouraging to southern resistance than that of Virginia, which would have been true despite the event in Arkansas. Small wonder that the President is reported as deeply troubled by the forthcoming concentration in Virginia of the six-State southern challenge to his concept that it is his constitutional duty to enforce Federal inferior judicial rulings equally with Federal statutes (in this case there is none) as the law of the land.

The Supreme Court's 1955 decree puts it within the power of the Federal judiciary at least to postpone indefinitely this ominous showdown. The courts, confronted with political and social situations which made it imperative as a matter of public policy, in the past have adjusted or reversed their interpretations—as in 1934 with principles of New Deal laws previously held invalid. This goes historically by the name of judicial statesmanship, and it has averted national crises before.

Congressman Baker, Republican of Tennessee, Tells Why TVA Should Have a Self-Financing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has already passed a bill to provide a program for TVA's future financing. The House Committee on Public Works has also reported a bill for this purpose which is pending before the Rules Committee. In this connection, our colleague, Congressman HOWARD H. BAKER, has written informatively on the need for prompt passage of this legislation. Under unanimous consent I include Congressman BAKER's article entitled "Why I Think TVA Should Have a Self-Financing Program" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHY I THINK TVA SHOULD HAVE A SELF-FINANCING PROGRAM

(By Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee Member of Congress)

On January 7 when the 2d session of the 85th Congress convenes in Washington, every Member will be intensely aware of challenging new problems which press for attention. Grave national issues have developed during the recess; new perils to our security have been revealed. In such an atmosphere, it may be difficult for us to remember that half-finished tasks cannot be abandoned just because new problems have appeared and to realize that nothing has happened during the recess to diminish the importance of the backlog of unfinished business we left when the 1st session adjourned on August 30.

I hope you will be ceaseless in your efforts until the House acts favorably on one item of unfinished business of great concern to every rural electric cooperative—the TVA financing bill which was pending when we adjourned. Its enactment is vital not only to the area served by TVA, but to the future of rural electrification over the whole Nation.

TVA must have a way to finance the capacity its growing loads require or this great partnership between the Federal Government and the people will be ended. That would be a disaster. This amazingly successful demonstration of the results achieved when power is made abundantly available to consumers at the lowest possible cost must be continued.

Here TVA, an agency of the Federal Government, owns the facilities for generation and transmission, the wholesale part of the regional power system. It is the sole supplier of a great area of 80,000 square miles and a population of over 5 million. The people themselves through 151 municipal and rural cooperative distribution systems own the retail end of the business, purchasing at wholesale from TVA the power they deliver to over 1,400,000 consumers. In their contracts with TVA these distributors agree to carry out the policies laid down by the Congress in the act of creating TVA. They accept the responsibility of pioneering in the regionwide demonstration. Their experience is a contribution to power systems and power consumers everywhere, and particularly to the rural electric cooperatives of the Nation, no matter where they are located.

TVA FATE NATIONAL CONCERN

I am astonished by the propaganda which is intended to convince those who live outside the area that what happens to the TVA power system is a matter of purely local concern, that you can be indifferent to the fate of TVA. That is not true. What happens to TVA is of grave concern to you. What happens to TVA is important to the entire country.

When I say that the continuance of this regional power system is vital to the Nation I am not thinking solely of TVA's enormous contribution to defense, and the fact that the Federal Government experiences considerable savings because more than half of TVA's energy output is delivered to Federal facilities located in the area. I am reflecting also on the value of this power system as a pace setter in the nationwide movement to make electricity available to the farms of America and at the "lowest possible" cost. I sometimes wonder if the contributions of TVA and its distributors to that program are forgotten.

I wonder how many farmers recall that the great network of rural electric cooperatives had its beginning in this region. That did not happen because rural electrification was already far advanced in this area when REA began and a wealth of experienced managerial talent readily available. On the contrary, rural electrification was almost nonexistent here, with less than 3 percent of the farms in the region now served by TVA having electric service. The impetus to a national program was not generated here because a rich and prosperous agricultural community demanded electricity no matter what the cost. The area supplied with power by TVA was not and is not an area of high agricultural income. The countrywide program of rural electrification got its start here and has prospered for a very good reason—TVA. TVA had been created and was given a mandate by the Congress to supply the electricity to cooperatives so that the farmers of the area could be served at rates established at a level which would increase use.

COVERAGE REFLECTS PROGRESS

The fact that more than 95 percent of the farms in the area have electric service today reflects the progress of the region, but the story of increased use and the financial results of that use is the record which qualifies the 51 cooperatives which buy power from TVA to be called pace setters. They represent only 5 percent of all the cooperatives in the United States, but they sell to their consumers nearly 20 percent of all the power sold by the cooperatives in the Nation.

NATIONAL AVERAGE EXCEEDED

Today the average residential use of power on the farms in the TVA area is 4,670 kilowatt-hours per year. This compares with a national average residential use for all utility systems, including urban centers, of only 3,003 kilowatt-hours a year. Starting from scratch, these cooperatives have made that phenomenal record because under the terms of their contracts with TVA they have set themselves these definite goals: Extending their lines, keeping rates low, helping their members to make increasingly effective use of electricity, relying upon the expanding volume of their sales for the revenues to keep them in the black. During the past year alone, 11 of the 51 cooperative distributors reduced their charges to their consumers. Those consumers will realize more than $1 million in annual savings as a result. The importance of such rate reductions to our national experience in rural electrification is tremendous.

What will be the result to the cooperatives themselves? You can find the answer in detailed reports made by TVA. The record so far gives a hint of the results to be expected, for in spite of increasing costs of labor and material the sale of power by cooperatives in the TVA area has increased so rapidly that the costs per unit of power sold have been and still are on a downward trend. I am told that in fiscal 1957 the operating costs per kilowatt-hour of power sold by TVA cooperatives were about 25 percent less than the kilowatt-hour costs of the same cooperatives 5 years earlier, and as their sales have increased the investment per kilowatt-hour sold has been reduced from 9.4 cents to 6.4 cents during the same period.

What has been done here can be done elsewhere. TVA and its cooperative distributors are taking the risk out of the widespread adoption of low rate-high use policies by rural systems. Their record ought to encourage the timid, prod the slothful. For these results have not been achieved in a test tube or pilot plant. This is the actual operating experience of 51 cooperatives, with a total investment in plant of approximately $212 million. The areas they serve vary in income levels as they vary in other regions of the country. The skills and experience of their managements are not identical. Only one characteristic is common to them all. They are all in partnership with TVA. They are all committed to a common purpose—to make power abundantly available to consumers and at the lowest possible cost, to demonstrate that such a policy is good business. This demonstration will continue if the TVA self-financing bill is passed. TVA must have capital to meet the load growth such a dynamic program requires. The measure can be passed, and promptly. The basic issues are not complicated. This is the situation.

Except for a small amount of bonds—about $65 million—all now retired, the investment in TVA power facilities has been made either by the owner, the Government, through appropriations by the Congress, or by the reinvestment of earnings. Currently TVA has no authority to borrow money, but the management of TVA has assured the Congress that if such authority is given, future capacity to meet its normal load growth can be financed by the issuance of revenue bonds. The bonds will not be tax exempt; they will not be guaranteed by the Government. They will compete in the money market with securities offered by private utility systems. They will be backed by TVA's reputation for good management. The competence and reliability of TVA's distributors will stand behind them, and the electricity consumers, through their power bills, will provide the revenues to carry and retire the bonds. They will finance the additional capacity. The Federal Government will still own the TVA facilities, and each year the Federal Government, as owner, will receive from power earnings a cash return which must, at a minimum, cover the cost to the Treasury of the money invested in power facilities through appropriations. It is a fair proposal from every point of view.

At this critical point of its life TVA itself cannot command millions of dollars to use in a campaign of public education, nor can the distributors, the municipalities and cooperatives who deliver the power to the ultimate consumer, finance such an effort. Nationwide propaganda campaigns cannot be charged to their consumers, no matter how desirable such campaigns might be. TVA and its distributors must rely upon the people who know the facts to spread the truth. Members of Congress who believe in TVA will do their part. The people who care about TVA must do theirs.

Perhaps the meetings of your cooperatives can be considered a modern form of those cracker-barrel discussions to which the President recently paid tribute as a traditional device for public education. Use them to tell the story of TVA, to make certain that Congress does not forget the importance of this bit of unfinished business

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in the crowded weeks and months ahead. If this great partnership can continue to promote policies in the public interest, electric cooperatives everywhere will continue to find the TVA power system a bulwark of strength to rely on, a reservoir of experience to draw on, a guaranty of future growth.

Rehabilitation of the Injured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, in the month of December 1917, during World War I, I was in Paris. Seated at the table with me was a distinguished, elderly French professor, Dr. Doleans. He was a member of the faculty at Grignon University, an ancient agricultural college. The professor asked me to visit the university. What I saw there was a revelation in the field of humanitarian work. Instead of the usual student body, the college was engaged in the rehabilitation of her crippled soldiers. There were men with loss of arms, hands, legs, and the blind. I saw the blind being led to the chapel to hear inspiring music, by elderly men who had been blind all their life, who were telling the blind boys the compensations of the spirit in being blind.

These injured boys, all with heroic war records, were being trained in some vocation to enable them to return to their respective communities and be able to be gainfully employed, not a public charge.

In 1918, I was elected to the United States House of Representatives and thereafter appointed a member of the Committee on Education. It was there that I presented my experience in the French rehabilitation service. From this small beginning our Federal rehabilitation legislation was established. Hon. William Bankhead, of Alabama, and I labored throughout the years in urging the expansion of this humanitarian service.

It is a pleasure for me to insert as a part of my remarks what has been accomplished over the years in restoring our unfortunate citizens to useful, productive, gainful occupation:

Number of persons rehabilitated during each fiscal year and number of persons in process of rehabilitation at end of each fiscal year, 1921–27

Fiscal year ended June 30	Number rehabilitated	Number in process at end of year
1921	523	3,062
1922	1,898	9,966
1923	4,530	15,515
1924	5,654	13,044
1925	5,825	12,727
1926	5,604	13,606
1927	5,092	16,148
1928	5,012	16,393
1929	4,645	16,823
1930	4,605	20,561
1931	5,184	23,937
1932	5,592	27,666
1933	5,618	30,619
1934	5,062	37,661
1935	9,422	40,941
1936	10,338	41,726

Number of persons rehabilitated during each fiscal year and number of persons in process of rehabilitation at end of each fiscal year, 1921–27—Continued

Fiscal year ended June 30	Number rehabilitated	Number in process at end of year
1937	11,091	42,055
1938	9,844	47,843
1939	10,747	46,750
1940	11,890	47,174
1941	14,579	50,513
1942	21,757	55,149
1943	42,618	64,823
1944	43,997	74,224
1945	41,925	89,416
1946	36,106	101,451
1947	43,880	102,706
1948	53,131	117,795
1949	58,020	133,715
1950	59,597	140,941
1951	66,193	139,568
1952	63,632	137,452
1953	61,308	133,174
1954	55,825	126,770
1955	57,981	127,573
1956	65,640	134,457
1957	70,940	144,589

Source: Annual Statistical Reports. Prepared by Division of Program Statistics and Special Studies Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

It is a source of great satisfaction to know that our leading industrialists are cooperating magnificently in this great work. They find that the rehabilitated persons have fewer sick leaves, less absenteeism than the physically sound employees.

The retrained persons are performing the most technical tasks with all the skill and precision of the physically and mentally sound.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the small-business tax bill passed last week are gradually becoming known to the public. Fortunately it is receiving some publicity in the press and the provisions are being explained in newspaper language which the ordinary small-business man can understand.

One of these editorials is from the Decatur Herald of Decatur, Ill., of July 29.

It is good to know that this bill is receiving publicity and that the small-business man is being told of what he can expect under the tax provisions of this act.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Decatur Herald is appended herewith in full:

TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

In Congress everybody talks about helping small business, but very little has been done about it.

However, the House of Representatives last week passed a bill providing an estimated $250 million in tax relief for small firms. The main provision of the bill allows a proprietor to reduce taxable income by deducting up to 20 percent of the cost of machinery and equipment for depreciation in the first year after purchase. On the remaining 80 percent, he can also take the regular first-year depreciation allowance. The effect of this provision is to free the funds tied up in expansion at an earlier date.

The allowance applies only to the first $10,000 of investment, or $20,000 in the case of joint returns—the idea being to make the bill of greater value to small companies.

There was hardly any opposition to the measure, and what there was came mainly from Congressmen who felt that it did not go far enough. One of the chief criticisms of the bill was that its benefits would go largely to small manufacturers rather than to proprietors of retail and service establishments who do not as frequently invest in income-producing equipment.

The measure also liberalizes tax-deduction provisions for investment losses and expands to 3 years the period in which retroactive tax refunds may be claimed as a result of net operating losses.

While the House bill does not mean that the millennium has arrived for small business, at least it provides a better answer than such devices as dangling the will-o'-the-wisp of additional Government contracts in front of businessmen. The Senate should act promptly on this legislation.

Europe and Atoms for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Max Kohnstamm to the 12th American Assembly, Arden House Conference on United States Policy in Atomic Energy Development, entitled "Europe and Atoms for Power."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE AND ATOMS FOR POWER

(An address to the 12th American Assembly[1] by MAX KOHNSTAMM)

Speaking of Europe and atoms for power, two questions, it seems to me, must be put and, if possible, answered. In the first place, Why is Europe creating Euratom? In the second place, What does it expect from it?

In trying to answer these questions I shall have to talk about things which may seem to you scarcely relevant to atoms for power. But I think that if we want to understand the situation we must look at it in the framework of economic and political events in Europe since the war.

One more general remark: I am talking tonight about the six nations which, since 1952, have together formed the European Coal and Steel Community and which are now setting up Euroatom (the European Atomic Energy Community), and the General Common Market (the European Economic Community). If, when talking about these six nations, I call them Europe, it is partly because nobody would continue to listen to me if I had to say all the time: Belgium, France, the German Federal Republic, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Nether-

[1] Arden House Conference on United States Policy in Atomic Energy Development, October 17–20, 1957.

lands. But it is also because these six nations are convinced that, in building the "Europe of the six," they are at the same time laying the foundations of the larger Europe of their dreams.

Now to my first question: Why Euroatom?

War, an uneasy peace, the crisis of the thirties, the advent of hitlerism, the Second World War, if possible even more horrible than the first one—all these events separate our six nations from each other and form, at the same time, our common heritage. The agonies of hatred and defeat, which we all have known, made many of us realize that we had come to the end of the road. Nationalism, the nation state, no longer seemed to provide the answers to our problems. Even international cooperation and the pursuit of goodwill and friendliness among separate nations seemed completely insufficient. A fundamental change of structure seemed necessary.

Certainly, in 1945 reconstruction began within the old forms. With the exception of Germany, where the task of reconstruction was taken in hand by the victors themselves, national governments were the only available instruments. A Byzantine system of barter trade and money exchange between our nations sprang up, proving once more, and now in peacetime, that for Europe's nations new forms of living together were indispensable; 1947 made it evident that even the task of reconstruction could only be fulfilled with foreign aid and if undertaken in common. The Marshall plan not only prevented disaster but was the first peacetime realization of a solidarity, which, until then, had manifested itself only in coalitions of war. It trespassed upon the boundaries between friends and foes, introducing Germany, be it in the disguise of the uniforms of Allied military government, into the circle of European nations. The Marshall plan immediately captured Europe's imagination as a symbol of hope and change. But the OEEC, to which it gave rise, brought, together with great realizations, nevertheless disillusions. Undoubtedly trade was liberalized to the enormous benefit of all. But there as no beginning of the necessary change of structure. National sovereignty, the basis of the structure of a disastrous past, continued to be the supreme rule.

The Schuman plan meant a resolute turning away from the past, toward the future. It refused to accept the frontiers and divisions of Europe as immovable and looked upon our nations' resources, as well as on our nations' problems, as common resources and common problems to be dealt with according to common rules applied to all by common institutions. During its past 5 years of existences, the Coal and Steel Community has proved: First, that Europeans are capable of working federal institutions; and second, that industry, in none of our six countries needs tariffs, quotas, subsidies for itself and discrimination against its competitors, to keep alive. None of the calamities predicted with touching unanimity in most of our nations actually came about. While France increased its exports of steel to Germany, and Germany its exports of coal to France, Italy, thought to be the weakest of the six, quietly doubled its steel production. The incredible not only became true, but more than that, became believed and accepted; namely, that increased competition was in the interest of all, that the withering away of national sovereignty by common institutions of federal character did not mean disaster, but, on the contrary, served the interest of everyone.

The European Army plan was launched in August 1952, even before the Coal and Steel Community began to function. It was hoped that it would be an important second step on the road toward European union. But this plan raised too many passions of the past to give victory to the future. Its final defeat in 1954 was more spectacular than the quiet and gradual progress of the forces unleashed by Europe's first experiment in federal union: the Coal and Steel Community. Many observers outside, and even inside, the six nations did not notice the ground swell of public opinion, which made it possible for the governments, within a year after the defeat of the European Army to convene a conference of experts under the presidency of M. Spaak, charged to study the setting up of an Atomic Energy Community and a General Common Market. A few months later, Jean Monnet formed the Action Committee for a United States of Europe, of which all the major political parties and non-Communist trade unions of the six nations became members. The defeat of the European Army proved to be only an incident, while the current of opinion in favor of structural change gradually gathered strength. Out of M. Spaak's study group grew the intergovernmental conference at Brussels. In M. Monnet's Action Committee, Europe's political and trade union leaders found unity of purpose. The Brussels treaties, providing for an Atomic Energy Community and a European Economic Community on the lines of the European Coal and Steel Community, were signed in Rome last spring. Public and parliamentary opinion were well prepared. Within 4 months after the signature the Parliaments of Germany, France, and Italy pronounced themselves with huge majorities in favor of these treaties. The Benelux countries, where public opinion had often been in advance, preferred this time to wait for France's and Germany's decision. In the Netherlands, the Second Chamber has already accepted the treaties; Belgium and Luxembourg will do so immediately after the end of their parliamentary holidays, early in November. A few months from now both treaties will have begun to function.

The setting up of these two communities is in itself an even of major importance. But what has happend is more than the acceptance of two rather complicated treaties. It is the discovery and the acceptance at the same time, by all the major political groups with the exception of the Communists, of a new method of solving the economic and political problem of our nations. It is a method which implies changing the structure of Europe, basing it on the federal principle instead of on the principle of national sovereignty.

It does not mean giving up national characteristics, differences, and peculiarities—not to speak of our four languages. It does not try to substitute 1 monolithic superstate for 6 national states. It is simply a method of looking at our problems and resources as being common to all, of defining what actions should be taken in common and what rules are necessary to govern our behavior as citizens of a European community. It sets up the necessary institutions:

An executive in order to do what should be done in common and in order to apply the community rules;

A Council of Ministers to harmonize community action with state action;

A Court of Justice to ensure the respect of the law by the community's executive, national governments, and citizens alike;

A Parliament to provide democratic control.

Euratom now is simply the application of this method to the problems and the promises with which the advent of atomic energy confronts our six nations. In this challenge each of our nations disposes of limited, but important, resources.

In the first place: Scientific ability. Our scientists made fundamental contributions to the discoveries on which nuclear power prospects are based. If they have taken little part in the industrial application of these discoveries, we believe that this is not because the creative spirit is lacking in Europe, but because none of our nations separately is capable of offering our scientists the facilities they need.

In the second place: Industrial capacity. True enough, none of our countries disposes of a nuclear industry which can be compared with the nuclear industry now existing in the United States and the United Kingdom. Nevertheless all our nations are advanced industrial nations, with excellent mechanical and engineering industries. Euratom provides for the pooling of our scientific abilities and industrial resources. It provides, also, for the exchange, unhampered by tariffs or quotas, of all goods and materials necessary to build reactors.

But pooling our resources is not enough. Common actions are necessary. Under the treaty certain research projects will be undertaken in common. Certain enterprises, for example, for the fabrication of fuel elements, chemical separation and isotopic separation, may be built in common. In order to make the necessary coordination of investments possible, nuclear investments will be communicated to Euratom's executive. Supply of nuclear fuel will be a common undertaking; and, in the relation with other nations, Euratom will represent the six as a single unit. Common resources and common actions make a certain number of rules necessary, accepted by all, and applied by common institutions. The Euratom treaty provides for rules to govern the exchange of information and the opening, within only 1 year, of a complete common market for nuclear industry.

Rules for health and insurance will be established on a communitywide basis. Of great importance is the safety and control system set up under the treaty. Euratom will institute, among our six nations, a supra-national control not only over uranium and special fissile materials delivered to them by third countries, but also—and this is an extremely important departure from existing practice—over nuclear fuels produced within the community itself. In order to make the system watertight, it is decided that special fissile materials shall remain the property of Euratom, just as they remain the property of the Atomic Energy Commission in the United States. Furthermore, the Council of Ministers can unanimously adapt the community's control mechanism on the executive Commission's proposal.

To execute the actions, supervise and elaborate the rules, a Euratom Executive Commission, composed of five members, is formed. It acts in close contact with the Council of Ministers, which provides also the necessary coordination between state and community action. The same Parliament, which controls the executives of the coal and steel community and the common market, will control the action of the Euratom Commission. A supreme court, also common to the coal and steel community and the common market, will form the judiciary branch of Euratom. I have tried to explain why Europe has chosen Euratom as its instrument and how it is constituted.

We now come to our second question: What does Europe expect from Euratom?

As you know, even before the Euratom treaty was signed, the governments of the six asked the three wise men—Monsieur Louis Armand, Herr Franz Etzel, and Signor Francisco Giordani—to report on what should be Euratom's target. In their report, which gives a clear insight into what Europe expects from atoms for power, two major preoccupations appear.

The first is that Europe's industries should not miss the atomic bus as they would without the common effort, made possible through Euratom. In the words of this report:

"A critical movement has been reached: atomic power is coming of age. Nuclear power has moved out of the scientist's laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

onto the engineer's drawing board; it will now come quickly into commercial phase. This provides a great opportunity for our countries if we seize it and a grave danger if we do not. Scientific and technical knowledge can be borrowed; but industrial capacity one must create oneself. If our industries do not go ahead on a big scale now, at a time when others are poised to do so, they will soon be unable to face competition from the full-grown industries which have seen and seized their chances in time. Later developments would only be possible behind protective walls with all the drawbacks they involve. In view of the growing importance of atomic techniques for industry, Europe, as the world's greatest exporter of engineering goods, cannot afford to miss the chance to move off to a rapid start."

Their second preoccupation is Europe's increasingly serious energy situation. The figures are by now well known. The six nations, which were still nearly self-supporting in energy just before the last World War, are this year importing the equivalent of 110 million tons of coal. Assuming a moderate but steady rate of economic expansion, the import requirements will reach 200 million tons (35 percent of total requirements) 10 years later. These imports will create difficult balance-of-payments problems. Since they will for the most part take the form of Middle East oil, they will, at the same time, create a much more serious political problem.

In order to understand how Europe's growing dependence on Middle East oil has sprung on us so unexpectedly, we must look at three developments which took place during almost the same years, all three with revolutionary speed. These developments are first, Europe's rapid economic growth since 1950; second, coal's loss of its virtual monopoly as the source of energy; and third, the rapid rise of the Middle East as a major oil-producing region.

The first revolution took place in Europe's economic development. Between 1900 and 1913 industrial production increased rapidly not only in America but also in Europe. But in the 37 years between 1913 and 1950, which included two world wars and a world crisis, Europe experienced 2 full decades in which industrial expansion hardly kept pace with the destruction brought about by war, and another decade of crisis and near-stagnation. The same wars sped up American industrial expansion; only the crisis hit the American production very badly, too. The result was that the industrial production between 1913 and 1950 went up from 100 to 150 in Europe, and from 100 to 350 in the United States. Owing to more efficient use of energy during this period, energy requirements did not have to keep pace with industrial expansion. In the United States, where expansion was not held up as in Europe, energy requirements more than doubled during this period, but in Europe they could be allowed to remain stagnant. But then, in 1950, for the first time since 1913—with the exception of a few uneasy years in the late twenties—real expansion set in in Europe. Between 1950 and 1955 industrial output in the 6 nations rose by 34 percent more rapidly than in the United States. In the same years energy consumption shot up by 36 percent, slightly more rapidly than industrial production.

A second development, which had already been well on its way some years before in the United States, now took place in Europe within a few years: Coal lost its virtual monopoly as a source of energy.

And here Europe found itself confronted by a third development, also revolutionary in importance and rapidity. Until 1945 production of oil was, if we leave the U. S. S. R. aside, for all practical purposes, confined to the Western Hemisphere (1945: 85 percent Western Hemisphere, 6.5 Middle East). Ten years later the Middle East produced 25 percent of the free world's oil. Its share is expected to rise to one-third of free world production by 1965 and one-half of free world production by 1975. In the meantime, the Western Hemisphere, once a great oil exporter, will probably become a net importer. Known reserves in the Western Hemisphere represent only 13 times 1 year's production, against a hundred times in the Middle East. Nevertheless, the Chase Manhattan Bank oil report says: "From the standpoint of both exploration and development, the surface (in the Middle East) has barely been scratched." Between 1946 and 1955 the investments necessary to produce 1 additional ton of oil were 7 times as high in the United States as in the Middle East. Oil, as far as Europe is concerned, is rapidly coming to mean Middle Eastern oil.

It is for these reasons that the three wise men stated Europe's need to atomic power as follows:

"Thus without nuclear power, Europe's dependence on the Middle East is bound to increase. The Suez crisis has given us a warning of what this could mean. As the quantity of oil imported from the Middle East increases, there will be a corresponding increase in the political temptation to interfere with the flow of oil from that region. A future stoppage could be an economic calamity for Europe. Excessive dependence of our highly industrialized countries on an unstable region might even lead to serious political trouble throughout the world. It is essential that oil should be a commodity and not a political weapon.

"The European economy must be protected against an interruption of oil supplies, by finding alternative sources of energy to limit the further rise in oil imports. Only nuclear power, providing Europe with a new source of energy, can achieve this."

The wise men's target of 15 million kilowatts of installed nuclear capacity by 1967 represents an answer to a politically and economically threatening situation. One may deny the possibility of achieving this target, but one cannot deny, it seems to me, the necessity to leave no stone unturned in trying to achieve it.

The Euratom countries are deeply aware of the fact that the power program they need can only be realized in the closest cooperation with the United States and the United Kingdom.

The wise men, seeing in this cooperation the first condition of achievement, visited the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. In this country their discussions with the Secretary of State, the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, convinced them as they stated in their report that "on the healthy basis of a two-way traffic, a close partnership as equals can be built up between the United States and Euratom and their respective industries." Being neither capable nor authorized to do so, it would be foolish for me to make precise suggestions concerning this cooperation. Undoubtedly the form and content of it will be discussed immediately after Euratom is set up, that is, within a few months.

But I would be grateful if you would permit me to end with 1 or 2 general remarks on this subject.

I have described to you the new method of dealing with Europe's problems, which is the basis of the coal and steel community and the common market, as well as of Euratom. For 7 years my work has been to apply this method, first to coal and steel and afterward to new fields. Looking at this different object—our future cooperation—I find myself taking a busman's holiday. In Henry Kissinger's excellent Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy I was struck by this thought:

A power favored by geography or by a great material superiority, as we have been through most of our history, can afford to let a threat take unambiguous shape before it engages in war. It can do so as long as the outcome of a war cannot be decided against it by a single battle, or by the loss of an objective located outside its territory, which could cause national catastrophe, such as the loss of Middle Eastern oil would be for Western Europe.

But does such a thing as a purely European catastrophe exist? Does not European catastrophe spell western catastrophe? And is not catastrophe a thing dangerously near to war and, worse, defeat? And is it not the great maxim of trategy in our nuclear age to be as flexible as possible, which means to try as hard as possible to provent the development of a situation in which force would seem to be our last and only resort? Is it just my occupational disease which makes me look at Europe's energy problem as a problem common to Europe and the United States which may be solved by our common efforts?

A friend of mine said the other day: "America has the greatest knowledge of atomic power and no need for it; we have no knowledge of it and the greatest need for it."

Does not this situation in our mutual self-interest call for an intimate association between the United States and Euratom? The United States would bring into this association nuclear fuels and above all what the wise men called the most complete nuclear foundation in the world. Our need, that is, our difficult energy situation, has a very positive side to it. The average cost of electricity being much higher in Europe than in America, atomic power will be competitive in Europe long before it can be so in the United States. Europe, therefore, willing to pay 12 to 15 mils per kilowatt-hour, can become the testing ground for commercial nuclear powerplants. As the power program develops, experience gained thereby would become available to all. We would also contribute our rich inheritance of inventive science and industrial capacity.

But I must now mention what I consider our greatest asset—one which nobody has thought of looking for in Europe for a long time. But believe me or not, from now on people are going to find it there nevertheless: It is a growing sense of confidence. This may be not so strange after all in a European community which for the first time for nearly 40 years is at last enjoying economic expansion; a community which, after 40 years of crisis, war, and hatred, is at last turning toward the future. The rich past of our nations has kept us spellbound for many decades. But we are now experimenting with a method which, without destroying our nations, their past, their heritage, enables us to look toward a common destiny.

One of my friends, with whom I have been engaged in this European venture from the very beginning, happens to be one of the most French of all Frenchmen. He cannot live anywhere but in Paris. The only time I succeeded in bringing him to the Netherlands he fell ill immediately. There being no better proof of how far our silent revolution has gone already, I would like to read you a few lines, which he wrote the other day:

"For the rest, I care very little about being a good European. If anyone could tell me some more effective way of freeing Frenchmen from their staleness, from their fears, from their complexes; if anyone could promise to me a revolution which would change the structure more effectively while destroying less; if anyone could show me that progress lies elsewhere—then I should abandon the idea of Europe for this other quest, just as I abandoned the nationalist past in favor of Europe. I am not ashamed to admit this inconstancy, which is the logical outcome of a higher allegiance—the allegiance which I swore when I sided with

progress, and was torn away, as I have described, from the fatal charms of the past and its vanished glories." (Francois Fontaine, Preuves, October 1957.)

Provision in S. 3051 Dealing With Sustained Yield of Timber Supported by American Forests Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we near a Senate-House conference on the Klamath Reservation purchase bill, S. 3051, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a pertinent and thoughtful editorial from the August 1958 issue of American Forests magazine entitled Sustained Yield Versus Continuous Growth.

This outstanding magazine in the field of forest management, which has given us fine support on this issue, pleads for the Senate version of language in the bill dealing with the proper methods for operating the vast Indian pine-timber forest growing on the lands of the terminated Klamath Reservation, in southeastern Oregon.

This editorial should be of paramount interest to Senators and Representatives concerned with this question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSTAINED YIELD VERSUS CONTINUOUS GROWTH

Sustained yield is described by the Society of American Foresters as a policy, method, or plan of forest management, implying continuous production with the aim of achieving, at the earliest practicable time, an approximate balance between net growth and harvest, either by annual or somewhat longer periods.

This is the accepted definition by the professional foresters of America. We believe it was what AFA's board had in mind when it resolved on September 29, 1957, that "disposal of timberlands in the Klamath Indian Reservation should be made under such conditions as will assure sustained forest production and maximum permanent contribution to the economy of the area including the economy of the Indians themselves." If there were any questions on this score, (since the word "sustained yield" were not actually used) they were certainly dispelled by the board's subsequent action on February 24, 1958, when it enthusiastically embraced proposals by Interior Secretary Seaton as incorporated into S. 3051 to amend Public Law 587. The Seaton-Neuberger bill, as enacted by the Senate, is a clearcut sustained yield bill. On that score, there are no doubts whatsoever.

Consequently, deletion of all references to sustained yield in amendments to the Seaton bill as proposed by the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs is now a source of concern. In lieu of the words (sustained yield) the House version now refers to "a continuous supply of timber." In another change, the committee has whacked out the phrase "specifications and minimum requirements for sustained yield management," and refers only to "minimum requirements."

Thus the question now arises, minimum requirements to what? Sustained yield minimum requirements are one thing. Minimum requirements to Oregon's seed tree law that requires that a few seed trees be left on every acre otherwise clear-cut, is something else again: That something else is not necessarily sustained yield. Concern regarding the deletions is further heightened by the fact that NLMA, in a letter to the committee published below, states in one part that "the term 'continuous supply' may be construed as less impelling than the words 'sustained yield.'" There doesn't seem to be much question about that.

What has happened here is this. Someone has carefully pointed out to the committee that the words "sustained yield" are not present in the organic act of 1897 covering the national forests, which is true. However, the term is used in the Secretary's regulations and one would hope that any subsequent ruling would be made on the regulations, rather than the act itself. Also to be borne in mind is the fact that no ruling exists on just what a "continuous supply of timber" may or may not be. Any resort to the courts to obtain such a ruling, say my private purchasers of the Klamath property, would have ramifications of considerable import to forestry.

What this all boils down to is an attempt to weaken the sustained yield intent of the Seaton bill which AFA is supporting, at a time when we should be attempting to raise forestry standards, not lower them. So we say let's put the sustained yield language back in the bill to avoid any misunderstandings what might arise. The intent of the Senate version of the bill is clear. The intent of the proposed House version is not clear. While the urge is great, we aren't permitted to buttonhole legislators on this. That's lobbying. But readers aren't subject to any such restrictions. And if you still feel the same way about this Seaton bill after 32 articles, letters and editorials on this subject in the last few months, we suggest you now use your influence where it will do the most good and do so without delay.

Charles County, Md., Celebrates Its 300th Anniversary This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, an editor from Passaic, N. J., which appeared in the Easton (Pa.) Herald:

I had an unexpected pleasure to visit Waldorf, Md., during the weekend of October 25, and I learned a great deal about the rich history of Charles County, which will celebrate its 300th anniversary in 1958. Waldorf is situated only 20 miles south of Washington, D. C. I learned about the glory of Port Tobacco. No area in the Nation is richer historically or more interesting and picturesque than this, one of the oldest permanent settlements in North America as an English-speaking town.

Its history dates from a few years after the founding of Maryland in 1634. More and more of the English settlers came to the Port Tobacco region, and they soon founded a town. At first they called it Candlerstown, after the first settler Job Chandler. Later its name was changed to Port Tobacco on account, as some think, of tobacco being its chief product and an important commodity since Charles County was established in 1658. In spite of the fact that tobacco is linked with the history of the county, the historians claim that Port Tobacco does not owe its name to the magic weed. Their claim is that the name is anglicized version of the Indian word Pertafacco, Potopaco or Potobac, commonly descriptive of the town's location "between the hills." Historians claim that Port Tobacco's history goes back even more than 300 years. The Indian village of Potobac occupied the site in 1608 when Captain John Smith visited there. Others claim that the Spanish explorers, a century before, probably sailed their ships up Port Tobacco River because they were known to be in that vicinity then.

CONVERSION OF INDIAN QUEEN BY FATHER WHITE

There is so much interesting history here that one would have to write a series of articles. For instance Maryland's first historian, Father Andrew White, S. J., made his home among the Potopac Indians for several years. In 1639 he converted the Indian queen and 130 of her subjects to Christianity. It was here that Father White compiled the first catechism, dictionary and grammar in the Indian language. Incidentally, next year will also mark the 350th anniversary of the arrival of 4 Polish and 2 Slovak craftsmen on the Goodspeed, September 25, 1608, to help Capt. John Smith establish the first permanent English settlement in Jamestown, Va.

Maryland also has a Bohemian Manor, founded by Augustine Herman, first Czech in America, who arrived here in 1630 and was a close friend of famous Peter Stuyvesant. Herman was delegated to make a map of Maryland and Virginia, which he successfully compiled and as a reward received 20,000 acres of land, on which he established the Bohemian Manor. He was honored last year when a portion of Maryland highway in Cecil County was named in his honor.

Some 50 years ago an American Slovak journalist established a farming colony in St. Marys County, Maryland, for colonizing namely the members of the National Slovak Society. Many Slovak families still reside there and the famous American Jesuit, Father John LaFarge, S. J., noted lecturer and author, served these Slovaks for several years on account of his knowledge of Slavic languages. Father LaFarge describes the early years of this Maryland Slovak settlement in his autobiography published 2 years ago.

St Marys County is known as Mother County of Maryland. I shall describe it at some later date.

FIRST CONVENT IN 13 ORIGINAL UNITED STATES

Now let us concentrate on the 300th anniversary of Charles County. Its rich history thrilled me. However, I shall describe presently the place known as Mount Carmel, a religious shrine, where on October 15, 1790, the first convent in the Thirteen Original United States was founded. Its founders were 4 Carmelite nuns, 3 of them members of the well-known Matthews family of this historic Charles County.

Mount Carmel was known to the people of Charles County as the Monastery for almost 170 years. It is situated on a rolling hillside near Port Tobacco on Maryland Route 327. It has become the scene of pilgrimages from southern Maryland, Washington, Baltimore, and other American cities.

The Carmelite community which eventually grew to 40 nuns, occupied the place until 1831. They sold the property and moved to Baltimore for they were unable to operate the convent farm, which was their principal means of support. Mount Carmel, as the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

historians put it, slowly slipped into oblivion for a century. However, in 1933 the late Mrs. Benjamin E. Talbott and her daughter, Mrs. John J. Haggerty, created a movement to restore the historical site, which also contains an old Catholic cemetery with graves of many well-known residents of the Port Tobacco area. In 1935 the Society for the Restoration of Mount Carmel was formed. The society restored the main buildings and the chapel. This historical landmark, no doubt, through the generosity of its members, will be permanently maintained as a priceless relic of colonial religious life.

The original convent buildings and 14 outdoor stations of the cross and the large crucifix have been erected on the historic site.

TWO OLDEST CHURCHES

The histories of two of the oldest churches, one Catholic and the other Protestant Episcopal, are closely linked with the past of Port Tobacco, Md. Saint Ignatius Catholic Parish at Chapel Point, where Port Tobacco River empties into the Potomac, has had a resident pastor since 1662, which is believed to be a record in the United States.

Christ Church, located now at La Plata, Md., was created in 1692 as Port Tobacco Parish. Until 1904 the Protestant Episcopal Church was situated in Port Tobacco for 212 years.

The above-mentioned Father Andrew White, S. J., who accompanied the first settlers to Maryland in 1634 built a small chapel at Chapel Point in 1642 while he was a missionary to the Indians in that area. This was the first house of worship in Charles County, but has long since disappeared.

A Strong Transportation System Insures a Strong Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the House has approved the conference report on S. 3778, the Transportation Act of 1958. This legislation is of vital necessity if we are to maintain a strong transportation system in this country as a major bulwark in our economy and to bolster the defenses of our Nation.

I think it is significant that while this legislation has commonly been referred to as the railroad bill, S. 3778 is really designed to benefit all types of common carriers, and will also greatly aid shippers, consumers, and the general public. This is wise legislation which has been adopted by the Congress only after lengthy hearings, careful deliberation, and thoughtful study. The measure is designed to protect the public good and promote the general welfare of our Nation in every sense of the word. It is a forward step in insuring the continuation of our unequaled system of transportation which has been one of the primary reasons for the great economic and productive growth of our Nation. The transcontinental railroad systems which stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the cross-service trunk lines which link the United States with our neighbors, Canada, and Mexico, are the backbone of our Nation. This superb system of transportation, has contributed in large measure to our high standard of living and has helped to elevate the United States to its present position as the leading power in the world.

The Government of the United States recognized at an early date, the importance of building, and maintaining a system of transcontinental railroads to link the industrial East with the prairies of the West. The driving of a golden spike" at Rosbys Rock, W. Va., 7 miles from my hometown of Moundsville and in the heart of my congressional district, signaled the completion of the first railroad west of the Alleghanies which then terminated at Wheeling, W. Va. This event helped to fulfill a long existing need for a "ribbon of steel" to bind together the various States into a Federal Union where commerce could readily flow from coast to coast. The faith which was placed in the railroads has certainly proved one of the best investments ever made by our Government because it has paid dividends a hundredfold in prospering the economic welfare of our Nation.

Our Government has in recent years, through neglect, overly zealous regulation, and confiscatory taxation, allowed the Nation's transportation system to seriously decline, impairing the efficiency and service formerly enjoyed by the public. This legislation which the House has approved will help immeasurably in providing the assistance needed to assure the future growth and stabilization of the Nation's transportation system. The provisions of S. 3778, coupled with the recent action of Congress in repealing the burdensome tax on transportation of consumer goods, will go a long way in helping to solve the economic ills of the railroads and our other modes of transportation. I am only sorry that we were not successful in also repealing the transportation tax on personal travel, because it was a wartime measure which can no longer be justified.

The State of West Virginia with its mountainous terrain, its great mineral resources, and its strategic location, depends in large measure for its economic prosperity upon the continuation of a prosperous, efficient and adequate system of rail transportation to serve the needs of our many communities and industries. Especially is this true of the First Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor to represent. The seven counties in my district are largely industrial and produce a great amount of coal, steel, chemicals and other manufactured goods which find their way into the commerce of our Nation. Without the services of the railroads, the wheels of industry would grind to a halt in short order, because the flow of raw materials, and finished products would no longer be possible.

Consequently, I am certain the industrial workers, the manufacturers, and the general public will join in the joy shared by the transportation industry in the passage of this legislation by the House. I am happy to have supported this legislation and to have voted for its passage.

School Bells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to those of us on the Committee of Education and Labor, who have observed the diligent and patient efforts of our esteemed colleague, CARL ELLIOTT, hammering out legislation designed to meet the educational aspects of the challenge presented by sputnik, to welcome the forthright support of the retiring Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom.

The importance of the Elliott bill and the need for more vigorous support for it from the White House is effectively pointed up in an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 31. I recommend it to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

SCHOOL BELLS

"In education," said retiring Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Marion B. Folsom in a final appeal for Federal school aid, "the hour is late. We must begin to act before it is too late." He could have chosen no more significant a note on which to leave an office which he filled with real distinction. We share his conviction that the American people will be deeply disappointed if Congress neglects the national interest in education at this critical point. We share equally the feeling expressed in a speech last week by Senator CLIFFORD CASE that "if we adjourn this session without substantial education legislation, we will have failed in a national emergency."

The particular Federal-aid proposal to which Secretary Folsom sought to rally bipartisan support is the Elliott bill approved by a 23 to 2 vote of the House Education and Labor Committee early this month and by the Senate Subcommittee on Education this week. It is a bill which follows the line—although not so meagerly and ungenerously—laid down in President Eisenhower's education message to Congress last January. In brief, it would provide Federal scholarships and also student loan funds to enable financially disadvantaged youths to go to college; its emphasis would be on the teaching and study of science, mathematics, and foreign languages; it would improve testing and counseling in elementary and secondary schools; and it would help train more college teachers.

This newspaper for more than a decade has been urging Federal financial aid for school construction to repair the desperate shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation. That shortage has not diminished during the intervening years of neglect; it has grown and will continue to grow. We remain convinced that the need for new school buildings is now far beyond the capacity of the States and can be met only through a large-scale emergency program of Federal grants to the States.

Perhaps, however, Secretary Folsom is correct in saying that the Elliott bill "represents the best hope, almost the only hope, for effective new action at this session of Congress to advance American education." Certainly he is sound in saying that "enactment of this bill would demonstrate an awakening national recognition of the critical importance of education to the future

of the country." What a pity it is that he has been unable to persuade the President to give the Elliott bill more than the patronizing pat on the back and the quibbling over detail which he tendered to it in a letter to Representative WAINWRIGHT on July 7. Lack of leadership from the White House was largely responsible for the failure of the administration's own aid-to-education bill last year. If the President really believes, as he said in his letter, that "the passage of a sound education bill is a top-priority objective for this session of Congress," then vigorous support of the Elliott bill is an obligation of his office. The school bells are ringing, and time is running out.

Czechoslovakia Society of America Offers Sound Proposal for Dealing With Communists of the Czech Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no nation in modern times has held such high hopes for the future, only to have them so disastrously dashed, as the Republic of Czechoslovakia. Forty years ago this year the republic was born, only to hear the tocsin sounded a scant 20 years later. However, between Versaille and Munich the Czech people demonstrated their love of freedom and the fine responsibility of a free people toward their government and themselves. It is perhaps the most indelible blot on the statesmanship that followed World War II that Czechoslovakia was allowed to slip so quietly and quickly into the stranglehold of Russian communism. It was a tragic loss to the world.

Fortunately for us in America many hundreds of persons of Czech ancestry, still holding fast to the ideals of their forefathers, have become a part of our national life. It is to be expected that these people should feel distressed at the fate which has befallen Czechoslovakia. The desperate condition former friends and relatives now must endure are enough to torment any group.

The wonder, to many, is that the Czechs living in this country have been so moderate in their approach. Their demands have not been unreasonable. One reason for this calm, sound approach to the problems created by Communist rule of Czechoslovakia is the outstanding competence of those who from time to time act as spokesmen for those of Czech ancestry living in America. One of the most important organizations through which their aims are channeled has been the Czechoslovak National Council of America. This group recently issued a memorandum concerning the policy our Government should follow in dealing with Czech Communists. I think these proposals merit the close study of the Government, and am therefore presenting them for consideration by Members of the House. In essence, here are the proposals made by the Czechoslovak National Council of America:

I. PARITY IN ALL THINGS

Americans should be able to send free gift packages to friends if limited to the personal use of a family. As the United States Government permits its citizens to spend in Czechoslovakia or to send any amount of dollars to Czechoslovakia, the Prague regime should at least permit its citizens to receive small gift packages of American goods.

II. PARITY IN VISITORS

As practically all Americans wishing to visit Czechoslovakia are given an American passport and thousands of them have gone there last year and this year, Czechoslovak relatives should be allowed by their regime to visit American families as guests. Under present conditions, only those Czechoslovaks, handpicked by the Prague regime for special reasons, come to the United States.

III. PARITY AGAIN

For every Czechoslovak film shown here, we ask that an American film appear on the screen in Czechoslovakia, a film showing life in the United States as it really is.

We suggest that a closer check be kept on films brought here by private individuals, intended for public showing, and that the Censors Board include on its staff an adviser with a thorough knowledge of the wiles of communism. Communist propaganda is far too subtle, and it is not enough to know a foreign language. The Czechoslovak National Council of America offers its services gratis in Chicago, New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, D. C., Cedar Rapids, etc.

IV. PARITY IN NEWS INFORMATION

Inasmuch as this country permits Communist and proregime newspapers to be published in Czech and Slovak and to be sent to Czechoslovakia as representing American public opinion, and inasmuch as this country also permits newspapers, magazines, and books from behind the Iron Curtain to be delivered and sold here through various agencies and bookstores, we ask for the same privilege.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, with the help of other organizations of Americans of Czechoslovak descent would launch a magazine drive and send to Czechoslovakia thousands of issues of magazines—other than political, about everyday life in America. The Czechoslovak public is eager for the magazines, and we would supply them gratis.

Arthur Andrew Corcoran: A Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include several newspaper articles written by famous Boston writers, Bill McSweeny, Arthur Siegel, and Huck Finnegan, concerning the recent passing of my dear and valued friend, Mr. Arthur Andrew "Bunny" Corcoran, of Boston.

"Bunny" Corcoran was one of the great athletes of his generation. As a player and a coach, he greatly distinguished himself on the gridiron. He was also an outstanding baseball player, even though football was his great love, next only to his profound interest in training young people in character, citizenship, and athletic careers.

In his youth, attractive business opportunities beckoned "Bunny" Corcoran. But he rejected all of them in favor of the brilliant athletic career, in which he achieved such marked success. The immortal Jim Thorpe, regarded by many as the outstanding football player of all time, said of "Bunny" Corcoran that he was the greatest end that ever lived, and this opinion was shared by many in informed football circles.

Whether in victory or defeat, and "Bunny" had his share of both, he seldom lost, even for a moment, his quiet, earnest, unperturable mien. While he was a man of action, he was also a man of gentle nature and deep spiritual character. He was devoted to his religious faith, and he was a generous and loyal friend. Possessed of the courage of a lion, he was soft spoken and gentle and generous in his judgments of others.

He spent the last years of his life in the field he loved—working with young people in the athletic program of the Boston Park Department. He was especially proud of his work in connection with the Hearst sandlot baseball program and in that capacity developed many splendid athletes. He devoutly believed in athletic training for youth and told me not long ago that his program was keeping teen-age boys off the city streets, interested in wholesome activities and doing much to eliminate juvenile delinquency. He had a superlative faith in young men. He said:

Give them a chance to do something really worth while on the athletic field or classroom and they will usually respond 100 percent."

While he was genuinely disturbed by some of the current conditions affecting youth, he saw in expanded athletic and career guidance programs a large measure of the solution to the serious problem of juvenile delinquency.

For years he worked hand in hand on youth programs with his boyhood friend of many years, the incomparable Swede Nelson, to whom he looked for guidance and help. Needless to say, he always received the most generous measure of support and cooperation from his distinguished friend and he shared Nelson's oft-expressed injunction to the parents of America, "Be sure to know where your son or daughter is tonight."

"Bunny" Corcoran was modest and self-effacing. He carried his honors lightly. He sought no adulation. He did his job quietly and with heartfelt interest in young people, in whom he saw the Nation's future. Many young people, whom he coached in college and trained and counseled on the athletic fields of Boston, are deeply indebted to him. The community of Boston is the richer for his heartfelt contributions to its youth. The many loving friends, who mourn his loss, are the nobler and the more inspired for having intimately known this courageous, loyal, stout-hearted American. He was a great man and a great friend to the end, and in his untimely passing the community, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

State, and the Nation, have suffered the irreparable loss of a loyal public servant and a noble citizen.

The eloquent and touching services conducted at his grave by one of the Nation's greatest spiritual leaders, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis L. Phelan, pastor of St. Cecelia's Church in Boston, deeply moved those who had gathered to bid their tearful farewells to a loyal friend, loved, respected, and admired by all who knew him.

May "Bunny" Corcoran, who so well and so modestly exemplified the strength that America needs today more than ever before, find eternal peace and rest in his heavenly home.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Daily Record of July 29, 1958]

LEGEND OF CORCORAN TO LIVE FOREVER

(By Bill McSweeny)

"The greatest end in the history of football" crossed his last goal line Sunday. "Bunny" Corcoran died of heart trouble at the age of 64. Heart trouble? It hardly seems possible. No one ever had more ticker than this gray-haired lion of a man.

His full name was Arthur Andrew Corcoran. Biographers had to dig to find it out. It is doubtful that anyone has called him Arthur since he first played football at St. John's Prep. Some forgotten Boswell on that campus named him "Bunny." Because he had the swift moves of a rabbit. But the courage of a tiger.

Those who knew and really liked him are in the hundreds. Yet, there are many more who probably never heard of him. "Bunny" was exceptional in the world of sports. Both in ability and in the fact that he never capitalized the game and his fame into something tangible—like money.

He always had a good suit, a clean gray hat and a silk rep tie. He had a deep full laugh and he couldn't walk anywhere that people, old and young, didn't come up and say, "Hi, 'Bunny'." He never spoke a bad word of anyone. His hardest knock would be: "He's not right, that guy. He's offside." These were his riches.

GREATEST OF ALL PRO GRID TEAMS

A man sliced him with cleats once. The scar was a livid line down the left side of his face. Life was not always kind to "Bunny," but this was the only scar on mind or body.

Outside the realm of his family he loved, more than any other, three people: his commissioner, Frank Kelly, of the park department. His sidekick of half a century, "Swede" Nelson. His teammate of the great glorious days, Jim Thorpe.

He played end on the Canton Bulldogs, which athletic historians contend was the greatest professional football team. He had two jobs: catch Thorpe's passes and catch the wild Carlisle Indian when he "went off the reservation." Several years ago Thorpe passed through Boston on the final Sportsmen's Show swing before his death. Remembering back over seasons of laughter and of tears he told a press conference: "Here you have the greatest end in the history of football, 'Bunny' Corcoran. Believe it. Old Jim tells you so."

"Bunny" was good, apparently, at everything. He came out of Georgetown to play third base with Connie Mack's Athletics, staying with them until he joined the French Ambulance Corps in World War I. After that he had a chance with the Tigers. But Thorpe lured him back to his first love, football.

Then followed a succession of jobs, winding up as head coach at Holy Cross and, for the last 14 years, director of the Hearst sandlot system. A hard job. Searching, always searching for the kid who might make the big league. Trying to let kids who didn't have it down easy. Taking the rap from irate parents who didn't know he was saving their sons from wasted years as allmosts, but not quites. Standing at the pitchers mound for hours on end watching candidates work out.

PLAYED THE GAME BY THE RULES

Was he successful? For a starter a fistful of names: Monbouquette, Agganis, Gastall, Leja; his latest kid, a Framingham boy named Ryder, who'll be up there soon. And about 100 names which appear in the minor league box scores, working their way toward the top. And maybe a thousand names long since forgotten to whom he taught something about being a man, as well as a player.

He played the game by his rules and he never wavered. Last winter he had pneumonia and doctors rightly gave him up for gone. "I'll beat it," he said. And came home. Three months ago the heart grew weaker and weaker. "Bunny" grew shakier. Just last week he could hardly walk. He was wasted away to a shell of a man. The fire was there but the juice and the muscle was gone.

But he turned out at Fens Stadium for the first sandlot workout. And he picked 13 boys out of 188 in a six-hour workout. Then he went home to rest up for Thursday. He was en route to the next workout when time began to run out on him.

He was all ticker and all man, this grey-haired lion. He ran the full 64-year course like a thoroughbred. The kids he taught are running for him now. Perhaps 1 of the final 13 he selected will 1 day make it to the majors. Perhaps somewhere in his last pick "Bunny" Corcoran found his greatest player.

They're burying the body of Arthur Corcoran at St. Joseph's Cemetery in West Roxbury Tuesday morning.

But the legend has just begun to live.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of July 28, 1958]

* * * * *

The death of Arthur "Bunny" Corcoran marks the passing of another great athlete, especially in football, of this section. The soft-spoken "Bunny" was one of those football ironmen of the more vigorous days when only the less hardy wore helmets. He was of the era of Bull Lowe and Tom Whelan and Lou Little, when a collegian would pick up some spending money by playing a pro game on Sundays. And, upon graduation, played pro football when $50 a game was good money although an All-America would get more. There were the Frankfort Yellow Jackets and the Canton Bulldogs and the Ironton Steelers. "Bunny" and Jim Thorpe not only were teammates, but close friends. When Thorpe was here a few years ago, "Bunny" was a close companion. But "Bunny" also was a great teacher. He was an end coach at Holy Cross under the colorful John McEwan. And finished the season as head coach when McEwan quit after arguments with authorities. But "Bunny" didn't like the job of head coach. He would rather be an assistant, dealing personally with boys and never losing the gentle patience that was one of his greatest virtues.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening American of July 28, 1958]

"BUNNY" PAL OF THORPE

(By Huck Finnegan)

"Bunny" Corcoran is gone but fellow members of the Gridiron Club of Boston, true-blue friends like Dan O'Connor and "Swede" Nelson, will not let him be forgotten, just as they never let "Bulger" Lowe be forgotten.

"Bunny" was a product of the golden age of sports, when sports dominated the headlines. He was a pioneer in pro football right after World War I with O'Connor and Lowe and many others from New England. They helped lay the cornerstone of the National Football League. That league has produced some famous successes and some abject failures. But all its alumni seemed to have one trait in common: they never let down a friend.

THREE INDIANS IN BACKFIELD

"Bunny's" father was a successful businessman, and "Bunny" was known as the best-dressed kid at Princeton Prep and Georgetown. But business never interested him. Baseball and football were his life from cradle to grave. Only last Tuesday he was sitting in the grandstand at Fens Stadium directing the Hearst sandlot program as he had done for 14 years. He was with Joe Dugan, Bill Joyce, and Larry Woodall of the Red Sox and with Bill McSweeny, of the Record. All could see he wasn't the old "Bunny" but none could foresee such a quick fadeout.

"Bunny" was a great athlete in his day. Jim Thorpe called him the best end he ever saw, and Jim was looking for no favors because "Bunny" had none to grant. He spent his closing years with Boston's park department but the Hearst sandlot program was his pet project. He liked to help youngsters like Holyoke's Frank Leja, Medford's Bill Monbouquette, and Framingham's Steve Ryder to major league contracts.

He had signed one himself way back when. That was in 1915 after Connie Mack had broken up his $100,000 infield. "Bunny" was supposed to take Frank Baker's job at third but he wasn't ready. When he was ready after the war, when Ty Cobb made a bid for him, the owner of his club put such a prohibitive price tag on him that the Tigers lost interest. He managed a baseball team at Akron, Ohio, in his football playing days and later on ran the New York Athletic Club at Travers Island.

He made his reputation mainly in football. He attended Georgetown with O'Connor, Jackie Maloney and Ralph Gilroy but didn't stay long. He spent a year at Fordham with Frankie Frisch and Bulger Lowe, then enlisted with Lowe in the French Ambulance Corps (before the United States entry). The war over, he went to Canton to play with and against the men who actually made football. He played against Knute Rockne, Gus Dorais, Bert Bell (now National Football League prexy), Lou Little, Tiny Thornhill, Jock Sutherland, Elmer Oliphant & Co.

The Canton team had Bunny and Tom Whelan of Lynn at ends, Dan O'Connor (Dorchester) and Fats Henry of W-J at the tackles, Greasy Neale and Fat Spears at the guards, Al Feeny of Notre Dame, center, Carlisle Indians Pete Calac, Joe Guyon, and Jim Thorpe in the backfield, with Tony Griggs at quarter.

Others well known in New England who played in that league under their real or assumed names were Austen Lake, Mark Devlin, Al Pierotti, Spike Johnson, Milton Ghee, Guy Cogswell, Cuddy Murphy, and Bucky Sweetland.

HUNTED WITH THORPE

"We were at Canton from 1919 through 1924," said O'Connor. "I roomed with 'Bunny' but he spent most of his time with Thorpe. Old Jim was an avid raccoon hunter, and he and 'Bunny' used to prowl the woods at night. I preferred sleep. One night I induced 'Bunny' to get to bed early, and Thorpe came in, took 'Bunny,' mattress and all, and threatened to dump the package out the window. There were plenty of laughs and plenty of good times. There was only one hotel in the town, so everybody had to know everybody else."

His playing days ended, "Bunny" coached the ends at University of Virginia under Frank Murray and at Holy Cross under Capt. John J. McEwen. One of his Holy Cross proteges was Pat Lynch, now chairman of the State Democratic committee.

He was the most unpretentious of athletes, a kindly soul with a good word for everybody. It is easy to see why a boyhood chum from Winthrop like Swede Nelson and an old roomie like Dan O'Connor remained so deeply loyal to him to the end.

John F. Stevens: Celebrated American Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 53 years ago, on July 25, 1905, a great American, just appointed chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, landed at the Atlantic end of the Canal Zone to take charge of the historic work of building the Panama Canal. Arriving in the midst of chaos and hysteria incident to a yellow fever epidemic, he rescued the project from possible disaster, prepared the plan for the canal that was adopted by the Congress in 1906, formed the organization for construction, procured the major part of the plant, and brought the undertaking to a point where its success was a certainty, with estimated completion date by January 1, 1915. Resigning on January 30, 1907, he left the isthmus to attain new fame in other endeavors. His name was John F. Stevens.

It was my privilege on May 12, 1956, to have been the principal speaker at the 21st annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the decision by the Congress for the high-level-lake and lock-type canal at Panama. Thus, it was natural that I should choose as my subject, John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal, an address published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 29, 1956, volume 102, part 7, page 9285.

In my preliminary reading about the life of Stevens, I discovered a remarkable career of a remarkable man, whose achievements constitute important chapters in American history.

One of the greatest construction engineers that our country ever produced, Stevens is renowned, especially, for the following:

First. Discovery of Marias Pass in Montana in 1889 through which the Great Northern Railroad was constructed.

Second. Participation in the planning and building of that and other railroads.

Third. Design and starting of the Panama Canal.

Fourth. Rehabilitation of Russian and Siberian railroads at the end of World War I, 1917–23.

With a record indelibly associated with great projects, both railroad and interoceanic, his name has long since become a symbol of American initiative in the field of transportation.

Thus, it was with the greatest interest that I read in the July 20, 1958, Brooklyn edition of the New York Journal American a news story by Harry W. Frantz, distinguished Latin-American correspondent of the United Press International, reporting that the name of this famed engineer is now being widely advocated, especially in engineering circles, for the official designation of the great bridge that is to be built across the narrows from Brooklyn to Staten Island in New York.

As New York was the great shipping center from which nearly all the personnel and supplies for building the Panama Canal sailed, such naming of this bridge would be historically appropriate to a unique degree.

The indicated news story, together with the original text of the release, follow:

[From the New York Journal-American of July 20, 1958]

FOUR MORE NAMES SUGGESTED FOR PROJECTED NARROWS SPAN

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, July 19.—A famed Panama Canal engineer and three New York politicians are in the running for the honor of having a great New York bridge named after them.

The engineer is the late John F. Stevens. The politicians are Governor Harriman, Mayor Wagner, and Tammany Leader De Sapio.

The bridge is a huge span that will link Brooklyn and Staten Island. The structure, over the Narrows, one of the world's greatest marine thoroughfares, is not scheduled for completion until 1964, but its name already is being debated.

SUGGESTED NAMES

Among the suggestions have been Harriman Bridge, Robert Wagner Bridge, and De Sapio Bridge.

(Besides these and the proposal to honor Stevens, there has been a spirited campaign for several years to honor Giovanni da Verrazzano, Italian explorer and first white man to sight the shores of New York, by naming the Narrows span "Verrazzano Bridge."

(This campaign has been sponsored by the Italian Historical Society, 26 Court Street, Brooklyn, and Governor Harriman himself publicly announced he personally favored the name "Verrazzano Bridge.")

That it be named in tribute to Stevens, chief engineer of the Panama Canal during its early construction period, is being advocated by engineering circles in New York and Washington.

Stevens' proponents note that the connecting bridge between Staten Island and New Jersey was named for another celebrated Panama Canal engineer, George W. Goethals.

President Theodore Roosevelt appointed Stevens chief engineer of the Panama Canal Commission on June 30, 1905.

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—A great new bridge over the Narrows between Staten Island and Brooklyn might someday be known as Stevens Bridge, to honor one of the most famous engineers of the Panama Canal construction.

That it be named in tribute to Stevens, chief engineer at the canal during the early construction period, is being advocated by engineering circles in New York and Washington, with indications of wide support.

Sponsors of the movement presently reserve their identity, pending correspondence with the New York Triborough Bridge Authority and other responsible State and municipal agencies.

But they report privately that Stevens' name has been advanced and point out that the connecting bridge from Staten Island to New Jersey already has been named for another celebrated Panama Canal engineer, George W. Goethals.

The bridge over the Narrows, one of the world's greatest marine thoroughfares, is not scheduled for completion until 1964, but its name already is being debated. Among the suggestions have been Harriman Bridge, Robert Wagner Bridge, and De Sapio Bridge.

President Theodore Roosevelt appointed Stevens Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal Commission on June 30, 1905, after the early construction plans had revealed formidable difficulties in transportation, workers' welfare, sanitation, canal design, and the menace of yellow fever.

History recounts that barely a week after his arrival at Panama, Stevens decided to double-track the inefficient Panama Railroad, establish commissaries for all employees, build the Tivoli Hotel, speed up housing and sanitary construction, and apply railroad transportation to mass excavation.

His judgment influenced the later decision by Congress in favor of a high-level-lake plan with the Atlantic terminal dams and locks at Gatun and the Pacific dams and locks in one group at Aguadulce, a hill south of Miraflores. The alternative would have been a sea-level canal, involving far greater cost and time for construction.

The Panama Canal Society of Washington, composed of veterans of the Big Ditch construction, held a special meeting at Washington in 1956 to honor Stevens. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, then described Stevens as the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

"Often speaking to employees," FLOOD said, "Stevens told them that there were only three diseases on the isthmus—yellow fever, malaria, and cold feet—and the greatest of these was cold feet."

There are indications that the naming of the Narrows Bridge for Stevens might attract wide additional support because of his association with many other great construction projects in the United States and foreign countries.

Working for James J. Hill, Northwestern empire builder, Stevens early in his career discovered the Marais Pass in Montana, through which the Great Northern Railway was constructed.

During World War I, he was head of the United States railway mission to Russia and directed improvement of the Russian transportation situation.

From 1919 to 1923 he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board, which supervised the Siberian Railway.

After the war he became national president of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He received the John Fritz medal and many other awards for great engineering achievements.

Neah Bay-Lapush Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution presented by the city of Bremerton, Wash., supporting a proposed highway from Neah Bay to Lapush, in my district.

I am happy to know the Bremerton City Council and its mayor, H. O. Dom-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stad, have gone on record favoring this road, and sincerely hope that this desire is fulfilled.

The resolution follows:

"Resolution 1009

"Whereas from Neah Bay to the Point of Arches and to Cape Alava (the most westerly point of land in the United States) and thence to LaPush, as the panorama unfolds, the huge rocks of the sea emerge from the silence of the centuries to welcome travelers; and

"Whereas the lack of this road, less than 30 miles in length, from Neah Bay to LaPush is denying the people of the State, and the Nation, access to one of the most spectacular areas of this vast continent; and

"Whereas from a financial point of view this road project is sound. With the building of this highway thousands of tourists will stay 1 or 2 days longer in our State, greatly benefiting its economy; and

"Whereas the development of such a proposed highway would make it possible for additional thousands of sports fishermen to become acquainted with the famous king salmon, whose fighting ability is legendary; and

"Whereas this proposed highway would give mobility to the Armed Forces along the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and would likewise strengthen the western rampart of our Nation which lies directly in the path of potential invaders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the City Council of the city of Bremerton, That we go on record asking the Governor of Washington, the chairman of the legislative interim committee on roads and bridges, and the chairman of the State highway commission, and other interested agencies, that they endorse and help put into action whatever procedure is necessary to start the building of this road in the shortest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That letters be sent to members of the Washington State congressional delegation asking them to coordinate their efforts with ours and the elected representatives of this State in the procurement of funds and support from the National Government as needed."

Passed and approved by the City Council of the city of Bremerton, signed by the mayor and attested by the city clerk in authentication of such passage this 9th day of July 1958.

H. O. DOMSTAD,
Mayor.

Attest:

E. H. T. MCGOWAN,
City Clerk.

Colorado Has Lost a Great Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will be interested in an editorial from the Star-Journal of Pueblo, Colo., on the passing of Hon. E. D. Millikin, former United States Senator from Colorado:

COLORADO HAS LOST A GREAT CITIZEN

The death of former Senator Eugene D. Millikin Saturday brought to a close the life of one of Colorado's greatest citizens.

A brilliant, kind, and thoughtful man—he achieved the highest esteem of his colleagues in the Senate where he served from 1942 to 1956.

As a Coloradoan he always placed the interests of his State second only to the basic interests of the Nation. Partisanship was limited to those things about which political parties disagree as to principle, but when the interests of Colorado and its citizens were involved, he joined forces with other Coloradoans. His close friendship and working understanding with former Senator and Governor, Ed C. Johnson, constituted the outstanding State team in the United States Senate.

As a Republican leader he had no peer. He never dictated—he cooperated and worked for mutual understanding and beneficial solutions to all problems.

He was a close personal friend of the late Robert A. Taft and supported him for the nomination for President on the Republican ticket. But when President Eisenhower was given the party's nomination in 1952, Senator Millikin joined ranks and became one of the President's ardent supporters and workers.

His record of accomplishments is almost endless.

Colorado has lost a great citizen and devout worker. Poor health cut his senatorial service short and the entire Nation missed his leadership and guidance in the 85th Congress.

We know we express the sentiments of thousands of persons when we pay him our highest tribute and extend to his widow our deep sympathy and condolence. Senator Millikin was truly one of Colorado's and the Nation's greatest citizens.

Best Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, written by Mr. Jack W. Gore, editor and copublisher of the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., has been judged best editorial in 1957 by the better newspaper contest of the National Editorial Association. This new honor just received is in addition to many others received during the past years by this able and outstanding editor. This award-winning editorial "When Father Loses Contact With Son He Should Not Expect Help From Santa" was first printed December 22, 1957. It is a fine example of the kind of newspaper that serves our Sixth District in Florida. The lesson presented here is of importance to all of us; therefore, I am happy to present it here in the RECORD for all the Members to read:

WHEN FATHER LOSES CONTACT WITH SON HE SHOULD NOT EXPECT HELP FROM SANTA

(By Jack W. Gore)

A few days ago an incident happened in one of our department stores here in town which well illustrates how many of us today are looking to someone else to solve our problems.

The incident involved a father, his 6-year-old son, and the store Santa Claus.

The man, well-dressed and apparently of above average means, brought his little boy into the store to talk to Santa Claus. But before the little boy got to Santa the father handed the bewhiskered gentleman a slip of paper on which he had noted all the child's misdeeds and he asked Santa to read the list and then tell his son he shouldn't do those things any more.

Santa looked at the list to see what the man had written. With some astonishment he noted that the father wanted him to tell the little 6-year-old boy to stop biting other children; to stop destroying all the neighbors' plants and flowers; to stop calling his mommy names and telling her to shut up; to quit tearing down his bedroom window curtains and not to dig big holes in the walls of his room; to quit being selfish with his toys and his other possessions; and, finally, to quit telling lies.

This list was quite an indictment against a little 6-year-old boy, and when Santa finished reading it he called the man over to his side.

Gently, but rather firmly, he explained that he couldn't do what the father had requested. His job, Santa said, wasn't to make little boys and girls unhappy or sad. Nor could he do in just a few seconds of conversation what a father had apparently failed to do in 6 years. He would talk to the little tyke, of course, but he would talk to him like he did all the other youngsters so that the child would leave with a bit of happiness in his heart instead of a feeling of guilt.

We don't happen to know the father of this little 6-year-old boy, but he must be a very disturbed individual to think that a store Santa Claus can take the place of a parent in teaching a child the fundamentals of good behavior.

Or, perhaps disturbed isn't exactly the word to use in this case. Perhaps lazy, careless, indifferent, or just plain ignorant would be better words to characterize a father who has apparently lost any ability he might have had to control his own offspring.

Or then again, perhaps it isn't the father's fault at all. Maybe this child is one of those really unfortunate children who actually can't tell the difference between good and bad conduct and who need psychiatric treatment which few parents are qualified to give to straighten them out.

Whatever the reason behind the incident, however, it well illustrates an attitude which is all too prevalent today. Far too many of us are looking to others to do the things for us that we should do for ourselves. The home is a place where a child should learn the rudiments of good behavior and proper morals. But many of us are too busy to teach our children these essentials. So we turn the job over to our schools and churches, our juvenile authorities and police courts, and hope that in some magical fashion they will do what we are too busy to do.

Like a store Santa Claus these agencies cannot be an adequate substitute for a child's own parents. A school can apply discipline to a child but it cannot give him love. A church can preach the necessity for good morals but it cannot take the place of parents in setting good moral examples for a child to follow. And juvenile authorities and police courts can correct and punish but all too often by the time they are called in it is much to late to do any real good.

This Santa Claus incident in one of our department stores a few days ago wasn't a big thing. Quite probably it went almost unnoticed by people standing nearby waiting for their own youngsters to see Santa.

Yet, small as it was, it is still symptomatic of a great ill that is prevalent in our Nation. More and more of us are losing close contact with our children and then looking around for some Santa Claus to get us out of trouble we built up for ourselves.

Naval Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article, published in the July 1958 issue of Navy, official publication of the Navy League, entitled "Naval Tradition: Bulwark of the Republic," by Anthony Harrigan, of the Charleston News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., the South's oldest and best newspaper:

NAVAL TRADITION: BULWARK OF THE REPUBLIC

(Guest editorial by Anthony Harrigan, published in July 1958 issue of Navy, official publication of the Navy League)

In this second atomic decade the Nation's strongest shield is the character of its citizens. It is not something that can be provided for in a Defense Department budget or listed on a strength report. It is the principal means of defense in the arsenal of the United States. And the strengthening of character is an all-important task facing those who are charged with this Nation's defense planning.

The naval service of the United States has long recognized its responsibilities in strengthening the character of the men who serve in its ships and aircraft and who execute its battle plans. Moreover, the United States Navy is keenly aware of its role in holding up to the Nation a pattern of conduct and character for citizens to emulate. The Navy's heroes and outstanding officers—John Paul Jones, Stephen Decatur, Oliver Hazzard Perry, David Farragut, George Dewey, Ernest King—have represented to the Nation much more than professional excellence in the art of naval warfare. They have exemplified the highest type of American citizen.

This phase of the Navy's role should be stressed again and again these days. For the Navy has a character-training task to accomplish that the Nation cannot afford to have crippled or limited. The reasons for this stress are very clear.

The President of the United States and others in authority have expressed concern at signs of deterioration in some departments of American life. Public discussion in recent years has focused on lowered standards of public and private behavior. Under the pressure of modern living, ethical values have suffered. And there has been a downgrading of the importance of personal responsibility. Some educational theories have emphasized life adjustment and ignored the basic importance of sacrifice and discipline in human affairs.

The naval service has been fortunate in that its rigid standards of behavior have been maintained. Nevertheless, an age which excuses lowered standards and which is contemptuous of strictness and tradition has an effect on persons outside as well as inside civilian circles. Unnecessary emphasis on material rewards and inadequate understanding of the patriotism that causes men to stay in a profession that has limited monetary rewards has an adverse effect on morale. The blurring of responsibility, which is characteristic of much in modern life and which takes the form of saying wrongs are rooted in social conditions rather than individual failure, touches the judgment of citizens, whether in or out of uniform.

The willingness to forget the primary obligation to one's little platoon in life—indeed to one's own nation first and last—has troubled leaders of this Nation. Furthermore, the demands of a technological era could have the effect, if such is not already the case, of causing an officer to undervalue the traditions of his service. There is the real danger of officers forgetting that they are first of all naval officers as they become absorbed in the gadgetry of modern warfare. Such a situation, on a large scale, would be a national tragedy. For an officer of the United States Navy is not basically a button-pusher, reactor control technician, or a slide rule or electronic computer operator. He is an officer and a gentleman, a leader of men and a duty-conscious citizen who is the bearer of a special tradition that strengthens all Americans.

The customs and usages of the naval service, which advocates of a single service fail to appreciate, are the strengthening factors, in terms of human character and spirit, that made possible victories at Midway and a hundred spots on the board Pacific. The distinctive United States Navy traditions and customs build up a pattern of thought and action that carries men through crises that men, without a naval background would fail to overcome. They provide what Admiral Mahan referred to as "a reserve of strength which cannot be obtained by any novel device."

Naval traditions enable men of ordinary talents to work harder, sacrifice more, and act with greater promptness than would the rules and regulations of an artificially created single service. For that reason, the United States Navy, which must be prepared to fight on the vertical frontier and the undersea frontier, must not forget the frontier of character. On the American character, influenced by the traditions of the naval service depends, in large degree, the safety of the republic.

The Tax on Telephone Service Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity once again to make a plea for repeal of the 10-percent tax on telephone service.

We all know taxes are a necessary part of life. But why do we overtax a resource that is also an essential part of our life?

There is plenty of evidence that the Federal excise tax on communications is a discriminatory overtax on a service that people cannot do without.

It is a discriminatory tax. Telephone service is the only household utility so taxed—there is no excise tax on gas, water, or electricity. The tax also discriminates against long-distance users, because it is calculated on a percentage basis; people who live in remote sections of the country, away from population centers, are penalized by this tax.

Excise taxes on communications, until now, have been levied only during emergencies—and removed after the emergencies. Today, more than a decade after the end of the World War II emergency, the excise tax on communications is still in effect—adding 10 percent to telephone bills and all telegrams and radiograms.

Communications are a necessary in business, government, and community life. More than 75 percent of the American households have telephone service, and few businesses could operate without telephone and telegraph service. Yet these services are taxed at luxury rates. Only such items as club dues, cabaret bills, liquor, and tobacco are taxed at higher rates.

The question of excise taxes comes up before Congress just about every year. It is hardly necessary to point out here that removal of the tax from communication services has been urged repeatedly by representatives of the regulatory commissions.

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners has reaffirmed its stand with a resolution calling for repeal of the tax. The association also has authorized its president to appoint a special committee to work toward this end.

In 1956 the communication excise levies exceeded a total of $574 million or in excess of $9 per telephone per year. This is a big load for telephone customers to carry.

Representatives of the telephone industry, appearing before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee have graphically demonstrated this cost problem: for every dollar of additional net earnings granted a telephone company, the customer must pay $2.29—of which 21 cents is excise tax.

Expressed in another way—

One of these representatives testified—

for every million dollars authorized in increased rates, $520,000 of this amount goes to the Federal Government as income taxes. But another 10 percent, over and above the million dollars, must be paid directly by the customers as an excise tax.

Another point of concern registered by a telephone company spokesman was made in the following words:

We have now come to the point where the wartime pent-up demand for telephone service is lessening and the full impact of the excise tax is being felt increasingly. * * * A public utility like a telephone company has to compete in the money market with oil, manufacturing, and other utility companies and all other business requiring capital. The excise tends to dry up the capital market by subtracting from the customer's spendable dollar, amounts which might otherwise be saved and invested in new capital, and also raises doubts in the minds of some investors as to whether an industry so very heavily taxed is truly a good investment.

Even without the excise tax, communications already bear a heavy tax burden.

An example of just how big a tax load telephone customers carry was spelled out not long ago by one telephone company. It reported a total of $128½ million for Federal, State, and local taxes. About one-third of this—$36,985,000—was Federal excise tax.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The total tax bill in this case amounted to 2½ times the company's net profits and was 50 percent more than the amount it spent for maintenance costs, including wages and supplies.

Of course, the money to pay these taxes came from the telephone customers. Looking at the tax figures from the customers' viewpoint, the company found its customers paid an average of $60.34 in telephone taxes in a single year. This means, on the average, that 28 cents from every dollar the company collected from customers last year went for taxes.

An example of how the excise taxes on communications add to the family food bill has been given to the House subcommittee.

A spokesman for the fresh fruit and vegetable industry testified before the House Ways and Means Committee that the 10-percent tax on communications alone added about $1,575,000 a year, or roughly $5,250 a day, to the country's food bill for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Fresh fruits and vegetables, which make up about 21 percent of per capita food consumption in this country, are highly perishable. The industry moves an average of 5,000 carload shipments every working day, and fast transportation and use of the telephone and telegraph are indispensable.

At best it is wobbly economics to put a public necessity in the same category with luxuries for excise-tax purposes. And in a period of inflation, such reasoning collapses completely.

Utilities need rate increases as the cost of doing business rises. There is no way around this fact. But why add a tax on top of the utility bill?

This penalizes the customer for using a necessity—something he has to use. The tax is thereby locked into his cost of living. On the other hand, many items which he can choose to buy or not to buy go free of this type of tax.

A constituent recently wrote:

"With all of the talk, writing, and growing concern that there is about the slowdown in business, increasing unemployment, high public debt and today's cost of government, Congress certainly should understand that unjustly penalizing users of telephone service through the continuation of wartime excise taxes is not in the public interest, but is in effect—

A penalty upon very business which depends upon the sale of goods or services for its existence—once upon the use of telephone service by the business and once more upon its suppliers and customers use of telephone service associated with orders, etc., pertaining to the business.

A penalty upon workingmen and workingwomen and their efforts to retain employment or to find reemployment—once upon the use of telephone service by the workingmen and workingwomen and once more upon their employers, or potential employers, use of telephone service in calling them for available work.

A penalty upon every business, upon workingmen and workingwomen, and upon all investors, who use telephone service indirectly as an aid to retaining and improving their status as taxpaying businesses and citizens; a penalty upon the same taxpaying businesses and citizens who finally must carry whatever burdens grow out of the slowdown in business, increasing unemployment, high public debt and today's high cost of government.

The concern over this tax becoming imbedded in the tax structure is not an idle one. Very recently a joint Federal-State committee formed at President Eisenhower's recommendation to determine an orderly line of demarcation between Federal and State responsibilities, agreed tentatively to permit 40 percent of the tax on local telephone service to pass from Federal hands to the States in return for the States assuming certain additional responsibilities. This is a clear indication that some are coming to think of the excise tax as a permanent feature of our tax structure. I need not point out any such action would lessen whatever chance there may be of eliminating this discriminatory levy.

The position of the telephone industry, both Bell System and independent telephone companies, on the telephone taxes has been stated as follows:

The entire communications industry has urged the elimination of these taxes at every opportunity. Representatives of the United States Independent Telephone Association and of the Bell System have testified before congressional committees a number of times, beginning as early as 1947. The current international situation has cast doubt on a lessening of Federal expenditures and an overall reduction of taxes. Nevertheless, the question remains as to whether or not a tax so discriminatory as the telephone excise tax should be continued in lieu of obtaining needed revenue from other tax sources.

A Joint Federal-State Action Committee has been formed to determine an orderly line of demarcation between the spheres of Federal and State responsibilities. This committee has proposed that 40 percent of the local telephone tax be turned over to the States in order to provide funds for certain functions now handled by the Federal Government and to be assumed by the States. The proposal overlooks (1) that the local telephone tax was a wartime emergency tax, (2) that no excise tax was ever imposed upon local telephone service until required by World War II, and (3) that the proposal of the committee would have the effect of making the tax on local telephone services a part, and no doubt a permanent part, of the tax structure of State governments for the first time in the history of telephone service.

The committee's proposal, if adopted, would freeze the excise tax permanently into the tax structure. It would fasten an unequal tax burden on telephone customers and therefore should not be permitted to occur.

The necessity of maintaining Federal tax revenues at the current high level should not preclude the elimination of the unfair and discriminatory excise tax on communication services. The nature of this tax demands its early repeal.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the excise tax on communications service is an unsound tax that should be repealed now.

James Howard McClellan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there have been many fine editorials appearing in the newspaper of Capitol Hill—Roll Call.

The one appearing this week on James Howard McClellan is deserving of your attention:

JAMES HOWARD MCCLELLAN

Our heart and hand go out to the grief-stricken father, the young widow, and the stepmother of Jimmy McClellan. Those of us who know the senior Senator from Arkansas are aware of the love, affection, and hopes for the future that he held for his sole surviving son. Time after time, the solemn-faced man had walked slowly to the grass plot on the high ground in the little graveyard at Melvern. There he had bid a last goodby to James' mother, then to his eldest son, and then to his second son. On Thursday, he walked beside Jimmy through the stifling Arkansas heat to the resting place of his loved ones to say goodby again, and a bereaved nation walked with him.

Senator MCCLELLAN'S high hopes for his son were well justified. At 30, Jimmy had established a law practice in Little Rock that was well on the way to becoming the most successful in the State. He had served his country in the Armed Forces and there is little doubt, that had he lived, he would have followed in the footsteps of his illustrious father. The Senator looked forward to the day he could return to Arkansas and join his son in the practice of law, and Jimmy, too, looked forward to that day for they had established an ideal father-son relationship.

It is our fervent hope that this, the latest in a long line of personal tragedies, will not break the spirit of Senator MCCLELLAN. We do not think that it will, for the Senator is a strong man and he knows the Nation needs him.

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale Discusses Pay Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the subject of pay TV by one of the Nation's best known clergymen and authors, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale:

DR. NORMAN VINCENT PEALE DISCUSSES PAY TELEVISION

(By Ruth Nathan)

"It's simple. Pay TV won't pay. The people can't afford it."

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of the Nation's best known clergymen and authors, who has appeared frequently on the air, made this obseravtion in a recent interview.

"Sure, I've been thinking about pay TV, and so have other church leaders with whom I've had private shop talk; but we've been reluctant to declare ourselves publicly because the situation is fraught with politics. I think it is important to speak up now," he said, "especially since the people are gaining premature comfort from the decision of the Federal Communications Commission to postpone a trial test of pay television. This is the time to build strength."

Dr. Peale, who believes in positive thinking and confident living, as espoused in his best selling books, also believes that positive action should be taken against positive greed.

As pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church in New York City and founder of the Ameri-

can Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry, he drew on his own experience to document his conviction about free TV.

"When I go out on lecture tours to raise money for my foundation and other services, I charge a modest admission fee," he said. "I discovered that the people cannot afford even this small amount. It simply is a fact that most people are living on strict budgets. When our official organ, Guideposts, failed to get some subscribers to renew at the tiny cost of $2 a year, we sent out a questionnaire to learn why. Nearly every withdrawal was based on the budget factor—mind you, $2 was important to most budgets on a yearly basis."

Asked what he thought about the fee to see a religious service on television, Dr. Peale said:

"It's well to remember that in actual church, if the plate is passed, contributions are strictly voluntary. Imagine my saying to my parishioners, 'I don't intend to preach a sermon until you pay me 50 cents.'"

How does Dr. Peale weigh the power of television? "It is formidable, of course," he said. "The greatest showcase for the manufacturer of goods to advertise his wares; the greatest medium whereby a clergyman might persuade the viewer to allow religion to work in his life, to let it give him victory over his problems. * * * TV, in many respects, sets the tone, morals, idealism, and conditioning of the American mind.

"There is no question in my mind but that TV is in the public domain. It belongs to the people, like the beaches, the right-of-way.

"So many people are lonely," he said. "Unfortunately, their inner resources are limited—I mean intellectually. They find themselves with nothing to do, day and night, and no money to go out on the town."

Dr. Peale recalled a sight on one of his numerous train trips through the country. "I remember going through Baltimore," he said. "I saw this forest of TV antennas on a whole score of pathetic-looking, poor-district houses. It was symbolic, as if those antennas were being sent up by all those people into the heavens for something, something nice, to come into their homes.

Let's not forget the aged and the handicapped," Dr. Peale went on. "There are so many. My brother, Dr. Robert Clifford Peale, says that in about 80 percent of the home he visits on his medical rounds there is at least one elderly person on the premises either living on a small fixed pension or supported by his children. Often his eyes are glued to the TV set. I feel that TV is to the aged and disabled what braille is to the blind."

Does Dr. Peale have anything to say against TV programing as it is today?

"Well," Dr. Peale said in his perky drawl, "sometimes one thinks of it as a bad, metallic, inane mechanical screech getting into your nervous system. But as long as it keeps its good taste, it is a great force for education, enlightenment and pleasure."

And the possible elimination of commercials, sometimes labeled objectionable by some club and church groups?

"First of all," Dr. Peale said, "it would be unfair to the advertiser who perhaps wouldn't sell as much of his product as he does now, and then the American people would be footing the bill of higher prices. Secondly, I do not feel that commercials are a corrupting force."

Dr. and Mrs. Peale are the parents of 2 daughters, 15 and 23, and a son, 21. "Our family could afford pay TV," Dr. Peale admitted frankly, "but we're all against it because pay TV presents the great danger of filling the pockets of the few and emptying the pockets of the many. This is a case where the interests of the smallest citizen who is lacking in influence must be protected.

"Let's look at what we've got on present TV," Dr. Peale said. "There are many rich, regular hours of free religious programing and family counseling each week. Pay TV champions have not come up yet with any plans for providing such public service, to say nothing of news, science and other educational shows not classified 'pure entertainment.' On the other hand, heads of the broadcasting networks, such as Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS and Robert Sarnoff of NBC, have shown a sense of responsibility to the public. There is a growing number of food-for-thought programs for which free time, and often technical production are provided."

Dr. Peale's favorite programs are: The Lineup, I Love Lucy, Person to Person, Dean Pike, and This Is You Life. He was paid tribute over the latter about 3 years ago. He also loves westerns, especially Wyatt Earp. Dr. Peale pointed out that other cowboy sagas, such as Gunsmoke and Have Gun, Will Travel, often weave moral messages into their shows.

Revealing that in his talks with other religious leaders he has never found a single clergyman who was in favor of pay television, Dr. Peale announced he would seek an open, interfaith study-group meeting with leaders of all denominations. This he intends to do upon his return from a visit to the Middle East. "I think we must help the people prove that the fallacies of pay television are so great that its proponents would outsmart themselves and lose money.

"Pay television is a form of tax; the scheme won't take hold. But," Dr. Peale concluded, "we must do all we can to prevent it."

Bounty on Dogfish Shark Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, depletion of our salmon runs is a serious problem for the commercial fishermen and the sports fishermen of Puget Sound and the Pacific Northwest. This problem can be traced to two major causes, fishing with small-mesh nets by the Japanese, and predators. Negotiations with Japan are being undertaken to bring about a solution to the former, but something positive should be done in an attempt to solve the latter problem.

I have offered a bill that I believe is a practical method of controlling one of the most common predators, the dogfish shark. This salmon-eating fish has increased in numbers during the past few years, both in west-coast waters and in the waters off the Northeast Atlantic coast.

This fish is a serious problem to the salmon industry of my district and fisheries in general. Many tons of valuable commercial and sports fish are lost and thousands of dollars spent because of damage by dogfish to fishing gear. This means great losses to the fishermen of the Second District who rely on salmon runs for their livelihood, and affects the sports fisherman. Sports fishing in my disctrict is part of another industry, tourism. Poor fishing caused by these predators means potential reduction in incomes for resort operators. My bill would provide payment of bounties on dogfish to encourage the destruction of this menace.

I might point out that at one time the dogfish provided income because of its medicinal properties. Today, synthetics have replaced the value of these properties, leaving no incentive to take dogfish shark commercially. This may account for the rapid increase of dogfish in Pacific coast waters during the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress can give prompt attention to this legislation because of the seriousness of the problem. The destruction of this predator must be accomplished so we can protect one of our most vital natural resources.

Pay TV Presents the Great Danger of Filling the Pockets of Few and Emptying the Pockets of Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the accompanying article concerning pay TV, by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, came to my desk—I read it and liked it. I think others would want to read Dr. Peale's discussion concerning a minister's point of view, regarding pay television. The article follows:

DR. NORMAN VINCENT PEALE DISCUSSES PAY TELEVISION

"It's simple. Pay TV won't pay. The people can't afford it."

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of the Nation's best-known clergymen and authors, who has appeared frequently on the air, made this observation in a recent interview.

"Sure, I've been thinking about pay TV, and so have other church leaders with whom I've had private shop talk; but we've been reluctant to declare ourselves publicly because the situation is fraught with politics. I think it is important to speak up now," he said, "especially since the people are gaining premature comfort from the decision of the Federal Communications Commission to postpone a trial test of pay television. This is the time to build strength."

Dr. Peale, who believes in positive thinking and confident living, as espoused in his best-selling books, also believes that positive action should be taken against positive greed.

As pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church in New York City and founder of the American Foundation of Religion and Psychiatry, he drew on his own experience to document his conviction about free TV.

"When I go out on lecture tours to raise money for my foundation and other services, I charge a modest admission fee," he said. "I discovered that the people cannot afford even this small amount. It simply is a fact that most people are living on strict budgets. When our official organ, Guideposts, failed to get some subscribers to renew at the tiny cost of $2 a year, we sent out a questionnaire to learn why. Nearly every withdrawal was based on the budget factor—mind you, $2 was important to most budgets on a yearly basis."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Asked what he thought about the fee to see a religious service on television, Dr. Peale said:

"It's well to remember that in actual church, if the plate is passed, contributions are strictly voluntary. Imagine my saying to my parishioners, 'I don't intend to preach a sermon until you pay me 50 cents.'"

How does Dr. Peale weigh the power of television? "It is formidable, of course," he said. "The greatest showcase for the manufacturer of goods to advertise his wares; the greatest medium whereby a clergyman might persuade the viewer to allow religion to work in his life, to let it give him victory over his problems. * * * TV, in many respects, sets the tone, morals, idealism, and conditioning of the American mind.

"There is no question in my mind but that TV is in the public domain. It belongs to the people, like the beaches, the right-of-way.

"So many people are lonely," he said. "Unfortunately, their inner resources are limited—I mean intellectually. They find themselves with nothing to do, day and night, and no money to go out on the town."

Dr. Peale recalled a sight on one of his numerous train trips through the country. "I remember going through Baltimore," he said. "I saw this forest of TV antennas on a whole score of pathetic-looking, poor-district houses. It was symbolic, as if those antennas were being sent up by all those people into the heavens for something, something nice, to come into their homes.

"Let's not forget the aged and the handicapped," Dr. Peale went on. "There are so many. My brother, Dr. Robert Clifford Peale, says that in about 80 percent of the homes he visits on his medical rounds there is at least 1 elderly person on the premises either living on a small fixed pension or supported by his children. Often his eyes are glued to the TV set. I feel that TV is to the aged and disabled what braille is to the blind."

Does Dr. Peale have anything to say against TV programing as it is today?

"Well," Dr. Peale said in his perky drawl, "sometimes one thinks of it as a bad, metallic, inane mechanical screech getting into your nervous system. But as long as it keeps its good taste, it is a great force for education, enlightenment, and pleasure."

And the possible elimination of commercials, sometimes labeled objectionable by some club and church groups?

"First of all," Dr. Peale said, "it would be unfair to the advertiser who perhaps wouldn't sell as much of his product as he does now, and then the American people would be footing the bill of higher prices. Secondly, I do not feel that commercials are a corrupting force."

Dr. and Mrs. Peale are the parents of 2 daughters, 15 and 23, and a son, 21. "Our family could afford pay TV," Dr. Peale admitted frankly, "but we're all against it because pay TV presents the great danger of filling the pockets of the few and emptying the pockets of the many. This is a case where the interests of the smallest citizen who is lacking in influence must be protected.

"Let's look at what we've got on present TV," Dr. Peale said. "There are many rich, regular hours of free religious programing and family counseling each week. Pay TV champions have not come up yet with any plans for providing such public service, to say nothing of news, science, and other educational shows not classified pure entertainment. On the other hand, heads of the broadcasting networks, such as Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS and Robert Sarnoff of NBC, have shown a sense of responsibility to the public. There is a growing number of food-for-thought programs for which free time, and often technical production are provided."

Dr. Peale's favorite programs are: The Lineup, I Love Lucy, Person to Person, Dean Pike, and This Is Your Life. He was paid tribute over the latter about 3 years ago. He also loves westerns, especially Wyatt Earp. Dr. Peale pointed out that other cowboy sagas, such as Gunsmoke and Have Gun, Will Travel, often weave moral messages into their shows.

Revealing that in his talks with other religious leaders he has never found a single clergyman who was in favor of pay television, Dr. Peale announced he would seek an open, interfaith study-group meeting with leaders of all denominations. This he intends to do upon his return from a visit to the Middle East. "I think we must help the people prove that the fallacies of pay television are so great that its proponents would outsmart themselves and lose money.

"Pay television is a form of tax; the scheme won't take hold. But," Dr. Peale concluded, "we must do all we can to prevent it."

Stadium Bill Signed, Ending 50-Year Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was highly pleased with the final action by President Eisenhower when he signed the bill on Monday to provide a modern stadium for the Nation's Capital. This culminated efforts on behalf of many people over a period of more than 50 years.

Nearly 15 years ago, I proposed legislation with a view of providing such a facility for Washington. Some 10 years ago, I introduced a stadium bill. I have had the feeling that a facility of this kind was imperative for this city, which is not only the Capital of the United States, but looked upon as a center of operation in many, many ways throughout the world.

Many people have cooperated in this effort and even though there has been controversy, it is a tribute to the people of Washington that these differences have been resolved and through their cooperation this program finally is assured.

I would like to pay a special tribute to one who has been methodic and untiring in his efforts toward this action. William N. McLeod, Jr., clerk of the House District Committee, has on more than one occasion been the motivating factor that prevented our efforts in the last few years from subsiding. He has cooperated with the committee and pursued the suggestions that we have made that kept the program alive. A debt of gratitude and special thanks are due him for his cooperation and constant efforts.

An article appeared in the Star, Monday afternoon of this week, with reference to the stadium and something about its history. In order that it too may be made a part of the record, under unanimous consent, I include this article with these remarks in the RECORD:

STADIUM BILL SIGNED, ENDING 50-YEAR FIGHT
(By Grace Bassett)

President Eisenhower today signed a bill to give Washington a 50,000-seat stadium.

His signature made law out of language reflecting half a century of community effort to win a model sports arena for the District of Columbia. The stadium will be located near the armory between Independence and Constitution Avenues.

For the last 2 years, the drive has been led by William N. McLeod, Jr., clerk of the House District Committee. His orders came from a Representative from the Deep South with no constituents to serve nor votes to win by his compaign.

Representative HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, began championing a stadium in the Halls of Congress 9 years ago. A chairman of a House District Subcommittee, he steered through legislation in 1944 for a stadium-museum, to be run by a Presidentially appointed Commission.

BALKED BY DISSENSION

The aluminum-topped, marble-faced dream never was built because nobody could figure out how to finance it. The idea was buffeted about in Congress for a decade as civic leaders split on stadium sites.

Through the years, the relatively obscure Arkansas Representative rose to become a powerful, controversial House investigator of influence peddling in Washington. He kept the stadium top-drawer business.

Mr. HARRIS received a telephone call in Arkansas in September of 1956 from Mr. McLeod about reviving legislation.

George Marshall, owner of the Washington Redskins football team, had knocked on House District Committee doors with a new idea;

BILL DRAFT ORDERED

"Authorize an engineering study of financing, design, and location snags that have blocked the stadium for years," he said. Then, on the basis of a sensible plan, Congress would be willing to call for construction, Mr. Marshall reasoned.

When Mr. McLeod put the idea to Representative HARRIS, orders went out. The lawmaker told Mr. McLeod to draft a bill. Mr. HARRIS' prime concern was setting on a location. He was encouraged by Mr. McLeod's report that business leaders had promised to work for a public subscription of bonds to finance the arena.

Federal appropriations for the stadium were blocked repeatedly in past Congresses as "giveaways."

Hundreds of conferences began. They were to occupy many days and nights of Mr. McLeod's time for the next 2 years. George F. Shea, Armory Board chairman and lawyer; Floyd Akers, auto dealer; John A. Reilly, banker; and Robert E. McLaughlin, District Commissioner, cooperated.

They were prodded by Mr. Marshall, who held out the lure of long-term contracts at a new stadium. They were pressed by Calvin Griffith's threats to move the Washington Senators out of town because of lagging receipts at the old Griffith Stadium.

LIMITS SET

Edward R. Carr, the real-estate developer, was instrumental in bringing Mr. Marshall and Mr. Griffith into preliminary stadium discussions.

As drafted, the 1957 Harris bill set a $9 million limit on stadium costs. The Armory Board was to hire consultants to draw up final plans, which in turn would be handed Congress the following year before construction began.

The board hired the New York firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, which recommended:

A stadium to be set on the circular tract of land ringed by Constitution and Independence Avenues east of the Armory.

Financing by bonds issued to the public by the Armory Board and guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Transfer of land from the Interior Department to the Armory Board on a 30-year lease. At the end of 30 years, the stadium would revert to the Federal Government, along with the site.

Back went Mr. McLeod and Mr. Shea to draft amendments to the 1957 law.

DIFFICULTIES DISPELLED

The new bill, just signed by the President, overcame financing and site questions of Congress. Mainly, difficulties faded after the phrase written into the bill by Mr. McLeod that the stadium would be constructed in substantial accordance with the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury report.

This called for lifting the $6 million cost limit from the old law. Substituted was a variable price tag from $7 to $8 million, depending on how bonds sold and which design was adopted.

The United States Treasury backed the bond issue, under terms of the bill. Congressional fears that the stadium eventually would be a drain on the Treasury were allayed by a proviso that District Commissioners would budget money annually to make up the difference between bond payments and stadium receipts, if need be.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Commissioners were authorized by the bill to borrow from the Treasury if Congress refused the budget items. Loans would have to be repaid, with interest, by District taxpayers. So the bill made the stadium a clear local responsibility.

Representative HARRIS and cosponsor Senator BIBLE, Democrat of Nevada, blue-penciled from the drafted bill a promise that bonds would be tax free. That satisfied the Treasury, which otherwise would have objected to backing the issue even through loans.

To assure the land transfer, Mr. McLeod gained from Interior Secretary Seaton a pledge to lease the site to the Armory Board for a reasonable sum. "What is reasonable?" pressed Mr. McLeod. The Secretary said $100.

The words "substantial accordance" also settled the site dispute, at least to the satisfaction of Congress. Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury called the grassy oval of land beside the Anacosta the most desirable site.

So the bill as passed does not bind sponsors to the tract. But the intent of Congress to place the stadium there is clear.

With this language, Representative HARRIS was able to block brickbats thrown at the stadium on the House floor by economy-minded Republican Representatives GROSS of Iowa and SCHENCK of Ohio.

Five typographical errors caught in the Senate sent the bill back to the House for final passage. There, House District Committee Chairman MCMILLAN, Democrat of South Carolina, spent the afternoon on the floor with the bill in his coat pocket.

Thanks to his evening defense against Representative O'KONSKI, Republican of Wisconsin, stadium legislation went to the White House.

Farley Is Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the following clipping appeared in the Lebanon Daily News, a prominent paper in my district. Its insertion was requested by Congressman KEOGH, of New York, in line with congressional courtesy to me. I am sure Mr. Farley is a nationwide character and his whereabouts interesting.

FARLEY IS BACK

At the 1940 Democratic convention Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, placed in nomination the name of James A. Farley. He had left a sick bed to do so, because he shared Farley's determination to oppose a third term.

Neither Glass nor Farley had any illusions as to the outcome. Mr. Roosevelt received 946 delegate-votes against Farley's 72. But the seed of protest against a third term bore fruit, eventually resulting in a constitutional amendment to forbid what, until then, had been an unwritten law.

That break with F. D. R. marked the end of Big Jim's open participation in politics. He resigned as Postmaster General and became first chairman of the board of the Coca Cola Export Corporation. He now is its president.

Now, presumably after "the pause that refreshes," the 70-year-old Farley (who has not held elective office since the one term he served in New York Assembly in 1923) has suddenly announced his candidacy for New York's United States senatorial nomination.

It was the biggest bit of totally unexpected political news in some time. It seems to have caught that State's Democratic bigwigs completely off guard.

If, after an 18-year absence from active politics, Jim Farley manages to capture the top spot on the State ticket, the comeback will be one for the books.

H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by me to the Honorable Wilbur Young, State superintendent of the State of Indiana Department of Public Instruction, under date of July 28, 1958, in regard to H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958:

JULY 28, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR YOUNG,
State Superintendent, Indiana Department of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT YOUNG: This letter is in response to your communication of July 21, in which you summarize the results of a study of mathematics and science education in Indiana schools in support of your opposition to the enactment of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

As a Member of Congress representing the Eighth District of Indiana, I am deeply interested in the status of education in our State and throughout the Nation. In this time of peril for our Nation, during which it has become increasingly obvious that the quality of American education is a decisive factor in our struggle to preserve our freedom, I also feel that there is an urgent national interest in the kind and amount of education available to our young people. Therefore, I very much appreciate having the information you forwarded and your views regarding H. R. 13247.

It is extremely gratifying to me that Indiana boys and girls are doing so well in mathematics and science and that Indiana schools provide such opportunities for academic achievement. The teachers of Indiana are obviously doing a good job, and we should all be thankful that we have these men and women who have dedicated themselves to the most important work of a democracy—the education of our youth.

I think that we can all agree, however, that we cannot be satisfied with the quality of education—in Indiana or in the Nation—until it is the very best that we can make it. After the most careful consideration of the facts available to me, including those presented in your study, I cannot agree that they prove that H. R. 13247 should not be enacted. On the contrary, I think that the great mass of reliable information on the needs and deficiencies of American education conclusively proves that this legislation is needed and that its enactment is vital to national security. It was on this basis that President Eisenhower requested enactment of legislation along these lines early this year. Recently the President has reemphasized his support of H. R. 13247, which in large measure would carry out his recommendations. Based upon my own review of the available facts, I agree with the President in this matter. I think you are entitled to know my reasons for taking this position.

First, your letter deals largely with scholarships. A Federal scholarship program is merely one feature of this legislation, and perhaps not the most important one. The bill would authorize Federal assistance to help and encourage the States to improve counseling and guidance services in the schools so that more of our able youngsters will be identified and properly encouraged to study the hard subjects in high school and prepare to continue their education in college.

Your own study demonstrates conclusively that, even in Indiana, youngsters are not making the most of their abilities in subjects of critical importance to themselves and to the Nation. On pages 3 and 4 of your study it is shown that, of the ninth grade students taking science and mathematics tests, 58 percent showed a knowledge of mathematics and 36 percent showed a knowledge of physical science above their grade level, and 61.6 percent and 50.7 percent were above the national norms respectively in mathematics and science. (If Indiana is only average, the least we could expect is that 50 percent of Indiana students be above the national average in these subjects—without even inquiring as to whether our national average attainment is high enough.)

Yet, on page 2, the study shows that among graduating seniors, only 11 percent had actually taken 4 years of mathematics, and that nearly 75 percent had not taken more than 2 years of mathematics. Worse, it shows that only 2 percent had actually taken 4 years of science, and that nearly 85 percent had taken no more than 2 years of science. Surely you will agree, as an educator, that these 3d and 4th year high school mathematics and science courses are essential to the well-rounded academic education of children who have ability to take them—and are absolutely necessary for a student who plans to take college courses in mathematics and science. Unfortunately, the situation nationally is about the same as in Indiana. United States Office of Education studies indicate that only 1 high school student out of 8 takes trigonometry or solid geometry. This might be contrasted with the Soviet Union where science and mathematics are required study for all secondary school students for each of the final 4 years of secondary schooling. I feel that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the assistance provided by the bill to help improve testing, counseling, and guidance services in our schools would help reverse this condition.

The bill would provide assistance to the States to provide the modern laboratory and instructional equipment needed by the schools to properly teach mathematics, science, and foreign languages. Your study did not deal with the needs of Indiana schools for such equipment, but the lack of modern equipment is generally recognized as one of the major problems of giving effective instruction in these vital subjects. For instance, in the field of foreign lanugage instruction, the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor on this legislation (p. 10) reveals that only 60 high schools in this country have electronic laboratory equipment for drill in hearing and speaking the foreign languages offered.

H. R. 13247 would authorize the commissioner of education to contract with colleges and universities for the establishment and operation of foreign language institutes and foreign language and area studies centers in order to provide advanced training for elementary, high school, and college teachers of modern foreign languages and to provide training for individuals in extremely important languages which are not taught in the United States. I think the necessity for improving our understanding and command of languages is perfectly obvious. I agree with the President that this program will make a solid contribution to our national security and will help meet the growing needs for people with a knowledge of languages on the part of the Military Establishment, science, the diplomatic corps, business, and industry, and education. Did you know that over half of our American high schools offer no courses in a foreign language, and that less than 15 percent of our high school students study a foreign language? By contrast, 40 percent of the high school students in the Soviet Union are studying English. It seems to me that this bill will make it possible for a number of Indiana foreign language teachers to further develop their skills and knowledge to their benefit and to the benefit of their students. I would think that you would welcome such an opportunity for them.

The bill provides for Federal participation in the establishment of university loan funds in order that more deserving college students can be assisted in completing their education. These funds, which account for a large item ($220 million over 4 years) of the cost of the whole bill, would be returned, with interest, to the Federal Government. Your study does not cover the need in Indiana colleges and universities for additional loan funds for deserving Indiana students, but the need for such assistance has been amply demonstrated in the reports of colleges and universities to the United States Office of Education in its study of institutional student financial aid.

Nor does your letter or study deal with the needs in Indiana, or nationally, for assistance in expanding graduate education in order to increase the number of qualified college and university teachers who, in turn, educate the scientists, doctors, teachers, economists, linguists, engineers, and other highly educated people required by a strong America. Yet the bill you ask me to oppose would provide such assistance to graduate students and, through them, to the institutions in which they are doing advanced work in their fields. There are only about 9,000 earned doctor of philosophy degrees awarded annually in the United States. Yet, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School estimated that only about 5,000 of the recipients of these degrees enter, or are engaged in, college teaching—whereas it is estimated that our colleges and universities will need a minimum of 15,000 new faculty members each year during the next 12 to 15 years. Where are they to come from? One obvious answer is that a good many will not have completed the full education needed for teaching at the highest academic levels—as is often the case right now. In 1953–54, 40 percent of new college teachers had a doctoral degree; the figure today is 28 percent. You must be aware of the serious consequences of this trend for higher education. I feel that our needs in this respect are so serious—and the consequences to education so grave—that Federal assistance is required in the national interest.

The bill would also authorize the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to initiate the conduct of research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. The House committee felt that such a program of research would hold a great promise of improved methods in education which could, in turn, be utilized by schools and colleges in Indiana and elsewhere in the Nation to great advantage.

Finally—and it represents only a part of this proposed legislation—I come back to the single relevant question which your letter and the study raises with respect to H. R. 13247, the need for scholarship assistance.

Nationally, a number of reliable studies have demonstrated that a substantial number of our most able boys and girls—those who have the potential ability to become scientists, or engineers, or teachers, or other badly needed professionals—do not go on to college. Some drop out even before completing high school. Part of the reason for this loss—a loss of abilities we cannot as a Nation afford—undoubtedly lies in inadequate procedures for identifying able youngsters and for properly motivating them by expert counseling and guidance. Another reason is the lack of financial ability to pursue a college education. Through whatever combination of reasons, most estimates are that about one-half of our high-school graduates in the top 30 percent of their class academically do not go on to college.

But I shall confine my observations to the results of the study conducted in our State which you believe demonstrates that Federal scholarships are not needed to enable Indiana boys and girls to go to college, or to stimulate more of them to prepare for college by taking the "hard" courses—such as trigonometry—in high school. Let us look at the facts.

Your first false assumption with respect to this study is that only those intending to study mathematics or science in college should get scholarships. The scholarship aid in H. R. 13247 would not be so restricted. Our national security needs include mathematicians and scientists and linguists but are much broader. We needed educated men and women in all fields. We need gifted economists, political analysts (and political leaders), historians, teachers in all fields, philosophers, and administrators. But your inquiry was directed only to the need for scholarships on the part of those students who wished to study mathematics or science.

Secondly, among those who were capable of pursuing college work successfully, only those scoring in an extremely high percentile were considered eligible.

Thirdly, if financial assistance was needed at all, it is difficult for me to understand how aid ranging as low as $10 could be of much assistance.

The study, however, did not really answer the pertinent question: How many boys and girls in Indiana who graduate from high school with the ability and desire to successfully pursue a course of higher education are unable to do so because of financial inability?

Fortunately, we do have some reliable information on this question. A study of 60,000 high school juniors and seniors (representing a scientifically selected sample group) sponsored by the highly respected National Science Foundation and conducted by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N. J., led to the conclusion that higher education is still losing up to one-half of the top 30 percent or so of the Nation's high school seniors and that each year * * * between 60,000 and 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates with aptitude and interest for college fail to continue their education for financial reasons. In 1957, according to a research brief issued by the research division of your department, 38,165 students graduated from the public high schools of Indiana (and we must keep in mind that the scholarships provided by this bill would also be available for qualified private school graduates). One-third of this group—at least—must have had the ability to do college work. That would mean over 12,700 in the top third of the group which graduated in 1957. If Indiana is typical of the Nation, a good working hypothesis is that one-half of those top-third students—or about 6,350 Indiana boys and girls of exceptional ability—did not go on to college for financial reasons.

Now, granted, a great many of the graduates who were not in the top-third group did go to college. But it is the loss of these most able youngsters which must be of great concern to Indiana and to the Nation.

Let's approach this question of need for Federal scholarship help from another angle—which apparently was not considered. How many able Indiana boys and girls drop out of school before the senior year in high school? How many of these, if they knew (perhaps through improved counseling and guidance which this bill you oppose would help provide) that it would be financially possible for them to go on to college, might finish high school? Your study doesn't attempt to answer such questions. However, your own department of public instruction, in a May 1954 research bulletin entitled "Holding Power of the Schools of Indiana," reveals that for every 100 Indiana boys and girls who started first grade in the years between 1937 and 1941 only 55 finished high school. And among the recommendations your department made to improve this situation was provide better counseling services. Don't you think that another aid might be to provide a greater assurance that an able child who worked hard in school would be able to go to college despite his lack of financial ability?

To conclude, I cannot agree that this limited study shows that Federal help is unnecessary. On the contrary, the facts point the other way. I think that the teachers, the students, and the parents of Indiana need all the help they can get to improve the quality of educational opportunity for Indiana young people. I believe that a careful reading of the bill, H. R. 13247, would reveal the genuine help it would give to schools all over the Nation. Therefore, I am enclosing a copy of the bill, a copy of the committee report which explains what the bill would provide and a copy of the President's letter of July 7 to Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT in support of H. R. 13247. I hope that when you have had a chance to study these public documents you may change your mind and ask me to support this progressive legislation which is needed by Indiana and the Nation.

In these days of guided missiles, satellites and other advanced weapons of war, the defense of our country is so dependent upon scientific research, and the training of our brainpower to carry on this work, that we cannot afford the luxury of arguing whether the local, county, State or National Government should perform this training function. The defense of America is primarily the duty

of the Federal Government, but in this instance, I believe all the agencies of Government should work together to see that the education and training of America leads that of all the world. Certainly there is no strife in Russia among the various agencies of its government as to which one will carry out this function. America cannot afford to fall behind in this field.

Sincerely yours,

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Member of Congress.

Address by the Korean Ambassador, Dr. You Chan Yang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Korean Ambassador to the United States, my good friend Dr. You Chan Yang, appeared before the assembled representatives to Girls Nation on the campus of the American University on July 30, 1958.

Girls Nation is an annual mock government sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, and is the sequel to the Girls State in the various States.

This outstanding group of young women were moved and inspired by the remarks by Dr. Yang, and I want to insert them in the RECORD:

My young American friends, for the second consecutive year, I consider it a real privilege to be invited to address the Girls Nation. This year, as last year, I am grateful for the opportunity to chat with you charming young ladies for two reasons. First, I have long admired the tremendous good work done by both the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary in their Boys State and Girls State programs and their climaxes, the annual nations held here in Washington. I have long been of the belief that the Legion, through these programs, is providing the best practical exercise in American citizenship.

I am delighted to be here, secondly, because I can come to you as a father of a young lady of your own age. I know that my own daughter, Sheila, were she here, would thoroughly enjoy this program.

Beneath the veneer of slang and sophistication attributed to the youth of today, I believe that most American young ladies are gravely concerned about their own future and the future of their Nation, in these awesome, atomic times. The mere fact that you young ladies have gathered here in such a serious venture today illustrates that serious thinking is being done on all levels by the youth of the United States.

No one could have expressed more aptly the tenor of our times than did Charles Dickens, about a hundred years ago, in the opening lines of his great novel, A Tale of Two Cities. With the events in the Middle East reaching a crescendo and as we anticipate within the next 2 weeks the summit conference at the United Nations, the words of Dickens are as applicable today as they were a century ago:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only."

These are the worst of times, because it should be obvious to all that the Middle East crisis is a new variation of the proxy war tactics of the Soviet Union. Surely, there can be no doubt about who instigated the revolts in Lebanon and Iraq. About 2 months ago, I prepared a speech, which was delivered at Rockford, Ill., on June 13, in which I said in part: "I believe that it is far less than coincidental that riotings and bombings erupted in Lebanon just at a time when Nasser of Egypt was paying a courtesy call in Moscow." To a number of us here in Washington, the bloody sequence of events in the Middle East was not only clearly predictable but expected. The tragic frustrating part of it was that we could not seem to be able to awaken the free world so as to forestall the grim consequences. In a larger sense, the Middle East crisis has thus many of the earmarks of the Korean problem. It is, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his message to the people of the United States, the pretension of "civil" war. It is the pattern of the Communists seeking to subjugate by the indirect aggression of terrorism, assassination and bluff.

These are the worst of times also because many of us are apprehensive that the overall world pattern of Communist intent might not be clearly perceived. Also, we are concerned because we are apprehensive that the Communists may succeed in their strategy of talk and trickery until they are ready for an armed showdown. We are concerned that the free world's position might again be weakened as it was as a result of the Geneva Conference of 1954. Most important of all, we are gravely afraid that the United Nations itself might be further weakened in its effectiveness, should the Communists succeed in preventing valid expressions of opinions and important votings in that organization.

On the other hand, it is the best of all worlds because the American people awakened in time to the grave danger which confronted them. Also, the tremulous cries of those fearful of direct Soviet intervention in World War III have proved hollow. To the contrary, as President Syngman Rhee has often argued and as events in the Far East have proved again and again, when the Soviet Union is confronted with a show of strength, it backs down and seeks to appear to be reasonable. Think back a moment. In your wildest imagination, did you believe that even a month ago you expected Khrushchev to come to the United States? No. And while it is true that negotiations are still underway as to who will represent the Arab states, have you stopped to think that for the first time the Soviet Union is not insisting upon complete representation at a meeting by all of its phony satellite powers? Also, the crisis has had the effect of bringing the United States and Great Britain closer together in their views on the Middle East. Furthermore, the Security Council itself, including several nations not directly allied with the free world, voted 10 to 1 against the Soviet Union. The Soviet veto of the proposals to strengthen the United Nations force in the Middle East clearly revealed the bloodied Communist hand, and exposed the falseness of the Communist cry that they desire peace.

You know and I know that the Soviet Union and its puppets can have peace any time they want it. We should have learned the lesson, too, that the best chances for peace lie in the concerted actions of the free world to maintain pressure constantly against the Communist world.

One of the most important things we must realize is that if the United Nations does not strengthen its authority, it may easily go the way of the old League of Nations. Let us take a specific case—the United Nations observer group in Lebanon. It was the weakness of the UNOGIL which led to the deteriorated situation in Lebanon and encouraged the events in Iraq. Now, I know that you have been given different reports as to the actual events in Lebanon and you have been given criticism of the American action. But from my own files, I want to reveal certain other things to you.

1. The UNOGIL patrols did not go outside the passable roads.

2. The UNOGIL patrols were confined to the daytime; yet the infiltration of men and securing of arms occurred at night.

3. The UNOGIL included only those areas adjacent to opposition-controlled areas, not Rebel-held territory.

4. The headquarters of the UNOGIL operations were located in a hotel in Beirut, from which nothing could be seen; in Zahleh, 40 kilometers from the border; and Saida, which is a coastal city. Needless to say these centers were absolutely useless.

5. The UNOGIL observers could not enter any opposition-controlled areas unless they first secured a pass directly from the Rebel leader himself.

6. When the observers were asked at the press conference about their attitude, if and when they should find many non-Lebanese among the Rebels, they answered: "We shall not try to verify that because we are not investigators."

It should be obvious that any United Nations Observer Group must have access to all danger areas anywhere in Lebanon, in the Middle East and in the world. It should likewise be obvious that if the United Nations cannot beef up those observation teams with an international police force, then the United States and its allies must be given the international authority to maintain world order.

The reason why, as a Korean, I may seem to intrude myself into the Middle East picture is simply because we have seen this very scenario played over and over again. Between 1945 and 1948, repeatedly, United Nations efforts to enter North Korea for the simple purpose of observation were thwarted. Again and again the Communist world has refused permission for the United Nations supervision of elections in North Korea. Originally, this pattern led to the division of my country and ultimately to the Korean war. Since the armistice agreement in 1953 it has prevented a genuine political settlement of the Korean question.

An almost identical pattern occurred in Indochina. The same tragic design exists in Germany. We would be foolish, indeed, if we closed our eyes to the obvious pattern in the Middle East.

I am concerned about these times of crisis; also because I am afraid that our preoccupation with the well-publicized events and our concentration on the summit meeting may prevent us from noting events of equally great significance that are and shall be taking place in the Far East.

For example, in one southeast Asian country a rebellion against Communist infiltration in the central government is being ruthlessly suppressed with the aid of actual military weapons and material provided by the Soviet Union. In the same area, the tiny country of Laos is now in critical danger of being subverted by the Red tide of aggression. In my own country, we have seen a rash of outright acts of piracy in the air. The Communists in North Korea have increased their pressures tenfold during the past year hoping to break the economic and political back of my government. This they have attempted to do by stepping up their slanderous attacks upon my President and our Government and by seeking to isolate us economically through the conclusion of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

trade agreement with our nearest neighbor, Japan.

However, they have been unsuccessful. The recent election in the early part of May indicated that democracy is growing at a greater rate than ever before. We now have a flourishing two-party system. The incumbent Liberal Party won a majority of the votes in an election noted for its peaceful atmosphere and good self-regulation. Communist efforts to disrupt that election were completely thrwarted.

On August 15, our government will be celebrating its 10th anniversary. This celebration will mark the first decade of the existence of the Republic of Korea. This is a good time for a summing up of our accomplishments and a preview of our hopes for the future.

When President Syngman Rhee was installed as the first President of our country on August 15, 1948, in Seoul, he was faced with the enormous task of trying to create a functioning government in a half of a country which had been liberated just 3 short years before from Japanese occupation and which was politically inexperienced and economically deficient.

What has he accomplished?

As I pointed out before, he worked for and is now achieving a genuine two-party democratic political system. I am amused by the Communist charge that our President is a dictator. If he is, he is the only one in the history of the world who has as his vice president the outspoken leader of the opposition party.

We have accomplished a number of notable political reforms, such as direct voting privileges for both men and women, the establishment of provincial councils, the encouragement of political participation by our women, and a gradual expansion of sound foreign relationship with our friends abroad.

In the economic field, although severed in two by artificial division, the Republic of Korea has achieved stability and is reaching more closely toward the goal of complete economic independence. Thanks to the wonderful aid provided principally by the United States and the United Nations, we have rehabilitated our textile industries, restored our rice production to better than prewar levels, and have laid the foundation for a vast industrial complex that shall fulfill our hydroelectric power and fertilizer needs. We have constructed a new flat glass plant at Inchon, rehabilitated the cotton and woolen textile mills in Seoul, Taegu, and Pusan, and have put our coal and tungsten mines on a well-paying, productive basis.

In the field of social welfare, we have constructed dozens of hospitals and clinics, instituted programs for physicians and nurses, and have made my countrymen the most literate nation in Asia.

Several months ago, when I was home for consultation, I had an opportunity to go about the country and see for myself the remarkable signs of progress. Gradually the scars of Communist aggression are being erased. Smoke is coming from factory chimneys. New housing developments are going up. My countrymen appear to be better clothed and better fed than ever before in my memory. During this past quarter, for the first time in a decade, the wholesale price indexes, instead of rising, actually declined. The money rates have remained stable now for the past 6 months, indicating that the dangerous problem of inflation is well on its way toward solution. If we can count upon continued American aid for the next year or two, and if the people in Washington will grant some of our specific requests for moneys for important new productive facilities, I feel sure that the time will come soon when Korea will no longer be a burden upon the American taxpayer. I hope that you will help us plead our case.

It has been said that the first year of marriage is always the hardest and the first 10 years of any new country are also the hardest. We have had more than our share of troubles, but I think the way in which we have solved our problems indicates the inherent stability of my country and the dedication of my people.

It was the great British historian, Toynbee, who has argued that the annuals of history are largely written by a people being challenged; if they do not respond to the challenge they are obliterated, but if they do respond to the challenge they become a great nation. Our past dedication has been one of challenge and response.

Every day we constantly face new challenges. The greatest challenge right now is the possibility that our corner of the world, and particularly our country, will gradually slip back into the dimmer memories of our American friends. I want you to recognize along with us that there is a "clear and present danger" on the Korean peninsula. First, there is a dangerous military imbalance created by the Chinese Communists by bringing in planes, rebuilding airstrips, and replenishing men and supplies. As far as we are concerned, the Communists have so persistently and consistently violated the terms of the truce agreement that it does not in fact any longer exist.

The real danger in Korea is that the great American people, with all of their humaneness and easygoing way of life, may forget the horror that took place in Korea. It is well to remind ourselves from time to time of the bitter flavor of the free world's defensive crusade in Korea.

If you young women of America really want it, this can be the age of wisdom, the epoch of belief, the season of light, and the spring of hope. To paraphrase Dickens, we do, indeed, have everything before us, providing we see the world facts as they really are, remain resolute, and harden ourselves against the Communist barrage of lies.

It would be my hope that when you return to your respective States, you take every opportunity to tell your young associates how critical are these times and how necessary it is for Americans everywhere to be concerned with world affairs. I hope you will tell them something of the Korean cause. I hope you will tell them something of the growing desire of all the free peoples of the world for peace and security, a strengthened United Nations, and a turning back of the Red tide of aggression.

While I am a doctor, I hope your final impression of me is not that of the Witch Doctor. I have tried to be simply a reporter, tell you not A Tale of Two Cities, but a tale of two worlds. Make no mistake about it: Should our world, the free world, be destroyed by the Communist world, there would never again be a Girls Nation; the liberty to enjoy whatever fads and strange music would die; and, indeed, life as we enjoy it now would no longer be possible. I have great faith in the youth of America, because of their energy, their enthusiasm, and their wonderful articulateness. I hope that you will accept the challenge to join in the leadership to preserve the free world.

I thank you.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of articles which have appeared during the past days in the New York Times.

The events in Poland have caused the greatest concern to all friends of the Polish people and to men of all faiths. The situation in Poland is most precarious, and I insert these articles in the interest of clarifying the picture.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1958]

POLES KEEP CURB ON FARMS' SALES—REGIME DEFERS THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY DELIVERIES OF GRAIN AND POTATOES

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

WARSAW, July 28.—Poland's peasants were told by the Government today that they would have to continue compulsory deliveries of grain and potatoes to the state.

The decision to make deliveries compulsory for this year's harvest was taken by the Council of Ministers. It is important politically as well as economically.

After the political upheaval of 1956, when Wladyslaw Gomulka returned to power as first secretary of the Communist Party, the Government took several agricultural measures to win the confidence of the peasants. These included free sale of land, lower taxation, the breaking up of most of the collective farms and reduction of compulsory deliveries of grain at fixed prices.

The peasants also won the promise that compulsory deliveries at state prices—which are sometimes less than half of what the product would bring on the free market—would be terminated. Since 1956, compulsory delivery of milk has been abolished, compulsory deliveries of wheat have been cut by one-third and the state price of wheat has been raised.

REMINDER BY PEASANTS

But peasant leaders have urged the Government not to forget its promise to abolish compulsory deliveries. They said that the confidence of the farmers depended on keeping that promise.

The fact that the peasants have achieved a measure of economic confidence can be seen almost everywhere in the Polish countryside. The peasants are putting more of their money into farms, as new brick buildings, new barns, and new equipment show.

Today's announcement gave new price concessions to the farmers but made it clear that the Government felt it could not now afford to abolish the compulsory deliveries.

The Government explained its decision by pointing to Poland's poor balance sheet for grain. Last year the country had to import about 1,200,000 tons of grains. This year's floods will probably increase the food import bill and make Poland more dependent in shipments from the Soviet Union.

STATE PRICE OF RYE RAISED

The Government decision calls for compulsory delivery of 1,040,000 tons of grain, about the same amount as last year. But the Government has decided to raise the state price of rye by 25 percent, 150 zlotys for 200 pounds, or about $6 at the official exchange rate. This increase is not likely to be welcomed wildly by the peasants, who can get almost twice as much for the rye they are allowed to sell on the free market.

The Government took other steps to sweeten its decision. Local councils in the mountain regions will be allowed to exempt farmers from compulsory deliveries of grain and potatoes to encourage them to step up stock breeding. Peasants hard hit by the floods also will get special relief. All told, these concessions will amount to 60,000 tons.

The price of potatoes was raised, too, and Trybuna Ludu, the Communist Party paper, made it clear that the promise of abolition

of compulsory deliveries had not been permanently shelved. The newspaper said the changes were part of the transition from compulsory deliveries to a system of market purchasing.

CATHOLICS ASSAIL POLISH REGIME FOR POLICE INVASION OF SHRINE

WARSAW, July 28.—Official Roman Catholic sources accused the Polish Government today of having broken the law, violated the rights of citizens, and shocked the religious feelings of the nation.

These charges, which brought church-state relations in Poland to the lowest point in 2 years, grew out of the invasion of the ancient monastery of Jasna Gora on July 21 by the Polish police.

No reports of the search of the offices of a religious organization at the monastery have been carried so far by the Polish press. But the story of the incident at the pilgrimage city of Czestochowa is now known to all residents of that city and is beginning to circulate in Warsaw.

Yesterday, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland, attended a special mass at Czestochowa at which a letter from the bishop of the city protesting the search as an insult to the shrine was read from the pulpit.

LEGAL ANALYSIS PREPARED

Today, church sources close to the cardinal prepared a detailed account of the incident and a legal analysis.

The importance of the controversy goes far beyond any legal issues. Jasna Gora, the Mountain of Light, is the holiest shrine in Poland. It has deep emotional and national connotations to most Poles as well as a religious place in the history of the nation. The decision of the Government to search the offices on the monastery grounds was a grave one and a reflection of the belief of important Communists that the political powers of the church was growing.

GATE FORCED BY MILITIA

According to the version of the story given by church sources here, the first search party ransacked the offices of the religious institute directed by the cardinal, buffeted priests and officeworkers, and cut telephone lines. Pilgrims on the grounds, according to this account, protested the action.

At 9 p. m., 6 hours after the search began, priests locked the gate for the evening. The police searchers then used a shortwave radio to call for help.

About 200 helmeted militiamen, armed with truncheons, arrived in trucks, crashed through the gate, and attacked the crowd, according to this account, "beating up everybody without regard for women, children, or priests."

The sources said the state prosecutors had asserted they were looking for mimeographed material printed without having been passed by the censorship. The legal position taken by the church is that as a social organization it is exempt from censorship in certain cases.

"The prosecution itself, in a drastic way, violated legal order and essential citizens' rights," said the statement by the church sources. "This action must shock the whole nation, which has been hurt in its most delicate religious feelings."

[From the New York Times of July 30, 1958]

RIFT WITH CHURCH WIDENS IN POLAND—GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNIST PARTY ACCUSE CATHOLICS OF ANTISTATE MOVES

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

WARSAW, July 29.—The Polish Government and the Communist Party publicly recognized today the rapidly deepening rift between the state and the Roman Catholic Church. Two major political attacks were directed against church authorities.

The office of the prosecutor general accused church officials of issuing publications with an antistate context directed against the existing regime.

The prosecutor also charged that certain circles, apparently church circles, had put out false information about the police search of the monastery of Jasna Gora July 21 and warned that criminal proceedings would be started.

In the second political move, the official theoretical monthly of the Communist Party printed a long and sharp article accusing the church of carrying on a nationwide political campaign aimed at establishing the influence of the church over the Government in the interests of reactionary social forces.

RELATIONS GROW WORSE

These two moves brought into the open the fact that relations between the church and the state, which both sides insist are vital for the stability of the nation, have taken a sharp, serious turn for the worse.

The publication in Monday's edition of the New York Times of a story of the incident at Jasna Gora, Poland's holiest shrine, prompted today's statement by the prosecutor giving the Government's account of the episode. But the search of the offices of a religious organization on the grounds of the sanctuary was a symptom of the deteriorating church-state relations rather than its direct cause.

This deterioration has been deeply disturbing church and state officials for weeks. At the moment nobody knows how far and deeply it will go. There is no mood of optimism in Warsaw at the moment. But on both sides there are leaders who feel it would be a disaster for the nation if the church-state agreement worked out in 1957 was wrecked.

Both sides have major complaints.

COMPLAINTS OF COMMUNISTS

The Polish Communist Party believes the church thinks the moment has come when its own strength and the trouble within the Communist world makes a church political offensive possible. The party says the church has received rights in Poland not given to it in nations of the West but is abusing them for political aims.

Party leaders say pilgrimages organized by the church are political rallies in disguise, that the church is violating state laws and that it is spreading intolerance of other faiths and encouraging attacks against nonbelievers.

The Roman Catholic Church says the government is interfering with church rights, particularly religious education, the distribution of charitable gifts from abroad and the organizing of pilgrimages and religious rededication.

Jasna Gora and Szestochowa, the city in which it stands, are the symbols of Polish Roman Catholicism and to the church the search on the monastery grounds is proof that the state has decided to use its heavy weapons.

The statement of the prosecutor's office issued today said the search at the religious institute under the direction of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski on the monastery grounds was conducted because illegal publishing was carried out on the premises. The statement said laws requiring approval by censorship and registration of implements of publication, presumably mimeograph machines, had been violated.

The statement went to say that a previous warning had been ignored and that the search July 21 had uncovered many publications with an antistate context. The prosecutor said the church had used the monastery as a cover for its illegal activities of publication.

According to the government version 10 to 20 policemen were called in to put down resistance in the monastery. Church sources in Czectochowa said there were 40 policemen. Church sources in Warsaw said there were 200 policemen.

The prosecutor took note of comments made here yesterday by church sources. His statement said the information spread by these certain circles were lies and criminal action would be taken.

STATEMENT MAY BE PUBLISHED

The prosecutor's statement is expected to be printed in tomorrow's newspaper. This will be the first word Polish papers will have carried about the Gasna Gora incident.

However, party members have before them now an even sharper criticism, issued by Nowe Drogy, official monthly publication of the Polish United Workers (Communist) Party. The article, written by Josef Siemek, deputy director of the press bureau of the Communist Party, carried an attack against Bishop Zdzislaw Golinski of Czestochowa. It accused him of having made a speech to lawyers on a pilgrimage that could be interpreted only as instruction to treat leniently persons who had committed economic crimes.

"Will it not be justified if state authorities will not see the possibility of keeping in court service members of these pilgrimages and especially organizers to whom such instructions are given?" asked the article.

The article said church policy in Poland had become a political action and that the "Polish way" was being opposed "by the Vatican way, a way dictated by the raison d'etat of the International anti-Communist crusade of balancing on the brink of war."

[From the New York Times of July 31, 1958]

POLES ASK CHURCH TO MEET ON RIFT—HIGH OFFICIALS SET PARLEY TODAY ON THE GROWING CRISIS IN RELATIONS

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

WARSAW, July 30.—The Polish Government has called high authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to a special conference here tomorrow on the critically sharp relations between the church and the Communist regime.

The decision to call the meeting was accepted today by political circles here as a plain indication as to just how seriously the Government and the Communist Party took the disputes between the church and the state.

These disputes, a matter of whispers, a few weeks ago, were dramatized recently by government search of Catholic offices in an ancient monastery. Now the disputes are being related in detail in the party press.

Still not a matter for public discussion is the role of the Soviet Union in the current crisis.

Some Catholic laymen believe the state has adopted a tougher policy in response to Soviet pressures or at least to Soviet displeasure about the freedoms given to the church in Poland.

SOVIET SUSPICION NOTED

There are Communists in Warsaw who also stress the role of the Soviet Union, but from a different viewpoint. They say that Moscow has always looked with suspicion at Warsaw's policy of friendly coexistence with the church. They say church leaders have gone in heavily for politics in the last few months, that this builds up Moscow's case against Poland's church policy and forces the state to counterattack before Soviet pressure gets too heavy.

In any case, the Government indicated today that while it still hoped to narrow the gap between church and state it was prepared to fight against church illegalities and political influence.

The psychological atmosphere for tomorrow's conference—at which two bishops will

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sit down with two high Government officials—was indicated today by Jerzy Sztachelski, a calmly spoken, gray-haired man who is Minister of State for Religious Affairs.

M. Sztachelski, in a talk with foreign correspondents, said the Government's attitude toward church-state relations had not changed. He said that freedom of religion would be enjoyed by all Poles, that there would be no interference in the internal affairs of the church and that the principle of friendly coexistence between church and state would be maintained.

But M. Sztachelski also emphasized the state's sharp charges against the church. He said that ever since Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland, returned from a visit to Rome last year he had stopped saying positive things and the church was now emphasizing the differences with the state.

The minister said there was an "aggressive tendency" on the part of the church to impose a religious character on education, intimidate nonbelievers through pressures, and arouse the Polish youth.

Under a church-state agreement of December 1956, the state agreed to set aside schooltime for religious education. The state says the church now is trying to use this right as a method of getting control of the schools. The church says the state refuses to accept certain priests, monks, and nuns as teachers.

MONASTERY RAID RELATED

ROME, July 30.—Concern over renewed church-state tension in Poland was voiced in the Vatican today.

The police raid on the shrine of Jasna Gora at Czetochowa July 21 was termed here the most flagrant but by no means the sole violation of a truce that has existed between the church and the state since 1956.

It is seen as significant that the target of the most serious incident in church-state relations in the last 2 years was the office of the primate, which is the center of propagation of church doctrine. This institution was set up in the Jasna Gora monastery in May 1957, under the auspices of Cardinal Wyszynski.

The purpose of the office was to make public the teaching of the primate and of other members of the hierarchy and to issue instructions of a "strictly catechistic nature," it is said in the Vatican. The contention here is that Polish laws expressly exempted from censorship church publications such as those issued by the office of the primate.

Last May 13 the police attempted to search the office, Vatican sources say. Polish church protests elicited assurances on July 17 that similar incidents would not occur again.

Four days later the monastery was raided again. According to unofficial reports, 200 policemen participated in the raid. They used a truck to force open the gate of the Jasna Gora monastery, which houses Poland's national shrine and the office of the primate. Although without a search warrant, the policemen ransacked offices, seized equipment and documents, and detained several persons, these reports say. It is not known whether churchmen were among the detained.

Brig. Gen. Joseph W. Beacham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, July 29, 1958, at the age of 84, there passed away at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., one of my dearest friends. I refer to Brig. Gen. Joseph W. Beacham, my first football captain. Those of my colleagues who have played the game know how deep the devotion is between those who have battled on the gridiron together for the honor, prestige, and glory of their alma mater. As a mark of my deep affection and esteem for my lifelong friend, I want others to know the record of this great patriot and leader of men. Many are the men whose character has been shaped and enriched, ennobled and inspired by the influence of Joe Beacham. There are generations of Cornell University men who will mourn the passing of a man who throughout his long and useful life has been their ideal athlete, soldier, officer, and friend. As a part of my remarks I insert an article which appeared in the Washington Star of July 30, 1958, the day following the death of my beloved and lifelong friend:

GENERAL BEACHAM, EISENHOWER'S WEST POINT FOOTBALL COACH

Brig. Gen. Joseph W. Beacham, an Army officer for 40 years and President Eisenhower's football coach at West Point, died Monday in Walter Reed Hospital. He was 84.

Recalling the football days of the Cadet Eisenhower, General Beacham once said: "He had a lot of promise. He needed a little seasoning, but he would have been All-American if he hadn't hurt his knee."

The two men met for the first time since West Point days in 1953 when President and Mrs. Eisenhower entertained sick and disabled veterans and service personnel at the White House. The President's most enthusiastic greeting was for the retired general. "Oh, brother, are you as tough as you used to be?" he asked.

WON SCHOLARSHIP

General Beacham was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., and attended public schools there. An energetic student, he won a competitive scholarship to Cornell University in 1893. He majored in law but took more than an average interest in athletics.

He gained a place among Cornell football greats when he was picked second string All-American end in 1895 and 1896. After his graduation he remained at Cornell to coach the team the following season.

He began his military career in 1898 as an Army private and rose to the rank of first sergeant under Gen. Peyton March during the Spanish-American War. During the battle of Manila, he was recommended for commission for gallantry in action.

The general was head coach at the Academy in 1911. He returned to line duty in 1912 and was sent to France at the outbreak of World War I. He was assigned to General Pershing's staff and formed a close friendship with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, with whom he was quartered. During the war he earned the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the French Croix de Guerre with Palm, the order L'Etoile Noitre, and the Greek Order of Redeemer.

RETIRED IN 1938

The general retired in 1938 and moved to the Army-Navy Club here in 1948, shortly after the death of his wife, the former Bernadette M. Herman.

His eyesight continued to fail and eventually he was confined to his room at the Army-Navy Club.

Funeral arrangements are being handled by Chambers Funeral Home at 1400 Chapin Street NW. Services will be held at 11 a. m. tomorrow in Fort Myer Chapel with burial in Arlington Cemetery.

The Kennedy-Ives Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is an analysis of the Kennedy-Ives bill by competent legal minds which have been consulted by Mr. Edward J. Hughes, vice president of the Westchester County Publishers, Inc., White Plains, N. Y.

The far-reaching effects of the Kennedy-Ives bill, if it were passed, are almost frightening to contemplate and it is a mystery to the Representative from New York and to many of his constituents how the Senate could have condoned such a measure.

Here is a summary of the objections to particular provisions of the Kennedy-Ives measure as carefully analyzed.

First. By revising the definition of "supervisor" as now spelled out in the Taft-Hartley bill, the new measure will permit unions to grab off many confidential management workers—people like the confidential secretaries of executives, draftsmen engaged in creative work on highly competitive projects, and so forth. This will be done by the seemingly innocent requirement that a supervisor be only a person who actually and directly controls the activities of other persons.

Second. The Kennedy-Ives bill not only fails to prohibit evil organizational or recognition picketing but, by legal implication, gives such picketing a statutory blessing it does not now have under Taft-Hartley. In other words, it would make vicious picketing even more vicious.

Third. The bill would remove from Taft-Hartley the section which prohibits strikers from voting in a representation election. This will throw the doors wide open to strike-happy unions, which will be able to recklessly call men out without risking loss of representation. This long has been one of the most-sought-after union weapons—now seemingly to be handed to the unions on a congressional silver platter.

Fourth. Under the pious guise of outlawing bribery by an employer, weasel language in the bill sets an employer up for criminal prosecution if, for example, he exercises his Taft-Hartley law right to make a speech urging his employees to vote against a union. The Kennedy-Ives bill would cunningly make it a crime for an employer to pay or lend anything of value to his employees to get them to adopt his views, so, unless he docked his workers for the time spent listening to his speech, he could be criminally prosecuted for attempting to bribe them.

Fifth. One of the cutest bear traps in the Kennedy-Ives bill is section 103, which requires, with seeming propriety, that an employer who spends more than $5,000 in a fiscal year for activities intended to influence or affect employees in the exercise of rights must file a detailed report of such expenditures with the Secretary of Labor. If the employer

fails, even innocently, to file such a report, he may be fined $10,000 or be sent to jail for a year. On the other hand, if he does file such a report, and the Labor Department decides some of the things he reported were wrong, he may be criminally prosecuted, with his report standing against him as a confession. Thus he would, as a practical matter, be forced to testify against himself—in violation of one of his fundamental constitutional rights.

Under this same section of the bill, an employer who assigns an executive to time-consuming but legal efforts to convince a group of workers they should not join a particular union could be prosecuted if he failed to report the nature of those efforts and the amount of the executive's salary, and, if he did report, could still be criminally prosecuted if the executive's procedures were regarded as wrong by the Secretary of Labor.

Still under this section 103, the words "influence or affect" may be so broadly interpreted as to compel even an attorney, if engaged as a labor consultant, to report everything he said and did in a labor-relations campaign, disclose all fees received by him and all disbursements made by him, even though such disclosures by attorneys are expressly forbidden by numerous State laws.

Legal experts say there are numerous other camouflaged booby traps in the Kennedy-Ives bill, which is, it would seem obvious, why its proponents rushed it through the Senate and now seek to railroad it through the House.

Thus, apparently, the "boss" is in for a new shellacking at the hands of the labor lobby in Washington. Professional labor leaders are willing to take some regulation of their spending, lending, and other heretofore uncontrolled practices, as a cheap price to pay for a nice, shiny, new set of clubs to be whacked against the skulls of even law-abiding employers.

A National Debt to a Modest Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of July 28, 1958:

A NATIONAL DEBT TO A MODEST MAN

As Robert P. Clark noted in his Washington column in the Courier Journal the other day, Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH's decision to retire from Congress is of interest in Louisville on account of ties of family and friendship here. More than this, it is a matter of serious loss to the House of Representatives and thus to the whole Nation.

Already well experienced in important public affairs, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was elected to the House 30 years ago from a Massachusetts district and has served continuously ever since. During that whole period he has never sought a headline or any kind of personal preferment. Undoubtedly he has performed the parochial duties which constituents expect of a Congressman. Yet also as a member of the House Appropriations Committee he has been for many years an effective participant in the conduct of the entire country's business, both in peace and war.

This has required hard-working diligence, even drudgery. But no mere drudge ever had as much wisdom, spirit and humor as have marked Mr. WIGGLESWORTH's character and career. We are glad that the voters of his Massachusetts district have so long and so consistently recognized his worth and would very likely continue to do so as long as he chose to ask for their suffrage. Yet it is a pity that he is less well known to the country at large than some of the noisy windbags we have to read about in the Washington dispatches every day.

He is a conservative Republican whose politics have seldom agreed with this newspaper's but by their honesty and courage have always compelled our respect.

Washington Post Slurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, commenting yesterday on the tactics of Khrushchev and his efforts to divide the allies, had this to say:

"The whole plot is so palpable that one wonders why politicians or left-wing editorial writers lend themselves to anything that strengthens the Khrushchev hand at the expense of their own government."

In that connection, I note that on last Tuesday, the Washington poison pot, the Washington Post, spewed its editorial venom with a fine impartiality as between the quick and the dead.

Because the President of the United States has not enthusiastically welcomed Mr. Khrushchev's acceptance of his self-extended invitation to New York City, the Washington Post insultingly referred to the surly tone of President Eisenhower's last note.

And in its grudging editorial acknowledgment of the valor and military skill of the lamented Lt. Gen. Claire Chennault, the Washington Post could not forebear a slurring reference to what it called Chennault's unrealistic, stormy championship of reconquest of the mainland of China, and to the outmoded clique on Formosa.

Having contributed so much in the past to the public and official acceptance of the false premises which helped lose China to the free world, and now so assiduously supporting the line of coexistence and so-called flexibility in dealings with Moscow, I presume the Washington Post will hereafter judge equally unrealistic any subsequent American efforts to regain past, present, and future losses to international communism.

Erwin C. Uihlein on the Importance of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to James W. Martin, of Milwaukee, for calling my attention to the inspiring address by Erwin C. Uihlein, president of the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., at the 1958 sales convention of representatives of the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co. from the 48 States. Mr. Uihlein's remarks illustrate the family spirit which pervades this great organization, now in its 108th year. I commend to the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle the following address by Mr. Uihlein:

It is always a pleasure to see you and to realize what a fine body of people we have representing us in the field. This is very gratifying for no company is better than the men who represent it in the local communities of the Nation. Ours is no exception.

I understand that in the main you have had a good meeting, and I hope that you will all return to your respective areas better informed and oriented as to what we have in mind for 1958.

As our company becomes bigger and bigger, it becomes increasingly more difficult to continue to think of ourselves as just one big family. Unfortunately, that is one of the penalties that leadership has to pay in any industry. Nonetheless, we still manage to maintain that family feeling, and I, for one, hope it is a virtue that our organization will never lose.

While we are proud of our sales record, proud of the progress we have made in Milwaukee, proud of our plants in Brooklyn, Van Nuys, and Kansas City, and the great new Schlitz brewery now under construction in Tampa, Fla., such occasions as the present one should remind us all that in the last analysis it is the people, rather than things, that make an institution great.

We, the people, so to speak, are more important than tools and buildings, for however fine in the beginning, mechanical or material things wear out, and it is always the people—the thinkers and doers, and those who love their work, no matter how humble—who are capable of carrying the torch and passing it on to new generations and new workers who will arrive to take our place.

We, the people, are the spiritual essence of this company, whatever may be its ultimate destiny, or however big it may become.

We have countless treasures in our national history which I could recall to you today, but I should like to quote the remarks of just one man, Abraham Lincoln. He was a giant of a man, physically, spiritually, intellectually. I wonder what might have been the history of our country if providence had not supplied us this leader in its grave hour of decision. He was American to the core, a product of its environments, of its fields, and plains, and forests. He was intensely loyal to our Na-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tion, yet his philosophy transcends national boundaries and because of this he is today revered in many parts of the world.

Abraham Lincoln said: "You cannot bring prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Here, in nine short sentences, is a whole philosophy to guide a perplexed and confused humanity, as individuals in our daily affairs, in our relations with our fellow employees, with our community and in our national and international life.

This has always been our philosophy—ever since the company was founded in 1849. From the small beginning that year when Schlitz sales were a meager 150 barrels, it has been our aim to make a product that Americans wanted, and to build an institution which would merit the respect of our fellow citizens. This has been our single-minded purpose. Hard work, initiative, imagination, and, above all, the voluntary cooperation of every employee have built a world-famous product and an equally famous and respected institution. Today, 108 years later, I have the pleasure of congratulating you on another year of outstanding achievement.

Not only do you deserve to be congratulated for this accomplishment, but I also want to thank you. This could not have been achieved without the wholehearted support of everyone in this room, our plants in Milwaukee, Brooklyn, Van Nuys, and Kansas City, and our wholesalers and salesmen. You have my assurance that the entire organization will do its utmost to stand by and support you in every phase of our work in 1958 so that together we may carry this great company's sales to still greater heights.

What of 1958 and the years ahead? You know of our plans for the new Florida plant. These are physical plans.

If to these plans we add the counsel of Abraham Lincoln, we can face the future with faith and confidence.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we in the Middle West near the Great Lakes are all familiar with an object called the sea lamprey. It has depleted our once-abundant fishing grounds. It has thrown many of our fishermen out of work. It has cut sizably into the economy of our State.

The sea lamprey's method of attack is quite simple. It attaches itself to the side of a fish and hooks a free ride. It lives off the blood of the fish until it finally drains it dry, killing the fish.

We are faced with a similar problem in our consideration of S. 1869, which has been reported out of the House Public Works Committee. We are talking about the Tennessee Valley Authority and its relationship to the Federal Government. This bill would give the TVA the power to attach itself firmly to the Federal Treasury, draining it in gigantic gulps. We would give this agency the power to ride and grow alongside the Federal Government, but not as a part of the Federal Government. It would bear no direct responsibility to either Congress or the executive branch, nor would it be an integral part of the Federal structure.

The poor fish, of course, would be the Federal Government and the people who pay the taxes. We would be enlarging to tremendous proportions a parasite with the function of draining off Federal funds and growing in any direction it chooses.

We in the vicinity of the Great Lakes have taken a number of steps—with Federal help, by the way—to kill off these parasites. We have used electric fences and poisons to destroy them in their spawning grounds.

The spawning ground for the Tennessee Valley Authority is right here in Congress. We have the power of life and death over the Authority. Now I am not proposing that we kill the TVA, but I do propose that we shock it a little. Let us not give this parasite agency of the Federal Government the power to grow into something which can be dangerous. Let us keep it firmly in check and make it answer to Congress, its spawning ground, if it oversteps its borders or infringes upon the rights of our American taxpayers.

Let us always remember that the Tennessee Valley Authority is a parasite. It lives off the Federal Government. It feeds on the pocketbooks of our taxpayers, both directly and indirectly.

Let us defeat S. 1869 and keep this Government-created parasite in check.

Retirement of Joseph Warren Severy From Montana State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last month a group of his former students gathered at a dinner in Missoula, Mont., to honor Dr. Joseph W. Severy on his retirement from the faculty of Montana State University.

Dr. Severy is a botanist but he ranged far into the related fields of wildlife and resource management to make a solid contribution to conservation throughout the Nation.

He helped organize a statewide conservation committee and develop a course syllabus, now widely used. His pioneer work in developing a wildlife forum course for sportsmen, stockmen, and other lay citizens has resulted in a program now available to widely scattered sportsmen groups in various parts of the State. He assumed an active interest in the organization of the Montana Conservation Council. He served as a member of the Montana Fish and Game Commission for 8 years, 3 of them as chairman. In 1952, he received the award of merit from the National Association of Conservation Education. In 1953, he received the Nash conservation award for meritorous service in the field of conservation education.

It is noteworthy that many of Dr. Severy's former students occupy responsible positions as natural resources administrators with Federal, State, and private agencies and organizations. I am sure these men, and the cause of conservation, will benefit everlastingly from the understanding and appreciation of adequate natural resources management programs given them by Dr. Severy.

Here is a resolution, adopted by the Montana State Board of Education paying tribute to Dr. Severy:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, APRIL 14, 1958, ON RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH WARREN SEVERY FROM MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Resolved, That upon the retirement of Joseph Warren Severy from Montana State University, the State board of education joins the students, faculty and a grateful citizenry, in expressing appreciation of the years of service he has given the State. "An inspiring and convincing teacher and speaker he is equally at home in the academic atmosphere of the campus or in the forest and field amongst foresters, ranchers and sportsmen."

Very early in his career as a teacher and a citizen of Montana, his infectious interest in his chosen field, Botany, and related fields of wildlife and resource management, became felt throughout the State and the Northwest. Among his contributions, in the field of plant ecology and conservation, was his active support in organizing a statewide conservation committee and developing a course syllabus, now widely used. His pioneer work in developing a wildlife forum course for sportsmen, stockmen and other lay citizens has resulted in a program now available to widely scattered sportsmen groups in various parts of the State. He was instrumental in developing the course in Wildlife Technology. He assumed an active interest in the organization of the Montana Conservation Council, and has served as director and council member almost continuously since its inception. His interest in basic scientific research is evidenced by his active leadership and participation in the Northwest Science Association, serving as its president from 1942–45. His ability to translate scientific principles into practice is exemplified by the important position he occupied for 8 years as a member of the Montana Fish and Game Commission, 3 years of which he served as chairman.

His services have been constantly sought by civic, educational, and other lay organizations, and since 1950 he has occupied the chairmanship of the Missoula Labor-Management Board. For several years he has served on the Lolo National Forest Advisory Council. He received the award of merit from the National Association of Conservation Education in 1952. In 1953, he received the Nash conservation award for meritorious service in the field of conservation education. Recently he was elected honorary president of the Montana Wildlife Federation.

That the community and State demands on his time did not diminish his responsibilities to or his activities at the univer-

sity, is demonstrated by more than a quarter of a century service as chairman of the department of botany. He has served as vice president of the university, and has been a member of practically all the important appointed and elected faculty committees. He has been an inspiring teacher, sympathetic counselor, enthusiastic worker for his university, and above all, a citizen dedicated to his community and State. Montana is infinitely richer for having claimed him as one of her own.

Conflicting Comment of Capital Columnists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that American columnists mold public opinion to an extent not warranted by their access to factual data. Each day we are treated to what amounts to one man's opinion, dished up in a style which would seem to compel us to accept it as the last word. However, these men are fallible; and, from all of this welter of words that pour out of editorial offices and the National Press Building, just what is one to accept as authoritative?

For example, in yesterday's Evening Star an editorial entitled "Shaken Alliance" throws some cold water on Secretary Dulles' efforts to strengthen the Baghdad Pact. In the same paper, on the other hand, the brilliant Constantine Brown titles his column "New Life in the Baghdad Pact" and on that subject has this to say:

Mr. Dulles' commitment, with the full approval of President Eisenhower, that we will resist to the limit of our power any "direct or indirect" aggression against our Baghdad Pact allies was manna from heaven to all of them. It indicated that Washington had not really "caved in" before Mr. Khrushchev and his associates and that we intended to support these three free nations with everything we have.

In the same issue of the Evening Star and on the same general subject of our involvement in the Middle East, William S. White appropriately emphasizes a crucial point by labeling his column "Quieting the Destructive Clamor." He then goes on to describe President Eisenhower's prestige as falling at a frightening rate although he completely ignores the latest Gallup poll which reports that 68 percent of our people approve of the President's action. Further along, however, he makes a contribution to congressional solidarity by ascribing to the Democrat leadership this observation:

That many critics of the President's intervention in the Middle East properly stress its awkwardness and danger—but forget that but for this intervention, an admittedly bad situation would be far worse. For one thing Lebanon and Jordan would be gone, too, and with them the last hope of keeping Turkey's 20-odd divisions effectively in the Western alliance.

It is also noted that Mr. White properly comments on Republican criticism of Mr. Truman's "police action" in Korea but ignores the fact that most of that criticism was directed at Dean Acheson's virtual invitation to the Communists to attack, our woeful unpreparedness at the outset of that conflict, and our complete failure to carry the fight to the Chinese beyond the Yalu River.

All of us have our preferences and I have never made a secret of my partiality for the views and opinions of David Lawrence. By long odds he is my favorite columnist and this extract from yesterday's article, Khrushchev Unmasks Himself, in my opinion, sets what I think should be the general tone of all editorial opinion in this uncertain period:

One of the principal weaknesses in the American position is the petty attitude of so many antiadministration newspapers in this locality which, because of their deep-seated political and ideological antagonisms domestically, are pouring out criticisms that are gleefully quoted by the Soviets over the radio to the Mideast and the world generally. Such criticisms taken from American newspapers blame the United States for the Middle East situation and back up accusations of aggression. There seems also to be a delight in minimizing what the Communists have done to cause much of the trouble in that part of the world.

To sum up and to put things in their proper place, it seems to me that the time has arrived when we should ignore this Nation's detractors and return to the philosophy of an American hero of another age, Stephen Decatur, who left his mark in the Middle East and on the pages of history when he said, "My country, may she ever be right; but, right or wrong, my country."

"Big Jim"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to the editor of the New York Post, entitled "Dear Jim," referring to the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, and published on July 25, 1958:

"BIG JIM"

DEAR EDITOR: An outstanding injustice has been done Hon. James A. Farley in an article by Arthur Massolo in the Sunday, July 20, Post. It is therein stated that the United States Senate candidacy of Mr. Farley is not even genuine; that a a given signal he will step aside in favor of Mayor Wagner "or some Irish Catholic."

No such story should drip off the end of an American pen without supporting evidence.

Of course Messrs. Farley and Wagner do both happen to be Catholics. I happen to be a Jew. I don't know the religious affiliation of the person or persons from whom your scribe obtained his information—and I care less.

However, very many Americans do care enormously about loose accusations being made to the effect that James A. Farley, universally respected as one of our great living Americans, would place religious affiliations above duty to party and to country.

Americans know that no man has demonstrated complete freedom from bigotry more than has "Big Jim." Your own editorials have conceded how well he is able to retain friendships with those with whom he may happen to differ.

Among Americans of good will of all creeds, sniping of the type just attempted will only increase the stature of "Big Jim" that much more, and it will cause thoughtful Americans everywhere to ponder how much men possessed of his genuine qualifications are needed in the United States Senate in these especially trying times.

MANUEL DITTENHEIMER.

Four Truths for Betancourt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I read with some amazement, and certainly more interest, the exchanges between the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Oregon. I am not prepared to say who may be right or wrong, but I can vouch my own experience. When the Alaska statehood bill was before the House I noted that the gentleman from Oregon had arranged for an hour before the House. I promptly telephoned him to inquire whether or not he was going to speak on Latin American affairs and was told by the gentleman that he was not. The following day I read with surprise that his entire time was devoted to Latin America. The House will have to judge in the light of the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee and my own.

I read with real interest the statement by the gentleman from Oregon to the House upon his return from Venezuela that some of his remarks against communism failed to be printed in the press of that country. I am not at all surprised that they were not printed, if they were said. So far as consultation with the State Department is concerned, the gentleman from Oregon makes much of this. I, too, was called by the State Department and asked into consultation, but I declined the briefing with the pointed remark that I wish they would spend more time giving other people with distorted views the real facts.

I state without fear of challenge that Mr. Betancourt, of Venezuela, has fomented revolution not only there, but everywhere in the Americas. I know what I am talking about, and my only regret is that I am unable to produce the documents for the House. I deplore any attempts to lionize him in the Congress and to speak of his honorable desires for peace and democracy. There are other things the controlled press of Venezuela do not print these days.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I want to offer at this time a copy of a letter from a responsible person in Venezuela which has not been printed in the Venezuela press. I think this offers some light on the present political party in Venezuela headed by Mr. Betancourt which may illuminate the public discussion:

FOUR TRUTHS FOR BETANCOURT

(This letter from a member of the Democratic Action is being hand circulated because its publication in Venezuela has been prohibited. Here is what the Venezuelan newspapers have not been able to print)

CARACAS, *February 10, 1958.*

Mr. RÓMULO BETANCOURT,
City.

DEAR FRIEND: Upon your return to your country I take pleasure in extending to you my greetings and sincere good wishes because you are at the side of your distinguished wife reveling in the enjoyment of your country and your people. You should be pleased inasmuch as the reception which was accorded to you has been, without any doubt, [a] multitudinous [one], as you used to say in your younger years. Since the overthrow of the government of Gen. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, all of Venezuela has been waiting for your arrival, waiting, especially, to hear the speech that you would be making to the people after long years of expatriation. All of Venezuela has listened attentively to your speech which has been generously broadcast all over the country; a large part of the population heard you with rapture, but the other part interpreted your words with deep concern and attention. In your delivery it was noted that the eloquence as leader of masses which you had displayed in 1928 had undergone a radical change.

Business, the bank, big industry, people with money, high society, producers, cattlemen, farmers, the enormous group of independent politicians and, finally, those who are members of the political parties formerly opposed to the Acción Democrática ["Democratic Action"] government * * * were afraid of your return * * * and of what you would say.

Fortunately for everybody you have changed, "but grown older, your dignity more assured and more deliberate owing to experience and wisdom acquired."

When you spoke to the people you admitted that, "the term of government was characterized by the political immaturity of yourself and of all the parties, and by unnecessary aggression among them"; and therefore you preach and fervently pray for unity.

In these times of democracy there is much talk of unity. Up to now I have not been able to comprehend the real political meaning of that word.

I read that "if your presence would cause a break in unity you would refrain from coming back." You stated that you "have never been against unity and that you are willing to propitiate it to the fullest possible extent."

You ought to know what unity is.

Would you like to tell me, and explain to me in detail, what unity is? What are the principles sustaining it? What is its purpose? What group or party would it really benefit? How long will it last? Against whom is it directed? How would a break occur?

Nobody I know has thoroughly explained the political meaning of that word which has been repeated over and over again in every speech and political sermon of recent date. It has been said that those who are against unity will be considered enemies of the people and, as I don't want to commit a crime due to lack of knowledge or ignorance, I ask you to explain to me: What is unity?

As for your statements, I quite agree with you that the Armed Forces are indispensable. Had the army not intervened in the overthrow of Marcos Perez Jimenez, we would be suffering, instead of breathing the beneficial democratic air, under the most terrible and bloody dictatorship in the history of Venezuela.

You said in your speech: "The overthrow of the dictatorship was the culmination of a process of resistance which began on that same November 25, 1948, when the men in the prisons, in the concentration camps, in exile, and in the underground proved that a passionate desire for freedom was alive, uniting the people from shoeshine-boy to millionaire." On this point, my friend, we are not in agreement; it seems, that is the impression you give, that you want to forget historical facts. The military coup of November 24, 1948, against the government of the well-remembered and venerated maestro, Prof. Romulo Gallegos, was applauded and supported by all of Venezuela, with the exception of the atheist party in power. Romulo Gallegos, President of Venezuela by popular, universal, and secret vote, endorsed by over a million blank ballots, was overthrown by the same punctilious self-righteous young officials who swept you into power; and the maestro, teacher of the young people, the man who wrote by and for his people, did not, upon his overthrow, rely on majority votes to defend his election to the highest office in the land.

All of Venezuela, I repeat, approved and supported that military coup, and banking circles, large industries, big business, capitalists, the entire society, clergy, and all political parties of that day, applauded the military government board, Junta, and lent it their most outright and determined collaboration. Possibly the necessary and active search in which you engaged in those days for a foreign legation which would protect you against the wrath of the people, had not permitted you to see the situation in its real light; but now that you are back again in your country, ask for and read the newspapers of the time after the above overthrow, and try to account for what was thought of your democratic action government.

"Without denying you the positive role which the Democratic Action administration might have had as a government, you must admit that the balance (of its activities) was a frankly negative one; a very logical result derived from the political immaturity" and lack of education of its most outstanding leaders.

All of Venezuela was tired of the atheist sectarianism and arbitrariness; of the abuses of the press, of the famous investigators, the innumerbale spies, the mass incarcerations, the tortures by electric shock waves at the Trocadero defended in the congress by some of the party representatives; of the manifest administrative inability and the stubborness evidence by the atheist officials in coping with the production problems; of the famous imports of Argentine meats and animals from countries where foot-and-mouth disease obtained; of the arrogance of the men of the party, of the open contempt for the ability and honesty of citizens who did not belong to the clan (clique) in power; of the irreverence for the church, of 321, of Inciso Alfáro Ucero, of the negation of the postulates of the party when it came into power, of the sectarianism of the atheist syndicates, of the disgust of those working on important public works with the usual squandering of State funds; of the unjustified attack of all members of political parties whose doctrine was opposed to the atheist political platform; of the threats of strike directed against the country's large industries, with only you, the leader, to lift a finger to hold back the arm of the worker, the powerful muscle, the only force on whom the movement of that gigantic industrial machinery depended; of the attacks on outstanding politicians, etc. That entire Democratic Action government is still fresh in the minds of all the people of Venezuela.

The coup of November 24, 1948, was regretted only by the atheists who did not wish, or did not know how, to defend their government; the rest of the country applauded it, because that date marked the overthrow of the dictatorship of the Democratic Action Party.

You, as a politician, have made big mistakes, but the biggest of all was to have participated with your civic party in the overthrow of the most democratic of governments that Venezuela has ever had: the government of Gen. Isaías Medina Angarita. The date of October 18, 1945, stands out as a black spot on the record of Venezuelan democracy, and that indelible black spot was put there by you, the principal leader of the Democratic Action.

When those punctilious young officials, as you call them, invited you to take charge of the military coup of October 18, 1945, you were presented with the most brilliant opportunity of your political career: You, as a militant member of a civic, democratic party, should have been consistent with the civic principles preached by you in the public places, and should have directed all your energies toward avoiding that violation of the constitution and the law. But, far from acting like a civic-minded, democratic person, you preferred the garrison (military headquarters) riot in which you participated with your entire party. You should have considered that other peaceful and lawful methods could be resorted to in order to make the democratic government of Gen. Medina Angarita change the political course which he wanted to set for his government when elected President. On that date of October 18, 1945, the constitutional fiber of the Republic was lost, and up to now all efforts to retrieve it have been futile.

I am glad to see you embracing Dr. Rafael Caldera, Dr. Jovito Villalba, and Dr. Gustavo Machado; and I am even more pleased to hear you admit the mistakes which you previously made by insulting them in an unjust and bigoted fashion. I am also very happy that you have found a real 100 percent Venezuelan interested in strengthening the Venezuelan democracy, in the person of Gen. Eleazar López Contreras, ex-President of Venezuela. It is a shame that your former political blindness prevented you from realizing that he was the only military man of our day who may have handed over the Presidency of the Republic because of proven democratic affiliation in office.

All of Venezuela was amazed to hear you mention the name of Gen. Isaías Medina Angarita in your welcoming address to the people of Venezuela. There are political mistakes which cannot be made even in improvisations (impromptu addresses?) in public places. To my way of thinking, it was an indiscretion on your part to have mentioned the name of ex-President Medina Angarita, whose premature death was accelerated by the military coup of October 18, 1945, which you yourself had helped to set off.

You should have asked his pardon, on your knees before his tomb, for the evil done unto him and his country.

We heard you say: "Those sincere conversations and action undertaken by the Venezuelans, have revealed to us our past mistakes and have convinced us that there is only one course; namely, that of understanding and coordination of all sectors who wish the return of a legal government,

which can guarantee the life and coexistence of all Venezuelans, without exception." You also said: "We are waging a lawful fight for democracy, without impatience and without an appetite for government; we are, of course, basically interested in a political truce. It does not matter how long we must wait to reopen the debate from which insult and violence must disappear forever. That is the Venezuela which must be incorporated into the democratic revolution, but on a plane of nonviolent harmony, of general truce."

If in the period between 1945 and 1948 you had been thinking and acting, as the Government, along the line of those sound principles, how many sacrifices could have been avoided for the Republic.

Today, you beat your breast in public places and ask for the mantle of forgetfulness for everything [that has happened] in the past but, fortunately, the actions of men in public life are judged by history, and the definitive judgment pronounced for you and your party is positively damning. * * * You were born sectarian, you are, and you will be sectarian, and nobody can believe in your remorse outside of your partisan sects [fellow sectarians of your own party?]; all of Venezuela wants to hear [what] you [have to say] when the political truce ends and the party fisticuffs reopen in the coming election campaign. Every party wants to come to power, but on the path of your political life [career] you will now encounter a crossroads: one of the branches might take you to "Miraflores"; the other would lead you to be consistent with what you said at El Silencio, about [your] "lack of appetite for and disgust with government affairs." Don't make the mistake of ordering your legions to sweep you into power.

If your political maturity is real, if you are going to fight for democracy without violence, without insults, without sectarianism, and without aspirations for government, choose no other course but that of stating publicly and solemnly, with courage, that your Democratic Action has no presidential candidate in the atheist ranks. You must state that the white [or blank] ballot will support a man of another party, and that man must be, unquestionably, Dr. Rafael Caldera, secretary general of the Copey Party. To support an independent, extra-party, man, would be to deny the very essence of the parties and to underestimate the ability of their men [members]. The democratic position of the Democratic Action, of the Democratic Republican Union, of Copey and of the Communist Party, will be to plunge into the election struggle with a party man, and I repeat, that man can be no other than Dr. Rafael Caldera. A desirable government would be one [composed] of Dr. Caldera as president of the Republic, with a Congress in which all political currents should be represented, and all ideologies, with able men who can represent and protect a constitution within and outside the Congress should anyone want to trample on it. In order to avoid confusion, I would like to make it clear to you that I have not [ever] belonged, nor do I now belong, to the Copey Party. My views are devoid of any personal interest, and I am guided only by my best wishes that Venezuela may, as soon as circumstances permit, have a government based on the lofty thinking of the father of our country: "The most perfect system of government is that which produces the greatest possible amount of happiness, the greatest amount of social security, and the greatest amount of political stability."

Please do not take this letter as a spontaneous and aggressive insult to your person as ex-President of the Revolutionary Government Board ["Junta"]; [but] accept it as the unshirkable duty, falling on every Venezuelan preoccupied with the problems of his country, to think about and scan closely the [roster of] persons of worth who, like yourself, are qualified to hold the office of President of the Republic. By unburdening myself to you I have only wished to avoid greater damage to the people of Venezuela.

Sincerely, your friend,

RAFAEL ZAMORA PÉREZ,
Ex-Governor of the State of Guárico.

Jim Farley and the Democratic Party Liberal Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Democratic Party envinces policies that have placed the power of Government in the hands of the people, and programs to protect the interests of all the people of the United States, from the era of Jefferson, through Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

This is what we Democrats proudly claim as the liberal tradition of our party. New life was injected into that liberal tradition with the inauguration of President Roosevelt on March 4, 1933, and during the subsequent famous "hundred days."

At the beginning of the "hundred days" the people of this Nation were fearful, discouraged, and in despair. The times called for leadership and hard work. President Roosevelt provided that leadership and his devoted and dedicated assistants produced the hard work as soon as the inaugural parade music faded away.

Office lights burned late in Washington during those "hundred days" as emergency and reform legislation was enacted by Congress. One of President Roosevelt's assistants who worked tirelessly to provide party leadership and guided legislation thorugh Congress was the Honorable James A. Farley, the new Postmaster General and chairman of the party. "Big Jim" expended every effort and long hours in assisting the Chief Executive to maintain and expand the liberal tradition of our party.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address on the liberal traditions of the Democratic Party delivered by Jim Farley at the annual dinner of the Putnam County, N. Y., Democratic committee at Bear Mountain Inn on July 26:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE AND THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, ANNUAL DINNER, PUTNAM COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE, BEAR MOUNTAIN INN, JULY 26, 1958

It is a sound navigational axiom that before you know where you are going you must know where you are at and to determine where you are at it is imperative to know where you have been. I have been a good many places in 48 years, as an active Democrat, and it often occurred to me that the basic maritime rules also applied to the ship of state.

Tonight I propose to briefly outline the history of the Democratic party, which I find, and oddly enough, causes me to rise to a point of personal privilege for the only time in my political career. Since I like to think that for 48 years I have always subordinated my own interests to the interest of the party I shall defer my claim of personal privilege to a last paragraph and address myself primarily to the business of our party.

Great issues are in process of being presented to the electorate of New York State and the word liberal has been used insistently enough to demand definition. Now, just what is a liberal? The United States Supreme Court relies upon the standard dictionaries and I see no reason why the dictionary is not equally acceptable, as objective authority, in this election. Far too often, the word liberal, at various times and in various countries, has been appropriated by small groups who use it confusingly to identify private dogma rather than broad political principles.

A liberal is defined as one who is liberal in thought or principles; one who favors greater freedom in political or religious matters, specifically in politics (Webster's New International Dictionary). It is further defined as favorable to reform or progress; not bound by orthodox or established politics (New Dictionary, Grosset & Dunlap).

Now it is my thesis that the only effective liberal party in American history is the Democratic party, and I want to tell you why.

If one who favors greater freedom in religion is accepted as a measuring mark of a liberal no man in American history, and few in any others, even remotely approaches the founder of this party, Thomas Jefferson. Just how much he regarded himself as a liberal can be gleaned from his own epitaph, written by himself. It may be assumed that the things he wished to be remembered by were those acts of his which he considered most important. Accordingly, it is of deepest significance that, omitting that he was President of the United States, he mentions himself as the founder of the University of Virginia, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and the author of Virginia's first statute of absolute religious freedom. This statute was as revolutionary, in its time, as his later Declaration of Independence. Europe was still soaking its fields in Christian fratricidal warfare when it was written. Jefferson's magnificiently liberal act was the very spark which lit the way to religious freedom in this country. Today few countries calling themselves civilized have failed to profit by Jefferson's foresight. Clearly, no other party in American history can claim such heritage.

Further, if we accept the definition of a liberal as one who is not bound by previous forms it is impossible to find a finer example of liberalism than the Declarations of Independence. It was more than written by the pen of Thomas Jefferson; it was underwritten by his very life. If there be any remaining doubt of the liberalism of the founder of this party one need merely read the transcript from his writings on the walls of his monument in Washington. There for the ages to see Mr. Jefferson wrote that man must adapt his growing civilization to growing institutions, casting off the old forms as a child discards his boyhood clothes to assume the garb of a man.

These writings are now the heritage of all mankind, but they are also the living dynamic charter of this party and again, parenthetically, I can tell you right now that it is not only the reason I entered this party it is the reason it has had and will have my unswerving allegiance, and why I consider,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in all humility, the fact that I headed it as national chairman, as the one thing I want my grandchildren to know about me.

When, on that fateful July 4, 1826, 50 years afterward, to the day, that his Declaration of Independence gave birth to this Nation Jefferson died—the great torch he had lit did not flicker. It had already passed into the strong and capable hands of another giant of the Democratic Party, another liberal, Andrew Jackson.

Now Andrew Jackson interpreted the powers of the Presidency in such manner as to spin Alexander Hamilton around in his grave; a spinning long overdue. The old forms could no longer contain the growing Nation. To meet this Andrew Jackson promulgated the theory that the President was the only officer elected by all the people and that he, Andrew Jackson, proposed to act for all the people. Now, if a liberal is one who is favorable to reform or progress and not bound by orthodox or established politics it cannot be denied that the full effective pattern was set for the 19th century by President Andrew Jackson of the Democratic Party.

For example, when the great crisis of 1861 arrived, did Abraham Lincoln turn to the tenets of Hamilton? No inded. He took bodily Jackson's conception of the Presidency and applied it without consulting his own party. He knew what the answer would be. The fact is, his own party very nearly impeached President Andrew Johnson for following the Lincolnian application of the Jackson and Jefferson principles.

Down through Cleveland to Wilson came the irresistible force of the people of this Nation in expansion after expanison of reform enacted by the Democratic Party. The totally new Wilsonian concept of credit and regulation, all of which bore the imprint of our party, carried the impact of the 19th century into the 20th and, in the American vernacular, this is where I came in. I had been in the fight as a Democrat in all the reform legislation since my entrance in State politics including the repeal of prohibition plank, when F. D. R. asked me to head the campaign and the party in 1932.

There are few Presidents in American history who have had a more encyclopedic knowledge of it than President Roosevelt. I say this because I want to emphasize that he knew the liberal tradition of the Democratic Party and he knew that he was expanding it. He intended to put the power more in the hands of the people than even Jefferson, Jackson, or Wilson, and he intended and succeeded in using the Democratic Party to do so.

Now even his worst enemies never accused Mr. Roosevelt of being naive or inastute. He would have been both had he appointed a man to head the Democratic Party who did not believe in its liberal policies. Apparently he believed that 20 years in the ranks established me as more than a Johnny-come-lately liberal, because he expressed his preference for me as head of the party and he invited me into the Cabinet, credentials possessed by few of his subsequent followers, followers who appear to have adopted a policy of cutting up his coat tails into personal campaign ribbons.

His was the strategy but the tactics on the Hill were left to the party.

Now, if liberal legislation be favorable to reform and progress I challenge any party and any candidate to name any comparable period in United States history in which there was enacted into the law of the land as broad a base of reform and progress. To begin with, 7A of the National Recovery Act, for the first time elevated collective bargaining into an integral part of the functioning industrial life of this country. The same great and splendid unions which are thriving today were then in desperate shape. Their leaders told us at the time that 7A was more than a new charter of liberty that it was a matter of life and death. No miracle drug of modern times has ever revitalized a dying patient, as that one clause brought back the hard-won status of the organization of the American unions. However, the activities of the President and myself, as head of the party, in behalf of the people of America did very little indeed to gain us the reputations of conservatives.

Nor did our successful activities in behalf of the farmers through the AAA; nor the Wagner Act; nor the national employment system; nor the Wagner-Lewis emergency relief; nor WPA; nor PWA; nor the TVA; nor the CCC; nor the Farm Credit Act; nor the Bank Deposit Insurance Act; nor the State Relief Act; nor the Stock Exchange Act; nor the creation of the Federal Communications Committee; nor the Railroad, Corporation and Municipal Bankruptcy Act. All, all of these and they are but a few major acts of legislation were the acts of the liberal Democratic Party. It was upon them that we went to the country in 1936 and our party carried 46 out of 48 States in the Union. Very obviously, we had brought the Government back to the people and even more obviously they endorsed the progressive reforms.

Now, the point of this partial enumeration is to demonstrate the incontrovertible. No other party in American history by inheritance or action even remotely compares in effectiveness with the Democratic Party as the instrument of the lawful, broad, consistent, and liberal expansion of the American people. Historically and factually, to be a Democrat is to be a liberal, in the true American use of that term.

And now I rise to my point of personal privilege. If I am not a Democrat, what am I? If 48 years of glad and proud service in its ranks to the principles of this party do not speak for me, what else can? If the offices I have held, town and county chairman, State and National chairman, and the great public office of Cabinet member, do not attest that I carried the fight to the forces of reaction, as a Democrat, what other evidence is there?

But I am informed that at this late date there are some late arrivals who question, believe it or not, whether I am a liberal. I shall not be uncharitable and ask who these people are nor where they were when the battle was thickest.

By the very testimony of those whom they profess to follow, I welcome examination as warmly as I resent the inference. The great responsibility of the managing of the critical campaigns of President Roosevelt and Senator Robert F. Wagner these men placed upon me. I tell you proudly that these men trusted me even more deeply than as a devoted Democrat; they trusted me and I, if I may say so, know that they had reason to trust me as confident and friend. I doubt very much if those who have dared, in most cowardly fashion, to challenge my status as a liberal candidate could say as much.

Honor is the monopoly of no man, nor of any party. It is in the nature of personal property, the personal property of the soul.

I have risen to this point of personal privilege because I am about to make the harshest statement I have ever made in public life. I say to you that for 48 years I have served the Democratic Party because it is the liberal party. I say that my record proves I have always been the protagonist of liberal Democratic platforms.

Therefore, whoever says that I am not a liberal in effect states that 48 years I have lived the life of a hypocrite. To these persons, whomsoever they may be, I say you are either grossly and inexcusably ignorant or you are deliberately untruthful, or both. In any event, I accept the challenge. I meet all comers. I will not only match my private, I will match my public, liberal record with any man in this State, or for that matter, in this country. Furthermore, I intend to do so. I am a candidate for the United States Senate. And in the true, liberal, Democratic, and American tradition, let the people of New York State decide.

The Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate goal of a good jounalist is to see things whole. Day in and day out one of the few news commentators who consistently attains this goal is Howard K. Smith, chief Washington correspondent for CBS News. Mr. Smith's forthright commentaries on the Middle East crisis have been notable both for their brilliant insight and objective balance. I believe our colleagues will profit from a reading of the broadcast Mr. Smith presented last Sunday on the CBS program The World Tonight. His remarks follow:

The second week of the new sharp crisis in the Middle East has produced few new events. But it has crystallized two longer range developments. One of those developments is bad from the American point of view; the other is good.

What is bad is—the crisis has revealed United States policy in the Middle East to be pretty threadbare. Our set of official assumptions and our array of potential initiatives to meet eventual situations have been shown to be inadequate, self-contradictory and out of touch with realities.

What is good is a crisis that was military has rapidly become diplomatic. Much of the danger of armed conflict has drained out of the situation. Where last week the air was full of military actions and threats of counteractions today the nations involved are talking entirely in terms of diplomatic conferences. This offers us a breathing spell to try to aline our policies with realities. The increased shooting last night in Lebanon, the threats of Lebanese rebel leaders not to come to settlement unless United States troops leave, the utterly prospectless situation of British troops caught in Jordan like flies on flypaper—all these things suggest that the breathing spell may be short. Military activity may soon resume its dominance over diplomacy. So the utmost and quickest advantage must be taken of it to analyze our situation, seek what is wrong and start thinking of alternative courses—to all of which any news analysis worth the name is obligated to make a contribution.

The crisis has revealed United States policy in regard to the Middle East to be in an unusually sorry plight. To substantiate that assessment consider what has happened in very days to Mr. Dulles' long husbanded strategy in foreign affairs.

The Secretary of State has long opposed a summit meeting unless there is long and careful previous preparation, and unless there is evidence the Russians mean business, not propaganda. We have been put in the position this week of calling a summit conference without preparation and with every evidence the Russians mean propaganda not business.

Mr. Dulles has steadfastly refused any kind of conference or action which would recognize Russia as having any decisive voice in

Middle East affairs. The coming conference will recognize Russia as having a decisive voice in Middle East affairs.

The Secretary has just as steadfastly resisted Khruschev's hints for an invitation to visit the United States. The coming conference will bring Khruschev on a visit to the United States.

With a bluntness sometimes characteristic of it, the Wall Street Journal this week summed up the situation in an editorial, saying, "The fact is we are no longer master of our own foreign policy."

Essential aspects of our policy for the Middle East have been shown to be extremely rickety. A keystone of the policy has been the Baghdad Pact. We face the near certainty Baghdad, capital of Iraq, will soon withdraw from the pact bearing its name.

The Secretary recommended the entry of our troops into Lebanon to sustain a pro-western government there. Most experts I have talked to believe that when we withdraw the result will be the coming to power of a non-pro-western government. We acted, to quote Time magazine, also in the faint chance that we might bolster resistance to the revolution in Iraq. That revolution in Iraq, however, has been wholly successful, and there is a suspicion that our action contributed to rather than hindered that success.

We supported the entry of the British into Jordan on the same reasoning—that it would bolster pro-Western government in Jordan and pro-westernism in general.

The fact is, the action puts the British in worse trouble than we are in. A good half of the people of Lebanon have been favorable to the United States. Those who are not have never seen us before, are curious about us and want to look awhile before shooting.

In Jordan, the percentage that is favorable to the British is very tiny indeed. And the British are well-known from a long unpleasant past and are intensely disliked. Where in Lebanon we have a bare chance of seeing stability return soon so we can get out, there is almost no chance of it in Jordan. An authoritative-sounding New York Times report yesterday gave Hussein 6 months of survival. He purged 150 of his army officers early this month, and the purge continues in the hope of eliminating disloyalty. But the effect has been, the report said, to demoralize utterly what used to be the most effective of Arab armies. The report gave Hussein 6 months of survival—unless there is all-out western support. All-out western support seemed to mean an imitation of the Russian satellite arrangement in Eastern Europe, that is, the sustaining of an unpopular regime against the people by means of foreign arms and occupation.

Results like these, in direct contradiction to the effects planned for, indicate something is very, very wrong indeed in our basic policies.

Lest the listener have a wrong impression let me make something clear parenthetically. This does not mean to suggest we should not have gone into Lebanon. Our basic prestige had been put into such a position that inaction might have been superdisastrous, while action was merely disastrous. So, perhaps we had to move into Lebanon for a little while. What this analysis does suggest is that a Middle East policy that puts us in a position of having to choose only between the disastrous and the superdisastrous is a very fallacious, not to say, derelict piece of planning, thinking, and acting indeed.

If the point that we have been very wrong indeed needs further substantiation, the state of our information about this vital area of the world, where war or peace may come from our intelligence will make the point.

We admit to being caught flat-footed by the outbreak of major revolution in a key country, Iraq. But even after that the state of our continuing intelligence has shocked the world.

A couple of days after the revolution, Mr. Lodge, our U. N. representative, caused emotional revulsion against the Iraqi revolutionaries in the Security Council by revealing our information that an Iraqi diplomat, known to all the members, had been murdered by the bloodthirsty Iraqi revolutionaries and his body dragged through the streets. Within hours, the new Iraqi Government was able to publish the photo of the allegedly murdered and battered diplomat—in good health and very much alive. It was to many diplomats, frightening that the world's greatest Nation should base its policy and actions on information so flagrantly false and utterly emotion-ridden as that.

Moreover, not many days after our scathing attacks on the bloodthirsty Iraqi revolutionaries whom we were close to going to war to oppose we are seriously considering granting them official diplomatic recognition—which undoubtedly we shall before long do. The foreigner looking to the United States for sober, wise leadership through the perils of the atomic missile age can be excused for not feeling reassured by policies that lead to extremes of that seeming volatility.

Again, parenthetically, this is not an argument against recognizing the new government in Iraq. It is a reflection on a policy so apparently uninformed about the most powerful forces in a key allied country and so unprepared for events as to operate in what appears to be a permanent state of astonishment at events that in fact were all predictable.

Current developments give little reassurance the situation has changed. Washington continues to be a chief, if not the chief capital in the crisis. Yet, getting guidance in this great Capital this week has been like trying to wring water from a stone. The President and the Secretary of State canceled their news conferences. No other important officials have given much of a lead to public opinion on these important developments.

The Wall Street Journal has commented pointedly on how more than a week after this crisis has dominated our lives, Washington remains wrapped in silence. And it remarked sharply, "In a country of free men it is essential to real unity that those who lead explain to people carefully and thoughtfully the course they pursue." Miss Doris Fleeson, an alert and usually fully informed columnist, had to open one of her reports this week, I quote, "Bootless Brutus who knelt to no avail to Julius Caesar had nothing on the earnest Washington reporter who decided to hunt hard news (in Washington) about Middle East policy." From Rome come reports that American private citizens returning from Baghdad, Iraq, were forbidden by the United States Government from exercising their free prerogative of talking to reporters, who are the mediums whereby the American public are kept informed.

Whatever the reasons for this silence, the suspicions are bound to arise (in many quarters) that it is in part meant to hide the fact that our leaders still do not know what to do or which direction to go into.

Bright spots in the dark have been evidences that Members of the Congress here and some of our good friends abroad are doing some positive thinking about the situation. The theme of most of these thoughts is that we ought to approach the coming summit meeting with less of the frustrated indignation and reluctance which the administration has so far displayed, and with more constructive plans which will channel it away from propaganda into useful fields that might produce good results.

Many, including visiting President Nkrumah, of the new African state of Ghana, have proposed the quarantining or neutralizing of the Middle East or at least of the Arab world. That is what the Arabs seem to want. Since it would keep the Russians out as well as us, objections to it are hard to understand.

Perhaps the most valuable piece of advice comes from a true friend of the United States who has proven it often, and whose wisdom in handling a past Middle East crisis won him the Nobel prize for peace. That is Mr. Lester Pearson, the former Foreign Minister of Canada.

In parts of a speech published here, Mr. Pearson dwelt on two realities that any Middle East policy will simply have to accept but which ours has not been willing to face. One is the existence of Arab nationalism as the overpowering, strongest urge of the Arab peoples. The suggestion is that we will have to live with it, so why not accept it and come to terms with it?

The other hard reality is a little more difficult for some to swallow. It is that Russia, having the Middle East on her southern frontier, has as legitimate a security interest in the area as we have in Central America. There is unlikely ever to be peace in the area as long as we persist in refusing to talk with Russia, negotiate with Russia and try to reach an agreement with Russia about it.

Those—the inevitability of Arab nationalism, the necessity of admitting Russian interest—are the two hard realities we have to take into account or else we will continue to get ourselves into contradictory positions which could lead one day to war.

In extenuation of the administration's policies in the area it must be said that both the two realities are tough ones. It is not easy either to get along with Arab nationalism or to negotiate successfully with Russia.

In criticism of administration's policy in the area there is the overriding thought that we have not really tried either and are in no position to judge whether it is possible until we do.

This is Howard K. Smith in Washington.

The Case for Modernizing Our Wiretapping Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's leading authorities on the practical aspects of widetapping and its need in crime detection recently delivered an outstanding address in which he effectively presented the case for modernizing our wiretap laws. The speaker was Paul W. Williams, who recently resigned as United States attorney for the southern district of New York—a post in which he had served with real distinction and a success which has made his name feared among the criminal elements in his jurisdiction.

In his searching, erudite and clear analysis of the problems inherent in the whole subject of wiretapping, Mr. Williams pointed up the need for changes in our communication law. He endorsed legislation substantially similar to that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I have sponsored for a number of years, as well as two new bills I introduced in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the words of this experienced crimefighter should be studied by every Member of Congress. I am extremely hopeful before long we will have an opportunity to consider measures dealing with this great unresolved issue of wiretapping. Certainly the wise words of Paul Williams will aid in the passage of sound and realistic legislation. Under leave previously granted, I insert his remarks in the RECORD:

SHOULD WIRETAPPING BE LIBERALIZED?

(Remarks by Hon. Paul W. Williams, United States attorney for the southern district of New York, at the summer meeting of the New York State Bar Association at Saranac, N. Y., June 27, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gerhart, and fellow members of the bar, the question is, "Should wiretapping be liberalized?" My answer is "Yes."

In making this response, it is necessary to remind you that I speak from the perspective of the Federal prosecutor, and as a prosecutor I must frankly admit that I am confounded by the present state of affairs in reference to wiretapping. The situation is so chaotic that in order to present my position with some degree of clarity and precision it is necessary to reanalyze this question. Only after such reanalysis can all of us observe what objectives we seek to serve in reference to wiretapping, and what measures can best attain these objectives.

I shall attempt, first, to analyze the interests which I think are to be protected in considering the advisability of wiretapping; second, to describe the present legal picture in reference to wiretapping; and, third, to make to number of concrete suggestions concerning possible new legislation.

PART 1. WHAT ARE THE INTERESTS TO BE PROTECTED?

The most important question to be asked, in reference to wiretapping is, "What are the private and public interests affected by the existence or nonexistence of wiretapping, and what type of protection should society extend to them?"

In referring to an interest, I am referring to that set of facts which society endows with a value and which it is willing to protect either by a tort action for damages, or a suit for an injunction, or the sanction of the criminal law. The creation and the protection of any interest usually depends on the particular social and economic conditions of the times, and the relationship of these conditions to this set of facts. It has been the genius of the common law that it has developed rules of law which have defined each particular interest and the protection which society wishes to extend to it.

When one discusses wiretapping, I would suggest that the primary interest involved is the right of privacy. This term "right of privacy" is a relatively new term to the common law. Its earliest use appears to have been in 1902 in an article by Justice Brandeis and Samuel D. Warren in the Harvard Law Review. At that time, the rapid developments in photography and the growth of new trends in journalism were making inroads on the privacy of the ordinary citizen. Brandeis and Warren were primarily concerned with the right to be left alone, and argued that legal protection should be extended against the unauthorized publication of personal papers and photographs.

Today, when I refer to the right of privacy, I mean the right of the average citizen to express his emotions, ideas, thoughts, and plans with a reasonable degree of privacy, or, to define it in terms of the threat to this interest, the right to be reasonably secure from electronic eavesdropping.

Eavesdropping is not a new phenomenon in our society. Blackstone refers to the eavesdropper as follows: "Eavesdroppers, or such as listen under walls or windows, or the eaves of a house, to hearken after discourse, and thereupon to frame slanderous and mischievous tales, are a common nuisance, and presentable at the court-leet, or are indictable at the sessions and punishable by fine and finding sureties for their good behavior."

Today we are confronted by the danger of electronic eavesdropping. The development of modern electronics has developed machines with fantastic powers of picking up voices and recording them. Wiretapping has been so vastly improved as to make it nigh impossible to detect it. The advantages of this equipment have been quickly recognized by many, and thus private individuals and groups have tended to use this weapon to serve their own selfish ends and enhance their power. I need not refer to the many scandals which have been in the newspapers where groups involved in political, business, and labor rivalry, or individuals with marital difficulties, have resorted to the use of electronic eavesdropping by wiretapping or other electronic devices.

Let me make quite clear that I have no sympathy with this electronic eavesdropping. When a labor union cannot plan a strike; when a business man cannot plan an advertising campaign which requires secrecy in order to get the edge on his competitor; when a lawyer cannot talk to his client; when an individual cannot speak about his or her private affairs to another individual; when each one of these groups or individuals cannot perform these simple but fundamental acts without continual fear of electronic eavesdropping, then our society has no alternative except to give the injured a cause of action for damages and an injunction, and to impose criminal penalties.

This invasion of the right of privacy of the individual or group is a severe threat. It represents a degree of immorality and unfairness which no democratic society can tolerate. And, what is more, it suggests the possibility of thought control. At this point our fundamental right of freedom is threatened. This is the interest affected by electronic eavesdropping: the right of privacy.

I have taken this time to define this interest because some cases in referring to section 605 of title 47 have spoken of the integrity of the communications system as the interest to be protected. I have attempted to analyze the meaning of this term, and I must frankly admit that it is of little value to a legal analysis of this problem. To speak of the integrity of the communications system as an interest is really to refer to the right of privacy insofar as it is affected by the communications system. Indeed, I would strongly suggest that the phrase "integrity of a system of telephonic communication is either a catchword to describe "right of privacy," or else a term which describes the jurisdictional basis of section 605 rather than the interest to be protected. It is important to be clear concerning this distinction for reasons which will be apparent later.

Another interest which is equally important in any society is the maintenance of law and order. If one examines our present national scene, one is shocked by the growth of crime—in particular, organized crime. There is little doubt in my mind that organized crime has become a serious threat to this country. The crime syndicates and their subsidiaries in different parts of the country have become an invisible government with millions of dollars at their disposal, and with astounding power which extends not only into every State of the Union, but also into many countries of western Europe and the Middle East. The resources of organized crime are being used to finance expensive but lucrative ventures such as narcotics, and, even worse, to infiltrate legitimate business and labor unions to the detriment of the economic life of the country. The total effect of this growth of organized crime is a corrosion of the moral, ethical, and democratic standards of this country. To maintain law and order in this country means to attack and destroy the crime syndicate as an effective criminal group.

In discussing these interests I think it is clear that in a country such as ours there is no interest or right which enjoys an absolute protection. All rights and interests have to be seen in their relationship to each other. Even an important right as free speech does not enjoy an absolute protection. If a man's speech tends to create a clear and present danger to the community, that speech ceases to enjoy constitutional protection. If a man uses his private dwelling to sell narcotics, then agents armed with a search warrant can search his home.

Thus, to the extent that the exercise of rights and privileges are employed in such a manner as to constitute a threat to the community or the country, then to that extent the interest of law and order makes and requires inroads and limitations on the exercise of those rights and privileges.

This same reasoning applies to the right of privacy. It is a right to be cherished and protected, but it is not a right which can demand absolute protection, no more than any other right. And, equally, it appears to me that whenever a serious felony is in the process of being planned or committed, this right of privacy must yield to reasonable limitations so that law and order may be maintained.

If this analysis is sound, the next question is, To what extent does section 605 of title 47 and the case law interpreting this section protect the right of privacy and still ensure the maintenance of law and order.

PART 2. AN ANALYSIS OF SECTION 605

At this point I wish to analyze the present state of the law.

Section 605 of title 47 states, in brief, that it is illegal to intercept telephonic communications and to divulge or use them. Only the sender of the communication can authorize the interception and divulgence or use of his communication.

A series of Supreme Court decisions have severely limited the Federal investigating and prosecuting agencies. If the Federal Government commences a criminal prosecution and then discovers that there has been wiretapping, State or Federal, the Government is placed in the following position: First, the evidence resulting from the wiretaps is inadmissible. Second, if the defendant moves to dismiss the indictment on the ground of illegally obtained evidence from wiretapping, the defendant has the burden of proving that there was wiretapping. Having done this, the burden of going forward with the evidence rests on the Government concerning what evidence was directly procured from the wiretaps and what leads resulted from the wiretaps. By the time the Government has met this burden of going forward with the evidence, the entire case of the Government has been completely revealed. In a case involving leaders of organized crime, this revelation of the Government's case may be fatal.

Theoretically, evidence procured from wiretapping is inadmissible in the Federal courts; but permit me to list two qualifications which have developed: In *Goldman* v. *United States* the Supreme Court held that a detectophone can be placed against a partition in order to hear what is said into the telephone, assuming there was no trespass. In *On Lee* v. *United States* (343 U. S. 747 (1952)), it was held that if a portable radio transmitter is used to transmit the

conversation of the informer with the defendant to agents outside the apartment, this is not a violation of the act.

Another question which has arisen in the construction of section 605 is who can consent to the interception and divulgence of the telephonic communication. According to section 605, only the sender can authorize this interception and divulgence. However, Judge Hand, in the second circuit, held that both parties to the communication had to consent. If one construes section 605 strictly, the sender can authorize this, but if the interest to be protected is the right to privacy, then the decision of Judge Learned Hand is the more logical, for both parties are simultaneously receiver and sender, and have a right of privacy to be protected. However, in the recent case of *Rathbun* v. *United States*, the Supreme Court held that if the receiver of a telephonic communication invited police officers to listen in on the conversation on an extension, this is not a violation of 605.

Federal and State jurisdiction

The last question which I wish to discuss is that of Federal and State jurisdiction in reference to wiretapping.

In *Weiss* v. *United States*, the Supreme Court held that section 605 applied to both interstate and intrastate communication. In view of the fact that the two cannot really be distinguished, this is logical. However, in the recent Benanti decision, the Supreme Court carried the Weiss case to its logical conclusion by stating * * * we find that Congress, setting out a prohibition in plain terms, did not mean to allow State legislation which would contradict that system and that policy." In support of this statement, the Court cited *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497), which I can only interpret to mean that Congress has preempted the field as to all wiretapping.

Let us assume that the present 36 States which authorize the police to wiretap, continue to allow such wiretapping—and I think this is a realistic assumption. If each of these States admits this illegally obtained evidence, and there is a conviction, what happens if the State conviction is appealed to the Supreme Court?

Under *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438 (1928)), there is no constitutional question of search and seizure involved. What would be the question which the Court would face? If it is a question of evidence illegally obtained by State wiretapping, then will the Court say that in this area the State courts do not have the right to determine the admissibility of evidence illegally obtained? Or would the Court find some infringement of due process by the State officials? And, what is the relationship of this exercise of congressional power over interstate commerce to the exercise of the police power of the State?

After scanning each one of these problems arising from section 605, I must frankly ask whether 605 serves any valid purpose today, whether it is not unrealistic and outmoded, and whether the Federal Government does not need to repeal section 605 and pass new legislation.

PART 3. SUGGESTIONS FOR NEW LEGISLATION

I stated in the beginning that I was in favor of the liberalization of wiretapping. In order to describe precisely in what sense I favor this liberalization, I have attempted to analyze the interests involved and the inadequacy of section 605 today. What are the specific points at which I would urge liberalization?

1. I am convinced that the Federal Government should be granted the right to wiretap when there is probable cause to believe that a felony is being committed. The threat of organized crime is becoming so serious as to necessitate this step. The telephone is such an important channel of communication and is so essential in committing most crimes today, that to deny this right to the Federal Government is to handicap it severely. For example, it would be of immense aid to us in detecting espionage, narcotics violations, extortion and racketeering—if we had the right to tap phones.

After carefully weighing the right of privacy against the maintaining of law and order, I am convinced that to this extent there must be some reasonable limitations of the right of privacy.

2. I would revise the basis of jurisdiction in order that both the Federal and State agencies would have the power to wiretap. In reference to the Federal power to wiretap, the jurisdictional basis would arise from the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. The outermost limits of this Federal power would be defined by Federal criminal statutes. In other words, Federal authorities would have the power to wiretap only when a Federal crime was being planned or committed. Likewise, the State officials would have the power to wiretap only when State crimes were being committed. The scope of the Federal or State jurisdiction would depend on the crime being committed, not on whether intrastate or interstate commerce was involved.

3. In order to exercise this power, the United States attorney would have to apply to the Attorney General or to the district court for a warrant to wiretap a specific phone in a specific case for a specific period of time. Such an application would be supported by an affidavit showing probable cause.

4. There is one exception to this procedure which I would recommend. In any cases where treason, espionage, or subversive activity are involved, I would suggest that the Federal Government should be authorized to wiretap phones on the basis of a written authorization by the Attorney General himself, and only the Attorney General. The reason for this exception would be to maintain the maximum secrecy.

5. Any evidence procured pursuant to a warrant or written authorization by the Attorney General, which was relevant material and of substantial probative value in terms of the issues of the trial, would be admissible in evidence.

The effect of these recommendations would be to permit wiretapping by Federal authorities in serious criminal cases. This is a realistic and necessary step. Such a practice would not result in the infringement of basic rights. And to those who insist on foreseeing unutterable dangers, I can only reply in the words of Justice Frankfurter in *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.*:

"It is always easy to conjure up extreme and even oppressive possibilities in the exertion of authority."

If my analysis up to this point has been sound, it appears to me that we cannot be satisfied alone with the above proposals. There is still the fundamental question—how to protect the right of privacy from electronic eavesdropping?

We must insure to the individual and the group the right to transact their personal and official affairs without rivals being able to intrude and eavesdrop. This can be assured only by Federal and State legislation. Indeed, I am of the opinion that as a result of the brilliant work performed by the New York State joint legislative committee to study illegal interception of communications, this State is further advanced in this type of legislation than any other State in the Union.

To insure this protection I would recommend that Federal legislation be passed which forbids any private party from either wiretapping a phone or picking up a telephone conversation by means of any electronic device without the consent of both the sender and the receiver; and, I would further recommend that a violator of this statute be subject to both Federal criminal prosecution and a civil action for damages.

In reference to State legislation, I would hope that there would be laws which forbid the use of any electronic device by private parties to pick up any conversation with intent to do injury or harm to any other party, the violator to be subject to both State criminal prosecution and a suit for damages.

Lastly, I would assume that with the above legislation any information procured by private eavesdropping would be inadmissible in any civil suit.

It is only by such legislation which is vigorously enforced that we can call a halt to the vicious practice of private electronic eavesdropping.

As you can observe, my analysis of this question causes me on the one hand to advocate liberalization of wiretapping in reference to criminal activity, and on the other hand to advocate stringent measures to protect the private citizen against electronic eavesdropping.

Conclusion

I have undertaken this analysis in order to determine in what sense our present statutes are valid, and what are the interests to be protected.

As a result of this analysis, I am convinced that the time has come for congressional and State reanalysis of this question in order that we may both protect the country from insidious elements and make more secure the citizens of our country in the enjoyment of their basic rights.

The Fallacy of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1958

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, with so many voices of appeasement again being heard in the land, it is gratifying to have a courageous and discerning analysis of the fatal folly of this policy.

Such an analysis is given by Past National Commander Donald R. Wilson, of the American Legion, in the July 28 issue of Human Events.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Wilson:

AMERICA'S CALL TO HONOR—COMPROMISE WITH RED TYRANNY INVITES DEFEAT

(By Donald R. Wilson)

The world is caught in an atmosphere of expectancy. The hope for "peace" in the Middle Eastern tangle, says Comrade Khrushchev, lies in some kind of meeting of the world's leaders at "the summit." This new appeal is a variation on the overtures that the Communist chief has been making since last winter. His demands have goaded the leadership of the Western World into a fervent search for some way to lay the groundwork for a discussion of issues on which there is reasonable prospect of agreement.

Responsible leaders have been so preoccupied with the question of whether there can be a meeting at the summit that seemingly nobody has bothered to ask whether there should be such a meeting. We have

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

frequently been told—indeed warned—that to refuse to negotiate differences with our enemy is to resolve to fight. This is a resolution that our political leadership has steadfastly refused to make with reference to the Soviet Union. But what is there to talk to the Soviet Union about?

All of the many specific prospective talking points advanced either by Russia or the United States are presumably calculated (a) to reduce international tensions, or (b) to diminish the possibility of war. Thus are justified proposals to talk about cessation of nuclear testing and production, creation of nuclear free zones, disarmament, cessation of war propaganda, strengthening of the U. N. the status of East European countries, devotion of outer space to peaceful purposes, reunification of Germany, elimination of Middle Eastern strife, etc.

It is true that if Russia and the United States could resolve all of these and many other issues to their mutual satisfaction and advantage, the world would indeed be closer to a state of peace. With or without a summit meeting, however, it must be apparent to all that these issues are not going to be so resolved.

These issues are not the real causes of international tensions. They are merely the outward signs of tensions. The true causes must be searched for and found in differences that are so fundamental for both the free world and the slave world that it is questionable that there can be room for negotiation.

These fundamental causes are rooted in the theory and practice of Soviet communism. The theory is that the non-Communist world is destined for extinction. The practice is to hasten this extinction by all means including, but not limited to, fraud, deceit, treachery, subversion and conquest without regard to human life and dignity and without regard to legal standards or values.

Our leaders keep asking the Soviet leadership to demonstrate its good faith. Unless the Soviet Union is prepared to renounce the very creed out of which it was born and by which it lives, such requests by our leadership are about as realistic as a mouse requesting a cat to give evidence of its good faith and friendly intentions before entering the well-known game of cat-and-mouse.

It may reasonably be asked how a question of such fundamental hostility can be negotiated. And if the basic issue is not resolved, if the root causes of tension are not removed, then what ultimate good is accomplished by negotiating or even reaching agreement on removing mere surface manifestations of the malignancy?

No compromise or appeasement regarding subjects such as the Middle East, disarmament, the status of Germany or Eastern Europe can possibly lead to peace while the Communists adhere to a belief in and furtherance of world dominion for the Soviets.

What reason do we have for relying on the sanctity of any agreements with the Soviets, on any subject? It is invariably admitted that we have very little other than the fact that there is always the possibility, however remote, that the Kremlin may actually honor its agreements, either by reason of "turning over a new leaf" or because the risk involved in breaking solemn agreements on crucial issues may be too great. As a clincher, the alternative to agreement is stated to be annihilation on a scale hitherto unknown.

Let us consider the argument about the Soviets' turning over a new leaf. Let us concede that anything is at least "remotely possible." Can we seriously bargain on life-or-death issues with no greater assurance than the "remote possibility" that our enemy will honor agreements made and entered into? What are the chances that the Soviets will abandon a strategy that has been winning steadily over the last generation?

What about possible Soviet unwillingness to run the risk of breaking such solemn and important agreements? The statements of our political leadership show clearly that this is a fanciful argument. When Russia announced the cessation of nuclear tests, not one of our leaders thought she was sincere. Not one of our leaders would seriously rely on the Soviet Union to keep her pledges on any disarmament agreement That's why we have had the steady insistence on an inspection system. Can our leaders believe that the Soviets would honor an agreement on the Middle East, or on Germany or East Europe?

Finally, what about the alternative to agreement—worldwide nuclear annihilation? We refuse to concede that we would take the initiative in launching such a human disaster. That leaves only the possibility that the Soviets might do so, at a time of their own choosing and on an issue of their own making. If the time should ever come when the Soviets felt they would have to resort to such a blow, it could only be because they felt the maneuver was both necessary and safe—necessary, to preserve themselves either internally or internationally, and safe because of the actual or prospective failure of retaliatory power. No mere agreement on any current issue would deter them under such circumstances. Only a major shift in their whole philosophy of life and government could protect us against such an eventuality under such circumstances.

We may be sure that the cold war will not be won at the conference table. The true issue is non-negotiable. The true issue involves the foundations of two utterly different and irreconcilable ways of life and philosophies of government. For either side seriously to compromise any of these fundamentals would be the beginning of the piecemeal destruction of its essential being.

There was a time when there was inspiration in the slogan, "Give me liberty or give me death." The issus was clear. There was no room for compromise or coexistence with tyranny. There was an unbending resolve to win. There was confidence in the triumph of right. There was no fear of death great enough to cause either a turning away from reality or a loss of belief in victory.

I cannot believe that this way of life and government of ours are only flashing meteors in the universe of man's political and personal aspirations. I believe they are stars of hope. I cannot believe that we are doomed to be eclipsed by depravity and bondage and moral and physical cowardice.

We have been victorious over the threat of tyranny before. We can be again. History teaches that peoples grow strong by responding to challenge. They grow weak only when they compromise or when they appease the challenger and avoid a determined response to the challenge.

What, then, is needed today?

First, there must be a recognition of the fact that the challenge which the Soviet Union has issued to us and the philosophy which has motivated its issuance have engaged us inevitably in a life-or-death struggle. There is no middle ground to be found and no compromise which can afford both life and victory to these antagonists. All efforts along these lines are doomed to failure. We can call this a cold war if we wish, but we must acknowledge it as a war.

Secondly, we must recognize that the threat of armed conflict is always with us so long as we continue the struggle. At one end of the spectrum of our struggle lies surrender. By surrender we could eliminate the threat of nuclear war. At the other end of the spectrum lies armed conflict. As we intensify our response to Rusisa's challenge we theoretically increase the risk of Russia's armed retaliation. As we grow more successful in the war of our different ways of life, we increase the possibility of forcing Russia to take the last desperate gamble. We must resolve to take this risk.

We must analyze Russia's strengths and sap them. Russia is not invincible—politically, economically, militarily, or ideologically. We must learn her vulnerable areas in each of these fields and exploit them to the fullest. This is precisely what Russia is trying to do to us. We keep temporizing and hoping that she will cease. While we hesitate and hope, we lose advantage after advantage. Until we plan as skillfully and effectively for the downfall of the Communists as they plan for our own, the tide of battle will continue to move against us.

Fear of open war will defeat us. Fear of failure will defeat us. Only courage, faith and inflexible responses to challenge will save us.

Why the Fight Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Virginia is now at the crossroads. We are facing a real crisis. Our actions will affect our State and Nation for generations to come. Virginians must decide in September the course they will pursue in attempting to work out the school problem which is so vital to all of us.

There are those in Virginia today who would capitulate and give up this fight for constitutional government in America and the rights and sovereignty of our State. We cannot afford to let this happen in Virginia. We cannot submit to usurpation of authority by a despotic Federal Government who has forgotten about the importance of preserving the rights and privileges of the people and the sovereignty of the States.

There appeared in the Richmond News Leader of Wednesday, July 30, 1958, an editorial which sums up the situation cogently and points out clearly the necessity that we not give up the fight. In the hope that more of the people of this country will realize the seriousness of our situation and understand why it is necessary that we make great sacrifices in a real effort to preserve our way of life and to retain the freedoms of our people and constitutional government, I desire to include with my remarks the editorial which is as follows:

WHY THE FIGHT GOES ON

Now and then, when it appears that everything has been said about school segregation that possibly could be said about school segregation, some events come along in the news and once again the necessity arises for a restatement of basic considerations.

Such a time is at hand now. A number of parents, who possibly have not pondered the problem wholly, are asking why the various Virginia localities are not permitted

to go their own way. Here in Richmond, it is termed absurd to risk the closing of Westhampton and Nathaniel Bacon Schools to prevent half a dozen Negro pupils from attending classes with a thousand white children. In the Arlington area, a few apostles of panic are protesting the possibility that even one child may lose as much as a single day from public school.

It may be useful, in view of the crisis now only a month away, to set down anew the reasons that underlie Virginia's policy of massive resistance. What is the State fighting for?

Three things:

1. To preserve a constitutional position that ought never to be voluntarily surrendered.

2. To preserve the ethnic and social structure of the South against forces that would destroy it.

3. To preserve the greatest possible educational opportunities for the greatest number of children, white and Negro alike.

Those are the State's aims. They are the only aims. But it should be understood that meeting these aims demands a great deal of the people of Virginia. We are asked to rise above those interests which are personal, concrete and immediate, and to dedicate ourselves instead to goals that, to a degree, are abstract and remote. We are asked to think earnestly upon the Constitution of the United States and the structure of the American Republic, and these are big things, hard to catch hold of. We will be asked, some of us, to accept temporary sacrifices that affect our own children, and this is hardest of all to understand.

But the fight is worth making. If Virginia quits now, we will repudiate the political heritage passed down to us, and we will leave to succeeding generations a shameful inheritance. It is no disgrace to be defeated, and in the end we may be defeated. This disgrace lies in failing to resist.

THE CONSTITUTION

The constitutional position taken by Virginia is simple, direct, unambiguous. Virginia entered the Union in 1788, at a time when she could have remained forever apart, upon certain clear understandings: This was to be a Federal Union of sovereign States, in which the States would delegate certain limited powers to the Federal Government they were creating; all other powers, apart from those prohibited to the States by the Constitution itself, were to be retained by the States individually. This structure of the Union was in no way altered by the war of 1861–65.

After the war, when the 14th amendment was forced upon the South, Northern legislators inquired what effect the amendment would have upon the maintenance by the States of racially separate schools. Proponents of the amendment agreed that the amendment was not intended to prohibit this power to the States; the power, therefore, was to be reserved to them. For a long period thereafter, pursuant to this explicit understanding of the correct meaning of the amendment, States both North and South continued to maintain segregated schools. Their power to do so was repeatedly reaffirmed by the highest State and Federal courts; this construction of the 14th amendment, directly and vitally affecting millions of people and enormous investments in school property, became in effect a part of the Constitution of the United States.

The South's position is that the Constitution may be amended in one way only: That is by the consent of not fewer than three-fourths of the States, expressed in the ratification of a specific amendment. The Constitution cannot be amended by mandate of the Supreme Court. The Court's function is to interpret the Constitution; and as the Court applies its interpretive powers to new situations, so the Court properly may shape the Constitution to changing times. But the States' power to maintain separate schools was not a new situation in May of 1954; it was an old situation, dating back to the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868. And Virginia's position is that in the school cases, the Supreme Court usurped the amendatory power that is vested in the States alone.

Virginia's position is not limited to the school matter only. If the Court may usurp power so drastically in this instance, we have said, then, the Court may usurp power in every instance. The concept of a Federal union of States, held together by checks and balances, will be lost altogether.

If this trend is to be halted at all, it will be halted only because the States resist it—resist it dramatically, resist it steadfastly, resist it in every legal and honorable way that can be devised. If it takes a noise to arouse the rest of the country, then we must make that noise. If it requires a court fight to attract attention, then we will have to fight in court. Quiet submission to the Court's revolutionary demands would be an invitation to new judicial excesses. Stubborn and unyielding resistance, if it accomplishing nothing more, may deter the Court from fresh encroachments. This constitutional fight is of primary importance. It must not be abandoned.

THE SOCIETY

The second reason for Virginia's policy lies in subjective considerations that are most difficult for outsiders to understand—at least until they have exprienced, over a considerable time, the much mocked "southern way of life." Our entire socity is predicated on, and influenced by, the intimate coexistence of two races. This relationship has operated, until recently, upon well-understood rules—rules that were not static, rules that, in fact, were steadily undergoing change—and under these rules the Negro people were making astonishing progress. What the Supreme Court has attempted to do is not only to amend the Constitution, which it had no right to do, but to revolutionize the social structure of the South, which it has no power to do.

This is because the public schools are perceived not only as educational institutions, but as social institutions also. In rural areas, especially, the schools provide a center for all community life. Everywhere else, the two races may meet and pass—in business, in farming, in transportation, in employment. It is only in schools that both races would be thrown together, social equals, in a compulsory relationship intimate, personal, and prolonged.

The white South cannot accept the long-range prospect of such a relationship. We of Virginia know, in a hundred ways, that our distant critics cannot know, something of the differences that divide white and Negro in the South. These are ethnic differences, racial differences—differences in morals, in behavior, in language, in inhibitions, in aspirations. The South acknowledges, of course, the achievements of many Negro citizens of exceptional competence and ambition; and the South is ruefully aware of its "po' white trash." But we view the "classless society" as sheer fiction. In one way or another, all men are divided into classes. And what the South holds is that the harm done by segregating these classes in the public schools (and admittedly, there is harm done) is infinitely less than the social chaos and civil decline that would follow inexorably in the wake of massive race mixing.

We are not talking here of the consequences this year, or next year, or the year after that. These are consequences 20, 30, or 50 years hence. And Virginia has only to point to the dismal history of civilizations dominated by mixed blood to insist that such a fate must be resisted here.

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The least of the considerations, though it may seem the most important to distressed parents whose children are directly affected, is the aim of keeping every public school open every single day. Virginia does not need any lectures on the importance of public schools; everyone concedes the importance of public schools. But the ultimate goal is not necessarily public education, by which is meant tax-supported education in publicly owned buildings. The ultimate goal is simply education. In one fashion or another, satisfactory educational opportunities must be provided, and they must be provided for the children of both races.

Virginia's position is that the public school system, as a statewide system, can be preserved for the foreseeable future only as a racially separate system. A little integration will not preserve the system. A little integration will destroy the system. This is because integration anywhere means, inevitably, integration everywhere. And once a precedent is set, disruption follows. Talk of massive school closings. If Virginia were to accept integration in principle, in time Virginia truly would see massive school closings, county by county, city by city, in the wake of violence, bloodshed, and bitterness never known before. And instead of facing the problems of establishing a relatively few private schools, Virginians would face the problems of private education across the whole State. In the resulting atmosphere of hatred and resentment, education would be all but impossible.

It now seems likely that as a consequence of Federal court orders and unyielding State policy, some schools will not be opened in Virginia in September. That will be unfortunate, regrettable, and to the parents directly involved, damnably inconvenient. But this newspaper does not regard the immediate prospect as catastrophic. The resourcefulness of the people will not let any substantial number of children go long without some adequate educational opportunity.

Virginians have known sacrifice before, and they have met hard challenges before; they are not lacking in character or energy. We can meet the multiple emergencies of September calmly, without panic, without violence, without hysterical pleas to surrender. All that is required is that we hold to the long view, abide by the law (no law compels Virginia to operate any schools), and maintain a steadfast faith in the inherent rightness of Virginia's position.

The Goldfine Contempt Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, considerable publicity has accompanied the testimony of Bernard Goldfine before the so-called oversight committee, and often referred to as the Harris committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, of which the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, is chairman.

During the hearings the witness, Bernard Goldfine, had the benefit of the advice and counsel of a Mr. Sears, a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Boston attorney, together with other attorneys, as to what questions propounded to him were within the jurisdiction of the committee. Mr. Goldfine answered frankly and fully many of the questions addressed to him. However, there were some 22 or 23 questions which he refused to answer on advice of his attorney as not being pertinent to the committee investigation.

The committee over a period of days and on several occasions sought to have Mr. Goldfine reconsider his refusal and answer the disputed questions. However, he refused to do so. In each instance he based his refusal on the advice of his counsel. Accordingly, it became necessary for the committee to consider the propriety of instituting contempt proceedings. The subcommittee and the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce thereupon, and, in accordance with established procedures, found that the questions asked of Mr. Goldfine were appropriate to the investigation and that his refusal to answer the same was not justified and as a result thereof he was in contempt of the committee which was acting as an agent of the House of Representatives.

The committee has now taken formal action and recommended that the House of Representatives take the necessary action to have Bernard Goldfine found in contempt of Congress by the appropriate Federal Court.

It is not my intention to recite in detail all that justifies the action, and, on the basis of which the House of Representatives is asked to act. Suffice it to say that a study of the resolution adopted by the House authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or subcommittee thereof, to make the investigation for the purposes set forth in the resolution, together with the testimony presented, leaves no doubt in my mind that Mr. Goldfine was wrongfully advised and that he should have answered the questions in question, and, accordingly, upon his refusal to do so he is clearly in contempt and should be held to full accountability. Failure to do so would greatly handicap all investigatory proceedings.

In connection with the above views I have expressed as to the relevancy of the questions that are the basis of the proposed contempt proceedings, it is interesting to note that in the issue of the Washington Post Times Herald, dated Thursday, July 31, 1958, appears a new article written by David Wise of the New York Herald-Tribune News Service, which I herewith include as part of these remarks. Of course, the information contained in the article has had no part in the consideration of the subject by the committee as it is not part of committee proceedings. However, it is of interest as a sidelight on the action taken by the committee. The article to which I have referred reads as follows:

LAWYER FEUD IN GOLDFINE CASE ERUPTS

(By David Wise)

On the eve of an expected contempt citation against Bernard Goldfine, his Washington attorney, Roger Robb, last night made available a sensational memorandum he sent to the industrialist's Boston lawyers on July 10 warning them not to tell the committee to go to hell.

The memo showed that Robb had warned Goldfine's attorneys almost 3 weeks ago that questions asked by House influence investigators were clearly relevant.

The document showed also that Robb disagreed with what he described as the Boston team's position that we should lightly dismiss the possibility that Goldfine would be cited for contempt.

A House subcommittee probing whether Goldfine got special treatment from Federal regulatory agencies—after they were contacted by Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams—voted Tuesday to cite the Boston textile magnate for refusal to answer 23 questions as not relevant. The parent House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is expected to recommend contempt today. After that, it will go to the full House for a final vote.

Robb took the extraordinary step of releasing an internal, confidential memo prepared only for the eyes of lawyers after this reporter brought to his attention the fact that a portion of it was quoted over the weekend in the Boston Globe, together with excerpts from a blistering reply by one of Goldfine's Boston attorneys, Lawrence R. Cohen. Robb said his memo was addressed to Samuel P. Sears, who, with Cohen, comprises Goldfine's Boston legal team.

Existence of the memos for the first time revealed the substance of the smoldering feud reported between Robb and the Boston team.

Robb's memo said:

"From the beginning of our representation of Mr. Bernard Goldfine there have been fundamental differences of opinion between us and you with respect to the policy that should be followed by Mr. Goldfine in respect to questions from the committee and its counsel.

"On the one hand, it has been our position, and we have advised Mr. Goldfine, to answer all questions that he possibly could; that each question should be judged upon its merits with respect to pertinency and relevancy; that he should refuse to answer only those questions which were clearly irrelevant and beyond the scope of the committee's authority; and that, even in the case of irrelevant questions, he should answer if he could do so without damage to himself.

"On the other hand, you have argued that Mr. Goldfine should refuse to answer every question that he possibly could; that the test of irrelevancy should be applied with great strictness and that we should lightly dismiss the possibility that Mr. Goldfine would be cited for contempt.

"A fair summary of your position is your statement, which you have made several times, 'Tell the Committee to go to hell.' Notwithstanding our differences of opinion, we have done our best to work in harmony with you.

"This afternoon Mr. Goldfine, relying upon your advice, refused to answer a question which in our opinion was clearly relevant, and the answer to which could not reasonably be expected to damage him."

In answer to questions, Robb said Sears had specifically used the expression "tell the committee to go to hell" on more than one occasion in their private discussions.

He added:

"I don't think it's proper for an attorney to release documents affecting his client. Since Mr. Sears has seen fit to do so, I can say I think its the duty of a lawyer to give his client the best advice he can. That is why I sent the memo to Mr. Sears. Period."

Robb also confirmed that he received a "5- or 6-page" answering memo from Cohen in which the Boston attorney denied he used the specific expression "tell the committee to go to hell" and criticized Robb for employing public relations advisers, who Cohen said had proved more harmful to Goldfine than any charges by the subcommittee.

Robb also said that he wrote his memo after Goldfine refused to answer the first of 23 questions, for which he now faces contempt charges, dealing with the operations of two realty firms Goldfine controls, the East Bostoh Co. and the Boston Port Development Co.

Robert W. Lishman, subcommittee counsel, had asked Goldfine whether in 1946 he and his late business partner had withdrawn $20,000 apiece from Boston Port "allegedly as commissions" with supporting vouchers explaining the reason for the withdrawals.

Goldfine replied:

"I respectfully decline to answer the question because it is not pertinent or relevant to the matters which the subcommittee is investigating or about which it is authorized to inquire."

The next day, the witness declined to answer 22 more similar questions about his withdrawal of more than $100,000 from Boston Port. Lishman charged that Goldfine had "milked" the company of this amount during part of an 8-year period when he failed to file required reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission for the benefit of other stockholders in the company.

Robb's position, disclosed last night, is particularly significant since he is regarded as extremely close to the administration, which had a large political stake in the hearings because they involved the name of Adams, the Assistant to the President. It is now clear that Robb, at least, urged that Goldfine cooperate with the subcommittee.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert at this point in the RECORD the resolution unanimously adopted by the Detroit Common Council urging support of the legislation to appropriate $30 million for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway connecting channels:

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway, after many years of effort upon the part of many, is slowly approaching a much anticipated reality; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway cannot be brought to a necessary completion without the construction of the connecting channels; and

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a bill to appropriate $30 million for such construction of the connecting channels; and

Whereas any amount of appropriation smaller than the aforementioned sum would seriously hamper the progress of such construction and cause unnecessary and unwarranted delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council hereby urges and requests the Honorable LOUIS G. RABAUT, acting chairman of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee, to give favorable consideration to this $30 million appropriation proposal and to use his good offices in expediting the enactment of it into law; and be it further

Resolved, That this common council urges and requests all of the honorable Members

of Congress, representing the people of the city of Detroit, to lend their full support to the above mentioned appropriation bill thereby insuring its prompt passage.

Adopted unanimously.

A Subject for Study: Old Age Pension Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting editorial which was part of the newsletter issued by the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., in Washington, D. C., whose editor is T. A. McInerny:

A SUBJECT FOR STUDY

When the social-security system was decided upon, the old-age pension requirements were based primarily on rent and food.

There was some talk of reducing drastically the amount pensioners would receive if they owned their own homes. It was therefore an act which could be construed as a relief measure for an industrial economy. The farmer and the self-employed were not seriously considered and they are pretty well out of the range of the act.

Twenty-five years have now passed since the act was first proposed, and as a whole it has operated very well. However, under a war economy from 1939 onward, the requirements of retired individuals have trebled and quadrupled with the trend in the economy. People are living longer and are living better. The currency has been inflated so that the dollar of the 1930's is worth only about one-third in terms of foodstuffs, one-half in terms of rent.

In the original compilations utilities such as gas and electricity were written off with the rent at absurdly low figures and were carried, as one source had it, at $2 per month each.

No account was taken of telephone or transportation.

Thus a retired couple today is not reasonably covered in the utility fields which have become necessities of daily living and not luxuries.

There are 12 million citizens who are receiving this pension currently. The average amount for the individual is $65.54 as of last May and the average per couple is $108.

The telephone and the automobile have become necessities in the United States economy. Likewise the household appliances which have jumped the use of electric power to astronomical proportions.

Take one appliance alone, the electric refrigerator. The iceman just doesn't come any more. And the household cost of running an electric refrigerator amounts to more than was originally calculated as sufficient for all utilities for pension purposes.

Without an automobile and money to operate it, most American families would be trapped in apartments or suburbs.

There just isn't transportation available in many communities. There are supermarkets and shopping centers across the Nation which are only available by automobile. After taking rent and food out of $65.54 or $108, where do the other necessities come in?

The customary, offhand, unthinking argument is that: Well, a couple should have saved enough to take care of these factors. A retirement home should have been purchased also.

Taxes during the past 15 years have sucked up United States savings. Union dues, and lack of a realistic approach to deductions for health, education, and necessities on the tax collectors' part, have caused many a retired couple to rely upon the good will of their relatives.

The Inescapable Liberation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these past few years the American people have been exposed to quite a number of slogans which are supposed to characterize new courses and directions in our foreign policy. According to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, despite this penchant for new slogans and forms, the American people are still confronted by the same fundamental issue which faced this Nation in 1952.

In an article entitled "The Inescapable Liberation Policy," which appears in the June issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, Dr. Dobriansky develops this basic view in the simplest terms possible. He takes pains to demonstrate also the intrinsic flexibility of this policy by showing concretely what could be done in the course of its implementation. The writer maintains the basic conviction that the prime and fundamental area for American concentration of interest and plans is captive eastern Europe and central Asia. It is in this essential area rather than anywhere else that the global struggle of this century will be ultimately resolved.

Because of its timely thoughts and ideas on fundamental issues, I include this article on the inescapable liberation policy in the RECORD:

THE INESCAPABLE LIBERATION POLICY

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In this decade the American people have been exposed to a rapid succession of concepts dealing with our foreign affairs. The verbal parade has included "containment," "liberation," "peaceful liberation," "massive retaliation," "peaceful coexistence," "the Geneva spirit," "competitive coexistence," "deterrence," "evolution," and "disengagement." What the morrow will bring in verbal novelty is anyone's guess. Similar to the annual dress-fashion shows, old ideas seem to require new terms. Perhaps the title of this article should be in terms of a new policy of "expansive freedom" or something of like nature. But whatever the verbal dress, the structure of ideas would be the same. This holds true for the other so-called new concepts.

We Americans generally do not go in for rigorous conceptual analyses. The reasons for this condition are many. However, this very succession of conceptual constructs indicates that there is much confusion of thought and an inability to draw logically proper distinctions. Beyond containment and liberation the other concepts are essentially reducible to the one or the other. Careful reflection will show that the issue still is fundamentally between the continuance of containment or the projection of liberation. Yet it is amazing how few understand this. The apparent reason for this is that too many individuals don't seem to grasp the basic meaning of liberation and what it entails. To this writer the liberation policy is logical, sensible, and—assuming that we have the will to survive as an independent nation—inescapable. It is really the only alternative to either codestruction or peaceful surrender. Call it what you will, the ideas incorporated in it are nevertheless distinguishing.

Let us begin with the concrete question: "What are the prospects of liberation for the captive countries not only in eastern Europe but also in the Communist empire as a whole?" My answer to this question is in the affirmative: that the opportunities, the prospects are bright; that there are many opportunities for us if we have the knowledge, the understanding, the will, the courage, and the determination to plan for them and to seize them. Cast in the simplest possible terms, this article will attempt to conclusively justify this answer. One section will deal with the logic and reason of the liberation policy. The second section will briefly develop the history of liberation thought. And the third section will consider some concrete measures of implementation.

THE LOGIC AND REASON OF LIBERATION

Let us look first at the logic and reason of liberation. One may formulate it into some sort of syllogism. The first proposition is this: We are in a cold war with a Messianic enemy—a Messianic, dedicated, determined Russian Communist enemy. The second proposition is that war, whether cold or hot, is a situation which poses the question of victory or defeat. Then the third proposition is that as a nation, it is necessary for us, in fact we cannot but logically seek, to defeat the enemy, which also means political defeat, the political and decisive defeat of the Russian Communist enemy.

Just consider the first proposition. It really requires little elaboration. We read of it in the papers and hear it over the radio, time and time again. Individuals talk about the cold war and winning this cold war. So there is at least verbally a recognition of the fact that we are in a cold war. To support this particular proposition, it is obviously unnecessary to provide all the overwhelming evidence that easily substantiates it.

Let us take the second and third propositions. The second is that war, whether hot or cold, is something that poses victory or defeat. Being primarily concerned here with the cold war, there should be no question that victory is possible and achievable. And the third is that for survival as a nation we must logically seek victory or be ready to surrender even in a state of ignoble compromise to the enemy.

Now this third proposition certainly cannot be supported by present empirical evidence as such. Its support rests, instead, in common sense, in the ideals of freedom, and in our dedication to these ideals. Unfortunately, here in the United States we have to some extent lost that sense of patriotism. To be sure, it is explicable on numerous grounds. One need only recall that during the thirties many a professor referred to the flag as a colorful symbolic rag. This kind of negativism still manifests itself in the writings and addresses of many different individual. Nevertheless, this dedication is one

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the very springs of our American democracy, going back to the Declaration of Independence and to our Constitution. It takes these documents seriously and inspires us to uphold the ideals of freedom. Still, much of this has been sapped and, as a consequence, we have anything within the range of the irrational excesses of a Kennan over to the insular Fortress America concept.

Knowing that this is war, albeit a cold war, if we are not dedicated to the defeat of the enemy, then it obviously follows that we are ready to compromise morally and politically. It is a compromise in the sense that we are willing to accept the status quo of slavery in a substantial part of the world. And as we develop that predicational position, we shall continue to compromise more and more. In the process we cannot but expose ourselves to perhaps ultimate defeat.

With our present position, really one that has been maintained since World War II, it seems that time clearly favors Moscow. In completing this logic of the liberation concept, let me point out that there are five factors which should be soberly considered. They constitute, in a sense, certain irreducible general abstracts.

The first factor is adequacy of arms. It can be firmly argued that it isn't necessary for Moscow to have a clear-cut superiority in all arms. For its purposes in the future, a sufficient adequacy of arms to achieve its ends is enough. At the beginning of this decade, we hid behind the fact that we had a distinct superiority in arms. We spoke effusively of physical deterrence, the great deterrence against the Russian Communist wave of the future. It plainly was a fact that we had overwhelming material and physical superiority. Now, however, since the sputniks, since the ICBM, etc., we have begun to doubt this. As a consequence, one could maintain that there is a relative decline in this power of physical deterrence. This also means that there will inevitably be, in the continuing arms race, Russian Communist superiority in many lines.

Take now the second factor in this calculus, also an asset in Moscow's position. By maintaining our present position, we, in effect, guarantee to the Russians the steady consolidation of their empire. In other words, by maintaining the narrow policy of containment, we, in effect say, "Let history do it." "Don't make any delicate decisions." "Let us see pragmatically—day by day, expediently—how things will work out, and let's shift accordingly—by all means, no long-range plans, no fixed and set objectives"; "We mustn't appear inflexible." In that case, then, we have unmistakably declared ourself. We will do nothing, nothing of serious import, to disturb the consolidating processes within this vast Russian Communist empire. As a result, we guarantee to them the consolidation of their empire so that they may become stronger and stronger.

A third point is the international conspiracy. We must not overlook this fact despite the political offensive fanning the pretensions of peace on the part of Moscow. The undercurrent of international conspiracy continues. Moscow persistently plans for sabotage when the appropriate time arrives. Without hazard one can postulate the thought that they far surpass us in this conspiratorial preparation. Widening of the network of subversion, conspiracy, and sabotage, which is a third asset, is a Russian stock in trade either in times of so-called peace or in times of war.

Now a fourth asset is the highly concentrated and very persistent political propaganda waged by Moscow. Historically, this has always been, and always will be so long as we have this kind of institutional setup in the Soviet Union. In this a typical case it is a faucet-like propaganda which many oftentimes overlook. Only 2 years ago there was a great political offensive for peace. Immediately thereafter Moscow prostituted everything that was said and done at Geneva. Now we are plunged again in another phase of summit fever. The same Moscow initiative is seen in the changing of directions. As under the Czars, sometimes it is political concentration in the East, other times in the West, then in the South. Without question, they will continue to use these traditional techniques. And again, as a result, Moscow will continue to breed confusion and debate and to sow the seeds of disunity in the United States and the free world.

A recent example of Russian propaganda flexibility even within their own empire deserves mention. This is about a truly Krokodil position in Ukraine. Issued in November right after sputnik, this Krokodil number aims to impress upon the people of Ukraine the worldwide superiority of Moscow. The periodical tries to persuade the captive Ukrainian people that they are really associated with the leaders of the future.

The fifth factor is the real advantage of the first shot which we also guarantee to Moscow. For various reasons we can't contemplate any sufficient action in terms of a preventive war. As a result, they are in a position to develop their arms and also to seize the real possibility of firing the first shot. The power of blackmail looms large here. Thus, when one considers these five factors, one cannot but arrive at the conclusion that there are two real frightening possibilities. One, it is patently within the realm of real possibility for the United States to suffer military defeat, given a peculiar complex of events and situations. But in my estimation the more important is the second. There is also the real possibility of the United States becoming in time psychologically isolated, and this, too, would mean disastrous defeat.

Obviously, no rational person would hold that a football team could possibly realize victory by constantly playing on its own side of the 50-yard line. This is precisely what the United States and free world are doing. We are playing on this side of the 50-yard line. Indeed, here is the crucial differentiating point between a policy of containment and a policy of liberation. Under the former, all the tensions are on this side of the Iron Curtain fence. In Africa, in Asia, in Europe, and here tensions are being created or aggravated, and we are led to disperse ourselves, tending to this tension today, that one tomorrow, and so on. In the meantime, as a functional correlate to our second factor above, we also guarantee that there will be no creation of disturbances or tensions within the Communist empire.

A BACKGROUND OF LIBERATION THOUGHT

Setting this crucial political distinction aside from certain moral and psychological distinctions that could also be drawn upon, we ought now to look at the background of liberation thought. In doing so, keep in mind that its main differentiating aspect is that it prepares us to carry the political offensive to the terrain of the enemy. Remember, too, that this is a cold war; that we are dedicated to freedom; and that, as a consequence, we wish to realize victory decisively by defeating the enemy.

Indeed, there is a background of thought on the liberation policy. No one can say—as do some editorial writers and people on TV and radio—that there is little, if anything, we can do about our relations to the Communist empire. On the contrary, there is a great deal of literature showing what can be done. What can be done is essentially determined by our awareness of the opportunities existing within the Russian Communist empire. Actually, such questions of skepticism and doubt usually reflect one's unfamiliarity with or ignorance of the facts, more than being the result of any painstaking absorption in the outstanding literature. Again, is there any accessible body of literature on this whole liberation matter? First, let me cite the passage of the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act in August of 1951. This was the first concrete measure designed to produce our political offensive about 7 years ago—or 5 years before Hungary.

Briefly, what is the Kersten amendment? It means simply three things. Remember, it was during this time that many escapees were coming through the Iron Curtain. There was a great opportunity to have many more. Thus the first provision of the Kersten amendment was and is to attract escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. The second is to quickly rehabilitate these escapees and to form them into military units. In the amendment, the aim is to have, for example, several thousand Poles from behind the Iron Curtain, even those in England, Germany, Italy, Lebanon and elsewhere, forming military national battalions with their own commanders, their own insignia, own flag; in other words, constituting in western Europe, or Turkey, or elsewhere, the brilliant symbol of Polish freedom and liberty. The same is to be applied to Russian, Ukrainian, Slovak, and numerous other national units.

Not only are there to be these national military units, but the amendment's third provision also calls for the support of the existing undergrounds. There were and are a number of them. In Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and elsewhere political undergrounds have existed. The amendment seeks to employ them as the means of conveying our political offensive.

In many quarters the Kersten amendment received very serious consideration. Significantly, when the United Nations Assembly convened in Paris in December 1951, right down to the end of that Assembly at the end of January, about three-quarters of the sessions were devoted to the Kerstein amendment. By this amendment Mr. Kersten himself was able to strike a highly sensitive note in Moscow. They were extremely sensitive to it. Mr. Vishinsky attacked it incessantly in Paris. And Mr. Truman found it necessary at the time to send Congressman MANSFIELD in order to explain that we had no intention of really interferring, mind you, in these captive nations.

There were some official and private criticisms of the amendment, to be sure. However, none of them stood up to the logical test and the general consensus was clearly in favor of the amendment's implementation. Why it has not been implemented is still a deep mystery. The Kersten idea continued, and there is much more to it. It was significant that at the beginning of 1957, immediately after the Hungarian crisis, Senator RUSSELL revived the idea and thought that the Armed Services Committee would sponsor it.

Now a second item in this background emerged before the Dulles liberation article appeared in Life magazine in May 1952. In the Republican national committee, as early as 1951, preparations were being made to advance the whole concept and idea of national liberation. During the Republican convention and the subsequent campaign this whole idea was presented to the country. One significant incident should be cited. It took place at the beginning of October in New York when Mr. Harriman met with Mr. Dulles on a TV show. Probably well primed by the Democratic national committee, Harriman challenged Dulles or any Republican to show where or when Mr. Acheson or Mr. Truman ever used the term "containment." This meant that by that time even the Democratic Party was disowning the very thought, or at least the wording of the policy of containment.

In 1956 the same thing was repeated. Witness this statement by President Eisenhower, "the peaceful liberation of the cap-

tive peoples has been, and will continue to be a goal of United States foreign policy." And again much material and several hundreds of thousands of pamphlets were circulated throughout the country. In a more formal way Prof. James Burnham systematically gave expression to this policy of liberation in his work on Containment or Liberation? In a sense you can say his work is the liberationist's bible. In May 1955 General Sarnoff felt that it was necessary to convince many in this country of the urgency of the Russian threat and presented a memorandum to President Eisenhower in which he likewise gives detailed expression to the liberation policy. In 1956 Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, took steps in the Senate to propose a freedom administration on the basis of a two-level concept. Moscow operates on two levels, the Communist Party with its subversive network and the conventional diplomatic level. Why can't we have a freedom administration, subverting, if you will, for freedom, with the other parts of Government remaining on the conventional level? This constitutes, in brief, the background of liberationist thought.

The logic of liberation teaches that the best way to prevent a hot war is to win a cold war. We hear of peaceful coexistence; we hear of Allen Dulles' naive notion of evolution. These are verbal variants of containment. Let it be emphasized that the liberation policy does not theoretically reject the concept of containment. On the contrary, it is necessarily founded on containment. Certainly we have to contain the forces of Russian expansion, but we also have to go beyond this in creating pressures and tensions behind the Iron Curtain and throughout the Russian Communist Empire. Our situation is as simple as this.

FLEXIBLE LINES OF IMPLEMENTATION

If we can indicate the flexible lines of implementation of the liberation policy, briefly show what could be done, perhaps the perennial question as to our ability to do something will in some degree be answered. First, by all means we should appreciate the nature of the enemy confronting us. This timely picture more than justifies the old, patriotic Chinese proverb that one picture is worth ten thousand words. In the middle you have a typically squat five by five Russian master, characteristically gripping his holster. This was taken in a street in Hungary during the 1956 revolution. It vividly typifies the enemy before us. What can we do? This question has been raised time and time again. In itself it indicates that we have not been acquainted with the growing literature on liberation to see what could possibly be done. Certain concrete measures of action have been advocated for years.

The first thing necessary is a general, comprehensive national policy. What do we want? What are our objectives? They have to be clearly stated and realistically well founded. Many have submitted that liberation, independence, and federation is the policy formula. A universalized Declaration of Independence would strongly reflect the general objectives of the United States in consonance with its institutions and its long-run national security interests.

The second urgent step is the creation of a Freedom Administration. This is what Senator DOUGLAS has proposed, an Administration that would exemplify the two-level concept. The Administration would not be affiliated with any existing power of the Government. However, it would be directly under the supervision and direction of the President. It could use counterpart funds, the $100 million appropriated in the Kersten amendment, and other sources. National freedom committees here and abroad would be in its network.

Furthermore, we must have guideposts of action. If we take the cold war seriously, the first of these is a moral commitment to all of the captive nations. Such a commitment means the certainty of liberation for all captive nations, including those in the U. S. S. R. Fundamentally crucial to all of our present issues and problems is eastern Europe. This is so because there is the very basis of the strength and power of the enemy. Instead of neglecting this basic area by being absorbed in what goes on in the fringe areas of Indonesia and parts of Asia and Africa, we should begin to concentrate on the enemy, find his weak spots, and begin to magnify and deepen these weak spots. As shown on this map, this can only mean the liberation and independence of all the captive non-Russian nations, both within and outside the U. S. S. R.

Our problem is in a real sense their problem for the basic reason that they have already been conquered. They are submerged as nations. This is, after all, our primary concern. We naturally fear being submerged as a nation. To prevent this tragedy, surely, should be the overriding passion of every American.

With regard to the Russian masses, for them it is not a matter of conserving and preserving their national unity. There hasn't been on record any genocide against the Russian nation. It hasn't been, as a national unit, submerged. Moscow is the capital of Russia, and the problem there is, and has for a long time been, one of liberation in terms of civil and personal political freedoms. We have to keep alive throughout the Communist empire the spirit of resistance, the hope of freedom, and the fiery spirit of nationalism. Also, we should have no qualms whatsoever about hailing freedom as the wave of the future, instead of permitting colonial and imperialist Russian communism to assume this role. In pursuing all this, we would have to sharpen by every device Moscow's fear of its own captives. This is another salient point in the policy of liberation. One of the greatest deterrents against a hot war is Moscow's own fear of its captive millions. And this is what we should support, broaden, and magnify.

Let us view now some examples of specific operations. For reasons of space the list has to be restricted at least alphabetically, going from "A" to "Z." The first was already mentioned—a full implementation of the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act. Second, moral and material aid to opposition and resistance groups behind the Iron Curtain. We talk a great deal about giving them time to develop. Yet when Kersten presented a rough draft of what could be done in carrying on a political offensive, his opponents cried out, "Ah, but you can't do it." They preclude the possibility of a guided evolution in the unfolding of our liberation policy. If you will note the various other operations which can be effected: Passive resistance, for instance, has been found to be very effective in many areas, especially in several closed non-Russian areas within the U. S. S. R. Progressive infiltration of the armed forces of the U. S. S. R., particularly into its 43 percent non-Russian composition, has always borne great potentiality. One of the most glaring misconceptions is to equate the nature of these forces with that of the United States or any other true national entity.

During the Hungarian revolution, it was quite significant that several hundreds of officers and men deserted the U. S. S. R. Army. Testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, one of the first Hungarian revolutionaries to appear in this country took pains to point out that these deserters were not Russians. They were Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and other non-Russians who deserted and joined the Hungarian freedom fighters.

With regard to mass communication, mobile broadcasting facilities about the Communist empire and special messages to respective nations and people will have to take prudent account of each targeted area. Aiding in this endeavor would be a Voice of America for liberation, independence, and justice. Mass-production achievements of various sorts, lightweight receivers, hand-operated photographic devices, literally millions of such instruments can be funneled into the empire.

Then there is the use of the facilities of friendly countries. One can be certain that not one of them would hesitate to aid us in this type of political offensive. Impressed by positive American leadership, the free Chinese, Koreans, Pakistani, Turks, and others would collaborate. This would have to be a sustained day-to-day offensive; not a thing to be won one day and then forgotten about until a week or a month later, but rather a persistent campaign against the enemy. And it can be used in vast, multiple ways.

Now, certainly, at this given time it would be unfeasible to embark upon one or two of these proposals. In the present climate it would be better to concentrate on a diplomatic political offensive and on economic warfare. With a change in climate new activity would be initiated with adequate preparation for follow-ups, such as the dislodgement of Albania from the empire. With changes in climate and organized, dedicated effort, there are many things that could be done, and with maximum flexibility and initiative. The main thing to bear in mind is that by just sitting and maintaining a policy of mere containment, we are allowing the enemy to build himself up militarily, psychologically, politically. It has been truly said that we can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

WHAT COULD BE DONE

1. General comprehensive policy: Liberation, independence, federation.

(a) A universalized declaration of independence.

2. A freedom administration: Unify political warfare conduct, overcome piecemeal efforts.

(a) Not affiliated with any existing part of Government.

(b) Under general direction and supervision of President.

(c) Funds: counterpart, MSA $100 million; appropriations.

(d) National freedom committees here and abroad.

3. Guideposts of action:

(a) Moral commitment: certainty of liberation of all nations, including those in U. S. S. R.

(1) Liberation, independence for all captive non-Russian nations in the entire Moscow-centered Communist empire.

(2) Civil and political freedoms for the unvested Russian masses.

(3) Keep alive throughout Communist empire spirit of resistance and hope of freedom and national independence.

(a) Break awful sense of isolation in which internal enemies of Moscow live.

(4) Support spirit of nationalism inside and outside U. S. S. R.

(b) Shatter wave of future aura of Russian communism.

(1) Instead, certain defeat of Moscow and complete victory of freedom.

(c) Inspire millions in free countries with feeling of moral dedication to enlargement of area of freedom.

(d) Sharpen by every device Moscow's fear of own captives.

4. Examples of operations:

(a) Full implementation of Kersten amendment to MSA.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(1) Attraction of escapees; rehabilitation; national battalions; underground support.

(b) Moral and material aid, including trained leadership, to oppositions, resistance groups.

(c) Broadening of organized resistance—eventual cacophony of protests, riots, and then a symphony of revolts.

(d) Encouragement of passive resistance in every sphere of society.

(e) Infiltrations into chief areas—armed forces of U. S. S. R., national republic administrations, "satellite" administrations, etc.

(1) No means of communication overlooked: spoken and written word, radio and TV, films, balloons, missiles to distribute leaflets, secret printing and mimeographing presses on enemy terrain, wall scrawls, etc.

(g) Fixed and mobile broadcasting facilities about Communist empire. From each area:

(1) Far East: special messages to Siberyaks, non-Russians.

(2) Middle East: special messages to Turkestani, Caucasians, Ukrainians.

(3) Western Europe: special messages to Russians, Balts, Ukrainians, Poles, Slovaks, etc.

(h) Voice of America: For liberation, independence, justice.

(1) Appeal to universal emotions—love of family, country, God, humanity.

(i) Mass production of cheap and lightweight receivers.

(j) Production of hand-operated phonograph devices for millions in empire.

(k) Use of facilities of friendly countries—South Korea, Nationalist China, Philippines, Pakistan, Turkey, Italy, Spain.

(1) Training of Chinese, Koreans, etc., in political warfare.

(l) Make maximum use of fugitives from empire.

(m) Offset redefection operations of Moscow.

(n) Publicize names of former democratic leaders now in Communist jails, etc., for world to know their fate.

(o) Expand existing programs of correspondence—liberation stamps, etc.

(p) Indictment and condemnation in absentia persons guilty of Communist crimes—broadcast.

(q) Systematic execution of sabotage, assassination, confidence and bribery programs.

(r) Proposals, demands, exposés, publication of official documents carefully calculated to show true motives of Kremlin.

(s) Day-to-day and sustained publicity on Russian Communist genocide, slave labor, Hungary, etc., in U. N. and elsewhere.

(t) Utilization of labor unions, churches, veteran groups,,universities, etc.

(u) Cultural exchanges with political objective attunement.

(v) Diplomatic political offensive; e. g. American Ambassadors to non-Russian countries in U. S. S. R.; withdrawal of all, etc.

(w) Selected projects—reunify Korea, reunify Germany, etc.

(x) Economic warfare in empire—e. g. offers of surpluses to people via neutral channels.

(y) U. N. activity—continuous pressure on U. S. S. R., Ukraine, Byelorussia, "satellites."

(z) With adequate preparation for followups, dislodge Albania from empire.

These are only the guidelines. Each operation suggests a program in itself, providing endless opportunities for imagination, innovation, and cunning. Above all, they once and for all answer the question, "What could be done?"

Switzerland: A Land of Liberty and Fraternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, August 1 marks the anniversary of the first recorded act of the union of Swiss communities.

Switzerland's independence day is an occasion which deserves the attention and the congratulations of the United States. The anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation is both a reminder of our sympathetic attachment to this brave country of the Alps and an inspiration to promote the values and characteristics which the Swiss have, throughout their history, perpetuated.

Their history is, indeed, a long one. The day we celebrate, August 1, carries us back nearly 700 years. On August 1, 1291, the men of Uri, Schwyz, and Lower Unterwalden entered into a defensive league. Three of the twenty-two cantons that make up Switzerland today bear the same names. The qualities which generated this union have been characteristic of the Swiss down through the centuries: independence, courage, mutual support.

Independence on a national level, on a community level, on a personal level is practiced in Switzerland as in few other places in the world. The other countries of Europe have respected the independence of the Swiss nation not only because it suits the self-interest of surrounding rival factions; not only because nature has erected almost insuperable barriers to invasion, but also they respect this island of neutrality because of its eminent self-respect. They know that special opprobrium would fall on the head of one that violated its stanchly defended frontiers, this natural fortress of freedom.

They honor, too, in recent years, the seat of international understanding. Geneva, the home of the League of Nations, the cornerstone of the International Labor Office, the site of the World Health Organization, and of various other monuments of worldwide cooperation, was, characteristically, the birthplace of that great humanitarian organization, the International Red Cross. Significantly, the flag of this organization is simply the reverse of the Swiss flag.

Where but in a country of independence, a country with freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom for the individual—where else could such international establishments spring up and flourish? Where else, too, could individuals fleeing oppression of mind or body find such a refuge and a home?

The world looks upon Switzerland as a haven for the escaped, the abandoned, the sick, the lost, the bewildered. It sees there too a host for the happy. Tourist, vacationer, son of intellectual freedom, seeker of spiritual uplift basks together with the weary in Switzerland's clean, clear atmosphere. He enjoys there the protection exemplified for us in our youth by the rescuing St. Bernard dog; the freedom we learned about from the happy, liberty-loving Heide; the independence that calls to us in the stirring strains of Rossini's William Tell. The very name of Switzerland has pleasant connotations. This is a nation which enjoys the utmost respect on an international scale. It merits the love of the world for its freedom-loving and humanitarian principles.

We in America take pride in a bond of kinship with this land of liberty and fraternity.

Art in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article which appeared in the July 25, 1958, edition of the Roseburg, Oreg., News-Review:

ARTISTS, ARTWORK RISE SUBSTANTIALLY IN OREGON

(By Matt Kramer)

A solitary figure appeared on a dock at Astoria and began sketching the waterfront. Another was on a coastal headland, sketch pad in hand, and still another beside a highway in southern Oregon.

Gradually they appeared at places where none ever before had been noticed—beside airports, in rail yards and even on city streets.

By this time Oregon artists knew something was up, and the public should have suspected it, too.

But the artists said nothing, and, since they are not known for their reticence, it is probable they did not realize themselves how big the boom was in Oregon art.

Artists are not much given to keeping statistics anyway, and often seem able to pursue their work only in isolation, which sometimes is a place behind a clump of brush and sometimes is a state of mind.

EVERYTHING MEASURED

It is disturbing to minds other than artists, but in this age nearly everything can be measured—land by surveyors, health by insurance companies, and art by supply houses.

It isn't easy, however, to get the measurement of art in Oregon, for artists also have infiltrated behind sales counters. With their minds fixed firmly on other matters, they are vague about statistics.

"Sales of art supplies are up, all right. Maybe 10—no, maybe 30 or 40 percent in recent years. But there is no easy way for me to determine exactly how much," said one sales head, who instructs art classes in Portland at night.

It was the same story at another Portland supply house, where the increase was estimated at perhaps 50 percent in recent years.

But measurements creep in everywhere and a businessman knew how much the sale of art supplies had gone up in the last decade at the State's largest art supply house, Gill's in Portland:

Nine hundred percent.

TEN TO ONE RATIO

That means 10 artists behind the bush that used to hide one. No wonder they are beginning to push each other into the open.

Most of the new ones are Sunday artists, who have multiplied as income and leasure time have increased since World War II.

It is the Sunday artist you will find on the coast, squinting at a landscape and drawing lines on a canvas he later will entitle, "Vichysoisse."

But you also will find him, along with the full-time artist, at the art centers that have sprung up in Oregon communities, the Portland Art Museum, the State fair, and even the Portland rose festival.

The Oregon Society of Artists is an example of the increase in recent years. The society started with 15 members and no money in 1926. At first growth was slow. Then came the postwar boom. Four years ago the society acquired its present headquarters—a sleek building in Portland's West Hills. Today it has 660 members, 110 of them upstate.

CLASSES AND LECTURE

It offers classes and lectures for the amateur and the professional. It is one of the principal headquarters of the Sunday artist.

Art groups have bobbed up all over the State. To name a few of them: The art League of Grants Pass, the Coos Artists League, the Coquille Valley Art Association, Corvallis Arts Guild, Salem Art Association, Inc., Snake River Valley Art Association, Eugene Art Center, Lincoln County Art Center, Yaquina Art Association, and the Sage Brushers.

There are thriving art programs at Oregon State College, the University of Oregon and other colleges, but the biggest art center in the State is, as might be expected, in Portland.

It is the Portland Art Museum, which was the first art museum established in the Pacific Northwest. That was in 1892. It nearly went under in the depression, and the museum had to appeal to the public for $5,000 to save it.

Now the museum, occupying a square block beside the South Park blocks in downtown Portland, is on safer ground. It has nearly doubled its membership since World War II, to a total of about 2,000.

It is operated by the Portland Art Association, which holds to the purpose announced by the founders in 1892, "to make a collection of works of art and to erect and maintain a suitable building in which the same may be studied and exhibited; to develop and to encourage the study of art * * *."

MANY STUDYING ART

Some 85 persons study art in day classes and 300 in evening classes there. In addition, 1,200 persons visit the museum weekly. The building, located at SW. Park and Madison, is closed only on Monday. Wednesday it is open from noon until 10 p. m., and from noon to 5 p. m. on the other days.

Besides the extensive collection of paintings, statuary, and other objects the museum puts on display, the museum has been showing increasing interest in Oregon art.

Max W. Sullivan, director, estimates the museum singles out an Oregon artist for a one-man show on 4 or 5 occasions a year. In between, there are exhibitions of Oregon sculptors, print makers, and painters.

The next will be for painters and sculptors, October 18 to November 16.

Entries come from many unknowns. A panel of judges selects those considered worthy of exhibit. The aim is to reward talent with recognition, not to discourage it. Some years up to 75 percent of the entries reach the exhibit floor.

An example: An ex-shipyard worker took a line of poetry for his theme and with welding torch, a few pieces of metal, and 5-foot length of bamboo put together a piece that won recognition.

Not all Oregon art is so ingenious, but give it time. At the rate it is growing, it will capture half the population—and hence half the State's ingenuity—in the next few years.

Bishop Dagwell, Portland's First Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, there came across my desk a booklet two-hundred-odd pages in length, mysteriously entitled "Twenty and Five-tenths Percent: A Compilation of Public Records—1,411 Protestant Episcopal Rectors," published by a so-called publishing committee, giving as its address a post office box in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Listed inside the booklet were the names of many persons. Below the name of each person was set forth the names of various organizations and descriptions of public statements with which the individual had allegedly been affiliated.

No statement of purpose is contained in the booklet. All is left to innuendo, smear, and implied accusation that somehow the individual's connections with these organizations were inimical to the security of the United States.

These smear tactics, employing the well-known and equally well-discredited tactics of "guilt by association" should be roundly condemned.

Listed in the booklet was the name of a man whom I have known and respected for a long time. He is the bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon—a man loved and revered throughout my State—a man who has labored long and hard for causes which would be of maximum benefit to the people. His loyalty to his country has ever been beyond question.

The bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon does not need me to rise to his defense. He needs no defense. His life and his works speak eloquently of his character, his integrity, and his love of country.

When, in February 1957, the Right Rev. Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon, was awarded the B'nai B'rith brotherhood award, Rabbi Julius Nodel, of Portland, Oreg., had this to say to him:

No person in this community is better deserving of this award. Bishop Dagwell has literally practiced what he preached and never has limited his services to the sanctuary confines.

Last January 15, the Portland Realty Board of Portland, Oreg., honored Bishop Dagwell as Portland's "first citizen for 1957." The report of the realty board's committee, which selected Bishop Dagwell for this very much deserved award, is a testimonial to a man whose life has been dedicated to the good of his fellow man and whose deeds are eloquent tribute to a man whom all Oregonians honor, respect, and admire.

Vague innuendoes and smear tactics will not detract from the good which Bishop Dagwell's deeds have wrought in strengthening Oregon and the Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the report of the realty board's committee which selected Bishop Dagwell as Portland's first citizen for 1957 in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL FIRST CITIZEN BANQUET HONORING THE RIGHT REVEREND BENJAMIN D. DAGWELL, D. D., PORTLAND'S FIRST CITIZEN FOR 1957

Sponsored by Portland Realty Board, Portland, Oreg.

1957 officers: A. A. Horsfeldt, president; Richard H. Lucke, first vice president; Stanley C. Wiley, second vice president; Charles K. Cummings, third vice president; Margaret Twerdal, secretary; Kenneth Murfree, treasurer.

1958 officers: Richard H. Lucke, president; Vance M. Sayles, first vice president; John G. Clarke, second vice president; Margaret Twerdal, third vice president; Ken Evans, secretary; Waldemar Spliid, treasurer.

Banquet committee: Charles K. Cummings, chairman; Lem P. Putnam; E. A. Jensen; Carolyn Bowles; Lamar Newkirk; R. J. Frank, Jr.; Ken Evans, Oscar Pederson; John L. Denny; Taylor Treece.

Portland's first citizens: Ben Selling, 1928; J. C. Ainsworth, 1929; Aaron M. Frank, 1930; Henry B. VanDuzer, 1931; Raymond B. Wilcox, 1932; George L. Baker, 1933; Hopkin Jenkins, 1934; Edward C. Sammons, 1935; Arthur L. Fields, 1936; Richard B. Dillehunt, M. D., 1937; Franklin T. Griffith, 1938; Charles H. Martin, 1939; Ross McIntyre, 1940; Mrs. Thomas D. Honeyman, 1941; Edgar F. Kaiser, 1942; Portland's Service Men and Women, 1943; Mrs. C. S. Jackson, 1944; Theodore R. Gamble, 1945; Chester A. Moores, 1946; Sid Woodbury, 1947; Hillman Lueddemann, 1948; Thomas Harry Banfield, 1949; David B. Simpson, 1950; Frank Erwin McCaslin, 1951; Edgar William Smith, 1952; C. B. Stephenson, 1953; Ben H. Hazen, 1954; Dr. Morgan S. Odell, 1955; Harold F. Wendel, 1956.

MENU

Crab legs and avocado supreme; iced relishes; barbecued sirloin steak; Rissole potatoes; French green beans amandine; hot Cafe Baron rolls; Napolean slice; coffee.

PROGRAM

A. A. Horsfeldt, presiding.
Hillman Lueddemann, toastmaster.
National anthem.
Invocation: The Right Reverend James W. F. Carman, D. D.
The Oswego Four.
Introduction of guests.
Presentation of former first citizens and welcome to the Right Reverend Benjamin D. Dagwell, D. D.
Felicitations: Charles A. Hart; the Reverend Lansing E. Kempton, D. D.; Dr. Blair Holcomb; Rabbi Julius Nodel.
Presentation of plaque to first citizen: The Right Reverend Benjamin D. Dagwell, D. D., by A. A. Horsfeldt.
Response: The Right Reverend Benjamin D. Dagwell, D. D.
Dinner music: Glenn Shelley at the organ.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Oswego Four: Mark Beach, John VanLeeuwen, Lou Lavachek, Ted Corbett.

After several sessions where a considerable list of worthy names were considered, the seven members appointed to serve on the Portland Realty Board's secret committee voted unanimously, on the first formal ballot taken, to designate as Portland's first citizen of the year 1957, the Right Reverend Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, who will retire next July after 22 years of distinguished service as Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon.

This is the second award bestowed this year on Bishop Dagwell, he, in both instances, being the first cleric ever so honored in Portland.

Because of his outstanding record in the field of inter-faith work and for "his active influence and courage in making real the religious idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," Bishop Dagwell was last February declared winner of the annual B'nai B'rith Brotherhood award.

"No person in this community is better deserving of this award," said Rabbi Julius Nodel in conferring the honor. "Bishop Dagwell has literally practiced what he preached and never has limited his services to the sanctuary confines."

The clipping files of Portland's newspapers are bulging with accounts of Bishop Dagwell's long running fight for fair employment practices, better housing, civil rights and civic responsibiliites. His has truly been a voice of wisdom and human understanding in the community.

Bishop Dagwell has been referred to as the editor's dream who makes good newspaper copy by taking the "sacred cow" of public opinion and swinging it by the tail. The newspaper index file in the Portland Public Library contains 31 cards referring to interesting articles relating to Bishop Dagwell and his activities.

Known as the breaker of precedents, Benjamin Dagwell began his career in Portland by ignoring the custom that a new bishop should be consecrated in the field in which he had worked, being the first bishop in the history of the Oregon Diocese to take the solemn vows in Oregon. In explaining why he desired to part from the tradition established by his four predecessors, Bishop-elect Dagwell said, "I want to be in the presence of those with whom I am to labor when I take my vows and receive episcopal authority."

In 1940 while addressing the 52d annual diocesan convention, Bishop Dagwell again proved that he is not a man to let tradition stand in his way by advocating a streamlining of church services, contending that the sermons and prayers dragged out and were too long.

While he must soon retire from his official post in the church, Bishop Dagwell will not be lost to Portland. Last year a group of his admirers and friends formed a charitable organization to be known as the Benjamin Dagwell Foundation which was launched with contributions totaling $30,000. As additional sums accumulate in the foundation, funds may be used for a wide range of charitable, social, welfare, health (including mental health) or educational purposes. Knowing that Bishop Dagwell has been responsible for many acts of kindness and charity, the foundation was formed to honor him, and he has agreed to remain in Portland after his retirement, on his 68th birthday, to serve as administrator of the foundation.

Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell was born in Susquehanna, Pa., July 21, 1890. His parents being of modest means, he lived as a boy in a humble home in Cincinnati at a time when his lifetime friend and adviser, Rev. Paul Matthews, later to be bishop of New Jersey, was dean of the Cincinnati Cathedral. At the age of 14 years Benjamin Dagwell went to work, and, when his father died 3 years later, he became responsible for the support of his mother. For a time he had a responsible position with Standard Oil Co., but he gave up what seemed to promise a successful business career and returned to school in order to prepare for the ministry, his principal motive being a desire to work with young people, especially boys and young men.

Following attendance at the University of Cincinnati in 1912 and 1913, young Dagwell attended Seabury Divinity School where he was later, in 1932, awarded a D. D. degree, and took postgraduate work at the General Theological Seminary. He was ordained a deacon in 1916 and ordained a priest in the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1917.

Between the years 1917 and 1920 he served as rector in New Jersey and after 4 years' service in Pueblo, Colo., was in 1924 elected dean and rector of St. Johns Cathedral in Denver, Colo., where he remained for 12 years prior to his election as Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Oregon.

After his election to the bishopric he acted as rector of Trinity Church until the election of Rev. Lansing E. Kempton in April 1937. He was consecrated bishop by his lifelong friend, Bishop Matthews, who had encouraged him to enter the ministry, prepared him for confirmation, and also ordained him as deacon and priest.

When Bishop Dagwell was consecrated in Trinity Church, Portland, the diocese was at a low ebb, having 17 active clergy with 12 parishes and 8 missions. It now has 71 active clergy and 28 parishes and 40 missions. At that time pressure was being exerted by eastern church officials to combine this diocese with its eastern counterpart, the missionary district of eastern Oregon. After two decades under Bishop Dagwell's leadership a second bishop was required, and the Right Reverend James W. F. Carman was called from Phoenix, Ariz., to be consecreated as bishop coadjutor until Bishop Dagwell's retirement next July.

In the meantime, the communicant membership had more than trebled, and at the time of Bishop Carman's arrival in Portland there were 61 parishes and missions in the diocese with 27,000 baptized persons and 19,500 communicants. The diocese extends from the Columbia River to the California line and from the Pacific Ocean to the summit of the Cascade Mountains.

When Benjamin Dagwell became bishop, he said he did not intend to occupy the swivel chair in his office very much of the time and remarked that, being unmarried and not tied down with duties at home, it was his desire to travel over the diocese as extensively as possible in the hope that he might know every man, woman, and child in the diocese as a family. Recently it was reported that in 4 months' time he had traveled 12,000 miles, 2,200 by ship, 4,500 by air, and the rest by automobile, driving much of this distance himself. During that time he visited 61 churches, some of them several times, and confirmed 750 persons at 57 services. Bishop Dagwell has been especially effective in persuading a number of local churchmen to enter seminaries and holy orders and has helped many young seminarians through school.

In addition to his work over the diocese, Bishop Dagwell has served as president of the board of the Good Samaritan Hospital which has been greatly expanded and modernized under his leadership, as president of the board of St. Helen's Hall, the Good Samaritan Hospital in Corvallis and the Rogue River Valley Hospital in Medford. For 7 years Bishop Dagwell served on the National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches.

For a number of years Bishop Dagwell served as chairman of the Portland Housing Code Commission, a responsibility he accepted because, he said, "I am interested in how my fellow man lives." He has also served as chairman of the Fair Practices Committee. Here in Portland our First Citizen has served on a number of boards and directorates including Reed College, Goodwill Industries, Oregon Tuberculosis Association, Portland Remedial Loan Association, Portland Council of Churches, Portland Chamber of Commerce and has served as a member of the Board of Overseers of Whitman College, and as a director of the Deaconess Training School in Berkeley, Calif.

He has served on the governing board of Willamette View Manor, which is sponsored by the Methodist Church, and has worked earnestly and effectively in the organization campaign for the Rogue Valley Manor, a 284-apartment structure to be erected in Medford as a Christian home for people of moderate means under the sponsorship of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopal Churches of Oregon. Bishop Dagwell is a member of the Newcomen Society and chaplain of the Oregon chapter of that distinguished organization.

In referring to Bishop Dagwell at the service commemorating the 10th anniversary of his consecration, the late Bishop Matthews said, "Without ever losing his characteristic quality as primarily a religious leader, Bishop Dagwell has nevertheless exercised his unusual gifts, mental, moral and spiritual, in matters of public concern. He is a Christian gentleman with never the breath of suspicion that he is a self-seeker in the tempting field of personal aggrandizement or publicity. He is indeed a leading citizen."

Though a man of great courage and deep convictions, Bishop Dagwell is essentially a quiet, gentle man with a shy, engaging smile and a delightful sense of humor. He is a capable leader and a highly efficient administrator, but even when he is busily engaged in handling a difficult problem, he can cheerfully endure an interruption and flash a twinkle in his eye as he grants some simple personal favor. Whenever he is called, be it at any hour of the day or night, he always responds promptly and graciously.

Such are but a few of the admirable personal traits of the modest yet eminent church leader who is loved throughout the west—Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, whom we are proud to salute and acclaim as Portland's first citizen for the year 1957.

Evidence of their admiration for Rt. Rev. Benjamine D. Dagwell and their appreciation of his many civic achievements is expressed by the attendance of the following friends and associates:

Speaker's table: the Right Reverend Benjamin D. Dagwell, D. D.; Mr. and Mrs. Hillman Lueddemann; Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Horsfeldt; the Right Reverend James W. F. and Mrs. Carman; Mr. Charles A. Hart; the Reverend Lansing E. Kempton; Dr. and Mrs. Blair Holcomb; Rabbi and Mrs. Julius Nodel.

Past first citizens, tables 23–24: Mr. and Mrs. Aaron M. Frank, Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Sammons, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur L. Fields, Mrs. Thomas D. Honeyman, Mr. Thomas H. Hindman, Mr. and Mrs. Chester A. Moores, Mr. and Mrs. Sid Woodbury, Mr. David B. Simpson, Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. McCaslin, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar W. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Ben H. Hazen, Mr. and Mrs. Harold F. Wendell, Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Stephenson.

Table 10: Mr. Curtis J. Shady, Miss Willafred Dixon, Dr. and Mrs. Martin Howard, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence D. Phillips, Mr. and Mrs. Thaddeus B. Brunc, Col. Kenneth Hauser, Mr. A. G. Klostermann.

Table 11: Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus T. Walker; Mr. and Mrs. Adolphus Andrews, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Hillman Lueddemann, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Phillip W. Patterson, Jr.; Mrs. Erling Jacobsen; Mr. Gerald Frank.

Table 12: The Reverend Lewis B. and Mrs. Keiter, Mr. and Mrs. Laurence C. Mann, Mr. and Mrs. Milo K. McIver, Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Henry.

Table 14: Mr. and Mrs. George N. Meyer; the Reverend George R. and Mrs. Turney;

Dr. and Mrs. John Raaf; Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Sammons, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Douglas McIver.

Table 15: Mr. and Mrs. Jack E. Arndt, the Reverend John R. B. and Mrs. Vance, Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Reger, the Reverend Robert F. and Mrs. Crafe, Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Fletcher.

Table 20: Mr. J. C. Burgard, Mrs. Ernest E. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. James McDonald, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Dant, Mr. and Mrs. Jack L. Meier, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Kerr.

Table 21: Mr. and Mrs. Waldemar Spliid, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Bauer, Mr. and Mrs. Ray F. Becker, Mr. and Mrs. James H. Huddleson, Mr. and Mrs. Ray B. Woodbury.

Table 22: Mrs. B. F. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. R. May, Dr. and Mrs. A. B. Dykman, Mrs. Joseph P. Knapp, Mrs. Anthony Gattie, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Branch Riley, the Right Reverend Richard S. Watson, D. D.

Table 25: Mrs. Charles deSully, Miss Jessie M. Woodhouse, Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Walter, the Reverend John A. Bright, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Bennett, Mr. John Vassie, Mrs. T. T. Bennett, the Reverend Reginald A'Court Simmonds.

Table 26: Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Snell, Sr., Mr. and Mrs. Ronald J. Honeyman, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Malarkey, Mr. and Mrs. Thorburn Reid, Mrs. Edward T. Wilson, Jr., Mrs. West Stone.

Table 27: Mr. and Mrs. C. M. Gartrell, Mr. and Mrs. Harold M. Phillips, Mr. and Mrs. Russell M. Colwell, Mr. and Mrs. Earl R. Wilkinson, Mr. and Mrs. Stetson B. Harman.

Table 30: Mr. and Mrs. Rogers Kimberling, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ridehalgh, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Cochran, Mr. and Mrs. Julian Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stenger.

Table 31: Mr. and Mrs. Richard L. Lucke, Mr. and Mrs. Albert R. Bullier, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Leon H. Bullier, Mrs. Herbert J. Dahlke, Mr. Douglas A. Fleming, Mr. and Mrs. Albert R. Bullier, Sr.

Table 32: Mr. and Mrs. Michael J. Frey, Mr. and Mrs. W. R. Morrish, Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Notson, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Moore, Mr. and Mrs. Max Taylor.

Table 33: Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Kolar, Mr. and Mrs. Roy L. Orem, Mr. and Mrs. Carvel C. Linden, Mr. and Mrs. Walter L. J. Davies, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Harding.

Table 34: Mr. and Mrs. William W. Knight, Mr. and Mrs. Arden X. Pangborn, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Young, Mr. and Mrs. Harry C. McLain, Mr. and Mrs. George H. Putz.

Table 35: Mr. and Mrs. Edward T. Dwyer, Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Muschalik, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Altstadt, Mr. and Mrs. D. V. McCallum, Mr. and Mrs. C. H. McGirr.

Table 36: Mr. Paul B. McKee, Mr. D. R. McClung, Mr. and Mrs. George T. Bragg, Mr. and Mrs. F. Robert deLuccia, Mr. and Mrs. George Mackenzie, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Vernstrom.

Table 37: Mr. George J. Beggs, Mr. and Mrs. V. William Dominey, Mr. Philip V. W. Fry, Mr. and Mrs. Harold R. Wacker, Mr. and Mrs. Harrison R. Kincaid, Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. Cameron.

Table 40: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas W. Delzell, Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Warren, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Bosch, Mr. and Mrs. Randolph R. Lamar, Mr. and Mrs. Abe N. Hoss.

Table 41: Mr. and Mrs. Donald C. Peek, Mr. and Mrs. Stanton W. Allison, Mr. and Mrs. R. G. Macdonald, Mr. and Mrs. Albert L. Buchner, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Bontty.

Table 42: Mrs. Lee Patterson, Mr. Will H. Masters, Mr. and Mrs. Bert J. G. Tousey, Mr. Larry W. Bome, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Buck, Mr. and Mrs. Budd G. Burnie, Mr. W. C. Kavanaugh, Jr.

Table 43: Mr. and Mrs. Charles L. Paine; Mr. and Mrs. James F. Bell; Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Holloway, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Cook; Mr. and Mrs. Gibson Bowles.

Table 44: Mayor Henry L. and Mrs. Schumacher, Mr. and Mrs. Bond Richards, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Cannelos, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Burnham, Mr. and Mrs. George Rahoutis.

Table 45: Mr. and Mrs. August G. Teepe, Mr. and Mrs. Fred C. McGowan, Mr. and Mrs. Will H. Ross, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneson Brookes, Miss Caroline Buckingham, Mr. George Englehart.

Table 46: Mr. and Mrs. Oren N. Brandt, Mr. and Mrs. Carl C. Donaugh, Mr. and Mrs. Z. F. Earl, Mr. and Mrs. Max F. deSully, Mr. William H. Ragsdale, Mr. Melvin G. Viken.

Table 47: Mr. and Mrs. Charles K. Cummings, Mrs. Manda Crofts, Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Peder Twerdal, Mrs. Mae P. Grable, Mr. S. E. Gjerde, Mr. Robert B. Hurd, Mr. Charles F. Adams, Mr. Ward S. Kelley.

Table 50: Mr. and Mrs. Lou Lavachek, Mr. and Mrs. Ted Corbett, Mr. and Mrs. Mark Beach, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Leeuwen, Mr. and Mrs. Richard C. Horn.

Table 51: Mr. and Mrs. S. I. Jaggar, Mrs. Zina Wise, Mr. and Mrs. B. V. Hancock, Mr. and Mrs. H. B. Cooper, the Reverend E. James Kingsley, Dr. and Mrs. William M. Wilson.

Table 52: Mr. and Mrs. Harold P. Rogers, Mr. and Mrs. Rex DeLong, Mr. and Mrs. Walter T. Williamson, Mr. and Mrs. Arvin Burnett, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Foster.

Table 53: Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. Greendale, Jr.; the Reverend John and Mrs. Richardson; Mr. and Mrs. Frederick H. Torp; Mr. and Mrs. Harry J. Beeman; Mr. Samuel M. Smith; Mr. T. B. Wilcox.

Table 54: Mr. and Mrs. Ken Evans, Miss Hazel M. Evans, Miss Helen E. Evans, Mr. and Mrs. Lamar Newkirk, Mr. and Mrs. John L. Denny, Mr. and Mrs. H. Gordon McCall.

Table 55: Mr. and Mrs. Lem P. Putnam; Mr. Carl W. Poss, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Beach; Mr. and Mrs. John Smeaton; Mr. and Mrs. R. J. Frank, Jr.; Mr. Harry O. Trip.

Table 60: Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Lowell, Mr. and Mrs. David Farr, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Pierson, Mr. and Mrs. C. Whitney Hastings, Mr. and Mrs. George J. Smith.

Table 61: Mr. and Mrs. S. E. Norby, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Cake, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Chapman, the Reverend George R. V. and Mrs. Bolster, the Reverend Leslie D. V. Dunton, Miss Virginia M. Welch.

Table 62: Mr. and Mrs. Edmund Hayes, Dr. and Mrs. Lyle B. Kingery, Mr. and Mrs. L. Stanford Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph B. Stratford, Mr. E. P. Hoener, Mr. Gordon D. Orput.

Table 63: The Reverend Neville and Mrs. Blunt, Mr. and Mrs. David Mason, Dr. and Mrs. H. C. Fixott, Mr. and Mrs. Ray W. Lengfield, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Adair.

Table 64: The Reverend George H. and Mrs. Swift, the Reverend Charles Scott Neville, Mr. Ben Medofsky, Dr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Hunter, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Gerber, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Alexander.

Table 70: Miss Ann Brewster; Mr. James H. Clarke; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Shelley; Ven. Walter W. McNeill, Jr.; Mr. James F. Hodges; Mr. Allen G. Fletcher; Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Miller; Mrs. Max Weaver.

Table 71: Mr. and Mrs. Victor Risley, Mr. and Mrs. Marshall N. Dana, Dr. and Mrs. O. Howard Cox, Mr. and Mrs. Richard M. Cole, Mr. and Mrs. Richard M. Brown.

Table 72: Mr. Glenn Stanton, Mrs. J. F. Trowbridge, Mr. and Mrs. Rollin Boles, Mr. and Mrs. Kingsley Church, the Reverend A. H. MacDonnell, Dr. A. G. Bettman, Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Fariss.

Table 73: Mr. George Rodgers, Mrs. W. J. Pearson, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Peterson, Mr. A. E. Benson, Mr. and Mrs. John C. F. Merrifield, Mr. and Mrs. Harry N. Peabody, Mr. Frederick Greenwood.

Table 74: Mr. and Mrs. W. C. May, Dr. and Mrs. E. W. St. Pierre, Dr. and Mrs. G. B. Eisenhart, Dr. and Mrs. William Lehman, Mr. and Mrs. Worth W. Caldwell.

Table 80: Dr. Denorval Unthank, the Reverend L. O. Stone, Mr. Alex Palumbo, Mrs. Edna Peake, the Reverend J. W. and Mrs. Goodyear, Dr. and Mrs. Homer P. Rush, Mr. and Mrs. David H. Logan.

Table 81: Mrs. T. H. Banfield, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Workman, Mr. and Mrs. George C. McFarland, Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Neu, Mr. and Mrs. Addison P. Knapp.

Table 82: Mr. and Mrs. Lamar Tooze, Mrs. James Fenwick, Mr. and Mrs. George C. Sheahan.

We're sorry the names of some in attendance were received too late to appear in the program.

Contributors: Art work, Mary Worth; backdrop, Northern School Supply Co.; plate glass, Auto Glass Service Co.; Wurlitzer organ, Joseph-Lucas Music Mart.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we can number among some of our most loyal citizens the people of Puerto Rico.

Their progress during the last decade has been phenomenal. This has been brought about by the cooperation of various segments of their population and all political parties of the Island.

I have in the past addressed this House many times regarding these fine people, their patriotism, their loyalty and the great courage of their troops who have fought, bled and died under our flag and for the causes in which we and they, as Americans, believed.

I have in the past been interested in their political status and relationship with the mainland, and fought upon this floor for the adoption of the constitution under which they now operate. There are many thousands on the Island whose desire is to advance their present status to full citizenship with all the rights and prerequisites of citizens together with the responsibilities.

The newspaper El Mundo is well known throughout Latin America. It is one of the leading Spanish newspapers of the world and has always fought steadfastly for the advancement of the people of the Island. On July 20, 1958, El Mundo contained an editorial which I believe should be of interest to the Members of this House.

I, therefore, ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to insert herewith an English translation of that editorial:

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO?

The news echoes throughout the world. Alaska has just been admitted to the Union and another star shines in the glorious flag of the United States.

This news must be reverberating right now in the Puerto Rican consciousness. And it must be reverberating painfully.

Here we are, at the end of centuries, at a tragic crossroads.

We are, as we were yesterday, as we have always been, at the gloomy and humiliating crossroads of our old fears and doubts.

We don't know where we are going, nor have we wished to know.

Here we are with our queer and ridiculous straw puppet, facing the congregation of nations who knew what they wanted to be and became what they wanted. Because they wanted it. Here we are, fearful and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hesitating, groping for our destiny like a blind man zigzaging through the haze of his tragic life.

Alaska, knowing always what it wanted, already has it. The greatest honor that can be bestowed upon a people.

Hawaii, also knowing what it wanted, will obtain it very soon because the doors of liberty have been opened to noncontiguous territories.

And here we are at the crossroads with our "Estado Libre Asociado," which pretends to be, but is not and cannot be, the summit of our destiny. Here we are with our miserable straw puppet at the very moment in history when the new stars begin to shine in the flag of the glorious Nation whose citizenship we enjoy only in part. Because we are and are not citizens.

And now, Puerto Ricans, what are we going to do?

The Senate of the United States, a few hours before granting statehood to Alaska, rejected the formula of the Estado Libre Asociado as unworthy to offer to a land that aspires to the full enjoyment of liberty. Are we to remain hanging on, like a shipwrecked person, to that rag of liberty just called a colonial experiment by Time magazine? Are we to continue to experiment with our destiny?

The historic determination of the Congress of the United States puts us at the crossroads with a responsibility that we cannot evade. Where are we going? What are we going to do?

The unavoidable responsibility falls upon the Popular Party with its overwhelming electoral majority. It falls principally upon its chief, Luis Muñoz-Marín, with his absolute control of the party and the government.

But the unavoidable responsibility does not fall only upon the Popular Party and its chief.

The unavoidable responsibility belongs to all, absolutely all Puerto Ricans. Those who vote and those who do not vote. Those who have been born and those yet unborn.

Are we going to continue with this half-citizenship, gambling with formulas of mere party and personal convenience, or are we going to set another star in the national flag to light our destiny and bring pride to our lives?

What are we going to do.

Tucker Sno-Cats in the Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the article entitled "An Epic Journey Across the Antarctic" appearing in the August 4, 1958 edition of Life magazine.

In a series of beautiful color shots, the story is told of the first land crossing of the Antarctic Continent by a motorized British expedition. That expedition was lead by geologist Dr. Vivan Fuchs.

The stalwart Britishers traveled in Tucker Sno-Cats which are made in Medford, Oreg. I have on earlier occasions discussed these intrepid snow and mud tamers, but this is the first occasion I have had to see color pictures of the vehicles at work.

Snow, crevasse, ice were no deterrents. The Fuchs expedition ended—

Says Life—

as the triumphant finish is celebrated with flags as two fuel-laden sleds, drawn by a snow cat and flying Royal Navy flags, slide into Scott Base.

Statement on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much about who opposes and who is blocking the two labor bills passed by the Senate during this session of Congress, S. 2888, the Kennedy-Douglas-Ives Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act, and S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958.

It is interesting to note that the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, insurance companies, and other employer groups have opposed S. 2888, the Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act.

A spokesman of the National Association of Manufacturers was yesterday quoted in the newspapers as having said that they opposed the so-called labor reform bill, S. 3974, sponsored by Senators KENNEDY and IVES.

For comparison I am inserting into the RECORD a statement adopted by the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO at its executive committee meeting held in Denver, Colo., July 24 and 25, 1958, strongly and vigorously supporting both of these same bills.

If these bills, which have been passed by the Senate, are killed the blame should rest squarely on the shoulders of those who have opposed them, principally the National Association of Manufacturers and its allies.

STATEMENT ON LABOR LEGISLATION

In May 1958 the Senate passed S. 2888, the Kennedy-Douglas-Ives Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act. Subsequently, in June 1958 the Senate passed S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958. These bills were passed by unanimous and nearly unanimous votes. Together, they constitute two of the most important measures affecting the welfare of the Nation's wage earners to come before the Congress in recent years.

S. 2888 was approved by a unanimous Senate vote after more than 4 years of careful study, including exhaustive investigation and hearings. Similar bills also have been the subject of extensive consideration in the House.

S. 2888 provides for public disclosure of the financial operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, whether administered by unions, by employers, or jointly by labor and management. Its objectives have long had the active support of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, and the AFL–CIO generally.

Despite the fact that S. 2888 was passed by the Senate more than 2 months ago, it is not yet law largely as a result of the opposition of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, insurance companies, and other employer groups. These groups would apparently prefer to have no legislation to reveal the financial operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans at all if this means, as the bill provides, that the public is to have a look at the operations of employer-administered funds, as well as those administered by labor alone or by labor and management jointly. These groups oppose the pending legislation notwithstanding the fact that these employer-administered plans cover more than 90 percent of all workers protected by welfare and pension benefit plans.

The enactment of a bill containing the essential features of S. 2888 before the end of the present session of the Congress is of utmost importance to millions of wage earners throughout the United States. We welcome the fact that the House Committee on Education and Labor has now voted out a bill incorporating some of these features. We hope that on the floor of the House or in conference between the House and Senate a bill will be agreed upon and enacted by the Congress substantially incorporating the provisions of S. 2888. We regard the enactment of such a measure as of prime importance to the wage earners of the Nation.

While a welfare and pension plan disclosure bill should receive first consideration in the House of Representatives, the problems dealt with in S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 are likewise of great importance from the standpoint of enhancing ethics and democracy in the labor and management field and correcting acknowledged abuse in the Taft-Hartley Act. We therefore call upon the leadership of the House of Representatives to take all necessary steps, after action has been taken on the welfare and pension plan bill, to assure final congressional action on S. 3974 before the present session of the Congress comes to an end.

This bill deals with some of the major problems which have come to light in the labor and management field. It requires reports on union internal procedures and financial transactions, conflicts of interest involving union officers and employees, and antilabor arrangements participated in by employers and employer-middle men. It deals with the administration of trusteeships and safeguards union democracy by requiring secret ballot elections. It calls upon unions and employers to police their own activities by adopting effective ethical practice codes and provides for a tripartite advisory committee to assist the Secretary of Labor in administering the act. It provides for urgently needed amendments to correct acknowledged antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

S. 3974 was in a far more satisfactory form when it was reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee than when it was passed by the Senate. Amendments were added to the bill on the floor of the Senate as a result of shameful maneuvering by the administration and by some antilabor Senators more desirous of hamstringing labor than curbing corruption. A number of these amendments were clearly unwise and unworkable. Some provisions were added which seemed to us clearly unfair and repressive. However, we agree with President Meany of the AFL–CIO that while S. 3974 was a better bill before the floor debate, it still retains enough substantive anticorruption sections to make it worthwhile.

It had been our hope that during the weeks intervening between the passage of the bill by the Senate and the adjournment of Congress, the House would be able to take action to improve S. 3974. It now appears that if any action is to be taken on the bill this session, such action will have to be taken by the House directly, without reference to committee.

This presents the question of whether the bill in its present form should be passed by the Congress. The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, American Retail Federation, and other employer groups have bitterly denounced the bill and have called for its rejection by the Congress. Despite their attempt to camouflage the fact, these antilabor groups are opposing the bill because, for the first time, they and their Sheffermantype representatives would be required to make public disclosure of their antilabor activities. The honest labor movement represented by the AFL–CIO stands ready and willing to make public disclosure of its operations. Employers and their representatives should be no less willing.

While there are provisions in the bill which we would like to see improved or eliminated, they do not, in our opinion, outweigh the worthwhile features of the bill. On balance, the good in the bill outweighs the bad. The industrial union department calls upon Members of the Congress of both parties to meet their responsibility by passing the Kennedy-Ives bill before the current congressional session comes to an end.

The 81st Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive this morning the very fine program which is planned by the American Bar Association for its 81st annual meeting, convening in Los Angeles commencing Monday, August 25.

This will mark one of the great assemblies of the practitioners of the American bar.

There will be as outstanding and diverse a series of reports and deliberations as has ever marked this great body of officers of the courts of our land.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the schedule of events be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, preceded by a list of the able 1957–58 officers and members of the board of governors of the bar.

There being no objection, the program and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, 1957–58

President, Charles S. Rhyne, Hill Building, Washington, D. C.

Chairman, house of delegates, Jas. L. Shepherd, Jr., Esperson Building, Houston, Tex.

Secretary, Joseph D. Calhoun, 218 West Front Street, Media, Pa.

Treasurer, Harold H. Bredell, Circle Tower, Indianapolis, Ind.

Assistant secretary, Richard H. Bowerman, 205 Church Street, Box 1936, New Haven, Conn.

Board of governors:[1] The president, the chairman of the house of delegates, the secretary, the treasurer, David F. Maxwell, last retiring president, Packard Building, Philadephia, Pa., Tappan Gregory, editor-in-chief of the American Bar Association Journal, 105 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., ex officio; 1st circuit, Willoughby A. Colby, 18 School Street, Concord, N. H. (1960); 2d circuit, Whitney North Seymour, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1960); 3d circuit, Vincent P. McDevitt, 1000 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1958); 4th circuit and District of Columbia circuit, Douglas McKay, Barringer Building, Columbus, S. C. (1959); 5th circuit, John C. Satterfield, Box 466, Yazoo City, Miss. (1958); 6th circuit, Glenn M. Coulter, Ford Building, Detroit, Mich. (1960); 7th circuit, George S. Geffs, Jackman Building, Janesville, Wis. (1959); 8th circuit, Richmond C. Coburn, 411 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1959); 9th circuit, John Shaw Field, 15 West Second Street, Box 1291, Reno, Nev. (1958); 10th circuit, Franklin Riter, Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah (1960).

[1] Year shown in parentheses indicates expiration of term.

PROGRAM OF THE 81ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AUGUST 25–29, 1958

THE ASSEMBLY

First session, Monday, August 25, 10 a. m., Philharmonic Auditorium, the president presiding

Call to order.

Invocation, the Very Reverend David de L. Scovil, D. D., dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Addresses of welcome: The Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of the State of California; the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor of the city of Los Angeles; E. Avery Crary, president of the Los Angeles Bar Association.

Response: Joseph N. Welch, Boston, Mass.

Introduction of distinguished guests.

Nomination of 5 assembly delegates for 3-year terms.

Nomination and election of assembly delegates to fill vacancies.

Annual address of the president, World Peace Through Law.

Address by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Presentation of awards of merit to bar associations.

Presentation of awards of merit to cities showing greatest improvement in traffic courts.

Presentation of resolutions.

Seventeenth annual meeting of the American Bar Association endowment, Jacob M. Lashly, president, St. Louis, Mo.

Second session, Wednesday, August 27, 10 a. m., Pacific Ballroom, the Hotel Statler, the president presiding

Invocation, the Reverend Carroll L. Shuster, D. D., executive secretary of the Synod of California, Southern Area of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America.

Addresses by the Honorable Arthur Kelly, Q. C., president of the Canadian Bar Association, The Unimportance of Differences; the Honorable William P. Rogers, Attorney General of the United States.

Third session, Thursday, August 28, 2 p. m., Pacific Ballroom, the Hotel Statler, the president presiding

Invocation, Dr. Edgar F. Magnin, senior rabbi, Wilshire Boulevard Temple.

Presentation of Ross Bequest Award for 1958.

Rising memorial to former presidents of American Bar Association: Joseph W. Henderson, Philadelphia, Pa., 1943–44; Guy A. Thompson, St. Louis, Mo., 1931–32.

Addresses by the Honorable Leslie E. Peppiatt, M. C., president of the Law Society, London, England, Some Thoughts on the London Conference—and on English Solicitors; the Right Honorable Sir Harry Hylton-Foster, Q. C., M. P., Solicitor General of Great Britain, The Lawyer and Democracy.

Consideration of amendments to constitution and bylaws.

Report of committee on resolutions, Hale McCown, chairman, Beatrice, Nebr.

Fourth session, annual dinner, Thursday, August 28, 7:30 p. m., International Ballroom, the Beverly Hilton, the president presiding

Invocation, His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Address by speaker to be announced.

Presentation of American Bar Association medal.

Presentation of the First American Bar Association public service awards to the media of information and entertainment.

Introduction of incoming president.

Fifth session, Friday, August 29, Pacific Ballroom, the Hotel Statler (immediately following adjournment of the final session of the House of Delegates), the president presiding

Report by the chairman of the house of delegates of action upon resolutions previously adopted by the assembly.

Action by the assembly upon any resolutions previously adopted by the assembly but disapproved or modified by the House.

Unfinished business.

New business.

Introduction of new officers and members of board of governors.

Adjournment sine die.

PRELIMINARY CALENDAR FOR THE 23-D ANNUAL MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, AUGUST 25–29, 1958 (PACIFIC BALLROOM, THE HOTEL STATLER)

Sessions convene promptly at 2 p. m. Monday, August 25, at 9:30 a. m. and 2 p. m. Tuesday; and at 9:30 a. m. Thursday and Friday. The afternoon session will recess at 5 p. m., and the morning sessions not later than 12:30 p. m.

The final calendar for the house of delegates, containing the final order of business and the text of all available resolutions to come to the attention of the house, will be distributed at the first session. Items on the calendar will be considered in the order in which they appear unless otherwise ordered by permission of the House.

The attention of committee and section chairmen is called to paragraph 5 of rule VII of the rules of procedure, which provides that "Reports * * * that are printed in the advance program * * * or otherwise * * * shall not be read orally * * * but shall be stated to the house in substance only."

The cooperation of all persons presenting reports in adhering to the order of business stated in the calendar is earnestly solicited, in order that those persons and the members of the house may rely upon the schedule as announced.

The chairman of the house of delegates, presiding.

Rollcall.

Report of the committee on credentials and admissions, Glenn M. Coulter, chairman, Detroit, Mich.

Approval of the record.

Statement by the chairman of the house of delegates, James L. Shepherd, Jr., Houston, Tex.

Approval of the calendar as orders of the day.

Offering of resolutions for reference to the committee on draft.

Report by the president, Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D. C.

Election of officers of the association and members of the board of governors, as prescribed by the constitution, article VIII, section 1 and article IX, section 3.

Report of the board of elections, Walter V. Schaefer, chairman, Chicago, Ill.

Nomination of member of committee on scope and correlation of work, as prescribed by article X, section 7 (y) (2) of the bylaws.

Report of the treasurer, Harold H. Bredell, Indianapolis, Ind.

Report of the budget committee, Vincent P. McDevitt, chairman, Philadelphia, Pa.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Report of the editor-in-chief of the Journal, Tappan Gregory, Chicago, Ill.

Presentation of any matters which any State or local bar association or any affiliated organization of the legal profession wishes to bring before the house.

Unfinished business: Report on Canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics.

Reports of standing and special committees

Reports expected with recommendation for action by the house:

Civil service, Fanney N. Litvin, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Commerce, Benjamin Wham, chairman, Chicago, Ill.

Judicial selection, tenure and compensation, Henry E. Foley, chairman, Boston, Mass.

Professional ethics and grievances, Henry S. Drinker, chairman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Customs law, J. Bradley Colburn, chairman, New York, N. Y.

Scope and correlation of work, Joe C. Barrett, chairman, Jonesboro, Ark., jointly with rules and calendar, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., chairman, Newark, N. J.

Cooperation with the legal profession of friendly nations, Robert G. Storey, chairman, Dallas, Tex.

Economics of law practice, John C. Satterfield, chairman, Yazoo City, Miss.

Grievances, Cuthbert S. Baldwin, chairman, New Orleans, La.

Impact of atomic attack on legal and administrative processes, Hans A. Klagsbrunn, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Awards to media of public information, Richard P. Tinkham, chairman, Hammond, Ind.

Traffic court program, Albert B. Houghton, chairman, Milwaukee, Wis.

Uniform evidence rules for Federal courts, Ben R. Miller, chairman, Baton Rouge, La.

Administrative agency appointments, Clarence A. Davis, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Atomic energy law, Gordon E. Dean, chairman, New York, N. Y.

Communist tactics, strategy and objectives, Peter Campbell Brown, chairman, New York, N. Y.

Federal legislation, Robert W. Upton, chairman, Concord, N. H.

Federal liens, Laurens Williams, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Income tax—submission of amendment, Wm. Logan Martin, chairman, Birmingham, Ala.

Individual rights as affected by national security, Ross L. Malone, chairman, Roswell, N. Mex.

International law planning, Thomas E. Dewey, chairman, New York, N. Y.

International unification of private law, Joe C. Barrett, chairman, Jonesboro, Ark.

Jurisprudence and law reform, Henry M. Hogan, chairman, Detroit, Mich.

Lawyers in the Armed Forces, Osmer C. Fitts, chairman, Brattleboro, Vt.

Legal services and procedures, Charles A. Horsky, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Membership, Robert G. Storey, Jr., chairman, Dallas, Tex.

Professional relations, William J. Jameson, chairman, Billings, Mont.

Retirement benefits, F. Joseph Donohue, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Rights of the mentally ill, John Biggs, Jr., chairman, Wilmington, Del.

Unemployment and social security, Earl F. Morris, chairman, Columbus, Ohio.

Reports expected requiring no action by the house:

Board of Governors, Joheph D. Calhoun, secretary, Media, Pa.

Admiralty and maritime law, Henry C. Blackiston, chairman, New York, N. Y.

Aeronautical law, William S. Burton, chairman, Cleveland, Ohio.

American citizenship, Cecil E. Burney, chairman, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Communications, Fred W. Albertson, chairman, Washington, D. C.

Federal judiciary, Bernard G. Segal, chairman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Law lists, David J. A. Hayes, chairman, Chicago, Ill.

Lawyer referral service, Harry Gershenson, chairman, St. Louis, Mo.

Legal aid work, William T. Gossett, chairman, Dearborn, Mich.

Legal assistance for servicemen, Milton J. Blake, chairman, Denver, Colo.

Peace and Law through United Nations, Alfred J. Schweppe, chairman, Seattle, Wash.

Unauthorized Practice of the Law, Thomas J. Boodell, chairman, Chicago, Ill.

Report of sections following annual section meetings

Administrative Law, Donald C. Beelar, chairman, Washington, D. C.; John W. Cragun, delegate, Washington, D. C.

Antitrust Law, Herbert A. Bergson, chairman, Washington, D. C.; W. Glen Harlan, delegate, Atlanta, Ga.

Corporation, Banking and Business Law, Herbert F. Sturdy, chairman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Churchill Rodgers, delegate, New York, N. Y.

Criminal Law, Rufus King, chairman, Washington, D. C.; Arthur J. Freund, delegate, St. Louis, Mo.

Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law, L. J. Carey, chairman, Detroit, Mich.; George E. Beechwood, delegate, Philadelphia, Pa.

International and Comparative Law, Homer G. Angelo, chairman, San Francisco, Calif.; Arthur H. Dean, delegate, New York, N. Y.

Judicial Administration, Tom Clark, chairman, Washington, D. C.; Douglas L. Edmonds, delegate, Los Angeles, Calif.

Junior Bar Conference, Bert H. Early, chairman, Huntington, W. Va.; William C. Farrer, delegate, Los Angeles, Calif.

Labor Relations Law, Gerard D. Reilly, chairman, Washington, D. C.; Theodore R. Iserman, delegate, New York, N. Y.

Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, Herbert W. Clark, chairman, San Francisco, Calif.; John M. Allison, delegate, Tampa, Fla.

Mineral and Natural Resources Law, Raymond B. Holbrook, chairman, Salt Lake City, Utah; Harry D. Page, delegate, Tulsa, Okla.

Municipal Law, George F. B. Appel, chairman, Philadelphia, Pa.; David M. Wood, delegate, New York, N. Y.

Patent, trademark, and copyright law, Frank E. Foote, chairman, Pittsburgh, Pa.; James P. Hume, delegate, Chicago, Ill.

Public utility law, Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., chairman, New York, N. Y.; C. Oscar Berry, delegate, Washington, D. C.

Real property, probate, and trust law, Joseph Trachtman, chairman, New York, N. Y.; William A. Lane, delegate, Miami, Fla.

Taxation, Lee I. Park, chairman, Washington, D. C.; Thomas N. Tarleau, delegate, New York, N. Y.

Reports received too late to be calendared.

Other reports

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, James Dezendorf, president, Portland, Oreg.

ALI–ABA commitee on continuing legal education, Harrison Tweed, chairman, New York, N. Y.

American Law Student Association, Francis J. Larkin, president, Washington, D. C.

Report of the committee on rules and calendar on action taken by the assembly on amendments to the constitution and by-laws, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., chairman, Newark, N. J.

Report to the house of delegates upon resolutions adopted by the assembly for action by the House.

Reports of house committees: Draft, Philip C. Ebeling, chairman, Dayton, Ohio; hearings, Edward L. Wright, chairman, Little Rock, Ark.; credentials and admissions, Glenn M. Coulter, chairman, Detroit, Mich.

Presentation of any matters which any section or standing or special commitee of the association wishes to bring before the house of delegates.

Unfinished business.

New business.

Adjournment.

The Middle East Crisis and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East crisis this month has, once again, focused world attention on the Security Council of the U. N. And once again the weaknesses—and strengths—of this organization were on exhibit for all to see.

An incisive report on these sessions of the U. N. was written by Richard Rovere and appeared last week in the New Yorker magazine. As Mr. Rovere points out, it is plain that the United States had rough going at the U. N. during these meetings. It is plain, too, that we still have much to learn about the function of the U. N. and our role in that institution. Mr. Rovere's article follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS

There are, as of this afternoon, no official responses to the Soviet proposal for a summit conference, except from the Swiss, who say that Geneva on Tuesday is altogether out of the question. It is being assumed here that the plans agreed upon by the Security Council a couple of nights ago will be carried forward. The Council will meet again tomorrow afternoon, and the first business before it will be a resolution that is now getting its last delicate touches from the clever Japanese, who said last week that they believed they had found a way to save face for themselves, for Dag Hammarskjold and the Secretariat, for Henry Cabot Lodge and the Marine Corps, for Arkady Sobolev, President Chamoun, and Colonel Nasser, and for the Iraqis, both republican and royalist. This seems a large order, but Ambassador Koto Matsudaira has explained that his plan is exceedingly simple: it is to send to Lebanon a lot more unarmed U. N. observers and to pull out all American troops—or, as someone here has said, "rubbernecks for leathernecks." The language is sure to be artful and soothing and peace-loving. There will be a clarifying debate in the afternoon, and the motion is expected to come to a vote before the day is over.

The passage of such a resolution would no doubt be a defeat of sorts for everyone except the authors and Mr. Hammarskjöld, but it would be a defeat that the Americans, certainly, would welcome at this point. We went into Lebanon not so much to gain any specific ends in that country as to forestall an epidemic of coups d'état, and to show Colonel Nasser that we are a force to be reckoned with east of Suez. There have been no coups d'état since last Tuesday, and we probably made our point with Nasser the first day. Whether we chose the most efficacious of means is another matter, but in view of all that has happened since, we would now be pleased to have our marines and paratroopers back and be spared any further embarrassment. The Russians may not allow us to get out so easily; indeed, the majority view of the old hands here is that the Russians will veto the Japanese resolution. But there are knowledgeable members of our delegation who are saying that Ambassador Matsudaira's hopes are well founded, and that if the West is able to resist the pressure

for an immediate summit conference, the Russians may find it expedient to buy themselves some international goodwill by going along with the Japanese and the U. N. Secretariat. These people point out that the Russians must surely realize that a strengthened U. N. team in Lebanon could bring no possible harm to any of their interests. The Iraqi regime seems now to be as safe as the Bank of England. If there was any threat to it last week, it came from Jordan, not Lebanon, and the British in Jordan are now pledged to leave Baghdad alone and to restrain Jordan's Arab Legion, which shouldn't be hard to do. United Nations observers might hinder the Lebanese rebellion, but the Communists seem to have regarded that as a rather footling affair from the start. (The Russians did not oppose the original U. N. observer force in Lebanon; on the vote that created it, Mr. Sobolev abstained.) The Russians, as a few hopeful Americans see things today, have had an excellent week and may very well—if their latest maneuver is not immediately successful—decide to bring it to a close with a show of deference to this worthy organization.

If the West agrees to an early summit meeting, that will of course change everything, and there will be nothing much doing here until the next crisis comes along. And if the Security Council fails to adopt the Japanese proposal, the prospect will be for a long, unpleasant wrangle in the General Assembly, which will have before it both the Russian and American resolutions that were rejected in the Security Council las week—the first calling for withdrawal of our troops and a condemnation of American aggression, the second for the replacement of our troops with an armed U. N. force. The Russian resolution would have no chance of passage, but the speeches in its favor would be blared over radio Cairo for weeks on end. In time, the American resolution might get the necessary two-thirds vote—our major allies are solidly behind us, and a combination of the great Western Powers and all their client states should be sufficient to carry the day against the Russians, their satellites, and those of the Bandung powers that would be ranged against us—but the victory would probably be meaningless in political terms; it would take so long to come that the situation in Lebanon would very likely bear slight resemblance to the one that the resolution was intended to deal with. Even if the situation remained the same, it is hard to see how the fruits of victory—an armed U. N. force between the feeble rebels in Beirut and their Syrian sympathizers—would be worth the price we would have to pay. Indeed, it is hard for anyone here to see any really satisfactory outcome for the present American policy in the U. N. Our friends and critics are agreed that neither our intervention in Lebanon nor the course of action we have been urging on the Security Council makes very much sence in United Nations terms.

This is not to say that it is unsound or immoral, or not in accord with international law; on the contrary, the difficulties we have been encountering may reveal more about what is wrong with this parliament of man next door to Tudor City than what is wrong with President Eisenhower's pursuit of the national interest at the far end of the Mediterranean. Under international law, one sovereign state may aid another whenever the party of the second part requests such aid. This covers the Lebanese situation nicely (it would also, to be sure, cover the loan of 50 or 60 Russian divisions to the United Arab Republic), but article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which President Eisenhower claimed as a sanction for the landings in Lebanon, says something else altogether. Article 51 says that "nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, if an armed attack occurs against a member of the organization, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." The U. N. was established to deter aggression, not revolution, and "armed attack" means an assault upon one power by another, not an armed uprising of the discontented. Ambassador Lodge's instructions last Tuesday morning were to square the President's decision with article 51. It was an impossible task. Quite apart from the fact that recent press reports out of Lebanon had been largely devoted to the happy intelligence that the revolt was petering out, there was the fact of the report of the U. N. observers on the scene, who said that the commotion was in the main a civil disturbance, with no signs of the "massive infiltration" that President Chamoun had been talking about. Mr. Hammarskjold, on his return from Beirut, confirmed this report.

The American mission here, aided by State Department dialecticians and hurriedly declassified reports from the Central Intelligence Agency, did as much as it could for Ambassador Lodge. Someone came up with the theory of indirect aggression, and the CIA provided enough instances of aid to the rebels from the United Arab Republic to demonstrate that Colonel Nasser had an interest in the outcome, and that the rebels were working with imported firearms. But there were very few people to whom the theory seemed either sound or applicable, and at least some of the CIA's findings were as close to hearsay as some of John Fox's stories about Sherman Adams and Bernard Goldfine. (Mr. Sobolev, according to the running translation of his comments, described them as "O. W. A. W.—or 'one woman told another woman'—stories.") In any case, the American argument relied on an unworldly concept of a civil war as a conflict altogether shielded from outside influences. There has never been such a civil war in modern times; in every struggle for power within a nation, both sides have appealed to friends in other countries. There was plenty of gunrunning and foreign financing in our own Civil War, and there would be great surprise in Washington if it could be shown that the very agency that provided Ambassador Lodge with such documentation as he had never did anything to aid or put down insurrections in other countries. The Ambassador may have been right in saying that if the U. N. can't take steps to deal with indirect aggression, it may fall to pieces, but the feeling here is that the dangers of the approach he has been taking are every bit as grave as those of the one he has argued against. For if the charter could justify our response in Lebanon, it could equally well justify the Russians in moving into Syria or Iraq.

It was not, of course, any defect of logic in our case that led to its defeat last week. Eight members of the Security Council voted with us, and we would have had our way if it hadn't been for the Soviet veto. In the General Assembly, we will have to make the same case all over again, and although the outcome will not hang on the quality of our reasoning, we will once more risk having our antagonists make the worse cause look like the better one. Substantially the same problem confronts the administration in Congress, where the intervention has to be justified—or so, at least, the administration appears to think—under the Eisenhower doctrine, which fits the facts even less well than article 51 of the Charter. (The Eisenhower doctrine empowers the President to take action against "armed aggression from any [Middle Eastern] country controlled by international communism.") The everlasting curse of American diplomacy is its way of becoming trapped by its own rhetoric. We need phrases and formulations and doctrines for everything we do, and these tend to obscure the essential realities. The essential reality in the Middle East right now is a pan-Arabism that we identify as nationalism but that actually is dissolving nations and forming a federation of peoples who inhabit territories that have resources essential to our allies. We can't do much to hinder its development without running the risk of bringing about a world war, and we can't ignore it without relinquishing our leadership of the Western democracies. Our choices are few; in fact, there may be only one, as all our policy-makers know, and that is to acknowledge the existence of pan-Arabism and seek a way of living with it. This we have not begun to do. Instead, we have worked ourselves into a position of apologizing in wholly irrelevant terms of our maiden effort in trying to slow the pace of the Arab revolution, and also into a position where we may be forced to negotiate with the Russians, not with the Arabs—Colonel Nasser, evidently, is not to be invited to the summit conference that Khrushchev has proposed—for recognition of our position in the Middle East.

No observation has been more frequently made throughout these last few exhausting and seemingly misspent days than that the United Nations has once again demonstrated its obsolescence. The Security Council, it is said, is incapable of dealing with anything that is really concerned with security. The veto power makes negotiation impossible here; even a summit meeting, where the participants are men of true power and are under heavy pressure to get something done, can produce solider results. It used to be said that at least the Security Council had great value as a forum for debate; nowadays, it is more often said that because of its peculiar composition and its cumbersome procedures it is inevitable that the questions of real substance—the things that are truly at issue in the world beyond this compound—will not be talked about here. Time is frittered away in discussing whether it would be a frittering away of time to allow delegates to explain their votes immediately upon casting them, and in soliciting the views of a delegate from a shadow government of China, and in debating whether or not a delegate from a shadow government of Iraq has the right to be seated. Not even the heat and passions of events are felt here; as one watches the delegates bantering in the corners, snoozing in their chairs, or sipping drinks in the Delegate's Lounge during the interminable French and English translations and the frequent seizures of protocol, it is difficult in the extreme to be convinced that any of this has anything to do with the making and breaking of nations, with kings being shot in their palaces and princes being torn to bits in the streets, with angry crowds, with marines in battle dress, or with the disposition of the basic fuel of the world's industry. Everything seems to be outside this sanctum; everyone seems intent on bypassing it. It makes an attempt to keep the peace in Lebanon, and the President of the United States, holding that the effort is inadequate, dispatches the marines. It shows signs of coming to life with something like the Japanese proposal, and the Premier of the Soviet Union demands a summit meeting in Geneva.

For all that, there is one accomplishment of the past week that cannot be denied the U. N. In a moment that appeared to hold the possibility of universal destruction, it focussed the world's attention on an effort, however forlorn, at a settlement. It is barely possible that a concentration on irrelevancies and trivialities, on fudged issues and procedural delays, is just the thing to keep the worst from coming to pass. It's just possible that if, upon the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, the world's diplomats had been able to score debating points on one another before television cameras, catastrophe might have been averted.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on information withholding and budgetary methods and approved studies to be held on foreign policy and relations with American republics.

Bill increasing social security benefits passed by House.

Housing bill approved by House committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14341–14356

Bills Introduced: 8 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 4207–4214. Page 14343

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 11722, providing compensation to the Crow Indians for certain lands required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, with amendment (S. Rept. 2068);

S. 2905, providing a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the vicinity of Ashford, Wash. (S. Rept. 2069);

S. 3682, authorizing the sale or exchange of certain U. S. lands in Pima County, Ariz. (S. Rept. 2070);

S. 3882, providing for the procurement and supply of Government headstones and markers (S. Rept. 2071);

H. R. 1244, providing for the development of Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia (S. Rept. 2072);

H. R. 2689, private bill (S. Rept. 2073);

H. R. 3402, providing for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range (S. Rept. 2074);

H. R. 4381, authorizing the furnishing of markers in memory of certain unknown Armed Forces deceased (S. Rept. 2075);

H. R. 4208, authorizing funds for construction of aeronautical and space research facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (S. Rept. 2076);

H. R. 4503, reconveyance of certain land situated in Franklin County, Ky. (S. Rept. 2077);

H. R. 5450, authorizing enlargement of the administrative headquarters site for Isle Royale National Park, Mich. (S. Rept. 2078);

H. R. 6038, to revise the boundary of Kings Canyon National Park, Calif. (S. Rept. 2079);

H. R. 6198, to exclude certain lands from the Sequoia National Park, Calif. (S. Rept. 2080);

H. R. 6274, providing that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept title to and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial (S. Rept. 2081);

H. R. 7790 and 8211, private bills (S. Rept. 2082-2083);

H. R. 8842, to quitclaim interest of the U. S. to certain land in Smith County, Miss. (S. Rept. 2084);

H. R. 9792, private bill (S. Rept. 2085);

H. R. 11008, authorizing exchange of certain land at Vicksburg National Military Park, Miss. (S. Rept. 2086);

H. R. 11868, relative to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area (S. Rept. 2087);

H. R. 13026, private bill (S. Rept. 2088);

H. R. 8980, authorizing exchange of lands at Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (S. Rept. 2089); and

H. R. 7125, to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, with amendments (S. Rept. 2090).

Page 14343

Bills Referred: Three House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 14341, 14388

Bill Placed on Calendar: H. R. 12728, to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable, was ordered to be placed on calendar. Page 14388

Military Construction—Correction: On page D758 of the DAILY DIGEST of July 30, 1958, in the account of Senate action on H. R. 13015, fiscal 1959 authorizations for military construction, it was incorrectly stated that Senate adopted amendment by Senator Martin (Pennsylvania) to include $375,000 for National Guard facilities at Johnstown, Pa. This amendment by Senator Martin was rejected rather than adopted.

Pages 14241–14242

Appendix

Twelve Brothers in Texas Family Have Served in Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Cleveland (Tex.) Advocate, one of the truly outstanding weekly newspapers in my State, recently published a feature story about a family that is remarkable, even for Texas.

This is the Ripkowski family, of Dayton, Tex.—a family of 12 brothers and 4 sisters. Every one of the brothers has seen active service in the Armed Forces.

The story of the Ripkowski family is one to bring a glow to the hearts of all patriotic Americans. It was written for the Cleveland Advocate by Tom Fatherree; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Tom Fatherree)

DAYTON.—When 22-year-old Stanley Ripkowski enlisted for 6 months' active duty in the Army last month, he became the 12th brother of the Dayton family to enter the Armed Forces.

As far as can be established, no other family in the United States can match this record. And only a handful can approach it.

Stanley, youngest of the 12 Ripkowski brothers, has followed in his brothers' footsteps, keeping the record 100 percent intact.

Of the 11 Ripp boys who already have seen their tours of duty, all served overseas and the first 9 to enlist saw action. They are Bernie, Felix, Alex, August, Leon, Bill, Raymond, Herman, and Franklin.

SIX AT ONCE

At one time during World War II, the brothers have established that six of them were in different combat zones at the same time. They put in an aggregate total of about 60 years in the service.

During that conflict, the Ripkowskis were scattered from Africa to Alaska, from the South Pacific to Europe.

Alex and Herman were in on the Normandy invasion and remained with the Allied Forces all the way through Germany.

Bernie, oldest of the Ripp offsprings, saw extended duty in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. One of the brothers, Raymond, crashed in the South Pacific on his 45th Air Force mission.

ISLAND HOPPERS

August and Bill were Pacific island hoppers, and Felix and Leon followed the north Africa-Sicily-Italy-France route.

Franklin saw duty with Army Intelligence in the Mediterranean theater of war during World War II, then was called back in during the Korean war.

Of the two brothers immediately older than Stanley, John J. was stationed in Germany—Mike in Okinawa during the Korean war.

All the brothers were in the Army except August, the only Navy man of the group, and Raymond and Mike, Air Force men. Franklin was in the Army during World War II and joined the merchant marine when called back in the Korean war.

FOUR SISTERS

In addition to the 12 Ripkowski brothers, there are 4 sisters; Catherine (Mrs. Joe Machola), Virginia (Mrs. Mike Carter), Pearline (Mrs. Glenn Tilton), and Anna Lee (Mrs. Kenneth Campbell). And all the sisters' husbands except one have seen service, and the other worked in a defense plant during the war.

But the most remarkable phase of the Ripkowski record is the fact that the nine brothers who saw action were returned to Dayton safe and sound. War nerves and battle scars have healed and the 11 Ripps now in civilian life are shouldering their own responsibilities and taking active roles in community life.

Staying close to Dayton, where all but 2 members of the family still live, the 10 married brothers and 4 sisters all own their homes and paddle their own canoes.

They're all hard workers, and their jobs range from service station operator to refinery supervisor. They aren't afraid of sweat and toil.

FARMED 200 ACRES

This probably is due to their having lived on a farm near Eastgate for 14 years, farming 200 acres of highland.

Mr. and Mrs. Stash Ripkowski and their 13 oldest children moved to Liberty County in 1931 from New Waverly, Tex. With the exception of Bernie, who lives at Kountze, Catherine, who lives at Crosby, and Stanley, who is stationed at Fort Chaffee, Ark., all the brothers and sisters still live in and around Dayton.

Mr. Ripkowski died 12 years ago, but "Mrs. Ripp" has held the family together. Approaching 62 years of age, the mother of 16 is still active and keeps up with the goings-on of the Ripkowski brood.

The family has recently won two television sets at Houston Buff baseball games on family nights for having the biggest representation, and the Ripp brothers put on an exhibition with sports writers and announcers at Buff Stadium, winning 3 to 1.

MISSES HER "BABY"

Right now Mrs. Ripp is missing her "Baby" Stanley and spends a goodly amount of time corresponding with him. However, Mike, the only other unmarried offspring, is still at home with Mrs. Ripp. Too, there are the 22 grandchildren to keep her time occupied.

Outside of praying for the welfare of her boys when they were scattered to the four corners of the world during World War II, probably her biggest chore was writing them letters, keeping them posted on the rest of the Ripps.

Dayton postal employees well remember mail call for Mrs. Ripkowski when enough to fill a newspaper would come in.

ALL STILL LIVING

Another unsual side to the Ripkowskis is that all of the children—and grandchildren—are still living, and all enjoying healthful, normal lives.

Mr. Ripkowski came from a family of 6 brothers and 2 sisters, and all of them are still living except 1 brother. And Mrs. Ripp's mother and father, the John Olybriches, are still living at New Waverly.

The remarkable Ripkowskis in 1949 had no less than 12—all the Ripp boys—on a Dayton-Crosby softball team in the Crosby League. Called the Ripp Brothers, the team was a highly respected and capable nine, hustling, clean playing and hard to beat. From Stanley, then 13 and acting mascot, through Bernie, 35, all the Ripp brothers were carried in the lineup.

ARDENT SPORTS FANS

The Ripkowski boys have always been ardent sports fans. Between Herman, Raymond, John J., Mike and Stanley, the brothers won about 35 letters at Dayton High School.

They'll tell you real quick like that they're diehard St. Louis Cardinal, Houston Buff, and Dayton Broncho supporters and are solid Rice Institute backers in the Southwest Conference.

Franklin presently is cosponsor of the Dayton Little League Dodger team.

Ten of the Ripp boys are members of the growing Dayton American Legion Post 512 of which Herman is secretary-treasurer.

RUNDOWN GIVEN

The Ripkowski boys and girls range in age from 22 to 43 years. It would be easy to write a book on the family, but here's a rundown on the sons and daughters:

Bernie, aged 43, lives in Kountze where he has been working for Truck Line Gas Co. for 5 years. Married Olivia Eaton, of Dayton. They have two boys, the oldest a top Little League player.

Felix, 42, has been with General Crude Oil Co. at Dayton for 12 years. Married Ann Zaruba, of Dayton. They have 1 boy, 1 girl, boy plays pee wee baseball.

Alex, 41, is a rice farmer and cattle rancher at Eastgate. Married Daisy Hatcher and his stepdaughter has a son, making him the only grandfather of the Ripp brothers.

August, 40, runs Magnolia service station in Dayton. Married Naomi Miffin, of Dayton, and they have one son.

HOME BUILDERS

Leon, 38, Dayton farmer and carpenter, was first of the brothers to join service, entering Army in 1939. Married Mary Osbolt, of Liberty, and they have one son.

Bill, 37, is also a Dayton farmer and carpenter. He and Leon have built some of Dayton's most beautiful homes. Married Dorothy Etheridge of Crosby and they have two girls. Bill was the first of the Ripp brothers to marry.

Raymond, 36, lives in Dayton and has been working at Humble Oil refinery at Baytown for 5 years. Was made supervisor at Baytown in 4 years. Married Cornelia Damek of Dayton and they have one boy, one girl. Boy plays Pee Wee ball.

Herman, 35, is a Gulf service station operator in Dayton. He is married to the former Mary Jane Hartel of Liberty and they have two boys.

HOUSTON WELDER

Catherine, 34, is married to Joe Machala of Crosby, a Houston welder. They have 1 girl and 3 boys, 1 in Little League.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Virginia, 32, is married to Alton Carter, owner of Dayton Barber Shop. They have a girl and 2 boys, 1 playing Pee Wee ball.

Franklin, 31, is a Dayton Humble service station agent and a member of the volunteer fire department. He married Mildred Damek of Dayton and they have one daughter.

John J., 28, lives in Dayton and has been a crane operator for Sheffield Steel of Houston for the past 4 years. He married Julia Ann Zaruba of Dayton.

Pearline, 27, is married to Glenn Tilton who has been working for Truck Line Gas Co. in Kountze for about 4 years. They have one daughter.

STAYS AT HOME

Mike, 26, the only unmarried member of the family besides Stanley, lives with Mrs. Ripp. He has been with Sheffield Steel for 4 years.

Anna Lee, 25, married Kenneth Campbell who also has been with Sheffield Steel for 4 years. They have one boy.

Stanley, 22, worked with Dow Chemical at Freeport for a year before enlisting for 6 months of active service in the Army at Fort Chaffee, Ark. He has been in active Reserves since February of this year. At Fort Chaffee, he was appointed platoon leader and has been selected neatest soldier of the week. After basic training he will attend 16 weeks of radio communication schooling at Fort Knox, Ky.

Fabulous, remarkable, extraordinary, eminent, special—it takes all that and a lot more to explain the Ripkowski family of Dayton.

Mining Claim Decisions Under Public Law 167

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in July 1955, Congress adopted Public Law 167, the Multiple Surface Use Act, which initiated a system under which the United States Forest Service can manage the timber on mining claims in the national forests, while prospectors and miners pursue their development work on the claim. This law went a long way toward avoiding the "mining" of timber on mineral claims.

It did not, however, go far enough. As I pointed out in my individual statement in the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it did not touch mining patents. A patentee may still receive, along with his mine—as a free bonus—a rich and luxuriant stand of national forest timber which may actually exceed the mine itself in value. It was this existing law of mining patents, rather than claims, which was involved in the Al Sarena case, and I have always regretted that Public Law 167 is invariably linked in public discussion with that unfortunate episode of resource mismanagement. The law with respect to mining patents in national forests still remains to be reformed, as suggested, for instance, in my bill S. 3247.

Meanwhile, however, some progress is being made with respect to claims under Public Law 167. The press in the Pacific Northwest has recently reported the decision in the first contest over the management of surface timber on a mining claim, under the new law. In the first contest, the United States Forest Service won the right to manage and dispose of timber on a series of arsenic mining claims in Snohomish County, Wash., which prior to Public Law 167 would have been wholly at the disposal of the claimants. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that articles reporting this precedent-setting case under Public Law 167, published in the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal of Portland on July 23, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 23, 1958]

UNITED STATES WINS TIMBER RIGHTS FROM MINING CLAIM PAIR

The United States Forest Service has won timber rights on a Snohomish County, Wash., mining site in the first contest of a law adopted following the famed Al Sarena case.

Hearing Examiner Graydon E. Holt, Portland, ruled against Robert T. Curtiss, Monroe, Wash., and A. G. Brennan, Seattle, the owners of arsenic mining claims and a mill site near Stevens Pass.

Holt ruled an arsenic deposit on the claims "is not presently or prospectively marketable," and the mill site "is not being used or occupied for the purposes contemplated by the mining laws."

As a result, some $90,000 worth of timber on the mine site may be managed and disposed of by the Government instead of by the claim owners.

Frank Folsom, regional chief or recreation and lands of the Forest Service, said the new law gives a Government agency timber management authority over mining claims on its lands in most cases.

Authority for timber management on mining claims filed before the law became effective July 23, 1955, depends on several factors, including a ruling by a qualified mineral examiner on the validity of the mine in question.

The Snohomish mill claims—called June, June No. 1, Crow, Crow No. 1, Marie and Marie No. 1—were brought to hearing after the owners challenged the Forest Service charge that no valid discovery of a valuable mineral had been made and that the mill site was not being used or occupied for mining or milling purposes.

Mill claim owners had authority over timber disposal on their mill sites prior to passage of the new law. The new legislation had been in the process for some time, but was hastened after charges in the Al Sarena case were made.

In that controversy, mining claim owners in southern Oregon were accused of obtaining mining patents principally in order to gain ownership of valuable timber.

Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrats, of Oregon, since have said the Al Sarena Co. has sold thousands of dollars' worth of timber, but has not engaged in mining.

[From the Oregon Journal of July 23, 1958]

FOREST SERVICE WINS FIRST TRY UNDER NEW MINING CLAIM LAW

(By Jim Running)

The regional United States Forest Service office here has won its first contest brought under the new mining claim law which was adopted shortly after the famed Al Sarena mine patent was publicized.

Hearing Examiner Graydon E. Holt, of Portland, ruled against the owners of arsenic mining claims and a millsite in Snohomish County, Wash., near Stevens Pass.

Partners in the millsite and claims—called June, June No. 1, Crow, Crow No. 1, Marie and Marie No. 1—are Robert T. Curtiss, of Monroe, Wash., and A. G. Brennan, Seattle.

Holt ruled that the arsenic deposits on the claims is not presently or prospectively marketable and that the millsite is not being used or occupied for the purposes contemplated by the mining laws.

Consequently, some $90,000 in timber on the claims and millsite may be managed and disposed of by the Government instead of by the mining claim owners.

The controversy reached the hearing stage when Curtiss and Brennan challenged the Forest Service charge that no valid discovery of a valuable mineral had been made and that the millsite was not being used or occupied for mining or milling purposes.

Under the new law, according to Frank Folsom, Portland, chief of recreation and lands of the Forest Service in this region, the Government agency on whose land the claims are made has authority in most cases to manage the surface and dispose of the vegetation resources located thereon, insofar as such management and disposal do not materially interfere with mining operations.

Although the new law was in the making for some time, it apparently was hastened after charges were made regarding patenting of the Al Sarena mining claims near Trail. The owners were accused of getting the patents principally to obtain ownership of the valuable timber on the tract.

Authority to manage the surface of mining claims filed since the new law became effective July 23, 1955, is given to the Forest Service without further procedure.

On claims filed before that date, however, such as the Snohomish tracts on which Holt ruled, "the new law provides a procedure for classifying the status of the surface rights." Folsom explained. He continued:

"This procedure involved, among other things, examination by a qualified mineral examiner to determine validity of the claim in question.

"The Forest Service has initiated procedures to clarify the status of surface rights on all claims located prior to July 23, 1955. It is planned that this operation will be completed by 1965.

"It cannot be stressed too strongly that under (the new law) mining claims cannot be invalidated. The procedure is only to determine whether the Federal agency or the claimant possesses the right to manage the surface on unpatented mining claims."

Navy Certificate of Award to Richard Courant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Prof. Richard Courant, director of the Institute of Mathematical Sciences at New York University, was recently honored by the Navy with the Distinguished Public Service Award.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the citation that accompanied the award to Professor Courant. This award is further evidence of Professor

Courant's outstanding and continuing contribution to national security.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF AWARD

In appreciation of distinguished public service to the Department of the Navy the Secretary of the Navy takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Public Service Award to Richard Courant for services set forth in the following citation:

"For oustanding contributions to the Department of the Navy in the field of mathematical sciences. As recognized leader in the field of applied mathematics and in his capacity as director of the Institute of Mathematical Sciences at New York University, Professor Courant has rendered exceptionally distinguished service to the scientific progress of the Navy by fashioning modern mathematical methods and tools, greatly enhancing the capabilities of the Navy, as well as of the National Defense Establishment generally, in dealing with its present and future technological problems. He has made these contributions personally as one of the great research mathematicians of our time and through a nationally unique research organization of his creation. With exceptional vision and indefatigability, Professor Courant has sought out and clarified major problems, confronting the Navy as well as the other armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission in their technical developments, whose solution could be furthered only by advancing current methods of mathematical analysis. He has been a major contributor to the scientific progress of applied mathematics as an integral part of the technology on which the Navy relied in the design and evaluation of its latest weapons. In recognition of and appreciation for his outstanding achievements this award is approved this 21st day of April 1958."

THOMAS S. GATES,
Secretary of the Navy.

Fate of the Kennedy-Ives Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "The Latest Political Murder Mystery," written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in this morning's issue of the New York Times. In the article Mr. Krock sizes up the impasse with which Senate bill 3974, sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, is confronted.

I believe Mr. Krock's analysis is reasonably accurate. Therefore, I desire to call the attention of all the Members of the Congress to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 1, 1958]

THE LATEST POLITICAL MURDER MYSTERY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—A familiar political hunt is on for the doer of the deed which apparently has laid the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill on its deathbed. As in a good many other murder mysteries (few believe the wounded legislation can survive), the suspects are accusing one another, and there are also insinuations that a policeman on the case may have been hired by the criminal.

The suspects thus far enumerated are: The National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, some unnamed union labor leaders working under the cover of the endorsement of the Kennedy-Ives bill by George Meany, head of the AFL–CIO, and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, the policeman. The only principals clearly innocent are the sponsors of the legislation—Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IVES, of New York—which the Senate approved by a vote of 88 to 1.

These two could have no rational motives for wanting their bill to die in the House. They labored long and arduously for its passage through the Senate committee and on the floor. Whatever political damage they may have done to themselves among the labor groups which want no reform legislation at all is fait accompli. This applies also to the industrial groups opposed to this particular bill. The death of the legislation in the House would not repair the political damage, if any, suffered by the two Senators. And its passage by the House would clinch whatever political credit they may get for their activities among the groups which favor the bill's reform provisions. So in reason, KENNEDY and IVES must be eliminated from the quarry.

KENNNEDY has named the NAM as responsible for the plight of the legislation in the House. But the Republicans promptly retort that, if this were true, then the Senator has said in effect that a Democratic House, with a very powerful Speaker, does the bidding of the NAM. Thus to prove his charge KENNEDY would be obliged to rebut this point made by the Republicans. And this has confused the trail so far as KENNEDY is concerned.

THE POINTING FINGERS

Secretary Mitchell put the Kennedy-Ives bill at its birth in what its sponsors describe as "a bad light." He did this by his sudden blast from Geneva, uttering broad criticisms of the measure which were not removed by the subsequent amendments. Moreover, his attack fed Democratic suspicion that administration politicians would rather have a labor reform campaign issue than a labor reform bill. Nevertheless, Mitchell has assigned the responsibility for House inaction exclusively to Democrats—RAYBURN and Chairman BARDEN of the Labor Committee, the Speaker in particular.

As evidence he cited that RAYBURN kept the Senate bill on his desk "for 40 days and 40 nights" before sending it to the Barden committee, notoriously a sluggish legislative channel, at a point so late in the session that House action was extremely unlikely. Mitchell also criticized the NAM and the chamber for their opposition, but he placed the murder weapon in Democratic hands.

Speaker RAYBURN has rejected the charge or implication that he deliberately employed his desk as a death chamber for the legislation. His only purpose, he said, was to keep it from jeopardizing committee action on a welfare-pension labor bill on which the committee was deliberating. This, however, has not satisfied the sleuths who asked the Speaker this unanswered question: How and why would his prompt reference to committee of the Kennedy-Ives bill have jeopardized the other?

These interrogators are equally unsatisfied with an answer they did get to another question: What became of an understanding with the Democratic leadership that it would bring up the Kennedy-Ives bill under suspension of the rules if necessary for floor action at this session? (The answer made in behalf of the Democratic leaders was that they discovered they could not get the two-thirds vote necessary for suspension, and probably not even a majority.)

Those who administered the fatal stroke, therefore, are visible only through the binoculars of suspicion. There is not enough evidence to convict anyone. But on the other hand there is enough to require from all concerned, except KENNEDY and IVES, better proof of innocence than has been offered. And this includes some labor leaders whom no sleuth has been able to identify.

Where Do We Go Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Do We Go Next?" published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 29, 1958. This editorial relates to the proposal of our Government for a summit conference at the United Nations.

I believe, however, that it offers some very provocative thoughts. The concluding paragraph reads as follows:

If our Government is as cool to a summit conference as it appears to be, what is its alternative solution to the problem of getting our troops out of Lebanon? There still does not seem to be any clear answer as to where we go from here.

I am convinced that every thoughtful American is today asking the question, "What do we do? Where do we go?" Thoughtful Americans are looking for direction and guidance.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DO WE GO NEXT?

Foot-dragging by the United States and the reluctance of Gen. Charles de Gaulle to attend a summit conference in New York have permitted Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union to score another propaganda victory in his latest letter to the western powers.

For Khrushchev now is offering to have the meeting in Moscow—or in Geneva, Vienna, Paris, or any other place in Europe—because, he says, "We do not want to make it difficult for the United States Government." Concern had been expressed by American officials over security arrangements for Khrushchev if the meeting were held in New York.

The Russian Premier's reply also made it clear that he is seeking an opportunity to bypass the United Nations even though in his earlier letter he said flatly that "the considerations concerning the convocation of the meetings of the heads of government within the framework of the Security Council are acceptable to us."

It still might be possible to convene the Security Council in Europe—perhaps even in Moscow—but it would seem more logical to have the session right at the U. N. Headquarters in New York. That would help dramatize the fact that the U. N. is an integral part of the world's peace machinery. And

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

we don't think the security arrangements would be so difficult as to make the meeting impossible there.

In his reply, Khrushchev also found the opportunity to note the continuing buildup of American forces in Lebanon, and thus raised inferentially at least the question that must be occurring elsewhere in the world:

If the United States really is interested in a summit conference or any other solution to the crisis that might led to the withdrawal of American forces from Lebanon, why does the United States continue to pour troops into the Middle East?

Perhaps the purpose is to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that we do have the ability to move troops into the area in a hurry. The trouble is that our actions don't seem to match the words in which we offered to pull our troops out if a small U. N. force replaced them.

Nor does the situation in Lebanon so far as the rebels are concerned seem to warrant any further American buildup there, although the longer our forces remain in Lebanon the greater the prospect for incidents which might lead to renewed outbreaks of civil war and our own involvement in a shooting war.

If our Government is as cool to a summit conference as it appears to be, what is its alternative solution to the problem of getting our troops out of Lebanon? There still does not seem to be any clear answer as to where we go from here.

Impressions of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently there has come to my attention a report entitled "Impressions of China," written by Mr. James Muir, chairman and president of the Royal Bank of Canada, the largest bank in Canada, with assets of nearly $4 billion.

My colleagues will find that many of Mr. Muir's observations are contrary to the ideas often disseminated in our country by official Government sources. Not having been in China myself, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the report, which speaks for itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA

(By Mr. James Muir, chairman and president, the Royal Bank of Canada)

This is an attempt to report information on life and conditions in China as I saw them on a short visit. It is not meant to prove or disprove anything. If anyone is interested enough to read it, I ask that he read it all through before drawing any conclusions; and particularly I ask that he refrain from lifting any passage from context which, with an elaboration built thereon, might create quite a wrong impression of the whole.

The first question you would probably ask is, "Why did you go to China, what was the purpose of your visit?" Quest of knowledge, the desire to see how other people live and have their being, the desire to see how business, and more particularly how banking operations are conducted, were the main urges that prompted me to go, plus of course a fairly healthy measure of natural curiosity.

I went of my own accord, at my own expense, and received invaluable physical assistance from Bank of China officials in arranging such things as accommodations and travel facilities. From first to last their courtesy, assistance, kindness and general good humor under all circumstances were of infinite help. Their explanations of their system were naturally of the highest interest, and they showed not the slightest reluctance to answer questions, and plied me with queries in return. I have read that in visits to China one is put in the hands of Intourist, a Government agency, which in effect leads one around by the nose. I was not under such auspices. Actually, I saw but one Intourist official and that was in Canton. In many respects I would compare Intourist, as I saw glimpses of it functioning, as a sort of Chinese Thomas Cook & Son or American Express operating under Government auspices.

The cost of living is unbelievably low, probably about one-fourth to one-third of ours in many directions. In the main cities we had good and immaculately kept hotel accommodation; laundry was done and returned the same day and looked less war worn than is the case on our continent; clothes pressing was often and prompt—dry cleaning in a matter of hours in case of need.

I was told rats have been exterminated so bubonic plague has gone. I saw one fly and one mosquito and no sparrows in the cities. National campaigns were organized to get rid of these pests, and I believe were used as a test to see how successful or otherwise the authorities could be in organizing the populace to singleness of effort. From their point of view the results must have been astonishingly gratifying.

The growth in industry, the change in living standards, the modernization of everything and anything, the feats of human effort and the colossal impact of human labor are not within our power to describe and still give a worthwhile picture of the scene. All I can say is that it must be seen to be believed. It's truly stupendous. The effect is almost to bewilder one when he sees what has been accomplished in less than 10 years but, if he is a thinking person, to appall him and dumbfound him when he realizes what had not been done in the previous 4,000 years or even 100 years. There are 600 million people in the land—the net population is increasing 20 million per annum or 38 per minute. Take deaths into consideration, and births must be at something resembling machinegun speed—and we were freely told there is already a labor shortage. Twenty-five percent of the population of the world lives in China and in a score of years or less it will be nearer half the world's population. How one can fail to recognize this colossal scene is over my head.

I shall give but one example, an exceptional one perhaps, of the inexorable effect of human effort in terms of human labor. I saw the new irrigation and flood control dam in the Ming Tombs Valley. It was practically finished and had taken only 140 days to complete. It is over 2,000 feet long, about 95 feet high, 555 feet wide at the base and about 25 feet wide at the top. It has a concrete core, the upstream side is clay and the other is earth, gravel, and stone. One hundred thousand people were working in 3 shifts around the clock. All work was described as "voluntary"—certainly it was unpaid. About half of the work force was provided by the army, the rest by citizens from every walk of life who go and live and work at the site for days or weeks as circumstances, age, health, and physique permit. With little else than their bare hands, picks, and shovels, this colossal task has been accomplished. I stood on high ground and looked down upon this vast human anthill. I took photographs of the scene, a shift of 30,000 toiling people, and hope when developed these pictures will have caught something of the atmosphere of the drama.

The almost fanatical drive toward hygiene and physical culture by the people is a study in itself. At 10 a. m. and 4 p. m. all work must stop and physical exercise be indulged in—young and old, over and under weight alike. I saw few in the former category. Many people wear gauze masks as a protection against dirt and fumes. En route from Shanghai to Canton by air we stopped at an airstop for lunch. We were met at the plane by a girl wearing a white gauze mask, in white skirt and long white smock, spotless. She conducted us to the dining room and it was she who served our lunch. Part of the table dishes was a porcelain spoon, resting upon a piece of paper. As I was about to pick up the spoon, she nudged my elbow, pointed to the paper and made motions to show I should first thoroughly rub the spoon with it.

In many ways Peiping is a beautiful city and in and around it are vast historical buildings and relics. They have been maintained and repaired with the preponderance of Chinese red paint and offer a startling and pleasing appearance. To mention just a few, the Imperial Palace within the Forbidden City, the Summer Palace, the Ming Tombs in the Ming Valley and, of course, the Great Wall itself, all go to fulfill a sightseer's and photographer's dream.

I have been asked about the standard of living in China. It's difficult to give an understandable answer because for vast millions there is not such a thing as we know it. Man, woman and child have not risen much beyond the beast-of-burden stage. The sights one sees of the stresses, the strains, the unbelievable extent to which a human frame can be abused, leave one almost physically ill. And yet the lot of these people is better than it was, and improving. For millions more one sees contentment, happiness, and one would believe more freedom from oppression and civil strife than their previous generations have known. Corruption and graft we were told—and confirmed by people living outside the area—have disappeared. Petty theft is rare; one does not bother to lock his home. We did not bother to lock our hotel room doors. As an example of their apparently fanatical honesty, when leaving the hotel in Canton I failed to pick up some $2 or less in change. They followed me to the station and found me after I was seated on the train in order that they might deliver this change to me.

It cannot be that the present way of life is pleasing to everyone; there are many refugees constantly arriving in Hong Kong, for example, but they can be but a fleabite compared with the country's population of 600 million people, and we should think they are mostly small farmers who are still individualistic enough to resist being brought into the cooperative farm movement. Those in authority freely state that the aim is to add slowly and patiently, yet without interruption, to the standard of living, that to try too much too quickly would be fatal—lead to inflation and endanger their whole program.

Unless the whole scene is a dream or one's senses of observation and appraisement are less than useless, then we think the vast majority of the people of China have a government they want, a government which is improving their lot, a government in which they have confidence, a government which

stands no chance whatever of being supplanted. All this quite obviously indicates a political problem that will sear the very souls of some Western powers, and which at some stage is going to pose an overwhelming face-saving problem in more directions than one. It's difficult to believe that anything resembling war is desired in China if for no reason other than that such a development would have a disastrous effect upon the plans for improvement they are trying to bring about.

While in personal contacts we found individuals courteous, friendly, good natured, and prepared to go through a generous dose of good-natured ribbing, they are as a people exceedingly sensitive and touchy at the slightest implication of lack of confidence in their business undertakings or at sharp or belittling criticism of them as a nation or at the thought that there is or ever can be a divided China. We would caution those businessmen and men in public life who would have dealings with China to bear the foregoing ever in mind. Only undesirable results can ensue and nothing whatever can we hope to gain by ignoring these sensitive areas in the Chinese character.

The so-called strategic list of prohibited exports adopted by some nations has become in Chinese eyes almost ridiculous. So far as we can see (always with the exception of really strategic materials) about all that is happening so far as China is concerned is that annoyance is created, the goods are forthcoming from some other source, progress is not being seriously retarded, and ironically, a great long-run benefit may be conferred upon the Chinese by forcing them to make things for themselves.

One highly placed person, not resident in China but thoroughly familiar with Chinese people, made the statement to me that the capacity of the Chinese to learn and perform is governed entirely by the teaching capacity of others who would undertake to instruct them. Their thirst for knowledge is now great, and a visit to the University of Peking shows a lot of eager and enthusiastic students. A similar attitude, we were told, prevails in other seats of learning. As far as education of the masses is concerned, they have a long, long way to go. Steps are now afoot to change the Chinese characters to the Roman alphabet which is in general use in the Western world, and it is believed this will be a tremendous help in the educational process. There seem to be many professors of political economy around—and many students. We twitted one professor with the gibe that no doubt he found Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill among his mentors. Laughingly he replied, "Well, their theories are not exactly popular with us at present."

One innovation in economic organization has resulted from the liquidation of the Kuomintang. Businessmen who were clean or free from entanglement with this organization have been allowed to maintain their financial interest in the business and receive 5 percent on their capital, even though the enterprise may be managed by state appointed personnel. If the owner of the business is appointed manager he will, of course, receive the regular state salary for his type of managerial service plus the 5-percent return on his investment. Here we have joint private-state enterprises which should be of interest to all students of comparative economic organizations. How long this hybrid will persist, one cannot say. But I understand that the private rights involved may be bequeathed or transferred; and, if this is true, the joint private-state type of enterprise may last for generations to come.

The all-important matter of trade was constantly coming up, and listening to the Chinese side of the story and to the outside phase of it, none of which incidentally came from traders, we are frankly a little confused.

One thing is certain—China needs a multitude of things and is most desirous of trading. It would be a waste of time for us to try to cover this field in a report of this kind. Any Canadian exporter who wants to trade with China—and if he is conscious of his own interests and is farsighted enough to realize his responsibilities to our Canadian economy—can readily obtain from our Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa a good idea of what is wanted. The Trade Commissioners of our Government who cover that area are fully conversant with the picture, and we feel we should assume they keep Ottawa headquarters fully advised.

If we have anything to suggest here it is that our exporting fraternity shake themselves loose, get busy and visit China either individually or as a group, probably in the latter form initially, but keep at it. It was galling to meet and to talk with the selling forces of other Western powers, not only obviously getting business, but enthusiastic about it while our people seem to sit back and wait for a silver platter deal. Our exporters have got to learn to develop resourcefulness and to take reasonable business risks. Outside China we heard a good deal about the Chinese importing movement endeavoring to make one-sided deals, about their reneging on contracts and so on; but we were unable to uncover a substantiated case. Our people should make clear the deal they want, make it reasonable and orthodox, and have a full and complete understanding of the transaction before they start—documented, if necessary, throughout. If they do this, deliver on time, and do not deviate from the terms, we should be inclined to believe they won't experience undue difficulties. This opportunity, coupled with our need for export markets, should sound a clarion call to our Government to see to it that, if any Canadian enterprise should be induced by outside influence to deviate from its responsibility to the Canadian worker and to the Canadian economy by declining legitimate and clean business, drastic and immediate steps be taken to discipline any such Canadian corporation. Canada needs export trade, and it should be sought after everywhere with no interest other than the welfare of Canada involved.

We had some interesting discussions relative to the new Chinese Constitution, which provides for freedom of speech, right of assembly, and freedom in the practice of religion. Freedom of speech, we believe, can be followed in the criticism of how things are being done in a material way, or of the people who are charged with the responsibility of doing them—but the Chinese can't be "agin the Government" as we know it. Anything savouring of sedition would meet with the inevitable treatment: so perhaps freedom of speech could in our view be largely confined to the suggestion-box principle. In this highly restricted sense it might even be welcomed by the authorities.

Right of assembly exists in the sense that crowds can immediately assemble and listen to a speaker. We saw such crowds at street corners and at country crossroads. When we asked what the spouter was dispensing, it was always a harangue on the virtues of hygiene, on the desirability of continuing to swat flies and kill mosquitoes, or on some such subject. Theoretically, we suppose one could assemble a crowd and talk about anything—but for how long we don't know. There is no Chinese Hyde Park.

Regarding the freedom to practice religion, there could be a need for this—not perhaps out of regard for religion but because there is a political problem due to the large number of Moslem followers in addition to the Buddhists. I found Christian churches of many denominations—I also visited a Buddhist temple. On Sunday morning in Peiping we heard what sounded like church bells. At first we could not believe our ears. Persistently we went down a side street from which the sound was coming, and certainly it was the sound of church bells. We found the church, a large Roman Catholic edifice, within a walled enclosure. The front court was full of children playing, the front doors were closed and again children playing and squatting in front of them, but we proceeded to a side door and found a church which could accommodate a very large congregation. Mass was in progress; the church was not full but there was a large congregation of people, devout to all appearances, young and old—male and female—very small children crawling in the aisles—older ones moving around from pew to pew. The clergy were all Chinese. We stayed for part of the service. There are other authorities more competent than I am to discuss this phase, but so far as I could find out all clergy must be Chinese and, if this is so, then perhaps freedom is more apparent than real. This is only an observation. Someone else, I am sure, can give a positive answer.

Unquestionably there is some subtle difference in life between China and other nations of Marxian persuasion. One feels no sense of domination, no depression, no lack of freedom in moving around, and so on. Perhaps it is inspired by the courtesy, good nature, and natural politeness of the people. One goes shopping as he would in Montreal—big stores, little stores, all sorts of goods. Food is rationed on a seasonal basis, we were told. In hotels and restaurants there are no restrictions. One can go sightseeing, rubbernecking, and camera using at will—but must get an export permit for his undeveloped film which was a rather perfunctory procedure.

For those who have read so far no doubt a variety of impressions of life in China has been formed. Some may be favorable, even too much so, some skeptical and unbelieving. Both are wrong.

As I said at the beginning, one has to see what is going on with his own eyes before he can realize what the picture unfolds. Nobody can do so for him. China is a Socialist state, a managed economy adhering to the teachings of Karl Marx, with some modifications to meet Chinese reality. The state is supreme, man an instrument—therefore, he can't be really free. There is none of the comrade technique, there is no pretense that all are equal; on the contrary, the working class, the peasants, are freely refered to. One is rewarded in the material sense according to his talents and his responsibilities; but the plunder, the privilege, and corruption are said to be gone. One wonders what China would be like today if over the last 150 years it had moved along the lines of democratic progress instead of exploitation and corruption. The wind was sown, the whirlwind is being reaped.

As mentioned earlier, 25 percent of the world's population live in China; maybe in 20 years they will be one-half of the world. Their present rate of progress is beyond description—but they have, as we have said, a million miles to go before the masses have a semblance of a decent standard of living. They are moving fast, however. If one can picture a future nation of 1 billion people—skilled, educated, industrialized, and with a capacity for work that beggars description—the high cost economy of the West is eventually in for revision. We of the West want no part of the political and economic philosophy that governs such states—but I wonder if we had a similar experience as a people how we would feel about it. The answer seems to be clear.

Regarding the so-called recognition of China in the political sense, one just does not see how 600 million people, which may be a billion before too long, can be given myopic treatment. I am no prophet—but a "bonnie Prince Charlie" from across the sea from Taipan seems more than unlikely. Just how face is to be saved there presents a staggering problem. There is every indication that the people of China as a whole are satisfied with their Government. It seems to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

meet their needs and it seems to be conscious of a great job to be done to lift the standard of living and the general way of life of the masses out of the black hopelessness that has prevailed in the past.

I believe there is good and legitimate trade to be done. Other Western people are getting it. Canada will be negligent and unfair to herself if she does not get her share. She won't get it, however, without aggressive action.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the well known writer on economic affairs, Sylvia Porter, which appeared 2 or 3 days ago in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Aid for Small Business."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS
(By Sylvia Porter)

For the first time in years, the small-business man is getting solid help from Congress—in the form of a new system of financing and tax relief.

To the 4 million business firms classified as small, this report has vital meaning. It is with pleasure that I submit the highlights of three separate moves on the small-business front.

1. The Small Business Administration has been made a permanent agency. The new law, signed by the President a fortnight ago, also raises the maximum loan the SBA can make to a single applicant under its regular program from $250,000 to $350,000 and cuts the interest rate on loans from 6 to 5½ percent.

2. A new bill which will become law any day will create a new system of financing small business, thus facing up to the little business firms most crucial need. Specifically:

Under the new law, the SBA will be voted $250 million of new money by Congress to promote the formation of local small business investment companies. An investment company can be formed voluntarily by a local group of at least 10 businessmen; it must have a minimum of $300,000 of capital to begin operations; half of this capital it can get from the SBA and the other half must be raised by local sources. When set up, the local investment company will decide whether to invest risk capital directly in any little firm or whether to extend to the firm a long-term loan of up to 20 years. The investment company can't put more than 20 percent of its capital and surplus into any one business but even on its initial capital, that means it could make a loan of $60,000 to a single firm—and many investment companies will have much bigger pools of funds.

3. A third bill which also will become law any day will give small business firms some welcome tax relief. Again, specifically:

Most important of the new tax bill's provisions is one allowing a small firm to write off for tax purposes 20 percent of the cost of machinery, equipment, other tangible personal property in the year of purchase. The property may be either new or used when bought. Farmers will be permitted to take advantage of the liberalized depreciation allowance. The fast writeoff will apply, though, only to the first $10,000 of investment purchases each year or $20,000 in the case of joint returns. Other limitations are that the property must have a useful life of 6 years or more and must have been acquired since December 31, 1957.

Another significant clause in the new tax bill will allow investors in stocks of small businesses to deduct, in certain cases, losses as ordinary losses instead of as capital losses—up to $25,000 for individuals and $50,000 in the case of joint returns. This is much more liberal tax treatment of losses and should stimulate investment in small businesses.

Still another significant clause will allow payment of estate taxes resulting from ownership in closely held businesses to be paid, under certain circumstances, in 10 annual installments—a move designed to help heirs to small businesses avoid forced liquidation because of estate taxes.

When you put it together, it's an impressive package of aid to small business and the most impressive part of it is the creation of the new small-business-financing system.

If the new financing system works—and I'm positive it will—the next Congress can refine and extend it. Meanwhile, the small-business man can say truthfully today that the 85th Congress not only has talked piously about his plight but also has done something great to ease it.

The Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, several days ago I made a speech on the floor of the Senate pointing out what I considered to be highly irresponsible activity by several major business organizations in opposing enactment of S. 3974, the labor reform bill passed recently by the Senate. In connection with those remarks, I inserted a number of editorials commenting on this activity by business organizations, and inadvertently an article by Mr. John Herling was omitted from the RECORD. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and note be made of the fact that it was a part of my previous remarks.

There being no objection, the article ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News of July 29, 1958]

STRANGE LABOR MISALLIANCE
(By John Herling)

Teamsters President Jimmy Hoffa, like his predecessor, Dave Beck, has now become the political darling of spokesmen for organized business.

Teamster leader and business tycoon have set up legislative housekeeping together—but not in the same place. The objective of this strange roving misalliance on Capitol Hill is to abort the labor-reform bill in the House which passed the Senate more than a month ago by a vote of 88 to 1.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, the NAM, and the Retail Federation have combined forces to kill labor-reform legislation—a bipartisan measure sponsored by Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IRVING IVES, of New York, Democrat and Republican, respectively. In April, the same employer groups had warned their members that organized labor was trying to knock off such reform legislation at all costs.

AFL–CIO President George Meany has made it plain that organized labor favors the Kennedy-Ives bill despite some objections. But Mr. Meany says that the AFL–CIO would much rather have such a bill as it is than see it run down the legislative drain.

This labor-reform measure is not to be confused with the Douglas disclosure bill which calls for governmental power over pension and welfare funds. The labor-reform bill is a product of the McClellan investigations of improper practices in the labor or management field.

The attitude of organized business last spring is illustrated by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce. Strongly opposed to the comprehensive pension and welfare disclosure bill because it would include one-party employer plans as well as joint plans under scrutiny. The employer spokesmen charged that the unions had an ulterior motive in supporting this disclosure legislation.

What was labor's ulterior motive, according to business spokesmen? It was, said the Illinois Chamber, "to quench the fires of public indignation which have been ignited by the McClellan committee investigation. Labor groups will claim that this legislation (the disclosure bill) has cleaned up the mess, thereby avoiding their responsibilities in other areas where reform-labor legislation is badly needed."

Repeatedly, during the Senate debate, Senators of both parties replied to such suspicions by insisting that two types of legislation—pension and welfare disclosures and labor reform—were to be part of the legislative picture.

This promise was made and kept. The labor-reform legislation was introduced, amended, passed, and sent on to the House. And then, the business spokesmen did a hairpin turn. Why the switch? Here's why:

This legislation goes after abuses the McClellan committee found prevalent in the Teamsters and some other unions. But it also aims at the elimination of management abuses. This, business spokesmen charge, will impose heavy penalties on employers. So the word has gone out from employer organizations to kill the labor-reform bill. The teamsters say kill the labor-reform bill.

Legislative murder is about to be committed to the hoarse sounds of this macabre harmony.

The Middle East Crisis as Related to Oil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I was very much interested to note an article in the New York Herald Tribune under date of July 30 last, by P. C. Spencer, chairman of the board of the Sinclair Oil Corp. The financial editor of that paper is on vacation, and in his absence leaders in the business world have been filling in for him by writing articles for the Tribune. Mr. Spencer wrote a very informative article on the crisis in the Middle East and the possibility of the loss of the

oil resources of that area to the free world.

Percy Spencer is an oldtime resident of Wyoming and he has countless friends in our State. He started his career in the oil business about 35 years ago while still a citizen of Wyoming and is recognized today as one of the outstanding leaders in the oil industry of America.

In the event the free world is cut off from the Middle East oil, I am sure the oil industry of this country will cooperate in every way possible in order to provide for the fuel needs of the people of the United States and of Europe. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Spencer entitled "United States Oil Accord Urged in Crisis," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OIL ACCORD URGED IN CRISIS

(By P. C. Spencer)

Once again the world is laboring nervously in a period of high international tension. All men of good will fervently hope the crisis can be peacefully resolved. But, even as we hope and pray, we must be prepared for adverse eventualities. Since the center of the crisis is again the Middle East, it is obvious that the American oil industry may be called upon again to make its vital contribution to our national security, as well as the security of our allies.

At this critical moment, it is timely to review the status of relations between Government and the oil industry, to see what kind of teamwork might be expected in case of urgent need.

Over a period of many years a unique and most effective working relationship between the oil industry and Government has existed under both Democratic and Republican regimes. It has served Government with outstanding success in both war and peace, particularly in World War I, World War II, the Korean episode, and the Suez Crisis. It is fair to say that, in performing its responsibilities on these occasions, the oil industry has contributed to the Government program without question the very best that it had in time, talents, and energy.

Some people close to Government and national affairs have observed in recent times what they term to be an alarming deterioration in these invaluable Government-oil-industry relations. And they are frankly disturbed. They cite, for examples, the increasing flood of congressional inquisitions on oil; the indictments at Alexandria as a special reward for its magnificent performance in the Suez crisis; the sad fate of the gas bill; the persistent demands to change the basic ground rules in the very effective national petroleum setup; the harassments in relation to the so-called consent decree in the pipeline cases; the attempts by some in the Department of Justice to influence other departments prejudicially against oil at home and abroad.

HELD BLOW TO ALL

It is not necessary for the purposes of this article to attempt to fix the blame for this condition. Suffice it to say that such a situation is deplorable—not only because it hurts the oil industry—and because it hurts America and it hurts every cause for the peace and the progress of mankind with which America is identified. Obviously, a change of attitude and a better understanding leading to a more favorable atmosphere of mutual confidence and respect is required on both sides. It is intended here to deal only with the oilman's side.

Oil people are human, too, and they would not have to be overly perceptive or sensitive to experience grievous disappointment and resentment over some of these wholly unwarranted acts of Government representatives.

Every intelligent oilman will remember, however, that his industry is absolutely essential to the welfare, strength, and survival of our great country. Our dynamic economy—yes, even our national security—depend upon an abundant supply of reasonably priced petroleum products. There is a continuing job of gigantic proportions to be done by oil for the American people. And the oilman has inescapable duties and responsibilities accordingly.

READY FOR EMERGENCY

In the future, as in the past, oilmen must not only be ready and able, but willing, to respond wholeheartedly to every call for help in case of need. They have never failed in any emergency and certainly they can be relied upon to meet any challenge in the future.

Even though he may feel that he has been badly treated, every responsible oilman knows that getting the job done comes first. No matter what the provocation, he must continue to do everything within his power to preserve and strengthen a live, vital industry. And most of all, he must not in any way contribute to a worsening of Government-oil industry relationships, while at the same time fighting forthrightly against any unwarranted charges or unfair attacks.

If oilmen will respond to current problems in this spirit, and I am certain they will, they may have every confidence that in the end the fundamental fairness and good sense of our American people, and our public servants as well, will recognize their performance, and that the fruits of effective teamwork will be restored to the high peak of efficiency which is so essential to our country and its welfare.

Convention of Jehovah's Witnesses in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent years much publicity has been given to so-called rowdy and boisterous conventions of various organizations.

It is a pleasure to see a totally different kind of attention accorded in this respect. On August 1, 1958, America's leading daily newspaper, the New York Times, reported that the religious group known as Jehovah's Witnesses had just held in America's largest city, New York's best behaved convention. That is the description which the Times applied to the recent meeting of Jehovah's Witnesses in the city of New York.

And the Times has added:

Whatever New Yorkers may think of the Witnesses' theology, they are unanimous in agreeing that the Witnesses' conduct has been exemplary.

Many prominent hotel operators in New York are quoted as describing their patrons among Jehovah's Witnesses as orderly, considerate, and pleasant.

So that there may be a permanent recording and noting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the fact that a very large number of our citizens can meet in a great American metropolitan center in orderly, well behaved and thoroughly considerate fashion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Witnesses Styled City's Best Guests," published in the New York Times of August 1, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITNESSES STYLED CITY'S BEST GUESTS—180,000 AT WORLD ASSEMBLY WIN PRAISE FOR COURTESY, QUIETUDE, AND NEATNESS

(By George Dugan)

New York has been host for the last 6 days to its biggest and in all likelihood its best-behaved convention.

Since Sunday some 180,000 Jehovah's Witnesses have been eating, sleeping, and working in the metropolitan area. Their Divine Will International Assembly, in daily session at both the Yankee Stadium and the Polo Grounds, will end the day after tomorrow.

Whatever New Yorkers may think of the Witnesses' theology, they are unanimous in agreeing that the Witnesses' conduct has been exemplary.

A typical comment was voiced yesterday by Norbert P. Popper, reservation manager of the Dixie Hotel.

He reported that never in his career as a hotelman had he seen "a nicer bunch of people." He said the Dixie was "jammed" with Witnesses—every one of them orderly, considerate, and pleasant.

PARSIMONIOUS BUT CLEANLY

Equally glowing phrases were used by Mrs. Elizabeth Alonso. Mrs. Alonso is a cashier and waitress at Jiffy's Food Shop on the northwest corner of Eighth Avenue and 43d Street.

She observed that "the Witnesses never have given us any trouble and are considerate as well as cooperative." Asked about their tipping habits, she reluctantly said that they "could do better."

But this is a common complaint wherever most religious folk gather. A standard cab-driver joke from coast to coast goes like this: "Ah, they came here with the Ten Commandments and a 10-buck bill and haven't broken either."

Aside from their failure to tip in the New York manner, no serious gripes could be lodged against the Witnesses.

Their cleanliness is now almost legendary. A week ago a corps of volunteer Witnesses washed down every seat in Yankee Stadium. When they leave on Sunday night the ball park will be spotless. Three years ago Yankee maintenance men testified that when the Witnesses departed the arena had never been cleaner.

CONSIDERATE OF PASSERSBY

In the Times Square area where members of the movement have been passing out tracts, handbills, and periodicals, courtesy has been their watchword.

On the East Side paeans were also sung. Royal Ryan, executive vice president of the New York Convention and Visitors' Bureau, called the Witnesses "an asset to the community." He described their behavior as "out of this world."

Neil Lang, general manager of the Roosevelt Hotel, said about 750 Witnesses were staying in his hostelry. He characterized them as "very nice, not a bit demanding, and easy to do business with."

To Witnesses, the words of the Bible are not to be tampered with. They regard them as exact, true, and prophetic. Certain Biblical texts, they insist, predict in the not too distant future the end of the world, preceded

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by the battle of Armageddon, or the final conflict between good and evil.

Then 144,000 elect of the ages will reign with Jesus in heaven as the body of Christ. The wicked will be destroyed, and only Witnesses will remain on earth to live in eternal peace.

The figure 144,000 was arrived at through a combination of Biblical verses appearing in Revelation, Luke, and other books.

Our Middle East Policy in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mission Unclear," written by Walter T. Ridder, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer of July 21, 1958. This article relates to our Middle East policy in Lebanon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION UNCLEAR

(By Walter T. Ridder)

WASHINGTON.—The Middle East crisis almost—almost—drove the Adams-Goldfine case off the front pages of Washington newspapers last week. As well it might, for the drama now being played out in Iraq and Jordan and Lebanon is among the more critical faced by this generation.

There is little use now in indulging in the might-have-beens about the Mideast situation. What if we had supported the French and British during the Suez invasion? What if we had not helped to shape the State of Israel? What if our policy had been more discernibly pro-Arab? These questions make for good dinner-table conversation, but under the conditions now prevailing they are, as Mr. Goldfine would say, irrelevant.

Taking stock of the United States position at the moment, it is not entirely clear what we do now. Our marines and paratroopers are in Lebanon and British soldiers are in Jordan. Thus we are physically present in two of smallest Middle East countries, but what good that does us is another matter somewhat obscure.

The mission of our troops in Lebanon is unclear. Who are they supposed to be protecting? What are they expected to do—sit for weeks or months now on the beaches of Beirut?

The confusion over what we are doing in Lebanon has spread to the Pentagon where a briefing officer managed recently to bewilder the press.

In explaining the situation, the officer made use of the word "rebels," then hastily corrected himself and substituted the words "the opposition." "The rebels," he shamefacedly told newspapermen, "don't like to be called rebels." Apparently we are afraid of hurting the sensibilities of the rebels, although it is beyond comprehension to figure out what we are in Lebanon for if it is not to oppose the rebels.

While we are busy saving the fringes—that is, Lebanon and Jordan—the real prizes, Iraq and Iran, are either gone or in mortal danger. While it is obviously better to have saved both Lebanon and Jordan from being overthrown, nevertheless, they can be considered only small fish in the big middle eastern sea. It will do us precious little good to hold on to those countries while fabulously wealthy and strategically important countries go the way of all flesh. At the present writing, the opportunity, if it ever existed, to save Iraq has apparently gone a-glimmering. The rebel government appears to be in full control and only a major invasion would seem to have a chance of dislocating the new regime. But as long as the oil flows out of Iraq—and it probably will continue to flow, because the new government no doubt needs the oil royalties—the western states are not likely to launch any such invasion. This leaves it up to King Hussein, of Jordan, whose spirit is certainly willing but whose arms are weak. Thus one can all but write off Iraq.

Iran poses another problem. Its government has been none too strong, and the same white heat of Arab nationalism must be searing that country as well as others of the Arabian group. On the Russian-Iranian border the Soviet Army is ostentatiously holding maneuvers and, through agitators, is no doubt prodding dissident elements in Iran. How we save Iran if a coup should be undertaken there is another of those perplexing questions the answer to which does not come readily to mind.

Golden Jubilee of the New York State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the New York State Society, of Washington, D. C., is celebrating its 50th anniversary. In connection with this important event, the historians of the society have prepared a letter to the president of that splendid organization, outlining some of the society's activities and history. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1958.

Re golden jubilee of the New York State Society.

Mr. JAMES E. M. BROWN,
President, New York State Society,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This year the New York State Society of Washington, D. C., marks the 50th year of its existence. We are proud to be celebrating the golden jubilee of one of the oldest State societies in the Nation's Capital.

The Empire State has many close ties with Washington. It was George Washington who first named the broad reaches of New York an empire. New York City was the first Capital of the United States, and it was in Federal Hall, at Broad and Wall Streets, that our first President took his oath of office, on April 30, 1789. Since the 18th century numerous New York State Governors, from George Clinton to Averell Harriman, have served their country with distinction overseas and here in Washington. The roster of our State's national leaders in politics, business, religion, and the arts is a long and notable one, too familiar to need reciting here.

One of the enduring sources of strength of our great country is the fact that, although our institutions tend to become increasingly federalized, our democratic government must take into account the differing beliefs and needs of all sections of America. Although we are a highly mobile people, most of us maintain roots, sentimental or legal, in our home State. The State societies in Washington, besides their numerous good works, also serve a greater purpose—to activate this home-State patriotism and channel it into worthy and useful ends.

Among our various activities as a society we have during the past years contributed to the following organizations:

1. We have donated $2,000 to endow a room (No. 4080) at George Washington University Hospital, which has a door plaque reading "New York State Society."

2. We participate every Christmas in the charitable drives sponsored by the local radio stations.

3. We have donated to Children's Hospital, the Arlington General Hospital, the Tuberculosis Foundation in Denver, Colo., and numerous other worthy causes.

The main objective of our dances is to raise funds for any nonsectarian need that may arise. Servicemen in uniform are admitted to all our affairs gratis.

We are always represented in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival by having a New York princess and a float in the parade. We also send a delegate to the Conference of State Societies. We endeavor wholeheartedly to make New York the outstanding society in Washington. We number among our honorary members our most distinguished statesmen.

As we recall with pride our many achievements of the past, let us resolve that those who celebrate our centennial may be as proud of us as we are of our founders on this our golden jubilee.

Respectfully submitted.

DOROTHEA MACKAY,
ETHEL MAY NODEN,
Historians, New York State Society.

Neighbors Help Dravo Union Celebrate 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling the attention of the Congress to an excellent article appearing in the Pittsburgh Press for Sunday, July 27, 1958, concerning the Dravo Corp.'s Local 61, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers Union.

The well-run Dravo Corp., whose fine yards and plant are located near Pittsburgh, Pa., on Neville Island in my congressional district, is a successful construction company working on shipbuilding, yards, dams, docks, plants, and other large consrtuction both on Neville Island and throughout the world and whose officers and employees contribute to the fine progress that we in America are making.

The whole area around Neville Island has joined with Local 61, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers Union, in the celebration of their 15th anniversary.

I wish to compliment this union of 1,100 members, the Dravo Corp., and

President Carl Jansen and his fellow officers, as well as the fine industries and their employees on Neville Island for their wonderful spirit and cooperation in working together to make Neville Island the heart of the Pittsburgh workshop area.

The article follows:

NEIGHBORS HELP DRAVO UNION CELEBRATE 15TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Asa Atwater)

Allegheny County's wealthiest island will take time out today to join members of Dravo Corp.'s Local 61, Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, in the celebration of their 15th anniversary.

Tied in with the Neville Island ceremony is the formal dedication of the local's new $35,000 headquarters building.

Armand Palmerine is justly proud of the achievement of the local which he has headed for the last 6 years. Boasting a membership of 1,100, the local has come a long way since the earlier regimes of Richard Hastings, John Howard, Charles Gilman, and Jack Thornberg, former presidents.

LAUNCHED 145 LST'S

Local 61 reached its height during the hectic World War II years when, Mr. Palmerine estimates, more than 145 LST's (landing ship tanks) and a dozen PT's (Navy patrol boats) slid down the ways at the Dravo shipyards.

Many of these craft helped write history in landings on shores in the Pacific and the European theaters of war. Since then, the local has turned to peacetime efforts—building barges and tows. Mayor David L. Lawrence, Robert Marvin and W. G. Greer, Dravo officials, and Ross D. Blood and Charles Leone from the union's international office will find plenty to talk about today.

FLOATING FACTORY

For local 61 has become part of the life of the 860-acre island which one writer once referred to as "the floating factory anchored in the Ohio."

Mrs. Jeannette Wiley, secretary to the Neville Township commissioners, says the 6½ mile long island—which is all there is to the Neville Township—has an assessed valuation of $24 million.

More than 7,000 persons work in the island's 23 industries, producing such things as ships and barges, coke, chemicals, steel, cement, paint and concrete products. More than 2,500 live there.

Dravo, Neville Chemical and Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel added new laboratories last year. A new 4-lane paved highway runs the length of the island.

"Few people realize that Neville is one of the key industrial centers of Allegheny County," Mrs. Wiley boasted. "We have lots more room, too," she declared.

This is not news to Mr. Palmerine or the membrs of local 61, who know the fertile, agricultural history of Neville Island.

"We will just grow along with the island," Mr. Palmerine grinned.

President Eisenhower Replies to Plea for Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter which I received from President Dwight D. Eisenhower in reply to a request from me that consideration be given to the application of mutual security aid to the State of Israel.

Israel has demonstrated during the 10 years of its existence its determination to defend its independence at all costs. It has demonstrated effectively its opposition to international communism which now threatens the peace of the Middle East.

I am happy to hear that our Government is giving thought to material assistance for this freedom-loving state in the midst of Communist encroachment.

President Eisenhower's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 25, 1958.

The Honorable ALBERT P. MORANO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORANO: I appreciate your July 18 letter and fully subscribe to your position that the United States must continue its support of those nations which are being threatened in the Middle East. This Government is, of course, keeping closely in touch with the Israeli and other friendly governments in the Middle East area and with all free nations concerned with developments in this region. In addition, as you no doubt are aware, our efforts to have these problems resolved through the United Nations have not ceased.

I can assure you that the United States will take whatever action is found to be appropriate and necessary. As consideration of these matters progresses, I shall not fail to keep in mind the interest and concern you have expressed for the welfare of the State of Israel.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The Gentleman Is Mistaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix yesterday I found an insertion, of which I had had no notice, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] who criticizes me and Romulo Betancourt, the leader of the Democratic Action Party in Venezuela.

The gentleman is confused. He says he telephoned me when the Alaskan statehood bill was before the House because he saw I had arranged for an hour of time. He says that I told him I was not going to speak on Latin American affairs but that then I went ahead and did just that. The gentleman is mistaken. He never telephoned me then or at any other time.

If the gentleman's feeling, based on an erroneous recollection, is that I avoided debating him on Latin American policy, I am at his service at any time convenient to him. He has seen fit to defend Trujillo Senior and Trujillo Junior on the floor of the House, a matter I am prepared to debate with the gentleman on the floor or elsewhere.

The gentleman states that he is not surprised that my remarks against communism in Venezuela were not printed in the press there and adds, "if they were said." If the gentleman had undertaken to inform himself in any measure, he would have learned that I made many statements about the Communist menace when I was in Venezuela and that, ultimately, these statements were with a few exceptions published widely in that country.

The gentleman states that he declined to be briefed by the State Department. My respectful suggestion is that he reconsider that decision.

As for his remarks against Romulo Betancourt, I cannot take them seriously because it is evident that the gentleman again is both uninformed and misinformed.

Valley Aids Space Battle—Booster Engine, Gas for Explorer IV Created Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, our community is proud of the part we are playing in our country's conquest of outer space. Many men and women with a variety of technical skills helped develop the booster engine and worked on the fuel necessary for Explorer IV. An article pertaining to the development of the engine and fuel follows:

VALLEY AIDS SPACE BATTLE—BOOSTER ENGINE, GAS FOR EXPLORER IV CREATED HERE

Another satellite boosted into space with the help of a valley-developed engine and high-energy fuel orbited over southern California yesterday. An hour and 20 minutes after the United States Army's Jupiter-C rocket, the heaviest thus far, thundered skyward and, upon assuming an orbit acquired the title of Explorer IV, the Temple City tracking station reported it was overhead.

The time was 9:50 a. m.

BUILT IN 1956

Though, a station official said, the Explorer IV was not visible, its track being followed entirely by radio, it was probably passing through the space somewhere above the Rocketdyne plants in Canoga Park and the Santa Susana Hills where the Army Redstone engine and the fuel hydyne used to provide its first stage boost were developed and tested.

The engine used on Explorer IV was built 2 years ago at the main plant in Canoga Park, officials said yesterday.

After thorough checks, it was transported to the Rocketdyne test section at the Army Ballistic Agency, Huntsville, Ala., in the fall of 1956.

SHIPPED IN JUNE

Acceptance tested, it was formally delivered to ABMA in December 1956 and was shipped to Chrysler Corp., the missile contractor, in Detroit in January 1957. There it was mated with the missile.

The complete Redstone was transported back to ABMA in July 1957 and stored.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Static tested as a complete system in April 1958, it was then ready for shipment to AFMTC, Patrick AFB, in June of this year.

The Redstone engine is the most thoroughly proved of the American ballistic missile program, Rocketdyne scientists contended.

GIVES 98 PERCENT OF THRUST

"The Redstone has performed with extreme reliability on three previous Explorer launches as well as in tests of its normal mid-range use," they said.

"With Explorer IV, as with previous Army satellite launches, the Redstone engine is using Hydyne, a high-energy fuel developed by a Rocketdyne team of scientists and engineers working with the ABMA.

"In furnishing the first-stage boost, the Redstone engine provides 98 percent of the total effective impulse to place the satellite in orbit.

"INCREASE SPEED

"It is programed to thrust the upper stages of the Jupiter–C to orbital altitude.

"These succeeding stages increase the speed, but not the altitude of the vehicle.

"Rated in the 75,000-pound thrust class, the engine develops its propulsive power through the combination of liquid oxygen and alcohol.

"GIVEN HEAVY TESTS

"Designed for combat reliability and for manufacture by conventional methods, the engine entered developmental test in 1950.

"Consecutive, full-duration firing tests that followed proved out the reliability of the design, and the engine went into production in 1952.

"It was the first rocket engine with a thrust of more than 50,000 pounds to reach this level of development in the United States.

"STOOD TIME TEST

"A pioneer in American rocket technology, the engine received additional recognition for reliability after Explorer I went into orbit."

It was learned then the engine had functioned flawlessly after being in storage for almost 14 months, the company spokesmen said. The engine was a 2½-year-old model—an advanced age for rocket engines.

The seventh model of the engine will soon be delivered to the Army and to Chrysler Corp. from the Canoga plant.

Tribute to the Late Herman Griffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last month, in Anderson, S. C., an act of heroism resulted in the death of one of the finest young men of the community.

Herman Griffin, while driving past a lake, observed an 8-year-old boy in the water who was struggling for his life. Without hesitation, Mr. Griffin went to the aid of the child. Tragically, both were drowned.

I believe that full recognition should be given Herman Griffin for his heroic act.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article from the Greenville News of Greenville, S. C., entitled "White Man Gives Life Trying To Save Negro," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 25, 1958]

WHITE MAN GIVES LIFE TRYING TO SAVE NEGRO

(By Sara V. Liverance)

ANDERSON.—A 27-year-old white man lost his life early Thursday afternoon in an unsuccessful attempt to save a young Negro boy from drowning in Cleveland's Lake on Lewis Street Extension.

Herman Griffin, 27, of West Market Street Extension, a furniture salesman, gave his life in an attempt to save that of Ezelle Wideman, 8, of Watson Street.

Two other small Negro boys, who were with the Wideman child, were almost hysterical and unable to give a clear account of what happened.

Anderson firemen who were called to the scene recovered Griffin's body in 10 or 12 feet of water about 15 feet from the shore. The child's body was 18 or 20 feet from the shore.

The pond is on the property of Lester Cleveland, and is posted with "No trespassing" signs for swimming, boating, and fishing. A high wire fence surrounds the pond.

Apparently Ezelle, Joel Wiles, 7, and Charles Belton, 11, all of Watson Street, got into a boat tied up at the bank. Wyles and Belton said some older Negro boys, whom they did not know, pushed the boat away from the shore. It is believed the child became frantic and jumped out. His screams and those of the other two children attracted at attention of Griffin, driving a pickup truck along Lewis Street. He went to the aid of the child. The other children said he had Ezelle who was struggling and fighting, and was within 10 feet of the bank, when Ezelle got away from him and sank. Griffin went under, apparently in another effort to reach the boy, and did not come up.

Grady Wright, Gene Latham, Elmer Sanders, and Hazel Loftis, of the Anderson fire department, answered the call, which was received at 12:15 p. m. They recovered Griffin's body within a short time, and got Wideman out in 15 or 20 minutes. They worked over both victims for a long time, trying to revive them.

Dr. Mason Young and his nurse arrived on the scene and assisted in the efforts, administering heart stimulants. Dr. Young advised taking the victims to Anderson Memorial Hospital in the rescue truck after he detected a weak heartbeat in Griffin. However, both were pronounced dead on arrival at the hospital.

Deputies Norman Wilson, M. F. Driver, and Leroy Wilson answered a call to the scene.

Coroner J. Olin Burton, who was called to the hospital after the drowning victims had been taken there, said he did not feel an inquest would be necessary.

Alaska Land and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a speech was written in connection with the Alaska statehood debate but not delivered which is of such interest and importance in describing the land situation there that I consider it advisable even now, with the statehood bill having become a law, to place the speech in the RECORD. It follows:

Settlement in Alaska is sparse and on the edge of the unused. Into the Territory's raw and differing areas there is an immigration of men and institutions, seeking to use and develop latent resources. Development is the keynote in the Territory. Its growth prospects instill the hope of great reward and spur great efforts by its people.

There is economic motivation but there is also the driving energy of Alaskans as evident in their homesteading in the wilderness, their building in the cities, and the establishing of new industries in many places. This vitality and hopefulness together with action now to promote its economic growth would assure the extension of the economic heritage of an expanding America.

Growth aspiration and economic opportunity go together. Each is a means to the other. Traditionally, in America, economic prospects have been brightest on the frontier. About the pioneer fringe of an earlier America it has been said "the most significant thing is that it lies at the hither edge of free land." Alaska is in about that position today.

The Territory of Alaska is of tremendous size. It is about one-fifth the size of the United States or about twice the size of the State of Texas. It contains 586,400 square miles of which 571,065 square miles or approximately 365 million acres is land. Of this about 270 million acres is federally owned land or public domain land. Popularly this has come to be regarded as free land though of course this is not literally true.

All of the public domain is not usable land. Of the vast total, only about 2,870,000 acres are subject to cultivation. An estimated 125 million acres is forest land. Estimates of range land vary from about 5 million acres for nearly year-long grazing lands to a total of about 20 million acres for both seasonal and nearly year-long grazing lands. Approximately 120 million acres have been classed by the United States Geological Survey as geologically favorable for oil and gas development. The roughly estimated and inferred coal reserves involve a large acreage containing a total of more than 100 million tons. Prime recreation lands are spread over large areas of Alaska and for the most part are not intensively used. Settlement lands for home-site, business-site, and town-site purposes is largely an adaptation of varying forms of raw land of which only a relatively minuscule amount has been subjected to use.

The lease and disposal of the public domain includes the granting of use and disposal of unreserved Federal lands under a great variety of public-land laws for homestead, home site, trade and manufacturing, headquarters, industrial, and commercial, grazing, small tract, recreation, institutional, town site, rights-of-way, and other purposes. In the appendix is a summation of the principal land use and disposal laws operative in Alaska. Provision of lands for these and other purposes ordinarily is a response to applications for the use of or title to land by private individuals or companies, public or semipublic organizations or institutions, or Federal, territorial, or municipal Government agencies. Effective action on the applications nearly always involves an examination of the land and the qualifications of the applicant, and under certain of the land laws a classification of the land for specific forms of use and development.

The lease and disposal of mineral resources include the letting of deposits of oil and gas and coal under the mineral leasing laws and the patenting of metalliferous and nonmetalliferous mineral lands under the mining laws. The lease or patenting of mineral lands is in response to applications filed by private individuals or companies. Effective action on lease applications fro-

quently involves an examination of the land and the qualifications of the applicant while those on patent applications nearly always involves a determination of the validity of the mining claims.

Free land, or what is more correct, land at nominal cost, is commonly regarded as the certain fillip for further development. In reality this popular concept is partly true, especially if there are reasonably operative land and mineral laws under which use or title to idle resources can be obtained. Also if there is intelligent, prompt, and equitable administration of the public domain under such land and mineral laws. That these are generally being obtained in Alaska, after long years of neglect, is recognized but much more needs to be done.

The present complex system of public land laws is clumsy and difficult to apply. This is understandable since many are simply extensions of laws designed to fit conditions in the States. To the extent that they are ill adapted or inflexible, they tend to hamper development.

In general, an enterprise, whether it be private for home, business, or recreational purposes, or public for institutional, community, or Territorial purposes, must be shaped to conform with a specific land law. On the other hand, the Alaska Lands Act, recently adopted by the Territory, is simple and flexible to apply. Under it the land provisions can be tailored to fit the needs of a particular enterprise. This legislation would supplant the multitude of Federal laws and regulations governing land use and disposal in the Territory when Alaska received its own land patrimony.

Settlement in Alaska has been impeded by some of the laws of American pioneer days. Homesteading is an example of this. Homesteading was the vanguard of permanent settlement and development in central North America. It usually came after the more migratory occupance of fur traders, cattlemen, and miners. Over a million good farms in the breadbasket of America began as homestead entries or locations on the public domain. Homesteading became a part of the American folkway to be followed by more intensive farming by the equipped farmers and in places with special economic-geographic advantages by industrialization and urbanization of our modern economy.

In Alaska it was generally expected that settlement and development would proceed in a similar manner. First agricultural occupancy came through homesteading. Parts of Alaska especially the middle Tanana Valley and the upper look Inlet areas have witnessed considerable homestead settlement, but wherever it has occurred most of it has been temporary with little land development. The Homestead Act alone without a complement of those special aids to agricultural settlement needed in Alaska has not been a successful vehicle for rural occupation and development.

Many of those most concerned with land settlement in Alaska advocated various alternative forms of agricultural settlement more suitable for Alaskan circumstances but it is in the nature of folkways to outlive the conditions which created them and ordinary homesteading continues to this day. With statehood it would be possible to put land and people and money together in aid of agricultural settlement under a system which would work. Alaska needs the produce of 30,000 to 40,000 additional acres of farmland.

Beyond the provision of effective land and mineral laws and efficient public land administration, however, there is a further and complementary need. There is a requirement which is basic to Alaska's settlement and development through successful application of good public land laws and administration. It is the adequate provision of what is called the economic-social "infrastructure" on which the apparatus of production from land and mineral resources can be based. That is the set of basic facilities needed for production such as a minimum of roads, power stations, schools, harbors, hospitals, housing, and Government buildings. Much has been done by the Federal Government to meet some of these needs but a large backlog of public works remain to bring Alaska to an adequate level for development. With local control over resources as well as the provision for public services of all kinds there can be the full measure of coordination required to bring development in a northern environment. Development of basic facilities can be assured at the proper place and at the proper time to foster economic growth at least cost.

Experience over a long period has shown that it is only when effective land and mineral laws, efficient public land administration, and a basic economic-social infrastructure are provided that orderly, economical, and permanent settlement and development occur on America's northern public lands in which private initiative plays its full part, and then only if all are carefully knit into a suitable pattern of area development. The Alaska Lands Act has an area development concept underlying its provisions while the Federal land law system has an individual tract concept as basic to its provisions. The 40 acres and a mule approach to land development in a land like Alaska simply has not worked.

Settlement by the modern pioneer has tended to be in cities in Alaska just as elsewhere in the more northern lands. In 1950, a total of 96,833 people or 75 percent of the Territory's population lived in the greater area or recording districts of the 12 largest cities and towns, and the relative importance of the larger cities is increasing.

The fact that Alaska is predominantly occupied by city and town dwellers was not really recognized until a few years ago when the Alaska Public Works Act was adopted by the Congress. Alaska's needs, present and future, include more community facilities and services and housing to accommodate the white-collar and blue-collar pioneers on the last frontier. Our Federal Government has not fully recognized this fact of life in Alaska. The Federal townsite laws for Alaska are still piecemeal, complicated, and archaic.

The provisional constitution for the State of Alaska adopted at a constitutional convention at College, Alaska, on February 3, 1951, recognized the importance of urbanism on the Alaskan frontier. It provides for a simple and flexible system of local government adapted to the needs of the people of Alaska. It establishes just two classes of local governments, boroughs, and cities with cooperation between them encouraged by provisions for intergovernmental agreements and the representation of members of city councils in borough assemblies. The constitution recognizes, in short, that urban centers are the foci of the scattered settlement of the northlands—that they are the interchanges for goods and ideas that connect region with region and mold the way of life in Alaska.

I am concerned, as I know you all are, about the development of Alaska for the sake of Alaska. It is developing under Federal custody, to be sure, but not fast enough. I am convinced that if Alaskans were the masters of their own house, it would be developed more rapidly and effectively. I have tried briefly to demonstrate why I think so. An environment that affords incentives to growth can be more readily molded on home grounds by a State government than in the faraway Halls of Congress. National policies and programs, legislation and regulations, administrative plans, and action to promote growth, have tended to be too little, too late, and too cumbersome.

Perhaps, if I were considering the interests of Alaska alone, I would be concerned but not really anxious that Alaska obtain statehood. In view of the obvious need for America to continue to grow to fulfill its obligations at home and to meet its responsibilities abroad, however, I am more than anxious that it do so. I fear, that unless it obtains statehood so that it can fully contribute to the growth of America, we are not being prudent about our Nation's destiny.

As long as America had a frontier being developed it was able to expand its productive capacity at the rate of 4 percent annually. With the closing of the frontier our economy slumped but it became revitalized by the demands placed upon it by World War II and the Korean war. The building of our northern frontier in Alaska, under peace and the more favorable growth conditions statehood would provide, may well be the potent revitalizing force our economy needs. It would, I am sure, help the Nation toward the 5 percent annual growth we need.

Development of the public lands of the United States has produced an economy of relative abundance, a people of comparative plenty. It seems but prudent to continue along the same economic path. Statehood for Alaska is but another milestone in this path. Economically, it seems, the Nation needs to turn the milestone now.

The need of the United States for development of Alaska to meet the material requirements of Americans and their technological economy by 1975 is abundantly clear. Take account of the supply of natural resources in the United States and the prodigious demands to be placed upon them by an expanding economy for a rapidly increasing population. Economists believe that by 1975 our consumption will exceed production by 20 percent. Conservationists believe that many lower grade resources will need to be brought into use by 1975 through development of new technologies and improved extraction processes. The resources of Alaska, oil, gas, coal, timber, forage, soils, minerals, and waterpower, the bone and sinew of our economy, have a certain place in this picture. They need to be drawn into use to be sure we have a stronger America each year.

The balancing of resource supply with consumption is a challenge to innovation, to inventiveness, and to statesmanship. Statehood now will help. The America of tomorrow needs Alaska statehood today.

Assuming it is our purpose to one day grant statehood, and, as you all know by now, we are committed to do this, it is in the national interest to do so now. Many of the latent resources of Alaska will be in national demand and in demand by the free world a few years hence. I have tried to show that Alaska as a State can better provide the incentives for development than a national government far away. Industry is now actively engaged in appraising Alskan resources, some with thought of immediate investment in development, but some with the future in mind. Business, large scale, the kind that can develop the resources of the giant of Alaska, is in need of lead time for planning development. It needs that, but also it must know the rules of the game. Effective planning now requires knowing whether development will be under Alaskan rules or national rules. For sake of development for a stronger America, the stage needs to be set now by granting statehood so private enterprise can confidently press forward plans for resources development. Statehood now amounts to national prudence.

Lastly, I, as you, have been alarmed by the economic progress of the Soviet Union. It is forcing development everywhere with which to support worldwide economic warfare. In the Soviet Union astonishing development is occurring in its northern lands. Develop-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ment there is certainly strengthening its economy and its military posture. There is no question we are not doing as well. There can be no doubt we need to do more than now to develop the resources of our northland for use in aid of defense and economic development of the free world. A State government and a National government working together is the best combination I know of for the task.

In summary, Alaska's growth is needed for Alaska's sake. It is needed in aid of national growth. It is needed in aid of the free world. Accelerated development that would be encouraged with statehood is common national prudence. Statehood now, it seems to me, would serve a national purpose.

Our Good Senator, Ed, and Charity Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride that we in Pennsylvania mark the careers of Senator ED MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, and his loyal wife, Charity Martin, as they complete their joint public careers in Washington, D. C., with the close of this term of Congress.

We personal friends, as well as the many admirers of this charming couple, wish Charity and ED a rewarding life as they return to their lovely home and fellow townsmen in the beautiful old town of Washington in western Pennsylvania.

Charity and ED have served together in so many public capacities in Pennsylvania for the good of our people that no other couple in the history of Penn's Woods has been rewarded with so many elected and appointed positions, in our State and local governments. In addition, they have rendered outstanding service in the Presbyterian Church where ED and Charity have served in many capacities. Likewise, ED has been honored many times as a general in the United States Army to whose service he has been devoted through the years.

It is a pleasure to call to the attention of Congress and the American people the editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of July 27, 1958:

AWARD OF MERIT

An unusual event took place last week in the United States Senate, which is often a forum of heated debate. Nine Senators rose in turn to pay spontaneous tribute to one of their number.

The Member they honored is Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, Republican, who is retiring from the Senate at the end of this year after a notable career in public life.

The Senators who expressed their esteem of the Pennsylvania Senator included both Republicans and Democrats. Many of them are fellow members of the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which Senator MARTIN is former chairman and now ranking minority member. (Senator MARTIN could not be present because he was helping a couple of Pittsburghers plead for Federal help for the Crosstown Boulevard.)

In general, the Senators told the story of ED MARTIN, which is familiar to most Pennsylvanians. Born in a log house in Greene County, he achieved notable success in many fields, served his country in three wars; headed the 28th Division, Pennsylvania National Guard; went up the ladder of politics, and was elected by the people of Pennsylvania to almost every post within their power to fill, including auditor general, State treasurer, governor, and Senator.

Senator FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota, Republican, saw Senator MARTIN's career as "an example of the rewards offered in the United States, under the American system of free and equal opportunity, to the youth of our land, no matter how humble may be their origin." Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Oklahoma, Democrat, believes the Pennsylvanian to be "one of the great men I have known." Others expressed themselves in similar vein.

We of Pennsylvania have good reason to know ED MARTIN's caliber, for he has served us, in one capacity or another, for these past 60 years, and many of our people have served with him in various endeavors, in war and peace. All who know him will want to associate themselves with the remarks of his fellow Senators, which were richly merited.

Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10, more commonly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals, has been legislation long in the making. I have been familiar with this legislation and have been trying to get such a bill before the House since 1952. It is good legislation and in the public interest.

I. PURPOSE

This bill permits self-employed individuals to take a current income-tax deduction for a limited amount of investment in a retirement annuity, or a specific type of retirement trust. Penalty provisions are provided for withdrawing the amounts during the lifetime of the self-employed individual if they are withdrawn before he is 65 years of age. On the other hand, he must begin to withdraw these amounts not later than when he reaches age 70.

II. REASON FOR THE BILL

This bill will give greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed individuals and employees. At the present time employees of a business may postpone tax on retirement income savings if the employer pays into a qualified pension plan. In that case, the business firm gets immediate deductions for amounts contributed to the plan and the employee is not taxable until he draws his benefits under the plan.

Likewise, those of us who have favored this legislation believe it is reasonable that self-employed persons should have the same right under the law to obtain equivalent tax treatment on retirement savings.

The bill will be effective for the taxable year beginning in 1959.

III. SUMMARY OF THE BILL

A. Eligibility: The bill applies to all self-employed persons who are subject to the tax on self-employment income—for social-security purposes—except that certain categories such as doctors and ministers, who are exempt from the self-employment tax, will be eligible for the deduction under this bill. The deduction, however, will not be available to a self-employed person who is subject to the self-employment tax if in the same year he has earnings which are covered in a qualified pension plan or if during the year he draws benefits under a qualified employer plan.

B. Deduction: Self-employed individuals will be permitted to deduct from their adjusted gross income an amount paid as a premium in a retirement trust fund. This deduction will be limited to 10 percent of the net earnings from self-employment for any 1 year. The deduction under this bill may not, in most cases, exceed $2,500 in any 1 taxable year. The deduction may not exceed a total of $50,000 during the lifetime of the self-employed person. No deduction is allowed for any year after the taxpayer attains age 70.

C. Type of retirement policy: The retirement policy for which an individual may take a deduction must fundamentally be an annuity or an endowment policy issued by a domestic life insurance company. The policy may provide life insurance benefits, but these may not extend beyond age 70. The policy may provide for an endowment not later than the time the self-employed individual reaches age 70, or it may provide a life annuity or a joint and survivor annuity to the insured and his spouse, beginning not later than when the self-employed individual reaches age 70. The policy must be nonassignable.

D. Restricted retirement funds: Instead of purchasing an insurance policy, the deduction may be obtained by making deposits in a restricted retirement trust fund. This trust must be established for the exclusive benefit of one or more participating individuals. The trustee must be a bank. The investments of the trust are limited to stock or securities listed on a registered exchange, stock of a regulated investment company, Government bonds, or face-amount certificates.

The income of a restricted retirement trust fund will be tax exempt. The trust may distribute income or corpus to participating members at any time. When the members attain age 70, the trust must begin a program of distribution of that member's interest, which must be completed before he attains age 80.

E. Reporting requirements: The bill requires each bank trustee of a restricted retirement fund and each insurance company which has issued a restricted retirement policy to file such returns and information as the Secretary may prescribe. It also requires each self-employed individual to furnish certain information to the trustee of his restricted

retirement fund or to the insuror of his restricted retirement policy.

F. Effective date: This bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

I personally am much pleased that the great Committee on Ways and Means has finally brought this legislation to the floor. This bill gives relief and encouragement to the small, independent business and professional man, including doctors, dentists, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and consultants, and others who make up the life of the smaller communities of this country.

For a long time the big companies have had deductible pension plans for which income-tax credits could be taken by the corporations.

All of us realize that in many instances the professional and small-business man has a very limited period of good income. It takes the ordinary professional man quite a few years to get started. When he reaches his peak income his years are few until retirement. There was no way in which he could accumulate a small nest egg for his old age before taxes. This legislation takes recognition of that fact.

Also, it encourages savings. In recent years this has been one of the shortcomings of our tax system. This legislation recognizes that.

This bill is good legislation, in the finest American tradition.

Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, Writes on Hopes for Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an article in the August 1958 issue of the Progressive magazine has served to demonstrate once again the thoughtful leadership in the field of foreign policy exercised by our brilliant colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He serves as chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee.

Senator HUMPHREY's article is entitled "Turning Point for Disarmament." In it he stresses that a nuclear test ban, safeguarded by adequate inspection provisions, could help to liberate the world from the crushing economic and psychological burden of evermounting armaments of all kinds.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the able article on our hopes for disarmament by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is our recognized spokesman and advocate in this field, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINT FOR DISARMAMENT
(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

When the technical experts of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries convened recently at Geneva to explore the requirements of inspection for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, the event was widely greeted as a turning point in the disarmament problem. The vital significance of their meeting was that the great military powers, after years of futile talk, delay, and obstructionism, were finally getting down to cases and were penetrating to an area of the disarmament problem where there might be meaningful accomplishment.

Lack of political practicality has long bedeviled disarmament negotiations. For a great many years we toiled away at a proposal for controlling nuclear arms—the so-called Baruch or United Nations plan—that, as we look back on it now, was too elaborate and advanced in its aims. It was a comprehensive proposal envisaging international control of fissionable material from mine pit to end product. While in many respects the Baruch proposal was one of the noblest offers ever made by any nation, it was impractical because it misread the acceptability of the proposal to a government that feared contact and interchange of information between its own people and non-Communist countries. Time and technology inevitably took their toll of the Baruch plan, and eventually our scientific inability to detect hidden and rapidly swelling stockpiles of nuclear bombs made it obsolete.

In an effort to adjust to technical and political realities, international discussions then shifted to plans for disarmament by phases or stages. Last year the administration settled on what it euphemistically called a "first step" proposal. But this proposal, containing interlocking provisions for ending nuclear weapons tests and production, for cutting back armed forces and conventional arms and for inspection against surprise attack, was entirely too complicated for a first step. To expect a tightly sealed entity like the Soviet Union to embrace in one gesture a package like that was naive. To continue to cling to the package after its acceptance became utterly hopeless was, and still is, incomprehensibly obtuse.

When the negotiations broke down at London last year, commonsense dictated that the package be broken up and subdivided, particularly since there was no logic in keeping all of the provisions locked together. It was plain to see that an initial step had to be relatively small and simple, if it were going to be politically acceptable as well as technically feasible. To be of substantial disarmament value it had to check the forward rush of the arms race. All signs pointed to a suspension of nuclear tests as one of the most logical steps. A ban on tests would be relatively uncomplicated scientifically, and it would check the arms competition—which is in large part a technological competition—at a key point, the development of nuclear weapons.

The mounting pressure from world public opinion has created an opportunity for the nuclear powers to demonstrate their will to slow down the arms race. But the Eisenhower administration has dragged its feet. Its stubbornness has cost us dearly in the eyes of the world. It was foolish of the administration to believe that the Kremlin would ever hesitate to seize an opportunity to score a propaganda point. When Moscow announced several months ago a conditional suspension of nuclear tests, I called on our own Government to press for an international agreement to suspend tests with inspection. The administration has not thus far been able to reconcile its own differences of opinion over whether a suspension of tests with inspection should be sought.

Part of the battle revolves around the question whether there can be an effective inspection network to check on a nuclear test moratorium. Dr. Edward Teller, director of the Livermore Radiation Laboratory, maintains that the Soviet military nuclear experts could cheat on a complete test ban. Dr. Hans Bethe, of Cornell University, a leading physicist on Dr. Killian's Scientific Advisory Committee, says they could not get away with sneak testing. A conclusive answer to the question cannot be found if the question is viewed solely in scientific terms.

Much of the controversy over inspection could be allayed if two principles were kept in mind. First, there must be an inspection system which is effective and adequate. We could not permit ourselves to be drawn into an agreement under which we would deprive ourselves of an important weapon in our armory while the other side secretly continued to arm itself with that weapon. Such a situation would not contribute to peace and would only hasten the conflagration we are trying to avoid. Inspection has to be good enough so that every country knows there is a great probability it is going to be caught if it tries to cheat on the agreement.

As long as an inspection system possesses this amount of certainty, we would have a high degree of assurance that no signatory of a suspension pact would run the political risk of sneaking an illegitimate test explosion. The military advantage it might get from a sneak test under such conditions would probably be so limited it would be far outweighed by the political disadvantages of getting "caught in the act" and thus ignominiously causing termination of the agreement, incurring the opprobrium of world public opinion, and, most important, causing the arms race to continue unabated.

What the perfectionists overlook is that there is a risk in whatever course we take. The second principle, therefore, is that there must be a balancing of risks between one course of action and another. This is the way we usually solve the problems of life. In disarmament we must weigh prudently all the dangers of continuation of the nuclear-arms buildup toward an unpredictable climax against the risks that might be involved in a suspension of tests with an inspection network. We must balance the danger of spreading nuclear weapons know-how to fourth, fifth, and innumerable other countries against the danger that the U. S. S. R., which has, according to public reports, made about 50 tests to our approximately 100, might try to sneak a few more.

The joint study group which was conferring at Geneva as this was written can be a major breakthrough on the inspection front. For years the United States has been insisting on adequate nuclear inspection and other forms of disarmament. The Soviet diplomats have stalled, squirmed, evaded, and several times raised our hopes mightily with concessions that appeared to be consequential but eventually turned out to be more smoke than substance. In general they have refused to be pinned down on the inspection issue. In the hope that a nonpolitical approach might get results, I have suggested several times that experts from each side study the general inspection question from a purely technical aspect. Finally, Khrushchev turned his habitual "nyet" into a reluctant "da," and accepted the offer of President Eisenhower to have technical groups study inspection for test suspension.

The administration deserves much credit for going ahead with studies for inspection of a test ban. But it has struck a sour note in refusing to modify its nuclear disarmament

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

policy. The President asserted that the technical studies would be without prejudice to the respective positions of the United States and the Soviet Union "on the timing and interdependence of various aspects of disarmament." In plain English, this meant that the United States did not consider that the technical studies on inspection for a test suspension, if successful, would commit us to negotiate at a political level for an agreement on a test ban separate from the disarmament package. As I was writing this the administration was still feverishly debating with itself whether a test halt should be entered into independently. Yet, how long does the White House think it can deny the logic of events? What if the American and Soviet technical committees agree on what constitutes effective and reliable inspection for a suspension of tests? Is the administration, which insisted on creating the technical committee, still going to clench its teeth in determined refusal to go along? To dispel any misimpression the world might have of United States intentions in participating in the technical study, the President should immediately announce the willingness of this country to agree, separately and distinctly from other disarmament measures, to negotiate at a political level for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests if the technical committee agrees on the inspection requirements.

One question I am often asked is whether I really believe that the secretive U. S. S. R. will ever accept a reliable inspection system. This is going to be a tough mouthful for the Soviet leaders to swallow, but there is genuine evidence that they will come around to it. First, there is a great deal of evidence that they want a lessening of their arms burden. Economic pressures in the Soviet economy—mounting consumer demand, dwindling manpower reserves, and the multiplying complications of an expanding industry—are working to restrict the labor and materiel going into the military effort. Some of our experts on Soviet Russia now believe that top Russian officials are beginning to see more clearly that they cannot have an internation agreement to limit armaments without accepting some kind of inspection.

But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. When the technicians' committee reports, we shall then have a sharper picture of how far the Soviet Union is prepared to go. The number of inspection stations will be a key issue. There is a close correlation between the number of inspection stations and the extent to which a test ban can be effectively inspected. The larger the number of stations the smaller the size of a nuclear test explosion that can be reliably identified. But if the number of stations should be radically limited, then the likelihood of confusing earthquakes with underground explosions would increase. The greater the number of stations, the greater the chance any explosion would be correctly identified.

The really significant thing is to get a test ban in effect and an inspection system in operation. Installation of an inspection system would be a political breakthrough of momentous proportions. It could be a landmark of the greatest historical importance in free world-Communist relations, a turning point toward peace in our time. Opponents of a nuclear test ban often miss this vital political factor.

The arguments for continuing tests to develop defensive weapons against enemy intercontinental missiles or for small clean tactical weapons to limit the threat of all-out nuclear war may be justified within a purely military frame of reference. But such a frame of reference is much too narrow. A purely military frame of reference will sooner or later eventuate in a purely military result.

Our frame of reference must encompass broader considerations, in particular the acceptance of the fact that differences between the Communist bloc and the democratic West must be resolved through peaceful competitive coexistence. History teaches that the most antagonistic ideological opponents have an interest in survival, and sooner or later learn to reach a peaceful modus vivendi. This is why disarmament is primarily a political rather than a military problem. This is why an inspection breakthrough into the Soviet Union outweighs the military value of the development of new varieties of nuclear weapons.

Those who insist that a cutoff of nuclear weapons production be linked to a nuclear test suspension should be more perceptive of the political realities and view this whole problem of disarmament in more of a time perspective. A temporary inspected test termination would constitute a natural step toward a prohibition of nuclear arms production.

The President has often insisted that a cutoff in the production of nuclear material for weapons purposes is the heart of the nuclear weapons problem. Bulganin and Khrushchev have also asserted that the discontinuance of the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons should be among the aims of disarmament. Since both governments have individually proclaimed this as a goal of nuclear disarmament, I propose that this and perhaps other specific disarmament goals be jointly affirmed in principle by both governments. The best time to do this would be at the time a test ban agreement is concluded for it would then refute any impression that the test ban was the only disarmament we wanted.

Both supporters and opponents of a temporary nuclear test suspension should realize that it would be only a beginning. It is only the first phase of our total disarmament blueprint. As a test ban comes closer to realization, we must stress our purpose of progressing to other phases of arms control; otherwise the momentum we desire as one of the main effects of the ban might be lost. By pressing inexorably onward to bring into operation a nuclear weapons test suspension and the rest of our disarmament blueprint, we shall bring closer the day when we can rid the world of its burdens of fear, hate, and want. The inauguration of a test ban now could start the wheels of international reconcilation turning and initiate a movement that will eventually bring genuine peace to the troubled peoples of the world.

Hon. John A. Burns of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to present here my estimate of the effectiveness of the work in this Congress of Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, of Hawaii, in connection with statehood. It is my opinion that had JACK BURNS been a man of narrow vision instead of broad statesmanship it is quite possible that Alaska would not have achieved statehood in 1958; and if Alaska had failed it is certain as certain can be, in consideration of all prevailing circumstances, that Hawaii would not have been admitted to the Union alone. If JACK BURNS had insisted upon coupling the two bills a great storm would have been raised but no constructive accomplishment would have been made. That is an absolute fact. But nevertheless that is the course of action which might well have been followed if JACK BURNS had been a less dedicated and devoted servant to his people than he is. He could have perhaps gained some temporary political credits at home if he had moved to link the two statehood bills. In refusing to do so, he not only demonstrated political courage of a rare type which ought to be appreciated by his constituents but he did something more important for them—he brought Hawaii statehood ever so much closer.

Years ago when Hawaii was ahead in this search of the two Territories for political equality by way of statehood I took the position that if one went through the other could not remain far behind. That is as true today as it was true then. I firmly believe now as I believed then that Hawaii is justly entitled to statehood and I dare say that Alaska's delegation in the 86th Congress will be proud to associate themselves with those pressing for early and affirmative action on Hawaii statehood.

In the meantime, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Delegate BURNS. In a speech I made a couple of weeks ago at Ketchikan I was happy to state a belief that his actions in this Congress not only were important in the attainment of Alaska statehood but brought Hawaii statehood that much nearer. I do not think any other conclusion can be reached after an appraisal and assessment of what JACK BURNS has done. He is entitled to and will, I know, receive as much credit at home for all of this as he has from those in a position to know here in Washington.

Life's Wonderful, and So Is Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein the following statement which briefly outlines the aims and purposes of the Life's Wonderful Club.

This is a most unusual and inspiring organization which I am happy to say started in my own congressional district in Chicago by the Spector Freight System, Inc., one of the largest and most important motor freight carriers in the United States. Its own headquarters and principal terminal is located in the heart of my district at 3100 South Wolcott Street and from this center its services radiate into every State of the Union.

The president of Spector Freight System, Inc., Mr. W. Stanhaus, a longtime friend of mine, and one of the important civic leaders of Chicago, has informed me that membership in this unique club

has now reached the staggering total of only a shade below the half-million mark and is still on the upswing.

Mr. Stanhaus has furnished me with considerable information concerning this club and I am quoting herewith a brief digest which I believe should receive the national attention it deserves:

Various well-known companies have made splendid contributions in time, money, and effort toward the objective of speeding general recovery throughout the Nation out of the recession.

Spector Freight System, Inc., has been proud to play a modest role in seeking to aid this national recovery.

Back in April a few of Spector's salesmen conceived the idea of a club within the firm to be called Life's Wonderful, and So Is Business. It was a simple idea designed primarily as a company morale booster to inspire increased optimism and confidence.

To the great astonishment of these salesmen the idea spread enthusiastically and rapidly to the 3,000 company employees scattered in our 14-State area stretching from Kansas on the west, through the greater part of the Midwest, to Massachusetts, and the northeast Atlantic seaboard.

In joining, the member signs a credo pledging himself to make no less than two optimistic remarks daily. He receives a membership button, a membership card, but he has no dues and no meetings. The button is a large, yellow sunburst with the club's name printed in large letters thereon.

As the drivers began to wear these dramatic buttons on their long, cross-country trips, interest speedily was created among drivers of other companies and these in turn began joining and wearing buttons. The idea caught fire nationally in a few weeks and soon the club was represented in every State.

Requests for membership became so numerous that Spector was obliged to accede to public insistence to embark on a national public-service campaign with free buttons and other material. Moreover, we set up a special department to service these requests.

We will reach the half-million mark almost any day now and membership requests continue to pour in.

If this idea has served a useful purpose in rekindling confidence and optimism in our national economy we will feel amply rewarded for our efforts. If confidence and optimism were desirable objectives when this program was launched in April they are infinitely more vitally needed today with our Nation facing new international dangers.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the greatest threats to the security of this Nation lies in the danger that the Federal Government will spend itself into a state of collapse. Nothing would please the rulers of the Kremlin more. The bankruptcy of the American Government would fit in very well with the objectives of world communism.

During this session of Congress, too many Members have thrown caution to the winds in authorizing new spending programs. We cannot afford to skimp on appropriations vital to our national security, but there are many domestic programs which should be sharply reduced.

A forceful editorial on this subject entitled "We're Off on Another Money Spree" appears in the August issue of Nation's Business.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE OFF ON ANOTHER MONEY SPREE

A frightening silence has marked our entry into a new fiscal year.

By July 1959 the Federal Government will be at least another $12 billion in debt. This will push the total Federal debt close to $290 billion.

This fiscal forecast has been made with an air of finality and accepted with quiet resignation.

A year ago the announcement that Federal spending was expected to total $72 billion for fiscal 1958 united the people at large and Congressmen in a drive toward Government economy. This drive showed many places where continued effort could eliminate waste and inefficiency. It justified hope of eventual tax reform, sensible depreciation rates and a lessening of public demand that the Government constantly expand its paternalistic services.

Then Russia demonstrated an unexpected technical competence and at the same time our own business growth hesitated. To parry these dissimilar threats the single cure was proposed:

"The Government must spend more money."

Economy talk henceforth became unpatriotic.

Although estimates for expenditures in fiscal 1959 reach up to $80 billion and anticipated Government income may drop to $68 billion, few voices are raised in protest.

As Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, told the House of Representatives:

"The most alarming feature is that nobody is alarmed. I cannot recall a single instance in which any Member of the House in all the debate on these bills appropriating millions and billions of dollars has referred to the effect which the expenditure would have on the balance in the Treasury, the national debt, or the financial preparedness of the Nation for war or other catastrophe.

"It has grown unpopular here on the floor even to mention balancing the budget."

In this atmosphere Congress added its bit to the budget's imbalance by increasing several appropriations even beyond the budget requests. It raised the supplemental appropriation for the Labor Department by $20 million. To the Interior Department, for which $414.8 million was asked, it granted $459.6 million; to the Treasury, which asked $699.3 million, it gave $704.6 million; to independent offices for which $5.9 billion was asked, the House proposed $6.5 billion, the Senate $6.1 billion.

If the road to national salvation were really paved with dollars such free spending might be commendable.

But Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has pointed out, "Neither changing needs nor an interruption in economic growth provide any excuse for loading vast new expenditures on the Federal Government; for unnecessarily shifting responsibilities from private enterprises or from State and local governments."

In fact, both sputnik and the recession have made the goals of last year's economy drive more urgent than ever.

Government inefficiency will hinder rather than help a missile program, no matter how much money is available for spending. A business system will grow faster if freed from the blight of Government competition, restriction, and waste.

The Government must spend what is necessary to meet challanges to our safety or prosperity. But we need to remember that it is not the spending that brings security. We had money enough to get 9 satellites to the launching pad but only enough technology to get 3 into orbit.

Dollars spent carelessly or for the wrong things can do more harm than good. The way to prevent this kind of spending, as Mr. Merriam says, is for all of us "to know what is going on, to make our voices felt, to participate in decision making."

The goals of last year's economy drive are still attainable. They will contribute to defense and prosperity. The type of citizenship that dares to speak up against reckless spending is needed today as it has seldom been needed in the past.

"We have played into the enemy's hands," Mr. CANNON told the House. "We are bankrupting the Nation at a time when we should be saving our money, reducing our debt and preparing to meet the enemy, both economically and militarily."

This Tax Plan Would Boost Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART, recently introduced S. 3718—a bill providing for more rapid depreciation for tax purposes. In the August issue of Nation's Business, there is an interview dealing with this. Under unanimous consent, I include it herewith, as the article contains some very worthwhile information:

THIS TAX PLAN WOULD BOOST BUSINESS—IMMEDIATE SPUR TO THE ECONOMY WOULD COME FROM PROPOSED CHANGE IN DEPRECIATION BASE

Moves to encourage investment in new plant and equipment could spark the next boom, many economists believe.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, is author of pending legislation which he is convinced will do just that.

Capital expenditures are expected to plunge this quarter to an annual rate of $30.3 billion from the $37.8 billion annual rate of the third quarter last year, according to the most recent Federal survey.

Senator CAPEHART, chairman of the board of Packard Manufacturing Co. and operator of a 2,400 acre farm in his home State of Indiana, is the ranking minority member of both the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

He was elected to the Senate in 1944.

In this interview, Senator CAPEHART describes the economic impact his proposal could have:

"Question. Senator CAPEHART, what are you advocating as a possible stimulant to the economy?

"Answer. I am advocating legislation to permit larger tax deductions immediately on new capital investments. My bill would reduce the useful life (which is the basis the Internal Revenue uses for allowing depreciation for tax purposes) of all capital assets or goods bought or contracted for in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

calendar 1958 and 1959, be it buildings, machine tools, farm equipment, adding machines, typewriters, air conditioning, new store equipment, or any of the hundreds of items covered by the broad term of capital assets.

"The bill would apply to all of them, so that its advantages would accrue to all on the same basis, an estimated 10.5 million business units, including our farms.

"Question. How would this stimulate the economy at this time?

"Answer. It would encourage businesses and farms to purchase immediately every conceivable kind of a capital asset because the bill provides that payment of part of the taxes could be deferred.

"However, there would be no loss to the Government in tax revenue over the useful life of the product. The purchaser would have an immediate saving but in the end he would pay the full amount of tax.

"Specifically, the depreciation period for any capital investment now based on an estimated useful life up to 15 years would be reduced by half. That part of the estimated life of a capital asset over 15 years would be reduced by two-thirds.

"So with a shorter life to base the depreciation on, more of the cost of the investment could be deducted as depreciation each year. But, of course, depreciation deductions would not extend over as long a period as the present schedule of useful lives provides. If a taxpayer should choose to take the deductions over longer periods, he could do so, since my bill sets minimum, not maximum, useful lives.

"Question. Could you cite specific examples of how businesses could take advantage of this bill?

"Answer. For a farmer, a new tractor could be depreciated within 5 years, instead of 10; a combine could be depreciated within 7.5 years instead of 15; a corn crib could be depreciated within 12.5 years instead of 30.

"The small factory owner could depreciate tools and dies in 1.5 to 2 years instead of 3 to 4 years; heavier machinery and tools could be depreciated in 7.5 to 9 years instead of 15 to 20.

"For heavier industry, a new plant of average construction could be depreciated in 16 years instead of 40. Rental housing—homes, apartment buildings, and office buildings—average construction could be depreciated in 16 years instead of 40.

"For transportation systems, the beneficial effect of this bill on our railroad system would be tremendous. Because they could depreciate it more rapidly, it is my best judgment the railroads would immediately acquire hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new equipment.

"Of course, the bill would also be applicable to other forms of transportation.

"The bill would provide an incentive for wholesale and retail stores to carry out renovation programs, new store fronts, new fixtures, and so forth, that they may need and have been anticipating in the future.

"Question. What would be the advantage of a depreciation measure such as this over, say, pump-priming legislation?

"Answer. There would be many advantages: First, under this plan you do not forgive any taxes, you only postpone them. Pump priming requires taxes immediately.

"Second, pump-priming projects require many months and sometimes a year or two to plan before they can be started. Under this bill you would put men and women back to work the first day the bill became law.

"Third, under pump priming, projects may well be several hundred miles away from the unemployed person's home, requiring many either to travel long distances to work or denying them the right to work on pump-priming projects. Under this bill these people would no doubt be able to get the same job they were formerly laid off from, or at least obtain jobs in their own neighborhood.

"Fourth, pump priming primarily only helps the unemployed. This act will not only find jobs for the unemployed, it will likewise guarantee the stability of existing jobs by increasing the business of all producers and processors in the United States.

"Question. Could your bill be expected to reverse the present decline in plant and equipment investment?

"Answer. My best judgment is it would not only reverse the decline, but likewise would increase the investment in plant and equipment over any previous year.

"Question. Would your bill advance technology or provide more modern productive capacity?

"Answer. The purpose of the bill, of course, is to provide jobs for the unemployed, and guarantee the stability of existing jobs, without costing the taxpayers any money.

"However, it has another big advantage: It will enable manufacturers, processors, retailers, and farmers to revitalize, rebuild, and modernize their existing facilities; to buy new bookkeeping equipment, farm implements, air conditioning, and dozens of similar and useful items.

"Question. How would this legislation eventually affect the Federal budget picture?

"Answer. The Government would collect less taxes immediately, but, in the end, it would collect all the taxes that it collects under existing law.

"However, many people believe there would not even be an immediate loss to the Federal Treasury, because the bill would provide so many additional jobs and new businesses that the taxes paid on them would offset the deferred tax payments. The Federal Government, as a result of the improved, modernized, enlarged facilities, might, in years to come, collect more taxes rather than less, and be in a position to balance the budget or to reduce the national debt, or both.

"Question. If your bill should not be passed this year, will it be reintroduced next year?

"Answer. I feel so strongly that such legislation is in the best interest of the United States, particularly of the wage earners, that I should continue to introduce and fight for such legislation as long as I am in the Senate.

"Question. If the economy should take a marked upturn soon, would the legislation be just as vital?

"Answer. I think the legislation would be just as vital, because we should have overhauled our depreciation tax laws many years ago. The depreciation tax laws of the United States are less liberal than any other industrial country in the world.

"Question. Senator, would you care to expand on that any?

"Answer. Yes. In Germany, for example, expenses incurred for short-life assets can be fully deducted from income in the year of acquisition. In the Netherlands, too, fixed assets of small value may be written off in the year they are acquired. Another stimulant is a credit against tax for improvement and purchase of capital assets. This credit is in addition to normal depreciation so that a taxpayer spending more than a minimum limit is allowed the equivalent of depreciation of 120 percent of cost over the life of the asset. This allowance for investment is a trend discernible throughout Europe as an excellent stimulus for investment.

"Question. Who should be the most enthusiastic about this bill?

"Answer. It is obvious that the most enthusiastic supporters would be the men and women who want and need jobs, and the men and women who run the 10 million business units which could provide these jobs.

"Question. Senator, what can wage earners and businessmen do to get this type of legislation enacted in Congress?

"Answer. Immediately contact their Congressmen and Senators, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the President of the United States, express their interest in the legislation and urge its enactment."

The Late John J. Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include material relating to the former Representative from New Mexico, John J. Dempsey:

[From the White Haven (Pa.) Journal of March 12, 1958]

JOHN J. DEMPSEY

In the years before and after America's entrance into the Second World War, Luzerne County played a leading role in Government and defense through native sons in key posts.

For example, the Chief of Naval Operations was a Wilkes-Barrean. The only commodore in the Navy was from here. A four-star general, with headquarters in the Pentagon, was an Ashley product. A lieutenant general in command of the Philippines was a White Haven native. A member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet was from Larksville. Pennsylvania's Governor was a Plymouth breaker boy. The list was long.

Among others, it included the name of John J. Dempsey, who first saw the light of day in White Haven, where he launched his career as a waterboy, subsequently becoming an outstanding executive in New York and Oklahoma and eventually winding up in New Mexico, where he served as Governor. In the years that followed, he went to Washington, where he was Representative in Congress, Under Secretary of the Interior, and member of the Maritime Commission. He was one of a distinguished company.

Representative Dempsey, who died in Washington last night at 78, went a long way in business and in Government service since quitting familiar boyhood scenes. It is a privilege to salute the memory of another local boy who made good.

[From the New Mexican of March 13, 1958]

DEMPSEY COMES HOME

John J. Dempsey comes home to Santa Fe for the last time tomorrow, having served his adopted city and State long and well.

There isn't room here to even touch upon what the New Mexico Congressman accomplished in his 78 years. His service is too well known to need repeating.

But two incidents in recent days serve to illustrate better than we could the kind of man he was.

The first came at Washington. Dempsey was already suffering from the illness which cost his life. He had orders from his doctor to remain in bed.

But he left his sickroom to return to Congress and lead a final fight for passage of a bill to force faster construction of the Navaho Dam—a project which then appeared doomed by the administration economy move.

Dempsey won his final battle—as he had won so many others for New Mexico. It's quite possible that this last example of his putting interests of his State above his own cost Dempsey his life. He suffered a relapse and never recovered.

The first incident, we believe, serves to show the sort of Congressman New Mexico

had in Dempsey. The second shows the type of man he was.

The Republican city convention was just getting underway here. Attending were men and women who had unsuccessfully fought Dempsey in the political arena for more than two decades. But those Republicans took time out from planning their campaign against "our political enemies, the Democrats," for a minute of silent prayer for a Democrat they knew as their friend.

[From the Farmington Daily Times of March 18, 1958]

CONGRESS PAYS HIGH TRIBUTE TO DEMPSEY

(By Helene Monberg, Times, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—New Mexico suffered a grievous loss last week in the death of the late Representative John J. Dempsey, Democrat, of Santa Fe.

For "Governor Jack" Dempsey was one of the most beloved, effective, and respected Members of the United States House of Representatives.

Dempsey's death leaves Representative JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, as the sole Representative of 800,000 New Mexicans in the 435-Member House. That's a rough assignment for any man, particularly a freshman Congressman. MONTOYA has been in the House only 10 months. Fortunately for New Mexico, he is both conscientious and competent.

MONTOYA LEADS TRIBUTES

Led by MONTOYA, 60 Members of the House representing both parties and all sections of the country rose to pay tribute March 12 to their 78-year-old colleague who died March 11 of uremia following a virus attack. MONTOYA offered in the House and Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, offered for himself and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, in the Senate resolutions expressing the profound sorrow of Congress. The 3 New Mexicans and 7 other Congressmen attended Dempsey's funeral in Santa Fe March 15.

No part of the State has suffered a greater loss than the San Juan Basin. But Dempsey left northwest New Mexico a mighty legacy before his death. Dempsey, February 26, secured adoption of an amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill directing the Department of the Interior to make an immediate start on Navaho Dam. As was his custom, Dempsey secured leadership approval of his amendment before offering it. It was adopted on the spot, without debate.

NO DISSENT

Of the action, Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Republican, of Utah, stated: "This amendment was most difficult to obtain. Yet, because of the high regard Members on both sides held for Jack Dempsey, it was adopted without a dissenting vote. This was one of the finest and most deserving tributes which could be paid to our esteemed colleague."

The Dempsey amendment killed administration opposition to immediate construction of the Navaho Dam. Sure that the amendment would clear the Senate (as it did on March 10) the administration on March 3 gave the green light to immediate construction of Navaho. Dempsey learned of the administration's reversal from his sick bed, and he was gratified.

Dempsey had been suffering from a virus infection for some time. He went to Capitol Hill to present his amendment against his doctor's orders. It was the last time he walked into the House Chamber. Two days later he was taken to the hospital. A week later complications developed. Blood transfusions were started March 8 to no avail. The end came 3 days later.

HE HAD MANY FRIENDS

New Mexico has many problems, and it needs strong allies. Dempsey was therefore a most valuable Member of the New Mexico congressional delegation. He had a genius for personal contact, and a host of friends. His varied and colorful background made him known from the Hudson to the San Juan.

Born in Pennsylvania, the son of a coal miner, Dempsey became a successful businessman in Brooklyn as vice president of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co. He went west in 1920, and became an independent oil operator and president of an asphalt company in Oklahoma and a realty company in Santa Fe.

From a successful business career he turned to politics. He served as National Recovery Administration Director in New Mexico in 1933, and as a member of the Maritime Commission and Under Secretary of the Interior in 1941–42, during the Roosevelt administration. He was governor of New Mexico from 1943 to 1947. He served 7 nonconsecutive terms in the House, from 1935–41, and from 1951 to date. Only one top political office was denied him. He failed three times in his bid for the Senate.

"NATURAL" IN HOUSE

Dempsey was "a natural" in the House, which is run by the southerners and the Irish. Dempsey was Irish to his fingertips, and was tolerant of the conservatism of the South. So he had powerful allies in each group.

In 1935, the first year he was in Congress, he sponsored the original Soil Conservation Act. After 3 years of House service he landed two choice committee posts, House Rules and the original Dies committee, investigating un-American activities. At the time of his death he was a member of the House Public Works Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He was particularly interested in highway and actuarial resources legislation.

He was atcive in securing passage of legislation providing a bonus for former prisoners of war, including 4,000 New Mexicans at Bataan; the Upper Colorado Storage Act and channelization of the Rio Grande. He had a remarkably high batting average in securing approval of his bills. Of 6 measures passed last year of particular interest to New Mexico, Dempsey sponsored 2 which became law—a change in the 1910 Enabling Act to permit the State to invest in sound common stock, and continued operation of the Barnalillo County Hospital.

WORKED FOR SCHOOLS, ROADS

As wartime governor of New Mexico Dempsey was active in backing legislation to strengethen the State's school system and to improve its highways, health, and housing conditions.

As affectionately viewed by his colleagues, Dempsey was a discerning but kindly man endowed with a colorful personality and background and an infectious and often earthy sense of humor. He was a man of strong convictions but he knew when and how to compromise—the true mark of any successful legislator. He had courage bordering on recklessness.

He was a strong believer in the American tradition of free enterprise, but he fought hard for Federal welfare programs for his State. He had a great attachment for his country and for the West, for his religion and for his family.

KNEW HIS JOB

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat of Texas, a close friend of Dempsey, said of his House service: "He knew how to do his job. * * * He was an effective man on the floor of this House."

Representatives of the upper basin States lauded his work in behalf of the upper Colorado storage project. Republican WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat of Colorado, said: "Very few except those who were most closely allied with him * * * realized what a tower of strength he was in that battle." Representative KEITH THOMSON, Republican of Wyoming, stated: "He typified the spirit of America and the West. His word was his bond. He was a man of courage and action."

Of Dempsey, Representative ROBERT HALE, Republican of Maine, said: "I always enjoyed his gracious personality which I thought reflected a life well lived, many friends well loved, and service freely and finely given."

Congressman Jack Dempsey also had a heart as big as the Irish land of his forebears.

Faubus' Victory Is People's Rebuke for Misuse of Federal Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit, herewith, an editorial from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier entitled "The People's Rebuke for Misuse of Federal Troops in the South":

FAUBUS' VICTORY IS PEOPLE'S REBUKE FOR MISUSE OF FEDERAL TROOPS

The landslide victory of Gov. Orval Faubus is a rebuke from Arkansas for the use of Federal bayonets to compel racial mingling in public schools.

In our opinion, the outcome of Tuesday's election—more than 2 to 1 for Faubus against the aggregate vote of both his opponents—reflects the feelings of southerners generally. It is a restatement of the spirit of independence that created the United States of America. It is a heartening signal that the Republic is not yet dead.

There will be great wringing of hands in the do-good press and elsewhere both here and abroad. What will Asia say? What, indeed, will the Kremlin say?

Propaganda mills will be grinding. Was it not Faubus who first drew bayonets by using the National Guard in Little Rock?

Our position is this: Whatever may be said for or against Governor Faubus—and before Little Rock he had been regarded as a liberal with the backing of the Arkansas Gazette—the issue became much bigger than Faubus. The issue became the justice of the President of the United States using the Army to coerce citizens of a sovereign State.

Citizens of Arkansas met the issue squarely. The issue was not separation of the races in public schools. All three candidates opposed integration. They differed over means of resistance.

The issue was not, as we view it, even a vote of confidence in the use of the National Guard. The issue was State versus Federal authority over a matter of local concern.

In this instance, the Eisenhower doctrine has met defeat. The use of United States troops on foreign soil involves other issues. We are not today comparing Arkansas with Lebanon, with Korea, or with any other theater of military operations.

Some operations involve the risk of nuclear war.

In Arkansas, the risk is destruction of the American Republic. Of the two dangers it

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

is difficult to decide which is the more serious.

President Eisenhower, by ordering the paratroopers to Little Rock; Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette, by helping to bring in the troops, and many another critic of Governor Faubus have helped to put him back in the governor's office. But for them, Faubus today might be a political has-been.

If popular government is to survive, even the bleeding hearts must bow to the will of the people freely expressed at the polls. Otherwise the police state is already here.

Boating Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed H. R. 11078, a measure designed to meet some of the problems brought about by the ever increasing use of small boats on the waterways of our country. An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the Chicago Heights Star under date of July 22, 1958, which I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

BOATING SAFETY

Greatly increased interest in boating appears to have brought with it an upturn in reports of tragedies resulting from what can be a fine form of recreation.

This is not surprising, when you consider that in many cases there are no regulations comparable to the most lax restrictions on motor vehicle operation.

According to Ed Mongeon, American Red Cross director of safety services for 16 Midwestern States, small boat accidents are responsible for about 1,400 fatalities each year—more than one-fifth of all annual drownings. There are 7,100,000 small recreational boats on American inland and coastal waterways, with an estimated 35 million devotees of the sport, Mongeon said. Outboard motorboats, of course, are in the majority of small craft.

Boating enthusiasts at all times should be familiar with the currents, as well as capricious weather conditions. And in this era of heightened popularity, they need to be more conversant than ever with the rules of the road.

The Red Cross executive listed these important safety rules which can prevent needless boating accidents:

1. Stay ashore in bad or threatening weather. Learn to recognize signs of storms so that, when out in a boat, you can return in time when bad weather threatens.

2. Don't overpower your boat. Many boats carry the Outboard Boating Club of America plate telling the maximum horsepower the boat's outboard motor should have. If your boat does not have such a plate, consult a reliable marine dealer for the information before buying your outboard motor.

3. Don't overload your boat. One adult passenger to a seat is considered a good rule of thumb.

4. Avoid sudden or excessive bursts of speed.

5. When in trouble, think—don't panic.

For the sake of boating safety, Mongeon suggested:

1. Know how to swim.

2. Before leaving shore, tell someone where you're going, and then stick to this cruise plan.

3. Provide a life preserver for every passenger. Insist that nonswimmers wear a life preserver when in your boat.

4. Equip your motorboat also with oars, an anchor and line, a fire extinguisher, a first-aid kit, a whistle for signaling, and, if you go out at night, flares for signaling.

Stay with the boat if it is floating after a mishap, he adds.

The American Red Cross has special small-craft safety courses offered without charge. Information about the American Red Cross small-craft program may be obtained at Red Cross chapter headquarters.

Boating will continue to be one of the best summer pastimes if all operators will take advantage of every opportunity to become as skillful as possible.

A New Nobility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of the date of July 28, 1958, dealing with the move to create a new-fangled nobility in this country.

The other body of Congress, as the editorial suggests, will be well advised to consign this bill, H. R. 488, to the legislative junkyard.

The editorial follows:

A RIBBON TO STICK IN HIS COAT

Some very dim views of the likely composition of the new American nobility were expressed in the House last week when that body voted a new Federal award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement. Mr. Eisenhower has been agitating for legislation of this sort since 1955, and a similar proposal was advanced when Mr. Truman was in the White House.

Representative GROSS of Iowa remarked dispiritedly that he supposed that likely candidates for the honors list would consist of public busybodies like Eric Johnston, Paul G. Hoffman, and Nelson Rockefeller. Johnston was the organizer of a Washington pep session in support of Federal aid and Hoffman a former administrator of the giveaway. Rockefeller, currently the "modern Republican" choice for nomination as Governor of New York, held a number of posts under both the New Deal and the Eisenhower administration and likes to present himself as the very embodiment of the enlightened millionaire.

Of course, Mr. Gross' fears are well founded. The awards generally may be expected to go to stuffed shirts, and it is inevitable that they will be regarded as a form of political payoff for services rendered.

The Constitution frowns on titles of nobility, but the merit medal bill is an obvious attempt to create a kind of German silver aristocracy. At best, it is unnecessary, for the rewards of constructive accomplishment are sufficient in themselves and cannot be enhanced by a medal conferred in the name of a politician. There are plenty of learned societies and professional groups associated with the arts and literature which already give respected awards for eminent attainment. The Government does not have to intrude itself in such matters.

When it does, it creates the impression that the State has somehow become responsible for excellence in the individual. That is the impression Russia seeks to foster when it gives Lenin (formerly Stalin) prizes and the various other awards at Government disposal to herald Communist achievement. We should avoid copying the Soviet practice, for civilian medals conferred by governments inevitably imply that the recipient is at the service of an ideology.

Let us trust that the Senate has better sense than the House and junks this scheme.

The Menace of Disinterest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown appearing in the Washington Evening Star of July 31, 1958, entitled "The Menace of Disinterest":

THE MENACE OF DISINTEREST—EVENTS ACROSS WORLD SEEN AFFECTING ALL IN UNITED STATES, INCLUDING "SO WHAT" TRIBE

There are a lot of Smiths and Joneses in the United States. But there is a name more legion than either of these old reliables, although it never appears in telephone directories. The name is "Sowhat."

A typical Sowhat, or So What, if you will, may be found in every city and town, every country crossroads store, every club and bar in America. Oftentimes Mr. So What will be a leader in his community, a civic worker, a churhgoer. He may be, and often is, a member of a legislature or a city council. He is prosperous in business or in one of the professions. He is levelheaded, sound, careful, thoughtful, responsible, and conservative.

But when something comes along outside the ken of his daily activities, something having to do with events and developments far from his own habitat, he spreads his hands, shrugs his shoulders and says, "So what?"

So, what if the Russians are fomenting strife and discord in the Middle East (or Asia, or Africa, or South America)? That's a long way from here. Besides, what can we do about it? What do we care if a bunch of bedsheet-wearing desert nomads get worked up about whatever sheik or sultan or king they happen to have, and shoot a few people while they look for a new government?

Why, asks Mr. So What crossly, are we talking about intervention, sending American troops into foreign climes, spending billions of dollars on foolishness, just to try meddling in some foreign matter that has nothing to do with the daily routine in which Mr. So What has his complacent being?

Above all, complains Mr. So What, why are our Senators down there in Washington, and our President and the Secretary of State and all those officials great and small spending all their time fooling around with all this foreign talk when they need to get down to business and get business up for us Americans?

And why are all those politician fellows getting all worked up about a few American-

type Communists and their pals who might like to betray their country's survival to a foreign ideology and a menacing military aggressor?

The trouble with Mr. So What, all thousands of him, is that he stops at the questions. He asks why because he is annoyed at the disturbance to his comfortable ways. But his why does not bestir him to find out why.

And the tragedy is that Mr. So What, as we said when we introduced him, is not a dolt, a ne'er-do-well, or even a run-of-the-mill citizen. He is a leader, or is looked up to as such at least, in his community. Yet he sets the example to his fellow citizens of lesser stature, and the example is the hands-spread-out "so what" when matters lie outside his immediate interest.

It may be submitted that this So What fellow is probably more of a danger to the free world, to freedom in America and everywhere else in the still-remaining and rapidly dwindling area of the world that is free than 10 times his number of diligent Communist agents, or a hundred times his number of just plain Communist subjects.

If one is to argue with a So What, the annoyed reply one gets is petulant: "What can I do about it anyway?" The answer to that one is just "plenty." Not at all by getting all excited and frenzied, worked up into a lather, or emotionally intoxicated. But just getting familiar with the world situation, at the same time realizing, like the great English poet, John Donne, that "every man's death diminishes me, for I am a part of mankind." Putting the two together—a knowledge of events and their significance, plus the realization that in this shrinking world no man can resign from the common destiny of mankind—will bring an end to the "So Whats" quite definitely.

These days, the events taking place in the Middle East, in Asia or Africa or Greenland or Antarctica are of immediate concern to the men and women of the United States. They can, and probably will, affect the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in America, not to mention the millions of people everywhere else.

Perhaps we who deplore the So Whats can begin by making everyone we meet provide the answers to his own querulous question.

Engineer Commissioner for District of Columbia Col. Alvin C. Welling Nominated for Promotion to Brigadier General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of July 31, 1958, which comments on the nomination of Colonel Welling to be a brigadier general:

MERITED PROMOTION

President Eisenhower's nomination of Col. Alvin C. Welling for promotion to brigadier general is gratifying to the community which has become his temporary home and to which he has contributed so much as Engineer Commissioner. Colonel Welling has earned the coveted star, not only because of his distinguished record in the Army as a wartime and peacetime officer in many parts of the globe but also because of his impressive efforts to build a greater National Capital.

Taking over the engineer commissionership from Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane just a year ago, Colonel Welling plunged with characteristic energy into the midst of some particularly troublesome local problems, including the bridge dispute, the routing of 240 through the District, etc. He has played a major role in solving the bridge and highway difficulties, in addition to devoting attention to many other District and metropolitan area matters. We are pleased to salute General-designate Welling as he continues his fine work for Washington.

Jacob Nelson "Nellie" Fox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in a season when the Chicago White Sox need an act of Congress or a shot in the arm in their pursuit of the Yankees, it is refreshing and stimulating to have Nellie Fox playing his usual brilliant game from day to day.

Everyone admires a competitor whether it is on the athletic field or in business, industry, or labor.

In a season when the Comiskey family is playing the judicial circuit it is nice to know that Nellie Fox is wearing the regimentals of the White Sox.

I would like to call attention to the following article in Bob Addie's column appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today:

CHICAGO, July 31.—Perhaps the most remarkable ballplayer in the majors today is Jacob Nelson Fox, a little man who plays second base for the Chicago White Sox.

They call him "Nellie" and he's chiefly distinguished for carrying the biggest wad of chewing tobacco west of Rocky Bridges. Nellie is the sort of guy who always makes the right play at the right time.

A couple of years ago Casey Stengel was marveling at the many talents of Nellie Fox.

"You take these all-star games now," Casey was saying, "and you see a lot of big fellas who can drive it out of the park. But this little fella (Fox) has won me more all-star games with his nub hits than all the big men."

Fox's forte is driving the opposition crazy with his slipper-slappery hits which know no geographical bounds. He's likely to push a ball into left, center, or right. On occasion, he can pull a ball with authority.

Last season, his Chicago mates were kidding him about his lack of power.

"I can hit home runs when I have to," Nellie defended himself. "But trying for homers isn't smart baseball. I'm a little man and I've got to meet the ball."

Actually, Nellie hit six homers last year but the important thing is that he led the league in hits. He's led the American League in hits three times and it appears he'll do it again. He always gets around 190 hits a year and his nuisance value is respected by every club.

Fox is perhaps the best bunter in the majors today. He lays down what is known in the trade as "a dead fish." It's a bunt which starts out fast and suddenly stops like a billiards expert putting English on a cue ball.

Nellie plays percentage baseball. He's a dangerous man in the late innings when a run is needed by his side. He personally beat the Nats in the first two games of this series.

In the first game, he tripled and then apparently was caught off third when the next batter, Jim Landis, grounded sharply to Ossie Alverez. Fox gave a great broken-field performance which would have done credit to a halfback. He avoided the tag, got back to third, and eventually scored the winning run.

He was the key man Tuesday night, too. Russ Kemmerer was going along on a 1–0 victory with nobody on and one out in the ninth. It was Fox who beat out a scratch hit to Alverez to pave the way for Sherm Lollar's homer. Nellie kept the Sox "alive." He's been keeping them alive for years with his incredible fielding and hitting.

His pickup from the Philadelphia Athletics was the best deal Chicago ever made. He was traded even up for Joe Tipton, a second-string catcher, back in October of 1949.

It must be admitted that Fox hardly looked like a star when he was with the A's. He batted .255 in 88 games for Philadelphia. The late Clark Griffith was looking for a second baseman about that time and called up his old friend, Connie Mack, about the possibility of getting Fox.

"I wouldn't advise it, Clark," said Mr. Mack. "He's a little fellow who is a good glove man but I doubt he'd hit enough for you."

So Fox went to the White Sox. He was no ball of fire there in his first year, batting only .247 in 130 games. But he batted .313 the next season and has been around the .300 mark ever since.

Fox isn't exactly as tiny as people make him out to be. He's listed as standing 5 feet 10 inches and weighing 160 pounds. He's probably around 5 feet 8 inches and weighs 150.

Since Albie Pearson came into the league, Fox considers himself a giant. He teases Pearson about being a midget. Yet, like all little guys, Fox has a sympathy for his fellow midgets in the endless battle of the Davids against the Goliaths.

He's helped Pearson quite a bit, stressing to his younger rival the importance of getting basehits instead of going for homers.

Fox is what is known as a choke hitter as distinguished from a chokeup hitter. In baseball, there's an ominous sign in which a player draws his finger across his throat indicating that another player chokes up in the clutch—or fails under pressure.

Nellie doesn't choke up but he does choke his bat to get increased mobility. The pesky, little guy is always pushing hits past the opposition and drives the enemy to distraction.

Nellie Fox is a great example of the made ballplayer who came up with modest talent and blossomed into a star through determination and desire. Horatio Alger, the patron saint of poor boys who rose from rags to riches, could have had a good story in Nellie Fox.

Is This Neutrality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I remember a brilliant statement on the futility of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

neutralism by Carlos P. Romulo some months ago in which the distinguished spokesman from the Philippines exposed the moral nakedness of this position in face of the depredations of communism.

An equally pertinent commentary on the subject is at hand in the form of a timely editorial from the Logan (W. Va.) Banner, entitled "Is This Neutrality?" It deals with the "self-styled" neutrality of India's Nehru, and it reads the Nehru record in this respect.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

IS THIS NEUTRALITY?

If you put a stopwatch on Indian Prime Minister Nehru's reactions to various moves by the United States and the Soviet Union it would prove rather embarrassing to him in his self-styled neutrality.

When American troops landed in Lebanon, at the request of the Lebanese president and under specific orders not to fight, Nehru was right in there with his condemnation.

But when Russia in 1956 sent the Red Army into Hungary, at nobody's request, to crush a genuine revolt against Soviet domination with cruel and bloody force, Nehru could not find his voice. Only after weeks did he grudgingly concede that the affair had its bad aspects.

By his own highly peculiar standards, Nehru may indeed be a neutral. But it is not a neutrality that many can admire or wish to copy.

Judge Carrick Buck, Dedicated Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a recent appointment by the administration, the Honorable Carrick H. Buck, 24-year veteran of the Circuit Court, First Circuit, Hawaii, is replaced on the bench thus depriving the people of Hawaii of irreplaceable and invaluable experience in a jurist accorded the highest respect by every member of the bar, as well as the citizenry of Hawaii.

An editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, a dedicated Republican newspaper, points out that this distinguished and eminent jurist leaves the bench on "the changing whims of political fortune." It is my memory that her appointment was to fill a vacancy on the bench, not to replace an incumbent.

Judge Buck has earned, in the minds of all Hawaii, the high praise paid her in the editorial. Hawaii regrets her departure. Having known the judge as a personal friend and having had occasion, as a police officer and a jury commissioner, to work with her, I am personally well aware of her conviction in Hawaii and her moral courage to act in accordance with her convictions. It is extremely unfortunate that she has been replaced.

The editorial follows:

SALUTE TO AN ABLE, FIRM JURIST

After nearly a quarter-century on the Territory's circuit bench, Judge Carrick H. Buck has been replaced as judge of Oahu's first circuit by the just-appointed Judge Edgar D. Crumpacker, former assistant United States attorney.

Thus, Judge Buck leaves the bench as she first assumed it, on the changing winds of political fortune.

So long as our circuit judges are appointed at Washington, so long will the inevitable result be appointment partly, at least, on a basis of Republican or Democratic Party allegiance. Judge Buck came to the bench under Democratic auspices.

Carrick Buck's name will live in Hawaii court annals as the first woman judge to preside over one of its circuit courts. Also as a circuit judge with unusual length of service.

But more importantly, her service will be remembered as that of a competent jurist, a meticulous researcher in civil actions, a firm and courageous dispenser of justice in criminal actions.

Her mother was the first woman lawyer in New Mexico, where Carrick Buck was born soon after the turn of the century. Judge Buck was barely old enough to vote when, in 1921, she was admitted to the California bar.

She came to Hawaii in 1923, was associated in law practice with the late Frank E. Thompson, then served as assistant United States attorney, the same post from which her successor has now been chosen.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed her to the Kauai Circuit Court in 1934. She moved to the Oahu courtroom in 1942, to serve continuously until she stepped down this week.

Although Judge Buck is an ardent Democrat, her sense of justice is all American. Her dedication to the high principles of her calling have won the admiration and respect of bench and bar alike.

Her long tour of duty on the bench ended this week. The record she has made as an able, impartial dispenser of justice continues.

Farley Will Try

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the Galena (Ill.) Gazette:

FARLEY WILL TRY

Your editor was seated in a Southern Pacific diner headed east out of San Francisco several years ago. Suddenly the steward ushered a huge hulk of a man to the empty seat across the table. "I'm Jim Farley," boomed the big fellow as he offered his hand. "What's your name?" Then he eat down.

Thus we were off on an interesting 3-day trip to Chicago which offered many opportunities to chat with the famous Democratic politician. In his warmhearted, informal way, Farley expounded his thinking about many of the great issues of the day. There was no pettiness in his judgment of others then basking in the national limelight, though it was apparent that he had been keenly disappointed by the turn of events which removed him from Democratic councils.

Now he has announced that he will seek his party's nomination as United States Senator from New York. The incumbent IRVING M. IVES, a Republican, is not seeking reelection. It is conceivable that Farley, now board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., could stage the political comeback of the year. The man who rose from the lowly office of town clerk in Stony Point, N. Y. (1911) to become the mastermind of Democratic politics in the early New Deal days may still have what it takes.

Leader's Clemency to Murderers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce publication for June 1958 carried the following paragraph:

RIGHTS VERSUS OBLIGATIONS

The Governor's proclamation of an NAACP Day, which has been hailed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in a 4-day program called Let Freedom Ring, seems entirely out of place, in view of the rampant hoodlum attacks in Philadelphia, directly chargeable to young Negroes. It is obvious that too much emphasis has been placed on citizenship rights and not enough emphasis on the obligations of citizenship, especially among our ambitious minority groups. May we suggest the Governor proclaim a Good Citizenship Day, with the admonition of all persons of good will to forget their petty bias and work for better citizenship.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of March 20, 1958, has this to say about his clemency to murderers:

LEADER'S CLEMENCY TO MURDERERS

Clemency to murderers has become the shameful hallmark of the Leader administration at Harrisburg.

Governor Leader has again, in his commutation of life sentences given 11 convicted murderers, displayed his contempt for justice and his disregard for the proper protection of our citizens from crime.

His latest acts of leniency, on the recommendation of his mollycoddling board of pardons, take their place in a succession of similar acts that have sprung the prison doors for murderers and, in effect, nullified the sentences of the courts.

Commutation of a life term in prison makes the convict eligible for parole. Every time Governor Leader takes this step he earns applause wherever lawbreakers may gather, particularly in the cell rooms of our State penitentiaries. But his leniency to killers can only produce among the law-abiding people of our Commonwealth feelings of deep dismay and disquiet.

Among those whose life sentence was commuted in the latest batch—which embraced a total of 35 commutations and 4 pardons—was Aaron M. Gore, who had been convicted of the brutal killing of a policeman, Henry J. Hicks.

Gore and a companion, both 15 at the time, were running away from their homes in North Jersey on Christmas Eve, 1946, when they were picked up in Philadelphia by Hicks. The patrolman attempted to take them to the station house so they could be returned to their families when the two suddenly attacked him. Gore shot him with an automatic pistol; his companion, Keith Donaldson, bludgeoned him with a club. Donaldson was found guilty of second-degree murder, sent to White Hill Industrial School and released after 5 years.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover termed the murder a "brutal and senseless killing" and a "shocking spectacle."

Governor Leader, on the other hand, sees reason for leniency to the killer. In his commutation of Gore's sentence, there is, as usual, cold disregard for the victim and his family.

Patrolman Hicks left behind him that Christmas Eve his widow and their six small children.

"Why," asked Mrs. Hicks, when she was told of Leader's action, "do they send murderers to jail if they are going to let them out? Who will this man kill next? What other family will suffer?"

Those questions demand answers from one man, Governor Leader, and they will nag at his conscience the rest of his life.

What would he say to Mrs. Hicks and her fatherless children? What would he say to the family of Edith Snyder, the 16-year-old girl who was shot to death by Robert D. Heineman, as she was doing her homework in her Abington home on April 25, 1940? Heineman is among those whose life term has been commuted by Governor Leader.

What would he say to the family of James F. Gannon, who was shot and killed on his 30th birthday during the holdup of a south Philadelphia taproom in 1942? A man convicted of first-degree murder in that case has had his life sentence changed by Governor Leader.

Beyond all else, what has the Governor to say to the people of Pennsylvania to justify his outrageous mass clemency to this group of savage criminals?

At a time when the police and the courts are trying desperately to stem crime, when teen-age delinquency has become an acute national problem, the spectacle of a Governor of Pennsylvania opening prison doors for persons convicted of the most heinous crimes is an appalling one, and one that George M. Leader will be held accountable for by the people.

The above comments do not come from my section. They come from Pennsylvania people.

The Pennsylvania Governor is making quite a record for himself in encouraging crime and pandering to minority groups.

Morris Ernst: Friend or Foe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in Puerto Rico, where democracy thrives, the Dominican tyranny is not popular, to say the least. Earl Parker Hanson, columnist for the Island Times, on June 13 and 27, 1958, wrote about Morris Ernst and Trujillo. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the two columns:

[From the Puerto Rico Island Times of June 13, 1958]

MORRIS ERNST: TRUJILLO'S ENEMY

(By Earl Parker Hanson)

A cry of shame and sorrowful disbelief arose from a thousand decent American Liberals when Morris Ernst, famous as a fighter for human rights and freedoms hired himself out for a special purpose to the worst, most ruthless, most murderous, most despicable, of modern Latin American dictators.

The Basque scholar, Galindez, well-known enemy of the Dominican Republic's Generalisimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, had disappeared in New York. The American flier, Gerald Murphy, had disappeared in Ciudad Trujillo. Overwhelming circumstantial evidence, uncovered in half a dozen careful investigations, pointed to a connection between the two disappearances, and to a diabolical plot, engineered by Trujillo and his highest henchmen, to do away with them both. The Dominicans ignored the United States Government's official charges of forgery in their official documentation of the case, submitted to rid them of blame. They also ignored Washington's official requests for complete and frank assistance in investigations of the mystery, which had stirred up great popular interest.

Trujillo's reputation suffered, and so did his tourist business. His henchmen and boughten public relations people, however, including some of the lowest professional Communist-hunters in the Americas, issued a lot of foul red herrings to the effect that Galindez was a Communist, and probably a crook to boot, who was short in his accounts as an agent for the Basque government in exile, and that Gerald Murphy was no better than he should have been.

That kind of stuff didn't impress the American public very deeply, so el benefactor put put three men on his payroll, among whom Ernst was the best known, to make an impartial investigation which was to be widely disseminated if it cleared Trujillo, and remain unpublished if it did not.

Former admirers of Ernst pointed out that when a lawyer takes a fee he can be impartial only on the side of his client, and that for a man like Ernst to undertake to whitewash a man like Trujillo in the matter of just one disappearance, was the equivalent of having set out 15 years ago to whitewash Hitler (for a price) by trying to prove that he hadn't caused the death of one specific Jew named Moishe Greenburg.

Now the Ernst report is out and widely distributed and if one of Ernst's ideas in taking on the job was to get his name in the papers, he made the grade. The job got on the front pages, and into the editorial sections, of dozens of papers with the stature of the New York Times and the New York Evening Post, to say nothing of el Mundo. Headlines read "Ernst Exonerates Trujillo"; the stories and editorial comments said just the opposite. They said that Ernst didn't prove a thing that his effort was merely a lawyer's brief for a client, and poor one at that. They said that the supposedly impartial report didn't tackle any of the evidence that pointed directly to Trujillo, and that it even aped the original Trujillo technique of implying that Galindez was a crook and short in his accounts—as though a smear like that, of a man who can't answer back, had anything at all to do with the question of whether or not Trujillo had him done in.

The sloppy, evasive, innuendo-filled report broke the case wide open again by drawing indignant comments from all over. Even my friend Tom Hayes abandoned his usual "Yes and then again No" technique and came out with a ringing denunciation of Ernst in a very fine, indignant column in el Mundo.

At-a-boy, Morris Ernst. Even though you didn't do it in such a way as to win anybody's respect for yourself, you sure played a well-deserved dirty trick on the Dominican Monster. Nobody seems to take your report seriously, but it did get into the papers, it did revive interest in the Galindez case, it did unlease new forces and efforts against your employer and yourself, and it did strengthen rather than weaken popular suspicion of that employer.

And if Trujillo should come to feel that he was rooked, because in hiring you he thought he was hiring a meticulously honorable man, an impartial fighter for the truth, if he should come to entertain a suspicion that the man he hired has shown himself to be something else, and that Trujillo therefore got a gypping, why so much the better.

I'm all for gypping Trujillo, let the gyps fall where they may.

[From the Puerto Rico Island Times of June 27, 1958]

THEY'RE SQUEEZING POOR MORRIS ERNST

(By Earl Parker Hanson)

It's like I said: when Morris Ernst took on the job of chief whitewash artist for one of the lowest, most brutal, most murderous figures in the modern political world—which has produced some beauts along those lines—he not only managed to get his name in the papers, but also to play the dirtiest trick that a lawyer every played on his client.

I never saw anything like it. Here a lot of people made a lot of independent investigations that all pointed in the same direction—to the abduction of Galindez in New York, to his subsequent murder in the Dominican Republic, to the later murder of the American flier Gerald Murphy—all by the henchmen, and under the general direction, of el benefactor, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Moina, to whose great bounty everything in the Dominican Republic must (had better) be credited publicly and gratefully, including confinement in loony-bins, jails, torture chambers, and cemeteries.

The usual howl that all this was the work of the Communists didn't do much good because the damning investigations were carried on by the FBI, the New York police, a Washington grand jury, and Henry Luce's Life magazine, and were spurred on relentlessly by a Congressman from Oregon with a history of having previously associated with such organizations as the Rotary Club, the church, some baseball teams, the Cub Scouts, and the bar association. Not only didn't the United States public believe that those people were Communists, but it had also come to regard at least some of them as among the world's most careful and highly skilled investigators. So the United States public generally concluded that when a magazine like Life came out with six pages, virtually accusing Trujillo point-blank of having ordered and master-minded the crimes, there must be something to it. So for a time there was a news-angle in the growing public apprehension that something sinister and terrible was going on, and that Uncle Sam was having his nose twisted by a two-bit Caribbean generalissimo.

But stories need constant new news angles to sustain them, and after a while the Galindez-Murphy case began to fade from the front pages. So then, who stepped into the picture but that well-known liberal fighter for human rights and decency, Morris Ernst, who undertook to make a new investigation for a good price, which was announced to be impartial in Trujillo's favor. And, brother, when a man of Ernst's untarnished reputation agrees to so tarnishing a job, that is news, and now there was a new peg on which to hang the whole story—and possibly Ernst's reputation as well. A new mystery, that of Morris, How Could You? was added to the two old ones. A new disappearance too, that of Ernst the stalwart liberal. In effect, the story became known as the Galindez-Murphy-Ernst case.

For the better part of a year, nothing much happened as far as the papers were concerned. One had the feeling that those who had evidence and information were holding it back, waiting for the appearance of Ernst's report so they could then dump it in his lap.

O. K. the report came out, and, to judge by its public reception, it was a pretty sloppy

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

whitewash job. One magazine expressed the prevailing feeling that it was so sloppy that—if that was the best that an experienced lawyer and investigator like Ernst could do—it was the most damning document produced yet in proof of Trujillo's guilt.

So now there is another news-peg and the case is wide open again. You have seen the front page, and all of page 10, of the New York Times of June 23, presenting the most clinching evidence produced yet, against Trujillo and of a sure tieup between Murphy and Galindez, and handling the whole story together with a running commentary on the holes in Morris Ernst's report. That evidence has been available for a long time; only now has it been released, and I have a strong suspicion that there is more to come, and that the case against Trujillo grows stronger daily as a result of Ernst's high-priced messing around.

What with all that, and his son spending a million dollars a year in the United States just so he could flunk a United States Army educational course, poor Trujillo must be coming toward the bottom of his pockets.

It's like I said, Morris, more power to you.

The Russian Communist Empire: Its Historical Roots and Its Present Vulnerabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that the American people generally have not yet come to understand the real nature of the Soviet Union, its historical past and its present fundamental weaknesses. Once this understanding is attained, I feel certain that our people would support every imaginative effort aimed at weakening our enemy, short of war. In fact, the process of weakening the U. S. S. R. empire from within would in itself reduce the possibility of armed hostilities.

In the Soviet Union itself there is a whole new field of possibilities open to us for winning the cold war. If nationalism is a potent and dominant force in the Middle East today, which indeed it is, then this same force is even greater in scope and intensity among the many captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It simply does not make sense for us to permit Moscow to exploit the force of nationalism against us in the Middle East while we shamefully neglect to support this force and all its aspirations within Moscow's empire. But, again, I am certain that as we quickly come to understand the patriotic nationalisms of the nations in the U. S. S. R. such as Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and other non-Russian nations, we will take the initiative on every level to support the liberation and independence of these captive countries.

Remarkable strides toward this necessary understanding are being made today. A good example of this appears in the two articles written recently by Dr. Paul H. Hallett in the Register, an outstanding national Catholic newspaper. The first article, dated July 6, is entitled "Without Moscow Would Communism Have Spread Over Earth?"; the second, dated July 20, raises the question, "Why not disintegration of the U. S. S. R.?" The facts and ideas advanced by Dr. Hallett deserve the most careful reading by our Members of Congress. The article entitled, "Lands and Nations in the U. S. S. R." to which Dr. Hallett refers, appears in the July 18 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 13011–13016. Because of their basic importance, I request that these two articles of the Register be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Register, Denver, Colo., of July 6, 1958]

WITHOUT MOSCOW WOULD COMMUNISM HAVE SPREAD OVER EARTH?

(By Paul H. Hallett)

A thesis ably propounded by Prof. Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University is that the dynamism behind Communist conquests of non-Russian peoples is but a continuation of the old Russian power urge, which began in the 15th century.

A work by Dr. Dobriansky called Lands and Nations in the U. S. S. R., now running in the Ukrainian Catholic weekly, Amerika, shows a Tsarist antecedent for almost every Soviet manifestation. In the light of current Russian aggressions and attempts of our Government to stop them, the words of a Polish 16th-century King, who threatened with death English sailors who should attempt to run arms into Muscovy, have a prophetic note:

"The Muscovite," said the King, "who is not only our opponent of today but the eternal enemy of all free nations, should not be allowed to supply himself with cannons, bullets, and munitions or with artisans who manufacture arms hitherto unknown to those barbarians." Those who helped build up Russian technocracy in the twenties and thirties might have pondered that warning.

Messianism, the belief that Russia is destined to lead the world, is an old note in Muscovite history. It was given classic expression in 1524 by the monk Philoteus who wrote: "All Christian empires ended and were absorbed by one empire—that of our autocrat, the Russian Tsar * * * Two Romes have fallen, and the third exists; but there will be no fourth." The first Rome in Philoteus' concept was that of the Popes, the second, Constantinople.

Even the nobles who were driven out of the land by the Bolsheviks sometimes expressed sympathy for Russian conquests made under the Communists. A fair example is Alexander Romanoff, Grand Duke of Russia, who wrote that "to follow the example of the early Romanoffs * * * meant to admit that the Soviet Government should be helped and not hindered in its experiment and to wish it would succeed where the Romanoffs failed."

Famous is the prediction of Alexis de Tocqueville in his Democracy in America, written in 1835: "The American struggles against the natural obstacles that oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword * * * Yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

If anyone doubts that Communist conquests are nothing other than Muscovite conquests let him consider how long Eastern Europe would remain behind the Iron Curtain without the threat from the East. Only China (with its conquests of North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet, once parts of the Chinese Empire) has become Communist without great Russian armies, though not without Russian intrigue. Communism as such, without Muscovite help, has as yet not demonstrated its ability to take over a single nation.

[From the Register, Denver, Colo., of July 20, 1958]

WHY NOT DISINTEGRATION OF THE U. S. S. R.?

(By Paul H. Hallett)

This is an age of civil strife. Everywhere we are told that the Western World is disintegrating. We behold France pouring out her lifeblood on the Sahara sands, though she has an army of 450,000 men in Algeria as against perhaps 125,000 rebels. Still the war shows no signs of abating.

Everywhere in the free world we see a revolt of subject nationalities, fomented by Moscow, and nowhere is rebellion encouraged to rise in the Communist-dominated world.

But why not an assertion of the nationalities within the Red empire that might bleed it to death?

Dr. Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University, prominent in Ukrainian-American circles, sees no hope of a revolt inside Muscovy proper, or what is known as Great Russia. The people there have no tradition of freedom, as do some of the subject peoples within the swollen U. S. S. R.

What is called for convenience "Russia" is a complex of 15 subject states, and 150 nationalities and tribes. The attitude of the members of this "union" toward Great Russia and communism has been demonstrated abundantly in the Ukraine, not to speak of satellite East Germany, Poland, and Hungary, where short-lived revolts have taken place.

In the period 1917–22, writes Dr. Dobriansky, had the national republics of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, White Ruthenia, the Far East Republic, and others succeeded in resisting the Red Russian armies, would there have been a Soviet Union, followed later by an expanded empire? "Obviously not."

Dr. Dobriansky urges that we conduct political warfare aimed at the very heart of the Russian Communist empire. It is impossible for us to expand freedom in the world, or even to preserve existing freedoms, by giving the enemy the prime advantage of continually creating tensions on this side of the Iron Curtain.

"With the minimum danger of precipitating any hot war, we can employ diplomatic, political, psychological, and cultural weapons in an area that is even more important than the satellite one."

A study of Russian history will reveal that even in Tsarist days Russian expansion was won by duplicity and propaganda as much as by force of arms. Ever since the Napoleonic wars Russia has never won a major war unaided, but diplomatic action and subversion have been responsible for her territorial gains.

Karl Marx, whose materialism Russia took over but who did not create Russian aggression, observed a century ago: "Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and timidity of the Western nations. * * * There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." Those words are even truer today.

Max Ascoli on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Max Ascoli, the perceptive editor of the Reporter, has some sober thoughts in the current issue of the Reporter on the hard choices facing us in the Middle East:

THE WORST YET

Since the end of the fighting in Korea, our country has undergone a series of traumatic experiences and each new shock has led us only to bitter soul-searching. When the Hungarians revolted, we did no more than wish them luck, secretly hoping that the other satellite peoples would not follow their example. Then, one after another, came all those technological Russian achievements that made our vaunted supremacy in gadgets and weapons more than questionable.

The latest traumatic experience is proving to be far more shattering than any we have previously undergone. This time it has not been caused by lack of action. Rather, we have found ourselves acting in Lebanon as if in a trance, with the Lebanese people and the rest of the world staring at us in dismay or in anger.

What are our marines doing there, particularly since Lebanon is a jumping off place to nowhere? They are not supposed to fight the rebels, and the rebels themselves, for all the massive military suport they are supposed to have received from the United Arab Republic, do not seem inclined to do much fighting anyway—a disposition shared by the regular Lebanese army.

The United States Marines have always been a redoubtable military outfit, but these Marines from the Sixth Fleet, it has been repeatedly stated, have the latest weapons. So have our ships and so have our planes. Yet what at the utmost might have been needed in Lebanon was a police force with night sticks. Actually, the U. N. observer teams were such a force and were guaranteeing the transition from the Chamoun government to one selected by compromise among the belligerent Lebanese faction. Compromise seems to have been the overriding aim of the Lebanese civil warriors. But when President Chamoun cried out for help, the Marines landed.

The incongruous quality of the whole operation was matched by the equally incongruous, and nearby unanimous approval by responsible Americans of the President's decision. It was a case of patriotic support given for patriotism's sake to an action that had been taken for action's sake. True, it was said that the President could not do otherwise, which may mean that he had let himself be maneuvered into a position where he had no alternatives, and where, therefore, a show of strength was determined by impotence.

It may be said that our British allies acted more or less the way we did. Yet once again they showed that patriotism does not require unanimous approval of whatever action the men in power may see fit to undertake.

Perhaps our intervention in Lebanon was made necessary by our previous policies. It was inevitable just as it was frivolous, and for this inevitability and frivolity the Republican administration is not solely responsible. How many times have we heard that it is America's destiny to be the guardian of all nations, great and small? To keep the independence and integrity of Middle Eastern nations was the avowed aim of the Eisenhower doctrine. No political aggregate that has come to be called a nation can—so it seems—ever get rid of its independence and integrity, nor can it ever be relieved of the burden of sovereignty. Even the fact of having no economic or political viability is no exemption from nationhood—an extraordinary extension of the Wilsonian principle. And no nation can change its internal order except via due process of an utterly unwritten, utterly unfathomed law.

This maniacal conservatism, this worship of the status quo, is counteracted by an equally maniacal acceptance of all nationalisms, of all movements for national independence. At present, Soviet Russia has become the champion of wholesale nationalism—provided of course it does not benefit Hungarians or Poles. Soviet Russia is riding high, while we have assumed the role of the world's arch-reactionary. Yet this playing with the sovereignty and independence of nations, whether to defend them at any price or subvert them at any price, is exceedingly reckless. It is an unchallengeable fact of international life—and particularly in these days of free-for-all nationhood and nationalism—that for the extravagances of the minor powers it is the major ones who pay.

The potential arbitrariness of the two major nations finds some check in the peculiar conditions of our bipolar, multinational world. Fortunately there are also intermediate powers endowed with different degrees of strength and influence—and we have found out only too well in the days following the Lebanon landings what a check these powers can exert. The small nations too, no matter how improbable some of them may be, have a role to play—witness the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In the world of the United Nations conditions have come into existence which make a new dimension of democracy—democracy in international affairs—not only conceivable but actual. The extraordinary thing is that in this new game of international politics the greatest democracy in the world consistently manages to be the loser.

Seaway Just Adds to Other Ill Winds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of three articles by Mr. Eckert Goodman which appeared in the New York Daily News on July 22, 1958 which deal with the effect of the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway on the port of New York:

SEAWAY JUST ADDS TO OTHER ILL WINDS

(By Eckert Goodman)

(First of three articles)

Three weeks ago a dull boom rumbled across the stilled St. Lawrence River Valley 5 miles north of Massena, N. Y. It reverberated up and down the Atlantic seaboard and echoed into coastal areas of Europe, Africa and South America. But nowhere did it resound with more impact than in the port of New York.

The explosion, blasting a temporary dike across the river's north channel, marked the last major step in the creation of the half-billion dollar St. Lawrence seaway, which next year will open the Great Lakes to sizable, ocean-going freighters for the first time.

The long-argued, Government-sponsored international seaway poses the latest and, perhaps, most dangerous challenge yet to the future growth and prosperity of New York. For it will be in direct competition with our city's single biggest and most important economic asset—its hard-pressed port and maritime industry.

If you live or work within 25 miles of the Statue of Liberty, you're among 13 million inhabitants of a 1,500-square-mile area generally designated as the Port of New York.

ONE OUT OF EVERY FOUR IS LINKED TO PORT

One out of every four people you see in a bus or subway owes his livelihood directly or indirectly to port activities. A second person in each quartet is supported by income from occupations which cater to the needs of "port workers."

Altogether, the port's waterborne commerce is estimated to produce an annual income of $6.3 billion—more than a quarter of all wages earned in the metropolitan area.

The 450 square miles of water encompassed by the New York Harbor's 8 land-locked bays are regularly plied by liners, freighters, and tankers representing 170 different steamship companies.

These vessels register an average of 26,000 arrivals and departures a year as they tie up and cast off from two hundred-odd piers capable of berthing simultaneously more than 400 ocean-going ships along nearly 800 miles of waterfront.

No other port in the world can duplicate New York's tremendous seaborne traffic, the almost $9 billion value of its annual cargoes, or its abundance of maritime services and facilities.

Yet New York's preeminence as the world's greatest seaport has been steadily declining for almost a generation; and its share of America's foreign trade has taken such an alarming dip in the last decade that we have reached what Mayor Wagner recently described as a time of crisis.

NEW YORK SHARE SHRINKS RAPIDLY

Thirty-five years ago, New York handled more than 28 percent of the Nation's foreign cargoes and a whopping 40 percent of its general cargo. By last year, the figures had shrunk to 13.2 percent and 24.9 percent, respectively.

Soaring imports of bulk commodities such as oil and mineral ores from South America, Africa, and Canada, and coal exports to Europe have already pushed the ports of Philadelphia (including Trenton and Camden, N. J., and Wilmington, Del.) and Hampton Roads, Va. (Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Newport News) ahead of New York in terms of total tonnage. And Baltimore is pressing close behind.

But it's in the field of highly profitable general cargo, in which New York has traditionally specialized, that there's cause for real concern.

General cargo, sometimes called package cargo, represents the blue chips in a port's foreign trade, the gilt-edged securities of its maritime industry. It consists of individual items of all sorts, from automobiles and breakfast foods to xylophones and zwieback.

SPECIAL TREATMENT OFTEN IS REQUIRED

Such merchandise requires special packing, handling, forwarding, individual bills of lading, high insurance, and innumerable other services not involved in the movement of bulk cargo, which is usually shipped by the boatload and handled mechanically.

In 1925, New York boasted 16 million tons of this cargo, 3 million more than it checked off last year. And during the last 10 years, the port's portion of the national total has dropped at an average rate of over 1 percent a year.

Where has this precious cargo been going? Mostly to coastal ports south of New York

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

along the Atlantic seaboard and on the Gulf of Mexico.

Last year, for instance, New Orleans, which has beaten out Baltimore for second place in the general cargo sweepstakes, rang up an almost 14-percent gain—more than 3 times the increase registered by the country as a whole and 35 times New York's.

The factors responsible for the port of New York's decline are numerous and not always clear cut, but most local maritime authorities agree on the following major ones:

New York's largely antiquated finger piers—some of them half a century old—and other outmoded waterfront facilities, which make cargo handling relatively slow and inefficient (hence, expensive).

A Government-established freight rate differential, which discriminates against New York by making it cheaper to ship goods by rail between the Midwest and southern ports, including Philadelphia.

The movement of large segments of industry such as upstate rug factories and New England textile mills to the Southwest, and the development of huge new steel, oil refining, chemical, plastic, and other industries in the South.

The practice of pier owners in some ports of offering steamship operators use of their terminals at bargain rates or for free, in order to encourage trade.

The rapid growth of interstate trucking, which has largely supplanted New York's coastwise shipping, and now causes costly, time-consuming congestion in overburdened waterfront streets and on piers which were designed for the loading of horse-drawn drays and lighters.

New York's past history of waterfront crime and strikes, which cost industry millions of dollars, often forced shippers to redirect their cargoes, and ultimately received the sort of worldwide publicity which provided perfect ammunition for promoters of competing ports.

The unprecedented expenditures by smaller ports since World War II on the development and promotion of modern facilities and harbor improvements, while New York marked time.

The toal lack, until recently, of any concerted effort on the part of local government or the maritime community to sell the port of New York or attract new business.

The so-called rail differential, which many authorities consider the most important single factor in New York's shipping decline, was set by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1877. It was designed to give southern ports a fair shake in competing against New York and Boston at a time when seaborne cargo rates were lower from the two northern ports.

FINALLY MAKE EFFORT TO ADJUST RATES

In 1935, ocean rates from all eastern seaboard ports were equalized by general agreement among the steamship companies, but nothing was ever done to even the rail rates.

As a result, a Midwest shipper can save an average of 2 cents per 100 pounds by sending his goods through the port of Philadelphia and at least an additional 1 cent per 100 pounds by routing them through Baltimore, Norfolk, and other southern ports. In the case of New Orleans, the saving is frequently as high as 6 cents.

Within the past few years determined action has been taken by eastern railroads, the Port of New York Authority, the city administration, and local maritime groups to have the inequitable rail rates readjusted. "But," as one port observer commented, "the effort should have been made years ago."

The same thing could be said in regard to regulation of New York's gangster-dominated, goon-controlled longshore industry, the putting into effect of a hard-hitting port promotion program, and the modernization of the city's cargo-handling facilities.

Ten years ago the Port of New York Authority, the nonpolitical bistate port development agency Al Smith helped to create, offered to take over and rehabilitate New York's one-hundred-and-sixty-odd municipally owned piers.

CITY NIXED OFFER AND DID NOTHING

The proposal was turned down by the city because, as Marine and Aviation Department Commissioner Vincent A. G. O'Connor puts it, "It was felt that New York could do the job more profitably."

"The only hitch," O'Connor hastens to acknowledge, "is that the city failed to do anything."

This isn't quite true, because in the intervening decade, while the port authority was building 14 modern terminals in Newark and Hoboken, the city did get around to replacing a North River pier (No. 57) which had burned down.

But only in the last 3 years has a city administration managed to shift out of neutral into what could become a high-gear, municipal-port-reconstruction program.

SAYS CITY NOW PAYS FOR ITS PAST SINS

"New York," remarked a veteran steamship official, "is belatedly paying the price for its past sins.

"For years nearly everyone in and out of the local shipping industry just took the port for granted. There was a general feeling of indifference about its welfare and a smug assurance that its position was unassailable.

"Groups most vitally dependent for their existence on the port's foreign trade had developed an attitude of mutual distrust combined with selfish opportunism and shortsighted expediency.

"Now a lot of smaller seaports are teaching the giant a lesson."

"Gulliver," added another official, "could have brushed off the Lilliputians like flies if he hadn't fallen asleep. By the time he woke up the pygmies had him pretty well pinned."

Business, Labor Versus Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we hear a tremendous din from reactionaries who dislike labor and who believe that labor never should enter the political arena.

From time to time amidst these false charges raised by the opponents of labor comes a gleam of truth. Such a gleam of truth appeared in a fine article written by Mr. John Herling a distinguished columnist appearing in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, July 31, 1958. That article set forth the real fear of the reactionaries over labor's political activities. They just don't like labor acting at the ballot box to protect gains made at the collective bargaining table.

The article follows:

BUSINESS, LABOR VERSUS POLITICS

(By John Herling)

From here on out, you are going to see, hear, and feel more business and labor in politics than you bargained for. Organized business has clearly sounded the alarm that now is the time for all good organization men to come to the aid of their corporations.

The defeat last Saturday of William M. Blakely, Texas multimillionaire, supported by oil, utility, and real estate interests, by RALPH YARBOROUGH, the incumbent Democratic Senator, has proved a bitter pill for the business-in-politics boys. Senator YARBOROUGH, considered a liberal by Texas standards and unabashed advocate of liberal economic policies, had the support of plain folks and organized labor.

Mr. Blakely made no bones about whom he represented. He is as class conscious as they come. His record as an interim Senator for 3 months revealed him to be quite uninhibited in his espousal of business interests. Labor spokesmen charged he was politically incapable of distinguishing between private enterprise and the public good.

Actually, leading American business is suffering from a split personality. Through spokesmen like Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, floods of words of warning have poured out over the airwaves and the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Fists are shaken at organized labor for its activity in political education. Business prophets predict that from labor in politics will come the worst national diseases. They are apt to talk of the power of labor bosses—especially when they fail to win the support of organized labor.

Over the past 10 years, American labor has developed a deeper belief in the importance of political education for the obvious reason that the American standard of living is tied up with Government policy. This belief has not been matched always by political competence. The need for political action goes back to the founding of the A. F. of L.—when it was plain that policies were then frequently made by legislators and politicians reflecting big industry. Congressmen and Senators came out of the legal and financial stables of these huge enterprises. For labor, political action became a matter of self-defense.

This week, General Electric has issued the latest of its directives to its executives: Get into politics—from the local level up. Question: If General Electric pushes into politics, with all its billions, its huge network of plants and banking interests, how can it object with a straight face to organized labor's activity in the field?

The facts are clear: Business has always been in politics. American labor—except in a few exceptional cases—has never yet had the same effectiveness in the political arena. What business fears is that organized labor will become more effective as the union members begin to understand how profoundly political participation affects their interests. Right now, labor's political power is exaggerated, but its political potential has business scared.

Medical Mission Sponsored by Baptist World Alliance, Headed by Dr. Robert A. Hingson, of Western Reserve University, Take Dramatic Story of Jet Inoculation to Peoples Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year I inserted a medical report on jet inoculation as a public health tool in the control of contagion and epidemics. At that time I told also of the

highly successful mass polio and influenza inoculation programs carried out last year by the post office employees of the greater Cleveland area in cooperation with Western Reserve University School of Medicine.

An important and exciting medical mission is now taking the story of jet inoculation and other modern methods and drugs to peoples around the world. Sponsored by the Baptist World Alliance and headed by Dr. Robert A. Hingson, of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, the mission left San Francisco in June. Accompanying the group as its only reporter is Mrs. Josephine Robertson, veteran medical reporter for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, whose colorful stories are being serialized in their columns.

Other members of the team are: Dr. and Mrs. John C. P. Cleland, surgeon and obstetrician from Oregon; Dr. and Mrs. Gobe A. Payne, pediatrician from Hopkinsville, Ky.; Dr. and Mrs. Eugene H. Dibble, director, John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital, Tuskegee, Ala.; Mr. Edward C. Dixon, documentary photographer for mission, Cleveland; and Mr. John C. Lawson, sales manager, Z. & W. Manufacturing Corp., Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, believing that my colleagues would like to know something of the adventures of the mission as it travels from country to country, I, under unanimous consent, include with my remarks an editorial and news item from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 24 together with the first report of Mrs. Robertson. Subsequently it is my hope to insert the entire series of articles:

PLAIN DEALER WRITER GOES ON WORLD MEDICAL TOUR

The Plain Dealer has assigned Josephine Robertson, its medical reporter for the last 20 years, to accompany the volunteer medical mission sponsored by the Baptist World Alliance in its coming around-the-world flight and report its progress through Asia and Africa.

This mission is the first of its kind and is expected to set a pattern for mutual medical aid through the world. It is a person-to-person movement that seeks to make medicine more effective and reach out to more and more of the earth's people.

It may become an important historical event in the direction of international friendship and world peace. Many such teams are expected to follow its precedent.

The mission will not be concerned with religious, racial, or political differences, but only with whether a human being is sick and needs help. It will include Negro as well as white members and will represent various Christian denominations.

It is an attempt to break through differences, to meet world neighbors in friendship and work with them in this humanitarian field of agreement—namely, healing.

Mrs. Robertson will be the only medical writer on the mission team. She will air-mail accounts of its work from many places, beginning with Honolulu.

Its itinerary continues thus: Tokyo, Seoul, Hong Kong, Manila, Iloilo, Rangoon, Moulmein, Gahauti, Calcutta, Delhi, Teheran, Rome, Zurich, Brussels, Athens, Beirut, Jerusalem, Cairo, Khartoum, Nairobi, Johannesburg, Durban, Leopoldville, Brazzaville, Lambarene, Lagos, Kano, Barcelona, Madrid, Lisbon, New York.

The mission leaves San Francisco Tuesday.

John S. Mills, president of Western Reserve University, hailed the round-the-world flight on behalf of medicine as being "in the best tradition of American world responsibility."

"We are proud that Dr. Robert A. Hingson, director of anesthesia at Western Reserve University's medical school, is a member of the mission," Dr. Mills said.

"The Cleveland Plain Dealer has a long history of reporting faithfully and accurately developments in medical care to the community.

"It is to be congratulated for extending its interest and concern to the world community by sending its medical writer, Josephine Robertson, with the mission.

"We live in a time which demands tangible manifestation of the fact that all men are brothers. This world medical mission is a true expression of the desire of private citizens of the United States to share the benefits of advanced medical care with their fellow men."

MEDICAL MISSION TEAM BRIEFED 5 HOURS PRIOR TO HOPOFF

(By Josephine Robertson)

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 23.—After a 5-hour briefing at the Mark Hopkins Hotel our around-the-world medical mission team is armed with admonitions for its unique humanitarian adventure.

We are scheduled to set forth upon it by plane to Honolulu, leaving on the last minute of tomorrow.

The admonitions concerned health hazards and conduct. Dr. Robert A. Hingson reminded us that the mission involved danger to all. The Western Reserve University professor is head of the mission.

READS LONG LETTER

"We will go into the slums and jungles," he said. "We will get our hands dirty. Some of us may not get back. Some of us may get sick and have to be left behind. Our job is to go on, once we have put our hand to the plow. If any of you think your decision was unwise, now is the time to withdraw."

No one spoke up.

A long letter from Dr. Robert S. Denny, associate secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, Washington, was given to each missioner. The alliance is sponsoring the mission. Dr. Gabe A. Payne, pediatrician and team member from Hopkinsville, Ky., read the letter aloud.

"Expect a certain percentage of things to go wrong," he read. "Things go wrong when traveling in the United States. When they go wrong, smile and say: 'That's the way the ball bounces.' * * *

"Wait to complain. Wait to criticize. Wait to condemn. Hurry to praise. * * * On duty and off, if you ever get off, which I doubt, avoid every appearance of evil. * * * The places you go, the things you do, the things you say.

"In some mission areas smoking is taboo. Then refrain. I would strongly suggest that you refrain from drinking any alcoholic beverages."

URGES CHECK OF CUSTOMS

"You ladies will want to check the local customs on makeup and whether to wear hats and dresses with sleeves. * * * You will go to some places where you take off your shoes to enter. Don't make fun of this. To these people this is holy ground. Other people will have strong convictions about smoking, drinking, maybe dancing. Check the local ground rules and conduct yourselves accordingly. * * *

"What has religious connotation to one people may not to another. Even though you may differ with it, respect it. * * * Remember we believe in every man's inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Dr. Denny defined the purpose of the team in this sentence: "You are looking for the needy areas of the world, and you will seek to bring the resources of the world to meet these needs, both while you are there and when you come home."

His letter concluded with a statement that the team would get more from the trip than the people served, since Christianity when given away left more than before for the giver.

WRAP-UP FOR DR. CLELAND

Dr. John Cleland, surgeon, obstetrician and team member from Oregon City, Oreg., said that his part in the mission represented the culmination of his life and destiny, and that it was in that spirit that he hoped to cooperate with the other members.

There is an increasing ground swell of support for the mission through contributions of medical supplies, and funds for their delivery to the appropriate places for the team's use. Gifts have passed the $300,000 mark. After the team's departure, supplies may still be contributed through Dr. Denny's office at the Baptist World Alliance headquarters in Washington.

The briefing was held in a suite furnished by Edward C. Dixon, a documentary photographer for the mission and president of Continental Hospital Industries, Inc., of Cleveland.

PLAIN DEALER WRITER TO BE ENVOY OF PRESIDENT—MRS. ROBERTSON TO REPRESENT IKE GROUP

A letter on the way to Tokyo will appoint Josephine Robertson, Plain Dealer medical reporter, good-will ambassador for President Eisenhower's People-to-People Committee.

Mrs. Robertson left Cleveland last week on an around-the-world medical mission to Asia and Africa. Mrs. Robertson is the only medical writer on the mission team.

The letter from the Committee will reach Mrs. Robertson in Tokyo next week. Mrs. C. R. Henderlider, director of volunteers at Euclid-Glenville Hospital and a member of the President's Committee, said yesterday.

"It will serve as an introduction to everybody in the areas where Mrs. Robertson is visiting," she added. "This mission is the kind of thing we of the People-to-People Committee have dreamed of—people of the profession becoming acquainted with people of the same profession in other countries."

The only Clevelander to serve on the President's Employ-the-Physically-Handicapped Committee, Mr. Henderlider has traveled around the world and is convinced that exchange of information on a global basis engenders friendships among the peoples of the world.

"This is a perfect deal," she said, speaking of the medical mission project preparing to launch it globe-girdling journey today from San Francisco.

The President's Committee functions under the aegis of the State and Labor Departments. Its 150 members represent every section of the United States.

EXCITING MEDICAL MISSION

Today an exciting medical mission will start from San Francisco on an around-the-world tour, and Cleveland will have a special interest in its work.

It will be headed by Dr. Robert A. Hingson of this city and will include several other Clevelanders. The Plain Dealer is proud that its medical reporter, Mrs. Josephine Robertson, will accompany the mission, the only newspaper representative on its roster.

The mission, sponsored by the Baptist World Alliance, but with adherents of numerous faiths among its team, will show physicians and civilians in many foreign lands how American medicine does its work. New vaccines, equipment and procedures will be used; medicines and apparatus will be donated where they will do the most good.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This is American private initiative at its best. The good that may result from it in saving lives and developing new patterns of medical education in faraway places will eddy on, long after the tour is complete. It is hoped that other teams later will follow.

This work reminds us of words recently spoken by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., before the Manufacturing Chemists Association: "Let us remember that in the long stretch of history, disease has ranked with hunger as man's worst enemy. War, so far, has run a poor third."

Connor then quoted Thomas A. Dooley, the young Navy doctor who in 1954 helped poor people of Vietnam fleeing the Communists. Dr. Dooley, who recently visited Cleveland, wrote:

"We had witnessed the power of medical aid to reach the hearts and souls of a nation. We had seen it translate the brotherhood of man into a reality plain people could understand.

"It made me proud to be an American doctor. But it also left me baffled. For why did our foreign aid planners, with their billion-dollar projects, ignore the enormous possibilities of medical aid? Since those possibilities were Christlike in power and simplicity, I could not understand it."

Connor, in the bulk of his speech, outlined Russian medicine and noted: "Should the Soviet Union continue its present rate of progress for another 5 years and then start exporting trained medical teams to sell communism as the only way to fight disease, it will surely be treading on our tails as we search for friends among the underdeveloped people of the world."

An added beauty of the medical tour starting out from San Francisco tonight is that it has no political strings attached, no commitments to sell an ism. Its purpose is to help and to instruct. May God be with it, for it is Christlike in power and simplicity.

Community Facilities Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adopt the rule making the Community Facilities Act of 1958 in order, I was not recorded as voting for or against the rule but with a general pair.

It is my desire to make plain the reason for such action on my part. I am in favor of the general purpose or objective of legislation to assist needy municipalities in obtaining necessary facilities such as water, sewerage, and other public works. In many instances it has been shown that such could not be obtained, particularly by small municipalities, without the payment of an exorbitant rate of interest and, in some cases, the necessary loans to finance such were not procurable at any price. I would gladly vote for such legislation in a reasonable amount and with reasonable limitations. However, the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and, which this rule would bring up for consideration (S. 3497), is so unreasonable in many particulars that I deem it wise to require the committee to give further consideration to the subject and report a more realistic bill.

The best evidence that the bill was not what it should have been can be drawn from the fact that the chairman of the committee addressed the House and announced that he would offer several amendments for the purpose of removing certain objectionable features. Of course, it was plain that this offer upon his part was with the evident intention of trying to get the rule for consideration of the bill adopted. This was a very unusual procedure and there was no certainty that the amendments he would offer would be adopted. If not, then we would still have an unsatisfactory bill.

It seemed to me that the proper course for me to pursue under the circumstances, being in favor of legislation on the subject, but not in favor of the particular bill as offered, was to refrain from voting on the committee bill as offered, and await further action by the committee. It is my hope that the committee will recognize not only the necessity for some legislation, but, that it must be reasonable in character as to the type of the facilities and terms upon which loans may be made, and the overall amount to be appropriated. A bill that would meet these requirements would be entitled to more favorable consideration than was accorded the bill presently reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, which the proposed rule would bring before us for consideration.

Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch supporter of bipartisanship in the conduct of our foreign relations, I was particularly impressed by an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Friday, July 25.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial:

EISENHOWER-TRUMAN-HOOVER

There is great merit in the proposal of Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND that President Eisenhower call into consultation our two living ex-Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman.

The United States, heading for another summit conference, desperately needs a clear and firm policy. We need national unity in support of whatever course is taken.

Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman, having carried the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency, are uniquely fitted to understand its trials. Mr. Truman, our last Democratic President, has upheld Mr. Eisenhower's action in Lebanon with patriotic disregard for partisan politics.

Conferences among these three men would, in our opinion, increase the assurance of the country that what is being done must be done—that every resource is being used to assure that we act wisely.

The President has stated that American military intervention in Lebanon may have serious consequences, which is a diplomatic way of saying it may lead to war. Another consequence might be appeasement which eventually, also, leads to war.

This is a situation demanding extraordinary action. Though no one can share the President's final responsibility, his predecessors should be able to help him.

And he needs help because—

THE UNITED STATES IS ON THE HOOK

The United States Government is going along with the Soviet demand for another summit conference not because it wants to, but because it has no choice.

Khrushchev has President Eisenhower on a propaganda hook, and he can't get off for the moment. All of the President's logical and patient explanations to our allies that a summit meeting will do more harm than good—like the Geneva summit conference—unless there are preparatory agreements proving Khrushchev's good faith, are ignored.

The President can stand out against Khrushchev but he can't stop the stampede of our allies. Prime Minister Macmillan has been forced to bow to summit demands of his British Labor Party critics. The nationalistic Canadian Government insists on such a conference almost at any price.

So we have been maneuvered again into an exceedingly dangerous position, where the President will be the butt of Khrushchev's poisonous slanders as the guilty aggressor charges the innocent with his crimes.

There is only one saving aspect, so far as we can see. This is the President's insistence that the summit meeting be held within the framework of the United Nations. This is an important move to salvage what little power and prestige the U. N. has left after long sabotage by Russia and others.

But even this U. N. gain is not yet assured. Though Khrushchev, Nasser, Nehru and company have accepted the summit-U. N. link nominally, there are already signs they will try to evade it in fact. This requires close watching.

Rafer Johnson Sets New World's Record for the Decathlon Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a splendid young Negro athlete from California has again demonstrated to the Soviet Union and other critics of our country that we produce the best, under a system of incentives and freedom which they would label inefficient and decadent.

The athlete I refer to is Rafer Lewis Johnson, a resident of Kingsburg, Calif. In recent games in Russia Rafer bested all competition in the decathlon event and in doing so established a new world's record for the event and reinvested the United States with leadership in a field which was earlier brought to a high point of United States leadership by Bob Mathias, of Tulare, Calif.

Rafer is to be congratulated on the fact that his accomplishments are not confined to the athletic field. He is a student leader at UCLA academically and otherwise.

I now make reference to a story which appeared in the July 29, 1958 edition of the New York Times which is a tribute to our greatest athlete:

At 3:30 p. m. yesterday in Kingsburg, Calif., Mrs. Lewis Johnson, a short, hefty woman known to all as "Dimples," was briskly ironing a basketful of clothes and listening to music on the radio, when the announcer cut in and said:

"We interrupt this broadcast to bring you an important bulletin from Moscow. Rafer Johnson, star athlete from UCLA, set a new world's record for the decathlon.

Mrs. Johnson smiled; she was happy, but not terribly surprised. Nor was anyone else in Kingsburg taken by surprise. In that central California town, population 2,310 citizens, Rafer Lewis Johnson, 22, is regarded as a kind of Ulysses.

SNAKES AND SPIDERS

For the last 5 years the local sports writers have been trumpeting Johnson's athletic glory; so much has been written, been said, and been repeated that nowadays his claquers merely retain an assured calm when Johnson does it again.

Johnson's father, Lewis, a 6-foot 5-inch former railroad worker, said, "Ray (as he's called by close associates) sure is a nice boy. He was always a playful child; always wore a smile. Main thing about him was he liked a litle joking, you know. He liked to buy those little rubber snakes, and spiders, and set them down at the breakfast table. He'd get me upset; he'd get a big kick out of that."

Rafer Johnson was born in Dallas, Tex., the second of six children (the first born, a girl, died) to Lewis and Elmer Johnson (Elmer's father wanted a boy, and gave his daughter a boy's name). Later she gained the nickname "Dimples."

BOY WHO BROKE BATS

Rafer shifted with his parents from city to city as a boy, and switched schools with the frequency of a career officer's children. His father was not entirely happy with his jobs, but a decade ago, when they moved to Kingsburg, they finally settled down.

"I recall Rafer as a grade school kid," said Benton Bowen, sports editor of the Kingsburg Recorder. He was a fine sandlot baseball player, but we remembered him as a kid who broke bats. He hit the ball so hard that he was forever breaking bats."

His sterling achievements as a high school athlete established him as a celebrity in central California, and when he went to the University of California at Los Angeles he was a marked man.

Through all his success, Rafer Johnson has maintained a quiet, modest disposition. He is supposed to have never had a street fight as a child, and when asked by Bowen last month how he liked Russia's Vasily Kuznetsov, the man he beat yesterday, Johnson replied, "He's a nice fellow. All the athletes I've ever met have been nice fellows."

Johnson never says anything controversial, has no stern opinions about anything, and is not generally regarded as good copy by track reporters. Yet everybody likes him. And, in school, he is extraordinarily intelligent. He is president of the UCLA student body and maintains a close-to-A average. He wishes to become a dentist, having never had any trouble with dentists in his lifetime.

QUICK TO LEARN

"Johnson picks up things faster and better than most athletes," said Coach Ducky Drake, of UCLA's track team. "You tell him what to do and he can do it immediately. A lot of kids are shy and look away when they're talking to you. Not Rafer. He is literate."

Injuries, mostly knee trouble, have plagued Johnson in his college years. He went to the Olympics in 1956 with an injured knee. Still he finished second in the decathlon to Milt Campbell.

Among the world's shotputters, Johnson now is in a classless society: he is all alone at the top. He is a shotputter who can also run 100 yards in 9.8 seconds; the 220 in 22 seconds; the 120-yard hurdles in 13.8 seconds, and the 220 low hurdles in 22.7.

As a sprinter he has high jumped 6 feet 2½ inches, pole vaulted 12 feet 9½ inches, and broad jumped 25 feet 5¾ inches. He also loves to ski, race boats, and take pictures. But he doesn't like to have his own picture taken.

A Sense of Congress Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the President of the United States is expected to attend a summit meeting with Nikita Khrushchev and other world leaders. At that time one of the principal subjects of discussion will be the Middle East and the very real threat of war in that area.

Certainly the question of Israel's continued existence will be raised.

A first premise of American policy must be that there will be no sell-out of Israel. Israel's right to continue to exist as a free independent sovereign nation with her territorial integrity preserved must be a basic American policy. There must be no compromise on Israel's continued free existence.

Ten years ago the restoration of Israel was supported by the United States and other free world countries. America was among the first to recognize this new sister democracy. This nation, which has given haven and sanctuary to more than 900,000 Jews, reclaimed a desert wasteland, and developed a vigorous economy and free democratic institutions, has earned its right to stay forever free.

Certainly the President must press for a program jointly with Russia in guaranteeing the borders and territorial sovereignty of all nations in the area. A similar guaranty should be made through and by the United Nations.

The conference should include discussion of assistance both by the United States and Russia independently, and through the U. N., in the resettlement of the Arab refugees who are causing grave economic and political disturbance during their period of meager existence privation and suffering in Jordan, the Gaza Strip and elsewhere.

The discussion must include a serious effort to achieve a U. N. police force sufficiently strong in number and in authority to prevent border raids, gun running, and military operations of any sort large or small. Economic assistance should be offered to those nations which will assist in restoring peace to the area.

To assist in this I am introducing a "sense of Congress resolution" in the hope that other Members who feel as I do may express their views on this subject. I hope this will manifest the sense of the Congress and the people of the United States that there should be a real U. N. police force to deal with the tension and strife we see in the Mideast.

Seaway Will Open Five Lakes Full of Rivals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second of three articles by Mr. Eckert Goodman, which appeared in the New York Daily News on July 23, 1958, which deal with the effect of the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway on the port of New York:

SEAWAY WILL OPEN FIVE LAKES FULL OF RIVALS

(By Eckert Goodman)

(Second of three articles)

The St. Lawrence seaway, whose opening next year will touch off incalculable new competition for the already hard-pressed port of New York, has been described as America's fourth coast and a gateway to the world's eighth sea.

It has also been called one of international shipping's biggest bundles of unknown quantities.

A 360-mile-long chain of interlocking lakes, locks, canals, and dredged riverbed between Lake Erie and Montreal, it will provide a continuous 27-foot channel for ocean freighters.

Thus the seaway is a vital link in a 2,400-mile inland waterway leading from the Atlantic Ocean north of Nova Scotia into the heart of America's Midwest, which claims two-fifths of the country's manufacturing and almost half of its farm production.

Disregarding the $650 million St. Lawrence power project, whose three dams now pen up in a 25-mile-long lake what used to be the International Rapids, the seaway is largely an improvement of an existing 14-foot waterway which has been in use on the St. Lawrence for over a half a century.

IT'S BIG ENOUGH FOR MOST FREIGHTERS

But its 27-foot depth and 7 new 800x80-foot locks will enable an estimated three-fourths of the world's ocean-going shipping to reach such inland cities as Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and eventually Milwaukee, and Duluth.

The waterway's joint United States-Canadian tolls committee has estimated that it will attract some 25 million tons of shipping in its first full year of operation and more than 50 million tons annually by 1967.

Half a dozen United States steamship companies, including the Grace, Isbrandtsen, and United States Lines, have announced that they intend to operate on the seaway; and its recent designation by the Maritime Administration as part of essential foreign trade routes to Europe and South America assures them of operating subsidies.

About 80 percent of seaway cargoes are initially expected to consist of bulk commodities like wheat, coal, and iron ore. But there are confident predictions that the proportion of high revenue producing general cargo, which every port on the Great Lakes is hoping to attract, will rise from a base of a million tons a year to nearly 7 million annually within a decade.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

COULD COST US ABOUT 200,000 JOBS

Five years ago, Port of New York Authority analysts estimated that the seaway could divert more than 3,500,000 tons of general cargo a year from New York, an amount which could ultimately result in a loss of 200,000 jobs and a $1 billion payroll.

Since the study was made, the figures have been revised downward, but it is still generally agreed that the seaway will be a constant threat and could have a seriously damaging impact on the port's foreign trade and, hence, the city's whole economy.

The main advantage, claimed for the seaway is, of course, lower shipping costs. At present, the average Midwest shipper has to spend about as much to get his merchandise on a New York pier as it costs him to ship it to Europe. Even with toll charges and the extra distance they'll have to sail, steamship operators are sure they can do a lot better than that—and some of them seem to have more or less proved the point.

INLAND STUDY SHOWS A 20 PERCENT TO 40 PERCENT SAVING

A group of Great Lakes manufacturers recently announced that a careful study, including generous allowance for unknown factors, had convinced them that the seaway would reduce their freight costs to Europe by between 20 percent and 40 percent, depending on the type of commodity.

A Milwaukee manufacturer has reported that he saved $5,000 in transportation charges by shipping a power shovel to France abroad one of the small, specially built foreign freighters which have been plying the St. Lawrence for years. And another claims an economy of $30,000 on the piecemeal movement of a medium-sized cement plant to Spain by the same little ships.

Midwestern seaport enthusiasts also like to point out that, by seaway, Cleveland will be 200 miles closer to Hamburg, Germany, than New York, and Duluth is almost 500 miles nearer Rotterdam by water alone than via New York by rail and water.

AND NOW: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

But even the most ardent seaway devotees are forced to admit that all is not clear sailing ahead, and a good deal remains to be spent and done if the trade route is to measure up to their highest expectations. Here are some of the problems:

1. The seaway will be closed down every year for 4 months, between early December and mid-April, by ice plus winter storms which make inland navigation hazardous.

2. The 27-year-old Welland Canal, which circumvents Niagara Falls and its rapids by lifting and lowering ships 326 feet in 8 locks between Lakes Erie and Ontario, is already jampacked on occasion and could easily become, with its partially one-way passage, a serious bottleneck.

3. The seaway's 27-foot-deep channel—in contrast with New York Harbor's 45 feet and Philadelphia's 37—cannot be safely navigated by ships with more than 25½ feet of draft, and is too shallow to admit more than 5 percent of today's American merchant marine freighters fully loaded.

4. It will cost at least $141 million in Federal expenditures to dredge deeper channels between the Great Lakes and leading into its harbors, and an outlay of some $100 million more by the 57 ports themselves to open the entire 2,400-mile route to sizable ocean commerce.

5. It is still hard to estimate ship operation costs accurately because definite tolls, while suggested, have not yet been set, and use of the present waterway is free.

6. A whole new midwestern maritime industry must be created and trained to insure efficient financing, insuring, forwarding, and handling of foreign general cargo.

BUT SEAWAYERS SAY THEY HAVE ANSWERS

But seaway proponents claim to have answers to most of these problems. During the winter, while the St. Lawrence is closed down, they explain, bulk cargoes can be safely and economically stored; and railroads and trucks can be reutilized, even at their threatened higher rates, to transport general cargo to eastern seaports.

Besides, a method of preventing ice from forming by the release of air bubbles from underwater pipes has proved successful in certain Canadian and Scandinavian harbors, and eventually it may even be feasible to pump relatively warm water from the Great Lakes into the river to keep it from freezing over.

The capacity of the Welland Canal, which supposedly can handle double the 23 million tons of shipping a year it now accommodates, can be doubled again by construction of a new set of parallel locks, when traffic warrants the expense. Meanwhile a schedule can, perhaps, be worked out to prevent traffic jams.

As for the seaway's 27-foot depth, most steamship companies say they can operate their freighters profitably even if they aren't loaded down to their Plimsoll lines, by taking on and discharging portions of their load at Quebec and Montreal, or by carrying cargo which is bulky but relatively light.

THEY'RE ORDERING SHIPS SPECIALLY FOR SEAWAY

In addition, both Grace and United States Lines report that they have on order freighters specially designed for seaway use. This is also the case with several European companies, one of which, Holland's Oranje Line, has announced that it will put two specially built cargo-passenger vessels into service between Chicago and Rotterdam next summer.

Contracts totaling $42 million for dredging and deepening Great Lake channels have already been let by the United States Government, and work is proceeding apace under supervision of the Army Engineers Corps in such farflung areas as the Detroit River and St. Mary's River, which flows out of Lake Superior, 600 feet above sea level.

The Great Lakes' ports themselves have earmarked millions of dollars for waterfront reconstruction and harbor improvements, and are cautiously contemplating the expenditure of millions more. Chicago, for instance, which has embarked on a $37 million port-expansion program, anticipates spending three times that amount within the next 10 years.

Milwaukee is in the midst of building an $11 million pier and general cargo terminal; Duluth has begun construction of a $10 million waterfront installation; and Toledo, with a new $5 million railroad dock near completion, envisions spending $25 million more on port expansion as soon as it has been assured of a 27-foot channel.

It's in the export fields in which New York is now predominant—automobiles, industrial machinery, electrical apparatus, steel products and fresh and frozen meat—that the port is apt to be most sorely challenged by the seaway.

WE NOW HAVE 83 PERCENT OF AUTO EXPORTS

Last year 83 percent of the Nation's automotive exports passed through the Port of New York. While most cars are shipped in knockdown condition for assembly after arrival, some are not; and a Milwaukee businessman pointed out a few weeks ago that from $160 to $200 a car was being saved on vehicles sent unboxed from Great Lakes ports.

Remarked the general manager of Willys Motors recently: "When it costs us $5.50 to get a jeep to the pier in Toledo, as against $53.62 when the port of New York is used, we are talking about a competitive advantage we thus have in the foreign country where the jeep is delivered."

THE GREAT LAKES ARE IN THE BIG LEAGUE

Another ominous note for the future was sounded by President Lewis A. Lapham of the Grace Line, speaking before a group of Wisconsin industrialists.

"The port of Milwaukee," he advised them, "may not immediately rise to such fame as the Braves, but they are both in the big league to stay.

"Ships always follow the cargo * * * and you need have no fear, the house flags of the world's fleets are in the lakes to stay."

Social Security Amendments of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13459) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the approval by the House by an almost unanimous vote of H. R. 13549, the 1958 Social Security Act amendments, is a source of gratification to the Representative from New York. The Ways and Means Committee of the House is to be commended for reporting this timely measure which will have a salutary effect on so many families. The infirm, the disabled and the penurious need sorely the financial assistance this bill will provide, if enacted into law.

It is an established fact that there has been an upward incidence in the cost of living since the benefit increase of 1954. To those people who have little monetary resourcefulness, any rise in the cost of living has painful results. The sorrowful letters received from many of my constituents bear testimony to this fact.

Many felt that the $3 minimum increase should have been double that amount. But the Ways and Means Committee used good commonsense by doing all it could do, while at the same time keeping the social-security fund in balance. The bill provides a method of increasing the tax revenue necessary to strengthen and maintain actuarially this valuable program. The 7 percent increase may not be acceptable to all who favored an upward revision, but it is equitable and desirable in the light of all the circumstances.

Today our system of social security is an integral and accepted phase of our life. Millions of citizens know that when they reach a certain period they will not have to depend on charity for sustenance, but will enjoy the benefits of a trust fund to which they, their employers and their Government have contributed.

Even as the situation now is, there is room for improvement. The payments, generous though they are, remain inadequate for the costly demands of everyday life. A study will have to be made as soon as possible to ascertain what

can be done to provide more adequate payments while at the same time keeping the system in balance with adequate contributions from future beneficiaries.

It is my belief that the above-mentioned measure constitutes a most timely and beneficial piece of legislation. It concerns millions of Americans; it affects the very mainstays of our system of economy.

The Age of the Goof-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it takes an experienced man to write the truths of life as enumerated in the sparkling editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 27, 1958. It is plumb full of good sense and spells out everything the public has been thinking about. Everybody wants to be identified with a title, a high-sounding one that would awe the common mortal and please the family, especially the frau.

Which reminds me that a certain friend of mine was given a sumptuous banquet attended by over 300 guests—he was being honored for having attained the high honor and trust reposed in him by the governor of the State—in appointing him a notary public—the issuance of said certificate, at that time, to any citizen over 21 years of age and filing of a petition signed by 50 citizens with 2 sponsors. Of course, many of the guests being of foreign birth and new arrivals conceived the idea that the professional status of the title "Notary Public" in their homeland was the same namely as special avocate. Speaker after speaker, in his foreign tongue, eulogized the guest of honor for his literary and legal attainments. I beg to state that the recipient of these superlative praises, had in his early youth manicured the floors of a kindergarten with a mop—what an education.

The bank official family are no exception with their junior classification of vice presidents. And the political bodies, with their chief engineer, chief assistant engineer, assistant engineer, and second assistant engineer; and then the chief, deputy chief, executive secretary to the chief, and in the administrative offices as the secretary to the executive assistant, secretary to the administrative assistant, and so it goes on. So let us enjoy the pleasing chuckles of the succinct editorial, the Age of the Goof-Off:

THE AGE OF THE GOOF-OFF

"I am skeptical," the man said, "about this thing we are in * * * this thing that is about to "saucer out" or "bottom out"—this recession or depression or whatever.

"Because look. There never was a depression before when prices continued to climb. There never was a depression before when people had money, but wouldn't take it out of the bank. I think the economists are wrong, because this is not an economic thing. I think people are just bored with us—with you and me—with the things we sell, the way we sell them. And it's better to have a prospect furious with you, than to have him bored.

"But mediocrity of salesmanship is only a part of our national pattern. For this, in America, is the great era of the goof-off, the age of the half-done job. The land from coast to coast is populated with laundrymen who won't iron shirts, with waiters who won't serve, with carpenters who will come around someday maybe, with executives whose mind is on the golf course, with teachers who demand a single salary schedule so that achievement cannot be rewarded, nor poor work punished, with students who take cinch courses because the hard ones make them think, with spiritual delinquents of all kinds who have been triumphantly determined to enjoy what was known until the present crisis as "the new leisure." And the salesman who won't sell is only a part of this overall mess.

"I think—and I hope to God it is true, that our people are becoming sick of this goofing off. Maybe we are gradually beginning to realize that history is repeating itself. The Russians are doing a wonderful job as the barbarians in our modern historical drama. But we are outdoing them in our superlative imitation of Rome. We may lack a few of the refinements of Rome's final decadence, but we do have the 2-hour lunch, the 3-day week, and the all-day coffee break. And, if you want to, you can buy for $275, a jewelled pill box with a built-in musical alarm that reminds you (but not too harshly) that it's time to take your tranquilizer."

Sounds like somebody who hates salesmen, doesn't it? But it isn't. The foregoing Dutch rub to salesmen was administered to the national sales convention here by a fellow who loves salesmen. He's one himself; Charlie Brower, president of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, the advertising firm that is to salesmanship what Dinah Shore is to showmanship. Mr. Brower's words are applicable, it seems to us, to ourselves and we suspect they might be read with profit by others in Washington, too. He has a solution—not new, but still good; and also an alternative:

"What you and I have to do; patiently, and day by day, is to teach those over whom we are given supervision, that work can be fun—that the only real reward that life offers is the thrill of achievement.

"We have got to work, or a stronger nation will put us to work."

Amen, Charlie.

Omnibus Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus labor bill passed some time ago by the Senate has now been referred to the House Education and Labor Committee which, I understand, may undertake hearings next week. This bill contains a number of provisions which, I know, the House committee will want to study carefully. Some of these questions are referred to in an editorial which appeared in the July 27 edition of the Sunday Times Signal, of Zanesville, Ohio. They are worthy of careful consideration. The editorial is as follows:

OMNI-BUST

The Kennedy-Ives omnibus labor-reform bill contains so many sleepers that it is a poor substitute for the bill Americans had the right to expect.

This pseudo-reform bill ties the hands of employer and deprives their employees of a bona fide free choice.

For example:

It would be a crime for an employer, at a company dinner, to express his appreciation to employees for the fact that they are still able to deal with each other.

It would be a crime for an employer if he loans money to an employee or gives a wage increase or any other benefits during or before an organizing drive.

It would, by making it a crime for an employer to directly or indirectly influence an employee's thinking, actually deprive the employees of their right to free choice to organize if they wish.

The bill, basically, means that the employer would have to remain silent. He would not know what or when to report to his employees.

Good employer-employee relations are based largely on communications. If this right is abridged it can only breed misunderstanding, distrust, and suspicion.

We do not believe that Americans want this kind of a labor bill. It will reform nothing; rather, it will place an even heavier burden on the men who make the jobs.

The Case for a Standing U. N. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week the other body passed a sense of Congress resolution urging the United Nations to create a permanent U. N. police force. A motion to reconsider the action taken on this proposal was defeated yesterday in the other body by a vote of 66 to 14.

Contemporaneously, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, chaired by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] held fruitful hearings on this vital question, and I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken by the committee—and the House—before Congress adjourns.

An excellent statement of the case for a standing U. N. police force was presented in the New York Times magazine last Sunday by Sir Leslie Munro, ambassador from New Zealand to the United States, and that country's permanent representative to the U. N.

Ambassador Munro's provocative article follows:

THE CASE FOR A STANDING U. N. ARMY

(By Sir Leslie Munro)

During these critical days in the Middle East, all thoughtful men and women reflect, in an unhappily divided world, on the ways in which peace may be preserved. I believe that they are ready to take out an insurance policy to avert a cataclysm. I further believe that the insurance policy is a permanent United Nations force.

Reflect on this: On July 15 the United States landed a force of marines in Lebanon for these purposes as expressed by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

President Eisenhower—"to protect American lives * * * and by their presence to assist the Government of Lebanon to preserve its territorial integrity and political independence." The President went on to say that he hoped "the United Nations would itself take measures which would be adequate to preserve the independence of Lebanon and permit of the early withdrawal of the United States forces."

In other words, Mr. Eisenhower asked for a United Nations force to replace the American marines now in Lebanon. Moreover, the United Kingdom landed forces in Jordan which it is ready to withdraw as soon as the Security Council is in a position to insure the protection of the political independence and territorial integrity of Jordan. Surely these developments raise once again the question whether there should be a permanent United Nations Emergency Force in being.

I think, first, that it is a matter of urgency for the General Assembly to have at its disposal a permanent corps of observers, ready at our headquarters in New York to go to any part of a disturbed world at the request of a government threatened with aggression or subject to subversion. Secondly, I believe that the Assembly should consider the establishment of a force which would be immediately available on its authority, or on the authority of the Security Council and at the request of a sovereign government whose territories are in jeopardy.

This force would be under the immediate direction of the Secretary-General, subject to the overall authority of the Assembly (if the Assembly created the force) or of the Security Council (in the unlikely event that the force was the creation of the Council, where the Soviet Union would probably veto its formation). I do not suggest that the international force be stationed in one place. Member states should agree to provide contingents immediately available for stationing in areas where tension has arisen.

How large should such a force be? The United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt is close to 6,000 mean. The marines and other forces in Lebanon number 9,400 at the time of writing. There may be other areas requiring in the future a force of a size similar to those now in Egypt and Lebanon. I would think that at a minimum the nucleus of a permanent force would be 20,000.

Until such a force were called on, its cost would be borne by the various member states holding contingents available. When called into use, then the United Nations would have to discharge considerable costs, which in the case of the UNEF amount to approximately $20 million a year.

I doubt that the force could be made up of troop contributions from the great powers. The differences among the great powers are, unfortunately, too serious to allow them to contribute except indirectly—perhaps by way of supply. I would hope that the small powers, which have played so great a part in the pacification of the Gaza strip, could now decide, through the Assembly, to make components available for a permanent force to be effective in any part of the world disturbed by a crisis.

The purpose of such a force would be to stand as a symbol of the United Nations and to act as a deterrent. It would assure the inviolability of frontiers; there are few aggressors who will flout public opinion in an area where an effective U. N. force is either functioning or is about to function.

One concept of this force was set forth in that valuable book, Strengthening the United Nations, a report of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace: "If UNEF were to be made permanent, and continued to enjoy the power of world moral opinion, it might become a deterrent to local hostilities or to the spread of such conflicts into global catastrophes. It should remain lightly armed, and would in no case be a combat force. It could not be used to fight a war to stop a war, but it would have certain peace-preserving functions.

"A permanent force of this kind could be used for observation, patrol and guard duty in troubled areas. It could patrol ceasefires, armistice demarcation lines and demilitarized zones, maintaining a separation of the parties and preventing breaches of the truce."

Lester Pearson of Canada, who played such a prominent part in the creation of the U. N. E. F., has made the following suggestion in respect to a peace supervision force: "By its very nature such a force would not be expected to fight its way into a country. Indeed, since it would be deployed upon recommendation of the United Nations, it could enter a country only with the consent of the government of that country. This consent would normally take the form of an agreement between the government concerned and the Secretary-General, acting on behalf of the United Nations.

In a case of direct aggression, especially if it were one of magnitude, probably in the first instance forces of the great powers would be immediately involved and it would be only later that the permanent international force would be used.

But the democracies have been much more successful in repelling direct aggression than they have in resisting subversion. The situations which can arise in respect of indirect aggression are numerous and cannot be defined in advance. In fact, the very definition of aggression has proved one of greatest difficulty and controversy.

A government may have been subverted and overthrown with startling rapidity. The question may then arise and be fiercely disputed as to whether what happened is a matter of purely domestic politics. I could imagine the Assembly being reluctant to call the emergency force into use in a matter where there was a question whether it was domestic in character and where the Assembly would have to weigh the international consequences of an intervention which might lead to a third world war.

In the case of Lebanon, had a permanent force been in being, and had its use been requested by the Lebanese Government, then I think the Council or the Assembly, as the case may be, would have made the force available. This seems to me an inevitable conclusion, since the Council did prove ready to send an observer corps to Lebanon.

The question of a U. N. force is as old as the U. N. itself. In the words of the charter, the Security Council may "take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." But because of the opposition of the Soviet Union and its power of veto in the Council, that body has been unable to create an international force disposable at its direction.

As long ago as 1947, the Assembly of the U. N. considered the question of keeping order in Jerusalem. My predecessor as New Zealand Ambassador, Sir Carl Berendsen, said most forcefully, then and later, that whether the Assembly decided to create a trusteeship of Jerusalem or open a special temporary regime in the Holy City, the Assembly would require means of enforcement of law and order, just as the enforcement of law and order is an essential requirement in every city of the world, however calm, however peaceful. Apparently and unfortunately, Sir Carl was in advance of his time in suggesting an international force to preserve the peace in and around Jerusalem. But in the light of subsequent events in that area, who can doubt that he was right?

It is true that, following an aggression by North Korean troops in 1950, the Security Council did condemn this attack, and forces under the leadership of the United States and consisting of men from 16 nations successfully repelled the aggression. These forces formed a great fighting unit, but they were not representative of the United Nations as a whole although they truly represented its ideals and purposes. Their cost, which was great, was not paid by the United Nations. Their Commander in Chief was not subject to U. N. direction.

Then came the Suez crisis of 1956. The force created subsequent to the intervention of the Anglo-French troops in Egypt and now famous as UNEF, was not one provided by the permanent members of the Security Council. It came from the smaller powers, as I believe a new permanent force would have to come.

The work that UNEF has done and continues to do is of far-reaching importance. Through its supervision as a police force—not a fighting force—it has preserved peace in two most contentious areas of the Middle East—in the Gaza Strip and the area of Sharm el Sheikh. Fortunately UNEF still remains in these areas.

Several difficulties arise in respect to supervisory forces like UNEF which are created by the Assembly and not by the Security Council. In the first place, the normal presumption appears to be that they can remain in the country where they are established only so long as the government of that country thinks fit. One can respect this presumption because a sovereign state is entitled at will to have its territories free of all foreign troops. But in the modern world and in situations such as that of Suez, it seems that we may have to revise our notions of sovereignty. Certainly it was the view of my government in 1957 that the departure of UNEF from Egyptian territory should be a matter for the Assembly to decide—by a two-thirds majority—not Egypt or any other country.

A second difficulty is the cost of forces like UNEF, which is very considerable. But considerable as it is—the yearly cost of UNEF is roughly half the annual budget of the United Nations—this cost is a trifling insurance premium against the risk of war. It was not without some trouble that the Assembly last year passed a resolution, opposed by the Communist bloc, whereby the expenses of UNEF are to be borne by the members of the United Nations in accordance with the scales of assessments adopted by the General Assembly for the financial years 1957 and 1958. The passing of this resolution insured that the maintenance of UNEF should be a collective responsibility, resting on the full membership of the United Nations.

This is the principle of financial responsibility which I would advocate if a permanent United Nations force were to be established by the Assembly. The reluctance of many nations to meet the bill for a permanent international force is, I am afraid, one of the greatest difficulties in the way of its establishment.

Even if a permanent international force were established, there would be critics who would say that the United Nations would not act with sufficient speed to use it. There is, of course, much substance to this criticism. Prime Minister Macmillan, in the House of Commons, said that his Government in sending troops to Jordan could not wait for the United Nations, which in any case had no available force. On the other hand, under the impact of urgency and crisis, the United Nations did act with great energy and speed in the Suez situation.

For all the criticisms and all the difficulties, I still think that the attempt to create a permanent international force and a permanent team of observers must be made. I respect the view of those who say that the U. N. should proceed on an ad hoc basis, dealing with each crisis as it arises and calling for contributions to an international force as it is require. But have not the crises in Lebanon and Jordan shown this attitude to be unsound?

Perhaps when this article is published a special Assembly will be in session. Such a session can deal only with the matters for which it is summoned. Thus, the special Assembly could not set up a permanent force. But the regular Assembly, which will meet in September, will have before it from the Secretary General a study of the experience derived from the establishment and operation of U. N. E. F. This study could serve as a basis for Assembly action.

The next regular Assembly faces an immense responsibility, in which leadership will be expected from the great powers on the establishment of a permanent force on something like the lines I have proposed. The need is great. The time may be short.

Another First for Private Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, an example of what private business can and will do under proper public utility commission regulation came to light in a very dramatic manner last week. It was the announcement that Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which operates under California Public Utilities Commission regulation, plans to produce electric power from the natural steam of geysers located in Sonoma County in the First Congressional District of California.

It is another first for Pacific Gas & Electric Co. This will be the world's first all privately financed geothermal plant. Other outstanding firsts for this same publicly regulated company include the all privately financed nuclear electric powerplant at Vallecitos and the plan for a 60,000-kilowatt nuclear plant to be placed in operation near Eureka, Calif.

Of course, these facts do not please the Federal or nothing advocates. They believe such progress can be made only by Government-owned plants. They are the same group that oppose partnership development of the Trinity River project. They say the only way the public can be protected is for the Government to do the job, but actual experience in California proves this to be untrue.

A full account of this important new development of private power was printed in many of the newspapers of California, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include one of these news stories from the Santa Rosa Press-Democrat of July 23, 1958:

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. TO BUILD STEAM POWER PLANT AT GEYSERS

THE BIG GEYSERS.—Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has announced plans to produce electric power from natural steam from the steam from the steam wells drilled here by Thermal Power Co., San Francisco development firm.

First stage of the development will be installation of a 12,500-kilowatt generating plant on the hill east of Big Sulphur Creek, in the heart of the volcanic area.

Thermal Power Co. President Dan McMillan said his company has an estimated 26,000 kilowatts available on the hillside, with another 12,000 kilowatts under development.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. engineers—whom he described as real happy with the development are designing the special low-pressure power plant now, he said.

The letter of intent signed by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. brings to fruition predictions by Thermal Power Co. made early last year.

Thermal Power Co., the developers of the natural steam, and Magma Power Co., which has the lease on the property, have agreed to supply steam to the plant at 100 pounds pressure and a temperature of 348 degrees Fahrenheit.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co., it was learned, plans to run a 30,000-kilowatt capacity line out of the area in the first stage of the development.

The first plant's cost is estimated at $2 million. The design, engineers say, will involve 50-year-old techniques because of the relatively low pressure available at the site.

The development will be the first thermal power plant—power taken from the earth itself—in the United States, and will be the first privately financed thermal power development in the world.

Government-subsidized plants are in operation in Italy, and similar developments are underway in New Zealand and Mexico.

The letter of intent signed by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and Thermal Power Co. calls for further development of the steam-producing area.

Mr. McMillan said Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will "take all we can produce." Estimates of the ultimate development here have been 200,000 kilowatts or more.

The Magma Power Co. lease covers 7,000 acres of land, owned by the Geysers Development Co., the original firm that attempted, in the early 1920's, to produce electric power from the volcanic earth.

The first wells—7 were drilled in 1922—were left to expend their energy in the steam geysers after promoters were unable to sell the power commercially. Present developers say that failure was due to an overabundance and low demand for electric power at that time.

The actual source of the steam is believed to be primarily water from the rocks of the earth, heated by magma, or molten rock from the center of the earth which has in this area leaked near the surface.

City Makes Strides in Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third and final article by Mr. Eckert Goodman which appeared in the New York Daily News on July 24, 1958, dealing with the effect of the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway on the port of New York:

CITY MAKES STRIDES IN FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

(By Eckert Goodman)

(Last of three articles)

There is no question but that the port of New York is in healthier all-around condition today than it was a decade ago, when warning signs that it was on the downgrade were being given little more than nodding attention, and virtually nothing had yet been done to brake its impending slide.

It remains to be seen, however, how much lost time can be made up in an industry in which time is such a precious commodity that truck companies figure 10-minute traffic delays in their overall operating costs, and steamship lines take a loss of around $5,000 for every day a freighter lies idle.

Nevertheless, a great deal has already been accomplished in the way of improved waterfront conditions, and a lot more is in the works or planned. Here are some highlights of New York's port picture as it shapes up today, including both plus and minus aspects:

The bistate Port of New York Authority, which already controls 20 percent of the port's deep-water, general-cargo piers, is well embarked on a tremendous 20-year, $380 million marine terminal and harbor development program, designed to provide new cargo-handling facilities and upland wharfage areas equal to any in the world.

BROOKLYN WILL GET MORE BROAD PIERS

broad piers—one has just been completed—in broad piers—1 has just been completed—in place of 25 obsolete, narrow ones, along a 2-mile stretch of Brooklyn waterfront south of Brooklyn Bridge; (2) addition of 11 new ship berths and a 115-acre upland development at Port Newark, and (3) the dredging of 2 new, 35-foot harbor channels which will lead to a projected 703-acre terminal for 24 vessels at Elizabeth, N. J.

In addition, the city of New York, lifting anchor at last, is being carefully piloted by Marine and Aviation Department Commissioner Vincent A. G. O'Connor along a council-approved, 6-year, $200 million pier-construction course, to which $50 million has already been committed.

The self-sustaining program envisions the replacement of 16 old North River piers with half as many modern ones, and the construction of about a dozen additional piers in Brooklyn, and along the 1¾ miles of run-down East River Manhattan-side waterfront between Broad and Jackson Streets.

ONE SOUR NOTE: HIGH RENTALS

New North River terminals for the Cunard and United States Lines are included in the plans, along with a huge, square, four-berth pier now under construction for the Holland-America Line at the foot of West Houston Street.

The Holland-America setup, like two similar ones slated to be built by the city for Japan's Mitsui Line and the Moore-McCormack Lines on Gowanus Bay and Creek in Brooklyn, is designed to get pier traffic off crowded city streets. It will contain a spacious over-the-water court for trucks and cargo loading, and space for 725 parked cars on the roof.

The only sour note in all this new port development is the fact that modern construction costs make the rental of such self-amortizing facilities relatively high, and lessees can only hope that the estimated 25 percent to 40 percent they expect to save through more efficient cargo handling and faster turn-around will enable them to get by.

Holland-America, for instance, has agreed to pay almost $1¼ million a year in rent (an amount which Port Authority cost experts have challenged as unrealistically low), and Moore-McCormack will be on the hook for $487,000 annually—more than twice what it is paying for its two present Brooklyn piers.

At the dedication of the Maersk Line's new port authority-built terminal in Brooklyn last June, A. P. Moller, managing owner of the steamship company, commented:

"Our pier rent will be quite a good deal higher than hitherto * * * but we will just have to hope that handling of cargo will prove considerably cheaper than before, and that the much better facilities will bring us more cargo."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

HAIL LABOR PEACE AS BRIGHTEST SPOT

Increasing improvement in labor peace and stability on the New York waterfront during the last 5 years has been hailed as the brightest spot in the recent past and hope for the future of the port.

Last year there were only 13 work stoppages—none of them lasting over a day—compared with an annual average of 75 to 80 strikes a few years ago, and an all-time high of 92.

Largely responsible for the improvement has been the grievance machinery set up under recent contracts between the ILA and the 156-member New York Shipping Association, whose chairman is an indefatigable ex-newsman named Alexander P. Chopin.

It provides for pier-level settlements, whenever possible, by official troubleshooters dispatched to the scene; hearings before a joint labor relations committee, and, if necessary, the submission of disputes to a mutually acceptable arbitrator.

This year, however, there has been a series of jurisdictional strikes by white collar pier workers, picketings by teamsters and localized wildcat strikes.

There's still considerable disagreement about longshore seniority rights, hospital benefits, added safety precautions and the growth of automation in cargo handling. So there's no assurance that, despite contract provisions, serious labor trouble will not flare up at almost any time.

However, last year's signing of the eastern seaboard's first master contract, binding on labor and the shipping industry from Portland, Maine, to Hampton Roads, Va., offers a bonus advantage.

It makes it unlikely that New York will ever again have to suffer from the loss of millions of tons of cargo to competing ports during a local strike—something which has happened on a number of occasions in the past.

The long-embattled, bistate waterfront commission, created 5 years ago to reform and regulate the longshore industry, is still vastly unpopular.

It is particularly resented by employers of waterfront labor who are required to (as they put it) "shell out $2 million a year to be policed," and money-grubbing bosses of certain ILA locals who have found it harder to operate some of their more lucrative rackets and shakedowns.

NOT AN INSTITUTION RUN BY INMATES

But no disinterested port observer denies that however successful or unsuccessful the commission may have been in its efforts, it has charted paths through what was formerly an impenetrable jungle and created relative order out of what came close to being utter chaos.

"Naturally," remarked a former port official, "any agency with the power to suspend and revoke its own work permits and hiring licenses is going to be feared and hated.

"Maybe the waterfront commission hasn't always been right in its evaluation of criminal records, curtailment of casual labor and substitution of hiring hall information centers for pierhead shapeups. But it has been conservative in what it has done—and in any event the port of New York is no longer an institution being run by the inmates."

INSURANCE CLAIMS TAKE SHARP DROP

The commission also has helped to reduce pierhead pilferage, together with the small but vigilant security bureau, which was founded by maritime interests 11 years ago when waterfront larceny was at its height.

Today, it's generally agreed that losses through theft are less than $30 out of every $100,000 worth of cargo—about one-tenth of the annual losses claimed by New York department stores from shoplifting or by hotels from stolen property.

Since World War II, the percentage of insurance claims for stolen cargo has dropped from 33⅓ percent to 17 percent, and most marine underwriters agree that New York's pilferage losses are now proportionately at least as low as those of any other general cargo port in the country.

Readjustment of the so-called rail differential, which discriminates against New York by providing Midwest shippers with lower freight rates to and from southern ports, is currently under consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission. But even if that agency issues a favorable ruling, port authorities feel certain that the issue will be in litigation for several years.

SEEKS UNIFORM PIER CHARGES

The same thing probably applies to the Federal Maritime Board's effort to set up uniform standards for pier charges and services, so that railroad terminal operators in southern ports can't offer steamship lines preferential rates for the use of their facilities.

Promotion of the port of New York had, until recently, been fostered virtually 100 percent by the port authority, which last spring opened new London and Zurich trade development offices, in addition to the four it operates in this country and a fifth in Rio de Janeiro.

Three years ago, however, Mayor Wagner established a 12-man city council on port development and promotion, and 1956 witnessed the creation of an industry-backed port resources information committee, which last winter issued a handsomely illustrated 192-page New York port handbook.

FIFTEEN GROUPS UNITE TO PROMOTE PORT

Last year, 15 local trade and maritime agencies formed a joint committee for promotion of port of New York, currently under the chairmanship of William F. Giesen, hard-driving general manager of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York.

But the opposition has also grown formidable. During the past 15 years, 13 competing ports have opened trade promotion offices in the city, and steamship companies are increasingly establishing new Midwest headquarters to push their seaway trade.

What many maritime authorities feel is most urgently needed today is a single, cooperative well heeled port promotion campaign, designed to sell the advantages of New York all over the mercantile world. For the stakes are high, and time, for the world's greatest port, is rapidly running out.

Bishop Dagwell, Portland's First Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, there came across my desk a booklet two-hundred-odd pages in length, mysteriously entitled "Twenty and Five-tenths Percent: A Compilation of Public Records—1,411 Protestant Episcopal Rectors," published by a so-called publishing committee, giving as its address a post office box in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Listed inside the booklet were the names of many persons. Below the name of each person was set forth the names of various organizations and descriptions of public statements with which the individual had allegedly been affiliated.

No statement of purpose is contained in the booklet. All is left to innuendo, smear, and implied accusation that somehow the individual's connections with these organizations were inimical to the security of the United States.

These smear tactics, employing the well-known and equally well-discredited tactics of "guilt by association" should be roundly condemned.

Listed in the booklet was the name of a man whom I have known and respected for a long time. He is the bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon—a man loved and revered throughout my State—a man who has labored long and hard for causes which would be of maximum benefit to the people. His loyalty to his country has ever been beyond question.

The bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon does not need me to rise to his defense. He needs no defense. His life and his works speak eloquently of his character, his integrity, and his love of country.

When, in February 1957, the Right Rev. Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon, was awarded the B'nai B'rith brotherhood award, Rabbi Julius Nodel, of Portland, Oreg., had this to say to him:

No person in this community is better deserving of this award. Bishop Dagwell has literally practiced what he preached and never has limited his services to the sanctuary confines.

Last January 15, the Portland Realty Board of Portland, Oreg., honored Bishop Dagwell as Portland's "first citizen for 1957." The report of the realty board's committee, which selected Bishop Dagwell for this very much deserved award, is a testimonial to a man whose life has been dedicated to the good of his fellow man and whose deeds are eloquent tribute to a man whom all Oregonians honor, respect, and admire.

Vague innuendoes and smear tactics will not detract from the good which Bishop Dagwell's deeds have wrought in strengthening Oregon and the Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the report of the realty board's committee which selected Bishop Dagwell as Portland's first citizen for 1957 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

After several sessions where a considerable list of worthy names were considered, the seven members appointed to serve on the Portland Realty Board's secret committee voted unanimously, on the first formal ballot taken, to designate as Portland's first citizen of the year 1957, the Right Reverend Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, who will retire next July after 22 years of distinguished service as Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon.

This is the second award bestowed this year on Bishop Dagwell, he, in both instances, being the first cleric ever so honored in Portland.

Because of his outstanding record in the field of inter-faith work and for "his active influence and courage in making real the religious idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," Bishop Dagwell was last February declared winner of the annual B'nai B'rith Brotherhood award.

"No person in this community is better deserving of this award," said Rabbi Julius Nodel in conferring the honor. "Bishop Dagwell has literally practiced what he preached

and never has limited his services to the sanctuary confines."

The clipping files of Portland's newspapers are bulging with accounts of Bishop Dagwell's long running fight for fair employment practices, better housing, civil rights and civic responsibilities. His has truly been a voice of wisdom and human understanding in the community.

Bishop Dagwell has been referred to as the editor's dream who makes good newspaper copy by taking the "sacred cow" of public opinion and swinging it by the tail. The newspaper index file in the Portland Public Library contains 31 cards referring to interesting articles relating to Bishop Dagwell and his activities.

Known as the breaker of precedents, Benjamin Dagwell began his career in Portland by ignoring the custom that a new bishop should be consecrated in the field in which he had worked, being the first bishop in the history of the Oregon Diocese to take the solemn vows in Oregon. In explaining why he desired to part from the tradition established by his four predecessors, Bishop-elect Dagwell said, "I want to be in the presence of those with whom I am to labor when I take my vows and receive episcopal authority."

In 1940 while addressing the 52d annual diocesan convention, Bishop Dagwell again proved that he is not a man to let tradition stand in his way by advocating a streamlining of church services, contending that the sermons and prayers dragged out and were too long.

While he must soon retire from his official post in the church, Bishop Dagwell will not be lost to Portland. Last year a group of his admirers and friends formed a charitable organization to be known as the Benjamin Dagwell Foundation which was launched with contributions totaling $30,000. As additional sums accumulate in the foundation, funds may be used for a wide range of charitable, social, welfare, health (including mental health) or educational purposes. Knowing that Bishop Dagwell has been responsible for many acts of kindness and charity, the foundation was formed to honor him, and he has agreed to remain in Portland after his retirement, on his 68th birthday, to serve as administrator of the foundation.

When Benjamin Dagwell became bishop, he said he did not intend to occupy the swivel chair in his office very much of the time and remarked that, being unmarried and not tied down with duties at home, it was his desire to travel over the diocese as extensively as possible in the hope that he might know every man, woman, and child in the diocese as a family. Recently it was reported that in 4 months' time he had traveled 12,000 miles, 2,200 by ship, 4,500 by air, and the rest by automobile, driving much of this distance himself. During that time he visited 61 churches, some of them several times, and confirmed 750 persons at 57 services. Bishop Dagwell has been especially effective in persuading a number of local churchmen to enter seminaries and holy orders and has helped many young seminarians through school.

In addition to his work over the diocese, Bishop Dagwell has served as president of the board of the Good Samaritan Hospital which has been greatly expanded and modernized under his leadership, as president of the board of St. Helen's Hall, the Good Samaritan Hospital in Corvallis and the Rogue River Valley Hospital in Medford. For 7 years Bishop Dagwell served on the National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches.

For a number of years Bishop Dagwell served as chairman of the Portland Housing Code Commission, a responsibility he accepted because, he said, "I am interested in how my fellow man lives." He has also served as chairman of the Fair Practices Committee. Here in Portland our First Citizen has served on a number of boards and directorates including Reed College, Goodwill Industries, Oregon Tuberculosis Association, Portland Remedial Loan Association, Portland Council of Churches, Portland Chamber of Commerce and has served as a member of the Board of Overseers of Whitman College, and as a director of the Deaconess Training School in Berkeley, Calif.

He has served on the governing board of Willamette View Manor, which is sponsored by the Methodist Church, and has worked earnestly and effectively in the organization campaign for the Rogue Valley Manor, a 284-apartment structure to be erected in Medford as a Christian home for people of moderate means under the sponsorship of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopal Churches of Oregon. Bishop Dagwell is a member of the Newcomen Society and chaplain of the Oregon chapter of that distinguished organization.

In referring to Bishop Dagwell at the service commemorating the 10th anniversary of his consecration, the late Bishop Matthews said, "Without ever losing his characteristic quality as primarily a religious leader, Bishop Dagwell has nevertheless exercised his unusual gifts, mental, moral and spiritual, in matters of public concern. He is a Christian gentleman with never the breath of suspicion that he is a self-seeker in the tempting field of personal aggrandizement or publicity. He is indeed a leading citizen."

Though a man of great courage and deep convictions, Bishop Dagwell is essentially a quiet, gentle man with a shy, engaging smile and a delightful sense of humor. He is a capable leader and a highly efficient administrator, but even when he is busily engaged in handling a difficult problem, he can cheerfully endure an interruption and flash a twinkle in his eye as he grants some simple personal favor. Whenever he is called, be it at any hour of the day or night, he always responds promptly and graciously.

Such are but a few of the admirable personal traits of the modest yet eminent church leader who is loved throughout the west—Benjamin Dunlap Dagwell, whom we are proud to salute and acclaim as Portland's first citizen for the year 1957.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 160, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*, 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*., University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*., 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*., 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*., 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Beamer, John V., *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*., 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*., 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*., 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*, 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*., Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*., 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*., The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*., 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*., 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*., Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*., Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*., 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*., 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*., 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*., 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*., 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*., The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*., 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*., 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*., 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J*.
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*., 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*., 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*., The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*., 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*., 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*., 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*., 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*., The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*., 1133 House Office Building
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*., 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*., 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*., Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*., 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*., 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
George, Myron V., *Kans*., 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*., 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Hale, Robert, *Maine*., 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*., 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind*., The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del*.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*., 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*., 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*., 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hill, William S., *Colo*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*., 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*., The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*., 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*., 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*., 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*., 2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*., Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*., 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*., The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*., 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*., 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*., 112 Schotts Court NE.

Appendix

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland to California Republican State Central Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made at Sacramento yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, REPUBLICAN NOMINEE FOR GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING, STATE CAPITOL BUILDING, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., AUGUST 3, 1958

Fellow Californians, this historic chamber brings back nostalgic recollections of the first State Republican convention I attended as a delegate and subsequently my service as a State assemblyman 26 years ago.

For more than half of my life I have sought, to the best of my ability, to serve the people of California as State assemblyman, State senator, and a Senator of the United States.

For this experience and this opportunity I shall be eternally grateful to the people of this, my native State, as long as I shall live.

On the world scene and in our Nation's Capital at Washington, grave events are producing major decisions—decisions which, for better or for worse, will have a great bearing on the lives and activities of all of us.

Our western civilization and our country are being challenged today as never before from without and from within.

The bold experiment—representative government—of our forefathers is confronted in our time by the destructive forces of communism, crime and complacency.

The history of governments and peoples from the beginning of mankind to the present day shows that twin evils of decay and tyranny must always be recognized and fought by resolute citizens and their public officials.

The American blueprint for freedom—recognition of a higher moral law to which governments are accountable, the Constitution of the United States with the separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial branches, and the division of powers between the Federal and State Governments—is being threatened by the growing influence of those who encourage compromises of expediency.

In 3 months' time the 6 million voters of our State will go to the polls to make a decision that will have a great impact on them and millions more in California for years to come.

Before this day arrives, we must focus the public's mind on what we stand for and where we propose to lead their affairs if accepted by the electorate.

They are entitled to know this before and not after November 4.

I want to discuss with you today what I believe to be three basic and fundamental questions: First, our objectives; second, our opposition this year; and third, a controversial issue.

First. What do we propose as our objectives? I am not speaking here in terms of political success, for that is naturally the objective of all political parties.

I am speaking now in the terms of objectives to serve all of the people of California. We could summarize in a phrase that our goal is to provide at the State and Federal level, the most humane, responsible, efficient and economical government that dedicated and experienced public officials can provide.

The problems of government in California now and for the foreseeable future are keyed to the population increases which within 20 years will see us as the largest State in the American Union.

Today our State is an expanding industrial, commercial and agricultural empire, larger and more productive than many sovereign nations. It is larger than 56 of the 84 independent nations constituting the membership of the United Nations.

In the next few years, our people face difficult and critical problems of government and administration which demand in public service the highest performance of competent solution and deliberate and decisive action.

We know that one of the most pressing problems in our State government is the fiscal condition of our State treasury. Right now the necessary expenditures to operate our government are being met by borrowing from reserve funds set aside for other purposes.

This takes me back to 1933 when I first went to the State legislature and at that time we also were faced with an unbalanced budget. As a member of the economy bloc, we made substantial reductions in governmental costs and we worked out a revised revenue system which met our basic requirements for the next quarter of a century.

In the central fields of business and agricultural development, in the promotion of industries, services and professions; in highway, home, hospital, and recreational expansion; in the control of crime and narcotics, our objectives will be to provide our citizens with government dedicated to advance their well-being and not those of powerful political-pressure groups.

In my judgment, there is a need now to reorganize the executive branch of the Government and to eliminate a duplication and overlapping of responsibilities. The State under my administration will live within its income.

With courage and common sense we can meet and solve the problems confronting our State and Nation.

We want and we shall have a solution to our water problems so that all sections of our State will share the agricultural, industrial, and urban growth which they are destined to have.

As Californians we want and we shall have an educational system second to none in the Nation.

We must construct nearly 6,700 classrooms every year to take care of the proper needs of our school children. That amounts to 130 new schools annually. We propose to give our educational needs the highest priority and to meet the challenge of new schools, additional teachers, and adequate financing.

We want and we shall have an attractive economic climate to bring new industry into our State and to encourage present industry to expand its capital plant so that we may have more jobs at good wages for our constantly increasing population.

We want and we shall have strong and effective unions that are responsible to their members and to the general public as well.

The power of certain national and international labor organizations is increasing to the point where the selection of candidates for public office solely depends on their willingness to produce the programs outlined by the organization involved.

Reported contributions from union organizations in 1956 showed that out of $1,078,822 all but $3,925 went to the candidates of the Democratic Party.

We want and we shall have safer highways for our motorists. This not only requires constant improvement in design and construction but it also requires the augmentation of our California highway patrol.

We want and we shall have a sound system of social security in keeping with our responsibilities and within our fiscal means.

We want and we shall have a sound fiscal structure for our State government which requires a balanced budget, the maintenance of our State's credit and a tax system that will attract and not repel the capital for our growing needs.

The labor boss allies of my opponent are the sponsors of proposition 17 which jeopardizes our State's fiscal system, threatens our educational and social security progress and will repel new industry and capital from investing which is so essential for the creation of new jobs. This measure should be overwhelmingly rejected.

We want and we shall have protection for our children and ourselves from the threat of narcotics; from the growth of crime and violence which the shocking figures of the FBI revealed.

The second basic question which deserves some discussion today is our political opposition.

For my part, I intend to place the full light of the facts upon the vacillating actions and the inconsistencies of my opponent both as a candidate for Governor and in carrying out his public responsibilities.

"Buster" Brown and his imported Chicago machine-type political organization seek to impose a package deal on the historic Democratic Party and on the people of this State. This is not good for California.

He has busted the historic Democratic Party and has been the instrumentality by which CIO–COPE is gaining control over his party. Their ultimate hope is to take over this State, Michigan fashion.

In this campaign my opponent's public record will be given all the light it will stand. And it will not stand much.

My opponent has been attorney general of this State for almost 8 years, with more powers than any law enforcement official in any of the 48 States.

A survey of his record reveals that his performance of duty never catches up with either his public statements or his campaign promises.

In the more than 7 years he has held the most powerful attorney general's office among the 48 States our population has grown 32 percent; crime is up 76 percent; aggravated assault is up 112 percent; auto theft is up 130 percent; rape is up 100 percent; burglary is up 89 percent; man-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

slaughter is up 70 percent; theft is up 63 percent, and robbery is up 58 percent.

These are statistics in which we as Californians take no pride and they are indicative of the failure of the attorney general's office under the incumbent to give the type of leadership from its chief legal officer that the State is entitled to have.

He has stated in recent months that there is no organized criminal element in our State, but the head of the intelligence of the Los Angeles Police Department testified before a committee of the Senate that mobsters and gangsters are moving into California's industries and labor unions at an alarming rate.

Californians have reason to be concerned by the reported influx of members of the eastern and midwest criminal syndicates into our State. There is ample reason to believe that they are seeking to gain control of some of our labor organizations and by the investment of underworld funds to penetrate the economic structure of California. The objective is the ultimate political domination of our State.

Our local police officials are among this Nation's top crime fighters. They deserve maximum support for their first line battle to control the criminal menace and to render our people, homes, and communities safe in California.

But the best efforts of our policemen and local public officials are handicapped unless effective and dedicated political leadership is provided. My opponent's record during the past 7 years shows his failure to provide this leadership.

The responsibilities of the governor as chief executive authority of this State are large. There are 8 constitutional offices, 24 departments, 128 boards and commissions and 46 independent agencies.

Under existing law, State narcotic enforcement comes under the attorney general. In recent months it has become obvious that not even this one office has received the necessary supervision or executive direction from the attorney general.

Recently he criticized the hardworking Federal Bureau of Investigation for allegedly presenting California's crime increases in an unjustifiable and unfavorable light.

After charging the Bureau with using incorrect statistics, Brown's own department released its crime statistics, and this revealed that the two crime reports differed in their crime increase rates by one-tenth of 1 percent.

During the 6 months prior to the primary election, my opponent was extremely busy getting around to all parts of the State and making political statements. He should have been devoting more time to the responsibilities of his office in view of the serious crime and narcotics problems in our State.

In reading his public comments during that period, I was struck by the feeling that possibly there were two Mr. Browns—a northern Brown and a southern Brown. His statements on the same subject were different in different places.

I wonder if my opponent really believes the people of this State think such artful juggling is a qualification to be Governor of California. To a particular California audience in the North, Mr. Brown is a conservative Democrat. To an audience in the South, he is a liberal Democrat.

In Los Angeles, he is for a bill of rights for union members. In Albany, he believes such protections would destroy unions.

In Los Angeles one day, Mr. Brown advocates no increase in taxes. In Oakland the day before, he stated we are going to have new taxes whether we like it or not.

My opponent cannot fool all the people all of the time. And I intend to be on the scene to help make sure that he doesn't.

The third and last basic question I want to discuss with you is a controversial issue.

The issue of voluntary unionism in California, or right to work as some call it, is a subject on which men of good intentions honestly differ.

My views are known and I have not abandoned them nor do I have any intention of so doing.

I want to emphasize at this time what it is and what it is not.

It involves the freedom of our working people and this basic human right should not be a partisan issue.

Before you is the portrait of our first Republican President who spoke the eternal truth that this Nation cannot endure half slave and half free.

In recent months our people have been dismayed and disturbed by the evidence of mounting corruption and arbitrary abuses of power among certain union barons.

We recall Lord Acton's warning that "power corrupts but absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Unless the members of organized unions have the power to control their union officers and curb the unscrupulous activities of wrongdoing bosses, their reign of control and domination will place in jeopardy the future and well-being of not only union members but the entire fabric of the American way of life.

I would like to read a brief statement to you made by a prominent American in recent months:

"We think of human bondage in the United States as a thing of the distant past, ended nearly a century ago. The grim fact is that in recent years there has grown up among us a new form of slavery—insidious, semisecret and sinister.

"Today's captives are those rank-and-file union members who have fallen in helpless thrall to crooks and gangsters disguised under the title of 'labor leaders' or 'employer representatives.'"

Continuing with his statement, "from my study of the evidence, I estimate that those now in bondage must number more than 1 million. Some put the figure as high as 4 million—which happens to approximate the number of American slaves in 1860."

Now did BILL KNOWLAND make that statement? No. Did any official of the Republican Party make that statement? No. Those are the comments of a leading Democrat, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, who as chairman of the Senate select committee investigating such matters had just finished the first year's work of that committee.

The outlawing of compulsory unionism will put an end to the unhealthy conditions that are destroying the benefits of our union movement. It will place in the hands of each union member the power to preserve his own dignity as a human being. He will be able to say thereafter to his union official that if he is not treated with respect, if his dues are embezzled or used for purposes not to his benefit, if he is not given the right to a voice in his union's affairs, then he will have the right to get out of his union and he will not be penalized by the loss of his employment.

To me, this objective is worth the risks of political defeat and the distortion of political motives.

Mr. Brown and his labor boss supporters state the passage of the initiative will mean the end of collective bargaining. As the chief law officer of the State he knows that collective bargaining is guaranteed by both Federal and State law and is guaranteed by the initiative proposal.

But collective bargaining must not degenerate into collective bludgeoning.

I am not prepared to stand idly by and see a combination of Hoffa and Bridges gain the power to strangle the economic life of our country or of California.

They state that voluntary unionism will mean the loss of the benefits and reduction of wages for our workers. Yet in the 18 States that have right-to-work laws, the record shows the increases in wages and employment are greater since the enactment of the laws than in the compulsory unionism States. And there has been a marked increase in new industry in these States as well.

Under voluntary unionism as well as under compulsory unionism the collective bargaining contract will protect all the workers in the bargaining unit without discrimination.

They charge me with attempting to foster voluntary unionism for the objective of curtailing union membership in California. This is the same charge they used against me for supporting the Taft-Hartley Act, which they called a "slave labor law." But the record shows that union membership has increased throughout the Nation by 17 percent since the Taft-Hartley law was passed in 1947.

The record of union membership in the States where voluntary has replaced compulsory unionism shows increases in union membership, not decreases.

My efforts in behalf of our working men and women is a matter of public record. In Sacramento, 25 years ago, when I started my public career, I helped draft the basic unemployment compensation law of this State. I supported the legislation which successfully outlawed the "yellow dog" contract that had been preventing workers from joining unions. In Washington, I opposed a President of the opposite party who attempted to draft railroad workers into the Army.

I believe in and support strong and effective unions. But they must be responsible to their members and to the public.

No permanent or constructive progress is possible in our institutions if they are based on compulsory membership.

Membership in our churches, our veteran and our farm organizations, and our community societies is voluntary, and their influence for good is increasing with our national expansion. We would not want it otherwise.

Having been active in public life for a quarter of a century, I am not unmindful of the penalties and the abuse of public service.

My opponent and his labor-boss allies have conducted as flagrant a campaign of misrepresentation as I have ever seen waged in this State. But, as a former President of the United States put it, "If you can't stand the heat, you should stay out of the kitchen."

In each job I have undertaken, including 3 years in the Army, from June 1942 until I was appointed to the Senate on V–J Day, on August 14, 1945, I have filled out my contract of service.

I would not have become a candidate for Governor of this State unless I had fully intended to devote all of my time and effort during the next 4 years to the heavy responsibilities of that office.

As the nominee for Governor, I am giving my wholehearted support to the entire ticket.

In order that our citizens may decide which candidate is best qualified to lead our State, I now propose to my opponent that we join the issues of this campaign before the jury of the people of California and that we have a series of joint appearances, starting on or about September 1, which will include public meetings at Eureka, Redding, Sacramento, Stockton, San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Modesto, Merced, Fresno, Bakersfield, San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles, Long Beach, San Diego, and such other places as may be mutually agreed upon.

Let these meetings be in public parks and townhalls. Let no admission be charged and the public to be invited to hear, to ask questions, and to make up their own minds after

listening to both candidates for governor and both sides of the story.

This is not the year nor is this the season for men of little faith to dominate our thinking or our actions.

Fourteen million of our people have a vital stake in the election this year. As great as has been our progress since our admission into statehood in 1850, we are still on the march to new horizons.

Need I remind this audience that the odds to start with were strongly against our Thirteen Colonies winning a struggle against the mightiest empire of that time.

A defeatist might have increased the odds to 50 to 1 against the tattered and poorly equipped Continental forces at Valley Forge. A doubter would have overlooked or discounted the actions of George Washington, a man of faith, on his knees seeking and receiving divine guidance.

Bull Run was followed by Appomatox.

Pearl Harbor, Corregidor, Bataan were followed by the surrender to MacArthur aboard the *Missouri*.

From a small, weak colony of 3 million in 1776 to 170 million in 1958—through war and peace, prosperity and adversity, our Nation has grown and we have held on to our freedoms when others have voluntarily or under duress abandoned theirs.

As a people our problems are great, but so are our opportunities.

With a fighting spirit and a determination to face with courage the issues of our day we can and we will carry this State on November 4.

Role of America in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is recognized as one of the leading spokesmen today in the field of foreign relations. He is also recognized as being among the best informed on the subject.

In March of this year the Senator delivered a very able address to the Student Conference on International Affairs at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute on the role of America in the Middle East. Many of the points and predictions he made at that time regarding the dangers to peace in the Middle East have become significant in view of the recent developments in that troubled part of the world.

Because of the timeliness of the views and conclusions expressed by the Senator in the address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Address delivered by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, at student conference on international affairs, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., March 28, 1958)

For me it is always a pleasure to return home. In these times the legislative program in Congress is so demanding that it is not easy to get back home very often while Congress is in session.

The situation in Congress was such that I could be with you today, and I am very glad. There is another—an even more important reason that I am pleased to be here. It stems from the nature of the subject which you have asked me to discuss with you today.

It is a source of great gratification to see the young people of the schools represented here turning their attention increasingly to international problems. In this new era of human existence the Nation's survival and progress in freedom depend not only upon our ability to grapple intelligently with local, State, and Federal difficulties but also with problems that are worldwide in scope. Moreover, the need to face and to meet this type of problem is likely to grow rather than to decrease in the years ahead.

One of the most intricate of the international difficulties which face the Nation is that complex of problems that goes by the general name of the Middle East question. If you find the Middle East sufficiently baffling to make it the subject of discussion, you need not ascribe your bewilderment to any inherent shortcomings in your own perception. You have a good deal of company. The Middle East has baffled and continues to baffle men in the State Department who have done nothing but study the region for years. Indeed, I suspect it sometimes baffles the Middle Easterners even more than it does us.

Illustrative of the point is a story that came to my attention when I was traveling in that part of the world. It is a story of a frog and a scorpion and it goes as follows: A peaceful frog was floating in a stream, minding his own business, enjoying the warm afternoon sun. A scorpion approached the bank of the stream. Unable to swim, the scorpion called to the frog and asked for a lift to the other side. The frog shook his head vigorously and wisely in the negative and said the equivalent of "Not on your life. You, Mr. Scorpion, have a deadly sting. If I give you a lift, you will let me have it."

The scorpion waved one of his legs in a gesture of beguiling reassurance and said: "Be sensible, my friend, I can't swim. If I were to sting you, it is true that you would die but I would drown. Obviously, it would be the height of insanity for me to sting you. Obviously, then, your fears are baseless."

The frog was persuaded by this logic and, for a small fee, agreed to carry the scorpion across the stream. Halfway out, the scorpion suddenly stung the frog and both promptly began to go under. With his last breath, the frog gasped: "Why on earth did you do that? Now, we are both going to die. Your behavior just doesn't make sense."

And with his last breath, the scorpion replied: "How right you are, my friend, that we both are going to die. But how wrong you are when you say my behavior doesn't make sense. You forget that this is the Middle East."

The story may exaggerate somewhat the peculiarities of the situation that confronts us in the Middle East. I wonder, sometimes, how much. Nations in that region, it seems to me, like the frog, on occasion display an almost inexplicable tendency to court their own destruction. And sometimes like the scorpion they seem even eager to invite it, especially if it promises to bring down others in the process.

I ask you to bear that in mind as I proceed to consider the problems of the Middle East as they appear to us. These problems may seem entirely different when seen through the eyes of the Middle Easterner. What appears logical to us may, perhaps, not have any meaning for people in Egypt or Israel or Syria.

I do not say that to disparage these people. They have reasons for approaching the problems of the Middle East from a different point of view than ours. It is not for us to judge them or to moralize upon their behavior. We look at the region from a comfortable position several thousand miles away.

We have not bled in its wars, holy and unholy.

We have not known, for centuries, the status of outcasts nor have we experienced life in the ghettos of Europe as have, for example, many people in Israel.

We have not, for a long time, suffered the indignities of colonialism with which most of the Arabs are all too familiar.

We have not known the crushing burden of an incredibly deep poverty and a stifling superstition.

Nor have we known the physical debilitation of relentless and widespread disease that is the commonplace in the Middle East.

If it is wrong to moralize on the situation in the Middle East, however, it is equally wrong to deny that we have a concern, a deep concern in what transpires there. We do have interests in that region, important interests which our Government cannot ignore with impunity. Because we do have such interests, we have every right to consider the Middle Eastern situation and to seek to determine intelligently what is the best course for us to pursue with regard to that situation. As we get clearly in mind what our interests are, we shall have a little better understanding of why we are concerned with Middle Eastern affairs, why indeed we are discussing the subject today.

At the top of the list is our interest in peace in the Middle East. All of us ought to know by this time that a serious conflict in any significant portion of the globe is likely to spread throughout the world. We could not insulate ourselves from World War II. How much less likely are we going to be able to do so from world war III, if it should break out?

All it takes now to set in motion the poised military strength of the major powers is a miscalculation somewhere. The missiles, the strategic bombing commands, the massed armies and naval forces are in position. Once unleashed, even in error, the tragedy would begin and would proceed relentlessly to its terrible climax of worldwide destruction. We would not be spared the consequences, in Alabama or anywhere else in the country.

The fuse of this conflict could be lighted in the Middle East. That is so, in the first place, because the political ambitions of the Soviet Union and the economic interests of the Western World meet in the region. The Russians, under both the czars and the Communists, have exerted expansionist pressure on the Middle East, from time to time, and they have had their eyes fixed even beyond on the Mediterranean and Africa. Across their path lie vital interests of the Western World, particularly of Western Europe, and particularly in petroleum.

The Middle East, as it has been said, is afloat on a sea of oil. This sea contains the greatest proven reserves of petroleum in the world. For many years to come, at least until we have made far greater progress in the development of nuclear energy than at present, Middle Eastern oil will be essential to the survival of Western Europe in economic decency and in freedom.

The danger of conflict in the Middle East does not lie solely in a potential clash between the political interests of Russia and the economic interests of the West.

Additional pressures of explosive force are to be found within the region itself. Between Israel, the Jewish homeland, on the one hand and the Arab States on the other, there is an implacable hostility that con-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stantly threatens to erupt into violence. There are rivalries among the Arab States themselves which may one day set them into conflict. Finally, throughout the area, there is a latent fear and hatred of foreigners, particularly westerners, which is a heritage of the period of colonial domination. The colonialism is all but gone but the fear and the hatred remain. They are fed today, sometimes to fever heat, by the fuels of ultranationalism and general economic and social discontent in the Arab world.

If a conflict should arise in the Middle East from any of these local causes, it would immediately tend to bring into play the interests of Russia and the West, since both camps are deeply involved in the region.

Our own interest in this highly charged and dangerous situation, as I said before, is predominantly in peace, for anything short of peace threatens the holocaust of world war III and that, in turn, threatens all of us.

To be sure, we have other more specific and limited interests in the region. American oil companies have sizable operations and valuable concessions in Saudi Arabia and other countries. We have a highly important interest in the continued and efficient operation of the Suez Canal through which much of our seaborne commerce passes. We have an interest in the air routes that traverse the Middle East and in airbases which we lease in the region.

We have cultural interests developed over the years by missionaries and educators. We have a religious concern because our population is largely Christian and Jewish and the holy places of both are found in the predominantly Moslem Middle East. We have an interest—a human interest if you will—in the survival of Israel as a Jewish homeland. We have a sympathetic interest in the progress of the Arab States, a concern growing largely out of our own revolutionary rejection of colonialism.

All of these interests, however important they may be in themselves, are subordinate to our overriding interest in the maintenance of a just peace in the Middle East. Indeed these interests can only be safeguarded and advanced if that kind of peace prevails in the region.

If we have this picture clearly in mind—that is—that our predominant interest is the preservation of a just peace, we may proceed to a consideration of the problems of the Middle East in that context. In short, we may ask ourselves, what is it that does or might seriously jeopardize the peace of the Middle East?

The first possibility that occurs is a direct Russian aggression. Russia has a common border with the Middle East. It has, at times, threatened Iran and Turkey. Such an aggression, if it were attempted, however, would come into direct conflict with the interests of the Western nations. We are partners with Turkey in NATO and the United Kingdom is a member of the Baghdad pact along with Iran and other neighboring states. A deliberate Soviet aggression against Turkey or Iran would almost certainly produce a general war. Indeed, the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, about which you heard a great deal a year ago, makes it clear that a Russian aggression or a Communist aggression against any Middle Eastern state is likely to be met with counterforce.

Let me examine that possibility a bit further. On the basis of information available to me in Washington, there is no evidence that the Russians have planned or are planning a direct military invasion of the Middle East. The Russians are fickle, to be sure, and it is entirely possible that they may change their minds and gamble on war in the Middle East. As of now, however, there is nothing to indicate that such a shift is likely.

As for a Communist aggression beginning within the region—and as I noted the Eisenhower doctrine is also directed at preventing that type of breakdown of peace—the principal Soviet intimate among the Middle Eastern nations is Egypt. But Egypt—now the dominant partner with Syria in the United Arab Republic—is not a Communist country. It has even banned the Communist Party. In these circumstances it could hardly launch a Communist aggression.

Where, then, is the aggression likely to originate—the aggression against which the Eisenhower doctrine is directed? The answer, I believe, as of now, is nowhere. Whatever its good intentions—and, along with most of the Senate, I voted for the measure at the urging of the President—for all its well-meaning intentions, the Eisenhower doctrine, it seems to me, is an illusory policy aimed at a shadowy objective.

Does that mean that there is no danger of war in the Middle East? Not at all. The dangers are very real and continuing. The observation I have just given you means simply that I do not believe that the Eisenhower doctrine gets at the dangers, at least at the dangers that exist today. Yet our policy must deal with these dangers, if as I said earlier, the overriding interests of the United States in the Middle East is the preservation of a just peace in that region.

The real dangers to peace, as I see them, arise from within the area itself. Foremost among them, as it long has been, is the Arab-Israeli dispute. I shall not discuss the merits or demerits on each side of this dispute. Proponents of the one or the other side have gone all the way back to Biblical times in cataloging argumente and counterarguments for their particular position. I have studied the matter sufficiently, however, to be satisfied that a peaceful settlement of the dispute is not impossible provided:

1. The Israelis are not intent upon pursuing a course of territorial expansion at the expense of the Arab States.

2. The Arabs are not intent upon the destruction of Israel.

3. Each side recognizes that there is more to gain from peaceful tolerance of one another, if not actual cooperation, than there is from destructive conflict.

For the present, an uneasy truce exists along the Israeli borders. It is maintained largely by the presence on the Egyptian-Israeli frontier of the United Nations Emergency Force. This body of men, drawn from the smaller nations, is making a major contribution to peace.

May I say, that the Senate has recognized the value of its work. During the last session of Congress, I introduced a resolution expressing the hope that the emergency force could be made permanent so that it would be available for critical situations in the future. The resolution passed the Senate without a single objection.

While the emergency force has been instrumental in keeping a truce in the Arab-Israeli dispute, it is important to bear in mind that a truce is not the same as peace. One of the weaknesses of our policy on the Middle East, it seems to me, lies precisely in this realm. The administration has been content to cling to a truce, however uneasy it may be, rather than to push ahead and try to convert the truce into a genuine peace. The truce in the Arab-Israeli dispute is costly to us since we pay the bulk of the expense of maintaining the emergency force and of maintaining several hundred thousand Arabs in refugee camps.

This latter expenditure involves tens of millions of dollars a year and it has gone on year after year ever since the Palestinian war in 1948. I do not believe we should begrudge these expenditures if they help to prevent a major conflict. The point is, however, that a truce is not likely to last forever. Unless action is taken to convert the Arab-Israeli truce into a genuine peace the conflict may break out again despite the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on our part.

The Arab-Israeli dispute remains the primary danger of conflict in the Middle East and it is one of the shortcomings of the Eisenhower doctrine that it does little, if anything, to deal with it.

As I mentioned earlier, another danger of conflict within the region grows out of the antiforeignism, the ultranationalism of some of the newly independent states. This has been stimulated by leaders with delusions of grandeur. The delusions express themselves in spoken dreams of recreating ancient empires, empires which stretch even as far as from North Africa to the Pacific; in short, wherever Arabs have gone in centuries past.

Now there is much to be said in favor of Arab unity. The small middle eastern states could gain a great deal from a voluntary integration of their peoples and economies for peaceful purposes. There is nothing to be said for an Arab unity based upon the sword and the cry of "holy war."

Presently, there are trends toward unity in the Middle East. They can be seen in the recent Egyptian-Syrian-Yeman linkage and in the tieup between Iraq and Jordan. What is not clear, as yet, particularly in the case of the Egyptian-led coalition, is whether the unification is for peaceful or warlike purposes. If it is for the purpose of expansion, then we will soon be confronted with a situation of the gravest kind in the Middle East. It will be a situation created by states which cannot be labeled Communist. Again, the Eisenhower doctrine does not come to grips with this possibility.

There is no doubt that these Arab leaders who make their appeal on the basis of the sword and holy wars have a considerable following among the Arab peoples throughout the Middle East. I believe that one of the principal reasons for their success in this respect lies in the terrible poverty and the economic backwardness that is the lot of the Arab people generally.

Some of these rulers have been able to divert the discontent which these conditions produce into military circuses and political adventures. People in the Middle East, however, no less than people elsewhere, will not be fooled forever by these tactics. Sooner or later they will demand responsible government. They will demand that their governments direct their attention to very real social and economic problems rather than to expansionist adventures in hatred.

It behooves us in determining our policies to do what we can to encourage that demand. So far, however, our policies have not done that. When they do, perhaps, we will begin to come closer to that just peace in the Middle East which is in our own best, our overriding interest.

It seems to me that specifically these are the basic problems that must be solved in the Middle East, and to which the energies and resources of United States policy must be directed.

First, there is the problem of the Palestinian refugees. It is not enough simply to continue to support these unfortunate human beings in the squalor of the refugee camps. So long as they remain sequestered in this fashion they will be an element of instability in the Arab countries in which they are located.

They will continue to be, moreover, prone to political exploitation for aggressive adventures by unscrupulous leaders.

It should not be impossible to launch a concerted attack on this problem of the refugees; one which would see some of them returned to Israel, and the balance justly compensated and permanently resettled in productive activity throughout the Arab world.

The second problem which must be solved is that of the boundaries between Israel and neighboring states. At present, there exists a demarcation for the purpose of the truce. The Arab States desire to go back to the 1947 U. N. plan of partition of Palestine, a plan which, if implemented, would represent a drastic reduction in the present size of Israel. On the other hand, the Israelis take the position that, by starting the war in 1947, the Arabs created an entirely new situation and that there can be no going back to a plan which was predicated on a peaceful partition of Palestine.

Here, again, it seems to me that if peace is the desire of all concerned some rectification of the frontiers in the interest of settlement is possible. Certainly, the U. N. might be of great assistance in this connection.

Finally, I should like to mention the need for action to develop the water resources of the Middle East. Rivers are literally the lifeline of the peoples of that region. Properly developed and managed the great rivers such as the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Nile, and the Jordan, and many lesser streams can make the desert bloom while at the same time delivering enormous power for the expansion of the economies of the middle eastern countries.

Furthermore, since some of these rivers cross national boundaries, their development will require joint action. I can think of no single factor which would do more to turn the Middle Eastern countries from hatreds and rivalries than a cooperative and constructive effort to improve their common livelihood in this fashion.

In dealing with all of the problems I have been discussing, it seems to me that the essential factor is the leadership of the United States. This leadership can be exerted through diplomacy and just commonsense reasoning with Israelis and Arabs. It should not be impossible for both sides to come to see that their present obstructionism is destructive of their true interests, that the way to a promising future for all in the Middle East is through genuine settlement.

If I may sum up my observations, I should like to make clear that I believe that there is a grave danger in becoming complacent about the Middle East simply because guns do not happen to be going off at the moment. Our policies, at great expense, so far, have helped to keep them muzzled. These policies have acted to keep the lid on the pot, so to speak, but the steam is still building up inside.

Unless our policies are adjusted and adjusted rapidly to meet the inner pressures of the Middle East—the various facets of the Arab-Israeli dispute, the need for social and economic progress, the imperialist tendencies in some of the countries of the area—we may not be able to hold the lid much longer.

Scientists and Humanists Join To Strengthen Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in mid-July at the University of Massachusetts the Humanities Center for Liberal Education held its third annual seminar, examining the problem of how America's scientists and humanists can join together in their mutual responsibility for strengthening democracy in the scientific age.

More than 100 scientists, liberal arts educators, representatives of industry, labor, government, and the mass communications media gathered for the seminar. They discussed means of mobilizing America's vast cultural and intellectual resources as the most effective instrumentalities for preserving the freedoms of our citizens and our leadership in the free world.

Of particular significance to the Nation is the statement adopted by the seminar at the close of its discussions. This statement recommends lines of action, as permanent United States policy, to achieve a simultaneous advance on all fronts of American education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE THIRD ANNUAL AMERICAN HUMANITIES SEMINAR, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, MASS., JULY 16, 1958

The United States is confronted with a systematic, total Soviet effort—economic, political, diplomatic, and psychological, with military force in the background—to exploit the weaknesses, confusions, and temptations of a transitional period in world affairs.

America must place her chief reliance in foreign policy on something more than military power and conventional diplomacy. We must mobilize our vast cultural and intellectual resources as the most effective instrumentalities for preserving the freedoms of our citizens and our leadership in a free world.

The enduring leadership which the United States must provide should be rooted in intellectual excellence: This is achieved by the continuing creativity of a highly esteemed and substantially supported intellectual power at work in an atmosphere of freedom.

The political leaders of the resurgent and newly emerging nations are intellectual leaders in their homelands. They respect the quality of America's arts and sciences, and their respect is heightened by the fact that this quality is grounded in free individuals.

It is the consensus of this seminar that the arts, sciences, and education—the sources of our cultural and democratic and spiritual values—are not adequately supported in America.

To make possible a simultaneous advance on all fronts of American education and the union of these fronts for integrated effect, we, the conferees of the American Humanities Seminar, recommend these lines of action as permanent United States policy:

1. Expand cultural, educational, scientific, and technological interchange among nations, for the purpose of mutually enriching nonpolitical relations in the pattern of the International Geophysical Year and the World Health Organization.

2. Devote a significantly larger share of the Nation's resources to the arts, scientific research, and education to meet our obvious need. This is necessary because United States expenditures in these areas are disproportionate to the Nation's income and to the expenditures of other, competitive nations.

3. Renew the emphasis on educational opportunity and enable each individual, as a significant unit in the Nation's human resources, to achieve the peak of his capabilities. This would mean provision for the fast learner and the gifted, as well as for the slow learner.

4. Educate the public mind to awareness of the common ground and shared concerns of scientists and humanists, as they demonstrate through joint action their mutual responsibility for meeting the problems of democracy in the scientific age.

5. Reduce the lags between the specialized knowledge of the experts and the knowledge of the community, to achieve closer cooperation between scientists and humanists, and to bring about greater understanding among the general public.

Portrait of a Man of Good Will, Jimmie James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when I receive a long letter from Portland with a number in one corner and a simple but effective crayon sketch in the other corner, I know I have again heard from my good friend and constituent, Jimmie James, who resides in my home city of Portland, Oreg. His letters never request anything for himself, but they are always filled with concern and sympathy for American Indians, whom Jimmie James champions with commendable loyalty and devotion.

David Sheer, legislative chairman of the Anselm Forum, of Gary, Ind., has written an appreciative and informative sketch of Jimmie James under the appropriate title "Concern for Justice," and his organization has just made it available to the public.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that selected excerpts from this eloquent sketch about Jimmie James, of Portland, Oreg., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERN FOR JUSTICE
(By David Sheer, legislative chairman, Anselm Forum, Inc.)

Somehow, when I think of Jimmie James, I think always of a big hulk of a man in the middle sixties bent over a typewriter, pounding out letters in defense of Indian causes. The more than five thousand letters he has mailed out, appealing for justice and humanity in the Government's dealings with that luckless people, has given meaning and substance to his life.

* * * * *

In the latter part of 1954, the Associated Press in Washington, D. C., picked up Gary Anselm Forum's protest against injustices to the American Indian. Letters soon started coming from all parts of the country. The first one received by Anselm Forum's public relations executive, Reuben E. Olson, bore the number 3059. It described the writer as "Indian Press Agent and Painter of the Columbia River." On the large envelope was a sketch in color of bison racing across the plain. This envelope was not laid aside but placed on the wall of the study.

This was the first of several hundred letters Anselm Forum has received from Jmmie James.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

With the letter, he sent an article written by RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, What's a Treaty With the Indians Worth? Congress had authorized an immense dam, a $348 million project which would destroy the Indian fishing stations at Celilo Falls. Salmon fishing at Celilo Falls was probably the oldest Indian religious and cultural heritage in the Northwest. Work on the dam was about done, but negotiations with the Yakimas were not yet completed.

NEUBERGER knew nothing could prevent the completion of the dam. The competitive position of much of the Northwest's economy depends on cheap electric power. The Yakimas would sign just as the others had signed. But not to give serious consideration to the Indians' rights, to proceed with the dam before the Yakimas had either given their consent or exhausted legal remedies, was to ignore their elemental rights. It was to turn the discussion in that direction that NEUBERGER penned the fighting phrase "A pledge addressed to warriors in feathered bonnets is as binding as one made to an ermine-cloaked ruler on a throne."

Jimmie James reasoned that the Yakimas had given up an area of 16,920 square miles, and retained as a reservation an area of 1,875 square miles. For the land they had surrendered, they asked the right to live in their traditional manner, to worship their Creator in their own way, and to fish in their accustomed places on the Columbia River and its tributaries.

* * * * *

Jimmie James argued in countless letters that the respect you show for the holy places of others is the respect you invite for your own. But the petroglyphs—carvings chipped into the solid rock facing the river—and pictographs—painted in natural durable pigments—and the seven commandments—carved into the solid rock in back of the rapids—have all gone to oblivion. The Indian burial island, Melameloose, where the Celilo Indians have placed their dead for countless centuries, is no more.

* * * * *

Here and there, from his letters, we gleaned bits of information about the man himself. We learned that he is part Danish, part Welch, but more than one-eighth Cherokee. That more than one-eighth Cherokee was the passion that guided much of Jimmie's conduct. For instance, in reply to one of our queries he wrote, "I do not smoke or drink, neither do I swear." Significantly, he added, "You know Indians had no cuss words until the white man came. I just guess they had no occasion to swear at anyone." Again he expressed conscious identity with his great grandmother in describing his belief. "I follow the golden rule," he wrote, "believing in God and that Christ lived * * * yet my heart is with the Indians. Their God is yours and mine."

The Indians' god was a god of conservation. He loved all life. "Kill nothing except to live," was one of his commandments. Another was, "If you kill 1, let 2 go by." Commandments such as these were for survival. The Great Spirit taught him that he must preserve life to live. There are no recorded accounts of the Indians completely exterminating any of God's creatures. The Indian fought when his land was invaded—but what people worth their salt would not?

Even as a young man, Jimmie James gave much thought to the survival problems of America's first citizens. They probably came to this continent toward the end of the fourth glacial period. What they could make with their few flint tools and fire was poor protection from the rigors of a hostile environment. And, as only a young man would, he asked himself whether he could survive as they must have had to do. Could he go to an isolated part of the desert and start from scratch? This, he did. For weeks he survived as a gatherer of wild fruits and berries; he dug roots and picked seeds. He dug a hole in a small ridge and used it for warmth and shelter. He found sharp edged rocks which he used to fashion a primitive bow and arrow. He killed wild game for food, both birds and animals. He stretched, dried, and tanned skins as the Indians did. At the end of 6 months, he lived in his own hut, dressed in clothes of his own making.

In rural Kansas, where Jimmie James was born, in a sod house with a dirt floor about a mile out of Woodston, a man was expected to be a sort of jack-of-all-trades. He was expected to know all that was necessary to be done around the farm and home. Neighbors were almost considered kinfolk. The spirit of helpfulness which prevailed in time of sickness and misfortune is what gave warmth to the long Kansas winters. In large cities, such as Chicago or New York, where life is more complicated, and people are more callous, such attitudes could hardly be expected to thrive.

* * * * *

Jimmie studied painting with John Knoff, Otto Schneider, and Eugene Devole. He also attended the School of the Art Institute in Chicago. He continued his studies in New York and worked with such men as Charley Russell and Howard Christy.

In between times, while the steel mills in Gary were being built, he helped set some bed plates for an engine room which weighed over 40 tons apiece.

When Jimmie James first came to the Northwest and visited Tum Tum (Celilo Falls), he knew that this was the place for him. He knew there was no more beautiful sight on earth. He fell in love with the Columbia River—that arrogant cat of a river—never sure where she was going but destined to get there. It was a roller-coaster—twisting, turning, dropping, churning. Its headwaters, a small lake of cold blue water by the same name, is located in a mountain valley between two ranges in Canada. It flows straight north for more than 200 miles, then with a sharp bend, turns to run south. After the big westward bend, it makes its way to the Pacific Ocean. He loved the bounder strewn nothingness that is Grand Coulee. He loved the sparse areas and the heavily wooded areas. He visited Kettle Falls when the Indians were still fishing there. There were salmon runs in the early spring and fall, and Columbia smelts compared favorably with mountain trout. The Columbia River was the principal coastal stream for the steelhead trout.

Jimmie painted what he saw and felt, combining reality and imagination. His style suited him and he expressed himself well. His paintings are pretty well scattered over the entire country. He made no special effort to keep track of them. When completed, they were on their own. Each had been a child with its own special problems, but he was never entirely satisfied with any of them.

His charcoal pictures, especially the historical ones, were drawn with material secured near the location of the scene. He dug up the charcoal where ancient Indian camps were once located. These camps, high above the Columbia River, dated back to the time when Mount Adams, Mount Hood, The Sisters, and what is now Crater Lake, were active volcanoes. The charcoal used for "The Ancient Fisherman," which Jimmie James presented to Anselm Forum, was more than 3,000 years old.

Jimmie tried to acquire as much knowledge as he could about the river and her moods, about the people whose fragile cultures grew up near the river's banks. He went about, canoeing down most of the rivers whose waters empty into the Columbia. He learned to respect all living things. It was the kind of respect that comes with the understanding that each living thing must live according to its own nature. Just as he wanted life, they also wanted life. It was this understanding that made him Tommy Thompson's welcome guest on festive occasions. This was the reason Wilson Charley welcomed him as a companion on long treks to the more isolated parts of the Yakima Reservation. He has eaten fish, eels, roots, and berries at the homes of Wilson Charley and Tommy Thompson numerous times. Indian fry bread he described as being "just about out of this world."

He is one of the few dedicated men who could understand and accept the Indians as they were. He saw nothing exotic about a hut too small to properly house an entire family. There were many, many days when there was little more than dried fish and Indian bread to eat. These Indians were bound together by the ties of language, custom, tradition, and a feeling of kinship. They felt their way was the right way because it had always been their way of life, and it suited them.

Jimmie also had a vision of the meaning of race hate. His father had taken him to Tennessee during his boyhood, and he had seen a Negro burned at the stake. The frenzied mob and the screaming victim made a lasting impression upon him.

Jimmie was honorably discharged from the Army after the close of World War I. He also served with the Portland Board of Embarkation during World War II.

He works mostly in the basement of his home. There, he has a large room where he keeps his Indian collection and a room where he does research with Indian herbs. Another room houses his library and the studio where he does his black and white historical sketches. His oil paintings are done in an upstairs studio.

Jimmie believed his efforts have helped to promote a better understanding and knowledge of Indian life. He believes there is now a greater degree of mutual good will and even affection between the two races. The strength of character of the Indian people will enable them to survive, to retain their character and identity, and to continue to contribute to this Nation's welfare.

American Policy in the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Graham Hovey, of the editorial staff of the Minneapolis Tribune, is an experienced foreign correspondent and commentator. He has traveled extensively in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Presently he is visiting the United Nations and reporting on the activity of the U. N. Security Council.

In the Sunday, July 27, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune, Mr. Hovey has written an article entitled "Our Mideast Need: New Policies, New Concepts." It is a candid, frank, and constructive appraisal of United States policy and actions as they pertain to the Middle East.

He also reports on some of the comments of delegates at the U. N. about United States policy. It is good to hear

what others say and think. All too often we have been listening to a few voices in Washington that continue to repeat old slogans and apply old policies to new problems.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hovey's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MIDEAST NEED: NEW POLICIES, NEW CONCEPTS

(By Graham Hovey)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—Some of America's constant supporters in the United Nations and the cold war are insisting that Washington rethink and redefine its policies and objectives in the Middle East.

These diplomats warn that if this country clings to impractical policies and outdated diplomatic concepts, other and greater blows will follow Iraq's coup, which provoked our military move into Lebanon.

By impractical policies they mean the Baghdad Pact and those pursued under the Eisenhower doctrine.

By outdated concepts they mean, for example, the notion that our side must never recognize publicly that Russia is a power factor in the Middle East or can have any legitimate interests in that area.

There was lively discussion of this latter point here after news dispatches from Washington purported to give the real reason why any summit meeting with Russia on the Middle East could take place only in the security council.

These dispatches explained that the Middle East is already on the council agenda. Any summit meeting on this subject outside the United Nations, they said, would constitute recognition by the West of Russia's "presence" in the Middle East.

Even some members of the United States delegation to the United Nations conceded privately that this kind of reasoning was unrealistic. Other pro-Western diplomats used stronger language to describe it. In effect, they said this:

Russia is in the Middle East and everyone knows it and no one will any longer be impressed by Western diplomatic maneuvers aimed at denying or ignoring the fact.

Russia would be in the Middle East for reasons of geography and power even if its Government were not Communist and expansionist; even though its economic stake in the area, unlike that of the West, may be relatively unimportant.

Russia is in the Middle East with military and economic aid programs and, of course, with a political program.

The West must find ways to parry and counter some aspects of these programs but it cannot wish the programs out of existence.

"In fact," said one Western diplomat, "the question is not whether Russia is in the Middle East but whether the West can find ways to remain in the Middle East."

Among the specific questions which many of America's friends wish the Eisenhower administration would face squarely in the present circumstances are these:

Have the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine proved to be effective instruments for parrying and countering Soviet influence in the Middle East?

In light of the recent events in Iraq and Jordan, will the United States continue its previous emphasis on military aid and military alliances in this area?

Many observers with experience in the Middle East believe that there would have been no major civil strife in Lebanon if President Chamoun had not embraced the Eisenhower doctrine; that Nuri Said would be alive and in power in Iraq had he not taken that Arab country into the Baghdad Pact.

Some go further and contend that it was the Baghdad Pact—and the pressures it represented for nations to stand up and be counted in the cold war—that gave Russia its best excuse and opportunity for penetration of the Middle East.

This is speculation, but by persons with some qualifications to speculate. It leads inevitably to another major question which many diplomats believe the West should confront at this time:

Can the West settle for a neutral Arab Middle East striving for political and economic unity?

There are experienced Middle East observers who believe this would afford the West its best chance—perhaps its last chance—of retaining influence in the area and of insuring the flow of the oil on which Britain and Europe so heavily depend.

Would Russia respect any formal agreement to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena? It would be unrealistic in the extreme to expect Moscow to cease all political activity in so promising an area.

The point that many of our U. N. supporters make, however, is that our present policy is not working; that it may, by its military emphasis, its pressures on small nations to join formally the western camp, be making Russia's job easier in the Middle East.

If the Russians encroached on any agreement that the Middle East should be neutral at least the Arab resentment now directed at the West might refocus on them.

There was little joy at the United Nations over the news that Secretary Dulles would fly to Europe to shore up the Baghdad Pact. Some of our best friends believe his objective instead should be to liquidate it—as quietly and gracefully as possible.

The National Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the August 4, 1958, edition of Aviation Week. This magazine has done a consistently outstanding job in reporting developments in astronautics as well as the more traditional field of aviation. Therefore, the praise which the editor, Mr. Robert Hotz, extends to the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration is accepted as a special tribute by the members and staff of the committee. The editorial is as follows:

MIDSUMMER SURVEY

(By Robert Hotz)

The aviation industry and its related technologies are steaming through the midsummer months in one of the strangest atmospheres since the first years after the end of World War II.

The Mideast crisis simmers dangerously close to a shooting war in strange contrast to a domestic calm and complacency that is hard to explain.

Although United States science and industry are on the verge of some of their most exciting explorations of space, the general public appears bored with the entire subject.

The industrial structure on which the Pentagon depends to develop and produce superior new weapon systems is creaking and groaning under severe financial stress but even the top civilian leaders in the Defense Department, most of them former business executives, are strangely indifferent to this problem or its implication for future defense strength.

BURNING ISSUES

In contrast the Congress has recorded a remarkable record during the session now drawing to a close on Capitol Hill in handling the burning issues of space technology, missile and advanced aircraft development and the sticky problems of air traffic control and air safety regulation. We cannot recall another session of Congress that has taken so much positive action on these perennial problems.

Perhaps the most important achievement in this field was the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency using the technicians and laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics as a nucleus. In the relatively short time of 4 months the House and Senate, with a fine bipartisan spirit, tackled the National Space Agency proposals submitted by President Eisenhower and have forged an instrument capable of executing a sustained national program in this vital area. We have been particularly impressed by the manner in which the special House committee, headed by Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, with the aid of a good professional staff, guided this program through what might have been a legislative morass and fought vigorously for the most effective compromise with a rather odd Senate approach to the problem. Sufficient starting funds have been made available for the new Agency in the current fiscal year. If President Eisenhower will now make the key appointments of the Director and the required new council members, the NASA can blast off toward a sustained, scientifically sound exploration of outer space.

VITALLY NEEDED AGENCY

The other outstanding aviation project before Congress is the creation of an independent Federal Aviation Agency with full authority to tackle the myriad problems of air traffic control and safety that have been so widely dispersed in a bureaucratic maze. This action, sparked by Senator MIKE MONRONEY in the upper House and skillfully steered by Elwood "Pete" Quesada on the executive side of the Government, is now facing its final hurdle in the House. We hope that Representative OREN HARRIS, key man in the House for this bill, will provide some extraordinary bustle to match the performance of Senator MONRONEY and Mr. Quesada in assuring the creation of this vitally needed agency in the current session of Congress.

In defense, Congress has also compiled a better than average record with a Defense Department reorganization bill that at least takes a positive step toward untangling the Pentagon knot of indecision. As usual Congress also was more sensitive than the executive branch in providing adequate funds for development of key weapons in advanced missiles, aircraft, and submarine programs. It has also begun to ring the bill on the vast bureaucratic expansion of the Military Air Transport Service into costly duplication of commercial airline services while neglecting the genuine problems of adequate military air logistics.

Congress also became more aware of the tremendously complex relationship between the military services and the industrial complex that develops and produces new weapons. It should study this problem more

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

thoroughly in the future. This area needs a complete overhaul of both its legislative and administrative aspects to develop a modern streamlined military-industry relationship that protects the taxpaying public agianst excessive profits but at the same time permits industry to move with the speed its technical capabilities make possible.

Congress Should Refuse To Legislate Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Barron's national business and financial weekly. The fair-trade bill, just reported by the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the Interstate committee, would not be fair to anyone—not to the consumer, nor the retailer for whom it is intended to protect. It actually could become the umbrella protecting big retailers. They could cut prices with their own products while the small retailer could not do so with trademarked items. Congress and the consumers should beware of this dangerous bill, which would destroy the competitive forces underlying our private enterprise system.

It is my hope that Members of Congress will inform themselves and discuss this matter with constituents before it is too lake to undo the damage.

BILL OF GOODS—CONGRESS SHOULD REFUSE TO LEGISLATE FAIR TRADE

Sweltering Washington these days is witnessing a spectacle more predictable than springtime cherry blossoms—the midsummer scramble by hot, weary legislators to wind up their work and head for the hustings. Despite the parlous state of the world, leaders on both sides of the aisle are talking wistfully of going home in less than 2 weeks. Before that day of emancipation, however, they must dispose somehow of an impressive stack of unfinished business. In view of this crush, it is distressing that much of their time and attention is being taken up by proposals that merit no consideration whatever. One sorry example is the surprise effort to breathe new life into the tattered corpse of fair trade.

Measures to legalize this type of price-fixing nationally, in a form more hostile to free enterprise than ever, have been introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, and Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas. In prompt response, a swarm of small-business advocates—trade association men speaking for druggists, jewelers, and appliance dealers—has converged on Capitol Hill to raise a supporting clamor. Less in evidence, as usual, are the representatives of the consumer, whose pocketbook is under attack. At any time and place, the record makes clear, fair trade, by keeping prices high, hobbles competition and restricts markets. For these very reasons, as even some of its erstwhile champions concede, it is virtually impossible to enforce. It adds up, in short, to a costly hoax. Few proposals could be more out of place during an economic slump, which calls not for less zeal and initiative in winning the consumer's favor, but for more.

Fair trade, a misbegotten child of the great depression, was born when several States enacted laws permitting manufacturers to establish minimum retail prices for their products. This novel approach to merchandising, exempted from the Federal antitrust laws by the Miller-Tydings Act of 1937, came to govern sales of most trade-marked United States drugs, cosmetics, housewares, sporting goods, and small appliances. When the postwar shortages were over, manufacturers and price-cutting retailers became embroiled in endless litigation. In 1951, the Supreme Court ended the confusion by deciding that minimum prices bound only stores that had signed contracts with their suppliers. Storming to the rescue the next year, the lawmakers passed the McGuire Act, extending the sway of fair trade over all retailers, including nonsigners, in any State which had adopted a price-maintenance law.

Congress, however, did not have the last word. Merchants, complaining bitterly that the fast-spreading discount houses were flourishing at their expense, began to slash prices in retaliation. When the manufacturers sued, many State acts were held to be unconstitutional. Last fall, General Electric, a staunch champion of price maintenance, carried a memorable battle against the $50-million-a-year Masters store chain to the Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of the discounter. In February, GE, Sunbeam, and many a smaller manufacturer freed their retailers from the restrictive contracts. Their action was hailed widely as the death blow to price-fixing.

Its champions, however, are a stubborn lot. Two months ago, Congressman HARRIS took time out from his three-ring investigation of the independent Federal agencies to toss his new bill into the hopper. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, Wisconsin, and Senator HUMPHREY, himself an ex-druggist, did as much in the Upper House. These enthusiasts propose to outdo anything attemped in the past. Far from leaving each State a free choice, as heretofore, both bills flatly would declare fair trade to be national policy, enforceable in Federal courts. Furthermore, they would abolish the need for any contract with distributors, letting the manufacturer simply serve notice of his minimum prices. Proponents argue that such legislation would tighten channels of distribution for the manufacturer, protect the small merchant and serve the real interests of the consumer. Above all, they contend, it would rescue retailing from the law of the jungle.

The flaws in this glib argument are readily apparent. Experience has proven that price fixing (when it works) overshoots its avowed target and kills all competition. For that reason, it has drawn the fire of the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission. As former Attorney General Brownell observed, "Price in some cases is the only area where the little retailer can compete against the big department stores." Price maintenance, then, is designed to hamstring the aggressive and imaginative merchant. The fair traders, in the scornful words of one of New Orleans' famed price-cutting Schwegmanns, "want to get up late, make money on low volume and not work too hard."

That fair trade keeps prices, at a comfortable, high-margin level is demonstrated anew whenever it is abandoned. Thus the decision by G. E. and Sunbeam to give it up touched off a rousing battle in appliances, which slashed prices as much as 40 percent, and incidentally broadened the market for manufacturer and retailer alike. Similarly, when Louisiana's price law collapsed, a Baton Rouge druggist, Charles F. Fort, marked down everything in his store from 10 to 50 percent. Customers appeared in such numbers that his eight clerks could not serve them. Today Mr. Fort has 6 drugstores, 52 clerks, and a $2 million-a-year business. Nor has he built up this volume, as some critics suggest, by reducing his profit to nothing. "We don't believe in giving our merchandise away," says this nonconformist, "but we do keep our costs low so we can give the people a fair price."

Such success stories offer a happy contrast to the frustrations encountered by many a giant firm which has clung to price maintenance. They also point up a final reason why Congress should refuse to clutter up the statute books with the proposed legislation. For no matter what the law may say, fair trade is essentially unenforceable. In all its woeful history, manufacturers, finding the price umbrella increasingly costly to maintain, have sold furtively to discounters. Retailers have struck back by marking down their own price tags. Consumers, too, somehow have managed to ferret out the best bargains available. Fair trade, in short, is no less vulnerable than any other attempt to rig prices. Sooner or later, a dynamic free economy will finds ways to topple any such jerry-built edifice.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see further tributes to our distinguished friend and colleague, TOM O'BRIEN of Illinois. I include three editorials:

[From the Chicago Tribune of August 4, 1958]

WILL WE LOVE THEM IN NOVEMBER?

We have given a good deal of attention both in our news and editorial columns recently to Representative SIDNEY YATES, a Democrat from Chicago's North Side, for his exertions in seeking to get Chicago a break on lake diversion and in starting things going on a new Chicago Federal building and courthouse. We had an editorial complimenting YATES for getting an appropriation for the planning and site for the buildings.

Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, a West Side Democrat, has also been most active in trying to get Chicago an increased flow of lake water for navigation and sanitary purposes. His contributions have been duly noted in our news stories.

These are Democrats, but at the moment we are fond of them. They are trying to get things done for Chicago and for the people they represent. We compliment them again on their exertions and wish we could find equal zeal in some of our Republican Congressmen so we could spread the flattery around.

Our solicitous feeling for these Democrats exists despite our awareness that there are many bones to pick with Democrats in general, and despite our having differed from time to time with these particular ones. If they make mistakes, we shall not spare them. The question is, as the old ditty has it, "Will you love me in December as you did in May?" And that, we are sorry to say, is something about which we cannot be entirely sure.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

ALMOST UNANIMOUS

In the entire Illinois delegation to Congress—2 Senators and 25 Representatives—

only 1, Representative SID SIMPSON, is not supporting the lake diversion bill.

The near unanimity is to a considerable extent due to the untiring efforts of Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Chicago, to win downstate converts to the cause of diversion.

Not so many years ago, Senators and Representatives from downstate were inclined to oppose any proposal to divert more Lake Michigan water into the Illinois Waterway, which consists of the Chicago River, part of the Des Plaines and all of the Illinois River. Finally, O'BRIEN's persistence overcame the resistance of all but SIMPSON.

SIMPSON, a Republican, is from Carrollton in Greene County, about 35 miles north of St. Louis. The Illinois River runs almost half its course through his west central Illinois 20th district, and SIMPSON's argument against diversion is that "we want less water, not more."

But the Illinois River also runs through portions of the 18th Congressional District of Representative H. MICHEL, Republican, of Peoria; the 17th, Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Melvin, and the 15th District of Representative NOAH M. MASON, Republican, of Oglesby, the most recent convert to diversion. The remainder of the Illinois Waterway runs through several Chicago districts and one suburban district, the 14th, all of whose Representatives now favor increased lake diversion.

The argument might be made that from a geographical standpoint SIMPSON's district has more at stake in the diversion fight than any other one district. But SIMPSON represents only about 280,000 people, while the remaining members of the Illinois delegation represent 9,160,000.

If SIMPSON were to study the diversion issue carefully, he too might change his mind. For the effect of increased diversion would be beneficial to his district as well as to others. The proposed extra diversion, 1,000 cubic feet per second as against the present 1,500 figure, is not enough to add seriously to present flood problems. Moreover, the advantages—a greater intake of oxygen to sustain more fish life and kill off undesirable plant life—would far outweigh any disadvantages that increased diversion might have, including the flood danger that doesn't exist.

But even without SIMPSON, the Illinois front for extra diversion ought to be united enough to persuade the Senate to pass the bill.

[From the Garfieldian and Austin News]

NICE GOING, REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN

Congratulations are due Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who is serving his 11th term as congressman from the West Side's Sixth District. For his untiring efforts in leading the fight for passage of legislation authorizing the important Cal-Sag Channel, Congress has ordered that a lock and dam to be built on the Calumet River be named in his honor.

Congressman O'BRIEN is not one to make the headlines very often. He is not an orator and very seldom enters into the debate in the House of Representatives. Nor does he dash off opinions and hand them to reporters on every controversial issue.

Most everyone knows that Congressman O'BRIEN is a faithful Democrat who has stuck to his party's principles ever since he first started his political career in the State legislature back in 1906. He has been known as a loyal, sincere, kindly man who has been true to his friends and has made very few, if any, enemies.

In Washington, where he is a member of the important House Ways and Means Committee, he is universally liked and respected by members of both parties. He is often called upon by members of the opposite party who need cooperation in a local problem and he has never been known to let one of them down.

The action to name a lock and dam in O'BRIEN's honor—adopted unanimously in both the House and Senate—comes as proof of the high esteem in which the West Side representatives held by his fellow lawmakers of both parties. We are sure that Mr. O'BRIEN has received many honors in his 52 years of service but none can match a tribute paid by the Members of the most important legislative body in the world.

We are sure the entire West Side joins us in extending congratulations to Representative O'BRIEN.

The Constitutional Freedom To Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the Sunday, July 27, issue of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, there appeared an editorial entitled "The Constitutional Freedom to Travel."

This editorial comments upon proposals before the Congress to govern State Department policies relating to passports.

The editor has made an analysis of the two principal bills relating to the subject of passports. I am very pleased that he has seen fit to comment favorably upon the bill I introduced some time ago—S. 4137.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTIONAL FREEDOM TO TRAVEL

Congress now has before it two proposals for legislation to govern State Department policy in the issuing or withholding of passports. One, in the House of Representatives, is sponsored by the administration. The other, in the Senate, is sponsored by Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY, among others.

Of the two, the Senate bill is infinitely to be preferred.

The House bill puts undue emphasis on matters concerning what it calls the proper conduct of our foreign policy. It reflects an almost frightened idea of what damage might be done to our national security by letting noisy dissenters or possible conspirators travel abroad.

Its stress is on the control of Americans' travel abroad, not on their constitutional freedom to travel.

The emphasis of the Senate bill, on the other hand, is on that freedom. Under it, the only restrictions which the Government could put on citizens' travel abroad would be: (a) in case of war, when the President could control entry into and exit from the United States; (b) in case of hostilities other than war in which United States forces might participate, when entry of citizens into the combat areas could be controlled; and (c) in the case of persons under indictment, information, or sentence for the commission of a felony, who may be denied passports.

The bill significantly omits any provision for the limitation of passports during times of so-called national emergencies, the authors pointing out that as far as the issuance of passports is concerned, the United States has been in a national emergency since 1940.

The authors of the Senate bill, in an explanatory memorandum accompanying their proposal, also aim a telling blow at the present practice of the State Department to proscribe large areas of the world as out-of-bounds to traveling Americans.

Under the bill, if the President and the State Department decided that temporarily the United States could not give its usual protection to American travelers in a certain area, passport applicants, the public and Congress would be notified of the hazard, but the President shall not forbid travel in these areas.

This "travel at your own risk" section makes sense, but it is likely to be especially distasteful to Secretary Dulles and others who seem to look upon citizens' travel more as an instrument of Government policy than as the constitutional freedom which the courts have found it to be. But Americans who believe that freedom to travel and other freedoms are inherent rights and not matters of official expedience will throw their support to the Senate passport bill.

Hon. John A. Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, most assuredly I wish to join with my colleagues in voicing our appreciation for the fine services which the Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS, has rendered to the people of the Territory of Hawaii particularly, and to the Nation generally during the 85th Congress. And, may I say, that to those of us who were privileged to know him personally before he made his presence here among us, his successes and achievements during the last 2 years have come as no surprise. With his knowledge of the area and people that he is honored to represent, his dedication to purpose, his humility of spirit, and his ceaseless activity in furthering the principles and objectives in which he believes, success was bound to be his reward. Not discounting in the least the records of his illustrious predecessors, I do not hestitate to say that the accomplishments of the present Delegate in securing favorable action on needed legislation for the Territory and his boost toward the goal of full statehood for that lovely land and its hospitable, intelligent, and loyal people has been second to none.

JOHN A. BURNS is a man of strong character. He practices openly the faith in which he believes so sincerely and which permits for him no compromise with evil, disloyalty, or doubledealing. His reputation is above reproach. His word, not lightly given, but when given, is his bond, and, to my knowledge, remains unquestioned. With these attributes he is possessed of far more than the average abil-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ity for the work to which he is now dedicated. He has learned well the intricacies of his new responsibility. As a newcomer, he has not hesitated to ask for advice and counsel, and he has done this, regardless of partisan or political division. The Members on both sides of the aisle have been only too glad to counsel and advise with him in the interests of the people of Hawaii. He is held in the highest of regard and affection by all Members of both Houses.

From the very beginning of his membership in this body he recognized the broad aspect of legislative responsibility. In my opinion, such approach is most outstanding and especially so when such wisdom is found in one just starting his services in this body. Never forgetting for a moment his first and primary responsibility to the area he represents, he has been able to recognize the whole picture—the whole project—rather than just the provincial approach. He started with a good understanding of the experiences of those who had preceded him. Having once made up his mind about what he though was necessary, he has never faltered or wavered. Consequently, the attainment of that ambition, which never has been absent from his conscious moments and, which, as I understand, is the goal of a great majority of the people who sent him to us, is closer to realization today than it ever has been heretofore. Success is just ahead. Statehood for Hawaii—providing its citizens still desire such status—will soon be a reality just as it is for Alaska today. In my opinion, no one understands better the procedure necessary to gain the prize and no one has been willing to give more, even to the point of jeopardizing his own personal welfare, in such struggle than the present Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS.

Brussels Fair Flop—Another Blow to American Prestige?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial by Dick Williams, entertainment editor of the Los Angeles Mirror News.

Without regard to who was at fault in letting this situation get out of hand, I am wondering if it has not meant another damaging blow to American prestige overseas. I am also wondering if it could not have been avoided by a little timely cooperation between our official representatives at the fair and this private company of wildwest performers.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to visit the Brussels Fair. My friends who have, tell me that on the whole it is a wonderful display of our way of life. Relatively little things like this, however, catch the public eye overseas, are blown out of all proportion by enemy propaganda agents, and eventually tend to overshadow all of our successful efforts.

Mr. Williams is to be congratulated for calling our attention to this situation, and I sincerely hope that steps will be taken to insure against the recurrence of such events.

BRUSSELS RODEO—EIGHT-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR FLOP BURNS "ANGELS"

(By Dick Williams)

A Hollywood promoter's dream of grandiose American wild west show and rodeo at the Brussels World's Fair has left local and other investors holding the bag for $455,000. The rodeo venture collapsed 3 weeks after it opened.

Even worse than the flop of the show, which closed July 12 owing an additional estimated $400,000 to Belgian creditors, was the dent to United States prestige overseas.

Gene Autry, whose Denver-based Cremer Rodeo Co. supplied 200 head of livestock for the show, decried the way the United States Government had let the situation deteriorate once it was obvious that the show was in deep trouble. He flew over to investigate the situation 10 days ago.

A troupe of 200 cowboys and cowgirls and a band of Sioux Indians were stranded in Brussels without funds by the show's flop.

They were finally flown home at Government expense after the Moscow Circus, also playing the Brussels Fair, offered to put on a benefit performance to raise money for the destitute performers, many of whom had received no wages for weeks.

AUTRY FLIES 72 COWBOYS HOME

Autry told me he paid the plane fares for 72 of the cowboys back to Denver.

"When they landed in New York they had had only a box lunch since leaving Brussels 20 hours before," he reported.

Autry instructed his New York representatives to take all of the cowboys and their wives to dinner before putting them on a plane for Denver.

"We spend billions for overseas aid but the Government let this thing go too far before it moved in," he observed bitterly.

Henry Fine, Hollywood publicist who handled the show and just arrived home, told me the experience was "so unbelievable I'm still sitting around shaking my head. I think the whole fiasco is bound to lead to a congressional investigation. If it doesn't, I've lost my respect for Congress."

Fine said he had received only 1 week's salary for 16 weeks work since he was hired by G. Robert Fleming, 111 Marquez Place, Pacific Palisades, the originator and producer-manager of the wild west show and rodeo.

Fleming, now believed to be in New York, has no past experience with show business ventures as far as anyone knows.

Autry said he was under the impression from the start that Fleming was in some way associated with the State Department, and had tacit backing of the Government in putting on the show.

Fleming took off for New York once the show flopped in Brussels, amid angry recriminations from the Brussels press. He told Fine he would seek further backing from ANTA, the national theatrical organization.

Caught in the worst debacle for Los Angeles show business investors since the demise of the ill-fated revue My L. A. in 1951 is a group of local backers headed by FM-radio station owner Harry Maizlish. He is in for a reported $250,000. Maizlish had his attorneys in Brussels last week investigating the situation.

Other local investors include Blanche Hill, 9419 Sunset Boulevard, Beverly Hills, and Morris Bernstein, a dentist, of 263 26th Street, Santa Monica. Additional investors were from Texas, San Francisco, and New York.

BAD LUCK, BAD MANAGEMENT

Autry and Fine agreed that a combination of bad management and bad luck killed the show, which started off with the kind of reception accorded the Russian Moiseyev Dancers here in the States.

It rained almost steadily during the early weeks of the fair, Autry said. As a cushion against this emergency, Fleming had originally purchased a new style, $60,000 air-cushion-type tent made by United States Rubber.

The tent suffered a quick series of disastrous blowouts at the start of the run and became unusable. Thereafter, rodeo show patrons were forced to sit out in the rain to see the show.

Autry, who was originally tendered an offer to star in the show with Gail Davis, of Annie Oakley fame, and turned it down, cited amazing expenditures.

One included a freight bill of $70,000 reportedly paid by Fleming to transport temporary circus-style seats from Los Angeles to Brussels, although they could have been obtained there.

Europeans have long had a penchant for American-style Wild West shows and it is highly ironic that at the start it was figured the rodeo had the biggest potential of any show playing the fair. It was spotted just outside the regular fairgrounds and was regarded as a World's Fair attraction.

"The show got a fantastic reaction when we opened," Fine told me. "The people screamed over it. They came by the busload from all over Europe—Germany, Holland, France—to see it. It was such a big hit that anyone connected with the show or even wearing a western-style sombrero had open sesame to everything."

REPORTED IN BANKRUPTCY

The situation now is a mad tangle. No one has any accounting books on the show. Tickets were distributed all over Europe to agencies with apparently no record kept of whom they went to or how many were given, Autry told me.

A flurry of lawsuits seems inevitable, but whether anyone will collect a franc, let alone a dollar, is problematical. The company reportedly was placed in bankruptcy in Brussels last week.

The harassed United States Embassy, struggling to combat the ill will built up by the fiasco, is now attempting to find money to pay off Belgian creditors, including 30 local musicians who received no pay.

Casey Tibbs, star of the show, and Verne Elliot, associated with Autry's rodeo company and in charge of the stock, are still in Brussels.

Loose Handling of Public Money in the Planning and Construction of the Air Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I am including in the RECORD several articles from

the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., edition of Sunday, July 27, 1958 and one from the Rocky Mountain News of July 25. I think these articles merit the attention of the membership for many reasons. They confirm the complete lack of consideration that the promoters and builders of this Academy have had for costs or future cost of operations, clearly demonstrates that little, if any, attention was given to the basic purpose of such Academy.

It is to be noted that this Academy is compared with Pike's Peak as an attraction. I think that comparison is appropriate, for Pike's Peak rises far above the surrounding countryside and is a highlight in the topography of the region. This Academy, on the other hand, too, represents a peak—in lack of planning, waste of public money—and is a landmark to those officers in the Pentagon and in the air service who have built a shrine to their loose handling of public money.

It is to be noted, too, that the basic purpose is not even mentioned in this almost full-page story; but the story itself leads to the belief that this could well be a political contribution to the State by the Federal Government. Any reading of the article will clearly show the terrific cost of maintenance which this Government will face in the future.

I call attention of the membership to the fact that a police squad of 91 is required to patrol this sprawling shrine to Air Force handling of finances. I think it appropriate, too, that on the same page of this same paper, there is an article about Steve Canyon and other comic strip characters being on the grounds of the Academy. This seems to me entirely appropriate, though a reading of the strip leads to the thought that this, too, is high-priced Air Force propaganda.

I would repeat again that the late Mr. Talbott bypassed all regular means of handling this public construction, and, according to my belief, handpicked the architect-engineer, and brought into his own office the handling of the plans for this Academy, where it is hard to find any real handling was ever done. It seems that almost any individual, from the Secretary of Defense all the way down to the working level, could get approval for any changes which would increase cost and use funds appropriated by the Congress for other purposes to meet such desires.

Truly, the hearings which our Subcommittee on Military Construction recently held, plus the publicity incident to it, including the article I insert in the RECORD today, should arouse the curiosity of the public; and perhaps Colorado will make even more money from American people than this article seems to think it will.

The serious side, Mr. Speaker, is that these fine young Americans, right out of high school, trained at this Academy for the Air Force, in 12 or 15 years will be setting the monetary policies and making the financial demands for spending in the name of defense of this country. At that time, apparently, they will be passing judgment on probably a third of the total income of the Government. Certainly their financial training in the rarified atmosphere of this shrine to public waste is hardly conducive to training them to protect the economy of this country. This is highly dangerous, particularly since, as the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, testified before our committee, the present outlook is that the loser between the United States and Russia will be that country whose economy cracks up first.

Mr. Speaker, this example, plus many others which I know about from having served on the Appropriations Committee for national defense, as well as on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, leads me to the firm belief that we seem determined to strike the first blows at our own economy, making it that much easier for Russia.

INVESTIGATION ASKED OF ACADEMY COSTS

WASHINGTON, July 26.—A congressional investigation into the costs of the nearly completed Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs was urged Saturday by Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi.

A member of the House Appropriations Committee, WHITTEN said the total figure will reach approximately $300 million as compared with preliminary estimates of $126 million.

The expenditures were approved, WHITTEN said, by the late Harold E. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force without having been considered through usual procedures for such projects.

The Mississippi Congressman said land for the Academy originally was to have cost about $1 million and was to have been purchased by the State of Colorado and given to the Government. In the end it cost about $5.5 million, with the Federal Government putting up all but about $1 million of the total, he said.

Observing that much of the data concerning the Academy cost came out during hearings on the military construction bill, WHITTEN said:

"I think anyone who reads over the testimony we received will agree that we should investigate the situation further."

He said he will urge that either his appropriations subcommittee or some other congressional group, such as the House Government Operations Committee, investigate.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post of July 27, 1958]

ACADEMY INFLUENCE FELT IN VARIED AREAS

(By John Morehead)

Late next month, 1,158 Air Force Academy cadets will move into their nearly completed permanent quarters just north of Colorado Springs.

This will be a significant occasion for the United States, and especially for Colorado.

For the Nation, the Academy attests to the new maturity of its youngest arm of defense. At last the Air Force has a nest in which to develop the men who will be charged with global defense responsibilities and perhaps the conquest of space.

For the State, the Academy will have meaning that is much more immediate and material.

Even in the 3 years the Academy occupied temporary quarters at Denver's Lowry Air Force Base, operating on a limited scale, it enhanced Colorado's prestige, boosted its economy, and made it the center of many new activities.

In its beautiful and costly permanent site, the Academy will continue to do these things on a far greater scale.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS SPENT

For example, the Federal Government already has spent more than $100 million to build a physical plant which promises to rival, in importance to publicity about the State, towering Pikes Peak which is clearly visible from the 17,800-acre Academy grounds.

While there is disagreement as to what the Academy's ultimate cost will be, Congress so far has appropriated $133.5 million. Only the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project, bringing water from the western side of the Rockies to the thirsty eastern plains, has cost the Government more in the State.

The greatest part of this money has gone to erect a complex of supermodern buildings that might best be described as startling. The Academy proper is a quadrangle of several steel, concrete, and glass structures atop a mesa where the cadets will live and learn. A part of this quadrangle is visible from the main Denver-Colorado Springs Highway (U. S. 85–87), which forms the eastern boundary of the Academy grounds.

But most of the Academy reservation cannot be seen from the road. The campus is 7 miles long and more than 5 miles wide, cut up by valleys and hills and butted up against the rugged Rampart Range.

Tucked into this terrain are the facilities needed to support the Academy—powerplants, warehouses, administrative buildings, pumping plant, sewage plant, barracks. There will be 550 homes in one area and 650 in another to house the Academy staff and their families, plus schools, stores, and all the other things necessary in communities of such size.

In all, there will be some 40 miles of roads linking the various areas, most of which are open to visitors.

This adds up to a fine tourist attraction. Last year, even while the buildings were rising, an estimated 80,000 persons came to see and enjoy. This figure is expected to increase to 250,000 this year.

"Ultimately," says Thayer Tutt, vice president of the Broadmoor Hotel and one of the leaders in the campaign to get the Academy for Colorado, "there should be a million visitors a year."

Former Gov. Dan Thornton, president of the Denver Convention and Visitors Bureau, says "The Academy will be like the Capitol in Washington and the Empire State Building in New York. People who visit the West will want to see the Academy."

Next June 3, the Academy will graduate its first class of 208 cadets with pomp and ceremony to rival the traditional graduation services at West Point and Annapolis. The crowd coming to this event is expected to set off a summer-long centennial-year parade of visitors.

And tourists mean dollars for Colorado's economy.

Aside from the money that visitors may spend in the State, the Academy is the economic equivalent of a new industry. Its business will be the care, maintenance, and education of 2,520 cadets, the projected capacity enrollment expected to be reached in 1963.

To get this job done, 2,200 officers and airmen will be assigned to the Academy. Their dependents will number an estimated 5,200. An additional 2,750 civilian employees, living off the site with the families, also will be needed. These persons will draw an aggregate monthly payroll of more than $1,150,000. Most of this money will be poured into the economy of the Colorado Springs-Denver areas.

FOOD BILL HIGH

The cost of feeding the cadets alone amounts to a substantial bill. Based on current costs, it would take about $100,000 a month to purchase the 75 tons of food which a full complement of cadets would stow away.

Academy officials say most of their food is being bought through Denver firms. Pur-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

chases will continue to be made in Denver and in Colorado Springs after the move.

No less important to Colorado will be the Academy's influence on the State's schools, in intercollegiate sports, and the area's social life.

The Academy's curriculum is roughly similar to that offered by a 4-year engineering school, with strong emphasis on the humanities and liberal arts. Maj. Gen. James B. Briggs, Superintendent, says the Academy "should provide the broad educational background required by senior air officers of a nation which has assumed leadership of the non-Communist world."

Dean James E. Perdue, of the University of Denver's college of arts and sciences, expresses the thinking of many educators when he says: "The educational philosophy finally adopted by the Air Force will have a tremendous impact on the rest of us."

It is expected that many of the region's outstanding teachers will be invited to address the cadets. By the same token experts from the Academy faculty—drawn from throughout the United States—will be available to this area's colleges as guest lecturers and consultants.

In athletics, the Academy has fielded teams in 17 sports, many of them, like la crosse, new to the West. The result is improved quality of competition and increased national recognition for this region.

Big-time football is only a season away. The Air Academy Falcons will play Army in the East next year. This year the Falcons play Colorado, Utah and UCLA along with teams of lesser renown. In a few years the Academy will be playing a full schedule against the top college teams of the country as well as Army and Navy.

The leisurely social life that used to characterize military posts may have gone the way of cavalry horses, but Academy officers and their ladies will find a warm reception in the various strata of Colorado society.

Not least among those who will be welcomed are the cadets. Hand-picked from among the Nation's brightest, sturdiest youths, the cadets are a reservoir of eligible bachelors for this region's young women.

POLICE SQUADRON OF 91 PATROLS ACADEMY SITE

COLORADO SPRINGS, July 26.—They look like cadets, these 91 policemen who patrol the beautiful new Air Force Academy site.

But they really are cops, maining law enforcement patrols, manning the north and south entrance gates to the 17,500-acre site, and supply maps, brochures and answers for thousands of tourists from all part of the Nation.

Hundreds of tourists have to be set straight about the young airmen.

The next question most frequently asked is: "Just where is the chapel that has been causing all the fuss?"

The new force of air police headed by Capt. Roger P. Fox, provost marshal and squadron commander, and Lt. Laurent Bougie, operations officer, was set up here July 1, working in four flights on a round-the-clock basis. The headquarters building has a spic-and-span newness from front office to padlocked clink.

Nearly 3,000 vehicles tour the area every weekend, an average of about 10,000 persons.

Visitors may stop at the entrance gates for maps and brochures.

While the academic area is temporarily blocked off from traffic because of construction, visitors may drive their own cars over many of the roads from 6 a. m. to 7 p. m. daily.

From lookouts in this sprawling mountian section of 7,200-foot altitude, they can get breathtaking views of the academic complex, housing and service areas.

Before the airmen took over at the Academy site, a civilian security force known as General Services Administration was in operation for 3 years.

The GSA crew did everything from jeeping groceries in to residents marooned by deep snows, to guarding construction payrolls.

By the time the cadets are moved here from Lowry Air Force Base in Denver in August, the air police squadron will number 112.

STEVE CANYON STRIP IN STATE MONDAY—SHOWS LOCAL SCENES

Air Force Lt. Col. Steve Canyon and his vivacious cousin Poteet arrive in Colorado Monday to do their bit in helping the Air Force Academy move from Lowry Air Force Base to its permanent site near Colorado Springs.

The two new arrivals will be recognized by Denver Post readers as the main characters of the Milton Caniff comic strip Steve Canyon.

The comic appears in 606 other newspapers throughout the world, but those acquainted with Denver will see in the panel backgrounds many familiar Denver area sights.

While Poteet becomes involved romantically with an Air Force enlisted man, Steve goes about his work helping the Academy personnel in their move.

Among the many local personalities brought into the strip is Maj. Gen. J. E. Briggs, commander of the Academy.

He is pictured on this page in a panel taken from one of the future Steve Canyon sequences.

Buildings, street and highway signs, the new Academy buildings and familiar details of Denver life can be recognized in the comic.

Six months ago a Denver Post reporter-photographer team toured the city obtaining photographs of such scenes and details for Caniff, who is a stickler for detail.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., of July 26, 1958]

AIR FORCE ACADEMY FINANCING PROBE URGED

(By Gene Wortsman)

WASHINGTON, July 25.—A Mississippi Congressman Friday urged a deeper probe into financing of the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs.

Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN (Democrat, of Mississippi) said, "There are lots of things that arouse your curiosity."

A member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which questioned witnesses about the Academy, WHITTEN said that the handling of contracts is questionable.

He said that after contracts were let values were increased by millions of dollars.

EASIEST THING

It "would be the easiest thing in the world" for the Government official handling contracts to award the original bid to a favorite who knew that the price would be upped later, WHITTEN said.

"I am saying that could have happened," he remarked in the hearing to John N. Ferry, special Air Force assistant for installations. "Could it not?"

"It is a remote and unthinkable possibility," Ferry replied.

"Why is it unthinkable?"

"Because of the character of the people who are running this job. * * *"

"Mr. Talbott resigned, did he not?" (Harold Talbott was Air Force secretary when Congress was told the Academy would cost $125 million.)

"Mr. Talbott resigned," Ferry agreed.

"Wasn't he using his position to influence business for his own folks?" WHITTEN asked.

"No, sir; I cannot agree."

MORE QUESTIONS

"Well," WHITTEN said, "you came here with him, and it is natural that you (would not agree). I am asking you again if that was not the basis on which he tendered his resignation, and that it was accepted—on these charges?"

"I could not comment on that, sir."

"Were the charges made?"

"The charges were made."

"Did he offer his resignation?"

"He did."

"Did the President accept it?"

"The President did, sir."

Later in the hearing WHITTEN said:

"I do not know whether I can get by with it, but I am going to try and get another investigation. I do not know how far I can get with that." WHITTEN reiterated his probe plea Friday.

Mail Rates Should Be Based on Delivery Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bloomington Sun, Bloomington, Minn., entitled "Mail Rates Should be Based on Delivery Cost," which points out the real need for a reexamination of the whole mail-rate structure:

COST

(By Pete Donaghue)

Although the postage rate hikes which will go into effect August 1 are certainly needed, there are many small-business men who wish that the whole mail-rate structure could be evaluated for fairness.

Unfortunately, in setting the new rates, Congress appears to have been more influenced by powerful special interests than by a realistic appraisal of the immediate economic problem. Everyone will feel the new postage hike, but the poor small-business man—as usual—is getting hit for more than his share.

It wasn't too long ago that a lower rate was charged for mail to be delivered locally, and letters which were to be sent out of town and required more handling, paid more postage.

Under the new rate structure, 4 cents is being charged for all first-class mail, whether for local delivery or transportation across the country. Using the postal department's own figures, however, the cost of distribution of first-class mail is less than 2 cents when that mail is handled only by the local post office.

Since the bulk of the mail of a small-business man goes to the local post office and to local customers, an across-the-board increase for all first-class mail is a further penalty on him. Conversely, a blanket increase is an aid to a large company, which otherwise would have to pay more because it costs more to deliver its mail all over the Nation.

Another area where a real investigation is needed to clear up inequities is in the second-class privileges allowed newspapers and magazines. Even though this newspaper would suffer a bit in higher second-class rates we'd gladly pay more to see an honest approach to the whole problem.

Second-class rates are scheduled to be raised in three installments, beginning next

January 1. Even with this raise, however, second-class publications will not come near paying the cost of their distribution.

We believe that all classes of mail—including second-class—should pay exactly what they cost to be delivered. Mailings which go to farflung corners of the country should pay more than those which are delivered in the next block.

An article in the Postal Supervisors says that the postal department loses $4 million a year on delivery of The Reader's Digest, and also mentions that the average copy of this publication is mailed for 1 cent.

A total of $8 million is lost annually by the Post Office in the handling of the Saturday Evening Post and the Ladies Home Journal. Biggest single loss of the post office however is Life, which costs the tax payer of this country $9 million a year to be delivered.

If all classes of mail were made to pay their own way, there would be a lot less grumbling at the coming postal increases, particularly on the part of the hard-hit small-business man.

Shopping Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial on the fair trade bill. This article is now even more significant since the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the Interstate Committee, of both of which I am a member, has reported the fair trade bill to the full committee. I am opposed to this bill, strictly on the basis of the merit of arguments offered for and against. This editorial sheds further light on the inequities and harm that would be done under a Federal fair trade law.

SHOPPING AROUND

As every housewife knows, the American economy is built on shopping around. By shopping around, the housewife knows she has a better chance of getting the thing she wants at reduced cost or perhaps a better article than the one she had in mind for the same price she wanted to pay. Shopping around is the result of the American system of competitive free enterprise, and most people will agree that it's a very beneficial result.

Some don't, though, and among them are some Congressmen who want again to hobble the public with the so-called fair-trade laws which in recent years have fallen not only into disrepute but into illegality. Fourteen State courts have declared unconstitutional various State fair-trade laws based on an act of Congress which permitted States to pass laws that fixed prices.

Representatives OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, has introduced a bill the House Commerce Committee is expected to report out favorably and the House to pass. The bill cuts through the evasions of former permissive acts of Congress. This one would make mandatory a national fair-trade law which would end retail trade competition altogether.

Mr. HARRIS, to say the least, is to be congratulated on his forthrightness. He makes no bones about State laws, agreements and so forth. The bill comes right out to permit a manufacturer to fix stipulated or minimum resale prices simply by serving notice to the distributors. Even the fiction of a contract is abandoned, and the same resale price would be set in all States, Territories, and the District of Columbia simultaneously. Violators could be hauled into Federal court for damages.

Perhaps some manufacturers will like such a bill, and maybe some retailers will, too. But the manufacturer who sets his prices either nationwide or by areas, reduces the flexibility of his price structure. And the retailer would be bound by the prices set and denied the possibility of moving his goods faster by reducing prices. In fact, the only way a retailer could legally lower the price, once it was set by the manufacturer, would be to go out of business or hold a damaged goods sale. It seems to us that both manufacturers and retailers should hesitate about a bill that might well curtail their sales.

There isn't much hesitation on the part of the Government, however; the Commerce, Agriculture, and the Justice Departments are against the Harris measure as written. The Justice Department says it would drastically change the basic concepts of our competitive economy. "The bill would suppress competition at the manufacturing level and at all levels of distribution. Obviously, competition would be eliminated at the retail level, since this is the apparent purpose of the bill."

And what would be the result of the elimination of competition at the retail level?

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in a speech in the Senate recently, put the case for fair trade quite succinctly. He said fair trade benefits the retailer and the wholesaler, by placing them on an equal footing with all other retailers and wholesalers of branded or trade marked products, whether they happen to be large or small. Also, the margins of profit for both are fixed.

As for the effects on the consumer, Senator HUMPHREY had this to say: "Fair trade eliminates the need for shopping around."

And what would happen if there were no more shopping around?

The Justice Department has an answer to that in a survey made in 1954, and we think the housewife who shops around now would like to know what happens when she can't.

The survey shows that drug and appliance prices in fair trade areas were 28 percent higher than drug and appliances prices in places where there wasn't any fair trade.

Federal Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the need for a careful and cool-headed study of proposed legislation is emphasized in the Indiana report on scholarships. This story is summarized in the editorial from the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle of July 31, 1958, which, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEED EXAGGERATED

It is easy to say this or that isn't true but you make a strong case only by backing up the opinion with solid facts. Such is the case in Indiana on the proposal for Federal scholarships to aid college students. And the need is exaggerated, as so often is the case when the Federal Government decides to take over functions which strictly are State affairs.

Proponents of Federal scholarships have been citing estimates that as many as 100,000 able high-school graduates do not go to college for financial reasons. On this basis, Indiana could be expected to have about 2,300 competent school seniors who will be denied a college education for lack of money.

A committee of 14 men, headed by Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School, was appointed by State school officials to investigate the situation. Letters were sent 707 high-school principals to find out how many students with interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform college work successfully would be unable to attend college because of a lack of funds. The answer was approximately 2,000—very close to the estimated figure of 2,300.

It was then that the true story came to light. These 2,000 students were invited to take a 4½-hour test in science, mathematics, English, and social studies with the view to obtaining a scholarship. Only 703 took the examination. The other 65 percent apparently was not interested.

The results of the 703 examinations disclosed only 179 students as having the definite ability to pursue successfully a college course. (This doesn't speak very high for their training in high school on an overall basis.) The students with ability were asked, by letter, if they could pay their own way to college. Twenty-three did not respond and 14 said they had the financial resources necessary for college for at least a year. Twenty-five others had interests other than in mathematics and science.

The standard-need formula then was applied to the remaining 117 qualified students. Of these, 64 were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 students qualifying for financial aid. And of this final group, 37 already had scholarships ranging from $25 to $750 but did need extra help.

The investigating committee now is devising a plan to aid these students from private sources and the Indiana Chamber of Commerce has undertaken the job of making sure that the assistance becomes available.

So the facts and figures are plain. Officials in Washington who want to force through the Federal-scholarship program obviously are exaggerating the need, at least as far as Indiana is concerned.

The Community Facilities Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in supporting this legislation, the community facilities bill, I do so because of the great need for congressional action at this time.

Too many Members are ready and willing to vote for so-called foreign aid with the Economic Development Fund to spend American dollars for community facilities in underdeveloped countries. To do less in our country is shortsighted and in a sense, against the best interest

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of our country, its communities, and its peoples.

Let us see what S. 3497 will do for the people. This bill as reported by the committee, would rewrite title II of the housing amendments of 1955, which authorized Federal loans for public facilities. The bill would make the following major changes in this loan program:

First. The fund for community facilities and public works loans would be increased to $2 billion, of which $400 million would constitute a revolving fund.

Second. The formula for computing the maximum interest rate to the borrower would be revised to produce a maxium rate, under present conditions, of 2⅝ percent.

Third. The maximum loan term would be raised from 40 years to 50 years.

Fourth. The existing program has been limited in practice to communities of 50,000 population or less; the bill extends the program to all municipalities and other political subdivisions of States without regard to population.

Fifth. Eligibility would be extended specifically to a wide range of facilities and projects. Priority would be given to projects which the administration determines could not be undertaken without the bill's assistance.

Sixth. Private nonprofit hospitals would be made eligible for loans under the bill.

Seventh. The amount of the authorization which could be used in any one State would be limited to 10 percent.

Eighth. The prevailing-wage and overtime requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act would apply to projects financed under the bill.

In addition, the bill would increase the authorization for Federal planning advances under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 from $48 million to $98 million.

The primary and urgent purpose of this community-facilities and public-works bill is to provide a much-needed stimulus to our lagging economy, to increase the flow of the purchasing power into the hands of the consumer, and to reduce the alarming ranks of the unemployed. It will provide a valuable tool in the fight against the current economic slump. Basically, the bill would provide a substantial sum of money for long-term loans on liberal terms to municipalities and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of many types of worthy community facilities and public works. I am convinced that the program will furnish a vitally needed economic stimulus and, at the same time, will enable communities to build essential and desirable public facilities which would not otherwise go forward.

The bill is a product of careful study and deliberation by the committee. It was one of the major pieces of legislation considered during an extended series of hearings on legislation to relieve unemployment. During the hearings, which began on April 14 and continued through May 22, the committee received testimony from witnesses of the highest caliber and competence, men of proved achievement and ability in their fields. The list of witnesses included former President Harry S. Truman, distinguished governors from 10 of our great States, distinguished mayors, top labor and business leaders, the leaders of the 3 major farm organizations, top administration officials, and Members of Congress. The cooperation of these witnesses was of invaluable assistance to the committee and their contribution has helped to improve both the content and quality of the bill.

In framing the bill your committee considered S. 3497, passed by the Senate on April 16, 1958; H. R. 11474 and H. R. 11272; and the reported bill incorporates features from all three bills.

The whole problem of aid to communities is not new. In 1955 Congress passed a community-facilities bill which set up a revolving fund of $100 million restricted to loans for smaller communities. Smaller communities have been defined as communities under 10,000 population, although the act actually contemplated communities of 50,000. Most of this money has been used for sewerage and water facilities.

This bill goes much further, not alone in its extension to all communities but also in its realistic increase in both the amount of money and the longer terms for the duration of the loan at lower interest rates.

Personally I can see no logic in a situation which refuses to lend money to our communities while at the same time, giving money, without hope of return, to foreign communities.

The vote to defeat the rule on this bill is of course a vote against the bill.

Any Congressman voting for foreign redevelopment and against local home community redevelopment loans should take another look at the situation and consider voting for loans to our communities for the construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers and public nursing homes and public convalescent homes; public refuse and garbage-disposal facilities, water, sewage and sanitary facilities, and other public-utility facilities; civil-defense facilities, public police and fire protection facilities; public wholesale farm produce markets; public libraries and offices and other public buildings—other than schools—and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

Loans to nonprofit hospitals to finance specific projects for hospital construction, repair, or improvement are also made eligible under the bill.

To insure that assistance under the bill will be channeled primarily into projects that will create employment, there is included in the committee substitute a requirement that in extending such assistance the Administrator shall grant priority to projects which he determines could not be undertaken without such assistance. Applications of communities which demonstrate that the project involved could not be undertaken without Federal assistance would be processed ahead of applications where such a showing is not made.

To assure a roughly equitable distribution of the loan funds, borrowing in any one State could not exceed 10 percent of the funds provided—including repayments into the revolving fund.

There are many features of the act that will be covered in other speeches and the report of the committee on this bill is an outstanding book of information concerning public expenditures under previous acts, and contemplated spending under this act. In the light of the severe opposition, and to my mind unsound arguments advanced by the opposition, I believe it is time to make a comparison of public expenditures under the present local facilities bill and the expenditures under the foreign aid facilities bill.

Under the present law there is a revolving fund of $100 million available for the smaller communities. Under the foreign aid bill there is at the present time, $8,278,000,000 with $595 million earmarked for facilities in foreign countries. Added to this, there is another $912 million unexpended out of this grand total, allocated for spending in development and redevelopment of these foreign communities.

As a matter of information I believe the following list of programs and the amounts allocated to each program is of utmost importance to local officials, particularly those who have begged this Congress to back legislation covering their communities for, if not more, at least one-half as much as we are giving to the foreign countries. I would like to have this schedule become part of the RECORD and I want to thank Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, for making it available to me.

Although defeat of the rule appears to be the order of the day, I cannot help but feel that failure to pass this legislation would be a severe blow to our economy and especially to the many local governments that have been looking forward to this aid.

Program by name and amount (House bill)

	Total available for expenditure
1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	$3,359,502,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	1,515,000,000
Total	4,874,502,000
2. Defense support:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	910,688,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	700,000,000
Total	1,610,688,000
3. Development Loan Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	295,118,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	300,000,000
Total	595,118,000
4. Development assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	168,211,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	168,211,000
5. Special assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	126,288,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	185,000,000
Total	311,288,000
6. President's Asian fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	88,677,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	88,677,000

Program by name and amount (House bill)— Continued

	Total available for expenditure
7. President's contingency fund (new program):	
New funds, fiscal year 1959	$100,000,000
Total	100,000,000
8. Technical cooperation, bilateral:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	165,899,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	150,000,000
Total	315,899,000
9. Technical cooperation, U. N.:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	9,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	20,000,000
Total	29,500,000
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	998,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	1,500,000
Total	2,498,000
11. Joint control:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	6,770,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	6,770,000
12. Atoms for peace:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	6,100,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	5,500,000
Total	11,600,000
13. North Atlantic Treaty Organization:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	1,000,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	1,000,000
14. Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	5,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	12,500,000
Total	18,000,000
15. U. N. Refugee Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	
New funds, fiscal year 1959	1,200,000
Total	1,200,000
16. Escapee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	1,800,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	8,600,000
Total	10,400,000
17. U. N. Children's Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	6,775,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	11,000,000
Total	17,775,000
18. U. N. Relief and Works Agency:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	6,428,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	25,000,000
Total	31,428,000
19. Ocean freight:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	100,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	2,100,000
Total	2,200,000
20. Control Act:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	160,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	1,000,000
Total	1,160,000
21. Administrative expenses, ICA:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	5,511,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	33,000,000
	38,511,000
22. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	3,105,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	6,692,500
Total	9,797,500
23. Hungarian refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	6,500,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	6,500,000
24. Egyptian refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	200,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	200,000

Program by name and amount (House bill)— Continued

	Total available for expenditure
25. Polish refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	$5,600,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	5,600,000
26. German refugee:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	1,123,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	1,123,000
27. Undistributed-unexplained:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	17,693,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	17,693,000
28. Undistributed-unexplained:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1958	746,000
New funds, fiscal year 1959	
Total	746,000
Grand total	8,278,084,500

H. R. 13621, a Bill To Correct Inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 31, I introduced the bill, H. R. 13621, to correct the inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. The purpose of the bill is generally indicated in its title.

Experience has shown that the act is discriminatory in many of its features, and behind the times so far as its pay features compare with general industrial practices. The suggested amendments will improve the act in those instances that have developed during the time the act has been in effect. A sectional analysis follows:

Subsection 1 provides that when an appeal is sustained the position on which the appeal is based shall be posted for bid in accordance with postal regulations.

Subsection 1 (a) would simply provide the right of organizations and the officers of organizations to file appeals in behalf of the members of their organizations.

Subsection 2 advances all nonsupervisory positions by one level.

Subsection 3 would provide that employees assigned to duties and responsibilities of a higher salary level shall be paid for such duties for the time employed. At the present time the employee is required to perform service at the higher level for 30 days in each calendar year before becoming eligible for the increased compensation.

Subsection 4 would require the Postmaster General to file annual reports on the operations of the act.

Subsection 5 would correct a situation wherein an employee who had held a given position for a number of years was converted under the act to a step and level lower than the step in the same level of the employee who was first promoted to the position on the day following enactment of the act.

Subsection 6 would remove the artificial restraint on the advancement of substitutes assigned to road duty in the Postal Transportation Service.

Subsection 7 would correct a situation which prohibits clerks and lettercarriers from promotion to higher salary levels unless they are in the top step of their level, while other employees in lower levels may be promoted to higher levels without regard to the step they occupy in their current salary level.

Subsection 8 would merely provide that the normal schedule of regular employees would be encompassed within 9 consecutive hours rather than 10. At the present time many employees are required to take 2-hour lunch periods making for an extremely long work day.

Subsection 9 would grant employees premium compensatory time (at the rate of time and one-half) for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays and would make it mandatory that employees be paid rather than be given compensatory time for Saturday and Sunday service during the month of December.

Subsection 10 would provide double compensatory time for services performed on holidays and the payment of double time for service performed on Christmas Day.

Subsection 11 would increase the night work differential from the present 10 percent of salary to 20 percent in common with the practice in enlightened private industry.

Subsection 12 would provide compensatory time for Saturday and Sunday service for employees in third-class offices and require that the hours of duty of employees in third-class offices be on the same basis as the hours of duties of employees in first- and second-class offices.

Subsection 13 would provide that whenever a substitute employee is required to be available for duty he shall be employed not less than 3 consecutive hours. At the present time when an employee is officially called for duty he must be employed for not less than 2 consecutive hours, but in many instances postmasters instead of ordering a substitute to report for duty merely tell him to remain within calling distance in the event his services are needed. In this manner the employee is as effectively tied down as though he had been ordered to report, but is not paid for the period of time involved.

Subsection 14 would not change the present substitute ratio but would merely provide that all substitutes, temporary as well as classified, be included in determining the number of substitutes to which an office might be entitled.

Subsection 15 is applicable only to employees on road duty in the Postal Transportation Service. If a run is less than 8 hours, the time less than 8 hours is characterized as deficiency time, and the total of all deficiency time must be made up before the employee can be paid over-

time for additional service. These requirements force employees to make additional runs without compensation.

Section 2 of the act prescribes the effective dates. The bill, with the exception of subsection 5 of subsection 1, would not be effective until the beginning of the first pay period following enactment. Subsection 5 of section 1 has a retroactive application.

Letter From Mr. Alsop to Mr. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column in the form of a letter written by Mr. Joseph Alsop to former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson which appeared in the Washington Post on August 4, 1958:

LETTER TO "ENGINE CHARLIE"

(By Joseph Alsop)

DEAR MR. WILSON: Maybe there are more important things to write about, but your recent remarks about Jim Gavin positively demand this letter of thanks.

General Gavin has been doubly impertinent. Rather than lie to the Congress about the results of your defense policies, he has preferred resigning from the service that he loved and gave his life to. And now he has dared to publish a book, suggesting that your defense policies have led this country into mortal danger. This kind of impertinence of course deserves the rebuke you so characteristically meted out:

"I know Gavin," you are reported as saying. "And he is just another overly inflated Army officer with an exaggerated regard of his ability. He's just trying to sell his book."

What was so wonderful was your simultaneous denial that Gavin could really know you, since you had only seen him on rare occasions. You know Gavin, in other words, as you knew about the defense of the United States—by interpreting the messages of your own peculiar mental telepathy in the powerful light of your own prejudices. Or one might say, you know Gavin as you knew about the danger to this country from the rapid growth of Soviet power—by ignoring all the unpleasant facts reported by the intelligence services, and faithfully following your own natural instincts (with some help from the budgetary policies of your friend, George Humphrey).

There are certain facts about Jim Gavin, to be sure, that lesser men than you still have a tendency not to ignore. There is the simple fact of the man himself—the brilliant intellectual who is also a great fighting man, the adored leader of the best division in the United States Army, the combat general with the cool courage that goes with knowledge, the shining soldier with the human style that all men envied and the best men tried to imitate.

One does not forget, either, the parachute landing that Gavin made in Sicily, and the long cruel battle at Salerno, and the drop at dawn into the inferno at Nijmegen and desperate attack that turned the balance in the desperate Battle of the Bulge. All these further facts still arouse strong emotions and call up vivid images—but only in smaller minds than yours. And, of course, you are right that the two Distinguished Service Crosses, and the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart, all won in the fire of battle, are mere military fripperies that probably had a lot to do with overly inflating Jim Gavin.

No doubt smaller minds are afflicted with these distorting emotions and are impressed by these foolish images, simply because they do not understand as well as you do what makes our country great. If you had left Westinghouse Electric to go into uniform, for instance, you might not have got the job with Delco-Remy in 1919. And if you had not got the job with Delco-Remy, you might not have got the job with General Motors later on. And if that job had been missed, heaven forbid, we might not have had you as Secretary of Defense.

Even before that great moment when you took over the Pentagon, you always insisted on the right priorities. One remembers, for example, your reply to Bob Lovett when he asked for a loan of one of your junior executives during a very bad moment in the Korean war. The man Lovett wanted did not mind the heavy cut in salary. He only asked Lovett for your assurance that his absence on the Nation's service would not hinder his later promotion in the peculiar hierarchy over which you then presided. With a thrill of admiration, Lovett still recalls your stern and patriotic answer: "Of course, it will be held against him, if he leaves General Motors the way you want him to."

At the Pentagon, too, how firmly and wisely you always insisted upon the right priorities. It was a dangerous moment when you took over, no doubt about it. Action was demanded on a whole series of ugly reports announcing the early loss to the Soviets of the existing American military lead. There were a lot of people who wanted to press the panic button in your immortal phrase, and make the effort to maintain the American lead.

But you went right on assuring everyone, in your coolheaded way, that the Russians weren't 10 feet high. So the Soviets are now well on their way to gaining almost unchallengeable superiority in nuclear striking power. For this, we have you to thank.

But this letter is meant to offer thanks of a more personal kind. It is intended to thank you for the final revelation of the true grandeur of your viewpoint; and it is especially intended to thank you for showing us all what gratitude is owing, what respect is due, from the comfortable people who have been saved to those men who have uncomfortably risked their lives to save them. Thank you, and goodby.

JOSEPH ALSOP.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 2, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, fifth district, Texas)

AUGUST 2, 1958.

The adjournment rush is on. Committees passing out final bills, Rules Committee assigning priority, floor action of debates and votes. Often all these are simultaneous. Frequently normal, more orderly, procedures are discarded in haste. These closing days are the most dangerous of each Congress as action is taken in haste, some allegedly intentional and political, to pass out the controversial legislation more easily. This was an unusually eventful week.

H. R. 10 (Jenkins-Keogh bill), a bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals, passed under suspension of the rules which permits only 40 minutes' debate, no amendments, and a two-thirds vote of those present. The purpose: a limited set aside of income to be taxed later when spent during retirement. The reason: to equalize tax treatment between self-employed and employees, the latter so benefiting now; the major criticism: the Federal tax revenue loss will be $360 million in the first year (and less later) at a time when the Government is deficit financing. Generally an excellent bill, as I see it.

The Presidential pension bill passed handily after amendment. The bill provided (1) $25,000 per year Presidential pension, (2) $10,000 pension for the widow, (3) clerical and administrative help (somewhere between $104,000 to $130,000 yearly), (4) suitable office space, (5) the franking privilege (4,000 pieces a month). By a vote of 127 to 76 the last three provisions were deleted (Alger for deletion). Many felt that Presidents were financially secure, others suspected financial help would be used politically by ex-Presidents. Most agreed, including myself, that the final bill was a good one.

The social-security amendments bill included a 70-percent increase in benefit payments, an increase in public assistance, maternal and child care, and welfare provisions and an increase in tax rates. The base pay for taxing was increased from $4,200 to $4,800, and effective January 1959 the rate upped one-fourth percent for employer and employee and three-eighths percent for self-employed, these to be progressively increased to 9 percent by 1969 (employer plus employee) and 6¾ percent for self-employed. The bill passed handily, 375 to 2, after 4 hours of debate. Since I opposed the bill after study and the debate, let's see what opposition grounds are to this bill: (1) The Advisory Committee set up 2 years ago to study and suggest changes to social security won't report until later this year, (2) even after tax increase the payments will be more than taxes. It is not pay as we go, but it stil actuarially unsound; (3) the $22 billion fund has all been spent, only Federal I O U's remain; (4) the deficit of payment to the 12 million present retirees is $65 billion. What will it be for the additional 75 million now paying in anticipating future benefit payments? (5) Payment is compulsory; yet you may never get it back; example: those oldsters who can't live on social security and seek to earn more, lose their social security. These and others. Now what do you think?

This stopgap legislation is a typical election-year gesture to voters. It happens each election year. Sidestepped or postponed is the answer to the question: Can our people afford the tax increases necessary to pay for social security? For many, social-security taxes will exceed income taxes. Instead, we transfer the debt and decision to our children. Unless it collapses in the meantime, a future generation may vote the program out. It is a political measure, after all. Then where will the elder citizens be who were forced to take this Government program instead of a private insurance program wherein their money would be returned. Or will we be forced to socialize our Government to bail out earlier failures to recognize social-security weaknesses. Should Congressmen be afraid to speak out and oppose the politically popular measures? Of course not. If we want a social-security program why don't we face up to the costs and make it pay as we go?

Why don't insurance and businessmen tell the people the facts of life and make the program actuarially sound? We're all of us for providing for our futures.

The Community Facilities Act, a $2 billion bill to loan Federal money to local communities for sidewalks, parking lots, recreational facilities, and almost every conceivable kind of project was defeated, 187 to 173, generally along party lines, a few Democrats joining most Republicans to defeat it. Since no local subdivision of this Nation is so in debt as the Federal Government, it is hard to understand the thinking of the proponents of this bill. This may slow down the $5 billion list of spending bills still awaiting action. Otherwise, 2 more debt-limit increases, instead of 1, may be required.

The fair-trade bill in our committee, allegedly to help retailers through manufacturers setting the prices for trademarked items, I have branded as unfair to consumers and self-defeating to the retailers. I predict, if this bill ever becomes understood, there will be a mighty roar by the shopping public that will drown out, perhaps even retire Congressmen supporting the bill.

A Big Step in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Saturday, August 2, 1958, commenting on the recent dedication of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Bank & Trust Co.:

NORTHEASTERN BANK MARKS ITS COMING

Branch banking is no new experience for our region, but it was climaxed yesterday in unique form when the new Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Bank & Trust Co., largest in its field, was dedicated. Size was not the sole criterion of uniqueness. Dedication ceremonies were held simultaneously in Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and Scranton. This is without a precedent in the banking field.

And as is well known by now, the new bank combines the operations of the Wilkes-Barre Deposit & Savings Bank, First National Bank & Trust Co., of Scranton, and the Markle Banking & Trust Co., of Hazleton.

As defined by President Frank E. Hemelright, formation of the new bank is based on a spirit of community interdependence and progress. This goal certainly has its proper place in a regional setup.

Luzerne county stockholders, patrons, and other friends of the newly formed institution will note with satisfaction that the Wilkes-Barre bank will be represented by Justin Bergman, president, and Attorney Robert Doran, both of Wilkes-Barre, on the new board, and that Alvan Markle, Jr., and Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, of Hazleton, will represent the Markle bank interest.

In a forward-looking statement, Mr. Hemelright makes note of a solid history of community service and public interest by the three predecessors of the new bank and points confidently to its slogan, "A Big Step in the Right Direction," as a symbol of area progress.

We join in wishing the new institution continued success and the expanded measure of usefulness to which it aspires.

Nursing Homes Called Shocking, Criminal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the fact that recently we have had considerable testimony in the Banking and Currency Committee in behalf of the nursing homes for the entire United States. Since the provision is carried in the housing bill which is expected to come to the floor of the House in the near future, and in order to substantiate the position of the nursing homes in the United States; I would like to submit this article concerning the nursing homes in Washington, D. C.; making clear the deplorable conditions of the nursing homes in the District of Columbia. This article makes clear the need for adequate and better care for our aged citizens:

NURSING HOMES CALLED SHOCKING, CRIMINAL—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL SOCIETY REPORT SAYS FEW EVEN MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS

(By Charles G. Brooks)

Most of Washington's private nursing homes are a disgrace to the city, a District Medical Society report released last night charged.

The special report by the Committee on Public Health was accompanied by comments ranging from "the situation is terrible and criminal," to "some of the holes I have been in should be burned to the ground."

The tone of the report was backed by Dr. Daniel L. Finucane, District Health Director, who said yesterday that very few of the private nursing homes here meet Washington's minimum standards.

A HORRIBLE SITUATION

Gerard M. Shea, Director of Public Welfare, agreed, saying "it is a horrible situation" with many persons barely getting room and board in run-down homes.

Dr. Finucane said the problem seems to be one of economics. The average person, he pointed out, can't pay the $300 to $400 per month generally required by the better homes. The Welfare Department, for example, allows only $110 per month for nursing home care for its wards.

Dr. Clifton R. Gruver, chairman of the Medical Society's executive committee, while recognizing the sad state of most of the private nursing homes, declared that a crackdown which would close many of the homes would be unwise at this time. The need for nursing home beds is too great, he added.

The report was presented to the executive committee last week. The committee appointed three subcommittees to work with the Health Department and Nursing Home Association toward improving the situation.

SUBSIDIZATION PROPOSED

The committee agreed there is no immediate solution. It noted, however, a number of opportunities for improvement in medical care and in sanitation. The group agreed on the need for a long-range program and on the need to explore the possibility of subsidizing nursing homes.

The unusual report from the usually conservative medical society is the result of a survey of physicians earlier this summer. Responses came from 129 doctors who said they had sent patients to nursing homes during the past 2 years. Another 102 doctors had not used the homes recently, and several gave their reasons for not doing so.

Many of the reporting physicians use only the few topflight nursing homes in the District so that statistics in the report show a higher general rating for homes than the Committee on Public Health expected.

However, more than 60 doctors returned special critical comments with their forms. These comments severely condemned the majority of nursing homes.

APPALLING CONDITIONS

Dr. Gruver declared: "Remarks by many indicate conditions which would appear appalling. We must elevate the standards of care as befits this Nation's Capital * * * to a level which allows us to view with pride rather than shame the facilities available for the care of these patients."

The doctors who responded to the survey noted a total of 81 nursing homes in the District, nearby Maryland and Virginia, including nonprofit or voluntary institutions and tax-supported homes. The committee, however, dealt only with the proprietary or private homes.

A medical society spokesman pointed out that the doctors who made special comments—most of them derogatory—were the ones "with the most experience with nursing homes."

TWO FORCED TO CLOSE

Another recalled that the 2 most satisfactory of 9 homes he had used were forced out of business by inspectors enforcing fire regulations.

Three others, the doctor noted, were run by women with "personalities shockingly unfit for the care of patients."

One was a registered nurse, another a practical nurse, and the third "probably making false claims to training."

Mrs. Josephine Prescott, head of Public Health Nursing for the Health Department, declared the situation is "shocking." She added that the department is trying to devise ways and means of correcting it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate heard memorial addresses in tribute to the late Senators Neely and Scott, and passed 92 bills on calendar call.

House passed 67 miscellaneous bills and received veto message on independent offices appropriation bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14543–14559

Bills Introduced: 2 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4227–4228; and S. Res. 352–355.

Page 14547

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2597, private (S. Rept. 2093);

H. R. 13, to revise chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act, with amendments (S. Rept. 2094);

H. R. 8943, to amend titles 10, 14, and 32 of the U. S. Code, to codify recent military law and to improve the code, with amendments (S. Rept. 2095);

H. R. 9989, S. Res. 353, H. J. Res. 609, 619, 636, H. Con. Res. 321, H. J. Res. 595, 620, 628, 634, S. 2494, 3739, 3768, 3818, 2057, 3221, 3509, 3547, 3640, 3743, 3826, 3004, 3308, 3696, 3801, 3921, H. R. 1293, 1691, 2319, 2759, private (S. Repts. 2096–2125);

H. R. 3368, authorizing district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (S. Rept. 2126);

H. R. 6353 and 6667, private (S. Repts. 2127–2128);

H. R. 6788, authorizing abbreviated records in reviewing administrative agency proceedings (S. Rept. 2129);

H. R. 7282, private (S. Rept. 2130);

H. R. 7306, to provide that notice of an action relative to real property pending before a U. S. district court must be recorded in certain instances (S. Rept. 2131);

H. R. 13378, facilitating naturalization of adopted children and spouses of certain U. S. citizens performing religious duties abroad (S. Rept. 2132);

H. R. 13451, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with regard to the status of certain aliens (S. Rept. 2133);

H. R. 4804, for relief of Newington School District, New Hampshire, with amendment (S. Rept. 2134);

H. R. 7260, to authorize confinement in jail-type institutions, followed by a period of probation, with amendment (S. Rept. 2135);

H. R. 7330, 7725, 3140, private (S. Repts. 2136–2138);

H. R. 3820, settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the U. S. Coast Guard, with amendments (S. Rept. 2139);

H. R. 7826 and S. 4054, private (S. Repts. 2140, 2141);

H. R. 13374, providing for the retention of the deferment or exemption upon change of membership in a Reserve component (S. Rept. 2142);

H. R. 5237, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft (S. Rept. 2143);

S. 4196, to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act to authorize incorporation of contract terms by reference in short-form documents (S. Rept. 2144);

H. R. 9833, to amend the Merchant Marine Act with regard to citizenship of corporations (S. Rept. 2145);

S. 3445, private (S. Rept. 2146);

H. R. 4635, providing for settlement and entry of public lands in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas, with amendments (S. Rept. 2147);

H. R. 11123, providing extension of certain functions of the Secretary of the Interior to areas other than the U. S., its Territories and possessions, with amendment (S. Rept. 2148);

H. R. 9543, to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to transfer of title of ceded land by the President (S. Rept. 2149);

H. R. 7149, providing for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian Home Administration account (S. Rept. 2150);

H. R. 9461, to permit the granting of patents in fee simple to certain occupiers of public lands in Hawaii (S. Rept. 2151);

H. R. 9500, relative to sales and exchanges of public lands in Hawaii to persons who suffered real property losses in the tidal wave of 1957 (S. Rept. 2152);

H. R. 8482, authorizing Commissioner of Public Lands of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for highway purposes (S. Rept. 2153);

Appendix

Texans Know the Value of the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas are disturbed by the proposed reduction in National Guard units. The people of Texas believe we should strengthen our defenses, not weaken them. The people of Texas know how nobly our National Guard men have served in the past, in time of war and in cases of civil disaster.

A typical expression of the feeling of Texans about the contemplated weakening of the National Guard is contained in a resolution passed recently by the commissioners' court of Bexar County.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution

Whereas a reduction of National Guard units is contemplated, although Congress has voted an appropriation to retain the units at the present level; and

Whereas this reduction of National Guard units would not only deprive Bexar County and San Antonio of these much-needed units, and of the trained and organized forces and equipment that stand alone as being instantly available in event of civil disaster or national emergency; and

Whereas this reduction or curtailment would reduce our strength, not only in the community but over the Nation; and

Whereas at this critical period, it does not seem to the best interest of our national security to reduce our National Guard units; and be it

Resolved, That commissioners' court go on record as opposing the reduction of the present strength of National Guard units; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that official copies of the same be sent to Gov. Price Daniel, Congressman Paul J. Kilday, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, and Senator Ralph Yarborough.

Witness the signatures of the members of the Commissioners' Court of Bexar County, and the seal of said court on this the 30th day of July A. D. 1958.

CHARLES W. ANDERSON,
County Judge.
ALBERT A. PENA, Jr.,
Commissioner, Precinct 1.
SAM C. BENNETT,
Commissioner, Precinct 2.
SAM JORRIE,
Commissioner, Precinct 3.
A. J. PLOCH,
Commissioner, Precinct 4.

Negotiations Between UAW and Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while other national and international events have taken the headlines, it is nevertheless important for the country to recall that in one of our most important and influential industries, the auto industry, there is an unresolved conflict between the principal employers and the representatives of the employees.

At the recent executive committee meeting of the industrial union department of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations at Denver, Colo., July 24–25, the committee adopted a statement on the negotiations between the UAW and the Big Three companies of the auto industry. Since this statement summarizes the results of the negotiations to date, naturally from the point of view of the UAW and its associated unions in the industrial union department, and since there was little publicity given to the statement, I believe the information in it should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The basic and concluding appeal of the statement that the representatives of management engage in real collective bargaining and seek to work out new contracts which will settle the pending dispute and provide a basis for the future working relationships of the companies and the workers, will be supported by all thoughtful citizens.

For the information of Members of Congress, therefore, I ask unanimous consent ta have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement just referred to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON UAW NEGOTIATIONS BY THE INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING, DENVER, COLO., JULY 24–25, 1958

For the past 2 months, the United Automobile Workers has been working without contracts in the plants of the Big Three of the auto industry. Throughout these weeks, the union has continuously sought to resolve its differences with the industry through the give and take of collective bargaining.

While the union has offered to extend present agreements pending the negotiation of new contracts, the companies have spurned this offer. They have instead issued take-it-or-leave-it ultimatums and have callously brushed aside the welfare of their employees.

Taking advantage of current economic problems besetting the American people, the Big Three of the auto industry have sought to impose upon the members of the union a continuation of previous contracts for the next 2 years. The companies have failed to move even in the slightest degree from their initial proposals, although the union has shown every willingness to engage in true collective bargaining.

The demands of the United Auto Workers have been just and fair. The union program has been noninflationary and consistent with the best interest of the Nation as well as UAW members. It has offered to bargain within the framework of price cuts, only to have this proposal brusquely rejected by auto-industry management.

As contracts neared their expiration dates, the UAW reduced its demands and offered to settle with the companies on the basis of contract improvements designed to meet pressing human needs.

These included long overdue improvements in supplementary unemployment benefits which can be made with little or no additional cost to the companies; a cost-of-living escalator in pensions to prevent the erosion by inflation of the small benefits paid retired workers, and severance and transfer payments to workers losing employment because of plant relocations. The union also is seeking improvement in the productivity factor governing wage adjustments since output per auto worker man-hour is rising steadily.

Instead of bargaining on the basis of the facts, the companies canceled the contracts. Management has also placed severe limitations upon established grievance procedures, although these have insured long industrial peace while protecting the rights of both the workers and management.

Despite the current recession, the auto industry has proved one of the most profitable in the Nation. Past profits have been fantastic and the future holds out an even more golden promise for the industry. The industry can well afford to meet the union's demands.

UAW President Walter Reuther has pointed out that while his union is not seeking any advantage over management, it is not willing to permit management to use the recession in order to gain advantage over the workers and deny them their equity. The UAW has called upon its members to resist management provocation and to hold firm.

The union membership has responded with a great demonstration of faith and solidarity that merits the commendation of all labor. Members are voluntarily paying dues in an overwhelming majority, assuring the continuity of their union. They are supporting their union with a discipline that has already given management proof that it cannot weaken or destroy the United Automobile Workers Union.

The industrial union department, AFL–CIO, representing 7 million organized industrial workers, pledges its full solidarity and support to the United Auto Workers in its struggle for economic and social justice. It pledges the full support of industrial labor across the country. It offers to place at the

disposal of the UAW, if required, its resources and staff personnel.

The industrial union department calls upon the AFL–CIO and all of American labor to provide full support to the efforts of the UAW to negotiate sound and satisfactory collective bargaining agreements with the Big Three of the auto industry. Such a demonstration of solidarity by labor can effectively meet the challenge of the united front of big business behind the actions of the Big Three in the auto industry.

The industrial union department calls upon the Big Three auto management to get down to cases and engage in real collective bargaining with the representatives of its workers so that new contracts will be negotiated without further delay. Such action will be in the best interests of the Nation, the automobile workers, and the industry itself.

Retrench, Tax, or Drift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Retrench, Tax, or Drift," published today in the Washington Daily News, and commenting on the speech made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRENCH, TAX, OR DRIFT

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH of Connecticut owns one of the few voices being raised in Congress against the spending deficit spree which has been prevalent in this session.

In a notable speech in the Senate, he put the question again: "How can we pay the bills?"

It is the biggest question before the country—whether you look at it from the standpoint of the taxpayers, national defense, the future of our children, or the general welfare.

The Government had a deficit of $2.8 billion last year. The deficit for this year already is estimated at $12 billion. Senator BUSH, with good reason, forecast annual $20 billion deficits unless the trend is radically reversed.

This could lead to only one result, frightening inflation.

Either the Government cuts back less necessary spending, or raises taxes, or both. The only other choice is to drift—drift into an era of terrifying inflation, and go the way of France, Germany before Hitler, and China.

"The poor and the families of moderate income, whose savings are in bank accounts or life insurance policies," said Senator BUSH, "are helpless as the cost of living gets higher and higher. Inflation offers opportunities for the speculator, the get-rich-quick artist; it spells disaster for the average American."

It spells disaster for the whole country. It can make our defenses impotent.

"Let us," said Senator BUSH, "have the courage to recapture control of our fiscal affairs."

And he well might have added: "Or else."

Navy Honors Tucker Sno-Cat Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 3, the Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. of Medford, Oreg., received the Navy's certificate of merit. This high honor has come to this Oregon industry as a direct result of the important part which a Sno-Cat played in connection with the Navy's recent expedition to the Antarctic. The award ceremony was duly reported in the Medford Mail Tribune of July 3, 1958. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this informative report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUCKER CORP. PRESENTED NAVY'S CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Tucker Sno-Cat Corp., Medford, was awarded a Navy certificate of merit in a formal ceremony Wednesday afternoon at the Medford Hotel.

E. M. Tucker, president of the company, accepted the certificate from Capt. S. P. Zola, district public works officer for the 13th Naval District, Seattle, who represented Rear Adm. E. J. Peltier, Chief of the Navy's civil engineers.

The certificate of merit, the 12th issued since its establishment, is one of the highest honors the Navy can bestow.

OPERATION DEEP FREEZE

It was awarded for the Sno-Cat company's participation in supplying its over-the-snow vehicles for Operation Deep Freeze, the Navy's expedition to the Antarctic in connection with the International Geophysical Year.

In making the presentation, Captain Zola told of the Navy's Seabees units and explained that the Tucker Sno-Cat is used and maintained by them. He added that no doubt the Seabees have found the Tucker Sno-Cat an intriguing piece of equipment and have possibly put it to some uses that Tucker did not dream about.

He welcomed the Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. to the midst of the "can do" organizations and that the corporation should feel justifiably proud of its accomplishments.

QUALITY PERFORMANCE

He said that the quality and performance of the Tucker Sno-Cat has been well established as it has been given a severe test in the Antarctic crossing over 2,100 miles of rugged terrain.

He concluded that "like the Seabees, you responded to a challenge of a difficult task. You were asked to meet an unexpected deadline and you met it. The Navy needed your cooperation and assistance and you gave it unselfishly and without hesitation. The spirit you have shown deserves recognition."

The citation states, "for outstanding service to the Department of the Navy in the expeditious manufacture and production of the Tucker Sno-Cat vehicle furnished for Operation Deep Freeze III, the Navy's expedition to the Antarctic in support of the International Geophysical Year. Personnel of the Tucker Corp. evidenced a commendable 'can do' spirit by exerting the greatest effort to meet ship movements of the expedition when the delivery deadline was moved up from the original date.

"This outstanding cooperation was extended by all of the personnel of the firm who participated in the prosecution of this contract, and reflected the highest integrity of purpose and professional ability. In recognition and appreciation of these valuable services, this citation is approved this 21st day of April 1958." It was signed by Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy.

Four of the big vehicles made by Tucker Sno-Cat Corp., were the only ones to make the trek all the way across the Antarctic continent, the first time this has been done by motorized ground transport, with Sir Vivian Fuchs of Great Britain.

A. C. Pierce introduced the persons at the speaker's table prior to the formal presentation. They included Don McNeil and Ron Gandee, chamber of commerce; Joseph Moore, vice president, First National Bank of Portland and manager of the Medford branch; Robert Duff, city manager; Robert Duncan, State representative; John J. Looser, member of directors, Sno-Cat Corp.; Mrs. Pierce; and Mrs. E. M. Tucker.

Duncan represented Senator Richard L. Neuberger and Gov. Robert D. Holmes.

TELEGRAMS READ

Senator NEUBERGER, in a telegram, said that "the Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. in building a vehicle that successfully traverses vast Antarctic snows has made a distinct contribution to the national welfare, while adding substantially to the industrial development of Oregon and Medford in particular. Deserving of special commendation is Mr. E. M. Tucker, Sr., whose inventive genius is, fortunately, matched by his faith and courage."

Governor Holmes, in writing of the contribution made by the Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. to the Antarctic explorations, said: "I am very proud that it was an Oregon plant that made this contribution. I am likewise proud that Oregon produced the kind of leadership in this instance that illustrates exactly what we need and want to achieve in our program for diversified industry and a stable economy in our State.

"If at any time the department of development can be of assistance to you in any way, I hope you will invite its cooperation. And I also hope that the Sno-Cat will be displayed at the Oregon centennial next year, where, I am sure, it will attract intelligent interest and certainly open to you an expanding market feasible for you to serve."

Approximately 50 people, including members of the Tucker family, public officials, and employees of the Sno-Cat Corp., attended the dinner and presentation ceremonies.

Farm Research Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Journal and Courier of Lafayette, Ind., on Friday, August

1, 1958, about the farm research bill which was recently passed in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTH TRYING

The Senate, by the smashing vote of 81 to 0, passed a farm research bill which Indiana's Republican Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART introduced 2 years ago with several other Senators.

The measure has been one of Senator CAPEHART's major projects. It authorizes a vast Government research program to discover and develop new uses in industry for everyday products of the American farm. CAPEHART greeted its passage with the assertion that it offers the only real and permanent solution of the farm problem.

The Hoosier Senator long has contended that we should be encouraging farm production instead of controlling it, as now. The farm research bill, he contends, is one of the most important passed by the Senate in recent history.

Also, he has expressed the belief that an adequate research program, patterned after industry, will eventually double the demand for products of the American farm, dispose once and for all of costly surpluses, relieve the great financial burden imposed by subsidy programs and assure farmers a fair price for the full production of every acre of tillable soil.

Research has done great things for industry. It may do the same thing for agriculture. Since farm programs tried to date have not worked, it is worth trying.

Most farm research to date has been concerned with increasing production. This has worked so well that it has created a new problem—surpluses. Now research is proposed which would increase consumption. If the latter succeeds any way near as well, great strides will have been made in giving the farmer the economic status he needs and deserves.

St. Lawrence Seaway To Rival Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article which was published in the Minneapolis Star of July 31, 1958, entitled "Seaway To Rival Panama Canal."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY TO RIVAL PANAMA CANAL

(By Edward T. Chase)

No single works project in our time can match the long-range significance of the St. Lawrence seaway in its impact upon the North American Continent.

The effects of this $1½ billion engineering marvel, whose hydroelectric powerplant operation was recently opened with great fanfare after 4 years of construction, will rival the repercussions of the Panama canal and the Suez—not as soon as the seaport press agents claim, to be sure, but by the 1970's and 1980's.

A recital of what the seaway does hardly reveals its meanings for all of us and our children and grandchildren, nor hints at the curious political turmoil surrounding its shamefully delayed birth.

The new 27-foot-deep seaway, upon completion in 1962 (its opening is for April 1959), will permit 80 percent of the world's ocean-going merchant marine to move 2,342 miles inland from sea level at Montreal to 600.5 feet above sea level at Duluth in Lake Superior, the farthest such penetration by ocean vessels of any continent.

Secondarily, in mastering the St. Lawrence, it will simultaneously create a hydroelectric plant outranked only by Grand Coulee, being capable of producing 1,880,000 kilowatts.

Such statistics are received unblinkingly in this age of material wonders. A more homely statisic may begin to help us understand why geographers, economists, political scientists, and industrialist are excited, however. That is that one horsepower will move a ton on 2 wheels, 40 tons on water.

In short, the energy-friction ratio explains why, despite scientific progress, waterways provide the cheapest transportation and why cultures have been determined by waterways ever since man's earliest civilizations developed—in river regions and around the navigable highways of the Mediterranean.

The seaway means, then, the further integration through low-cost transport of the industrial heart of America with the entire Atlantic community, in effect the industrial core of free western civilization.

The opening of the 4,300 mile fourth coast (to outrank in commerce both the Pacific and the gulf), thus means an immense industrial stimulation throughout a sector of the globe that is already unrivaled for both its industrial and agricultural productivity, the hinterland of the Great Lakes, already contributing 45 percent of our national product.

The eventual impact of this expansion in turn will involve vast population increase and regrouping, including the birth of entirely new cities.

Not the least of the seaway's effects, furthermore, will be a cultural reorientation as this population is made acutely aware, by trade, not only of the rest of the world, but the rest of America, as the seaway intermeshes with our other great transport systems.

Traditionally isolationist mid-America will confront the rest of the world as never before, almost as New York, Philadelphia and Boston do, bringing home the truth that one cannot sell abroad without purchasing the goods of your customers abroad, a genuine two-way street. And there is every reason to believe that this will accelerate the demise of American economic isolationism as well as political isolationism.

We can even hope that the cross-fertilization of ideas traditionally occurring with trade will result in other, subtler cultural understandings and stimulations.

Our Middle East Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and provocative article entitled "The Way To Achieve Our Middle East Aims," written by C. L. Sulzberger, and published in the New York Times of July 30, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE WAY TO ACHIEVE OUR MIDDLE EAST AIMS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—Hesitantly and reluctantly the world is approaching a critical negotiation. Its ultimate objective would seem to be isolating the Middle East from war by neutralizing that area.

Nevertheless, this remains a tense time, and the basic causes for tenseness have not yet been alleviated. It would therefore seem wise for both our own and the Soviet Governments to suspend exchanges of recrimination and to concentrate on the essential problem.

"Menaces always do harm to negotiation," wrote that expert diplomatist, François de Callières, in the 17th century, "since they often push a party to extremes that would not have been resorted to but for provocation."

Three changes must be reckoned with in stabilizing the Levant: the rise of Arab nationalism, the weakening of the western position, and the coincidental strengthening of Soviet influence. But history does not require that change bring chaos.

To avoid such chaos the region must be sealed off from great power clashes. Neither bloc at present can hold the area and each wishes to deny it to the other. Likewise, a curb on local aggression, both direct and indirect, must be created. And finally, Western Europe's access to Arab oil must be protected.

In approaching these objectives we should take special pains to maintain our alliance obligations, above all to Britain, France, and NATO. But that does not mean we are obliged to endorse each national aspiration of every ally.

FACING THE FACTS

Two salient facts must be faced. The first is that henceforth Russia's right to a voice in middle eastern affairs has to be acknowledged. The second is that we cannot escape certain special obligations to nations impinging on the Arab world. For example, as that region is neutralized, Turkey, Iran, and Israel become eligible for additional security guaranties from us.

Within this framework it does not seem impossible to reconcile our views with Moscow's objective of guaranteeing the Middle East from external interference and freezing arms shipments to the area. We must first define the territory affected. Then we must insist on excepting from this embargo countries with particular responsibilities such as Turkey.

A difficult puzzle is insuring the Levant against indirect aggression, today a greater danger than that of direct attack. One text to work from was once drafted by Molotov.

In 1939, when Moscow, London, and Paris sought unsuccessfully to negotiate an alliance against Germany, the Soviet foreign minister proposed that the three nations agree to help each other in the event of Nazi aggression—"direct or indirect"—against any European state. In a special annex Molotov suggested this obligation should apply in case of "internal coup d'etat or a political change favorable to the aggressor."

THWARTING SUBVERSION

It is not beyond possibility for the U. N. to devise similar machinery to thwart subversion by Nasser or other expansionists. If we can come to an essential agreement on neutralizing the Middle East, surely some mechanism can be invented to protect that area from its own internal combustion.

The question of oil is vital to Britain and the Continent, which depend for their existence upon access to this Arab commodity. Might we not be well advised to let London and Paris take the lead in negotiating settlement of this issue? We would lose little by retiring from that prominent position we have attained in middle eastern matters. About all this has gained us is the role once held by the aggressors of Suez as the favorite Arab whipping boy.

We should, of course, assist our friends in strengthening their position as they begin to bargain. We must help them to store larger petroleum reserves and to develop their nuclear power programs such as Euratom, thus making them less subject to potential blackmail pressures.

But beyond this we need not go. All of us must recognize the existence as a major force today of the revolutionary nationalism symbolized by Nasser. Our aim should be to avoid pressing this into Russia's arms; to prevent the U. S. S. R. from attaining dominance in the Middle East; and to protect the legitimate access of our allies to its petroleum.

This should provide foundation for a logical policy. And such a policy would be consonant with our long-term interests.

Cultural Exchange With Communist Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant memorandum furnished to the Department of State earlier this year by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. This memorandum relates to the cultural exchange with Communist Czechoslovakia as practiced today, and points out the manner in which the rulers of that country take advantage of these exchange activities to further their propaganda and to deny a parity or reciprocity of opportunity to the free world. In the face of the rather superficial assumptions that these exchanges are necessarily beneficial to the cause of peace and international understanding, it may be well for Members of Congress and others to give consideration to the tough realities which this memorandum outlines.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONCERNING CULTURAL EXCHANGE WITH COMMUNIST CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS PRACTICED TODAY

As representatives of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, we strongly protest against United States acceptance of cultural exchange and coexistence with Communist Czechoslovakia under existing conditions, that is, on Communist terms. We specifically object to the following:

I. TUZEX

Tuzex is a plot hatched by the Communist regime to extort American dollars. It is a government agency which sells all kinds of Czechoslovak goods from foodstuffs to automobiles to anyone living in Czechoslovakia for American dollars sent from the United States as a gift by American friends. It is no longer possible for Americans to send gift parcels with American goods to Czechoslovak relatives, as the Communist regime has slapped down a prohibitive tax on all things American. Since January 1, 1958, Americans are to send dollars only. Business agencies advertising Tuzex extensively in American newspapers and through the mail recommend "the excellent new way of sending gifts with the full approval of the United States Government. Tuzex is just like Sears, Roebuck and Macy's of New York," we are told.

Obviously, Tuzex is a defeat to us for several reasons:

First of all, by making it impossible for us to send American gift packages, the Prague regime has deprived us of an excellent propaganda channel, for every American package spoke of our way of life. The Communist regime is actually encouraging its citizens to ask American relatives for Tuzex dollars and discouraging American gift parcels. We know that Czechoslovak recipients were summoned to appear before a people's court for having received packages from American relatives. Furthermore, a careful check is now being made of people with American ties.

Secondly, Tuzex is detrimental to American business. Instead of buying American products, we have to spend our dollars on Communist goods. Our dollars are then used by the Communist regime to build up Czechoslovak industry. It is a recognized fact that Czechoslovak industry acts as a spearhead to Soviet economic penetration the world over. Moreover, we shall find that, as Czechoslovak industry expands, the Communist regime will be able to undercut our prices on world markets.

Without any doubt, the Communists are dictating the terms.

II. AMERICAN VISITORS

Americans are invited to Czechoslovakia to spend dollars. It is said that about 3,000 visited Czechoslovakia last year and from all indications, the number will be even higher this year. The United States Government permits practically anyone to travel to Czechoslovakia, but Americans in vain ask the Czechoslovak authorities to permit their old parents to visit them in America, although they offer to pay all expenses for their Czechoslovak guests.

The Czechoslovak border remains hermetically sealed to Czechoslovakia, except to the reliables who are sent abroad by the regime for a definite purpose.

And while the Communist regime is enticing Americans to visit Czechoslovakia, it is, at the same time, taking severe measures to prevent Czechoslovakia citizens from meeting or fraternizing with American visitors. Spy trials of alleged traitors are intended to strike terror among the population, as has been borne out by the testimony of Mr. Joseph R. Jacyno, the expelled member of the American Embassy in Prague. Hotel employees are carefully screened; many were discharged this spring and replaced by a more trustworthy staff. Everywhere people having American relatives are subjected once again to a government checkup.

III. FILMS

Agents of the Czechoslovak regime are making arrangements in the United States for the showing of Czechoslovak films. For instance, in Greater Chicago, three moving picture theatres, the World Playhouse, California, and Villas, are showing films from Prague. We know that a Chicago representative brought five Czechoslovak films.

The films we have seen to date are Communist propaganda. Písnička za groš (Song for a Penny) and Anděl z hor (Angel from the Mountains) are a glowing account of life under communism. (We are sorry to say that some of the onlookers fell for the subtle Communist propaganda). Even the story of Smetana's life has a red thread running through it: only the little people appreciated the great composer; it is always the little people who suffer and bring sacrifices etc.

In Czechoslovakia, if American news reports are correct, the Communist government, after months of negotiations, selected three American films. We ask, however, what can eager western-minded Czechoslovaks actually learn about America from the films finally approved by the Prague regime, such as Desire under the Elms? (This O'Neill play was given in Prague 30 years ago). So far, not one film showing life in the United States in a favorable light has been shown in Czechoslovakia.

IV. NEWSPAPERS AND PUBLICATIONS

Czech and Slovak Communist newspapers and other publications sympathetic to the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia are published in this country. These are the only ones to reach the citizens of Czechoslovakia to speak for the American people. No other American publications, except scientific, of course, are permitted. American tourists tell us that while their baggage was given only a perfunctory once-over, all printed matter, including children's books, whatever they happened to take along for the trip, was confiscated at customs under some pretext or other. Czechoslovaks are waiting in vain for the much desired American magazines and books.

Communist books from Czechoslovakia are sold in American bookshops (in Chicago, for instance, in Artia, Nova Doba, Slovak Bookstore) and mailed out to people living in the United States. For a one-dollar order, a recipient receives several other Czechoslovak publications free of charge. This would indicate that there is quite a supply of Communist material on stock in Chicago.

American tourists also report that the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are jammed.

Thus the Communist masters have complete veto power over news information and all forms of cultural exchange. The free world should not allow the Communists to get away with the hoax of exchange when, in reality, they are enforcing a black-out.

This Communist duplicity—the whip at home and the smile abroad—is most objectionable and dangerous. Abroad, the Communist regime has launched a worldwide campaign to win western confidence, but at home is carrying on a new wave of persecution, of which there can be no doubt. On June 18, at its plenary meeting the Communist Party is to devise ways and means of attaining the five-point program which calls for: (1) Complete ruthless collectivization of farmers—the Kulaks must be destroyed; (2) in the cities, impoverishment and terrorization of former middle class, the Government employees, army men, among the undesirables and unreliables being citizens with close family ties in the United States; (3) higher norms of factory workers; (4) a perfected system of factory informers—this network of accomplices to tie in with the secret police; (5) an ideological and cultural Marx-Lenin straitjacket.

In view of the new wave of persecution in Czechoslovakia, it is unthinkable that the United States Government enter into friendly relations with the Communist oppressors headed by President Novotny, called Heydrich by the people. Nor is it the time for so-called cultural exchange, especially since it is not an exchange but a Communist plot to entrench communism. If we accept Communist terms, we shall separate ourselves from the Communist victims, and the people

behind the Iron Curtain will lose faith in us. Naturally, they cannot help but feel abandoned if we carry on a program of so-called coexistence and exchange with their oppressors at the very time that persecution is sweeping across their unhappy land.

Therefore, the Czechoslavak National Council of America urges a policy of strength and deep conviction and respectfully submits the following recommendations for your consideration:

PARITY IN ALL THINGS

I. Americans should be able to send free gifts packages to friends if limited to the personal use of a family. As the United States Government permits its citizens to spend in Czecvhoslovakia or to send any amount of dollars to Czechoslovakia, the Prague regime should at least permit its citizens to receive small gift packages of American goods.

PARITY IN VISITORS

II. As practically all Americans wishing to visit Czechoslovakia are given an American passport and thousands of them have gone there last year and this year, Czechoslovak relatives should be allowed by their regime to visit American families as guests. Under present conditions, only those Czechoslovaks, handpicked by the Prague regime for special reasons, come to the United States.

PARITY AGAIN

III. For every Czechoslovak film shown here, we ask that an American film appear on the screen in Czechoslovakia, a film showing life in the United States at it really is.

We suggest that a closer check be kept on films brought here by private individuals, intended for public showing, and that the censors board include on its staff an adviser with a thorough knowledge of the wiles of communism. Communist propaganda is far too subtle, and it is not enough to know a foreign language. The Czechoslovak National Council of America offers its services gratis in Chicago, New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, D. C., Cedar Rapids, etc.

PARITY IN NEWS INFORMATION

IV. Inasmuch as this country permits Communist and proregime newspapers to be published in Czech and Slovak and to be sent to Czechoslovakia as representing American public opinion, and inasmuch as this country also permits newspapers, magazines and books from behind the Iron Curtain to be delivered and sold here through various agencies and bookstores, we ask for the same privilege.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, with the help of other organizations of Americans of Czechoslovak descent would launch a magazine drive and send to Czechoslovakia thousands of issues of magazines—other than political, about everyday life in America. The Czechoslovak public is eager for the magazines, and we would supply them gratis.

When giving these terms, we are not asking for anything we Americans are not willing to permit or to give ourselves; in fact, the United States and its citizens are already doing so.

If the Communist regime refuses to accept reciprocity, we should stop calling the Communist hoax an exchange and give it the proper name: a Communist blackout with American assistance.

On the subject of the proposed summit meeting, the Czechoslovak National Council of America pays tribute to the foresight and firm stand taken by the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, when he insists that any discussion with the Soviet Union must include on its agenda the fate of the captive peoples. May the United States continue to be a beacon of justice and hope to the Czechoslovaks and the other once-free nations of central and eastern Europe.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
JAMES HOVORKA, *President.*

CHICAGO, *June 9, 1958.*

A Spire Above a Fort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article written by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "A Spire Above a Fort," published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 3, 1958, in the column entitled "Spires of the Spirit."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate)

A SPIRE ABOVE A FORT

It is a summer Sunday afternoon at Fort Myer, so near the national seat of government. The United States Army is honoring its chaplains. For those who have eyes to see the deep significance of the occasion, spires of religion leap to the bending sky. To stirring martial music a famous regiment of marching men, armed to defend the liberties of a free people, are saluting dedicated servants of God and of man who, in heroic yesterdays and in the grim today, are witnesses to the reality and supremacy of spiritual verities—to the faith that has made and preserved us a Nation.

Planned and personally led by Secretary of the Army Wilbur M. Brucker, the celebration was deliberately set up to emphasize to the Nation and to the world the vital role of the chaplains of the Armed Forces in peace and in war. High military officers stand to receive the salute while throngs representing many churches approvingly applaud. This midsummer pageant in the year of our Lord 1958 is linked to the very beginnings of the Nation's life as the colonists' rebellion against tyrannical rule gathered strength. It was then that the Father of his Country called for ministers of the various churches, bringing the resources of restraining and sustaining divine grace to stand by the side of the men who, in the struggle, were to know the temptations and suffering of the camp and battlefield. Those who gladly answered came out of the differing traditions of the various denominations.

From then until now, devout men have been consecrated to the sacred task, not of furthering the peculiar tenets of their brand of sectarianism or to dispute about the tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum of theological distinctions but rather of interpreting to men under the stress and strain of a soldier's lot the God about whom all the creeds utter their faltering and partial words. Chaplains go forth, not to sell their particular telescopes, but to show groping souls the eternal stars. Their ruling passion is beautifully suggested by the familiar words of Bible, which has ever been the chaplain's handbook, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that sayeth 'The Lord reigneth.'"

From the Second Continental Congress to the 85th Congress, now in session, in the noble procession of chaplains is glimpsed the warning words of Washington, "Let us not indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. These are the pillars of human happiness—the finest props of the duties of men and citizens." Every President since has echoed the first President's sentiments, down to the present occupant of the White House who, as a leader of militant hosts, has known at firsthand the essential value of the chaplain's sacred task. Declares President Eisenhower, "The basic doctrine to which we must always cling is that our form of government is founded on religion. It has no sense without a deeply felt religious faith."

A true chaplain meets young men where they are, with understanding and sympathy, conscious of the weaknesses which beset all. It is his not just to fortify the strong, but to be the medium of redemption from deeds and attitudes that tarnish and stain, pointing to the glory of forgiveness and cleansing grace. Every chaplain worthy of his vocation finds himself continually asking, as his task unfolds, "Who is sufficient for these things?" It is the men now serving in that capacity, and others whose memory as servants of the Most High is held in sacred remembrance, symbolized by the four chaplains, Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic, who, giving their life-belts to others, went down with their ship, that led the outstanding churchman, now Secretary of the Army, to plan the 83d birthday of the Chaplains Corps as a red-letter observance.

Preceding the reception, attended by a glittering array of generals and chaplains and their families, when all were greeted personally by the Secretary and representatives of the General Staff, the deep meaning of the celebration was fittingly phrased by Secretary Brucker. Among other things he said, "It is an honor and an inspiration here today to pay tribute to this splendid group of men who are so completely dedicated to the basic principles upon which our country was founded. The Army and the Nation will forever be in debt to the able and devoted clergymen of all faiths who serve, or have served, as chaplains. Throughout all the years since the Second Continental Congress, and in every war, the ministry of the Army chaplain has been a spiritual mainstay of our soldiers. The chaplain has helped them to find inner peace amid the turmoil; he has fortified their faith in Almighty God and their belief in the ultimate triumph of a righteous caues; he has shared every hardship of those entrusted to his care. Some 284 Army chaplains have given their lives in the service of God and country. Today our Army chaplains, about 1,100 strong, have many momentous responsibilities and operate on a worldwide scale."

The able and devoted chief of chaplains, Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Ryan, in his greeting from a chaplain to chaplains, declared: "To us, the Army chaplains of today, has been passed a noble spiritual heritage. As defenders of our land, our soldiers must be fortified with moral and spiritual qualities. Where moral apathy exists we must dissolve it with positive virtue. We must project courage and confidence which come through knowledge of God and adherence to His law."

Never, perhaps, has an Army chaplain written his name on the very heart of a nation, as did Studdard Kennedy in a black hour of England's history. His verses, written in the inferno of conflict, live on for-

ever. To his men in the crowded trenches he said, "I see what you see—this eternal struggle in the dark. I see the foul disorder and the filth of mind and soul in which men wallow like swine, stamp on their brothers till they drown in puddles of corruption. Yet have I looked into my mother's eyes and have seen the light of love, pure love and true—and I know I must fight on this side or that. And so, I bet my life on beauty, truth and love—not abstract, but incarnate truth. Beauty made flesh and realized in love. I bet my life on Christ, who turns the soul of darkness into light."

And now, shall we take something from the literary heritage left by this inspiring chaplain as a greeting to the United States Army Chaplain Corps on their 83d birthday? Here it is, Studdard Kennedy speaking to all chaplains and to all soldiers, said: "I see all history pass by, and through it all still shines that face, the Christ face, like a star which pierces drifting clouds, and tells the truth. They pass, but it remains and shines untouched, a pledge of that great hour which surely comes at last, when the tempest sobs to silence, silver silence, and the moon rides stately in an open starry sky and there is peace."

And that is a spire above all camps and forts of any nation whose God is the Lord.

Protection of American Public From Violators of Securities Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over a period of several years I have pointed out the need for strict enforcement of the Nation's securities laws.

I have stressed that if the American private-enterprise system is to get an increasing amount of sound equity capital invested by 8½ million stockholders, the good name of investments must be protected from the handful of manipulators and chiselers who sell "moose pasture" stock, which is worthless.

Hardly a week goes by in which we do not read some new information from the Securities and Exchange Commission, from the office of the attorney general of the State of New York, or from other attorneys general elsewhere, announcing a new crackdown, a new court injunction, a new indictment against some company which has been mulcting the public in a boiler-shop operation.

Fortunately, the public is becoming increasingly sophisticated against the high-pressure type of glib promises of fantastic profits from quick investments.

The New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, and other exchanges, along with better-business bureaus, have carried on a very helpful information and education campaign to alert investors.

There is always, however, some new gimmick which the chiselers think up. For example, because of the lack of a blue-sky law in Alaska, fear has been expressed that that new State might become the home of boiler-shop operators.

Moreover, when some new metal appears on the market—some new wonder item which appears to have a profitable future—the crooks are quick to set up phony companies with mythical assets and unlikely prospects, in order to sell their certificates to the unwary.

In the past, there had been a certain number of chiselers operating from cross the border in Canada, fleecing the American public out of very considerable sums. Fortunately, such Canadian-based operations have been on the decline. They do not represent, and have never represented, the overwhelming bulk of sound security operations in Canada, any more than the small minority of chiselers represents the bulk of securities investments in the United States.

Nevertheless, one bad apple can tend to spoil the barrel. That is why, in my capacity as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have been in close touch with the SEC, with Canadian authorities, as well as State authorities in past years, in order to help assure continued close cooperation on both sides of the border.

Naturally, Canadian authorities are anxious to protect the good name of Canadian investments, just as we are anxious to protect the good name of the American securities industry.

I send to the desk the text of an article which appeared in the July 13 New York Times describing how the SEC list of companies on the Canadian restricted list helps to alert the unwary investor.

Of course, that list must be kept up to date. One of the problems of the list, or any other similar list, is that the crooks are faster in inventing new companies than it is possible to crack down on the new companies. Nevertheless, as fast as evidence is duly compiled and recorded, phony companies should be listed in order to alert the investor.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 13, 1958]

SEC BLACKLIST HELPS INVESTORS—NAMING OF POSSIBLY DUBIOUS CANADIAN COMPANIES IS TERMED MONEYSAVER

As blacklists go, the Securities and Exchange Commission's Canadian restricted list probably acts as one of the world's best money and headache savers for investors. It carries the names of 167 relatively obscure companies, including 4 added 2 weeks ago and one added last week.

First in line is the Aero Mining Corp. and the last is Woodgreen Copper Mines, Ltd. In between are such hopefully titled companies as Golden Hope Mines, Ltd., and such down-to-earth ones as A. L. Johnson Grubstake.

No one at the SEC knows the market value of the securities on the list. But each name has been placed there because the Government agency has reason to believe that the shares are being sold, or have recently been sold in this country, without meeting registration requirements. If a stock is not registered, the SEC has no way to make sure investors are getting the basic facts on which to base an investment decision and protect themselves from fraud or overpriced or watered stocks, according to Paul Windels, New York regional administrator of the SEC.

STARTED IN 1951

The SEC started the list in 1951, when large amounts of speculative Canadian stocks were being sold in this country. Each year the commission files many court actions seeking to bar brokers in this country or residents from selling securities on the restricted list. Last week, for example, it obtained injunctions against two such brokers.

But the commission points out "Canadian companies are beyond the reach of the process of Federal courts." Hence the list was begun to alert investors against possible risks involved in the purchase of such securities and also to alert broker-dealer concerns of possible illegal distributions.

The theory—and the hope—is that an investor reached by mail or telephone by a persuasive salesman for Canadian mining or oil shares will contact his broker or banker before buying. If the broker or banker finds the name on the blacklist, he knows the issue is suspect. But, the SEC warns that just because a Canadian stock is not on the list, there still is no proof that SEC registration requirements have been met.

The SEC has to depend on tips from brokers, Canadian authorities, or persons reached by questionable stock salesmen for information about possible fraudulent shares being sold in this country. It welcomes inquiries.

LIST REVISED

By this spring the list had grown to a record of 230 companies. So, instead of sending out more supplements, the SEC revised the list and winnowed it down in April to 162 names. The SEC said it had eliminated Canadian companies "concerning whose stock the Commission has no evidence of a public offering or sale in the United States during the past 5 years." Of course, if a listed company registers, its name will be removed from the list, but few care to do that.

The list tends to be effective because much of the selling relies on broker-dealer outlets in this country. The SEC holds a threat over these in the form of possible injunctions and suspensions from the National Association of Securities Dealers, or revocation of broker-dealer registrations.

The SEC believes that the 1955–56 peak of "boilerroom operators"—high-pressure salesmen of stocks with little or no value—has passed. But, while many of the big operators have been eliminated, the SEC said in its last annual report published at the year's start, salesmen for some of the worst "boilerrooms" had begun small operations of their own—a cancerous diffusion.

While it continues to wage war against these small operators, the SEC also is concerned about the activities of some formerly large operators who have fled this country and Canada for Latin America, especially Cuba. With this in mind, Wall Street will not be surprised if the SEC soon widens its restricted list to include other foreign securities.

The People Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by David Lawrence entitled "The People Speak," from the August 8, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK

(By David Lawrence)

It was no mob incited by agitators that went to the polls last week in Arkansas.

It was no small group of zealots determined to defy the supreme law of the land that voted overwhelmingly to assure Governor Faubus a third term—unprecedented in more than half a century.

It was the electorate of Arkansas, expressing in a calm and deliberate manner its belief that the wording of the Constitution of the United States must be accepted, rather than any fortuitous ruling by the Supreme Court deviating from the Constitution.

The electorate of Arkansas reiterated by its vote a belief that the 14th amendment should be enforced not by bayonets but by a law of Congress. Such a law has never been passed even though the amendment specifically says:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

What is the provision that has been deemed pertinent by the Supreme Court? The 14th amendment says that "no State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

For decades past "equal protection" has been construed by the Supreme Court to mean that equal facilities for education may properly be provided by the States through separate schools.

Ever since the founding of the Republic, education has been considered solely within the right of the States to administer. Nowhere in the Constitution is the word "education" mentioned, and certainly the debates in Congress when the 14th amendment was adopted do not reveal a scintilla of evidence to prove that the amendment was intended to give Congress the power to take away from the States the right to control their own educational systems.

There is nothing in the Constitution, therefore, which prohibits the States from assigning pupils to public schools on whatever basis the State feels will give the best education to the children of its citizens.

From the very beginning of our history—confirmed indeed by a specific decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in 1850—the right of a State to set up separate schools for different races has been upheld. In 1896 the United States Supreme Court formally recognized the custom when it said that "separate but equal facilities" do not violate the 14th amendment.

The people of Arkansas have as deep a respect for the Constitution as the people of any other State of the Union. There would not have been cast for Governor Faubus last week the largest percentage of votes ever polled by any candidate in a Democratic primary election in Arkansas—70 percent of the total vote—if the people had not wished to assert their right to interpret the plain words of the Constitution as they are written.

The people of Arkansas have refused to uphold the usurped right of the nine Justices in Washington to say that modern psychology or emotionalism is more important than the letter of the Constitution itself. The people of Arkansas reserve the right to control their own emotionalism, especially inside the schools.

The people of Arkansas have been abused on the radio and on television and in the northern press as "lawless." They have been told that their action—in controlling their own educational system—is a blot on America's record before the world, especially in Soviet Russia.

But the free election last week, is, on the contrary, a dramatic example of freedom of choice. Nowhere in the Soviet empire could there be such a vote recorded in opposition to the policies of the central government.

Arkansas has not merely upheld its Governor. It has gone beyond any question of personalities. It has upheld a great principle—the doctrine of States rights which Thomas Jefferson gave us.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution declares: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The problem of mixing the races in public schools cannot be solved overnight. It is one that is rooted in the customs and habits of the people.

This writer was enrolled for 12 years in integrated public schools in the North and never has had any personal objection to integration. The people of every State, however, are entitled to their right of self-government. If it was intended by the Constitution that there be uniformity of law throughout the States, then logically the Supreme Court long ago should have declared invalid all those laws which vary from State to State in different fields of human relations.

The people of Arkansas have spoken. They have said that the Constitution itself is the only "supreme law of the land." By their virtual unanimity, they have advised the Supreme Court to halt its usurpations and to follow the Constitution itself.

Welfare of Migrant Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the years that I have served as a Member of the Senate I have been concerned about the relative neglect of the working, living, and travel conditions of the migrant workers who are an important part of the process of cultivating and harvesting many of our crops.

A number of tragic accidents involving the unsafe transportation of these workers led Congress to give some power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish minimum safety requirements, which I hope will greatly diminish these hazards.

Some improvements have been reported in the terms under which Mexican nationals are imported into this country under international agreement with Mexico, although representatives of agricultural workers who are citizens still complain that work opportunities are not made available to nationals of our own country in some areas before Mexican workers are imported.

The need to improve the conditions under which these relatively helpless groups work and the conditions under which their families live, however, is very great. It recently came to my attention that the legislature in New York passed a number of measures looking in this direction. For the information of Members of Congress and of legislatures in other States, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that copies of these recent bills, together with the supporting statements describing them and a letter from the acting industrial commissioner of the States of New York, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I hope that this type of positive action to relieve the distressing conditions of migrant workers and their families will be studied with a view to parallel action by the legislatures of other States and by Congress.

There being no objection, the bills, statement, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Albany, May 13, 1958.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senator,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: As requested in your letter of May 5, 1958, I am very pleased to send you copies of the four migratory labor bills which were recently signed and enacted into law by Governor Harriman.

You might be interested to learn that three of these bills were initially prepared by this department as a result of our own surveys and investigations, and as an outcome of the deliberations of the interdepartmental committee on food and farm labor processing, which is an advisory committee appointed by Governor Harriman, consisting of representatives of the various heads of the state departments concerned with this problem, experts in the field of agriculture and farmers.

In addition to the bills I am enclosing supporting statements which were prepared for the introducers at the time that the bills were submitted to the legislature.

As a sidelight you may be interested to learn that the bills prepared by this department and subsequently introduced by Democratic members of the State legislature, were all defeated by the Republican majority. The Republicans, however, realizing that the need for this legislation was so imperative, reintroduced the bills under their own sponsorship. Nevertheless, we had the satisfaction of knowing that the reintroduced bills were word for word, comma for comma, period for period, identical with ours.

The Republican bills passed the legislature and were subsequently signed by the Governor. I am also enclosing a copy of the Governor's memorandum which was issued at the time of the signing.

These three measures are:

1. The licensing of farm labor camp commissaries, by Mr. Van Lare. Senate 3192, Print No. 4248, chapter 895, now chapter 895, of the laws of 1958.

2. Payroll records of crew leaders, by Mr. Watson. Senate 3193, Print No. 3498, chapter 254.

3. Revocation of grower's registration, by Mr. Watson. Senate 3194, Print No. 4060, chapter 896.

In addition, the department of health sponsored a bill, which subsequently became law (Senate 3025, Print No. 4187, by Mr. Speno, chapter 894), which requires the operator of a camp to obtain a permit or license from the department of health indicating compliance with the State sanitary code prior to the admission or housing of any migratory laborers. This bill, which in a different form, was already part of the law, was necessary in view of several county court decisions which held that a farm labor camp

operator needed only to make application for a permit in order to operate a farm labor camp. As very often happened, by the time the application was denied, the farmer had already completed the season. Under the new law he will not be able to operate the camp at all prior to the issuance of a permit by the Department of Health.

I hope that the above has been of some assistance to you. Should you have any further questions please do not hesitate to call upon me or any member of this department.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES W. HALLORAN,
Acting Industrial Commissioner.

Senate 3192

An act to amend the labor law, in relation to farm labor camp commissaries

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The labor law is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections, to be sections 212 (d) and 212 (e), to follow section 212 (c), to read as follows:

"§ 212 (d). Farm labor camp commissaries; issuance of permit; renewal, refusal, suspension, and revocation of permit; rules and regulations. 1. No person shall operate a farm labor camp commissary, or cause or allow the operation of a farm labor camp commissary, without a permit from the industrial commissioner to do so, and unless such permit is in full force and effect. Application for such permit shall be made on a form prescribed by the commissioner.

"2. A permit to operate a farm labor camp commissary must be conspicuously posted in the commissary. The permit may not be transferred or assigned and shall run to and include the 31st day of December of the year for which it is granted, unless sooner revoked by the commissioner. The permit may be renewed each year upon the filing of an application for renewal on a form prescribed by the commissioner.

"3. A permit holder shall post, and keep posted, in a conspicuous place in the commissary, the current prices of all goods sold or leased, and the prices charged shall not exceed the prices listed on the poster.

"4. The commissioner may refuse, revoke, or suspend a permit when he finds that:

"(a) the applicant or permit holder has violated any of the provisions of this chapter of the penal law, or has been convicted of any crime or offense, except traffic violations, or is not a person of good character or responsibility; or

"(b) the applicant or permit holder has made any misrepresentation or false statements in his application for a permit.

"5. The commissioner shall not refuse, revoke, or suspend a permit unless the applicant or permit holder, upon due notice, has been given an opportunity to be heard; provided, however, that pending the determination of such hearing, the commissioner may temporarily suspend a registration if, in his opinion, its suspension for such period is necessary to effectuate the purposes of the section.

"6. The commissioner may promulgate rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 212 (e). Definitions. As used in section 212 (d):

"1. 'Persons' includes any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation.

"2. 'Farm labor camp commissary' means a place where goods are offered for sale or lease and which is operated in or in connection with a farm labor camp, including meals sold to workers. 'Farm labor camp commissary' includes a building, shed, or structure, or any part thereof, occupied as a farm labor camp commissary.

"3. 'Farm labor camp' means a property consisting of a tract of land and all tents, vehicles, buildings, or other structure pertaining thereto, any part of which may be occupied by persons employed as laborers in farm activities who are provided with sleeping facilities, in whole or in part, by the owner, lessee, or operator thereof, with or without stipulated agreement as to the duration of their stay, whether or not they are supplied with meals but who are supplied with such services or facilities as are necessary for their use of such property. The term 'farm activities' shall include the following activities in connection with vegetables and fruits and the plants, bushes, or trees producing the vegetables or fruits: fitting, planting, cultivating, harvesting, vining, sorting, grading, packing, storing, canning, freezing, dehydrating, bottling, and preserving or treating by any method.

"4. 'Goods' includes all goods, wares, merchandise, food, or any article or thing."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BILL 34—SUPPORTING STATEMENT ON AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOR LAW IN RELATION TO FARM LABOR CAMP COMMISSARIES

This bill is an outgrowth of recent complaints that migrant-farm workers are charged excessively high prices in stores located on the site of farm-labor camps. These complaints were investigated not only by the labor department but by the interdepartment committee on farm food processing workers.

Frequently, migrants are housed in camps which are several miles away from the nearest shopping area. Without any means of transportation of their own, they are compelled to buy their groceries and supplies at the camp store. Some camp store operators have taken advantage of this situation, and complaints have been made that migrant workers have been charged as much as $1 for a small can of sardines and a pack of cigarettes.

The attached bill is designed to control such abuses. It would require that any person operating a store or commissary in a farm-labor camp must obtain a permit from the industrial commissioner. The prices of all items sold would have to be posted and they could not be substantially higher than the prices prevailing in the locality in which the store is located. Permits would not be issued to persons of bad character or with criminal records.

This bill is another step forward in the protection of migrant workers. The 1954 law, requiring the registration of crew leaders, protects migrants against misrepresentation of wages and working conditions; the attached bill would protect migrants against excessive charges for food and other items. In many respects, the wording of the attached bill follows that of the 1954 enactment.

Senate 3193

An act to amend the labor law, in relation to requiring farm labor contractors or crew leaders to keep payroll records and give wage statements to farmworkers

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Subdivision 7 of section 212 (b) of the labor law, as added by chapter 448 of the laws of 1954 and renumbered by chapter 786 of the laws of 1957, is hereby renumbered to be subdivision 8.

SEC. 2. Section 212 (b) of such law is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subdivision, to be subdivision 7, to read as follows:

"7. (a) Each farm labor contractor or crew leader shall keep payroll records for each worker of wage rates, wages earned, number of hours worked, and all legal withholdings from wages on a farm and in the manner prescribed by the industrial commissioner. Such payroll records shall be readily available and open to inspection by the industrial commissioner or any duly authorized representative at any reasonable time.

"(b) Each farm labor contractor or crew leader shall give to each worker with every payment of wages a written statement showing the worker's wage rate, wages earned, number of hours worked, and all legal withholdings from wages on a form and in the

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BILL 2—SUPPORTING STATEMENT ON AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOR LAW, IN RELATION TO REQUIRING FARM LABOR CONTRACTORS OR CREW LEADERS TO KEEP PAYROLL RECORDS AND GIVE WAGE STATEMENTS TO FARMWORKERS

This bill is designed to implement present provisions for the protection of migrant workers against abuses relating to payment of wages.

Although section 212 (b) of the labor law provides that the industrial commissioner may require crew leaders to file a statement of the wages he intends to pay farmworkers before a certificate of registration is issued to the crew leader, experience has shown that such wage statements are of very limited value. In many cases the crew leader does not know at the time that he recruits the workers what the wages will be. Workers may be recruited between January and April and not be brought into this State until June. In other cases the wages may be fixed by the grower and not by the crew leader. The present law does not require crew leaders to keep records of actual wages paid, with the result that enforcement of the wage-payment provisions of the labor law is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

This bill would require crew leaders to keep payroll records and to give workers a wage statement showing the wages earned and the deductions made from wages. It would afford greater protection to workers and permit better enforcement of the wage-payment provisions in the labor law. The forms for payroll records and wage statements would be prescribed by the industrial commissioner.

Similar provisions are now contained in the agreement between employers and Puerto Rican agricultural workers.

The attached bill is 1 of 5 proposals submitted by the labor department to improve working standards of migrant workers.

Senate 3194

An act to amend the labor law, in relation to the registration of persons bringing into this State 10 or more migrant farm workers

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 212 (a) of the labor law, as last amended by chapter 448 of the laws of 1954, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 212 (a). Registration—migrant labor. 1. Each person who employs, recruits, transports and brings into the State or is responsible for bringing into the States 10 or more out-of-State migrant farm or food processing workers who are residents of the United States, shall, in each instance prior to the importation of such workers, register with the industrial commissioner, and submit such facts on wages, housing, working conditions, and such other information, as the commissioner may prescribe. Copies of this information or summaries thereof shall be made available by the commissioner to each such registrant who shall (1) give a copy to each worker, preferably at the time of recruitment and in any event lot later than

the time of arrival in the State and (2) post and keep posted conspicuously at least one copy at all times in any camp in which such workers are housed. Upon registration with the commissioner as provided above, he shall submit to each registrant pertinent information concerning workmen's compensation insurance and farmers' liability insurance with medical payments, including the rates for such protection.

"2. The provisions of section 212 (b) relating to a certificate of registration and to the renewal, refusal, suspension and revocation of registration shall apply to registration under this section with the same force and effect as though expressly made applicable to registration under this section."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BILL 44—SUPPORTING STATEMENT ON AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOR LAW, IN RELATION TO THE REGISTRATION OF PERSONS BRINGING INTO THIS STATE 10 OR MORE MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

This bill is designed to achieve greater responsibility on the part of growers who utilize migrant farmworkers. It would extend to growers utilizing 10 or more migrant farmworkers the sanctions now applying to farm-labor contractors or crew leaders.

Regulation of employers of migrant labor was first enacted in 1946 when section 212 (a) was added to the labor law. This enactment required the registration of all persons bringing into this State, or responsible for bringing into this State 10 or more migrant farmworkers. It applied to crew leaders and growers. The law, however, merely required registration and the submission of information on wages, housing and working conditions; it failed to provide for revocation of registration or for any penalty for misrepresentation of working conditions or violations of law.

Recognizing the inadequacies of the 1946 enactment, the legislature, in 1954 added section 212 (b) to the labor law. This section, which only deals with crew leaders, provides certain penalties for misrepresentations, or, if they, in any way violated any provisions of the labor law or penal law. A crew leader violating the law may have his registration revoked and he would not be permitted to continue his operations in this State. This enactment, however, did not have a similar revocation provision for growers. As the law now stands, a crew leader's registration may be revoked for misrepresentation of working conditions, but if a grower misrepresents working conditions or violates the law, there is no similar provision for revoking his registration.

The attached bill will correct this deficiency. It will permit the industrial commissioner to revoke the registration of a grower for misrepresentation of working conditions, and make the grower subject to the same penalties and sanctions of a crew leader.

This bill is 1 of 5 proposals submitted by the Labor Department to improve working standards of migrant labor.

Senate 3025

An act to amend the public health law, in relation to permits to operate farm labor camps

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Paragraph (m) of subdivision 4 of section 225 of the public health law, as amended by chapter 175 of the laws of 1956, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(m) require that application be made for a permit to operate a farm or food processing labor camp as defined in the sanitary code; authorize appropriate officers or agencies to issue such a permit when the applicant is in compliance with the established regulations; prescribe standards for living quarters at farm and food processing labor camps, including provisions for sanitary conditions; light, air, and safety; protection from fire hazards; maintenance; and such other matters as may be appropriate for security of life or health, provided, however, that the provisions of the sanitary code established pursuant to the provisions hereof shall apply to all farm and food processing labor camps intended to house migrant workers and which are occupied by 5 or more persons. In the preparation of such regulations, the public health council may request and shall receive technical assistance from the board of standards and appeals of the State department of labor and the State building code commission. Such regulation shall be enforced in the same manner as are other provisions of the sanitary code;

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

GOVERNOR'S MEMORANDUM ON PAYROLL RECORDS OF FARM CREW LEADERS

(Memorandum filed with Senate bill 3193, Print No. 3498, entitled: "An act to amend the labor law, in relation to requiring farm labor contractors or crew leaders to keep payroll records and give wage statements to farmworkers")

MARCH 19, 1958.

Approved.

This bill will require farm labor contractors or crew leaders to keep payroll records and to give each worker a statement showing his earned wages and the deductions made. The bill will implement the present provisions of the law for the protection of migrant workers against abuses involving wage payments.

When I requested this legislation in a special message to the legislature earlier this year I pointed out that in my first annual message, the legislature was advised of the need for setting higher standards for the employment and living conditions of migrant workers who helped to harvest New York's crops. In 1956, the interdepartmental committee on farm and food processing labor was reorganized to enable it to coordinate more effectively departmental programs having to do with the problems of migrant labor. I also appointed an advisory council on seasonal farm and food processing labor to work with that committee.

This bill is a result of the inspections and investigations of conditions in migrant labor camps conducted under the auspices of these two committees. It will afford to thousands of migrant laborers greater protection against wage payment abuses. It will permit better enforcement by the industrial commissioner of the wage payment provisions of the labor law.

The bill is approved.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

Retired—But Busier Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think the sociologists who pursue the science of geriatrics as a special field of study would be well advised to observe closely the tempo maintained by the officials of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. If these officials have slowed down with the years, I pity those who must have tried vainly to keep pace with them when they were at the height of their careers in Government. They are a fine group of American citizens.

Frankly, Mr. President, these people are a great inspiration to me. I have watched them demonstrate in their meetings with the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, the incalculable value of the judgment, perspective and maturity which are the fruits of their years of experience. They helped to guide me in working for the recent increase in annuities provided for former Federal employees.

I am reminded of a small group of San Francisco executives, who on reaching the retirement age, but not relishing imposed inactivity, set themselves up as management consultants and were busier than they had ever been prior to retirement.

These thoughts occurred to me, Mr. President, when I read in the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1958, William Basham's stimulating story of Frank J. Wilson and John Madigan, president and secretary, respectively, of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, one of the truly useful organizations in our National Capitol.

So that my colleagues may enjoy the inspiration of this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIGAR CHOMPER, 71, BATTLES FOR RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES

(By William Basham)

Seventy-one-year-old Frank J. Wilson ground down on a fresh cigar and with both hands firmly planted on the oversized desk, snapped out: "This business is run by retirees—for retirees."

The straight-talking president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees added, "We don't run up to Capitol Hill asking for charity. We originate, sponsor, and promote legislation to meet the needs of civil-service retirees—the original intent of the Civil Service Retirement Act."

Telephone calls, letters, and visitors pour in all day long at the office at 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW. The staff is made up of 51 members, all over 60, and all very busy.

SEVENTY-TWO AVERAGE AGE

"The average age on the 3 floors of our headquarters is 72. That includes George Fonken, who's past 84. George has the responsibility of getting out the mail to member prospects—a project in itself," Mr. Wilson said.

"There's no time for dawdling," asserted Mr. Wilson, whose carriage still attests to his former days as head of the United States Secret Service.

"This group got its start right after the Civil Service Act was passed in 1920. Fourteen retirees chipped in a dollar apiece. Today we have a 93,000 membership, 23 State federations and 680 chapters functioning in every State, Hawaii, the Canal Zone,

the Philippine Republic—and Alaska," he said proudly.

Just then, the group's tall, silver-haired secretary, John Madigan, 68, walked in carrying an impressive amount of correspondence. He summed up the group's activities, saying, "A good description of our duties might be compared to that of a watchdog."

ALWAYS A BATTLE

Mr. Madigan's explanation is as good as any for the organization that has sicked its vast numbers on members of Congress who drag their heels on legislation affecting the welfare of the Federal retiree. "It's battle, battle, battle," said Mr. Wilson, "but it's gotten us increased annuities, tax exemptions, payments for widows of retires and a group hospitalization plan."

Reaching to a pocket crammed with more cigars, Mr. Wilson said:

"When a worker quits his desk after 30 years or so, he finds that it's an extremely sudden change. Many sit home for awhile, putter in the garden, watch TV, or read. But some of these can't take an abrupt break in their established routine and have mental breakdowns.

"One of our big aims is to get the potential retiree alerted several years before he quits his job. Recently, we've helped in urging Government agencies to set up preretirement counseling services in their personnel offices. It's a modest beginning, but we think it's catching on."

As if they didn't have enough to do, the association puts out a monthly 32-page magazine covering up-to-date developments on benefits, information on local units and giving "pats on the back" to sympathetic legislators.

H. R. 13610: A Bill To Assist in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Instruction of the Nation's Schoolchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which has a direct relationship to the future strength and security of our Nation. H. R. 13610 proposes to assist the States and Territories in extending and improving their programs of fitness through health and physical education, and through recreation instruction of the Nation's schoolchildren. In my opinion, this program of extension and improvement in these important areas is essential to our Nation's security.

This bill would provide a total of $15 million a year in Federal funds for a 5-year period beginning in 1960. Each State would receive a minimum of $50,000 a year, with additional funds allotted in proportion with a State's number of school-age children. Under the bill, each state would outline a program by which Federal funds would be used to extend and improve school health and safety education, physical education, and recreation instruction with special attention to fitness.

I am sure every Member of this Congress agrees with me when I say that American schools must produce physically fit persons to meet the challenge of present world crises. The reports of the large numbers of our young men between the ages of 18 and 25 who have been rejected by the Armed Forces on physical grounds are alarming. When we consider that in the six and a half year period from July 1, 1950, to the beginning of 1957, over 15 percent of the 4.7 million draft registrants were rejected because of physical defects, we cannot fail to acknowledge the urgency of the need for this program. Statistics from one study show, for example, that one out of three of our youths in their late teens and early twenties have been found unfit for military duty because of physical defects. This dramatic evidence of our neglect has in fact, been supported by every study ever made of the health of American school children.

It was shocking for Americans to learn the results of tests from a study by Dr. Hans Kraus, associate professor of physical medicine and rehabilitation at New York University, and Miss Bonnie Prudden, director of the Institute for Physical Fitness at White Plains, N. Y., which showed that out of 4,264 United States children tested for muscular fitness, 57.9 percent failed to meet minimum standards as compared with the much smaller percentage of 8.7 of the 2,879 European children who were given the same tests.

Additional evidence of the need for emphasizing the importance of physical fitness is outlined by the reports of the President's Conferences on the Fitness of American Youth.

I have followed with deep interest the reports and recommendations of these conferences. Because of my concern over the fact that present programs of physical fitness are not reaching all of the Nation's youth and because of my feeling that there should be more cooperation and financial assistance to these programs, I have introduced this bill which would provide Federal financial assistance to the States for their extension and improvement of school health and safety education, physical education, and recreation instruction with special attention to fitness in local schools.

The recommendations of the President's conference, with its representatives from youth-serving organizations throughout the Nation, support the fact that the Federal Government has a responsibility toward assisting the States in the promotion and extension of their programs of physical fitness. The conference gave formal recognition to the fact that physical and health education and recreation are essential to a balanced program of education for every boy and girl. Such programs of physical fitness are necessary for the development of healthy bodies and minds. Our all-out effort toward scientific and technical production requires that our citizens function at a high level of health and personal efficiency.

Scientific and productive manpower, present and potential, should be utilized to its fullest, unhampered by illness, accidents, or preventable or correctable health defects. Parallel to a national program aimed toward discovering and educating talented and gifted youth, it seems to me that there should be a program of health service and health instruction to encourage these youths, and others, to develop and maintain maximum physical and mental health. Certainly all youngsters should be "fit to learn." No youngster should be denied full achievement of his potentials because of preventable conditions of poor health.

We all know that public and professional interest in recreation is expanding rapidly. Everyone agrees that schools need to exert leadership now to meet recreation responsibilities, to avoid forfeiting their rights to other agencies, and to minimize wasteful duplication of personnel and facilities. Also youth unrest and youth delinquency need to be met squarely with school programs of physical education, intramural sports, athletics, and recreation.

The physical and intellectual efficiency of the Nation's youth must be improved through programs to develop the sound functioning of body processes, to correct remediable defects, and to assist our youth in the attainment of the endurance, strength, agility, and coordination and other qualities upon which the strength of a healthy Nation must depend.

As Americans we are proud of our high standard of living and our modern school facilities, yet, 91 percent of the Nation's elementary schools have no gymnasiums. We boast of our exceptional health record which less than 50 percent of our high schools provide programs of physical education. Furthermore, other reports indicate that 40 percent of the young men entering our Armed Forces in World War II could not swim 50 feet and that less than 5 percent of American youths have had the opportunity to enjoy camping and outdoor living.

These deficiencies must be remedied. I believe that the program outlined in my bill represents an important step toward the establishment and development of an effective program to insure the maximum degree of health, physical well-being, and fitness of our schoolchildren and to provide the Nation with a larger reservoir of persons whose strength, vitality, and stamina are essential resources to the Nation's security. Therefore, it is my hope that my colleagues will agree with me and assist in having this meritorious legislation enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

Financial Stability for Local Service Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, fiscal solvency and future financial stability which will insure increasingly effective local service airline flights were advanced a step nearer realization at the quarterly regional meeting of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, hosted by Frontier Airlines, Inc., and held at Denver, Colo., July 24 and 25.

The Honorable Louis J. Hector, distinguished newest member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered the remarks which mirrored this area of financial stability and increased public service when he championed bold imaginative thinking in matters of route adjustment and modification of operating restrictions.

Mr. Hector spoke on behalf of modification of old subsidy concepts to deal with the fabulous growth of local service and necessary introduction of new equipment by the local service airlines. He described the necessity for more definitive subsidy standards and the possibility of constructing a subsidy mail rate policy based on overall operating efficiency. This major address, which specifically seconded the CAB policy address on local airline service, delivered by the Honorable James R. Durfee, distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the ALTA meeting in Las Vegas, Nev., April 10–11, 1958, should prove of genuine interest to my colleagues and to their constituents in every State presently receiving local airline service, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LOUIS J. HECTOR, MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, AT THE QUARTERLY REGIONAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL AND TERRITORIAL AIRLINES, DENVER, COLO., JULY 25, 1958

I do not need to tell you how very pleasant it is to meet once again with representatives of the local service and territorial airlines. Since I have been on the Board, I have had the opportunity to meet a number of you personally and to see firsthand the energy, the enthusiasm, and the experience which you bring to the many problems which you and the Board together face today.

We spend a lot of our time in Washington these days on local service problems. I am sure you all appreciate the great complexity and importance of the Seven States case in which a tentative vote was recently announced by the Board. The tremendous scope of the new routes there under consideration; the use-it-or-lose-it principle implemented by specific standards outlined in the press release of the Board; the reconsideration of whole route systems that occurs in such a major area case—all these are matters of vital interest to the industry. You are all also certainly aware of the sweeping changes in restrictions requested by many of the parties in other area cases; the critical issues for the entire industry involved in the rate of return case; and the many broad questions concerning local service and territorial carriers involved in other cases presently before the Board. I know all these matters are of great interest to you just as they are of profound interest to the Board. But, of course, it is just these very things which are important and timely and vital—both to you and to us—which are being vigorously litigated before the Board right now and hence are the hardest to talk about. Under the principles of procedural due process which insure to every party the right to a full hearing on his specific case, we can discuss such matters only in very general terms. It is in this spirit that I would like to review briefly with you today a few of the general proposals recently made by the industry.

It seems to me that the bulk of the industry proposals can be divided into three general types. First, there are the proposals for reequipment. This subject has been talked about for years now, and I think we are all gratified that at last through the guaranteed loan programs things are beginning to happen. Of course, until recently even a guaranteed loan program wouldn't have done much good because the planes weren't there to be bought. The Board, as a matter of fact, may have been somewhat negligent in not using its developmental powers in this field. I think it might have been proper for the Board somehow to have underwritten the earlier development of an appropriate aircraft suitable to the needs of the local service carriers. But be that as it may, you now have the planes—some new planes and some old planes at new low prices—which seem proper for the job, and you have the financial machinery for buying them.

A second matter often discussed is route adjustment and the modification of restrictions. This includes a host of different proposals. These are all the proposals, for instance, for greater freedom in route realinement and changes of service pattern within a carrier's certificated system. I have heard it proposed even that such each local service carrier seems to have a general geographical area in which it is primarily responsible for air service, the Board should permit each carrier to serve the towns and cities in its area by any routings it seems fit, provided only that it gives adequate service to all points which produce a minimum of required traffic. This is certainly a revolutionary concept but not without a precedent—as a matter of fact it is somewhat akin to the Los Angeles Airways helicopter certificate which permits the carrier to serve any point in an area of 50-mile radius. The proponents of this idea point out that no one—neither the Board nor the carriers—can really predict in advance what the routings should be within a local service trade area, and that only trial and error can show which towns will produce passengers and which routes are the most efficient. I think you can see what complications such an idea poses in terms of subsidy standards and conventional route authorizations, but this may be the kind of bold, imaginative thinking which is needed to solve our problems.

Other proposals in the general category of route adjustment and modification of restrictions include a wide variety of skip-stop proposals and interroute, intersegment service proposals.

The real heart of the matter however, is the desire of the local service carriers for nonstop authorization between major traffic points. Let's face it, when a local service official talks route adjustment what he really means is nonstop between his major terminals. He may talk about other things too, but in the end he gets down to the real proposal which is the nonstop authority. Now what justification is offered for this? I'm sorry to say that I usually hear only one—that it will reduce the carrier's subsidy.

The usual speech or article on this subject outlines the financial plight of the local service industry, then speaks of the general desire to reduce subsidy, and finally ends with the statement, "The only way to achieve this is to give the local service carriers nonstop authority." Of course, this is not a bad argument. We all want to reduce subsidy and we know that this might help—but it is an argument that can't stop there, for the opposing argument is also a strong one. It runs like this: The Board gave out the first local service certificates in 1944, 1945, and 1946 specifically for the purpose of providing service from small towns and cities of our country into the larger cities. The whole argument for permanent certification before Congress, the whole tenor of the legislative history confirms this purpose. The Board and Congress have been and still are clearly willing to pay all the subsidity necessary to insure the continuation of this local service. So there is no real need to add another type of service.

I certainly wouldn't presume to tell you how to argue your case, but I would suggest that the best way to obtain authority to do something is to show, not that you need the revenue to be derived from the authority, but that you can so exercise the authority as to give better service to the public than anyone else.

I could not, of course, speculate whether or not and, if so, when and to what extent the local service carriers will obtain nonstop rights between major terminals. This would involve major readjustments within the industry, and will be greatly influenced by traffic developments, the operating economics of the new planes, and many other factors. But I do think we should always remember one thing. Whatever else happens, local service must be performed in ever-growing volume for the foreseeable future. Even if the local service industry should some day obtain these long-hoped-for nonstop rights, they will only be the frosting on the cake. The cake itself is still local service, and that cake must somehow be made sweet enough, palatable and nutritious enough, for you to thrive and prosper even without the nonstop icing. We must make local service itself a good, profitable, paying, thriving business. In this effort you will have massive governmental support. I think it can be achieved. Then if you get other broader authorizations, you will have two good, profitable businesses—a situation that any healthy private enterprise should certainly strive for.

Speaking of private enterprise, you may wonder why I haven't come to the announced topic of my speech, Private Enterprise and Public Subsidy. Frankly, the reason is that we are not as far ahead with certain subsidy studies as we had hoped. These studies are part of a general reappraisal of our subsidy standards and our machinery for subsidy determination. The many proposals in this field are the third type of proposal so often made by the industry in the past months.

Your own program has dealt very extensively with subsidy standards. You have advanced the suggestion that temporary mail pay should be set so as to anticipate probable increased costs rather than merely reflect the costs of a past period. You have urged that temporary rates be set so as to include interest, that the standards for mileage disallowances be more clearly established, and that mail rates should be based on overall efficiency rather than item-by-item examination. All of these requests, it seems to me, arise out of one basic problem, and that is the problem of operating under fixed rates in a period of rapid change,

development, and growth. The statement has been made, and it has much substance, that a final mail rate of the old type is almost meaningless today because almost as soon as it is established the basic data has changed. On the other hand, the present system of temporary mail rates leads to constant reexamination and renegotiation, and still often leaves the carrier in a position where it does not have the cash to meet its interest payments, not to speak of the constantly increased working capital required by a growing enterprise.

The Board has recently been studying not only all the details of the present subsidy standards and machinery to see if they can be improved, but have simultaneously asked the staff to embark on certain basic studies to determine whether some major modifications of our old subsidy concepts might not be the real answer to these problems. When I accepted your invitation I had hoped that certain of these staff studies would be completed and available for discussion, but unfortunately this kind of rethinking of basic policy takes a lot more time and involves many more problems, both legal and policy, than one ever anticipates. I can assure you only that the work is going forward under high priority.

Let me give you some of the general thinking which underlies this reappraisal of subsidy standards. Our chairman, James R. Durfee, expressed it very well in his speech to you at Las Vegas last April: "Our present system does not provide the necessary incentive to remain on final rates. It provides no real incentive to minimize expenses under a temporary rate, and no definite, dollars-and-cents standards by which carriers can judge their own performance. * * * Our basic objective will be to provide definite subsidy standards, within which the carriers will have to live—within which carriers will have the freedom—and the profit-and-loss incentive—to conduct their operations as good management judgment dictates."

I heartily concur in the chairman's remarks, particularly his comment concerning a "profit and loss incentive." We must always respect the daring and enterprise of those who organized the local service industry and the high degree of personal pride which guides its management today. We must realize, however, that we can little longer rely solely on these intangibles to insure the continuing growth of this industry. Your industry, like all other growing industries, must attract additional capital. You must someday soon show profits in order to attract equity capital and, thereby, break the cycle of constantly mounting debt.

I have always had a particular personal interest in these problems because I for a number of years ran a small business just about the size of the average local service carrier. I have always been amazed at the multitude of uncertainties which face local service management. You must operate your current system and chart your future course while often never fully knowing what your so-called temporary mail rate is. You are constantly negotiating final rates which in reality seldom stay final. You are nearly always involved in route extension cases. All of this takes place while you never really know what mileage may be disallowed and what expenses may be looked upon as not proper under honest, economical, and efficient management. I am convinced that your continued progress requires a new scheme which will enable you to plan operations with greater knowledge of what you can expect in the way of public support.

In many ways the subsidized air carrier system is a unique experiment in cooperation between private enterprise and the Government. It is totally unlike a public transportation system which is run by a governmental body for the public with the deficits automatically charged to Government expense. The subsidized air carrier industry bears little relation to other types of public utility, such as a light company or telephone company, which is guaranteed a virtual monopoly of an indispensable service, and which is only controlled by limitations on profits. The closest analogy to the airline subsidy I have been able to find is the maritime operating subsidy whereby the expenses of our American-flag ships are equalized so as to give them a fair opportunity against lower-cost foreign competition. But in this case the subsidy is based on a clearly definable standard—the difference between American costs and foreign costs—which can be ascertained with some precision in advance.

The airline subsidy is based on the principle that when a carrier performs needed services authorized by the Government in an honest, economical, and efficient manner and still does not show a reasonable profit, the Government will subsidize the difference. In carrying this out we have up to now become involved in an interminable round of discussions about what in minute detail is honest, economical, and efficient management.

One of the recent suggestions made by the local service carriers is that they be judged on their overall efficiency rather than by a point-by-point examination. To my mind, this suggestion may strike pretty close to the heart of the problem. The Circuit Court for the District of Columbia has recently reminded us in the American Overseas case that Congress did not put the responsibility for development of an air transportation system wholly upon Government agencies. In this statute the Congress sought to utilize the abilities and the capacities of the private air carriers. * * * Many different operations—different in policy, in mode, and in result—may all be honest, economical, and efficient. It is not enough for the Board to say that an operation it designs and favors meets those tests and it will approve that course and none other.

I know that you devoutly hope for improvements which will enable the local service industry in the foreseeable future to become self-supporting. I know that you share with many of us in government the feeling that after an appropriate period of development the users of local service should find it possible to pay the full cost of your operations. I feel too that you agree that in the long run the disciplines of private competition offer a better hope of cost-cutting and managerial efficiency than all the detailed policies wise regulators can ever hope to fashion. It seems to me that in the long run all we can hope to do is to devise broad general policies and within them permit local service management sufficient leeway to work out their own destinies. In short, our efforts must be directed to setting the climate in which you work—not substituting our ideas and energy for yours.

If general subsidy standards can be devised so that you and we will know in advance what amount of subsidy you may expect for any given type of operation, and if such subsidy standards can be so formulated that they contain for you a genuine profit incentive and at the same time give us a greater measure of control over the total subsidy bill, we shall have made a step of the most profound importance for all of us. Not the least of the benefits would be the enormous saving of time in mail rate proceedings—both our time and your time. We could well use the manpower and energy in the consideration of broader policy problems, and you could well use the time and energy in your real job—which is running your own airline in the most efficient and economical manner possible.

This is a major undertaking, however, and we will need the assisttnce of all of the local service and territorial carriers and their representatives. Members of our staff will probably be in touch with you for informal, individual discussions, and I hope you will give them the full measure of your constructive thoughts and experience.

In this job of subsidy standards, we in the Board have grave responsibilities, both to the public who require air service, and to the public treasury on which we draw for subsidy payments. You have both of these responsibilities in equal measure, and in addition you have the responsibility of making your own company a progressive and profitable business enterprise. It is my conviction that these aims are in no way incompatible, and I know that we can rely on you for the fullest measure of cooperation and assistance.

Oregon Participation in Benefits of Rural Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my native state of Oregon has one of the finest and most enlightened State libraries in the Nation. This library has now begun to make available, through Oregon's vast countryside, the additional book distribution and other operations authorized by the Rural Library Services Act, in support of which many of us in the Senate and the House were extremely active. Oregon also maintains an excellent system of county libraries, which contribute to our high literacy rate.

Miss Eleanor Stephens, who soon will retire as State librarian of Oregon, has contributed greatly to the standing and quality of our State's library facilities. Miss Stephens recently gave a most informative talk describing the services being provided by the rural library funds made available to our State. This talk was delivered to the annual Oregon Library Association conference, an outstanding group.

I think it is particularly heartening to read Miss Stephens' vivid description of the enthusiastic reception accorded the State's three new bookmobiles, as they roll through the wide-open spaces of Oregon, bringing information, enlightenment, and education in their shelves and files. She also pays tribute to public-spirited citizens like Herman Oliver, of John Day, who has donated his own funds to build a new library in that community, and to furnish a bookmobile for Grant County.

It is especially pertinent that I, as one of the Senators from Oregon, should ask unanimous consent to include Eleanor Stephens' splendid address in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because we are well aware that the distinguished Congresswoman from the Third Oregon District, Mrs. EDITH S. GREEN, was one of the leaders in helping to bring about enactment of the Rural Library Services Act in 1956.

I ask that the thoughtful report by Oregon State Librarian Eleanor Stephens be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORBITS FOR OREGON LIBRARIES

(By Miss Eleanor Stephens)

WHAT IS THE OREGON PLAN FOR LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE RURAL LIBRARY SERVICES PROGRAM? WHAT IS THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THE PLAN? HOW HAVE THE PROJECTS BEEN SET UP?

With this my swan song as State librarian at an Oregon Library Association meeting, I would like to make it something worthy of remembrance. Although exposition of this kind does not lend itself to dramatization, the implications of the program carry us out on a wave of the future which cannot be belittled, no matter how poor the narration. In such a mood I might start with Milton; for who else has such grandeur for the space age? "He looked and saw wide territory spread before him towns and rural works between."

I found in browsing through Milton's Paradise Lost and then in his Aeropagitica: "A good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." And again: "Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks, methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam."

These mighty words may seem a far cry from the midget beginnings of the projects in process in Oregon but, as I reminded you in my Christmas library letter, "All the flowers of tomorrow are in the seeds of yesterday." We in Oregon do have an unusually wide territory "before us spread," the towns are relatively few everywhere, except in the Willamette Valley, where 85 percent of Oregon's population is located. But, knowing how truly a good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, those of us who have been the architects of the Oregon plan determined that the experiment to be made possible, even with budgets cut 50 percent, should in some way help Oregon to rouse itself to its full library strength. We wanted a plan with sufficient geographical spread to make everyone in the State aware of it, yet we recognized that if we dribbled it out in amounts that were too small we would fail to demonstrate what could be done properly, and we knew we must enlist local cooperation if the projects were to be really self-supporting after the brief pump priming period had ended. We had to start where we had leadership to depend on.

Since this is a space year, in attempting to make graphic the Oregon plan, later in my explanation I shall use an analogy which relates our library program in Oregon to the universe and its encircling worlds. To clarify these relationships in our proposed library system may I first remind you of some dictionary definitions:

Universe: Defined as the totality of existing things, including the earth, the heavenly bodies, and all else throughout space.

Galaxy: Typified by the milky way or any galactic system, including those outside of the milky way.

Moon: May refer specifically to a body which revolves around the earth, or may be any planetary satellite.

Sputnik: Need I define this now most used word in the English language—a new thing created to spin about the earth in its own new orbit—of which less than half a dozen have been created to date, but imagination projects new dimensions in living from their devising and use.

Because the Multnomah County Library now operates in Oregon the only library system which in any way approximate standards of population, size, and support as set up in the American Library Association publication on public library service, and because the loans made to it by the Oregon State Library are less than one-tenth of 1 percent, in this delineation the Multnomah County Library is considered as outside of our operation, a milky way of its own. But we might approach the library cosmos, or library complex of public library service in Oregon, under our newly envisioned program, with a cosmology that differs somewhat from present concepts.

The Oregon library concept which served well a pioneer society was one in which there radiated out from the Oregon State Library, a well established book collection which has been loaned generously, not only to supplement existing library collections but also to serve the isolated patron. Ours has been an agency which had as its slogan "your State library is as near as your mailbox." This sun of the State library is not now capable of illuminating adequately the universe of Oregon, with its population of 1,700,000. But if we can conceive of some galaxies, with their own stars, or area library centers, being established in various portions of our universe Oregon, each of which has its own moons, or community library centers, and its sputniks (bookmobiles), the State library can conceivably supplement such library service quite effectively.

In the limited time allowed it is not possible to review all of the steps in public cooperation which led to making the Oregon plan a reality. It can easily be documented for you if you return home and reread my special bulletins of August and September 1956, as well as the one for September 1957 which reported the program implementation as approved by the board of trustees of the Oregon State Library on the 25th of that month. The bipartisan support which include the Republican governor and President in 1956 and later a Democratic governor and legislature in Oregon, as well as a Democratic delegation in Congress, all deserve their share of credit for making the dream come true.

Although the Rural Library Services Act was signed by President Eisenhower in June 1956 and Oregon's matching funds were voted in May 1957, none of the Oregon money was available under the Oregon law until Federal funds were on hand. The State library staff and the State purchasing agent rolled into action immediately, when the first Federal allotment of $40,000 was received on May 16, 1957 since this money had to be spent by June 30, a brief 6 weeks. By June 18, 1957 bids had been made on 3 bookmobiles costing approximately $7,000 each and books and plastic jackets for them totalling $10,333 were ordered. A plan for allocating these books was devised by July 1, 1957.

Since not only the professional journals have been full of facts and figures, but our local press has carried news about the Library Services Act as sponsored by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon, I shall not review it in detail. You will doubtless remember that the enabling act would have given $7,500,000 of Federal funds annually to State agencies for 5 years from July 1, 1956 through June 30, 1961, two-fifths of which time is already past, the budget for one-fifth more has to be in to Washington, D. C. this month, with only the two-fifths for the period from July 1, 1959 through June 30, 1961 remaining to be allocated. All this, although we have been in actual operation for only 1 year as of this month, while the grants-in-aid program swing into action only 9 months ago.

When you realize that Oregon in its first 2 years did not receive a total of $217,060 as it might have hoped for, if the full $7,500,000 had eventuated in the Federal budget, but had to cut its program to rather less than half of that amount, it is somewhat miraculous that our 11 projects have moved forward with the momentum which they have had. May I pause here to give praise not only to Eloise Ebert, Cora Miller, Mabel Baker, and Rose Davidson, of the State library staff, as well as to all of our subject specialists who worked selecting books for the bookmobiles but also to our splendid project leaders, many of whom you'll meet on the panel here today, and to trustees, county courts, and Jaycees who have all put shoulders to the wheels within wheels to make the projects click.

A year and a half ago when I prepared an article for the Oregon Library News titled "Bootstrap Lifting," the Oregon State Library lacked funds for adequate extension division staff and services, and had no budget for grants-in-aid to libraries in the State. The dynamic efforts of the board of trustees of the State library in 1957 brought into being funds from the Oregon State Legislature with which to match Federal funds for rural library services to communities of less than 10,000 population. In the spring of 1956 your State librarian had spent 6 weeks at Rutgers University under the tutelage of Keyes Metcalf and Lowell Martin, evolving a system of libraries for Oregon which incorporated ideas prepared by her and Eloise Ebert under Dr. Robert Leigh at the University of Washington in 1951, which in turn were revamped by the library development committee of the Oregon Library Association in 1953. If, as I had written in an article published in the Library Journal 10 years earlier, on January 1, 1943, it is true that "Patterns precede garments, and a map is an essential when evaluating an itinerary that takes you where you want to go," certainly mulling over plans in the last 14 years must have done something toward perfecting the pattern for 1957, evolved at Rutgers, which with the exception of the point relative to equalization funds, lays out the road which the Oregon projects are now traveling.

In a State which preaches self-realization, where we have many small isolated communities properly proud of local initiative, in which they have shown community spirit in recognizing library needs, even though they have little fiscal potential, it was natural for the board of trustees of the Oregon State Library and the Oregon Library Association to agree that "the pattern of development for libraries in Oregon must be diverse if it is to be tailored to suit the needs of people in both the more populous and the less populous areas." And so, in the May 1956 proposal which I prepared under the title of a "System of Libraries for Oregon" after an introductory statement:

"Any attempt to adapt library standards for Oregon should endeavor to arrive at some pattern which would define minimum services and facilities for all Oregonians and to provide—

"1. Easy access to adequate and varied collections of books and other materials, housed attractively and efficiently.

"2. The services of personnel skilled in selecting, guiding and stimulating the use of such materials.

"Owing to the multiplicity of books published and the difficulties attendant upon assembling stock, organizing and distributing it efficiently and economically, it is axiomatic in 1956 that books are best serviced by a system of libraries."

I analyzed functions for various levels of service, defining in such a system the place of the State library, as it now exists, the possibility of State-supported regional centers, or as an easier early expedient more frequent use of extension librarians from the State library (called in this document, field

consultant) and what might be expected of locally supported library systems. I mentioned that the local library headquarters might be set up under different jurisdictions, as provided under Oregon library law: The locally supported headquarters might be set up under—

1. A regional library constituted of participating counties or parts of counties—as promulgated in one 1955 Oregon legislation;

2. A county, sufficiently large in population with a tax base large enough to support an adequate separate county library;

3. A federation of existing public libraries which might experiment by sharing in cooperative book buying and cataloging and/or payment for the services of a specialist on some phase of children's adult work.

Stemming out from such suns as these galaxy headquarters, there were to be for each a system of area library services, which might be termed the moons or sputniks of the galaxies.

The State library sun of library service, now attempting to light our Oregon library universe in many areas and serving distant points all too weakly, would still have a big job cut out for it in supplementing with its rays of books and advice the activities of the suns, or headquarters libraries, at the center of the various galaxies. With the light waves conserved from no longer attempting to stretch its functions out too far, functions which no other library can perform so well in the State, the entire system would be greatly strengthened.

The Oregon State Library should continue to serve not only as an archival and legislative reference headquarters but also as a library center for materials and resources in a better library extension program. However, the emphasis of its book service to the general population might profitably be shifted from direct over-the-desk and mail-order service to individuals and to too small libraries, to working with a system of regional or county library centered services. In this newly envisioned setup the State library might operate in a variety of ways:

It would give leadership in planning, promoting and helping improve library service for the general population, schools, colleges and State institutions and would further develop its consultative services toward this end. The State library would not set up a union catalog for the libraries of the State as has been done in some States, but it would continue participation in the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center as a means of facilitating interlibrary loans among libraries in the State. Its collection of more than a half million volumes would be used primarily to supplement the existing resources of library systems throughout Oregon.

In an effort to give not only a richer but a more economical library service the distribution of books from the State library might be accomplished by two different methods operating in conjunction. Existing services would be continued from the Salem center; but, in order to give a more equalized service in more distant areas, there might be a subcenter or subcenters in other places.

* * * * *

The first allotment of $40,000 merely purchased materiel, or encumbered funds for such purchases, with which a statewide educational program to establish a favorable climate in which good libraries might develop. The new extension staff at the State library was not completed until the fall of 1957, but that wasn't too bad, since the second allotment of Federal funds did not arrive until August 1957, when the wheels for the second-year program began to grind slowly. You have all received library extension notes, one issue prepared by Mrs. Mabel Baker to quicken interests of small libraries in western Oregon, and the other by Miss Cora Miller for eastern Oregon. Both of these extension librarians were feeling their way and meeting local leaders in areas which did not already have county library services or bookmobiles or which had not joined with some nearby area to secure their share of Federal funds and were attempting to discern the climate of opinion as to new directions for these areas.

By September 1957 the trustees of the State library had evaluated proposals for projects which were made firm for the numbers I to VII as first conceived. However, since neither Umatilla nor Jackson County submitted official proposals approved by their county courts, Benton-Linn was substituted as VIII and Malheur as IX.

Hours, rather than minutes, should be spent to delineate properly the operations involved in making effective use of all funds, for which the librarian of the State library, as administrator, is charged with responsibility. I can assure you that difficulties were met not only due to the terms of Public Law 597 and its regulations, but also to the State's directive relative to the 10 percent for expenditure of the State's matching moneys, the merging of the funds in a common pool, and the insistence of both jurisdictions on a type of performance budgeting. Despite innumerable problems relating to delays in securing bookmobiles and personnel, all 11 projects are clicking, as indicated in the leaflet on New Orbits for Oregon Libraries.

We scarcely know what activity has created the greatest stir but suspect it is the 3 beautiful State-purchased bookmobiles, 1 of which served as an exhibit bookmobile in 10 western Oregon counties before moving on as a demonstrator in Clatsop, where it will remain until June 1959; the other 2 being allocated respectively for western and eastern Oregon. One of these is the project newly devised as a regional demonstration in Benton and Linn Counties, and the other in Malheur a too small and not adequately supported eastern Oregon county, is intended to show how service might be improved there by use of a bookmobile. Through the generosity of this county and its librarian Marjorie Pomeroy, the Malheur County bookmobile is also functioning on occasion as an exhibit bookmobile, having made a trip to Union County, as well as making a similar promise to Baker County, which plans to put on a county library campaign ere long.

Out of the total of $197,910 from State and Federal appropriations received in 1957 and 1958, $97,189 goes into direct grants-in-aid after purchasing bookmobiles, books, and consultant services. Although bookmobiles already were available in Clackamas, Deschutes, and Tillamook Counties, rural library services funds for personnel, books, and operational expenses, are providing greatly improved service to these areas, which have devised patterns of cooperation that merited award by the State library trustees.

If you will study the horizontal sheet enumerating projects I through IX you will discover a lien halfway across the page which serves to segregate the grants-in-aid from the projects under special supervision of the State library staff.

Owing to the manner in which matching for Federal funds is set up, it was fortunate that the Oregon State library carries forward, through its direct mail and advisory work services, some 80 percent of which reach out into communities having less than 10,000 population. This provided a backlog of expenditures under project I which made it easier to supervise from the State library directly such activities as that with library trustees and with junior chambers of commerce with whom Mrs. Baker has worked under project II, and Cora Miller's wide range of activities for eastern Oregon libraries under project III.

In project IV, because Herman Oliver and his wife provided money, not only for the new library building in John Day but also for the bookmobile in Grant County, this project was enriched with over 2,000 books from rural library services funds, to say nothing of the numerous hours of close cooperation made possible by Cora Miller having chosen to date John Day as the center of her field work. Bookmobile enthusiasts thrilled when a letter came to the State library from Mrs. Louise McKown stating that when 100 books were issued from the new library, 200 were issued in the same period from the bookmobile * * * and this in a county of less than 10,000 population. This county no doubt shows the most dramatic gains because in less than a year this county has been made the recipient of a beautiful building in which to house its reference and reading room and administrative quarters, a Parnassus, with which to serve rural people, made possible by county tax funds that lifted support from 34 cents in 1956–57 to over $1 per capita in 1957–58, more than tripling support.

Project V most nearly approximates the ideal of regionalization which is a goal of the Oregon plan. A new wing has been added to the Deschutes County Library for headquarters in Bend and a new bookmobile provided, under the supervision of their dynamic professionally trained librarian, Eleanor Brown. Cooperation has been established with two nearby counties (Crook and Jefferson) that also have demonstrated their striving for library betterment in making possible new housing, in this our first real grants-in-aid project. The Oregon Library News carried in its issue of February 1958 the story of the inception of this program. Were it not for the difficulty of securing adequately trained professional assistance, despite the great distances and the sparsity of population in the region this project would take a back seat to none. It would seem true, as Miss Brown said in her report, that central Oregon regional is on the way up—and fast.

Financed less effectively, because Linn County does not provide any of its own tax money to help with the large burden being channeled for a joint regional service in both Benton and Linn Counties, none the less because the Corvallis Public Library trustees and staff had the vision splendid of what cooperation might bring, if the counties joined forces, and because the Albany Public Library Board and its librarian said they would be willing to supply books as interlibrary loans for the bookmobile project, owing to greater density of population, project VIII no doubt approximates more nearly the library situation which might pertain in the Willamette Valley if it began to inaugurate rural library services via bookmobile. Mrs. Alice Davidson has prepared for the State library a splendid report on the vicissitudes of initiating such services, but when you hear that the first 2 months' runs (limited as they are) netted a circulation to rural people, previously without direct book access, of 2,752 in Linn County and 3,052 in Benton, you will understand our enthusiasm. The first month showed gains of 10 percent, the second 21 percent in use of books.

Projects VI and VII have in common, but with different approaches, their attempts to set up cooperative cataloging projects. Each as added professionally trained personnel for this program, but Miss Sally Lou Tipton, librarian for Clackamas County (VII) with its 1 unified county system for some 100,000 people with 10 branch libraries

naturally has approached its problems differently than Mrs. Mary Rutherford, library administrator for Tillamook and Clatsop Counties, in what we have chosen at the State library to call the north coastal region, which jointly total 48,720 people. In our idealized scheme we would hope that Lincoln County to the south of Tillamook might apply in 1959–60 for entry into this regionalized service. Already Mrs. Baker has worked with all the Jaycee groups in this area and a short inservice training program is to be offered Lincoln County librarians while State library extension workers sound out local residents regarding picking up local support.

Another phase of project VI includes the bookmobile on loan to Clatsop County, and the plan to provide a regional coordinator of work with children for the two counties in the north coastal area. A book could be written upon the vicissitudes of library development in Clatsop County, but the magnificent support of library trustees in both Clatsop and Tillamook Counties and the indomitable courage of Mrs. Farnsworth Wright at Astoria make it appear that, despite difficulties, this library service is to be lifted to standards.

Further considerations in discussing the project problems might well include the legal aspects of the problem, which I assigned to Miss Eloise Ebert after she returned from the University of Illinois last year. Although the contracts or agreements, as the attorney general desires us to call the arrangements between jurisdictions, have involved innumerable hours of time and patience we seem to have passed this juncture. Miss Ebert's yeoman service in the preparation of guiding principles for approving requests for grants made for demonstrations and/or projects as well as rules and regulations for project agreements should be extolled. Mrs. Baker's patience in scouting out exhibit bookmobile routes and setting up schedules for the same deserves special mention, and the dogged devotion of Rose Davidson to the arduous task of 47 days, rain or shine, on the exhibit bookmobile, are herculean labors which we hope not to have to repeat in the same fashion soon again.

It would appear as if in 1958–59 we are beginning to approach the situation envisioned 2 years ago by Governor Smith when he telegraphed the Congress on May day in 1956:

"The Oregon State Library Board and the Oregon Library Association advise me that the funds provided will stimulate the improvement of local service. Within the 5-year period specified in this bill (H. R. 2840) adequate demonstrations could be provided." By dint of great effort we at the State library have kept the faith. As the yellow leaflet New Orbits implies "Local jurisdictions might well begin to investigate what they can do since local funds must finance enlarged programs ultimately." It is not my part to discuss future planning, but I can assure you that this same leaflet gives some advice for the future. There were not too many requests in the past so no properly authenticated requests have been denied. But many large countries are now bestirring themselves, in Lane County, for example, the League of Women Voters has come out with a recommendation to set up rural library service so the next awards may be not too easy to gain. But we need not be discouraged for I truly believe with Thoreau that "if one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams and endeavors to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with success unexpected in common hours. He will put some things behind and will pass an invisible boundary."

Concern Over Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 27, 1958:

CONCERN OVER DEFENSE—WEAKNESSES IN LANDINGS IN LEBANON AND SENATE UNIT'S ALARM ARE CITED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Senate Appropriations Committee expressed concern about the United States defense position last week in unmistakable terms.

It not only criticized the optimism of the administration but it also provided some $1,200,000,000 more than President Eisenhower had requested for the armed services for the next 12 months. Some criticisms were overdrawn and some of the added funds may have been voted on the "it's better to be safe than sorry" principle.

Nevertheless the committee views were based solidly on an uneasy sense of weaknesses, some of which were evident during the recent landings of our Armed Forces in Lebanon.

Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy cited "the speed of our forces' reaction to situations of tension" as justification for his view that our air transport capabilities are adequate.

LITTLE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

But the Lebanese experience offers little evidence to support Mr. McElroy's optimism, in the opinion of other military observers.

Our forces made unopposed landings in Lebanon at the invitation of the Lebanese Government. One battalion of Marines was fortunately near by—the others farther away. None of them had helicopters; the initial landings had to be made in amphibious craft. Only 1 Army airborne battalion of about 1,600 to 1,800 men was flown—in the initial increment—from Germany to Adana, Turkey, and thence after a deliberate delay, to Beirut. A good airfield was available for the transports in Beirut. In addition to this airborne element—some 800 marines were flown as individual replacements—not as a combat unit—from this country to Beirut.

The numbers of men and the amount of equipment transported to Beirut in the initial increment were far too small and the time required was far too long, some observers believe. If the United States had faced fairly determined opposition the small units sent might have been defeated in detail.

Airborne operations must depend for success, in part, upon shock effect, mass, and speed.

Yet today, the air transport available is not sufficient to move any sizable numbers of airborne troops and still carry out the other emergency airlift tasks required. This was demonstrated by our experience in Lebanon.

The relatively slow and small air-shuttle operation from Germany to Beirut was hampered, in part, because some of our air transports had to be diverted to start a fuel airlift from Saudi Arabia to Jordan. Others were required by the Strategic Air Command, others by the Tactical Air Command. The Navy used some. Others had to be held in reserve for possible use in case an emergency developed elsewhere in the world. There was not too much left over for the Army.

In addition to its concern about our airlift weaknesses, the Senate committee apparently felt that the United States Army needed more modern equipment quickly.

United States weapons now ready for production or in advanced stages of development, may well be equal or superior in quality to Soviet weapons—but the Army budget has not included sufficient funds to expedite production and to get these new weapons into hands of troops.

BASIC PROBLEM BROADER

These and other weaknesses motivated the actions taken by the Senate committee last week.

But the basic problem is a broader one.

William C. Foster, who was cochairman of the Gaither Committee, which studied our defense posture, and who has held other important defense jobs, stresses this problem in the current number of the General Electric Defense Quarterly, published tomorrow.

He points out that Russia has been closing the gap technologically and has been matching our total overall defense effort, even though its gross national product represents only about 40 per cent of our gross national product.

About 10 percent of our total goes into defense, as compared to Russia's 25 percent. If we put just 10 percent more of our effort into defense production—"still leaving 80 percent for consumer goods, services, and all our present high standards of living, the Russians, to match us, would have to take away from their people one-third of the already sparse good things of life they have," Mr. Foster declared.

This is the kernel of our long-term defense problem which neither the executive nor the legislative branches of the Government have resolutely faced.

The Nation Would Be Better Served by an Early Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the dog days of Congress occur about this time of year when the Nation would be better served by an early adjournment. All sorts of legislative schemes appear and occasionally are passed when they should have been killed. A prime example, in my estimation, is the bill to provide pensions, free mailing privileges, suitable office space, and stenographic assistance for former Presidents.

With so many important measures which could be considered, I am not sure that I can agree that the session needs to be prolonged to attend to a matter of such low priority. Were we to concede that a pension for ex-Presidents would be desirable—and I do not concede it—there would seem to be no justification for the other emoluments of past office.

No similar treatment has ever before been accorded a class of American citizens. No need has been demonstrated for this legislation. Neither of the living ex-Presidents are what one might call penniless and they can and have adjusted their letter writing and other literary pursuits to their own temperament and disposition. When the day comes, if it does, that we have a President or a President's widow in financial distress the Congress will act quickly, and the people will certainly support such action. Meanwhile, if Congress is to remain in session, there are bills in pigeonholes which could be brought out on the floor which would affect thousands of people in need rather than two who are not in need and who have not asked for this legislation.

The Equity of H. R. 10

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, passage in the House of H. R. 10 was a tribute to the determination and hard work of two distinguished gentlemen. In indicating my support of this measure I wish to acknowledge the great accomplishment of Mr. JENKINS of Ohio and Mr. KEOGH of New York. Over a period of many years they determinedly fought the battle that has been won, at least, in the House. Their success is to be commended and nearly 7 million of professional men and women and other self-employed people will benefit from their foresightedness and determination. I congratulate them on splendid work and am happy to cosponsor this bill, I having introduced H. R. 11187.

A great number of the residents of the First District of Florida have expressed their interest in H. R. 10 and I was glad to represent their interests in introducing a companion bill, H. R. 11187 and in voting for this bill that would provide an equitable form of tax relief for those who wish to volutarily provide for the later years of their life. It is only proper that they do so. It is only proper that they be afforded the same benefits as the employee—in some cases their own employees—who, with the contributions of a company, are only taxed on money paid into retirement-benefit programs when they are received upon retirement.

The professional men and women of the first district have been nearly unanimous in support of such legislation. In fact, they have urged that I support this measure which simply encourages the establishment of voluntary pension plans by the self-employed. It fully provides for those affected a greater equality of tax treatment as related to the employee who will draw social security benefits and the employer or professional man who, of his own choosing, would protect his future and that of his family.

Tax deferment, up to $2,500 or 10 percent of the income of the individual electing to use the provisions of H. R. 10, can only inure to the benefit of the Government over a period of years and whatever loss of tax revenue there is at this time will become an advantage in the future. I must say that I sincerely hope a further form of tax relief may be presented to even more of the taxpayers of the Nation in the near future. The immediate tax loss that must be met with enactment of this measure, which I view as being overcome shortly through other taxes resulting from this plan, can certainly be overcome with stringent housekeeping on the part of the agencies of Government and cutting of waste throughout all departments particularly in our programs of mutual assistance planned throughout the world. This loss is insignificant in comparison to the benefits provided. Resultant investment of capital held in trust funds that would be provided in the execution of the provisions of this bill would be to the public good and a source of advantage to the Government through purchase of Government bond issues and through additional taxable investment incomes. We must further realize that this program will definitely encourage the growth of savings throughout the country and thus have a most significant anti-inflation effect.

There has been a long delay in the remedial legislation that we have provided by action of the House. I trust the Senate will act favorably thereon. I have been glad to support and cosponsor this legislation that brings about an equalization in tax benefits and which provides greater security for those who voluntarily elect to avail themselves of the provisions of this bill. I, again, congratulate the authors of H. R. 10, am delighted to join them as a cosponsor of this bill, and I express my full endorsement of this legislation.

Frank D. Gorsline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet region of Indiana suffered a great loss this year in the passing of Frank D. Gorsline. He was one of Hammond, Ind.'s, outstanding civic leaders and bankers. He was a citizen of Chicago, Ill., and well known throughout the Chicago and adjacent Indiana area.

I wish to submit with this statement a letter from J. Roscoe Miller, president of Northwestern University to Mrs. Frank D. Gorsline, 880 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. I also wish to include with my remarks a letter from Jens Nyholm, Northwestern University librarian, informing Mrs. Gorsline of a permanent memorial in the form of a bookplate in the Northwestern University Library in memory of one of its outstanding alumni.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Evanston, Ill., January 22, 1958.

Mrs. FRANK D. GORSLINE,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MRS. GORSLINE: I was very sorry to learn of the death of your husband, Mr. Frank D. Gorsline, who graduated from our Evanston School of Commerce in 1923. The officers of the university join me in sending to you their condolences.

As a memorial to Mr. Gorsline, we will place in Deering Library on the Evanston campus a book marked with a special bookplate bearing his name. It is our hope that it will give you satisfaction to know that his name is perpetuated in this way in the university from which he graduated.

Sincerely yours,

J. ROSCOE MILLER.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Evanston, Ill., July 14, 1958.

Mrs. FRANK D. GORSLINE,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MRS. GORSLINE: In memory of your husband, the Northwestern University Library has placed a bookplate with the inscription "In loyal memory of Frank D. Gorsline, class of 1923" in its copy of Madison Avenue, U. S. A., a book about the extraordinary business of advertising and the people who run it, by Martin Mayer.

This volume will stand on our library shelves during Northwestern's second century as a tangible evidence of Mr. Gorsline's presence here at the university.

Faithfully yours,

JENS NYHOLM,
University Librarian.

Resolution Adopted by Oregon State Conference on Social Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in a period of extreme international strain and tension, it is all too easy to bypass very important areas of public concern. One of these areas is the field of public assistance and the responsibility the Federal Government has in helping the States carry out adequate programs.

For this reason, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution adopted by the Oregan State Conference on Social Welfare:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY OREGON STATE CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE

Whereas the explosive postwar growth in population in the United States has greatly intensified the need for public services; and

Whereas the United States Constitution states that it is the function of the Federal Government to promote the general welfare, and Federal participation through grants to the States is essential to encourage States and localities to initiate and expand public services and to enable poorer States to achieve minimum standards in performance of public services; and

Whereas the concept of Federal grants-in-aid is under attack under the guise of States rights and the need for balancing the Federal budget; and

Whereas cuts in Federal aid to such vital programs as public assistance, child welfare, vocational education and rehabilitation and slum clearance would seriously affect the welfare of many of our citizens: Be it therefore,

Resolved, That the Oregon State Conference on Social Welfare affirm its belief in the concept that it is the function of modern democratic government to promote and protect the welfare of its citizens, and that continuing Federal participation is vital to the adequate provision of such public welfare services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Economic Recession Hurts All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is generally believed that the current recession has been confined largely to a few industrial sections of the country. Actually, as demonstrated in a recent finding by Elmo Roper & Associates, the recession has been felt most sharply in rural and smalltown areas of the Nation.

Under the impact of declining farm income, hundreds of thousands of farmers have given up farming to seek employment in nearby towns and cities. This type of employment opportunity has been very seriously curtailed by the recession.

Because of this situation the Roper study revealed that the Midwest and the South have both been hit hard by declining employment opportunities stemming from the recession. This fact indicates that Americans living in rural and smalltown areas have as great a stake in the proposed area development legislation as do urban residents. It is my hope that this forward looking, constructive legislation will be passed in the current session of the Congress.

Believing that it will be of interest to my colleagues, I include at this point a release by Elmo Roper & Associates dated July 19, 1958:

EVERY THIRD FAMILY HIT BY RECESSION

(By Elmo Roper & Associates)

One-third of the Nation has felt the impact of the current recession. This means that close to 60 million people have been affected in some degree—either by loss of employment or loss in income—by the economic malaise that has crept across the Nation in the past year. A nationwide cross section was asked this question: I'd like to know a little about how the recession has affected you personally. Which of these statements applies to you?

	Percent
I or someone in my immediate family is out of work	10
While no one in my family is out of work, our family income is less than it was a year ago	22
Our family income is the same as it was a year ago	52
Our family income is higher than it was a year ago	14
Express no opinion	2

What job statistics do not show is the millions of people who while still at their jobs, have suffered cuts in pay or in overtime. The official figures do not record how many salesmen are facing unaccustomed sales resistance, to the extent that their families face unaccustomed budget restrictions. Nor do they reveal the number of factory workers who have dropped from a 5-day week plus overtime, to a 4- or 3-day week. Yet such people represent a group more than twice as large as those actually unemployed.

High though those figures are, they still leave the majority of the public untouched by the 1957–58 downturn. They also reveal a substantial segment who are actually better off than they were a year ago. This last group is, of course, a mixture of people on their first jobs, people who benefit from automatic pay increases, as well as those working in businesses or industries that are actually doing better this year than last.

Inevitably, the economic blight is spread unevenly over the economic scale. Among people whose normal standard of living is above average, the better off and the worse off balance each other out. But among those already on the economic margin, half the families have suffered a setback in their standard of living:

[In percent]

	High or upper, middle income	Middle income	Low income
Out of work	3	7	21
Income lower	18	21	26
Income same	56	57	43
Income higher	20	14	8
Express no opinion	3	1	2

In addition, the old belief that Negroes are last hired, first fired gains substantial backing from today's results. Only 9 percent of white families have an unemployed member at the present time, but 24 percent of Negro families report this sad statistic.

RURAL RECESSION WORST

Although cities like Detroit have been hard hit, in general people in large cities have weathered this year's rugged economic climate better than people in small towns and country areas. While in cities of 100,000 or more, 28 percent either have a family member out of work or reduced family income, the corresponding figure for people from towns of 2,500 or less and those living in rural areas is 37 percent.

Since farm income is up somewhat, the rural recession appears to reflect a loss of job opportunities off, rather than on, the farms. With agriculture demanding less and less manpower, country and small town people have been turning more and more to forms of industrial employment within commuting range of their homes. Apparently this kind of employment had dropped sharply.

Regionally, Midwesterners and Southerners are most affected. The lowest out-of-work figure is reported for families in the Northeast. The far West, whose unemployment figures are as high as those of any other part of the country, also shows the greatest number of people better off.

[In percent]

	East	Mid-west	South	Far West
Out of work	6	11	12	12
Income lower	23	23	22	18
Income same	58	50	51	46
Income higher	12	14	11	21
Express no opinion	1	2	4	3

What do these figures mean? They make it clear that the blight of unemployment spreads quickly beyond those who actually lose their jobs. A dip that has not earned the name depression has nonetheless reduced the economic well-being of a full third of the Nation's families.

New England Council Calls for Better United States Economic Cooperation With Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting release on a statement by Raymond H. Trott, board chairman of the New England Council in Boston:

NEC HEAD CALLS FOR BETTER UNITED STATES ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH CANADA

ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK, August 3.—A prominent New England business leader said tonight that the United States could improve relations with Canada by employing more foresight in formulating some economic policies.

"The reasons for any actions are more easily understood before they are taken than afterward," Raymond H. Trott, board chairman of the Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co., Providence, told the welcoming session of a joint regional economic conference sponsored by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council and the New England Council.

Trott, who also is board chairman of the NEC, reminded the delegates to the 3-day meeting about the economic "stresses and strains" discussed during President Eisenhower's recent visit to Canada before such actions would have eliminated or lessened many misunderstandings.

"It is said that some of our attitudes have been too arbitrary and taken without regard for the feelings of our friends and neighbors," Trott also told the delegates to the Admiral Beatty Hotel gathering, "and if this is true we should and can make amends without receding from the course of action that we feel necessary for our own economy."

The group, which included some 50 New England businessmen, hailed Trott's declaration that "we need to understand each other even better than we do now" and his forecast that "the economic future for both the United States and Canada is a very bright one and offers a great deal to both countries."

New Brunswick Premier Hon. Hugh John Flemming, one of three maritime provinces premiers attending, welcomed the American visitors to the conference which was called to discuss mutual economic problems of the Atlantic provinces and New England. It is the second such meeting between the two regional economic development organizations, the NEC having played host to APEC delegates in 1956 at Bar Harbor, Maine.

Noting that the United States exports about $4 million worth of goods to Canada and imports an estimated $3 billion from her, Trott said the trade between the two nations is "greater than between any other two countries in the world and an obvious reason why we need each other economically." He laid the cause of friction to the failure to understand each other's problems.

On the other hand, the areas represented by the participating groups have "much in common socially and economically," the Rhode Island bank executive stressed, and

he predicted "even more intensive effort in the future" to develop resources and eliminate sources of irritation.

APEC President Dr. Frank MacKinnon and Trott presided at the reception. Included in the New England delegation were NEC Executive Vice President Gardner A. Caverly and Richard L. Bowditch, chairman of the NEC Canadian-New England relations committee and board chairman of C. H. Sprague & Sons Co., Boston.

Weekly Broadcast of Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, WINS Radio Station, New York, August 3, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the transcript of my weekly broadcast over WINS, New York, August 3, 1958:

PENSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS

I believe that ex-Presidents should get a lifetime pension, plus free office space, free mail, and a staff of workers. A plan embodying these provisions has won congressional approval. A former President would get $25,000 a year and during her life, his widow $10,000 per annum after his demise. As passed by the Senate, the former Presidents would get an office, a staff, and free mailing privileges. The House struck out these extra provisions. This was unfortunate. The bill now goes to conference, where the differences must be ironed out. I hope the Senate version of the bill will prevail.

The only former living Presidents that we have are former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman. President Eisenhower would be eligible when his second term ends January 1961.

The Republicans are objecting to the free mailing privileges and office staff features of the plan. They argue that a former President could thus aid a political party or a political candidate, or if the ex-President decided to run for office again, he would have a great advantage. I see no merit in these objections. Suppose an ex-President wanted to run for Senate or for Congress. Why should we try to stop him? Ex-President John Quincy Adams made a good Congressman and Ex-President Andrew Johnson made a good Senator. These ex-Presidents are public figures, called upon to make many public appearances. They handle vast amounts of correspondence. Harry Truman says it takes three clerks to handle his mail alone.

A number of former Presidents, after their terms of office expired, lived in penury and want. President Grant became bankrupt and died of throat cancer at Mount McGregor in New York, in dire financial straits. Thomas Jefferson was near bankruptcy at the close of his career. Both Madison and Monroe fared none too well in their declining years.

There are now two widows of former Presidents who would be eligible for this pension—Mrs. Woodrow Wilson and Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As matters stand today, a former President is one of the very few Federal officials, civilian or military, who gets no retirement pay. Even the Vice President gets a pension, but not the President. That makes no sense.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE AND THE MIDEAST

It is difficult to see how President Eisenhower can avoid—to the credit of himself and the United States—a summit conference. Apparently, most of our allies want this conference, the neutral world wants it and most of the Afro-Asian nations want it. If the President did not wish it and does not wish it, it would have been far better for him months ago to have negated the idea firmly and absolutely. He was always indecisive and woolly in his answers to the many nasty letters Khrushchev wrote. It looks now as if he will be euchered into a conference he does not want, a conference that may be a personal triumph, unfortunately, for Khrushchev, whose stock will skyrocket in Europe and in Asia, while Eisenhower's stature has been greatly reduced in the eyes of the neutral world. I say this reluctantly. He should have been advised to veto a summit conference months ago in no uncertain language, but once he said he would climb to the summit, he could not decline and descend.

If and when a conference is held, we must get somebody to match the cunning and caustic wit of Khrushchev. Make no mistake about it, despicable as he is, he has a dynamic personality and is given to homely proverbs and barbed quotations from Russian folklore. Neither Dulles, with his legalistic, negative attitude, nor the President, with his casual, indecisive manner, would be a match for Khrushchev. I say this is all kindliness to the President. There is only one man that I know of on the the American scene that could meet Khrushchev and worst him, smother him with satire, deluge him with witticisms and interlard his oratory with abrasive anecdotes—that man is Adlai Stevenson—who, in addition to all these qualifications, has an overpowering intellectuality and a mastery of history and diplomacy. Khrushchev would find more than his equal in Adlai. Why do not the President and Dulles call upon him, nay more, why do not the President and Dulles call upon former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman, and former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson? These are parlous times. All wisdom doesn't reside in this administration. Perhaps these former heads of state could lend considerable help and comfort to Dulles and Eisenhower in their present embarrassment.

A good deal of our trouble is our lack of a definite policy. Ours is an ad hoc approach, changing from day to day. We always seem to be doing things reluctantly—as though dragged to do them—as when Prime Minister Macmillan forced our hand to consent to the Summit meeting. Why do we always seem so negative and so unconcerned about the appearance we may create in the eyes of the world? We should insist and keep on insisting, in answer to all the diatribes of Khrushchev, that we want peace, but that he, Khrushchev, hampers peace. Frankly, some of the letters that Khrushchev wrote were so foul and so vindicative and so full of abuse that, diplomatic practice should have prevailed and the letters should have been returned unanswered to the Russian Ambassador. Heretofore, in previous administrations, when any nation practically insulted our head of State, the nation that sent such a letter got short shrift. That has not been the case these days with the present administration and that is unfortunate.

As to the Middle East, our policy should be clearcut and unmistakable. It should call for the following:

1. Settlement of the Arab refugee problem.

2. A Middle East arms embargo.

3. Withdrawal by Russia of its Security Council veto of the United Nations water resources plan for the Middle East.

4. Guarantee of the integrity of the borders of and sovereignty of Israel and the Arab States.

5. Prevention of not only armed aggression from without, but prevention of indirect aggression by infiltration and propaganda.

6. Free access of the West to eastern oil reserves.

7. Recognition of Arab nationalism, but insistence that it be for peace and not for aggression, and divorced from Soviet influence.

We hear little these days of the Eisenhower doctrine. Its tones are painfully silent. It came in with a bang and went out with a whimper. Where was the great flurry and flourish that ushered it in? It has not been a signal success and cost us over $300 million. That money has gone down the drain. Do you remember the Richards' mission? Former Congressman Richards was sent to the Middle East with a bundle of $300 million, which he distributed among the Arab countries. What did we get for this $300 million? The guns it purchased, apparently have been turned against us. Strange too, that little Israel, that did not participate in this booty, is the only country in the area upon which we can safely count.

Incidentally, Israeli intelligence gave advance notice to both London and Washington of the coup d'etat in Iraq that marked the Mideast flareup. But Macmillan and Dulles ignored the warning. Next time they had better listen to little Israel.

CONEY ISLAND

Coney Island has indeed had a checkered career—it has gone in turn from wilderness to boomtown; from a hangout for criminals to a watering place for the rich; from a playground for the well-to-do middle class to a gaudy seaside resort for the masses, where once the nickel ruled supreme. And now it has a new face—a more respectable face. It is no longer a seaside amusement resort with a boardwalk frontage as so many of us remember it. Its glittering past for recreation, amusement, and bathing, is no more. It has really and truly become an integral part of Brooklyn and is fast becoming a residential section—the site of splendid buildings to house middle-class families.

Ceremonies were recently held for the erection of the Luna Park houses on the site of the former Luna Park. At these groundbreaking ceremonies, Commissioner Robert Moses, as chairman of the mayor's slum-clearance committee, spoke of the emergence of Coney Island into a dignified, permanent year-round community and as a center for orderly, seasonal large-scale public recreation from a shabby, catchpenny, honky-tonk Coney Island, to which many nostalgic fables cling.

Coney Island has been synonymous with crowds and play—for it was here that millions of Americans came for relaxation and fun—to bathe in the ocean and enjoy the outdoor amusements. Many of these amusements and rides were first introduced at Coney Island and, later copied throughout the world. It was here the first roller coaster was built in 1884. Here too many of our entertainers first appeared in Coney's cabarets and vaudeville theaters, and went on to become outstanding stars of the stage, screen, radio, and television or achieved eminence in the world of music. At Carey Walsh's Cabaret, a young man named Jimmy Durante played the piano, while another, whose huge brown eyes became his trademark, was a singing waiter—yes, that was Eddie Cantor. At Perry's there was a 5-man combination with Vincent Lopez at the piano. And those who dropped into Stauch's for a glass

of their famous beer might have heard a slight, dark-haired young man sing. He later gave up his singing for songwriting and found fame and fortune under the now world-famous name of Irving Berlin. Long before he became a popular movie star, Cary Grant worked for a while as a walking advertisement for Steeplechase and could be seen making his way through the throngs on stilts.

And then there were some who became infamous. One young man earned his pay as a bouncer for one of the speakeasies. His name? Al Capone.

Famous and infamous, fashionable and unfashionable, good and bad, rich and poor, sober and gaudy—all have been a part of Coney Island's history, where fun, laughter and noise were the order of the day and night and always there were the throngs. One has but to say "Coney Island," and immediately there is evoked a picture of a mass of humanity, cramped together on beach and boardwalk, being constantly subjected to a cacophony of sounds. These sounds came first from the barkers and later from the public address systems, luring the customers into the hundreds and hundreds of sideshows, spectacles, animal acts, games and rides, which added their respective noises to the general confusion of sound.

Through the years, Coney Island is said to have attracted over 2 billion visitors to its playground and I imagine that there must have been moments when one would have thought that all 2 billion were there at the same time. In addition to all the sights and sounds, there were hundreds of cabarets, restaurants, ice cream parlors and food and drinking stands selling everything man would concoct for human consumption—and above all, the hot dog, to which Coney Island lays claim and which has become an American institution, famous the world over—so famous, in fact, that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt served hots dogs at a picnic for visiting royalty. Today, they are being served to the visitors who come to the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Fair.

There were many "firsts" at Coney Island and by the early 1900's, this playground had become a national and international phenomenon. It still attracts many people and will continue to do so for many years to come. No one would seriously consider cutting out the "fun" area entirely, but the face and character of Coney Island have changed and will continue to change. And the many legends will cling to its gaudy past.

Cheering News in the Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial which appeared recently in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala.:

CHEERING NEWS IN THE VALLEY

News to cheer about in the Tennessee Valley is the concerted approval of the three members of the TVA Board of Directors of the Senate bill proposing self-financing without crippling amendments which would take away the freedom of action so essential to TVA in providing additional power facilities.

Sometime ago in this column we mentioned the fact that the Board of Directors would earn much more confidence from home folks if they went to Washington, made their position known, and slugged it out with the enemies of public power.

Yesterday, Chairman Herbert D. Vogel and Board members Arnold Jones and Dr. Frank Welch, all Eisenhower appointees, endorsed the Senate bill and urged its passage. It was the first time the Board members had publicly opposed the Budget Bureau and given their approval to a specific TVA financing bill.

Their action will mean a great deal in this fight. Certainly it will solidify the forces in the valley. This sort of front has not been offered for several years. With Chairman Vogel, Mr. Jones and Dr. Welch taking this sort of position, we are certain that the millions of people in the valley will change their thinking and rally to the leadership of the three men to whom the destinies of TVA have been entrusted for the years ahead.

Extend Title VII, Public Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the right to good health has always been commonly accepted as a fundamental right by every citizen of this Nation. Fortunately, we have 85 medical teaching centers which have consistently, through extensive research and educational programs, enabled our people to enjoy the greatest health status of any people on this globe.

It is interesting to note that less than 60 years ago, most American medical schools could be called second or third rate when compared with those in Germany, England, and other nations. It was not unusual to have a proprietary institution or diploma mill operating for profit without such necessities as laboratories, equipment, hospital affiliations, or competent instructors. Today's medical schools, however, are more than just educational institutions. They have become complex centers of medical science and are the basic institutions involved in the search for new knowledge in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of human illness. Truly our 85 medical schools are the foundation of our entire health and medical structure.

The swarm of new activities has given rise to many new problems in our medical schools, chiefly those of finance. Medical school deans and university presidents are unanimous in designating finances as the No. 1 headache of the past decade. And in spite of the voluntary contributions by the people of this Nation through State appropriations and private gifts, plus the support the Frederal Government has provided in recent years, the increasing demands on the part of our healthy constituents for even more extensive health services forecast an even greater financial burden on these schools in the future.

From the standpoint of national prosperity and security, this Nation has no greater asset than the high standard of health so prevalent among its people. This is why the American people have supported medical education through their donations and support of State and Federal legislation. They fully realize that the smallest discovery in a research laboratory can eliminate polio, or perhaps prevent a plague, or control a dangerous disease such as diabetes. In other words, our people realize that medical research has not only made it possible for them to live 20 years longer than their forefathers, but that additional discoveries have made these 20 active and productive years. Knowing that the people of America support us, I urge early passage of H. R. 12876.

National Defense in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the following penetrating letter by Joseph Alsop, in his column in the Washington Post, places many of the actions of former Secretary of Defense Wilson in their proper perspective. Mr. Alsop might well have noted that Mr. Wilson tried to stop the Army Jupiter missile program. I and a few of my fellow Congressmen strongly opposed that cutback here on the floor of the House. Now, a year and a half later, we know that if Mr. Wilson had had his way, there would be no Explorers orbiting around the earth, America would be years behind the Soviet Union in space and rocket development, and our prestige would be way, way down. Looking back, with all the facts before us, it is evident that when the President thanked Mr. Wilson as he left the office of Secretary of Defense, the most accurate words he could have used would have been, "Thanks for nothing."

Mr. Alsop's column follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

LETTER TO "ENGINE CHARLIE"

DEAR MR. WILSON: Maybe there are more important things to write about, but your recent remarks about Jim Gavin positively demand this letter of thanks.

General Gavin has been doubly impertinent. Rather than lie to the Congress about the results of your defense policies, he has preferred resigning from the service that he loved and gave his life to. And now he has dared to publish a book, suggesting that your defense policies have led this country into mortal danger. This kind of impertinence, of course, deserves the rebuke you so characteristically meted out:

"I know Gavin," you are reported as saying. "And he is just another overly inflated Army officer with an exaggerated regard of his ability. He's just trying to sell his book."

What was so wonderful was your simultaneous denial that Gavin could really know you, since you had only seen him on rare occasions. You know Gavin, in other words, as you knew about the defense of the United States—by interpreting the messages of your

own peculiar mental telepathy in the powerful light of your own prejudices. Or one might say, you know Gavin as you knew about the danger to this country from the rapid growth of Soviet power—by ignoring all the unpleasant facts reported by the intelligence services, and faithfully following your own natural instincts (with some help from the budgetary policies of your friend, George Humphrey).

There are certain facts about Jim Gavin, to be sure, that lesser men than you still have a tendency not to ignore. There is the simple fact of the man himself—the brilliant intellectual who is also a great fighting man, the adored leader of the best division in the United States Army, the combat general with the cool courage that goes with knowledge, the shining soldier with the human style that all men envied and the best men tried to imitate.

One does not forget, either, the parachute landing that Gavin made in Sicily, and the long cruel battle at Salerno, and the drop at dawn into the inferno at Nijmegen and desperate attack that turned the balance in the desperate Battle of the Bulge. All these further facts still arouse strong emotions and call up vivid images—but only in smaller minds than yours. And, of course, you are right that the two Distinguished Service Crosses, and the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart, all won in the fire of battle, are mere military fripperies that probably had a lot to do with overly inflating Jim Gavin.

No doubt smaller minds are afflicted with these distorting emotions and are impressed by these foolish images, simply because they do not understand as well as you do what makes our country great. If you had left Westinghouse Electric to go into uniform, for instance, you might not have got the job with Delco-Remy in 1919. And if you had not got the job with Delco-Remy, you might not have got the job with General Motors, later on. And if that job had been missed, heaven forbid, we might not have had you as Secretary of Defense.

Even before that great moment when you took over the Pentagon, you always insisted on the right priorities. One remembers, for example, your reply to Bob Lovett when he asked for a loan of one of your junior executives during a very bad moment in the Korean war. The man Lovett wanted did not mind the heavy cut in salary. He only asked Lovett for your assurance that his absence on the Nation's service would not hinder his later promotion in the peculiar hierarchy over which you then presided. With a thrill of admiration, Lovett still recalls your stern and patriotic answer: "Of course, it will be held against him, if he leaves GM the way you want him to."

At the Pentagon, too, how firmly and wisely you always insisted upon the right priorities. It was a dangerous moment when you took over, no doubt about it. Action was demanded on a whole series of ugly reports announcing the early loss to the Soviets of the existing American military lead. There were a lot of people who wanted to "press the panic button" in your immortal phrase, and make the effort to maintain the American lead.

But you went right on assuring everyone, in your cool-headed way, that "the Russians weren't 10 feet high." So the Soviets are now well on their way to gaining almost unchallengeable superiority in nuclear striking power. For this, we have you to thank.

But this letter is meant to offer thanks of a more personal kind. It is intended to thank you for the final revelation of the true grandeur of your viewpoint; and it is especially intended to thank you for showing us all what gratitude is owing, what respect is due, from the comfortable people who have been saved to those men who have uncomfortably risked their lives to save them. Thank you, and goodby.

JOSEPH ALSOP.

Entry in Lebanon Not Justified on Moral or Legal Grounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the letters which I have received from Oregon on the latest crisis in the Middle East are overwhelmingly in opposition to the sending of troops to Lebanon. One of the most piercing editorials has been written by the former Republican Governor of the State, the Honorable Charles Sprague. Mr. Sprague was at one time an alternate delegate to the United Nations. Throughout his lifetime he has been a student of national and international affairs. For many years, he has been one of the most highly respected leaders in Oregon. I would call to the attention of my colleagues Sprague's editorial which says in effect that the United States entry in Lebanon was not justified on moral or legal grounds:

[From the Oregon Statesman of July 20, 1958]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

UNITED STATES ENTRY IN LEBANON NOT JUSTIFIED ON MORAL OR LEGAL GROUNDS

Let us have done with moralizing over United States intervention in Lebanon. We have not dispatched marines there just to shore up the present Lebanese Government. It is our move on the chessboard of power politics. Our concern is not chiefly for the Lebanese people to protect them from trespassing Syrians and Egyptians; but for our national interests which focus on the containment of the Soviet Union and of communism, and on prevention of Russian control of the great reservoir of petroleum in the Middle East.

We are not fretting particularly over whether the miserable fellaheen of Egypt and the impoverished villagers of Iraq and Syria and the nomads of Saudi Arabia fall under the sway of Russia—their lot could hardly be worse than it is and has been for centuries. We are fearful lest the Middle East, strategically and economically important, fall under Soviet domination. At least let us be honest about that.

The Oregonian, which declares that the United States is on firm moral ground in dispatching troops to Lebanon, tinctures its morals with oil when it says of the countries of the Middle East that these territories and resources cannot be permitted to fall under the arbitrary control of any bloc unfriendly to the West. And one of its stable of Washington correspondents, William S. White, makes the same dual defense:

"Washington has now put it plainly that we will not permit the Middle East to fall into the wide sink of communism. Made clear, too, is that we will not allow Western Europe to be shut off from the Middle East oil which she must have."

The New York Herald Tribune was more frank than the Oregonian when it headed its supporting editorial: "The West's Lifeblood Is Threatened."

We are told, too, that it was time for the United States to take a stand, otherwise we would continue to be pushed around. This makes intervention a matter of prestige, which again is part of the game of power politics.

If our policy is to save peoples from communism we had a much better case in Hungary in 1956 when its people tried desperately to free themselves from the Russian yoke and made an appeal to United Nations for aid against the Russian aggressors.

Or in Poland when there was a similar uprising. Then the United States joined other nations of the West to renounce any intention to intervene, although our ties to the Poles and Hungarians were much closer than to the Lebanese.

Justification even from the standpoint of national interest, of intervention in Lebanon requires the equation of pan-Arabism with Nasserism and it with communism. This calls for assumptions, such as that the rebellion in Lebanon and the coup in Iraq were plotted in Moscow or by agents of Moscow. For that there is no proof. It ignores the fact of Arab aspirations toward independence and national unity, which have lifted President Nasser to a world figure. It ignores, too, the pressures of the Arabs for expulsion of European protectorates from Syria clear around the Mediterranean to Morocco and Algeria.

If we now intervene in the Middle East because Nasser gives us offense, because he is a gimcrack dictator who will be just a pawn of the Soviet Union, then we were dead wrong in 1956 when we turned against Israel and Britain and France and forced through United Nations their evacuation of the Suez.

The Israeli had more provocation than the Lebanese because their borders had persistently been violated by the Egyptians; and Britain and France had more at stake in the Suez Canal and the Middle East than the United States.

On moral grounds (wisely, I believe) we moved to halt their aggression in Egypt. Now, for a similar reason, we intervene in Lebanon. True, we moved in troops at the request of the President of Lebanon, but our move did not square with our commitments under the Eisenhower doctrine which called for support on request when a nation was subject to or threatened by armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, which was not the case in Lebanon—no Soviet or Communist soldiers were anywhere near.

Nor did the United States rely on United Nations. We had besought the dispatch of an observation team by U. N. It reported that it found no evidence of substantial infiltration to support the rebel forces. It was only after the coup in Iraq that we rushed in our Marines and paratroopers—and then besought United Nations to take over the policing.

Washington simply got panicky after it got the news from Baghdad. Instead of waiting for some clearing of the atmosphere it reversed its policy and shipped in Marines and Britain followed with troops to Jordan. Now an Ambassador from Iraq named by the new Government declares that Iraq will honor its commitments, will continue to deliver oil to the West, still considers itself a member of the Baghdad Pact.

Meantime, we have conceded to Russia for the first time in the cold war the moral initiative. Now Ambassador Soboleff moves in U. N. for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. And President Khrushchev even more dramatically seizes the initiative with an invitation to an immediate summit meeting, dressing it in the attractive colors of averting the war which seems to threaten.

To sum up: Our intervention in Lebanon is not justified on moral or legal grounds. It is the consequence of our fixation in trying to polarize international politics between the Soviet Union (communism) and the West (the free world). It overlooks the surge of peoples lately emancipated from colonial status for independence and for material progress and for ethnic and national prestige. It overlooks, too, the turbulence of new and immature governments and the easy resort to revolt and assassination as a result of internal stresses. The intervention is essentially an attempt to counter, in advance, a power penetration of the Middle East by the Soviet Union. It must be assessed then solely in terms of power politics.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues the very challenging and forthright letter to the editor which expresses the views of 7 outstanding civic and church leaders of Portland.

These men all hold positions of great responsibility. People in my congressional district—yes, in my State—look to them for leadership in time of crisis.

The questions which they raise must soon be answered by the State Department.

And while they write as individuals, from the mail which I have received in my congressional office, I would say that Rabbi Nodel and the other ministers are also expressing the views of many, many others.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 23, 1958.*

EDITOR, THE OREGONIAN,
Portland, Oreg.

SIR: In a recent editorial, the Oregonian justified the sending of United States Armed Forces into Lebanon "on firm moral ground." We should like to insert a modest question mark after this phrase. It is easy for nations to confuse their own self-interest with the cause of world peace, or even the will of God. Newspapers, we think, ought to be on constant guard against this temptation.

There are, however, some very real moral issues involved. We believe that the United Nations, imperfect and slow-moving as it is, still remains our best hope for reconciling differences among nations peacefully and constructively. If this is true, we have a moral obligation to support it and make it more effective. When we bypass it for the sake of expedience, we weaken it. Furthermore, forgetting altruism altogether for the moment, we weaken our own position in world opinion and encourage the suspicion that the "moral" that most concerns us in this instance is spelled "m-o-r-e o-i-l."

Other moral considerations suggest themselves. One of the principal obligations of citizenship is the duty of scrutinizing the conduct of government to support it when it is right and oppose it when wrong. To attach morality too quickly to this act of armed intervention may relieve us of the necessity of thinking the issue through, but the searching questions still remain. How long are the troops to remain there? Will we send forces to Turkey, Jordan and Iran upon request? Will we leave Lebanon this fall if President Chamoun's successor, assuming Chamoun is sincere in saying he will not run for reelection, requests it? The overall cause of free institutions is not served by an uncritical endorsement of our present position in the Middle East simply because it is an accomplished fact.

There may be compelling reasons for our intervention related to world peace and security. If so, the government has an obligation—a moral one, we think—to state what they are, beyond the strategic necessity of guarding petroleum supplies which it declares flatly we do not need for peaceful purposes.

Is our object to stop the spread of Nasser's influence? If so, it was a mistake to stop the British, French and Israeli march on the Suez in November 1956. Do we seek to encourage Israel's commendable effort to bring democracy to the Middle East? This hardly seems to comport with our continuous efforts to cultivate the favor of Ibn Saud, one of the world's most autocratic rulers, including the extravagant ovation we gave him during his recent visit to this country.

We urge an honest and realistic appraisal of this and all other applications of our foreign policy. We deplore a facile readiness to rationalize questionable diplomacy after the fact. Most of all, we decry the careless use of an honorable term to serve as an expedient of the moment. The concept of morality has operated as a vast power good in men's lives for thousands of years. We dare not compromise it by misuse. We shall need it intact in the days and years ahead as we seek to build ever stronger the brotherhood of man and the commonwealth of God.

Sincerely yours,

REV. WILLIAM B. CATE, Ph. D.,
Executive Secretary,
Portland Council of Churches.
RT. REV A. RAYMOND GRANT, D. D.
Bishop, Portland Area of the
Methodist Church.
REV. FORD LEWIS, Ph. D.,
Associate Ministers,
First Unitarian Church, Portland.
REV. V. LOUIS LIVINGSTON,
Rector, St. David's Episcopal
Church, Portland.
REV. JAMES MCCOBB,
Associate Minister,
First Methodist Church, Portland.
RABBI JULIUS J. NODEL,
Temple Beth Israel, Portland.
REV. LAURENCE E. NYE, D. D.,
Minister, First Methodist
Church, Portland.

The Educational Program of the United States Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently when she looked out of the tower of the Empire State Building and gazed at New York, the Queen of England exclaimed that it was "Beautiful, beautiful."

A railing around the tower kept gravity from pulling the Queen groundward.

When you look out of a window at the new United States Air Force Academy near Colorado Springs, you are bound to sense that it is beautiful, beautiful.

It is said that man has been in touch with eternity for 2,000 years. When you stand on the grounds of the United States Air Force Academy, it seems easy for man to take off, sweep the skies, travel the solar systems, and put all things under his feet.

From Colorado Springs it seems indeed that the "Heavens are not too high," to borrow a Convair motto.

From Colorado Springs it is possible to sense that soon, perhaps, even rockets will be devised to burst in air writing messages across the sky that will direct the movement of people and good, especially, if other means of communication need implementation.

The above are some of the hopes for the cadets to realize whose good fortune it will be to take the airmanship program at the United States Air Force Academy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the contents of a recent brochure on the United States Air Force Academy be here spread on the RECORD. I trust that it will be read with interest and profit.

The brochure contains a foreword by Air Force Academy Superintendent Maj. Gen. James E. Briggs, United States Air Force. In his schooldays, General Briggs was head boy and senior captain of cadets at the New York Military Academy, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y. Later he graduated top man in scholarship and rank at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. General Briggs played varsity lacrosse at Cornwall and at West Point. He played hard and he fought hard. He knows scholarship and he knows men.

After the foreword by General Briggs, the brochure outlines a program of education for future Air Force officers that includes curriculum, instructional methods, faculty, library, selection of cadets, airmanship, athletics, extracurricular activities and the challenge of an Air Force career on the threshold of a space age.

Significant it is that two young men stand out in air and space scholarship at this time in the United States. Both graduated from the New York Military Academy within a few years of each other. General Briggs graduated in the mid-twenties and Byron G. McNabb, Mr. Missile of Cape Canaveral, Fla., as the New York Times, today, affectionately calls him, graduated in 1928. Mr. MacNabb, chief of Convair operations, Cape Canaveral, Fla., "pappied" the Atlas missile that accelerated toward 15,000 miles an hour last Saturday and hit "right in the pickle barrel" 2,000 to 2,500 miles downrange in the south Atlantic. Eventually, he and his 900 colleagues hope to fly their "bird" the full ICBM distance of 6,325 statute miles.

The question, of course, is, will Mr. MacNabb and his followers make obsolete the United States Air Force Academy? The United States Air Force Academy brochure that General Briggs pappied should answer the question. It follows:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY—A PROGRAM OF EDUCATION FOR FUTURE AIR FORCE OFFICERS

FOREWORD

Since the autumn of 1954, when competition for appointment to the first class of cadets at the Air Force Academy began, thousands of young men have expressed interest in this new institution. These young men have asked many questions about the Academy: What subjects are included in the academic curriculum? Is credit given for previous college work? Do all cadets follow an identical course of studies? Is the faculty well qualified? How good are the laboratory facilities? Is there an opportunity for graduate education after completion of the Academy course?

The purpose of this booklet is to answer some of the most frequently asked ques-

tions about the educational program of the Air Force Academy.

The men who have been responsible for planing, organizing, and operating the Air Force Academy have shared one conviction: that the United States must provide the best possible institution for the education and training of future Air Force leaders. While recognizing the importance of military tradition, the founders of the Academy have subscribed unanimously to the proposition that there is no place for rigidity, dogmatism, or inflexibility in the education of Air Force officers. You will find that philosophy reflected in the following pages.

JAMES E. BRIGGS,
Major General, United States Air Force, Superintendent.

INTRODUCTION

For the first time in our history, the United States is confronted by an enemy whose avowed goal is the destruction of our way of life. Every home and factory in this country is a potential target for the weapons of that enemy.

For the first time in our history, the freedom of each citizen of this Nation is challenged.

Today we are training military leaders not alone for the defense of the United States but for national survival, and for survival of the civilization of which America is a part.

This is the air age—an era in which oceans and mountains and deserts have lost almost all meaning as defensive barriers. No points on the face of the globe are separated by more than a few hours. No longer is it necessary to invade a country to destroy it. One aircraft with one thermonuclear device can unleash a greater destructive force than that of all explosives set off by man prior to the development of nuclear weapons.

Today, the most effective defenses against enemy attack are our wide network of warning devices and fighter aircraft, and the ability of our long-range bombers to strike instantly and with devastating force any foreign power which might launch an assault upon the United States. The security—the survival—of all that we hold dear lies to a very large degree in the hands of our airmen.

Where will the leaders of our Air Force come from? From the farms, the villages, the great cities of every State in the Union; from the rich and the poor; from families whose roots go back to colonial days, and from families who crossed the oceans to America less than a generation ago.

What will our Air Force leaders be like? They must be not mere technicians but broadly educated men whose characters are formed by the military virtues of duty, honor, and devotion to country and whose minds are adaptable to the rapid pace of scientific and political change which is a mark of our time. They must be the best that a free democratic society has to offer. Training, educating and motivating such officers for lifetime careers in the Air Force is the business of the United States Air Force Academy.

Future air leaders will continue to come also from the Reserve Officer Training Corps and from other sources. Experience has shown, however, that the number from these sources who elect to remain in the Air Force as career officers is not sufficient to meet all Air Force needs. It is the Academy's task to insure a nucleus of career leaders.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

What does an Air Force officer need to know in an age of supersonic jets, long-range guided missiles and nuclear weapons; in an era when man stands at the threshold of space; in a period of rapid social change and of great political decisions? This is the question which members of the Air Force Academy Planning Board asked when that body was established in 1948 to lay plans for the new United States Air Force Academy. Opinions were solicited from a large group of eminent civilian educators, from senior officers of the three services, and from the faculties of the Military and Naval Academies.

It was agreed that the Air Force Academy should not be an institution devoted to training junior officers, but rather should provide the broad educational background required by senior air officers of a nation which had assumed leadership of the non-Communist world. Clearly, Academy planners and advisers could not define with precision the problems which air leaders will face 20 years hence. It was equally obvious that traditional concepts of officer education could not be followed blindly. The academic curriculum which emerged after many months of study and consultation combined civilian and military educational thought, and was based upon a foundation of past experience, existing problems, and estimates of the future.

The curriculum drawn up by the Academy Planning Board and its consultants aimed at producing officers with a sound background in the physical sciences and a knowledge of aeronautical engineering. The planners recognized, however, that men are still the basic ingredient of any military force and hence that a competent officer must be skilled in human relations. Planning Board members agreed that the responsibilities of military leaders had been broadened many fold in the preceding decade and that problems of national security would be paramount in the years ahead. The role of air power was destined to be decisive in the future of the world and hence Air Force leaders must be aware of the major problems, both domestic and international, of the Nation they serve. The breadth of intellectual horizon required of future air leaders called for academic training in the humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and engineering.

Between 1948, when the first curriculum plans evolved and 1954 when President Eisenhower signed a bill authorizing establishment of the Air Force Academy, educational plans were subjected to review and refinement. This process has continued as plans have been translated into an operating program at the Air Force Academy's temporary location, Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo. The Academy will move to its permanent location 8 miles north of Colorado Springs in 1958.

The Academy, which opened its doors to the first class of cadets on July 11, 1955, is neither an engineering nor a liberal arts college, but combines certain elements of both. It may be accurately described as a school of general education for professional Air Force officers—a school which endeavors to give each cadet "the knowledge and qualities of leadership required of an officer in the United States Air Force, and a basis for continued development throughout a lifetime of service to his country, leading to readiness for responsibilities as a future air commander."[1]

A cadet who completes the 4-year course at the Academy will graduate with a bachelor of science degree, the aeronautical rating of navigator, and a commission as second lieutenant in the Regular Air Force.

THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

The curriculum of the Air Force Academy is, in many ways, unique among undergraduate institutions of the United States. While individual courses are, in many instances, similar to their counterparts offered by civilian colleges, the combination of courses required for graduation is not paralleled in any other collegiate institution. The Air Force Academy does not offer a major field of study, but rather seeks to give its graduates the broadest possible educational experience in preparation for a career which embraces the leadership of men, close association with the people of other countries, the development and operation of vastly complex machines, the management of an organization which counts its men by the hundreds of thousands and its capital investment in the billions, an active participation in the formulation of national policy, and the planning—if necessary, the execution of military strategy and tactics.

The program of academic studies is outlined in chart II. Within each major area of learning—the humanities, the social sciences, and the physical sciences—courses have been arranged to form a continuous learning process and at the same time to relate to the other major areas to the greatest extent possible. All courses have been planned with close interdepartmental and interdivisional cooperation. Coordination of course planning has made it possible to reduce the time devoted to the introductory phases of many courses.

Advanced, accelerated, and special courses

The majority of cadets will follow the curriculum outlined in chart II. About one-third of the cadets admitted to the Air Force Academy have had 1 or more years of college work before their selection as cadets, however. Opportunity has been provided for these cadets, and for unusually talented cadets who have not previously attended college, to take advanced and special courses. Two methods of curriculum enrichment are used. First, cadets who have satisfactorily completed college courses similar to those included in the Academy curriculum, or who show superior aptitude in a subject, may elect to substitute advanced or accelerated courses for some courses in the regular curriculum work. Thus, those cadets who have satisfactorily completed a course comparable to fourth class[2] mathematics, or who show great aptitude in mathematics, are encouraged to take an accelerated mathematics course in which the material of the regular course is reviewed rapidly, followed by an introduction to statistics and probability, and vector algebra. While cadets in the regular fourth class mathematics course complete 10 semester hours work, those in the accelerated course earn from 12 to 14 semester hours credit. Similarly, cadets who can demonstrate satisfactory knowledge of the history of western civilization may study, in lieu of that course, the history of Russia or history of the Middle East.

The second method of providing for superior students is the special course program. Cadets admitted to this program are allowed to carry one course per semester in addition to regular and advanced or accelerated courses. These cadets are encouraged to develop their special course plans in either the scientific area or the social science-humanities area. Admission to the special course program is based on the cadet's high school and previous college work, and the quality of his academic work at the Air Force Academy. The content of a cadet's special course program depends upon his individual academic background and his desires; hence it is not possible to outline a standard special course. A cadet granted permission to follow a special course in the social science-humanities area might enrich his educational plan by studying courses in anthropology, sociology, or social psychology, philosophy, political theory, fine arts, creative writing, and great issues. The sum total of the regular and special courses in the social science-humanities area might

[1] From the official statement of the mission of the Air Force Academy.

[2] Classes at the Air Force Academy are designated: Fourth class (freshman), third class (sophomore), second class (junior), and first class (senior).

in some cases, approach a major in humanities or social sciences.

The objective of the special course program in scientific and engineering studies is to provide additional instruction which will enable a cadet to complete all or most of the usual requirements for a bachelor's degree in engineering. The engineering special course program of qualified cadets will include most of the following courses: properties of engineering materials, physical chemistry, advanced mathematics, advanced engineering drawing, modern physics, nuclear engineering, aircraft structures, servomechanisms, heat transfer, stability and control, and flight testing.

The regular, advanced, and accelerated courses offered by each academic department are described briefly in the following sections. Under the special course program, the faculty will, within limits of competence and laboratory facilities, teach any course for which there is a demonstrated need.

Description of courses

The Air Force Academy faculty is organized in 16 departments which are grouped into 4 academic divisions as shown in chart I, with the entire academic program under the supervision of the dean of faculty.

The Division of Humanities includes the Departments of English, Law and Logic, and Foreign Languages. Collectively, these department present a total of 31½ semester hours of instruction, of which 16 semester hours are in the field of English.

The Department of English is concerned with teaching cadets to write, read, speak, and listen effectively and to understand and enjoy literature as a study contributing to the development of mature character. These two threads—instruction in communications skills and a study of literature—run through the entire 3-year equence of instruction.

The fourth class English course is devoted largely to instruction in communications skills. Each cadet writes some 20 short themes and 3 longer research papers. As a background for his writing, the cadet reads a number of expository essays which serve also as a means of improving reading speed and comprehension. The best of cadet writing in this course is published in a small magazine, Chandelles. Instruction in speech includes an introduction to semantics, public speaking, and the planning and conduct of conferences.

The study of literature in the fourth class year introduces the cadet to the literary forms with which he will be concerned during his next two English courses. In this block of instruction, a short novel, two dramas, several short stories, and a sampling of poetic forms are read and analyzed.

Third class English is largely a study of some masterworks of western literature from the time of Homer to the 18th century. The cadets read all, or at least substantial parts of selected works rather than fragments from the works of a large number of great literary figures. The authors studied include Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Moliere, and the English Renaissance poets. There is a continued but greatly reduced emphasis on communications skills.

Second class English is a continuation of the third class course. In this course, attention is centered on important European and American literary works from the middle of the 18th century to the present. Wherever possible, courses in English literature and history have been coordinated so that a cadet studies concurrently the history and literature of a country and period.

The Department of English offers an accelerated program to cadets who have completed a freshman English course at another institution or who show exceptional ability in English composition and speech. These cadets are excused from fourth class English and in their fourth class year take a special course which is much the same as the third class literature program with additional writing and speech exercises. As third classmen, this group takes the second class English program, and as second classmen they may take a special course in contemporary literature, literary criticism, and creative writing.

Instruction given by the Department of Law and Logic includes a one semester course in logic during the fourth class year and a one semester course in law during the first class year. The logic course embraces a study of propaganda and fallacies, semantics, syllogistic reasoning, and the scientific method. The cadet is taught to see logic not as propaganda or a game, but rather as a discipline with techniques and principles which can help him to organize and direct his own thinking and to test propositions which he, as an officer, will have to evaluate.

The course in law is both a survey of the theory of law and a study of law as a social institution. It is a course of fundamental cultural value, presenting basic principles of property, civil and criminal law, and the application of these principles to actual cases. This course is to some extent a pioneering effort. The need for a nonspecialized course in law at the undergraduate level is now being recognized in American undergraduate institutions.

Foreign languages are to be taught in the first class year. The objective of foreign language instruction is to give cadets a competence in the spoken form of one foreign language and an increased appreciation of the culture of foreign nations. Classes will meet 5 days a week throughout the first class year. Initially French and Spanish will be taught; other languages will be added as cadet enrollment increases.

The Division of Social Sciences includes the Departments of History, Political Science, Economics, Military History, and Geography, and Psychology, instruction in the social science area, which totals 33½ semester hours, is aimed at developing in cadets a deeper understanding of human society.

Regular courses offered by the Department of History are history of world civilization in the third class year and United States history for second classmen. The first 64 lessons of world civilization are devoted to western civilization and the last 36 to oriental civilizations. In both of these areas there is much emphasis on the cultural elements of civilization, including science, philosophy, and the fine arts. Primary and secondary source materials are used extensively to supplement the text. In United States history emphasis is placed on the period since 1763; a major objective of the course is to acquaint cadets with the role and responsibilities of United States leadership in the 20th century. The study of political, social, economic, military, and diplomatic trends and movements which have influenced our society is based to a large extent on a collateral reading program. Cadets who are qualified in the history of western civilization or in United States history may elect to substitute for those courses history of the Middle East, and history of Russia; United States diplomatic history, and Latin American history.

The Department of Economics teaches principles of economics and comparative economic systems in the second class year. These courses introduce cadets to some of the fundamental concepts of economic organization in a modern interdepartment society. Among the topics discussed are national wealth, national income, monetary and fiscal policies, and economic problems of capitalism and other economic systems. Throughout the course, techniques of modern income and monetary analysis are used to help cadets develop an appreciation of economic factors and how they affect national security. The final economics course, economics of national security, is taught in the first class year. It deals with national economic objectives, mobilization programs, economic stabilization, systems analysis, and economic warfare. In all economic courses, the case study approach is used extensively. Advanced courses in Contemporary Economic Thought, International Economics, and History of Economic Thought are available for qualified cadets.

The Department of Political Science at the Air Force Academy, as in many other schools, embraces two fields of instruction: government and international relations. American National Government is taught in the second class year, paralleling the United States history course. This course is concerned equally with the institutions of government and with giving the cadet an understanding of the body of fundamental ideas on which our system of government is built. Advanced courses in American Political Thought or American Political Parties are open to cadets who qualify for exemption from the course in American National Government. In the first class year, cadets study Contemporary Foreign Governments. This course treats both the structure and operation of major foreign governments and problems of political behavior. Some problems considered in the government courses are: the dilemmas of democracy, the problem of concentration of power versus decentralization, relations between government and the economic order, and conflicts between ideologies. The final political science course, International Relations, is taught during the second semester of the first class year so that cadets may bring to the course a background in geography, history, government, and economics. In this course, cadets study the nature of international relations, the bases of national power, and the formulation and implementation of foreign policy in the United States and other great powers. A behavioral rather than an historical or descriptive approach is used, with emphasis on analysis of the complex forces which influence world politics.

The Department of Military History and Geography teaches a 1-semester course in physical and cultural geography in the fourth class year and a 1-semester course in military history in the first class year. The geography course is aimed at developing in cadets an ability to evaluate the influence of geography on national security and the employment of air power. Qualified cadets may substitute political geography for the basic course. The general objectives of the military history course are to develop a broad, balanced understanding of the scope and complexity of war through a study of military history, military affairs, and military problems, and to provide a basis for continuing professional study in these subjects. Emphasis is placed on the period from World War I to the present. About one-third of the course is devoted to a study of air warfare; the remainder covers ground and naval warfare, military theory and organization, strategy and tactics, civil-military relations, and military leaders. This course is closely coordinated with instruction given in the military training phase of the airmanship program by the Division of Military Training.

One of the principal objectives of the Department of Psychology is to help cadets build a solid foundation for the understanding of the human problems of military training, leadership, and morale in the Air Force. The third class course in psychology is divided between principles of psychology in the first semester, and psychology in the Air Force which is taught the second semester. The second semester draws on actual Air Force case studies in the areas of personnel adjustment, engineering psychology, leadership, and morale. This study of applied psychology is coordinated with

leadership training presented in the airmanship program. A number of advanced courses such as social psychology, personnel psychology, and psychology through literature are offered for cadets with a background in psychology.

The Division of Basic Sciences includes the departments of mathematics, chemistry, physics, and graphics. Many of the subjects taught by these departments are a part of any program of general education. No one, regardless of profession, can well understand the modern world without some knowledge of mathematics, chemistry, and physics. Instruction in these areas and in engineering drawing, totaling 35 semester hours, also provides indispensable background for engineering courses offered by the Division of Applied Sciences.

The Department of Mathematics teaches courses in the fourth and third class years. Fourth class mathematics includes college algebra and plane trigonometry in the first semester. Wherever possible, applications in all mathematics courses are drawn from navigation problems and other uses characteristic of Air Force operations. The second semester is devoted to spherical trigonometry, a subject used in navigation training, and to plane and solid analytics. Calculus lessons cover the differentiation and integration of polynomials. Third class mathematics deals with differentiation and integration of more complicated functions and their application to area, volume, centroids, moments, series, and other physical applications. The last 20 lessons are devoted to an introduction to differential equations. Accelerated courses are offered for qualified cadets in both the fourth and third class years. In the accelerated courses, the material of the regular courses is covered at a rapid pace, followed by probability and statistics, and vector algebra in the fourth class year and differential equations in the third class year.

The fourth-class chemistry course does not differ materially from a freshman general chemistry course taught at a civilian institution, except that application to Air Force problems is stressed where appropriate. The Department of Chemistry conducts advanced courses for cadets who have special preparation or unusually high aptitude. The advanced courses are in qualitative and quantitative analysis. In both chemistry and physics, combination lecture-laboratory rooms are used.

The Department of Physics offers a 9 semester-hour course in the third class year. The course is divided in six subcourses: mechanics, heat, light, sound, electricity and magnetism, and modern physics. Classroom periods are of 75 minutes duration and are augmented by laboratory periods which are interspersed throughout the course to provide an opportunity for the cadets to verify the physical laws studied. Fundamental physical principles are related to practical Air Force problems. The course provides a firm scientific foundation for future work under the Division of Applied Sciences.

The Department of Graphics teaches two courses, charts and maps, and engineering drawing as a fourth class program. Instruction in charts and maps is designed to support the flying training phase of the airmanship program. The objective of the course in engineering drawing is to develop spatial visualization, an understanding of drafting methods, and skill in reading engineering drawings rather than to train finished draftsmen. The department offers advanced engineering drawing for cadets who have an adequate knowledge of the material covered in the regular course.

The Division of Applied Sciences includes the Departments of Mechanics, Electrical Engineering, Thermodynamics, and Aerodynamics. Instruction presented by these departments total 29 semester hours. All of the subjects in this area are peculiarly adapted to Air Force use. They provide a general background for all officers and a foundation for graduate study for those who will later specialize in engineering.

The Department of Mechanics presents its course during the second class year. Approximately 30 lessons are spent on statics, followed by 30 lessons on dynamics, then 40 lessons on strength of materials and strength of materials laboratory. Instruction is oriented toward an understanding of mechanical and structural principles as they apply to aircraft and missiles. The accompanying laboratory course deals with techniques used to test engineering materials and to verify the theories of mechanics of materials. In addition, an advanced course in properties of engineering materials as applied to modern aircraft is offered to selected students with high academic averages. This course runs approximately 30 hours.

Electrical engineering, taught by the Department of Electrical Engineering in the second class year, covers the fundamental laws governing electricity and electronics and presents a brief survey of nuclear physics. All instruction in electricity and magnetism required for the aerial navigation program is given in this course. Classroom periods are of 75 minutes' duration and are supported by some 20 laboratory periods.

The course in aerodynamics is taught in the first class year. The first two parts of the course in aerodynamics are designed to give the cadet a thorough understanding of the fundamentals of fluid flow and incompressible aerodynamics. The third portion will present an introduction to transonic and supersonic flow, followed by a discussion of the effects of compressibility on aircraft performance, stability, and control. The laboratory program is coordinated with classroom work throughout the year to give the cadet a physical appreciation of the material presented in the classroom. Aerodynamics laboratory equipment will include a transonic-supersonic wind tunnel with a 1 foot square test section and a mach number range of .5 to 4.5, a subsonic wind tunnel with a 2½-by-3½-foot test section, a smoke tunnel, and liquid-flow apparatus.

Thermodynamics, taught in the first class year, deals with the transformation of heat into useful power, with particular reference to the various types of engines and thermodynamic systems used by the Air Force. Applications studied include gas turbines, reciprocating engines, turbojets, ramjets, rockets, air-conditioning, refrigeration, and steam powerplants. The thermodynamics laboratory will be equipped with all types of aircraft powerplants, including rocket engines, and will have test cells for engines up to 3,000 pounds thrust. Laboratory equipment will also include the principal types of refrigeration equipment and equipment for testing fuels, and lubricants. Two small steam powerplants will be used to acquaint cadets with the probable methods of converting nuclear energy into mechanical energy.

The Department of Thermodynamics will also teach design appreciation in the first class year. This course consists of presentations by military and civilian research and development specialists, lectures, and group problems. Its objective is to give the cadet an understanding of the successive stages in the development of a weapon system and its components, and an appreciation of the compromises that must be made among conflicting engineering requirements and between engineering possibilities and operational requirements.

Summer travel

Although not an integral part of the Air Force Academy academic curriculum, summer travel must be considered an important element of each cadet's educational experience. During the summer following the cadet's fourth, third, and second class years, he will visit Air Force, Army, and Navy installations throughout the country. Cadets are given opportunities to visit places of historical and cultural interest near each installation.

During the summer following their third class year, cadets are allowed to use their leave to travel abroad, accompanied by officers of the staff and faculty. Arrangements were made for the first group of cadets to visit United States military installations in England, France, Germany, and Spain during the summer of 1957. Their itinerary was arranged to allow free time in London, Paris, and Madrid—time which could be used to enhance their knowledge of the political, economic, social, and cultural life of the nations with which they will be closely associated as Air Force officers.

The group received briefings on military problems at our own bases and at the various headquarters of the NATO military commands. These were supplemented by political and economic briefings delivered by personnel of United States Embassies abroad.

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY LIBRARY

When the library opened its doors on August 15, 1955, the collection numbered less than 500 volumes. On October 31, 1958, there were more than 26,000 volumes in the book collection and some 600 periodicals on the shelves. Ultimately, the library at its permanent site in Colorado Springs will house a general book collection of 200,000 volumes and an aeronautical research collection of 50,000 volumes.

Making books accessible to users is the guiding principle of the library. An open stack system is used, giving readers direct access to the book collections. This system transforms the book collections, containing the thought and achievements of the best scholars and scientists through the ages, into active instructional tools for both the faculty and the cadets.

The Academy Library possesses one of the best newspaper collections in the western part of the United States. The library subscribes to 70 daily newspapers which include the leading journals from every part of the United States, and outstanding foreign newspapers such as the London Times and Manchester Guardian. Its collection includes a complete file of the New York Times since 1913 on microfilm. The library is also a depository for Government documents.

The Academy Library holds a membership in the Bibliographical Center for Research. Through this service, the library is able to arrange loans of books and periodicals from library resources throughout the United States and Canada.

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

One of the objectives of the Air Force Academy is to develop in its cadets the highest form of discipline—that self-discipline which enables a man to see his responsibilities and to carry them out without compulsion. This is especially important in modern aerial warfare which may require single aircraft to operate independently, vast distances from home base, and out of contact with higher authority. Such discipline is not the product of stereotyped minds which have been trained to accept without question. One of the fundamental tenets of Air Force Academy educational philosophy is that cadets shall be encouraged to question constructively everything that they read and hear. This philosophy cannot exist in a rigid, formalized atmosphere. Visitors to the Academy are often surprised at the relaxed classroom atmosphere and by the give-and-take which goes on among the cadets and between cadets and instructors.

Cadets attend classes in sections of approximately 12 men. This small group teaching situation allows instructors to know their

students and to devote attention to the learning problems of each cadet. Teaching techniques vary with subject matter, but in all cases are calculated to derive maximum benefit from small sections. In the humanities-social science area, the discussion and seminar methods are used extensively. Interdepartmental seminars are especially productive in the social science field. These methods are supplemented by lectures to an entire class. Many of the lectures are delivered by guest speakers who are distinguished in their fields. Recitation, instructor demonstration, and student performance are frequently used techniques in the scientific area.

Although cadets are tested more frequently than is customary in civilian institutions, there is no standard testing pattern. In the basic science courses, a quiz or graded blackboard work is given at more than half the daily attendances. Testing is less frequent in the humanities-social science area where cadets may be given a short objective quiz or an essay test about once each week. Preparation of lessons is considered a military duty; each cadet is expected to have studied his lesson prior to class. Homework assignments are based on approximately 2 hours of outside preparation for each hour of classroom attendance. Generally, classroom periods are of 55 minutes' duration, although 75-minute periods are used in some of the scientific and engineering subjects. Laboratory periods are 110 minutes in length.

Audio-visual aids are used extensively where appropriate. Each academic department has available slide, moving picture, and opaque projectors. Audio-visual services, an activity under the jurisdiction of the dean of faculty, maintains a large library of films, transparencies, and recordings, and is equipped to produce other types of instructional aids.

Each department conducts extra instruction periods after regular classroom hours for cadets who need additional instruction on a particular lesson. Cadets are encouraged to consult with their instructors outside the classroom as frequently as they wish. Extra instruction and individual conferences are conducted on an informal basis, usually in the instructor's office.

THE FACULTY

Faculty members have been selected from among Regular and Reserve Air Force officers on active duty. Selection is based on academic preparation, teaching experience, or potential, and performance as an officer. Approximately one-third of the faculty are graduates of the United States Military or Naval Academies. The universities at which the instructional staff have done graduate work include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, California Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Georgetown University, and the Universities of Pennsylvania, Denver, Chicago, California, Missouri, North Carolina, Colorado, and Texas. The faculty averages 5 years' college-level teaching experience at civilian institutions or at the United States Military and Naval Academies.

Almost without exception, members of the Academy faculty have lived and traveled abroad. Often, their duties prior to joining the faculty have been directly related to the subjects which they teach. In the scientific area, for example, many instructors have served with the Air Research and Development Command, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Air Materiel Command. About half of the faculty are pilots or navigators who have served with operational units.

In addition to their primary function of academic instruction, all members of the Air Force Academy faculty are responsible for participating in the development of the cadet's character and leadership ability, and for motivating each cadet to devote his life to the service of his country.

By law, the Air Force Academy is authorized 21 permanent professors. Other faculty members usually serve at the Academy for a period of 4 years, though a few may remain for longer periods. Some instructors will return to the Academy for a second tour of instructional duty after having served an intervening tour in another type of Air Force activity.

THE AIRMANSHIP PROGRAM

The principal purpose of this brochure is to acquaint the reader with the academic plan of the Air Force Academy—with what is taught, how classes are conducted, and who does the teaching. An equally important part of the entire Academy plan of education and training is the airmanship program program which is under supervision of the Commandant of Cadets.

The airmanship program includes military, flying, and physical training which total 38½ semester hours over the cadet's 4 years at the Academy (chart III). Seventeen and one-half semester hours of airmanship training are given during the academic years (mid-September to early June); the remaining hours are taught in the summer months. During the summer, each cadet of the three upper classes is also granted leave.

The military training phase of the airmanship program includes those subjects which the cadet will need to know as a second lieutenant: squadron administration, airbase functions, Air Force organization, weapons, functions of the major commands, leadership, instructor training, and drill. The cadet is also given a broad understanding of the organization and capabilities of other elements of the national defense structure including the problems of joint military operations. His classroom instruction is supplemented by summer field trips to Air Force, Army, and Navy installations.

Flying training is concentrated in the 3 upper class years. The program includes classroom work in navigation, and practical experience in aerial navigation aboard the Academy's flying classrooms, Convair T-29 navigation training aircraft. Each cadet also receives introductory pilot training during the summer following his fourth class year. An increase in the amount of pilot training is presently under study.

Physical training extends throughout the cadet's 4 years at the Academy and includes both physical conditioning and instruction in team and individual sports. Emphasis is on contact sports, such as boxing, judo, and football. An extensive intramural program is part of the physical training curriculum. Upper classmen serve as team coaches and as instructors. These duties are considered important elements of the cadet's training in leadership.

Cadet life outside the academic classroom is supervised by the commandant of cadets and his staff. The regimen under which cadets live is actually a 4-year laboratory exercise in command and leadership. First and second classmen are responsible for the day-to-day administration of the wing of cadets and for the operation of the system under which the two upper classes assist in the military training and discipline of new cadets.

At the Air Force Academy, each cadet develops a rigid adherence to truth which is essential to his performance as a career officer in the United States Air Force. The honor code, which pervades every action of the Air Force cadet, is built around a basic and uncompromising premise: complete integrity.

During the initial phase of cadet training in his first summer at the Air Force Academy, the new cadet is given a course of instruction in ethics. In this series of lectures and discussions, the honor code is explained in detail, enabling him to understand fully the importance and benefits of his honor code. He learns that a cadet's word is never questioned; he is exposed to an atmosphere of complete trust among his fellow cadets and the officers of the Air Force Academy.

The honor code is administered by the cadets through a council of elected representatives who are responsible for maintaining the highest standards of honor in the cadet wing. Membership in this council is the highest office to which a cadet may be elected.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

The cadet's heavy workload is balanced by an extensive and well-rounded program of extracurricular activities. Social activities are centered at Arnold Hall, where excellent facilities have been provided for dances, informal entertainment of guests, and for club meetings.

Extracurricular activities may be divided into three general categories: those of an educational nature, those which are primarily recreational, and the program of intercollegiate athletics.

Educational activities

Extracurricular activities of an educational nature are generally supervised by members of the faculty. These activities include publication of the cadet yearbook; the cadet magazine, Talon; and Contrails, a booklet which contains a variety of information on cadet life and lore, Academy customs, and facts about the military services. The Cadet Forensic Association participates in intercollegiate debates and oratorical contests throughout the Rocky Mountain area. The Cadet Forum sponsors a series of informal Sunday afternoon meetings at which public affairs are discussed by guests who are authorities on various aspects of national and international policy. The Forum is also planning an annual intercollegiate conference on international affairs which will convene for the first time in 1958. Weekend and holiday trips to local areas of geographical interest are conducted by the Geography Club.

Recreational and hobby clubs

The cadets have organized radio, model engineering, photography, judo, skeet, and chess clubs. For cadets who are interested in music, there are three cadet choirs which sing at weekly religious services. A cadet dance band plays for informal social activities. Some of the best skiing in the country is found within 2 hours' drive of the Academy. The ski club provides equipment and lessons for its members and sponsors regular Sunday and holiday trips to adjacent ski areas.

One of the most fascinating and unusual of Academy recrational activities is the cadet soaring club. The Air Force Academy, standing at the foot of the rampart range, is in what is considered to be one of the world's best areas for soaring. The club has both two-place training gliders and high performance sailplanes. It is possible for a cadet to progress through a carefully supervise program to the highest soaring ratings granted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Soaring Society of America. The members not only fly, but also build some of their own sailplanes.

Intercollegiate athletics

Blue-and-silver clad teams of the Air Force Academy, known as the falcons, are rapidly carving a name for the Academy in the world of intercollegiate athletics. The Academy fields intercollegiate teams in football, soccer, cross country, basketball, wrestling, gymnastics, swimming, fencing, skiing, baseball, track, golf, tennis, rifle, and pistol. Lacrosse and hockey will be added to this array when the Academy moves to its permanent site in 1958.

During the first 2 years, Academy teams competed successfully with collegiate insti-

tutions in the Rocky Mountain area. In 1958, the Academy will schedule strong intersectional opposition in all varsity sports.

Intercollegiate athletics are open to any cadet who maintains a cumulative average of 70 percent or higher in every subject. Those cadets who are not members of intercollegiate athletic squads participate in the Academy's extensive intramural athletic program.

SELECTION OF CADETS

The procedures for gaining admission to the Air Force Academy are described in detail in the Air Force Academy catalog. The majority of candidates are nominated by Congressmen to compete in state competitions. There are other competitions among nominees of the President and Vice President; competitions for residents of the District of Columbia, the Territories, and the Panama Canal Zone; competitions within the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces; and a competition open to sons of deceased veterans. Selection within each competition is based upon the candidate's performance on college entrance examination board tests, airmanship and physical aptitude tests, and upon an evaluation of the candidate's high school record. Candidates are judged not only on their mental achievement and ability but also upon activities which indicate leadership potential.

The Air Force Academy is interested in young men who are outstanding both intellectually and physically, who have a wide range of interests, and who have demonstrated a capacity for leadership. The educational and training program and the demands of cadet life are exacting. Few men, no matter how talented they may be, will complete the Air Force Academy program unless they sincerely desire to serve their country as officers of the United States Air Force.

Although there are no specific minimums of secondary school courses or credits required of candidates, the Air Force Academy entrance examinations measure academic achievement that is expected of a secondary school graduate. The academic preparation which offers the best promise of success as a candidate and as a cadet includes the following minimum courses:

Elementary algebra: 1 year.
Intermediate algebra: 1 year.
Plane geometry: 1 year.
Solid geometry: ½ year.
Trigonometry: ½ year.
Physics: 1 year.
Chemistry: 1 year.
English: 4 years.
World history: 1 year.
United States history: 1 year.

Cadets also find that additional social studies (government and economics, for instance) and a short course in typing are helpful.

The Air Force cadet's standing in his class depends on a measure of leadership ability as well as academic achievement. The best demonstration of leadership potential that a candidate can show is active participation in extracurricular activities, both athletic and nonathletic. Candidates who have had a successful record in the Boy Scouts, in the Civil Air Patrol, and in student government have had experiences that contribute to success as a cadet.

The academic workload of a cadet and the programs of military training, flying training, and physical training demand a high degree of physical fitness. Prospective candidates are advised to attend to physical development as well as mental development. "A sound mind in a sound body" is old advice, but every successful Air Force cadet knows its value.

AN AIR FORCE CAREER

When a cadet graduates from the Air Force Academy with his bachelor of science degree, aeronautical rating as navigator, and commission as second lieutenant, his education and training, far from being completed, have just begun. Immediately after graduation leave, the majority of graduates will go to pilot training. A smaller number will be given advanced training in navigation skills. All will then be assigned to operational units as air crew members in fighter, bomber, or transport aircraft. Generally, a part of the Academy graduate's first 5 years will be spent overseas in Europe, the Far East, North Africa, the Caribbean area, or at one of our northern defense bases.

After about 5 years' service, the young officer will attend the first of the Air University courses for officers, the equadron officers' course. Some 5 years later, he will probably be assigned for 10 months to the Air Command and Staff School. A few carefully selected officers who are destined for the highest levels of command and staff positions will ultimately attend the Air War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces or the National War College. These last two schools are joint institutions for officers of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, and personnel from the Department of State and other governmental agencies.

In his years between service schools, the typical officer will rotate between air crew duties, staff positions, and command duty with various Air Force commands, such as the Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, Air Defense Command, Air Training Command, Air Research and Development Command, or Air Materiel Command. The officer's staff duties may be in personnel management, intelligence, operations, communications and electronics, training and education, research and development, meteorology, supply, or financial management. These are a few of the approximately 30 broad career fields open to Air Force officers. There are, of course, specialties within many of these fields.

A substantial number of Academy graduates will be sent to civilian universities or to the Air Force Institute of Technology for postgraduate work leading to a master's—and in some cases to a doctor's—degree. A few of the areas in which Air Force officers do graduate work are aeronautical, chemical, and electrical engineering, guided missiles, nuclear physics, mathematics, personnel management, business administration, journalism, economics, languages, international relations, and education. The range of professional specialization within the Air Force is extremely wide. So diversified are Air Force activities that virtually every profession found in the civilian world may also be found within the Air Force.

In addition to its extensive program of graduate education in civilian universities and its own Air University school system, the Air Force operates many specialized schools in such fields as maintenance, engineering, armament, photography, nuclear weapons, and intelligence. The principal peacetime function of the Air Force is training to maintain a high level of combat readiness, for any full-scale war of the future probably would not permit a long period of mobilization and training.

Some of the Academy graduate's assignments will be in the United States and others overseas. In 30 years of service, an officer may anticipate spending 8 or 9 years abroad. Generally, he will be able to take his family with him as he travels to foreign countries. This opportunity to live and travel abroad is one of the greatest attractions of an Air Force career.

As an officer advances in rank, his responsibilities increase proportionately. The commander of a combat wing (normally a colonel) has under his supervision many millions of dollars' worth of weapons and equipment and several hundred officers and airmen. The commander of a numbered Air Force, such as the 6th Air Force which is part of Strategic Air Command, occupies a position of responsibility comparable to that of the president of a very large corporation. Such a commander is accountable for the lives of several thousand people and the wise employment of weapons of tremendous destructive capacity. Officers who hold key staff positions in the Air Force participate actively in the formulation of military and national policy. Theirs are among the most complex and engrossing jobs of our times.

Whatever may be the direction of the Academy graduate's career in the Air Force, he will stand always at the forefront of the air age. The breadth of vision which he acquired at the Air Force Academy will stand him in good stead through years of rapid change and unprecedented problems, and he will find deep satisfaction in a career of service to his country and his fellow men.

For further information, write to: Director of Admissions, United States Air Force Academy, Denver 8, Colo.

CHART I

DEAN OF FACULTY

DEPARTMENTS

Division of basic sciences: Mathematics, graphics, chemistry, physics.

Division of social sciences: History, economics, political science, military history and geography, psychology.

Division of applied sciences: Mechanics, electrical engineering, thermodynamics, areodynamics.

Division of humanities: English, foreign languages, law and logic.

CHART II

U. S. Air Force Academy—Academic Curriculum [1]

SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

	Class year				Semester hours
	4	3	2	1	
Mathematics	[2] 10	[2] 6	----	----	16
Charts and maps, engineering drawing	[2] 4	----	----	----	4
Chemistry	[2] 6	----	----	----	6
Physics	----	9	----	----	9
Statics, dynamics, mechanics of materials	----	----	[2] 6	----	6
Electrical engineering	----	----	9	----	9
Aerodynamics	----	----	----	6	6
Thermodynamics	----	----	----	6	6
Design appreciation	----	----	----	2	2
Total	20	15	15	14	64

SOCIAL SCIENCES—HUMANITIES

	Class year				Semester hours
	4	3	2	1	
English	[2] 6	[2] 5	[2] 5	----	16
Logic	[2] 2½	----	----	----	2½
Geography	[2] 2½	----	----	----	2½
Psychology	----	[2] 5	----	----	4
History of world civilization	----	[2] 6	----	----	6
United States history	----	----	[2] 5	----	5
U. S. Government	----	----	[2] 2	----	2
Principles of economics, comparative economic systems	----	----	[2] 4	----	4
Economics of national security	----	----	----	2	2
Foreign governments and international relations	----	----	----	4	4
Law	----	----	----	3	3
Military history	----	----	----	3	3
Foreign language	----	----	----	10	10
Total	11	16	16	22	65

SUMMARY TOTALS, 4 YEARS

Scientific studies	64
Social sciences—Humanities	65
Airmanship studies	12
Total semester hours	141

[1] All departments participate in special course programs for selected cadets. See pp. 7-9 for discussion of advanced, accelerated, and special courses.

[2] Advanced or accelerated courses are offered in these areas.

CHART III

Airmanship curriculum summary

CONTACT HOUSE

	Summer period, class year				Academic year, class year				Totals
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	
Military training	138	127	172	284	36	72	72	19	920
Flying training	------	142	74	76	38	174	174	112	790
Physical training	85	18	28	18	98	36	36	36	355
Intramural athletics	------	------	------	------	57	57	57	57	228
Total	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2,293

SEMESTER HOURS

	Summer period, class year				Academic year, class year				Totals
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	
Military training	2½	2¼	3¼	5¼	¾	1½	1½	¼	17½
Flying training	------	2¾	1¼	1½	¾	3¼	3¼	2	14¾
Physical training	1½	¼	½	¼	1¾	¾	¾	¾	6½
Total	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	38½

Roger Babson Reports on Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting report on gold by the noted financier Roger Babson, which appeared in the Rancho Santa Fe Times on July 10, 1958:

ROGER BABSON SAYS

BABSON PARK, MASS., July 9.—As I have already expressed myself in these columns, I do not expect any shooting war to be started by Russia, and probably no chemical war. I do expect an intensified economic war and believe we are now in such an economic war, started by Russia some months ago. One of the weapons Russia will use is gold.

RUSSIA'S GOLD SUPPLY

Although over 50 percent of the free world's annual production of gold comes from South Africa, Russia is now reported to be producing $500 million worth a year; to have on hand $8 billion dollars worth to use as a weapon against us. This gold could be a real factor in breaking commodity prices and prolonging our business depression.

Probably Russia has in mind establishing a gold ruble which would have a constant value in foreign trade all over the world. This could make a great impression on both our allies and the backward nations. It should be an important weapon for Russia in the economic war in which we are now engaged. It seems, however, that as the next step in making a Russian ruble universal for trade, Russia must agree to the British insistence on mutual freedom of travel and communications and cease radio-jamming anything related to business or finance.

VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Previous to 1934 the American dollar was based on gold at a price of $20.67 per ounce. Under the Roosevelt administration, the price increased and the dollar diluted. It is said that Mr. Macmillan and President Eisenhower discussed the problem at their recent conference. They agreed that it should also be discussed with friendly nations; but this might cause them to become frightened and lead them to withdraw gold from the United States, which American investors do not want done.

Interfering with the price of gold would certainly cause more inflation. Many people think inflation is a bullish argument in the stock market; but it may not be so. If foreign nations withdraw very much gold, the bearish factors could offset the bullish.

THE TRUE STATISTICS

Since 1950, Europe has increased its gold holdings to $8 billion, some from mining and purchasing in the open market and some by withdrawals from other countries. This especially applies to West Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium. The latter country has also benefited from its large uranium holdings in Africa. During the last few months, our gold supply has been reduced $1¼ billion. At this rate we would lose over $3½ billion worth during 1958.

A statistical analysis of this loss shows that it has been due to a change in our foreign-trade situation. Up until recently, our exports exceeded our imports, and our stock of gold increased. Now this tide has turned and our imports of raw materials and manufactured goods exceed our exports.

WHAT ABOUT GOLD SHARES

Naturally, there has been an increase in the price of gold shares which are traded largely on the London Stock Exchange and in Toronto. There are two reasons for this increase: (1) When business is in a recession, as at present, the cost of mining gold decreases. Since the price of gold after it is mined does not decline, this increases the profits of good gold mines. These profits have not been very satisfactory during the past few years and the prices of gold shares have been abnormally low. (2) The current talk about devaluation of the dollar has also been a factor, but this is a very speculative factor.

It seems to me, however, that aside from the above two reasons, readers are justified in holding a few good gold stocks—not for profits, but for security. While I see reasons why many stocks should decline in the next year, I see no reason why many good gold stocks should sell lower than they did a year ago.

It is illegal for American investors to store any raw gold in safe-deposit boxes in the United States or its possessions. I am, however, seeking a Government ruling as to whether or not investors may store such gold in other nations. When I receive a copy of said ruling, I will freely send it to any reader on request.

H. R. 12704

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on the Consent Calendar today was H. R. 12704, a bill which would change the distribution of the funds derived from Federal forests. Two years ago during the 84th Congress, a similar bill was introduced and put on the Censent Calendar. At that time I opposed the bill for the same reasons I opposed H. R. 12704 today.

The money received by the counties may seem nominal, and yet when one thinks about it in terms of the help they give to education it is a good deal of money. My own State of Oregon receives a good share of the funds spent on education from this source, and I know that my State is not alone in this.

Cecil Posey, executive secretary of the Oregon Education Association, had this to say in a letter:

I have just received word from Forrest E. Cooper, counsel for the public lands committee of the Association of Oregon Counties, that H. R. 12704 has cleared the Agricultural Committee in the House and will appear on the Consent Calendar on July 21, 1958.

As you are aware, funds from the United States forest lands that now go to the counties are used for roads and schools. This proposal would allow these funds to be used for other purposes. We are very much opposed to opening up the use of these funds for purposes other than those for which they are now used.

Forrest E. Cooper, representing the Oregon Association of Counties, was promised by the clerk of the House Agriculture Committee that if this measure was called up for a hearing, he could oppose it in committee. He was not given that opportunity.

Albert Skaggs, research director of the Oregon Education Association, states:

There is a great deal of concern here with the attempt * * * to allow the counties to use the Federal forest land revenues for general governmental purposes (H. R. 12704). At the present time, one-fourth of the money goes to the schools, and three-fourths for public roads. The total amount of money that Oregon received for 1957–58 is $9,450,662.

Enclosed is a listing of the amount of money the schools in Oregon have received from the Federal forest land revenues that have been returned to the State.

Your help in stopping H. R. 12704 will be much appreciated.

This list of counties which I have inserted, below, shows that 29 out of 36 counties in Oregon have received benefits:

Federal forest land revenues for schools, 1957–58

Baker	$29,817.39
Benton	7,613.59
Coos	11,590.36
Crook	32,255.73
Curry	87,108.64
Deschutes	110,068.25
Douglas	350,689.32
Grant	92,099.59
Harney	38,228.47
Hood River	51,309.09
Jackson	56,547.52
Jefferson	19,343.31
Josephine	47,212.80
Klamath	133,833.60
Lake	107,916.14
Lane	531,558.75
Lincoln	84,000.82
Linn	178,225.45
Malheur	186.83
Marion	69,624.86
Morrow	4,169.33
Multnomah	16,837.23
Tillamook	45,987.51
Umatilla	12,656.90
Union	25,681.30
Wallowa	18,917.50
Wasco	51,163.47
Wheeler	10,646.57
Yamhill	12,432.52
Total 1957–58	2,362,665.52
Total 1956–57	2,355,704.14
Total 1955–56	1,526,204.52

Leaders of my State are not alone in opposing this legislation. Let me quote a few of the comments received.

Mrs. Bernie Jacobsen, president of the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers:

The Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers reaffirms its unanimous action in convention of May 1958 favoring legislation requiring countries to allocate at least 50 percent of Federal forest and grazing funds to the public schools. We strongly recommend amendment to H. R. 12704 that would protect school revenue.

Mr. Joe A. Chandler, executive secretary, Washington Education Association:

I have checked with the officers of the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Washington State School Directors, and Washington County Superintendents Association. They agree with us that our Washington State statutes should be changed to provide for compulsory division of forestry funds equally between the counties and the schools before we can support Federal legislation liberalizing the distribution of forestry moneys to the county general funds.

Forrest Rozzell, executive secretary, Arkansas Education Association:

H. R. 12704 will cost the schools of Arkansas $539,000 annually; we are unalterably opposed. Wiring our delegation to this effect.

F. E. Bass, executive secretary-treasurer, Tennessee Education Association:

In 1956–57 Tennessee received $86,066 from this fund. Of this amount, the schools received $62,978.20. While this is not a lot of money, it means considerable to some of our counties. There are 12 counties which receive funds as a result of this act.

Dix Price, executive secretary, Arizona Education Association:

Horan bill amending Forest Lands Act could deprive Arizona schools of $104,000 annually. Amount not substantial but vital to many small schools in forest counties. Have wired Arizona delegation urging opposition to bill.

Phares E. Reeder, executive secretary, West Virginia Education Association:

Recent West Virginia law allocates 80 percent of forest land money to the county school board. The balance goes to the State road commission.

Passage of H. R. 1270 * * * would divert school and road money to the county government, which has the barest of administrative responsibilities in our State.

Last year California received $4 million and Idaho received $1½ million.

Some may argue that under this bill the States will still receive these funds. This is true, but how can we be sure that any of that money would be used for education? Enough money is never allocated for schools. Speeches, editorials, articles, and so forth, have pointed this fact out to us often, and in the Congress, this year we have considered a great deal of legislation dealing with Federal aid to education in one form or another. Yet, the purpose of H. R. 12704 is to decrease that money which is already earmarked for education. If this source of revenue is lost to the State educational systems—how will they make up this deficit?

Because I recognize the importance of this money to Oregon schools and those of the rest of the Nation, I feel compelled to voice my objection to this bill.

Hans J. Morgenthau on Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Hans J. Morgenthau has been for some years director of the center for the study of American foreign policy at the University of Chicago. His article, The Lebanese Disaster, in the current issue of the New Republic is a contribution to the hard reappraisal of our policies in the Middle East which is now being undertaken:

THE LEBANESE DISASTER

(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

It is an odd experience to think and write on a momentous event in American foreign policy after being cut off for nearly a month from all meaningful contact with foreign policy. Having lived in recent weeks in different parts of Wyoming, limited to the newspapers of the region which are local in the sense our neighborhood weeklies are and to radio and television programs selected by local stations in view of local interests, I am struck by the isolation from what is going on in the world, in which the inhabitants of this region year-in and year-out live. This is not isolationism as a policy; this is isolation as a fact of life.

Yet in a sense this is also a fascinating experience. For the first time as far as I can remember, I am all by myself in having to make up my mind about a momentous contemporary event. The wisdom of Walter Lippmann is lost to me; James Reston cannot help me with lines to read between; the inflection in Ed Murrow's voice does not beckon me to turn in the direction all good men must turn. I know nothing about the mood of the Nation nor of the climate of opinion in Washington. No research assistant provides me with historic analogies; no punch card checks my facts; nobody and nothing reassures me. The temptation to trim one's sails to the prevailing wind or else to sail against it does not need to be resisted; for there is no way of telling which way the wind blows. Nothing stands between the observer's mind and the facts, and the observer has nothing to go on except the bare facts of the situation and the resources of his mind.

Thus I find the intervention of the United States and Great Britain in the Middle East both inevitable under the circumstances and a national disaster. To speak of America alone, this intervention has been made inevitable by the policies we have pursued, and the commitments we have entered into, in the Middle East. Our policy has been to defend the status quo in the Middle East by supporting as allies those states which would accept our support, and both the commitments of the Baghdad Pact and of the Eisenhower doctrine serve to implement that policy. It is the unsoundness of that policy which makes any attempt to implement it by unilateral military action a self-defeating enterprise, fraught with terrible dangers. For, as we might have learned from Metternich's experience more than a century ago, a policy of the status quo is sound only when it seeks to defend a status quo viable in itself. The defense of western Europe is such a policy; for the vitality of the nations of western Europe provides the indigenous element necessary for the defense of the existing distribution of power, guaranteed by the support of the United States.

What exists in western Europe is totally absent in the Middle East. None of the "nations" of the Middle East to whose defense we are committed is a viable political or military entity. Far from being the creatures of their own organic growth or of a sudden surge of inner strength, they are but the artifacts of the aspirations and rivalries of foreign powers. Where in any of these "nations" are the prerequisites of nationhood? What are the historic antecedents which would entitle the present territories of Lebanon or Jordon to house a nation? Is Jordan a nation—whose king dares entrust his life only to White Russian bodyguards, who during the last year has lost two chiefs of staff by desertion to Syria, who, after expelling British power 2 years ago, must now call it back to save his life and throne? The truth is that those nations are not nations at all. They cannot exist without an outside power supporting them. In the past, Great Britain and France supported them as semicolonial dependencies, taking a last fling at colonial control. With the collapse of British and French power in the Middle East, which the Suez debacle of 1956 both consummated and made manifest, those "nations" became like ripe fruit, waiting for somebody else to pluck them. Has the United States chosen to succeed France in Lebanon and to support the resumption of Britain's traditional role in Jordan? If this is what it is trying to do—and it is impossible to say what else it could be—then the United States is up against a force before which European colonialism had had to retreat when that force stood alone, and which is now supported by the power of the Soviet Union. That force is Arab nationalism, and for it the artificial boundaries of Arab "nations" are meaningless.

This being the background of the problem that confronts the United States, it is impossible to visualize a contingency under which the marines could ever be withdrawn from Lebanon short of a radical revision of the basic assumptions and objectives of

American policy in the Middle East. For obviously what threatens the present regime of Lebanon and the existence of the state itself is not an isolated act of outside intervention which can be frustrated by a show of military force. Nor is it Communist subversion; for after all, regimes have been overthrown and kings deposed and assassinated before communism was ever heard of, and Arab nationalism uses communism, as it is used by it, but the two movements are not identical. What threatens Lebanon is its congenital inner weakness, made acute by the simultaneous collapse of western influence and power in the Middle East, the rise of Arab nationalism, and the entrance of the Soviet Union into the Middle East as a major factor. How are the marines going to supply that inner vitality without which a state must become either the client of a stronger power or be absorbed by it? To land marines in Lebanon was easy; how to create conditions in Lebanon which will allow us to get them out again is not only difficult, but appears to be an impossible task.

Yet even if it were in the interest of the United States to frustrate the designs of Arab nationalism even by force of arms, is it likely that military intervention in Lebanon will serve that purpose? The symbol and the driving force of Arab nationalism is Nasser of Egypt. How is the prestige of Nasser to be diminished and the attraction of his cause to be impaired by sending the marines to Lebanon? Will both not rise to unprecedented heights by virtue of that very action? The answers to these rhetorical questions cannot be doubted. When Great Britain, France, and Israel invaded Egypt in 1956, they struck indeed at the heart of the trouble. Whatever else may be said against the wisdom of this action and, more particularly, against the manner of its execution, that action at least aimed at the right target and in that respect appears to have been inspired by one sound political judgment which is missing in ours.

Our action, then, is politically deficient even in terms of the overall policy that has made it inevitable; for it has led us into a political blind alley, with only the United Nations or the Soviet Union, that is, the policies of other nations, to extricate us. This is a miserable position for a great Nation to be in: to embark upon a policy which leads nowhere and then to have to try to maneuver other nations into policies which will at least prevent the debacle of one's own policy from becoming too obvious by opening up the possibility of retreat.

But this is not all and it is not even the worst that must be said about our intervention in Lebanon. Through the instrument of that policy we have already inflicted upon ourselves a defeat in the struggle for the minds of men greater than any which the Soviet Union could ever have hoped to inflict upon us by its own policy. The attitude which Japan and Sweden have taken in the Security Council and whatever other news about the reaction of foreign countries I could find indicate how unpopular our action is and to what an extent it has impaired the standing of the United States among the nations of the world.

This is a miserable position for a great nation, necessarily a valid argument against our action if only that action were politically sound. Mr. Dulles is most certainly right when he insists that the United States is not engaged in a popularity contest throughout the world. A great nation has interests which it must defend at any price, and loss of popularity is by no means the highest price which it must be willing to pay. However, the benefits to be expected from such a policy must be worth the price to be paid. Yet where are the benefits to be expected from the policy upon which we have embarked? And if there should be any, are they likely to outweigh the loss which is already obvious?

That loss is alas not limited to our position in the struggle for the minds of men. More serious than any argument we have advanced thus far is the fact that our intervention in Lebanon increases the risk of a third world war. The readers of this journal do not need to be reminded of my conviction that the United States has interests which may compel it in certain circumstances to take such a risk. I would not in the fall of 1956 have washed my hands of the fate of Hungary nor would I have destroyed the last vestige of British and French influence in the Middle East in order to save Nasser. Yet the interests at stake must be of overriding importance in order to justify such a risk and the risk must be taken under circumstances most likely to minimize it.

The intervention in Lebanon fails both these tests. That intervention has no rational connection with our vital interests being—as I have tried to show—the inevitable result of a mistaken policy. Furthermore it challenges the Soviet Union under circumstances which minimize our political and military strength and maximize that of the Soviet Union—under circumstances which make it virtually impossible for the latter to refuse to take up the challenge. Given our political and military weakness in this self-chosen theater of operations we have provided the Soviet Union with an opportunity which it must be expected to exploit fully either of dealing us a defeat of the first order or of engaging us by proxy in a costly limited war which can have neither a rational political nor military aim. In the end we will be faced with three choices each disastrous in a different way: either we will have to beat an ignominious retreat or we will have to waste our human and material resources in a senseless war or we will have to transform such a war into the ultimate catacylsm of a third world war.

However, while these are the choices which our present overall policy appears to leave open to us, there is still another choice, which we should have taken long ago, and that is to scrap altogether a policy whose consistent application has had such disastrous results. What is happening in the Middle East is but a particularly disastrous consequence of an overall policy which sooner or later is bound to have similarly disastrous consequences elsewhere. What the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine have achieved in the Middle East, SEATO may well achieve one of these days in southeast Asia. Committed as we are through these and similar undertakings to the defense of interests which are not necessarily our own and to the maintenance of the status quo which is not necessarily viable, we are bound to be faced with contingencies in which we either must go back on our word or else risk expanding our blood and treasure in enterprises either far removed from our real interests or else incapable of successful conclusion. The echo of those grandiloquent words and the shadow of those big gestures will come back to haunt us as they haunt us today in the Middle East.

How many more lessons must we learn, if time will be given us to learn any more, in order to understand that there is a difference between a heroic posture which may be good news for tomorrow's editorial and the next elections, and a foreign policy which commits a nation—its blood, its treasure, its very existence—for an indefinite future? How long shall we allow platitudes about the independence of small nations to obscure the obvious fact that most of the new nations of Asia and Africa do not constitute viable political and military entities and therefore offer a standing invitation to stronger powers to take over? When are we going to realize that there is a golden mean between Washington's injunction against "entangling alliances" and the collector's approach to alliances—the more the better regardless of interests and power—which we have practiced in recent years and which allows Lebanon to force us through an ultimatum into most risky action? How long are we going to continue to accept as a substitute for thought that primitive and vulgar devil theory which, in imitation of Nazi and Communist thought processes, attributes every disturbance anywhere in the world to a Communist conspiracy masterminded in Moscow? How much time have we left to learn that the introduction of the cold war into the Middle East through the Baghdad Pact—playing one Arab state against the other in order to collect a few more useless and costly allies—has been a self-defeating policy, opening the door for the Soviet Union and enlarging if not opening a wound which that policy is unable to close? In other words is it not high time to look at the Middle East as it existed before the Baghdad Pact and in the light of a radically revised over-all orientation of our foreign policy?

Such a new departure of our Middle Eastern policy must start with the recognition of certain fundamental facts. The first of these facts is the inevitability of Arab nationalism, owing nothing in its existence to communism, which might have been destroyed in 1956 at its Egyptian source but against which the individual Arab states cannot be defended through Western military intervention. An Arab government, accepting or seeking Western support, signs its own death warrant as traitor to the cause of Arab nationalism.

The second fundamental fact, which we have been trying to ignore, is the Russian presence in the Middle East. While our own policies are largely responsible for that presence, we only add new errors to old if we continue to refuse to face up to the unpleasant consequences of our actions.

The third fundamental fact to be recognized is the absence of any vital interests on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Middle East. The United States seeks stability both for stability's sake and in order to assure the flow of Arab oil to Western Europe. Let it be said in passing that American policy, in curious contrast to the policy of the oil companies, is in the habit of enormously exaggerating European dependence upon Arab oil and similarly underplaying Arab dependence upon European markets; for while Europe has alternative sources of supply, the Arab states have no alternative markets. Arab oil must flow west, or it will not flow at all. The Soviet Union seeks disorder for disorder's sake as a weapon in the cold war. The pursuit of these policies has brought the two super powers closer to the brink of a third world war than they have ever been before. Might they not have learned that the possible results for either side of the competition for power in the Middle East are not worth the price which disorder in the Middle East might impose upon both of them?

In view of the absence of vital interests engaged in the Middle East on either side, I have always believed—and there are men high in the councils of our Government who share this belief—that the Middle East offers a natural opportunity for a negotiated settlement between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a settlement would require of the United States and the Soviet Union a retreat to the position they occupied before they made the Middle East a battlefield in the cold war by trying to line up the Arab states on either side. Such a settlement would then have to create a new status quo in the Middle East viable within itself

and therefore susceptible to outside support. Such support would have to be provided by the United States and the Soviet Union working together in limiting the range of Arab nationalism under Egyptian leadership to the Arab peninsula, beyond which it could expand only with outside aid. Such a settlement would be enforced by the realization on either side that a drastic disturbance of the Middle Eastern status quo would constitute an equal threat to the vital interests of both by confronting both, as does the present disturbance, with the risk of a third world war.

If this analysis is correct then it was a mistake on our part to reject out of hand the Russian offers, made repeatedly in recent years, to negotiate a settlement of the Middle Eastern issues. While these lines are being written, the papers report another Russian proposal for such a settlement. In view of the disastrous consequences of the policies the United States has pursued thus far in the Middle East, it would be the height of folly to approach such negotiations with the same untenable assumptions and objectives which are responsible for the disaster which our Middle Eastern policy faces today.

Alex (Pop) Irion Retires After 52 Years' Service as a Rural Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest, most popular, courteous and accommodating rural mail carriers in the United States, Mr. Alex (Pop) Irion, retired on July 31, 1958, after serving on Rural Route 2 out of the Paris, Henry County, Tenn., post office for the past 52 years. He was a great credit to the postal service on account of his efficient record over a period of more than one-half of a century. He will be missed by the patrons of his route. Mr. Irion can now look forward to a well-deserved rest and vacation.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks a fine, deserving news article about his long, faithful service which appeared in last Thursday's edition of the Paris Post-Intelligencer of Paris, Tenn., an outstanding daily newspaper in the district which I have the honor and privilege of representing:

POP IRION RETIRES—UNITED STATES MAIL'S OLDEST CARRIER—HAS DELIVERED ON ROUTE 2 FOR 52 YEARS

(By Peggy Ragland)

Alex (Pop) Irion, who might well be this country's oldest rural mail carrier, retires today after 52 years of faithful service to the residents of route 2, Paris.

The Federal rural free delivery first began in this country in 1889 and it was one of the first governmental services ever given to the rural people of our Nation.

Mr. Irion, when he was just 17, first began carrying mail in 1906 over the 22 miles on route 2 as a substitute for his father, Phillip J. Irion. Since the time of the 22 miles of plain old dirt road with an average of 22 mail boxes and 22 pieces of daily mail, he has seen route 2 grow and lengthen to 46 miles with 288 rural boxes. At the last count period in May 1957, he delivered and collected 1,249 pieces of mail in 1 day. Local letters in the good old days were 1 cent and out-of-town letters were 2 cents. Some of Mr. Alex' coworkers at the post office said, tongue in cheek, that he picked today to make his last run so he wouldn't have to carry any 4-cent letters. The 3-cent stamp will become a thing of the past tomorrow.

If you are inclined to think mail service is slow now, just take this as a good example. Mr. Irion received notice on January 10, 1907, that he would officially become an appointed carrier on January 16 of the same year. The letter had been mailed from Washington January 5.

For the first 6 months of his postal career after receiving the appointment he traveled the 22 miles on horseback to get the mail through. Later he drove a horse and buggy and then a 1913 Ford with a red front and straight fenders. "Of course, the weather had to be perfect to use the car so I got the most use from it in the summer. That winter weather and roads were just too much for the old Ford." Still with the Ford, but not the 1913 model, he travels over 25 of the 46 miles on balcktopping and the rest on improved roads with gravel or hard bed.

Time was when he went to work at about 7 in the morning and returned to the post office after dark. With improved roads and transportation he now leaves for the route at 8 a. m. and drives up to the post office about 12:30 or 1 p. m.

Recalling one of the most hectic experiences he ever has had in delivering the mail, he told about the time he was trapped in quicksand.

"There had been a big rain around here and I was delivering mail around Bird's Creek. Well, sir, I drove off into the quicksand that had washed up. I was in the morse and buggy then and somehow I managed to crawl through the back end and escape. There wasn't too much mail that day so I took it out the back with me. The old horse pulled out breaking the harnesses. Couple of days later a friend, Horace Frazier, and I got the buggy out."

People have always been helping him and the rural people he delivers to are all his friends. Color makes little difference to him. He tells this tale: "One time an old colored grandmother who could neither read nor write, asked me to write a post card for her to send to a friend. Well, I always carried them with me, so I said I would. Everything went along fine and finally as I was running out of space, I told her she would have to end the letter. She added just a few more words and closed by saying, 'I'll end now but please excuse the bad writing and spelling.'"

The Post Office Department never had a more able public-relation representative than Mr. Irion. Once during the war, an elderly patron wanted to send a package to his son overseas. "I've only got a quarter," the father said, "but just send this package as far as the quarter will take it, and maybe it'll get to him." Mr. Alex won't say where the rest of the postage came from, but somehow the package reached its European destination.

All the children on the route are special friends of Mr. Irion. In fact all the girls are my sweethearts and all the boys are my fellows. Mr. Irion put it this way, "If I make friends with the children then I don't have to worry about the parents for they are my friends too." In the good old days when comic papers and books were hard to get his family had plenty of good reading material and he always saved anything he could take with him on the route so none of the children would be disappointed at the mail box.

The crackerbarrel philosopher gives this advice to young people. "If you ever want to invest in something, try kindness and courtesy. There are more rewards in this than any money investment you could make."

The friendliness Mr. Irion has for humans knows no barriers. "Part of my 288 I deliver to are colored and I show them the same service as I do my other. I never had to fix a flat or make a repair on my car. Some of my colored friends were always there to help me."

Seems like Mr. Irion has always been helping people. It goes from giving bubble gum to the children, to helping buy an organ for a new church, to helping an injured man. "One day as I was making my rounds I came across the father of Paris policeman Paul Baucum. His team had run away and he had broken a hip. I did the best I could and then drove to get help."

During his 52 years of delivering he has served four generations in one family he knows of and probably in others too. Of the Hartsfield family, he has served the grandparents and parents of Mrs. Mary Hartsfield Thompson and now her son and his family.

Of the rural subecribers, Mr. Irion says, they like to keep up with the news in the Post-Intelligencer and they just can't seem to do without it. "Sure, they may let the time run out but in a couple of weeks they are renewing it again."

People mean a lot in Mr. Irion's life. Perhaps he can best express it this way. "A thing that has been your life for 52 years, besides your family, well, it is your life. The thing I hate most about retiring is the dear friends I have to leave. After you have been with them for a while they are the best people in the world."

To say Mr. Irion likes his job and the people he works for would be putting it mildly. The people on the route are all his special friends and so are his coworkers at the post office.

The Paris postmaster, Tommy Vaughn, has this to say about Mr. Irion.

"It has been an enriching experience for me to have had almost daily contact with Mr. Alec Irion since I came to the post office. Our association, however, began much earlier because he was our carrier when I was a child and used to wait for him at our mailbox. Mr. Alex was the first official of this great Government of ours that I ever saw, and, to me his record for public service stands today as a model for others to follow.

It has been one of the highlights of my life to have finally worked with him and to have been privileged to have received his advice, which I have sought so often these last few years, both personally and in the conduct of the business of this office. I have never known a person who possessed a more selfless devotion to duty and such kindness for all mankind."

Of the many honors and awards Mr. Irion has received, he has many service awards. Just a year or so ago Mr. Irion received a letter from the postmaster after the annual inspection. The letter was in praise of the condition of the boxes on his route. Too, he received a letter of thanks from a Tennessee farm association for being the only carrier to deliver and return 100 percent of the letters sent out in an annual survey to rural box holders.

Mr. Irion has the respect and love of his fellow mail carriers over a big aren. He has served as president of the Tennessee State Letter Carriers' Association, and was a delegate to the national convention of the association in Boston.

He is a member of the board of stewards of First Methodist Church, and for many years was president of the Men's Bible Class.

Besides attending church and lodge meetings, the next most important thing in his life is bass fishing. In 1952 he strung a 9½-pound Kentucky bass, which is up to date the largest Kentucky bass ever to be taken

from Kentucky Lake. He likes to recall the time when he was fishing at the lake and felt a strong tug at his line. "It must have been the mother or father of that 9½-pounder, for when looked to see it wasn't my line he had swallowed, it was that old cypress stump that it had been hiding under."

With all those sweethearts on the route, Mr. Irion met and married the one he loved best, the former Sophie Hill, on May 21, 1911. They have 4 children—3 girls and 1 boy. Mildred Irion lives and works in Memphis. Inez Irion lives with her sister and brother-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Lester (Kid) Neese and their only son, Alec, Jr., has a family. All three live in town.

Mr. Irion, who makes his last run today, has no definite plans about what he is going to do. He and his wife have just moved into a new home, "to be close to the children," and the yard is filled with growing flowers and "that grass kinda grows, too."

"I think the first thing I will do is go fishing. I know the father or mother of that little bass is still out there, and I want to spend some time trying to hook it.

H. R. 12808, a Bill To Extend Section 8 of the Federal Highway Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 12808. It is a bill which amends the Highway Act of 1958 to extend for another 2 years the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate Highway System. It extends section 8 of the Federal Highway Act to 1962 instead of 1960.

The Interstate Highway program which would eventually link every capital city in the United States by 41,000 miles of wide highways is one of the biggest construction enterprises ever undertaken in history.

In the amount of money involved, in the amount of materials to be used, in the amount of planning and engineering skills to be employed, it would dwarf into insignificance most of the great building programs of the past years—even past centuries.

Support for H. R. 12808 has come from contractors, from the American Roadbuilders Association, from the American Association of State Highway Officials, and from no less a builder and executive than Bertram D. Tallamy, the Federal Highway Administrator. These witnesses pointed out with clarity and emphasis that the economy and accomplishments of a continuing, orderly, properly financed program—already effectively demonstrated in the past—is necessary if the highway departments of the various States are to project their programs on more than a season-to-season basis.

The same is true of the contractor. The further ahead a contractor can assess his volume of work, the purchase of materials, and utilization of personnel, as well as the distribution of machinery and equipment, the more efficiently he can operate and the lower the price he can offer. The responsible highway contractor of today must of necessity be able to plan well ahead for the anticipated amount of construction work obtainable if he is to operate his enterprise in an effective and efficient manner.

It is an established fact that most of the contractors doing highway work are literally small businesses. They may not fit into the category of small business as we generally know it, but when you consider that their annual gross volume averages about $5 million or less it becomes apparent that orderly planning is indeed necessary if they are to continue as a successful segment of our economy. The bill provides that safeguard by adding 2 years to the period of planning.

Highways today are more necessary than ever in the light of our defense situation and in the light of our domestic economy, and the passage of this bill will augment a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to be accelerated in the manner contemplated by Congress when it approved the 1956 act. The transport of our country will be immeasurably improved through the systems of highways which are being developed throughout the States and in times of emergency these roads would stand us in good stead.

Leaders in the road building industry are aware that if action as called for in H. R. 12808 were not taken by the House and the other body, they would go into 1959 without knowing how or when the 1961 apportionment can be made. If this legislation becomes law the 1961 apportionments can be made any time after the first of next January.

The program in terms of funds obligated has accelerated at about the rate expected and construction is rising right now toward the high plateau that should be sustained for several years. The constant approach to this plateau is indicated in the annual step-up in fund obligations—Federal and State funds—as follows:

Obligations for preliminary engineering, rights-of-way, and contract construction

Fiscal year:	
1957	$1,729,000,000
1958	2,223,000,000
1959 (estimate)	2,600,000,000

It is a well known fact that the interstate program was set up on a long term basis for two main reasons, first to assure that the system would be completed within a specified period of time; and second, to avoid costly peaks and valleys in demand for machinery, materials, and labor, as well as engineering services.

The American Association of State Highway Officials, through its president, Mr. C. R. McMillan, stated before the House Public Works Committee:

If the interstate program were to revert into a year by year determination as to the amount of money to be authorized, very objectionable "valleys and peaks" would be the inevitable and extremely unsatisfactory result.

The highway departments must be in the position of of being able to plan projects and their schedule for construction and of making definite time commitments to property owners, tenants, local officials and the like as to when projects will move to construction if the job is to be done properly.

Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during my service here in the Senate, I have come to hold great admiration for a man who can exercise influence not because of the stentorian tones of his voice, but because of his inner wisdom, because of his knowledge of our country, and because of the quiet consideration which he gives so fairly and so impartially to the views of others.

This man is the senior Senator from Arizona [CARL HAYDEN], who was serving here before many of us were born, including myself. His service dates from Arizona's statehood. Although I am one of the Senators representing the State of Oregon, let me say that CARL HAYDEN knows a whole lot more about the resources, geography, and needs of Oregon than I do. He is a walking encyclopedia of accurate information about the United States. I continually marvel at his detailed familiarity with the innumerable projects which receive appropriations and study from his great committee.

In the Reader's Digest for August 1958, appears a merited tribute to Senator CARL HAYDEN by Oren Arnold, under the title of "America's Silent Senator." Ex-President Harry S. Truman is quoted in the article in praise of CARL HAYDEN's kindness and consideration to others, a trait which we all realize characterizes Senator HAYDEN.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from Reader's Digest about our illustrious President pro tempore of the Senate be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SILENT SENATOR
(Condensed from Western World)
(By Oren Arnold)

In an eighth-grade exam not long ago an Arizona schoolgirl, asked to name the three great branches of American Government, wrote: "The President, the Superb Court and Mr. CARL HAYDEN."

Her astonished teacher decided she wasn't far wrong in naming Arizona's distinguished 80-year-old Democratic Senator as a separate branch of the Government. For, more than any other man alive, CARL HAYDEN does indeed personify the Congress of the United States.

He has served there longer than an other person in history—47 consecutive years. As Senate president pro tempore he is third in line (after Vice President NIXON and House Speaker RAYBURN) for the Presidency of the Nation. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he wields an incalculable power that touches every pocketbook in the land. A working, walking encyclopedia of legislative information, he is one of the most respected lawmakers of this country, and every President since Woodrow Wilson has sought his counsel.

Yet he is an immensely gentle, self-effacing spirit. He seldom makes a speech or

issues a statement. As for newspaper interviews, most reporters long ago gave up trying. Harry Truman calls him, aptly enough, "America's silent Senator."

His silence is a studied thing. It began in 1912 shortly after the brandnew State of Arizona sent him to Washington as its first Representative, a tall, muscular ex-sheriff in a cowboy hat. Having preconceived notions of how Congressmen should act, he made a speech at the first opportunity. It was notable chiefly for its verbosity. At the end of it, an older Representative took young CARL by the arm and walked him down the hallway.

"Well, son," the elder remarked, "you just had to say it, didn't you? Remember, that speech will always be in the RECORD. Someday you may want to change it, but you can't. There are two ways to be a Congressman—to be a show horse or a workhorse. One way will get your name in the paper. The other will win you votes and the respect of your colleagues."

CARL chose the workhorse route. Today, while noisier colleagues are pontificating, he is most likely to be found in the Congressional Library. Studying intimate details of some proposed bill, he works up to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, sifting out the chaff, extracting the essence. In committee he may sit, forgotten, through a 3-hour session while others wrangle. Then in perhaps 25 words he will point out precisely what must be done and why.

At the one-room school he attended in Arizona, CARL was a star pupil. He had a consuming curiosity about everything, especially faraway place. In those years it was the custom for towns and States to advertise for farmers to come and settle. Little CARL answered all the ads, got the free literature, absorbed every word. By age 10 he knew more about America than most adults.

He loved to read serious books, especially history. One hot, humid day when he was helping get in the alfalfa hay, CARL disappeared. His father found him in the shade of a haystack reading volume 3 of Ridpath's History of the World. With switch in hand the stern parent tested him to see how genuine his interest was.

"Why did Rome fall?"

"Because," the lad answered, "the people grew soft and pampered theirselfs."

It was a good answer, one that Senator HAYDEN often meditates on today.

At Stanford University CARL played center on the football team. Tall and proud in a stiff collar 4 inches high, with a middle-of-the-road hair part and a sultry lady-killer look in his eyes, he became a popular figure on campus. In 1899 he ran for the presidency of the student body against two classmates, one being Theodore Hoover, brother of Herbert. Friends told handsome CARL HAYDEN, "You'll win in a breeze."

He himself agreed, and in a burst of modesty said to Nan Downing, a fellow student whom he later married, "It would be unseemly for either of us to support me. We must vote for one of my opponents."

They did so, and CARL was defeated by two votes—the only election he has ever lost. Never since then has he underestimated an opponent.

Back home in Arizona, CARL felt the call to politics and public service. He was elected county treasurer, then from 1907 to 1912 served as county sheriff. The rough element in Maricopa County said at first that the college boy was too mild to be a law man. He managed to correct that impression. One day a notorious thug came to Phoenix, got liquored up, walked boldly into the new sheriff's office and announced that he could kill the biggest officer present. CARL, 6 feet and 220 pounds, stepped calmly from behind his desk.

"Draw," ordered the bully.

Sheriff HAYDEN drew—with a heavy open hand. He smacked the misguided badman right through the open door—then leaned out and grinned at the awed onlookers.

In 1912, when Arizona became a State, HAYDEN was elected her first Congressman at Large. In Washington, a few years later, the ex-sheriff made friends with a young clerk in the Department of Justice named Ed Hoover. They talked shop, discussed methods of identifying criminals, comparing the old Bertillon method with the new fingerprint system. When friend Ed was made FBI chief in 1924, it was CARL who helped push through a bill for $56,320 to start the Nation's far-reaching fingerprint bureau. The two men remain good friends today.

From the first, HAYDEN's technique was to avoid the limelight and get the job done, without regard to credit or publicity. Then, from the lower house, he moved to the Senate in 1926. Since that time few bills of importance—particularly in the fields of reclamation, irrigation, agriculture, mining, and Federal highway building—have escaped his touch.

Much of the colossal highway program now underway, for instance, stems from his prophetic thinking. "Our Nation lives on wheels," he says, "and good highways are almost as important as good homes."

Observers sometimes refer to the Arizonian as the Desert Fox. The story goes that Calvin Coolidge said it first when, in 1924, HAYDEN fought hard for the passage of the San Carlos Project Act, to open a new irrigation enterprise in Arizona, including a huge dam. The act passed, but it seemed certain that the economy-minded President would kill it. HAYDEN and others tried to figure out a way to prevent the expected veto. Finally, HAYDEN came up with an idea.

His Arizona colleague, Senator Henry Ashurst, made an appointment with Coolidge at the White House. "Mr. President," he said, "the great new dam in Arizona will be a thing of majestic beauty, the largest of its kind in the world, a showplace for centuries to come. We respectfully ask if we may name it in honor of you, sir. We would like to call it Coolidge Dam."

Cal signed the bill.

HAYDEN is also known as one of the friendliest, kindest men in Washington. When Harry Truman first turned up in Washington as Senator from Missouri, he was dubbed a "tool of the Pendergasts" and as such was so suspect that few Members of the Senate would even speak to him. Hypersensitive, the newcomer felt their coolness keenly. Then one morning in a Capitol hallway a tall, balding man approached him, stuck out his hand and said, "Welcome to Washington, Senator. I'm HAYDEN from Arizona, an old-timer here. Call on me for any help I can give you." It was a gesture that Truman never forgot.

In 1941, when the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was set up, it was through a parliamentary maneuver suggested by Senators Hayden and Barkley that Harry Truman became chairman—a position that earned for him the national prominence which eventually led him to the White House.

HAYDEN has a marked aversion to fence-straddling. "I have found," he says, "that you have to take a stand on every issue, not only for your conscience' sake, but to avoid making a fool of yourself. If you inform yourself well and take a definite stand, both sides will respect you."

Arizona's big interests used to try to pressure him occasionally. In one case some utility companies had their employees and customers write him thousands of letters opposing a pending utility bill. HAYDEN studied the matter, wrote back a short summary of his reasons for favoring the bill, and said he would not change. In the next election his vote plurality was the largest it had ever been.

Some have criticized HAYDEN, saying that as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he is guilty of profligate waste. They forget that his committee does not make the overall policy. Actually, though he handles billions, he is meticulously thrifty—the type who goes through his offices turning off lights that have been left on—and constantly concerned with finding ways to reduce national expenditures. "Give us a guarantee of world peace," he says, "and we could slice Government spending in half."

On Senator HAYDEN's 80th birthday last year a friend prepared a scroll thanking him for his decades of service. Space was left for 25 signatures. But word got around, and when the scroll reached HAYDEN it held 174,688 names, including that of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Not long before, Republican Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, had summed up the congressional sentiment toward HAYDEN by saying, "Some years ago a man said to me that CARL HAYDEN knew more about the United States Government than any other individual. I have never been disposed to take exception to that observation."

Harry Truman put it another way, when a newly elected Senator asked his advice on how best to do his job. "That's easy," said Truman, "just watch CARL HAYDEN."

Civil Air Patrol Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Friday, August 1, 1958, which comments on the military as well as civilian importance of the Civil Air Patrol:

CIVIL AIR PATROL TRAINING

These are busy days for the Civil Air Patrol. Over the weekend, Wilkes-Barre Squadron 205, of which Capt. Michael Solomon is commanding officer, will participate in Operation Pinpoint, a problem dealing with an enemy invasion of Pennsylvania.

Although it has been in existence only 3 years, Wilkes-Barre squadron, with 43 officers and 41 cadets, including 17 girls, has the distinction of being the outstanding unit in the Commonwealth. The training course of 30 months qualifies the individual for a place in civil or military aviation and has an estimated value of $25,000.

Now in its 17th year on a national level, CAP, the abbreviated form of Civil Air Patrol, is one of the few organizations which have sought to devise and put into effect programs to fit today's teen-agers for the world of tomorrow.

CAP has been making itself felt in the continuing problem facing the Nation in the shortage of scientists, engineers, and technicians. Eighty-six former CAP cadets now are in the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado. Throughout the country, some 36,000 teen-agers are enrolled in cadet ranks, preparing to cope with the challenges that are arising on every side.

The military aspects of aviation are fairly well known. In a less dramatic way, aviation provides many other benefits. The Na-

tion's well-being, growth, and prosperity are being advanced materially by air transportation while the industry, one of the country's largest, provides employment for more than 1 million men and women directly and thousands more indirectly through its purchases from small business.

America's world leadership depends largely on its progress in the air. Opportunity is knocking for youth in this field of endeavor. At the same time, there is a vital need for greater emphasis on technical education in programs, such as the Civil Air Patrol.

It is cheering to note that Wilkes-Barre is setting a stiff pace for Pennsylvania and America through Squadron 205.

An Approach to Better Inter-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent international events have clearly pointed out that the United States and the free world must fact, for years to come, a continuing struggle.

The principles of our life and Government are under constant challenge. Every moment of disinterest and relaxation will be capitalized upon as the time for a forward encroachment by international Communists and their followers.

The United States has just adopted the largest military budget in our peacetime history. We are all agreed we must be militarily strong to withstand any aggressive action,

Yet the most distressing gains against the free world in recent years have not been made by direct military attacks. The gains have been achieved by indirect means.

We in this country must marshal the forces and efforts of the free world to effectively combat the Communist nonmilitary and indirect methods.

It has been my belief the first place to consolidate and strengthen our mutual efforts is close to home—Latin America. A strong and effective Western Hemisphere will provide leadership and strong moral support for the rest of the free world.

Furthermore, as individual Americans we must use our enthusiasm and zeal to nurture and broaden the base of acceptance of our principles of life and government.

Our citizens have asked many times what can we do? There are many ways by which the individual can help foster and improve better international relations for his country.

In Florida we have been very conscious of this, particularly in my district.

One very good case in point is the program instituted by the Coral Gables Lions Club under the very able leadership of its immediate past president Mr. J. C. Morris—related to our own efficient House Postmaster, H. H. Morris. This people to people approach suggested and carried on is the type of effort we must multiply a thousandfold. The benefits in understanding, good will, solidarity, better international relationship, and contribution to the preservation to our way of life are valuable and incalculable.

In an article Serious Side, appearing in the Lionews of the Lions Club of Coral Gables, Fla., Joe Morris tells us what he and his club are doing—a very worthwhile effort, which I hereby commend for the consideration of all my colleagues:

(The article follows.)

SERIOUS SIDE

(By Joe Morris)

The Vice President NIXON incidents in Lima, Bogotá, and Caracas, three cities in South America, has started a lot of talk about Latin American relations by people who heretofore were limited in their concern in Latin affairs.

Now interest is aroused because of the slap in the face that hurt our national pride. But there were others who were working on the problem before these incidents happened. Some results should soon be evident with so many at work now.

Two months ago I made a tour of South America and visited 9 countries and talked to many people wherever I went, especially to people in Lima and Bogotá, because I was 3 days behind Mr. NIXON in those cities and the headlines made the topic for talk.

Returning to Miami, more than ever aware that something should be done, I asked five other businessmen in the aviation industry to meet together and try to formulate constructive ideas to pass on to our congressional representatives and aid in solving the problem.

Have you ever tried to study a complex problem the size of inter-American affairs and then consolidate your thinking into words that can mean a real solution? Well, it ain't easy.

Our group has met four times, however, and some progress is being made, we hope. But the best part is we are not alone.

The Festival of the Americas, a week or so ago brought representatives from 21 Latin countries together in Miami, Fla. Those 10 days of meeting each other—making friendships—and mixing customs was more than a miniature modulation, it was a strong surge forward.

The festival was immediately followed by a 4-day meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas where delegates and observers from 15 Latin countries, several cities in Florida and Government officials from Washington actually met in luncheon and business sessions to pose the problems existing in their country and ours, and then they offered their recommendation for a solution.

Again, this gigantic and complex problem cannot be solved in a day or two.

Some time ago, President Eisenhower put forth a plan designed to place the individual in a position where he could help his Government to better relations between countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The plan was to have each city in the United States adopt a sister city in one of the Latin countries and interbreed with her to bring forth new conceptions of both our ways of life.

The city of Coral Gables accepted the challenge and has adopted a sister city, Cartagena, Colombia.

So now the Coral Gables Lions have a new sister. Only the Coral Gables Lions had already taken such a step 2 years ago when the club adopted their sister, Santiago Club de Chile. But there is no desire to limit the size of the family. That's what we want, more good relations.

The immediate task is to arouse enthusiasm all over the United States for better inter-American relations—so it is recommended that one of the Coral Gables Lions project this year be: Start a campaign to get all the Lions Clubs in Florida to adopt a sister club in Latin America, do their best to help our Government improve inter-American affairs.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "We are the Government, you and I."

Fellow Lions—if the problems are solved they will have to be solved by all of the United States Government—U-U-U-U-U and I.

Untruths on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, August 2, 1958:

UNTRUTHS ON DEFENSE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The time has come, once again, to take a very grave step in this space. It is time to say quite bluntly that the Eisenhower administration is guilty of gross untruth concerning the national defense of the United States.

The false claims were most succinctly put by the President himself in his last state of the Nation message.

"We have now," he told the country, "a broadly based and efficient defensive strength, including a great deterrent power. But unless we act wisely and promptly, we could lose (the) capacity to deter attack or defend ourselves." He then outlined the action he proposed to take and he concluded with this promise: "We intend to assure that our vigilance, power, and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat that we face."

Either the President was consciously misleading the Nation, or he silently decided to break his promise later on, or he has been misinformed about the facts. The third alternative is not only preferable; it is also highly probable. But that does not change the hard facts about which the President has been misinformed. Nothing will change them but a vastly greater national effort to "keep abreast" of the "realistic threat we face."

The time of deadly danger will begin soon, during the period the Pentagon calls the gap—the years between 1960 through 1963 or 1964. Massive orders for hardware must be placed immediately—indeed, they should have been placed last winter—if we are going to make the feeblest pretense of keeping abreast during the years of the gap.

The prospective results of our present, fantastically inadequate effort were given in detail in the last report in this space. They may be summarized as follows:

First, we shall retain a modest margin of superiority in manned bombers throughout the years of the gap—unless the Kremlin puts its new, very long-range, supersonic jet bomber into early production, as must of course be expected. (It is not expected by the administration, but all the administration's expectations are based on the kind of reading of the grim intelligence that experience has repeatedly warned against.)

Second, the NATO estimates give the Soviets a strength in air defense that is at least two times, if not 3 or 4 times greater than our own air-defense strength; and this wide margin of superiority will be maintained throughout the years of the gap. This means, of course, that the balance of manned bomber strength must be weighed in favor of the Soviets; for our manned bombers are now increasingly vulnerable to interception by the more advanced defensive weapons.

Third, we shall be sending a few intermediate range missiles to our NATO allies in the gap years. Meanwhile, the Soviets will acquire between 1,000 and 2,000 ballistic missiles with suitable ranges to neutralize or destroy all our overseas air bases, on which the striking power of our manned bomber force heavily depends. And fourth, the United States versus U. S. S. R. score in operational intercontinental missiles in the gap years will be United States 0 ICBMs versus U. S. S. R. 100 ICBMs in 1959; United States 30 ICBMs versus U. S. S. R. 500 ICBM's in 1960; United States 70 ICBMs versus U. S. S. R. 1,000 ICMBs in 1961; United States 130 ICBMs (plus a few submarine-borne Polaris, perhaps) versus U. S. S. R. 1,500 ICMBs in 1962; and United States 130 ICBMs (plus more Polaris) versus U. S. S. R. 2,000 ICMB's in 1963.

Furthermore, only a few score more of the Navy's Polaris missiles will alter the balance in 1964. And the first solid-fueled Minuteman missile, on which the Pentagon is gambling the American future, cannot possibly be ready for operational use before the end of 1963 or early 1964. It will probably be later than this.

If this is "keeping abreast," one would like to know how the administration defines "falling behind." The effect of the present policy is indisputable. It will allow the Soviets to gain an overwhelming superiority in overall nuclear striking power. And if anyone wonders what results to expect from this kind of Soviet superiority, it is only necessary to look back a few years, to the last time this reporter took the same grave step of charging official untruth about the national defense.

This was when the egregious Louis A. Johnson was swearing he was "only cutting fat, not muscle." The Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament policy ended in the Korean war. But at least President Truman and Louis Johnson then had the excuse that the United States still possessed a virtual monopoly of nuclear striking power.

Now we are flaccidly letting the Soviets gain an overwhelming superiority in this crucial area where once we enjoyed a monopoly. We are doing this, moreover, after abandoning superiority to the Soviets in almost all other arms areas. Can any sane man suppose that this folly is not immeasurably more dangerous than the follies of Louis Johnson or can any sane man seriously suppose that the end-result will not be immeasurably more terrible? At this instant, the last chance to save ourselves is slipping through our hands.

Mr. Missile of the Cape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include two news items from today's New York Times. First, a story on Mr. Missile of the Cape, Mr. Byron G. MacNabb, and second, a note on Atlas men doing a 3-day data study. They follow:

MR. MISSILE OF THE CAPE: BYRON GORDON MACNABB

Byron Gordon MacNabb is Mr. Mac to thousands of rocket buffs on and around Cape Canaveral, Fla. But an equally apt name might be Mr. Missile. Nobody on or off the cape is a better symbol of a new order of Americans—the Missile Men.

Officially, Mr. Mac is operations manager for Convair-Astronautics at the Air Force Missile Test Center. The center's headquarters are at Patrick Air Force Base, 18 miles south of the cape. Convair has an office in the Starlite Motel between the two. But Mr. Mac is most often in his green "hard hat" and weathered field jacket, directing things at the Atlas launch area on the cape.

Convair is prime contractor on the Atlas. This is the Nation's first intercontinental ballistic missile. In its full-powered three-engined conformation, it made its first successful flight Saturday evening.

Several hours later, Mr. Mac was presiding at a celebration and chuckling over how the Atlas-B (the two-engined forerunner was the Atlas-A) had roared from its pad, accelerated toward 15,000 miles an hour, and hit "right in the pickle barrel" some 2,000 or 2,500 miles downrange in the South Atlantic. Eventually, he and his 900 colleagues hope to fly their "bird" the full ICBM distance of 6,325 statute miles.

WORKS HARD, PLAYS HARD

Mr. Mac plays as hard as he works. On a Sunday afternoon, in his home with its backyard right on the Banana River, he will do the following things in any order:

Cast for a sea trout (spotted weakfish) right off his own dock; go into the house for a drink and to explain to a caller the intricacies of a rate gyro (an instrument governing the speed of correction of a deviation in course); and stomp outside again to improve the house's drainage system with a shovel.

He is quick-moving, sharp-witted, good-natured—and, above all, dedicated to his work. For a while he stopped getting haircuts between preparations for an Atlas firing and the real thing. Once he went 6 weeks. A secretary chided him, so he gave that one [superstition] up.

Instead, he had symbolic missiles painted on his helmet. Each success meant a halo added to one of the symbols; each failure, a puff of smoke. Even after Saturday, the haloes were still outnumbered by the puffs—but the haloes were gaining.

He was born August 14, 1910, in Gary, Ind. The stocky Atlas boss attended New York Military Academy at Cornwall, N. Y., Rose Polytechnic Institute at Terre Haute, Ind., and the Illinois Institute of Technology at Chicago.

EX-FURNACE FOREMAN

For 13 years before World War II, he worked for the Carnegie Steel Corp. at South Chicago. He was general foreman in the blast furnace department when he entered the Navy.

He served as an ordnance officer on aircraft carriers, with shore duty in research and development at the Navy Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md. There he won a Presidential citation for development of an antikamikaze weapon for use against Japanese suicide planes. He took part in the first firing of a ballistic missile from a ship at sea, the carrier Midway.

From 1948 to 1955 he had research and operations with the Sandia Corp., the Pullman Standard Car Co., and the Cambridge Corp. With the latter, he was field operations manager on the hydrogen bomb program at the Atomic Energy Proving Grounds in the South Pacific. He joined Convair-Astronautics in February 1955.

His wife is the former Iris L. Cook, of Chicago. Their daughter, Doris Ann, is a secretary in New York. The MacNabbs live in Cocoa Beach at the foot of Fourth Street, just west of Route A1A. But the exact address, according to anyone but Mr. Mac himself, is 398 MacNabb Parkway.

ATLAS MEN START 3-DAY DATA STUDY—INITIAL 3-ENGINE LAUNCHING BELIEVED SATISFACTORY—ICBM GOES 2,500 MILES

Air Force generals on opposite coasts of the country kept in close touch yesterday in the wake of the first successful firing of a three-engined Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

It was understood that Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division in Inglewood, Calif., and Maj. Gen. Donald N. Yates, commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center, with headquarters at Patrick Air Force Base, south of Canaveral, were more than satisfied by the flight Saturday night.

The generals conferred by telephone to determine what additional details of the test, and its significance, should be announced officially.

Meanwhile, the Convair-Astronautics firing crew that fired the 80-foot Atlas-B "right into the pickle barrel" was taking it easy today after a celebration last night.

EIGHTY-HOUR CLUB IN SESSION

But other Convair personnel were on the job. These included the "Eighty-Hour Club," made up of engineers and technicians who start poring over telemetered data from the moment a missile is fired. It was their preliminary report at T plus 3 hours that led to the original enthusiasm. The complete data evaluation will take more than 3 days.

Also working at the cape yesterday was the host in the Saturday night festivities—Byron G. McNabb. The party began at the motel where Convair has its office, and continued at his home. Mr. McNabb is chief of operations for the Atlas project.

The Atlas-B is propelled by two boosters, a sustainer, and two small vernier engines. The boosters and sustainer are ignited together. The boosters drop off, leaving the sustainer to continue. The verniers provide the final adjustment to the velocity for accurate delivery.

The Atlas-B flew on about 150,000 pounds of thrust in each booster, 60,000 in the sustainer, and 1,000 in each vernier. The distance of about 2,500 miles was kept short of the full ICBM range of 6,325 miles by incomplete fueling.

Originally, the thrust pattern of the Atlas (in the A series) was 135,000 pounds for each booster, 100,000 for the sustainer, and for each vernier, 1,000 pounds.

A Matter of Life or Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over Krebiozen, a new drug, as outlined in previous articles listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, pages A4957, A5370, and A6712, has touched off a furore both in medical and layman circles; since the release of a new book treating with this subject, A Matter of Life or Death, written by Herbert Bailey, and published by Putnam.

This concern is one of the oldest and most respected publishing companies in the United States, and enjoys a reputation of only publishing books which must be proved, truthful in every degree, particularly in the field of medical science on a controversial subject—one as serious as krebiozen.

The recent release of the book resulted in the unanimous approval of the reviewers as to the treatment of the controversy and the favorable reviews recommending the book to the reading public as interesting and informative.

"From the reviewers' standpoint, if the book gets wide reading, the repercussions will be great," comments Robert S. Keckner, Chicago Sun Times, April 6, 1958.

In view of these developments, Congress should do something about this question in the public interest—a congressional investigation would force the American Medical Association to change its stubborn attitude against an intelligent and scientifically controlled study to determine officially the value of Krebiozen in cancer treatment. Present public appeal and the results of Dr. Andrew Ivy's experimental research, together with the favorable reports of the 200 physicians who administered the drug to their patients and reported the progressive observations of its successful effects in a personally prepared report to the Krebiozen Foundation.

Surely in the face of this overwhelming evidence of Krebiozen's activity, the American Medical Association cannot honestly disregard and with a disinterested attitude stubbornly refuse Dr. Andrew Ivy's request for fair play and a chance to prove its medical worth. In the interest of humanity, the AMA should cooperate and welcome this opportunity to recheck its previous evaluations of Krebiozen.

Otherwise, Congress must initiate its unpleasant prerogative and investigate this organized conspiracy of a few officials to suppress the freedom of research in the field of medical science.

The following articles pointedly show the future trend of the public attitude on this question. The men of the press specializing in evaluating the books of our time are equipped by their special talents to recognize an honest issue regardless of their personal opinions. It is evident that their comments on the treatment of the subject matter by Herbert Bailey is not only interesting but would also exert a persuasive influence upon public opinion:

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

Here are a few representative newspaper reviews which Herbert Bailey's book, A Matter of Life or Death, has received thus far. We have been assured that more are to follow. In spite of its being one of the most "embattled" books ever published, and on a subject which has torn the medical and lay world apart, it is highly significant that to date A Matter of Life or Death has not received even one unfavorable review.

As one of our reviewers has told us: "You might be able to ignore Bailey's book and not review it at all, but if you really read it your sense of public responsibility will be so aroused you'll be forced to bring it to public notice, even though several power-manipulator medical groups are trying to suppress the book. It answers all the really important questions about a national scandal any reviewer, medical or otherwise, would wish to know. You don't have to have much medical or scientific knowledge to know that the facts glare out at you and are undeniably true.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 6, 1958]

TWO ABSORBING BOOKS ON CANCER, ONE BRISTLING WITH CONTROVERSY

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey; There Is an Answer to Cancer, by Dr. Leonard B. Goldman)

(By Robert S. Kleckner)

It can be forecast with almost certainty that if Herbert Bailey's new book on Krebiozen, the controversial cancer drug gets wide reading, repercussions will be great.

It also can be forecast definitely if Dr. Leonard B. Goldman's work hits large circulation many fears about cancer will be allayed and more lives will be saved by conventional treatments.

The first book tells the amazing story of Chicago's internationally known researcher, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who because of his championing Krebiozen as biologically active and worthy of further study in management of cancer, has become to his partisans a martyr persecuted by the Chicago Medical Society, the American Medical Association and others. To some he has become almost a crackpot.

There is no question Bailey has done a devastating job of presenting dramatically what he set out to do, attempting to bolster these theses:

1. Businessmen and one official of the AMA sought to gain financial control of Krebiozen.

2. Because of failure they conspired against Ivy and the drug.

3. The official got support from AMA staff men.

4. Krebiozen was damned before it had a chance in the professional eye because it was unintentionally announced in lay rather than scientific publications.

5. A concerted campaign by organized medicine forced reputable doctors to change testimony about the drug and prevented others from testing it.

6. This campaign has even carried to Government circles in Washington.

Principals involved have at least to their satisfaction denied the charges—but not to Bailey's and many others over the country who are convinced that Krebiozen has been of benefit.

Much of the Krebiozen story in this latest book has been told but Bailey makes one wonder anew not only about the possible worth of the drug but whether the material developed by Dr. Steven A. Durovic displaced Yugoslav physician who came to Chicago has really had a proper chance for widespread controlled testing.

New statistics are presented to show that since the drug had first trials beginning in 1949 with hopeless cancer patients, it has been used by some 200 doctors and several clinics experimentally on about 1,500 sufferers, with more than 50 percent having pain relieved, cancers diminishing, and many still alive, several back at their jobs after being on their deathbeds.

This would be in direct contradiction to early findings of an AMA committee which held the drug worthless after a review of the first 100 cases treated. If there had been any improvement, AMA witnesses later said, it might have been due to natural remissions of cancer, admittedly unusual even in medical circles.

Bailey's book is thought-provoking. However, organized medicine as such is likely to continue to disregard the charges, having taken the position that nothing relative to Krebiozen has changed since its early investigation.

As to Dr. Goldman's book, no facts presented are controversial.

He does a masterful job of telling in simple language the signs of various cancers and what can be done not only for treatment as recognized by the medical profession, but how many cancers may be prevented.

One excellent chapter is devoted to simple questions and answers which concern everyone.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News of May 17, 1958]

MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey)

Herbert Bailey, veteran medical reporter and general champion of suppressed causes, goes to work with the firm touch of a master surgeon as he brings to life the incredible story of Krebiozen, a drug intended by its discoverers to alleviate the ravages of cancer in humans.

Presenting what he calls incontrovertible evidence of its effectiveness in many cases, Bailey excoriates the American Medical Association and the American Cancer Society, accuses their leaders of not only persecuting the Yugoslav doctor and his American associate but of sabotaging the use of Krebiozen in a determined campaign, both political and medical, to suppress any approval of this amazing drug.

Now, 8 years after its discovery, there is evidence that public opinion is beginning to assert itself. Opponents now are giving way to the people's demand that Krebiozen, or any other efficaceous drug for cancer, be given a chance to show what it can do, freed from opposition of a group of kingmakers who ought to be champions of any remedy that lessens the ills to which man is subject.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel Star's Florida Magazine of May 25, 1958]

NEW HOPE FOR CANCER

(A Matter of Life or Death—Herbert Bailey)

(By Ruth Smith, Florida magazine books editor)

If you would canvass any group of people to discover the disease they hold in the greatest dread, you would probably find that it was cancer.

The reason, of course, is that because so often this disease is not discovered in early stages when it is possible to arrest its course, a cancer victim usually feels that his case is hopeless.

Many times there have been news stories that someone has at last discovered a cancer cure. The medical profession, justifiably cautious, has not accepted these cures until they have undergone long and exacting tests.

A new book which came out April 7 tells the fantastic yet purportedly true account of the discovery and development of an effective anticancer agent, krebiozen, and the courageous fight of the discovers of their allies for its acceptance.

The book, A Matter of Life or Death, is by Herbert Bailey, a veteran reporter who has worked for newspapers in North Carolina, Nashville, and Chicago. At one time he was radio and dramatic critic for Billboard.

AMA DENOUNCED

In July 1952, he first became interested in krebiozen, which has been termed a "natural immunity" agent against cancer and was discovered in 1949 by Dr. Stevan Durovic, former assistant professor at the University of Belgrade Medical School.

Since then Krebiozen has been tested by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, eminent cancer re-

searcher, formerly a director of the American Cancer Society and now head of the department of clinical science, University of Illinois Medical School.

Bailey scathingly denounces certain high officials of the American Medical Association who, he maintains, have falsified and suppressed favorable evidence of krebiozen.

He calls for a congressional investigation of the AMA outlining with documentary proof the suppression and reprinting sworn testimony given at the Illinois State legislative hearing on krebiozen in 1953–54.

Mr. Bailey states: "The American Cancer Society owes it to the American people whence it receives all its funds to settle the controversy once and for all."

The society is now considering Dr. Ivy's proposal. The AMA refused a similar proposal by Dr. Ivy.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of April 27, 1958]

INSIDE STORY OF DRUG TO CURB CANCER

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey)

(Review by Jack Oswald)

This is the story of the research, skulduggery, slandering, greed, egotism, and altruism that were unleased when the medical and financial world learned of a drug that might control cancer.

Subtitled "The Incredible Story of Krebiozen," the book tells how a Yugoslav scientist arrived in Chicago in 1950 with a substance isolated from horses' blood. The chemical was the result of the physician's search for a growth inhibitor he hoped would stop cancer-cell multiplication.

Three years later, Krebiozen was the subject of a legislative investigation involving the American Medical Association, eminent doctors, Senators, the FBI, businessmen and cancer victims. Author Bailey writes a medical cloak-and-dagger tale to satisfy the most cynical observers of this business of science.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of June 2, 1958]

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey)

A writer with a newspaperman's background of appreciation of the laws of libel, Herbert Bailey, includes in these pages a compilation of information and facts, which had it not been carefully weighed, investigated and backed by actuality and proof could bring about serious repercussions for the writer.

Why should the American Medical Association, or certain members of that group attempt to block the progress of research, by nonrecognition, of what could be the possible answer to humanities' most dread disease—cancer? Part, if not all the answers are here recorded.

For 6 years past Dr. Andrew Ivy, tireless medical researcher, interested only in the welfare of his fellow men, has led a cry in the wilderness on behalf of the cancer drug Krebiozen. His criest have reverberated against the bastion walls of the principal walls of the principal group behind the medical profession—the AMA. To their cries for proof he has added proof upon proof of the greatness of the drug's work.

Hertbert Bailey has replied to the opposition here as in his original book K-Rebiozen of several years back, to some of the intrigues motivating this disregard by the AMA or its specific members.

[From the New York Times of March 22, 1958]

BOOKS—AUTHORS

Krebiozen, as a natural immunuity agent against cancer, has been the subject of disagreement in the medical profession since its discovery in 1949. In A Matter of Life and Death, Herbert Bailey gives an account of the discovery and development of the substance and tells of the fight of the discoverers and their allies for its acceptance. He denounces certain high officials of the American Medical Association, who, he maintains, have falsified and suppressed favorable evidence of the material. The book will be published April 7 by Putnam.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of April 13, 1958]

CANCER DRUG FIGHT AIRED; HANDBOOK RECOMMENDED—CURE HANDLING STIRRED TEMPEST—INFORMATIVE NEW VOLUME EXCELLENT FOR LAYMAN

(By Campbell Moses, M. D., Director, Addison H. Gibson Laboratory, University of Pittsfiburgh School of Medicine, and past president, Allegheny County unit, American Cancer Society)

Subtitled The Incredible Story of Krebiozen, A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey is a reporter's dramatic account of the chain reaction in American medicine following the 1951 public introduction of a new and controversial drug for the treatment of cancer.

This drug, Krebiozen, was developed by Yugoslav Dr. Stevan Durovic and first studied in the United States by a front-rank scientist, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and vice president of the University of Illinois.

March 26, 1951, in Chicago, at a meeting called by Dr. Ivy to present a cautious preliminary report to the physicians who had been cooperating in the Krebiozen study, an unauthorized publicity release stated:

"The battle of medical science to find a cure for cancer achieved its realization today. * * * Cancer need no longer signify certain and inevitable death."

This release, supposedly with the prestige of Dr. Ivy behind it, was worldwide front-page news.

Medical scientists' reaction to this announcement was one of critical dismay. And in the events that followed Dr. Ivy was dropped as vice president and Dr. George D. Stoddard resigned as president of the University of Illinois. Dr. Ivy was suspended from the Chicago Medical Society and the American Medical Association became embroiled in a violent and continuing controversy.

The author, a strong supporter of Dr. Ivy's actions in this controversy, ably presents the events in dramatic, narrative fashion. Except for Dr. Ivy, none of the individuals or groups involved escaped unscathed and the American Medical Association is especially scarred in this account.

Despite the evident bias of the author, the book is a most interesting account of the maelstrom of events that can becloud the scientific issues when an exciting new observation is first presented in an unconventional way.

The sobering thesis of the book is that the unconventional presentation of an unorthodox idea may prevent its careful scientific appraisal even when the stakes are as high as they are in achieving the control of cancer.

There Is an Answer to Cancer, by Leonard B. Goldman, M. D., is a small volume, written to provide the public with accurate answers about cancer. It is both informative and delightful in its approach.

The author faces many questions that are frequently asked and answers them frankly and with excellent descriptive detail.

While all physicians will not agree with all the author's recommendations, a successful effort is made to present the alternative methods of treatment in an unbiased manner.

The book is highly recommended as an interesting volume with accurate answers to cancer.

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times, Fayetteville, Ark., of May 30, 1958]

FIGHT OVER KREBIOZEN MAKES BIZARRE TALE OF INTRIGUE

(By Allan Gilbert, Jr.)

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey)

Controversy and conflicting stories concerning Krebiozen, an agent for the control of cancer, continue today on only slightly less bitter a plane than during the early stages of what has become a protracted war between its proponents and the American Medical Association.

Herbert Bailey, a professional journalist with a long background of newspaper and magazine work, has compiled the story of this running battle.

The facts as set forth in his book point to an incredible conspiracy in which the AMA hierarchy has deliberately misled not only the public but its own members as well. Bailey indicates from testimony at several hearings on the drug that the motive behind this conspiracy has been a grab at control of the manufacture of Krebiozen.

It is hard to believe that the American Medical Association would purposely prevent the distribution and use of an agent that has promise of providing a cure for cancer. Yet, according to the mountain of facts in this book, it is this feeling that has enabled the AMA to accomplish this very thing. Too many persons, Bailey contends, feel that the AMA obviously wouldn't be a party to the deliberate suppression of a possible cancer cure, and hence ignore the accusations.

Whether this is the actual situation or not is a moot question. But the contention makes one of the most bizarre stories ever to see print.

Bailey starts out with the original theory behind the discovery of Krebiozen by a distinguished Belgrade doctor, Stevan Durovic. He traces experiments carried on in South America, where Dr. Durovic took exile residence during the war, and explains how a substance known as Krebiozen was isolated and found to be effective in control of cancer on animals.

The next step was Dr. Durovic's trip to the United States where he gained support for research and experiment with the drug from a number of persons including Dr. Andrew Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois.

Use of the drug was finally undertaken and the results amazed those in charge. Dr. Ivy helped set up a thorough trial and became convinced that there was great merit in the substance. It not only alleviated pain in many terminal cases of cancer, but in some caused the cancer to disappear entirely.

Dr. Ivy prepared to expand the testing phase of the drug in 1951, but an overzealous press agent released a story that Dr. Ivy was announcing a cancer "cure." This created a serious ethical problem. Then, too, the wheels of economics had begun to turn with several persons seeking to gain the obviously valuable rights to the manufacture of the drug.

Dr. Durovic refused to grant rights to anyone until Krebiozen had been proven effective and medically acceptable. This created an impasse.

At about this point a member high in AMA circles instigated a quick and, according to all evidence, cursory look at Krebiozen and had an article prepared for the AMA's Journal to the effect that the drug was worthless. This article, according to Bailey, was written by a doctor who had had no actual experience with the drug.

Dr. Ivy attempted to set the record straight in the light of research to that date and lost his vice presidency at Illinois and his membership in the AMA as a result. Even the president of the University of Illinois was unseated in the controversy.

A hearing by the Illinois Legislature was virtually pigeonholed by delaying tactics of the AMA legal staff, which refused to permit a conclusion to the hearings. A proposed congressional investigation was nipped by the death of Senator Tobey of New Hampshire, who had become convinced that something was wrong somewhere.

Tobey, aware of the powerful AMA lobby in Washington, quietly secured an investigator from the Department of Justice. This man found the same facts that are outlined by Bailey, and turned them over to Tobey shortly before he died. Senator BRICKER assumed chairmanship of the committee that had been headed by Tobey and carefully ignored the investigator's report.

Drew Pearson ran a series of articles on the report and finally a hearing was forced. However, the investigator was not called as a witness and Krebiozen was carefully sidestepped.

The investigator shortly, according to Bailey, lost his job.

Bailey carried the fantastic story into 1957, a time in which Dr. Ivy was succeeding in his attempts to duplicate Krebiozen himself as a final step in the scientific proof of the drug's worth.

But even Bailey's story has its contradictions.

A Fayetteville doctor reports that he wrote inquiring about Krebiozen for one of his patients and was informed the cost would run almost $50 a day, indefinitely.

Bailey quoes the principals in the fight to have Krebiozen recognized as saying on numerous occasions that they have never charged a penny for the drug and that they have never authorized any doctor, anywhere, to charge for the drug.

And so it goes.

Whether Krebiozen is a "quack" cure, or the real answer to control of cancer will never be decided on a book review page. But the story of this drug and the tangled web into which it has fallen makes one of the most interesting tales of intrigue you'll run across. And it will provide a great deal of food for thought.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of May 25, 1958]

In a scathing denunciation of certain high officials of the AMA, Herbert Bailey charges that the medical men have falsified and suppressed favorable evidence of the anticancer substance, Krebiozen, and calls for a congressional investigation in his new book, A Matter of Life or Death. Author of numerous medical articles, Bailey has spent 6 years accumulating evidence, both pro and con, and now believes Krebiozen's efficiency is so overwhelming it can no longer be challenged.

[From the United Press Book Review of April 20, 1958]

The sensational pro side of the long-continuing controversy over Krebiozen, a chemical substance used in treatment of cancer, is minutely detailed in A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey.

Bailey leaves no doubt that he is a Krebiozen partisan and of his conviction that it has helped and even cured victims of cancer. He charges that certain officials of the American Medical Assiciation conspired against Krebiozen and asks for a congressional investigation of the AMA.

This charge was made first before the Illinois State legislative commission which investigated the Krebiozen controversy in 1953 and 1954. It was the basis of Bailey's first book on the subject, Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? published in 1955.

It is the basis of his second book which also includes charges made since against some medical men and medical organizations by Krebiozen proponents.

Bailey reports on the treatment of 1,500 far-advanced cancer patients by more than 200 physicians, all members of the American Medical Association. He says Krebiozen showed favorable results in half these patients.

Bailey formerly was a reporter who worked for newspapers in North Carolina, Nashville, and Chicago. He now writes for magazines.

[From the International News Service]

CANCER DRUG TIFF ON AGAIN

(By Patricia McCormack)

NEW YORK.—The long controversy over a hotly disputed cancer drug broke out again Saturday with the publication of an explosive report on it.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, publisher of the new book, A Matter of Life or Death, claimed that author Herbert Bailey presents documentary evidence that the drug—Krebiozen—has helped 50 percent of the 9,800 patients who have taken it.

The drug has not been accepted by the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society or by most leading cancer scientists—who rely on an independent AMA investigation in 1951 which found the treatment of no value.

However, Bailey's book revolves about one highly respected scientist, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who has backed Krebiozen since the early fifties—after watching it used on dying cancer patients.

Dr. Ivy is head of the department of clinical science at the University of Illinois medical school and a former American Cancer Society director. Before his endorsement of Krebiozen, he had been slated for a much bigger post at the university.

In A Matter of Life or Death, Bailey calls for a congressional investigation of the American Medical Association, which, according to the publisher, has suppressed facts about Krebiozen.

Bailey says the reason for such an investigation is the fact that millions of persons the world over have died and are dying of cancer—when they may have been saved.

Leo Brown, public relations director of the American Medical Association, meanwhile, told International News Service that the AMA has no comment on Bailey's book—or the charges made in it.

Bailey, a medical writer, spent 6 years accumulating evidence, pro and con, on Krebiozen, a treatment with a substance derived from horse blood.

Critics of Krebiozen maintain that they have never been able to learn the exact chemical nature of the drug. They say that this, to some extent, places them at a disadvantage when attempting to evaluate its effectiveness.

But Bailey's publisher said that the proof of Krebiozen's efficiency against cancer is so overwhelming it can no longer be challenged.

The mystery drug thought to regulate cell growth, was discovered in 1949 by Dr. Stevan Durovic, former assistant professor of medicine at the University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

It is taken from the blood of horses which have been previously injected with an antibiotic substance.

Bailey reports on 50 cancer cases treated with Krebiozen in which, he says, the patients have survived 5 years or longer—the period ordinarily used in establishing whether there is a cure.

In addition, the book's publisher says, there are "hundreds of 1-, 2-, 3- and 4- year cases in which the cancer has regressed or disappeared, or the progress of the disease has been halted consistently."

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of May 31, 1958]

KERBIOZEN-CURE, QUACK? SCIENCE STILL DOESN'T KNOW

(A Matter of Life and Death, the Incredible Story of Krebiozen, by Herbert Bailey)

(By Edward Kintner)

The first scene in this remarkable story is set in the council chamber of the city of Chicago, where a committee of the Illinois Legislature was to investigate the causes of a controversy over Krebiozen at the University of Illinois. This was in 1953 and the hearings were held intermittently over a period of a year. Unfortunately, the legislative committee did not end the controversy.

Prominent men in the medical world have been involved in charges of conspiracy to control the distribution of this material for their own financial gain. Some have believed that Krebiozen is of much value in the treatment of cancer. Others have seemingly been convinced that it is worthless and have roughly denounced it as a fake. The author has been interested in the controversy for several years and this is the second book he has published on the subject. This one apparently carries much of the material of the first, with the addition of the developments of the past 3 years.

It is the story of many charges and countercharges without any certain conclusions reached as to the value of the drug or the lack of it. It tells of Dr. Stevan Durovic, a Yugoslav physician who believed that since cancer is characterized by a wild growth of cells, that the body should develop in the blood an antigrowth substance that would be effective against cancer if it could be isolated. He tried to isolate this substance from cattle with actinomycosis a disease characterized by tumor formation, but was unsuccessful. He then tried horses that had been inoculated with the same fungus and this time he was able to secure minute amounts of what he thought to be the substance he sought. It was tried on cancerous dogs and he found that their tumors shrank appreciably and in some cases, disappeared completely. Later it was given a trial on hopeless human cases. Some showed improvement, others did not. Dr. Durovic did most of this work in Argentina, as World War II had forced him from his own country. Later he came to Chicago with the hope of perfecting his methods and of having his material given a trial that would prove its worth. From there on the story reads like those involving hunting for pirate treasure, with their intrigues, plots, and threats, until one wonders if he is not concerned with underworld characters rather than with men interested in arriving at scientific truth.

No claim is made that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer, but considerable evidence in the form of case histories is given to show some objective improvement in 50 percent or more of the cases treated. Some of the patients, in the last stages of the disease did not recover but were free from pain after treatment was begun. Others were much improved and continued as arrested cases while the injections were continued, and still others have been symptom-free for as long as 5 or 6 years.

When one remembers turtle serum of some years ago and the many quack remedies that unscrupulous men have used to enrich themselves at the expense of the unfortunate victims of this disease, he is inclined to be skeptical of anything new. Nevertheless would it not seem like good sense to give this a carefully controlled trial and an unbiased evaluation, by competent doctors of unquestioned integrity? This seems to be the purpose of the author.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post of April 4, 1958]

(By Michael M. Gildea)

Pain and death are much too personal subjects to permit logic and reason to prevail when medicine is discussed by laymen.

The disease that today signifies pain and death to most people is cancer. With doctors estimating that 1 out of every 4 persons now living will develop cancer, a cure for this disease is one of the most sought after.

One aspect of the search for a cancer cure, and possibly a preventive, deals with the controversial drug Krebiozen.

Developed by Dr. Steven Durovic, a Yugoslav working in Argentina, the drug was first brought to this country for testing in 1949. Since then it has been the subject of the most violent accusations and countercharges.

Herbert Bailey, a reporter who has written a number of medical articles for popular magazines, has undertaken to chronicle the dramatic history of Krebiozen in A Matter of Life or Death.

The author seeks to answer two basic questions with this book: Can Krebiozen be of value in the treatment of cancer and have the results of investigations of its use been deliberately obscured?

Evidence he presents apparently proves that, as a result of the attempts of pharmaceutical firms to control the drug's distribution, an organized compaign to discredit it was inaugurated. Charged with taking a dominant part in this campaign are a number of officials of the American Medical Associatfon.

The AMA has often been accused of entering too eagerly into the field of politics and of failing to promote the interests of medical research. The evidence presented by Mr. Bailey seems to back up these accusations.

Obviously he is impressed with the results of the drug on a number of cancer patients and the volume includes a number of case histories. However, he refers to an AMA report tending to discredit the drug but fails to report its findings in the same detail.

The real question raised by the publication of this book, however, is that of the value of presenting such a discussion to the public in this manner.

Admittedly, the development of a cancer cure is not only of interest but of importance to everyone. But how much good is done by arousing the public with an essential, emotional appeal?

Even though Mr. Bailey's charges might be completely valid, just what is the value of stirring up the public with articles in magazines over a question that can only be settled by diligent scientific research and evaluation?

Mr. Bailey feels the public and Congress should demand that the Federal Food and Drug Administration allow the manufacture and distribution of the drug. But what would be the value of an agency to regulate the production of drugs if it could be controlled by public hysteria?

Perhaps of more value would be his suggestion of a congressional investigation of the AMA. He would have the probe delve into the group's stand on health insurance, veterans hospitals, and other issues, as well as the Krebiozen controversy.

Finally, and probably most pertinent, he would have the American doctors clean out their own house and wipe out the political intrigues of the AMA.

After all, doctors are neither fools nor gods, but simply men with the training and experience to handle our medical problems for us.

Public opinion has its value in forcing issues, but it does not seem to be the force needed to decide a controversy that must depend on an accurate analysis by medical experts.

Mr. Bailey's book is valuable in that it presents readable and presumably accurate statements of one side of the story. It should not be accepted as the complete evaluation of the Krebiozen controversy.

[From the Saturday Review of July 5, 1958]

TRADEWINDS

A Matter of Life and Death (Putnam). Herbert Bailey's second book on Krebiozen, the first one being published 3 years ago and entitled "Krebiozen—Key to Cancer?" (Saturday Review August 13, 1955). The pro-Krebiozen forces don't bother with the question mark any more, and this current book is just as controversial a story as you could expect. What it boils down to, according to the author: A cure for cancer has been sabotaged by all the insidious power of the American Medical Association because some of its officials want control of it. Now: Is it a cure, has it been sabotaged, or is it as ineffectual as the AMA declared some years ago? In any case, read the book and find yourself in the midst of the hottest medical imbroglio since the Pharaohs started trepanning.

[From the San Francisco Daily Commercial News]

BOOKS

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

Is there a cure for cancer? Of course not. Don't be silly. Not for serious forms of cancer, anyway.

For certain other forms—skin cancer, for example, yes. Cure is possible in 85 per cent of the cases. But the possibilities of cure are limited.

Are they?

How about a little footnote? Perhaps all the facts are not in, perhaps all the truth is not known yet. I say 'perhaps'. Nobody has a right to make any claims.

This week a reputable New York publisher—the ancient firm of G. P. Putnam Sons—has put on the stands a disturbing and challenging book. It is titled "A Matter of Life or Death: The Incredible Story of Krebiozen," by Herbert Bailey.

Now I am not saying the thesis of it is right or wrong. I am only saying the merits of it should be carefully examined. First, because the author does not offer the drug (Krebiozen) as a "cure" for cancer. Second, because the American Medical Association has denounced it as worthless. Or at least, it did so several years ago. It has said very little about it lately.

What makes A Matter of Life or Death absorbing reading, however is the amazing array of documented evidence it presents that many supposedly hopeless victims of cancer who have been treated with it are now living and well.

Some of the curious angles of it are:

The late Senator BRIAN MCMAHON, Democrat, Connecticut, went on record as saying Krebiozen brought him freedom from pain and prolonged his life. His own physician said it diminished his cancer, but that so much of his body tissue was destroyed before it was administered that death was inevitable.

MCMAHON WAS so impressed that he persuaded SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, to pass legislation granting the developer of it, Yugoslav physician Dr. Steven Durovic, permanent residence in this country.

Seven cancer patients, reported in an issue of the AMA Journal to be dead or dying after the administering of Krebiozen, are still alive and well. Their affidavits cover two pages in the book.

About 200 members of the American Medical Association have expressed faith in the drug. (A relatively small number, of course, out of the total.)

The claim of some major hospitals that they have tested Krebiozen in hundreds of cases and found it worthless has been denied by the Krebiozen Foundation on the ground that these hospitals never at any time received a single ampule of the drug.

One of America's most distinguished medical scientists, a former director of the Naval Medical Research Institute at Bethesda, Md., and a former vice president of the University of Illinois, Dr. Andrew Ivy, has been driven into obscurity because he insisted that the drug should have the most exhaustive tests, not merely on hopeless or terminal cases but on incipient cancers.

The defense of the possible merits of of Krebiozen on the one hand by Drew Pearson, plus the magazines Pageant and Argosy, and the cry of "fake" on the other hand by publicists like Walter Winchell has only tended to becloud the whole issue.

Author Bailey's book would be more intelligible if it had an index. A controversial book, without an index, is almost worthless. Names must be checked against names, facts against other facts.

Not illogical, however, is the author's suggestion that a Senate investigation is in order. If the late Senator TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire) had lived a little longer, he would have had it.

[From Writer's Digest of June-July 1958]

Mr. Howard Cady, vice president and editor in chief, has a strong instinct for books that will please many people. He is partial to good solid Americana, to light, subtle humor, to distinguished biography, or to well authenticated readable books which convey important information of help to the general reader.

A good example of this last category is Herbert Bailey's new book, A Matter of Life or Death, dealing with aspects of cancer treatment which have aroused considerable opposition in some quarters. After careful investigation Putnam's published this title in the belief that it may turn out to be one of the most important books of our time. If you have any reason to be interested in cancer, get this book.

[From Argosy magazine of April 1958]

EDITOR'S NOTE.—A new book dealing with the highly controversial anticancer agent, Krebiozen, entitled A Matter of Life or Death, has recently hit the stalls. It is authored by Herbert Bailey, who also penned the article about Long John Nebel on page 24 of this issue. Bailey wrote the provocative pieces on Krebiozen for Argosy last summer.

[From the Chicago Sunday American of May 25, 1958]

NEW WORK REVIEWS KREBIOZEN PROGRESS

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey)

(Reviewed by Effie Alley)

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the University of Illinois' internationally known physiologist, continues to plug away at research on the controversial cancer drug, Krebiozen.

And medical writer Herb Bailey continues to plug away at the American Medical Association for what he alleges are its persecutions of Dr. Ivy and efforts to suppress the drug.

In his new book A Matter of Life and Death he summarizes the material previously presented in his 1955 publication Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? and brings the reader up to date on Dr. Ivy's later researches.

Among these is Ivy's new production of what he claims is Krebiozen, accomplished during 1956. Using basically the same methods as Dr. Stevan Durovic, the drug's discoverer, Ivy succeeded in obtaining from 40 horses miniscule amounts of a substance

which Bailey reports had the same anticancer effects as the original Krebiozen.

As to the latter, Bailey presents new statistics on patients treated with the drug. All, he says, were in the hopeless stage of the disease and had previously exhausted benefits to be gained by other forms of treatment, he says.

Included are terminal cases of cancer of the stomach, bladder, breast and colon and one case of widespread melanoma or "black cancer."

The latter patent was reported by her physician to have been "failing rapidly," with a life-expectancy of 2 to 3 months in August 1951, when Krebiozen treatment was started.

As of 1957 with no other treatment, Bailey says, the same doctor reported her well and with "no evidence of cancer." The doctor is said to have commented:

"I have never seen a 'cure' of malignant melanoma by any method of treatment. This one is miraculous and surpasses all understanding.

According to another report quoted by Bailey, eight ampules of Krebiozen brought complete disappearance of widespread cancer of the stomach as proved by exploratory operations before and after treatment. The patient was alive and symptom-free 3 years later, the report states.

A bedridden, terminal patient with cancer of the bladder who weighed only 90 pounds when Krebiozen treatment was begun in 1951, is reported well and with no sign of tumor as of 1957.

These are among the cases cited by Bailey among the 1,000 treated with Krebiozen.

Such results doubtless account for Dr. Ivy's recent proposal that the American Cancer Society sponsor a blind controlled test of the drug.

The society is now considering the proposal and it is to be hoped that it will undertake the project since on the face of the claims made for it—and claims made by a man of Dr. Ivy's stature in science cannot be ignored—Krebiozen would seem to be well worth investigating.

[From the Hollister (Calif.) Free Lance Hacienda of April 1958]

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

(By Herbert Bailey)

Cancer and its cures has been a hotly contested subject for decades. Countless cures have sprung up from time to time only to be proven valueless after extensive investigation. Now, Herbert Bailey, a medical writer but not a medical doctor has published a book about the drug, Krebiozen, that he claims has cured cancer in many dying victims of the disease. He produces evidence that he says proves that 50 percent of 1,800 patients treated with this wonder drug have been helped and in many cases have been entirely cured.

To the layman reader Mr. Bailey presents a convincing argument, but the American Medical Association and the American Cancer Society are far from convinced. The AMA, after an intensive investigation in 1951, found the treatment of no value. However, Mr. Bailey presents evidence from many leading recognized scientists that seems to back up his claim.

To us, this sort of thing is always dangerous for it gives hope when often hope should not be given. Naturally, anyone who has cancer and knows it, will reach for any straw that is offered, and this false hope is what the AMA is fighting.

Bailey calls for congressional investigation complaining that the AMA has suppressed information concerning the drug and he quotes Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, a highly respected scientist and head of the Department of Clinical Sciences at the University of Illinois Medical School as proof that Krebiozen has done wonders in the treatment of the disease.

With 800,000 cancer patients in these United States, Mr. Bailey has a tremendous potential reading public. Without question the American Medical Association will have to change its views of "no comment," for it must either back the claims for the drug or completely repudiate them. Cancer is one of leading killers in the Nation today. The public is vastly interested in any supposed cure. Krebiozen must either be accepted or rejected after Mr. Bailey's A Matter of Life or Death. This is indeed an intriguing book and Mr. Bailey has produced a book of national interest.

[From the Westport (Conn.) Town Crier of May 8, 1958]

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

(By Herbert Bailey)

This is a new edition of Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? revised and brought up to date, and reissued by a publisher with greater facilities for distribution than the publisher of the first edition. Just as the book appeared, a news story in the New York Times announced that the American Cancer Society was seriously considering a new and more extensive test of this anticancer chemical, krebiozen, than any that has been conducted to date. The book itself is still as forcefully written as the earlier edition and the story it tells more dramatically than most novels. The new material includes references to one case that occurred here in Westport, among Mr. Bailey's neighbors; he, himself, is a resident of Norwalk. We hope that the new edition will give this important book the wide distribution it deserves, though we are aware of a certain irony in the fact that, while one part of our society works so hard to find a cancer cure, another part of our society is busy making bombs with carcinogen fallout on such a scale that the whole business of a cure may become purely academic.

[From the Ontario (Canada) St. Catherines Standard of April 19, 1958]

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

The sensational "pro" side of the long-continuing controversy over krebiozen, a chemical substance used in treatment of cancer, is minutely detailed in A Matter of Life or Death by Herbert Bailey.

Bailey leaves no doubt that he is a Krebiozen partisan and of his conviction that it has helped and even cured victims of cancer. He charges that certain officials of the American Medical Association conspired against Krebiozen and asks for a congressional investigation of the AMA.

This charge was made first because the Illinois Legislative Commission which investigated the Krebiozen controversy in 1953 and 1954. It was the basis of Bailey's first book on the subject Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? published in 1955. It is the basis of his second book which also includes charges made against some medical men and medical organizations since by Krebiozen proponents. Bailey reports on the treatment of 1,500 far-advanced cancer patients by more than 200 physicians, all members of the American Medical Association. He says Krebiozen showed favorable results in half these patients.

Bailey formerly was a reporter who worked for newspapers in North Carolina, Nashville, and Chicago. He now writes for magazines.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal of April 27, 1958]

BOOK SHELF—ANGRY WRITER HITS CANCER DRUG "PLOT"

(By Margot Jackson)

Has an arrestant, a pain-reliever, perhaps a cure for cancer, been developed? Is it being withheld from the public by a powerful group of proud men because they could not cut themselves in on the honors and/or money that might accrue?

Such are the charges made in A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey, a newspaperman and a medical writer.

He revives the furor of a few years ago over krebiozen. His book details the theme that certain Chicago businessmen and some top medicos of the American Medical Association (AMA) have joined forces to thwart its testing, development, and use.

A Matter of Life and Death reads like a fantastic and complex scheme of greed and power. Yet it is full of names and addresses, quotes testimony before investigating groups, names dates, and publications.

Krebiozen was developed by a Yugoslav doctor, Stefan Durovic, who came to the United States on a visitor's visa from Argentina. He had tested a cancer arrestant on animals. He wanted facilities for further testing and so sought out the head of the School of Medicine at the University of Illinois, Dr. Andrew Ivy.

Bailey comments that usually a new hope, an untried drug, comes from a well-known pharmaceutical house.

He characterizes Dr. Ivy as a thoughtful, hopeful researcher who did not believe that wisdom, genius, and science were prerogatives only of the established.

Anyway, Dr. Ivy helped the foreign doctor with his testing—even though, again contrary to custom, he did not himself know the complete process by which krebiozen was extracted.

The patients responded surprisingly well, says this book. The wonder news spread to some Chicago businessmen, who promptly, insistently, demanded they be sold full rights to distribute krebiozen.

The Yugoslav doctor refused—for scientific and personal reasons—and a vast plot began, Bailey charges, against him and against the drug.

When Dr. Ivy invited selected medical writers to a cautious showing of the drug, says Bailey, a sensational news release was distributed before his quiet meeting began. Dr. Ivy still does not know who wrote this, Bailey charges, but it made such fantastic claims that Dr. Ivy was promptly suspended "for unethical practices" by the AMA.

He explains for the layman that doctors are not supposed to sponsor drugs. He also says there is a tradition that a drug is not properly introduced until the Journal of the AMA has presented it.

Shortly after this, the Journal published reports from doctors who said they'd used Krebiozen, Bailey writes. Yet his research, through the Krebiozen foundation, shows that the doctors signing had not requested sufficient dosage of the drug to treat a patient, let alone make a worthwhile testing.

Case histories favoring Krebiozen were not printed, Bailey says.

Another episode is more bizarre. There are a couple of chapters here, full of quotes and testimony, involving an alleged attempt to bribe a South American businessman so that Dr. Durovic's visa would be invalidated and his drug turned over to other parties—those same Chicago businessmen who originally wanted it, says Bailey.

Perhaps Bailey's strongest charge is that the AMA officials ignored an invitation from Dr. Ivy that both parties cooperate on a definite test.

Bailey's anger is intense, but his material is written clearly despite the complexities of the actions he describes. He wants science to be free from greed or vanity. He knows the public is the loser when it is not.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press of April 10, 1958]

CLAIMS OF AUTHOR ARE CONTROVERSIAL

(By Bish Thompson)

It's fantastic to consider that there may be even now an effective anticancer agent.

Herbert Bailey insists it is not fantastic at all. The astounding fact in his mind is that

this agent, called Krebiozen, has been frowned upon, suppressed, and even falsified against by the medical profession.

In a scathing denunciation of certain high officials of the AMA, Mr. Bailey calls for a congressional investigation of that organization.

"The fact that millions of persons the world over have died, and are dying, of cancer—when they may have been saved—is reason enough," the writer asserts, "but just as important is that such a thing could happen in our country."

Certainly his book, A Matter of Life or Death, makes a stout bid to become the most controversial volume of the year. Such shocking accusations as it contains, cannot help but create a verbal riot.

After a study of 6 years, Mr. Bailey presents his findings and conclusions. He traces the struggles of the discoverers and testers of Krebiozen since 1949. He offers documentary proof of actual suppression of the facts by AMA officials.

He builds an impressive case for Krebiozen and against AMA. It is disturbing, to say the least, to think there may be something in what he says. Because it is indeed "a matter of life and death." It is hoped the charges he makes will be either refuted by evidence to the contrary or carried into a further investigation of the case.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of May 11, 1958]

BATTLE OVER CANCER CLAIMS STILL RAGES HOTLY

(A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey; There is an Answer to Cancer, by Leonard B. Goldman)

The sensational pro side of the long-continuing controversy over Krebiozen, a chemical substance used in treatment of cancer, is minutely detailed in A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey.

Bailey leaves no doubt that he is a Krebiozen partisan and of his conviction that it has helped and even cured victims of cancer. He charges that certain officials of the American Medical Association conspired against Krebiozen and asks for a congressional investigation of the AMA.

This charge was made first before the Illinois State legislative commission which investigated the Krebiozen controversy in 1953 and 1954. It was the basis of Bailey's first book on the subject, Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? published in 1955.

It is the basis of his second book which also includes charges made since against some medical men and medical organizations by Krebiozen proponents.

Bailey reports on the treatment of 1,500 far advanced cancer patients by more than 200 physicians, all members of the American Medical Association. He says Krebiozen showed favorable results in half these patients.

Bailey formerly was a reporter who worked for newspapers in North Carolina, Nashville, and Chicago. He now writes for magazines.

DR. GOLDMAN'S BOOK

There is no controversial matter in Dr. Goldman's book, There Is an Answer to Cancer. Asserting that factual information about the causes, prevention, and treatment is the best answer to this baffling killer, Dr. Goldman attempts to reply to such questions as:

What are the latest findings in cancer research?

What steps can you take to minimize its dangers to you and your family?

In popular vein he then goes on to describe in detail the most common forms of cancer, the parts of the body most vulnerable to attack, and the different methods of attacking the disease. One of these notably is a byproduct of the atomic reactor, particularly in diagnosis and treatment.

Dr. Goldman has been a practicing cancer specialist for 25 years and is now clinical professor in radiotherapy at New York Medical College.

[From the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour of April 29, 1958]

HAVE INTEREST IN NEW BOOK

Herbert Bailey, of Saugatuck Shores, is the author of a new book, A Matter of Life or Death, published by G. P. Putnam & Sons, of New York City. The story deals with a new drug, Krebiozen, an agent used to treat cancer. David M. Kasson of Ellery Lane, Westport, president of a Brooklyn, N. Y., electronics firm, is mentioned in the book as one who was treated with the drug.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of May 18, 1958]

WRITER DISCUSSES ANTICANCER AGENT

The account of the discovery and development of what is said to be an effective anticancer agent, Krebiozen, and the courageous fight of the discoverers and their allies for its acceptance, is the subject of the aptly titled book A Matter of Life or Death, by Herbert Bailey. In a scathing denunciation of certain high officials of the AMA, who he maintains have falsified and suppressed favorable evidence of the anticancer substance, Krebiozen, the author calls for a congressional investigation of the AMA.

"The fact that millions of persons the world over have died, and are dying, of cancer—when they may have been saved—is reason enough," he asserts, "but just as important is that such a thing could happen in our country."

Bailey, author of numerous medical articles, has spent the past 6 years accumulating evidence, both pro and con, and now presents in A Matter of Life or Death his claims of Krebiozen's efficiency, which he feels is so overwhelming it can no longer be challenged. He charges actual suppression of the facts by various officials of the AMA.

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Gazette of May 3, 1958]

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH

(By Herbert Bailey)

Reputable publishers like Putnam's always have controversial books like this one checked very carefully for possible libel suits and the fact that they allowed Herbert Bailey to make the statements he does must mean they believe the book is true. For this in a book about Krebiozen, a drug which has been used as a cure for cancer during the last 6 years but which has been attacked by the American Medical Association.

Herbert Bailey gives the history of development of Krebiozen, the attacks against it, and the records of the cures which have been made through its use. He documents all the claims he makes for Krebiozen, its discoverer, Dr. Steven Durovic of Yugoslavia, and one of its leading sponsors in this country, the eminent scientist, Dr. Andrew Ivy, and the story he tells of the persecution they were subjected to is not a pretty one.

As he suggests, some action should be taken immediately to either approve Krebiozen or prove it worthless. And, as long as they can show the number of cures they do, it should be approved.

[From the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of June 1, 1958]

CANCER CURE?—EX-ATLANTIAN PENS INDICTMENT OF AMA

(By Sam F. Lucchese)

(A Matter of Life or Death)

Subtitled "The Incredible Story of Krebiozen," this book, by a former Atlantan, is an angry indictment of the American Medical Association, which has refused to accept the drug Krebiozen for cancer treatment.

Herbert Bailey, a southern newspaperman who was at one time promotion manager for defunct radio station WCON, makes out a dramatic case for the drug, citing miraculous results and cures in cancer cases.

Krebiozen was developed by a Yugoslavian, Dr. Steven Durovich, and is derived from horse blood.

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, professor of physiology and vice president of the University of Chicago, became interested in the drug and a subsequent hassle ensued. Dr. Ivy was dropped as vice president and Dr. George D. Stoddard resigned as president of the University of Illinois. Dr. Ivy was suspended by the Chicago Medical Society and the AMA board found itself in the middle of the violent controversy.

Herbert Bailey does not pretend to be unbiased as he tells the story of Krebiozen and the squabble that has raged around it for the last 6 years. He presents documentary evidence of the drug's positive effects on 50 percent of the "hopeless" patients treated with it. He says that "several doctors" in Atlanta are using it successfully.

Krebiozen is thought to regulate cell growth. This is his second book on the mystery drug. The first, K—Krebiozen—Key to Cancer? was published in 1955.

In view of the documented "testimony" presented by Bailey, it would seem that the Krebiozen controversy should be easy to settle. If it is as successful as Bailey claims it is, the AMA and the American Cancer Society should give it the green light. If it isn't—and tests could prove it—then it should be repudiated officially.

If Krebiozen can forestall cancer, the killer, or even minimize the pain that afflicts the sufferer, it deserves the wider use acceptance would assure it.

Meanwhile, if something isn't done, Bailey if apt to get the congressional investigation he clamors for in this book.

A Matter of Life or Death was favorably discussed over Ray Henley's Three-Star Extra (NBC); Henry P. Morgan's News (ABC); Long John Nebel's Party Line (WOR and Mutual network); Dr. Carlton Frederick's Living Should Be Fun (WOR); Norman Ross Show (WBKB–TV, Chicago).

Forthcoming: favorable mention in Saturday Review (Trade Winds); Mike Wallace interview in the New York Post.

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said here by those of us who favor the bill now pending in the House of Representatives, to give a much needed increase in benefits to some of our senior citizens.

In the past I have supported legislation to liberalize the Social Security Act, and I feel that this legislation now before us deserves our favorable consid-

eration and attention. With the tremendous increase in the cost of living over the past years our elder citizens have, to a great extent, exhausted what little savings they might have had, and have been forced to exist solely on pensions or annuities for which they might have been eligible, on the benefits they have been receiving through the Social Security Act, or on public welfare. When you realize what the maximum benefits payable under the Social Security Act amount to, the very fact that they can exist on such a sum, or even less, is quite remarkable.

During the last Congress, and earlier this year I introduced legislation which would remove the present limitation of $1,200 per annum on outside income that can be earned by those who are recipients of social security; which would make full social security benefits payable to men at the age of 60, and to women at the age of 55; and which would eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 before he is eligible to receive disability insurance benefits. Unfortunately, none of these provisions has been incorporated in this current bill, but there are certain other benefits and protections now offered to the many citizens for whom the system was originally designed. For that reason, I shall be happy to support the bill. I am hopeful that further consideration will be given these provisions called for in my bill, possibly during the next Congress after the Advisory Commission on Social Security has completed its study of the social security program and has had an opportunity to report to the Congress in 1959.

I have said before, and I shall say it again, the welfare of all our citizens, whether they are young or old, able or disabled, should be of utmost concern to us all. We should continue our efforts to improve and liberalize the existing system, and to correct any inequities which might be revealed.

I shall be happy to pledge myself to work for the continued improvement of the social-security system.

Tribute to Wisconsin Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the July 1958 issue of the Wisconsin Alumnus magazine, official publication of the Wisconsin Alumni Association, whose able executive director is Mr. John Berge, a most interesting article in tribute to a particular group of faculty members.

These particular professors and instructors are the honored individuals who have devoted literally decades to teaching at the university and who are retiring this year.

In reading the brief tributes which have been paid to each of these faculty members, one is impressed by several facts:

(a) The outstanding caliber of the individuals, themselves. How fortunate it is, I say that the university has been blessed with their services.

(b) The breathtaking way in which these members of the teaching staff have not only served the university, but have served the State of Wisconsin, as a whole. This is, of course, part and parcel of the university's entire concept of serving all of the people of the entire State; and not simply the cause of higher education.

(c) The inspiring way in which these dedicated individuals have carried their vocational talents and skills into what might be considered in other States almost extracurricular activities but which, in our State and our university, are part of the whole career of whole leaders.

These faculty members have been pacemakers. Their names stand out in the ranks of the teaching profession in the 48 States. Many of their names have become bywords in texts which they have written; in organizations which they have served.

They represent a vast number of man-years and woman-years in the devoted service to the cause of education and of our American system, as a whole.

I congratulate these faculty members for all that they have meant and all that they have done on behalf of the university and of my State.

We need more members of the teaching profession like them. There are few, if any, professions more noble than that of teaching.

In singling out these individuals we honor them for what they symbolize in the faculty of other institutions of learning across the land.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Wisconsin Alumnus article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WISCONSIN ALUMNUS SALUTES RETIRING FACULTY MEMBERS OF 1958

(These statements are not intended to be complete biographies. But they do express the sincere and personal feelings of friends and colleagues, prepared especially for the alumnus.)

William H. Liesch, director, bureau of high school courses extension. The retirement of William H. Liesch closes an effective service of nearly 4 decades for the promotion of education through university extension programs. Joining the staff at Milwaukee in 1919, he was given a field organizer's status the next year at Oshkosh, where he served a large populous area until called to the Madison headquarters in 1942 to direct the program of extension courses for high-school students. In evaluation of total results of this program, it may be said that large progress has been made in the acquirement of credits and proficiencies by countless young people in our high schools. The large yearly increase in enrollments and known benefits are one index of a program that few States can equal, none surpass. Mr. Liesch has given this undertaking the assiduity and energy that have brought about its still growing reputation so widely creditable to the University of Wisconsin.

Alma L. Bridgman, executive secretary and instructor, economics. For 37 years Alma Bridgman, more than anyone else, has personified the economics department for our graduate students, both American and foreign. She has been concerned with the personal and educational problems of them all. And those who studied economics as undergraduates remember her, too—some for her stimulating quiz sections in 1a and b, others in the main economics office where so many came to her with their problems and were encouraged by her to high standards of performance. In the UW economics department since 1921, and its executive secretary since 1927, her familiarity with the complex university organization and her personal contacts with so many campus personalities have been of immeasurable value to the department and its successive chairmen. By her example she has helped us all to put the interests of students and of the university above personal or even departmental aims or ambitions. For years to come we shall do well to test many of our departmental decisions by asking the question: "Would Alma approve?"

Arthur R. Albert, associate professor, soils. "A. R." devoted 37 years of outstanding service to the improvement of soil management through research. Most of this work was carried out in various parts of the State on the branch experiment stations where farmers came to him with their problems. He designed and constructed the first cultpacker seeder for sowing grass seed, and is widely known in the sandy areas of the State as the best-informed man on management of sandy soils. His work showed the great importance of lime and fertilizer, and, in some cases, irrigation, in the efficient production of farm and vegetable crops. He was a pioneer in the use of shelter belts to protect crops and soil from blowing sand. His cordial manner, enthusiasm, and willingness to lend a helping hand have won the affection of all who come to know him.

Harlan Seyforth, assistant professor, agriculture extension. A certificate of distinguished service from the National Agricultural Agents Association is an indication of the respect for Harlan G. Seyforth after 37 years' service as Pierce County agricultural agent. He has been a driving force behind adoption of many improved farm practices. He started the first 4–H Club program in the county and has helped its growth from 82 members in 1921 to over 500 in 1958. He also started the first homemaker program in Pierce County. Mr. Seyforth received certificate of merit awards from the Wisconsin Extension Workers Association in 1937 and 1946. In 1945 he received a citation from Epsilon Sigma Phi, national extension fraternity. He served as regional director of the National County Agents Association and was secretary of the Wisconsin County Agents Association for 10 years. In spite of these and many other activities, he never failed to find time to render services when needed. His many friends are grateful for his contributions to agriculture and his willingness to work for the betterment of rural life.

Philip H. Person, professor, sociology and anthropology. Phil Person has served his university and the Milwaukee community as teacher, scholar and dedicated citizen for 27 years. He was attracted to Wisconsin for his graduate work by the university's dedication to academic freedom and the informed liberalism of Ross, Gillin, Ely, and Commons. As charter founder and president of the International Institute of Milwaukee for 12 years, organizer and first president of the Milwaukee chapter of American Civil Liber-

ties Union, and member of many committees of the community fund, he helped to give substance to the Wisconsin idea. As scholar, he compiled many ecological maps of Milwaukee. As teacher, he has helped generations of students to see their world in the light of sociology. To his friends he embodies the best in the legacy of Wisconsin progressivism.

Alanson H. Edgerton, professor, education. "Lon" Edgerton came to the University of Wisconsin 30 years ago after taking 3 degrees at Columbia and holding positions in New York, Michigan, Indiana and the Canal Zone. In his 34 years here his writing and teaching have resulted in national recognition which was recognized in his election to the office of president of the National Vocational Guidance Association. His services to the State included many years as an adviser in employee selection and classification. Space does not permit elaboration of all his accomplishments in research, teaching and writing, but special mention must be made of his willingness to spend endless hours in counseling with individuals. In this process he has truly practiced what he has taught about the importance of concern for the individual.

William D. Stovall, director, State laboratory of hygiene and professor, clinical pathology. The hygienic laboratory to which "Bill" Stovall came in 1914 was examining some 7,000 specimens annually with a staff of about 6. From that meager operation he has built for the State board of health and the people of Wisconsin a laboratory service whose staff of 90 examines over half a million specimens annually, and which is unexcelled anywhere in the world. In the field of cancer control he has been a leader among physicians, and has fostered the citizen's activities of the American Cancer Society. His untiring efforts with the medical societies as a speaker, adviser, and friendly counselor in medical problems has endeared him to the medical profession throughout the State. He has lived his motto "example is better than precept" by spending many hours through the years at the laboratory bench and microscope with other workers, to give the physician a laboratory service so vital to the treatment of his patient. He has been an inspiring teacher to the many medical students and nurses through the years. In medical and sanitary laboratory service he has made the boundaries of the university the boundaries of the State.

Blanche L. Lee, professor and assistant agricultural extension director. Doubling in size of the home demonstration program in the 22 years Blanche L. Lee has served as leader of home economics extension work in Wisconsin is only one indication of the real change she's brought about. Today's program now extends to 69 counties (this figure contrasts with 19 in 1936), and shows great change of emphasis. In 1936, making clothing and feeding the family was a large part of homemaker training. Today, State specialists and county home agents train, too, in the field of child development, family economics, housing, home management and consumer marketing, study of government, health, and safety programs. Influenced by Miss Lee's interest in the development of people, Wisconsin women now carry out their own programs of scholarships, youth work, and international understanding through county home demonstration councils. This interest, coupled with her respect for her county and State staff, her leadership, fairness, and friendliness, has been responsible for the development of today's strong program.

George F. Baumeister, associate professor, agricultural extension. George F. Baumeister has been an outstanding leader in development of dairy organizations, farm cooperatives and other special agricultural programs in Wisconsin. He led organization of the largest direct-number dairy breeding association in the United States and also Wisconsin's largest milk marketing cooperative. Mr. Baumeister entered Wisconsin extension work as Shawano County agent in 1929. His continuous efforts to develop capacities and interests of people in his county have made Shawano County outstanding in farm leadership, particularly in cooperatives. In 1942, his appointment as district county agent leader brought Mr. Baumeister in contact with extension workers throughout Wisconsin. He assisted in formation of the Pacemaker Corn Club to promote adoption of improved practices in corn production. He cooperated in development of procedures for getting farmers to raise alfalfa in north central Wisconsin areas where it had practically gone out of production. These are but a few of his many contributions to Wisconsin farmers. George Baumeister's influence on farm practices will benefit Wisconsin agriculture for many years to come.

Cornelius C. Janzen, professor, economics. Cornelius C. Janzen is a recognized pioneer in economics education. His dictionary of terms in economics was the first such book to be published in the United States; he has devoted 39 years to the teaching of economics, the last 29 of which were to the State of Wisconsin in the former State college in Milwaukee and later the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; he served as head of his department in the State college for 26 years. The unpredictable quality of life, as he calls it, has led him to have an insatiable curiosity about the behavior of people. His extensive knowledge about the economic behavior of individuals has made his teaching unusually interesting and stimulating to students.

Charles L. Fluke, professor, entomology. A versatile, mild-mannered person who may well be called a Father of Entomology Teaching in Wisconsin, Charles L. Fluke has distinguished himself well within his profession and by his teachings. He has attracted to the field of entomology the enthusiasm and interest of many students who enrolled in his classes, and the effectiveness of his teaching has brought to him the reward of having been one of the best instructors on the campus of the college of agriculture. Many technical papers on the taxonomy of Syrphidae have been published by Dr. Fluke and at the present time he is considered a world authority on this important insect group.

Robert Nohr, professor, director, physical education for men. Robert Nohr has devoted the past 32 years to teaching hundreds of Wisconsin students the fine points of physical education and athletic coaching. He has served as director of the men's professional course in physical education since 1945. During his administration, the department has continued to grow and expand while maintaining a healthy relationship and balance between the learning of physical skill activities and academic studies. Now, in Florida, Bob will indulge in his favorite pastimes of fishing, golf, and gardening the year around.

Ernest V. Ryall, assistant professor, agriculture extension. Ernest V. Ryall has been named the dean of county agents, by the National Director of Agricultural Extension, C. M. Ferguson. Ernie, as he is called by his many friends, has served agriculture in Wisconsin for 37 years, 31 of those years as agent in Kenosha County. He is the only Wisconsin county agent to receive the Superior Service Award of the United States Department of Agriculture. Ernie has been instrumental in working for adequate extension retirement systems throughout the Nation. His efforts made it possible for all extension workers on a Federal appointment to benefit from the Federal retirement program. He has served on committees of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents for many years, as well as the State association. He has always had an interest in professional improvement and worked in establishing some of the first summer agricultural extension courses. Extension workers all over the Nation hold him in high esteem.

Selma S. König, assistant professor, German extension. Selma S. König became a member of the university faculty in 1946 and has since that time taught German at Racine and Kenosha. In this capacity, she has introduced many a student not only to the German language but also to German culture, for she is a firm believer in the precept that a language cannot be learned in a vacuum. Her students will long remember her for the thoroughness of the training she imparted to them, a thoroughness that stands them in good stead both in their knowledge of German and in their general approach to the tasks of life.

John H. Kolb, professor, rural sociology. John Harrison Kolb is internationally known for his research on Wisconsin rural communities and neighborhoods. Born on a farm near Berlin, Wis., on April 18, 1888, he took his doctor of philosophy degree from Wisconsin in 1921. He organized the department of rural sociology in 1930, serving as its chairman for almost 25 years, and his reputation as scholar and teacher has attracted many graduate students. Over the years he trained more doctors of philosophy than any other rural sociologist in the world. Generations of students will testify that he was also a superb undergraduate teacher. His contributions to the improvement of rural life in the State, through community and neighborhood organization, school reorganization, and the cultural arts, will be a lasting influence. On a number of occasions he has been called upon by Federal and international agencies. His colleagues at the university will miss his energetic and insightful leadership as much as his warm and friendly companionship.

Chester Allen, director, special service correspondence study. A dedicated exponent of the concept of adult education in many phases, Chester Allen has devoted nearly five decades to the cause of learning for the out-of-school citizenry. His introduction to the university extension division was in 1910; from that start in Milwaukee his service led to the Oshkosh office and to Appleton, and in 1926, to Madison, where he was called to administer the farflung extension field services in the State. Among the programs he administered most effectively were the courses of study for inmates in the State's correctional institutions and the division's efforts to protect individuals from ill advised enrollments in shady commercial correspondence schools. His direction of the statewide field work in its many ramifications has, however, constituted his major accomplishment toward extension's highest vocational and cultural aims.

The Grain Processing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday approved H. R. 13268, relating to the Government's grain processing program. Several of my colleagues have expressed strong interest in this program, so I include with these remarks information from the Depart-

ment of Agriculture on the donations both here at home and overseas.

H. R. 13268, as approved by the House, does not begin any new program. It is aimed at improving and simplifying the existing operations of the Department. This bill authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation — CCC — when it deems advisable, to purchase wheat flour and cornmeal for donation purposes, rather than entering into a contract to have flour and cornmeal milled from grain in the CCC inventory. It also authorizes CCC to sell an equivalent amount of wheat and corn to offset purchases of flour and cornmeal.

Thus the grain donation program would continue with an improved method of operation and with some saving to the Government.

The need for this legislation is apparent from the statement presented to the House by the Department of Agriculture and from the hearings by the House Committee on Agriculture. I refer you to the committee's report for detail on the grain processing program.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture started its grain processing program following the passage of Public Law 311 in the 84th Congress in 1955. The House Agriculture Committee reported in May of 1955, H. R. 2851, a bill that I introduced to give authority for the processing of surplus grain into a form suitable for home or institution, and for donation to needy persons. The House approved this bill on May 25, 1955, by the overwhelming vote of 344 yeas to 1 nay.

Final congressional approval of this processing authority came later in the year, and the President signed an amended version of H. R. 2851 on August 9, 1955.

Support of this 1955 legislation for processing and donation of wheat flour and cornmeal came from many Members of the House and Senate with high unemployment in their areas, especially in the coalfields of the Nation. The purpose, essentially, was to make bread available to the many thousands of unemployed who were receiving surplus food commodities.

Public Law 311 provided for a 2-year program. In 1956, Public Law 540—the omnibus farm bill of that year—was approved by the Congress. Included in this law was a provision to make the processing authority permanent. Since the passage of Public Law 540, the program has continued to make wheat flour and cornmeal available to domestic outlets in all 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and to nonprofit voluntary welfare agencies at east, gulf, west coast, and Great Lakes ports for export to needy persons in foreign countries.

The importance of this donation program to those areas of the Nation with substantial unemployment is great. Many of my colleagues advise me of the need for these processed grain products, and it is essential to the welfare of many thousands of persons that we continue these operations. Of course, donation of our surplus grains to those in need is as important part of the surplus disposal program.

The Department of Agriculture has provided the following information on the domestic and foreign donations of cornmeal and wheat flour for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958:

[In thousands of pounds]

Fiscal year	Cornmeal	Flour
DOMESTIC		
1956	50,560	77,051
1957	117,060	243,693
1958 (preliminary)	120,000	270,000
Total	287,620	590,744
FOREIGN		
1956		
1957	268,229	528,179
1958 (preliminary)	299,200	776,300
Total	567,429	1,304,479

I also include the following tabulation, by State, of domestic donations for fiscal year 1958. These are preliminary totals of the Department of Agriculture and may be subject to some revision, but they give a good estimate of the program in the past 12 months:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Quantity of surplus cornmeal and wheat flour distributed to domestic outlets, fiscal year 1958 (preliminary)

[In thousands of pounds]

	Cornmeal	Flour
Alabama	5,155	9,993
Arizona	229	1,273
Arkansas	7,329	14,108
California	1,745	10,233
Colorado	227	2,508
Connecticut	145	1,708
Delaware	54	404
District of Columbia	554	1,517
Florida	762	3,375
Georgia	2,404	5,200
Idaho	38	473
Illinois	2,280	7,658
Indiana	2,139	3,399
Iowa	1,566	4,470
Kansas	264	2,912
Kentucky	7,312	9,248
Louisiana	7,590	11,059
Maine	375	1,506
Maryland	345	960
Massachusetts	248	2,430
Michigan	5,690	14,886
Minnesota	40	3,276
Mississippi	16,788	25,204
Missouri	2,420	5,513
Montana	87	649
Nebraska	42	1,434
Nevada	11	80
New Hampshire	90	977
New Jersey	295	3,806
New Mexico	808	2,087
New York	1,736	17,468
North Carolina	1,199	3,409
North Dakota	301	1,778
Ohio	572	3,027
Oklahoma	8,902	14,312
Oregon	183	1,292
Pennsylvania	5,479	22,761
Rhode Island	103	836
South Carolina	778	2,770
South Dakota	1,203	3,643
Tennessee	8,939	11,356
Texas	5,054	8,986
Utah	374	2,681
Vermont	95	599
Virginia	2,223	4,547
Washington	275	2,084
West Virginia	6,191	11,550
Wisconsin	518	3,461
Wyoming	217	525
Total continental United States	111,374	269,431
Alaska	27	137
Hawaii		239
Puerto Rico	8,587	
Virgin Islands	12	
Guam		3
Trust territories		190
Total United States and Territories	120,000	270,000

Mr. Speaker, the grain processing program has been of tremendous help to the needy people of the Nation; it has enabled the school-lunch program to receive needed supplies of processed grain; it has been utilized in aid to charitable institutions; it has helped our friends overseas; it has made a significant contribution to the farm program by using surplus stocks of grain.

The legislation now being considered by the Congress will serve to eliminate difficulties being encountered by the Department of Agriculture and, in effect, help to meet the objectives of the donation program.

Principle Sound, Details Negotiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune of July 16, 1958, on the Trinity River partnership proposal:

PRINCIPLE SOUND, DETAILS NEGOTIABLE

If we accept the theory that private capital and private enterprise have a legitimate place in our economy, then the principle underlying the Trinity River partnership proposal is sound.

If, as some of its opponents charge, details of the proposed contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. are not in the public interest, then the thing to do is to seek a revision of the contract—not to let the matter drop and commit more tax money to the powerplant.

In principle, the partnership proposal provides for the Federal Government to build the multipurpose Trinity Dam as part of California's great water program—a mammoth project not attractive to private capital but of such general benefit as to justify Uncle Sam's expenditure of tax money.

The power-creating potential of the water falling over the dam would be sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which offers to build a powerplant and distribute the power as a part of its business.

The opposition which killed the proposal as far as the present session of Congress is concerned fell into two general categories. There were the public power doctrinaires and there were those who, while agreeing with the partnership principle, criticized details of the Pacific Gas & Electric offer.

The former are dedicated to the policy of having all development of natural resources financed and controlled by the Government, regardless of efficiency and in spite of the dangers of growing bureaucracy. Many details of the Pacific Gas & Electric offer have come in for question or criticism. For instance, E. A. Heath, chief electrical engineer for the city of Palo Alto, takes issue with certain cost estimates on which Pacific Gas & Electric bases its proposed payment for falling water, and notes that the 50-year contract carries no provision for renegotiation if conditions change.

Confronted by a 2-foot-high stack of documents, opinions, arguments, and conflicting statements on the Pacific Gas & Electric proposal, we are in no position to agree or disagree on the specific points at issue. We

believe, however, that it is proper and should be profitable for the Federal Government to sell the falling water potential to the utility.

We believe that a further effort should be made to meet the objections of those who accepted the plan in principle but opposed certain contract terms. If this can be done, then new legislation can be introduced at the next session of Congress.

If it cannot be done, then it will apparently be necessary for the Federal Government to commit additional millions to the project and further extend its control over our economy.

Two Democrats View the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the second session of this Congress has heard many pronouncements of gloom about our economy. Despite the prophets of gloom, the economic situation throughout the Nation is better and the upturn is more apparent daily.

It is interesting to read of the differences of opinion on this subject which two of my colleagues across the aisle in the Senate hold. The editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of July 31 is quoted:

TWO DEMOCRATS VIEW THE ECONOMY

Two prominent Democrats felt the country's economic pulse over the weekend and came up with conflicting diagnoses. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a conservative who believes in economy and sound money, was alarmed at what he called the seeds of a terrific inflation." Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a liberal who believes there is nothing that a little Government cash won't cure, found a distinct improvement in the outlook.

For Senator DOUGLAS to be able to look ahead and not see a depression is indeed a novelty. In fact his very optimism is perhaps the most convincing justification for Senator BYRD's pessimism. Senator DOUGLAS' forebodings became the gloomiest when, after the Republican victory in 1952, the galloping inflation of the Democrats was slowed to a walk. If the outlook is pleasing even to Senator DOUGLAS, an inflation of large proportions may be in prospect.

There are a good many other signs that Senator BYRD is right. In order to make up its deficit of about $10 billion a year, the Government has asked for an increase in the debt limit and is going to have to borrow more money. By the end of the year, its refunding operations and new borrowing will total about $33 billion. Large Government borrowing is an accepted prelude to inflation. The Government spending in itself—aggravated now by the Middle East crisis—tends toward inflation.

Senator BYRD sees "no possibility of any tax reductions in the next 2 years and probably for a long time after that," and he sees no chance of balancing the budget for a long time.

With this prospect, it is hard to see how we can escape the inflation which beset us after World War II. The whole vicious circle of rising costs and prices will be on us again. As long as the Republicans do not seem to have a policy of their own to follow, they would do far better to follow the Democratic policies according to Senator BYRD than the Democratic policies according to Senator DOUGLAS.

Letter to Hon. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY G. HASKELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it an obligation, in order to keep the record straight, to place the following letter which I believe speaks for itself in the RECORD:

GROTON, CONN., *July 7, 1958.*

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

SIR: You have failed up to the present time to provide me with the name of the individual whom you quoted in your remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1958, as authority for your statement that General Short and I were not on speaking terms when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. I know that to be wholly false and believe I am entitled to the name of the person so testifying. Whether or not he testified under oath and his qualifications. Moreover, I would appreciate a definite reference to the hearing of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee if printed, and if not, a transcript of that part of the record to which you refer.

The receipt of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18 is acknowledged. It was forwarded without accompanying letter in a franked envelope bearing your name and I presume sent by your direction.

Your remarks are a continuation of the frantic efforts of the Roosevelt administration to divert attention from the failures in Washington and to place the blame for the catastrophe on the commanders at Pearl Harbor. Your account of the testimony that General Short and I were not on speaking terms given to your committee shortly after Pearl Harbor was effectively publicized, though 16 years later I am still denied the name of the individual who perpetrated this lie.

For 4 years, from 1941 to 1945, the administration supporters and gossip peddlers had a field day making statements which the wall of Government wartime secrecy prevented me from answering.

One of the most persistent and widespread was to the effect that General Short and I were not on speaking terms at the time of the attack. Another was that the uniformed services in Hawaii were all drunk when the attack came. This is the reason the Naval court of inquiry investigated these charges thoroughly and set forth their falsity in unmistakable language.

You still seek to sustain these charges by the simple expedient of attacking the integrity of the investigators and witnesses who reached conclusions or gave testimony which does not suit you.

You have slandered the honorable, capable, and devoted officers who served as members of the Army board of investigation and the Navy court of inquiry. You have also slandered the personnel of the Army and Navy stationed in Hawaii in 1941, many of whom gave their lives in defense of this country.

It is astounding to me that you should charge General Short and me of falsely testifying as to our personal and official cooperation even when as you phrase it "all but life itself depended on their convincing the world that they had been friends when they should have been friends."

The testimony on this matter, given before the Naval court of inquiry, was given under oath and was true to my personal knowledge and is substantiated by much other testimony.

You, yourself, refer to the statements in the Roberts report to the effect that General Short and I conferred on November 27, and December 1, 2, and 3. You further state from the Roberts report: "They did not then or subsequently hold any conferences specifically directed to the meaning and significance of the warning messages received by both" (General Short, Admiral Kimmel).

How ridiculous it is to assume that the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet is unable to understand a message sent by the Navy Department without conferring with the commanding general of the Hawaiian department to determine what the Navy Department meant by the messages that were sent to him and conversely that the commanding general, Hawaiian department, had to confer with the commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, in order for him to know what the messages sent to him by the War Department meant. If the messages were so worded the fault lay neither with me or General Short.

You imply that my request to revise the transcript of my testimony before the Roberts commission is censurable and completely ignore the published statement of Adm. William H. Standley, United States Navy, retired, a former Chief of Naval Operations and a member of the Roberts commission. He wrote regarding Admiral Kimmel: "He was permitted no counsel and had no right to ask questions or to cross-examine witnesses as he would have had if he had been made a defendant. Thus both Short and Kimmel were denied all of the usual rights accorded to American citizens appearing before judicial proceedings as interested parties." Even Communist plotting the overthrow of our country are accorded far more legal safeguards than were granted to me and General Short. Admiral Standley also wrote: "In spite of the known inefficiency of the commission's reporters, when Admiral Kimmel asked permission to correct his testimony in which he had found so many errors that it took him 2 days to go over it, the commission voted to keep the record as originally made although the answers recorded to many questions were obviously incorrect and many of them absurd. At my urgent insistences, the commission did finally authorize Admiral Kimmel's corrected testimony to be attached to the record as an addendum."

Your remarks with regard to the conduct of both officers and men on the evening preceding the Pearl Harbor attack is an insult to the gallant men who died in the treacherous Japanese attack and to all the members of both Army and Navy stationed on the Island of Oahu. Infrequently there might be an individual who overindulged in intoxicants but these were promptly apprehended by the shore patrol or military police and returned to their ship or station. The evidence as to the sobriety of officers and men was clear in the documentary evidence available to the investigation boards and yet in spite of their findings you state: "But the very fact that it was considered necessary to emphasize this testimony naturally gives rise to some doubt." You apparently are quite willing to doubt the testimony given and believe the worst of the fine young men in the Armed Forces that were stationed in Hawaii.

I was not permitted to know what testimony was presented to the Roberts Commission and was never given an opportunity to clarify or refute any statement made before it.

I was not made a defendant before the Hewitt one-man investigation, was not called to testify, and was not permitted to have any knowledge of the proceedings. I requested authority to attend this investiga-

tion and was advised that time did not permit. When I repeated my request the Secretary of the Navy did not even reply. Perhaps the reason may be found in the testimony of Captain Safford who narrated before the joint congressional committee the pressure to which he was subjected by the committee counsel to make him change his testimony. All did not have the strength of character of Captain Safford and some modified their preceding sworn statements.

Although I requested the joint congressional committee to call certain witnesses many of them were not called to testify. Among these was Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey, my senior fleet air officer at the time of the attack.

The Navy court of inquiry was the only investigation of Pearl Harbor before which I was permitted to cross-examine and call witnesses. You are substantially correct in your statement that this inquiry "found Admiral Kimmel as pure as the driven snow." In more moderate language expressed by Admiral Murfin, the president of the court, years later, "we found Admiral Kimmel had done everything possible under the circumstances."

On advice of counsel I declined to take part in the Hart investigation because the stipulations demanded of me would have placed my fate completely in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy. This I did regretfully because it was through my efforts that this investigation was initiated. The proceedings of the Hart investigation were a valuable contribution.

Why were the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War so anxious to have the damaging testimony in both the naval court of inquiry and the Army inquiry changed? The answer is very simple, both inquiries had found that the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster rested in large part at the headquarters of our Government in Washington. Admiral Standley, whom I have referred to above, wrote:

"From the beginning of our investigation I held a firm belief that the real responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbor was lodged many thousands of miles from the Territory of Hawaii."

Even the Hewitt investigation found:

"During his incumbency as commander in chief of Pacific Fleet, Admiral Kimmel was indefatigable, resourceful, and energetic in his efforts to prepare the fleet for war."

You refer to the information that had been forwarded to me and to General Short and specifically to a message based upon information from our Ambassador in Tokyo, Mr. Grew, dated January 27, 1941, to the effect that the Peruvian Ambassador in Tokyo had heard rumors that, in the event of trouble breaking out between the United States and Japan, the Japanese intended to make a surprise attack against Pearl Harbor; but you make no mention of the letter of the Chief of Naval Operations which forwarded this information to me on February 1, 1941, to the effect that "The Division of Naval Intelligence places no credence in these rumors. Furthermore, based upon known data regarding the present disposition and employment of Japanese Naval and Army forces no move against Pearl Harbor appears imminent or planned for the foreseeable future."

This estimate was never changed.

When you refer to "A position so admirably defended as Pearl Harbor with every facility, submarine nets, radar, sonar, planes, and ships of the line," you create a very false impression. Admiral Richardson was relieved because he so strongly held that the fleet should not be based in the Hawaiian area.

The Army antiaircraft batteries were woefully lacking but the War Department was unable to supply more.

Of 180 long-range bombing planes authorized by the War Department early in 1941 only 12 had arrived, and of these 6 were out of commission as they had been stripped of vital parts to enable other planes of similar type to continue their flight to their destination in the Philippines.

Of 100 Navy patrol planes authorized for the 14th Naval District at Pearl Harbor not 1 had arrived prior to December 7, 1941.

With regard to the radar installations, these had just been installed and their personnel were under training. The installation of these stations had been delayed due to the inability of the Army and the Interior Department to agree upon the location of these stations.

With reference to personnel for the ships there were serious shortages of both officers and enlisted personnel and men were constantly being detached to provide crews for ships being newly commissioned.

No one has ever explained why the weaknesses so clearly described in the Secretary of the Navy's letter of January 24, 1941, were permitted to continue during all the months at this outlying station whose security was vital to the safety of the fleet and of the United States.

Facilities to fuel the fleet were inadequate and a severe handicap to all fleet operations.

The only planes in Hawaii suitable for long-distance scouting were the patrol planes assigned to the fleet and they were totally inadequate to cover the approaches to Hawaii. The only planes suitable for long-range bombing were the 6 B–17 Army planes and those attached to the 2 carriers.

At the time of the attack the two carriers were on missions initiated by the Navy Department.

These and other deficiencies had been repeatedly reported by General Short and me as well as by our predecessors.

The messages of October 16, November 24, and November 27, 1941, from the Navy Department to the commander of the Pacific Fleet and the messages of November 27 and November 29, 1941, to General Short from the War Department stressed sabotage and that an attack if made would be directed against ports in southeast Asia or the Philippines. With the benefit of the intercepted Japanese messages, how they arrived at this conclusion will always be a mystery to me.

To add to our difficulties the messages also directed that "if hostilities cannot, repeat cannot be avoided, the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act."

The message of November 27, 1941, from the War Department to General Short specifically directed him to "report measures taken." On the same date General Short replied, "Department alerted to prevent sabotage. Liaison with Navy."

Recorded testimony shows this report was read by the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of War Plans, Army, and the Chief of War Plans, Navy. There can be no reasonable doubt that this report was read and understood by these responsible officials in Washington. For 9 days and until the Japanese attack the War Department did not express any disapproval of this alert and did not give General Short any information calculated to make him change the alert.

What was most needed at Pearl Harbor at this time was the information in Washington from the Japanese intercepts that indicated clearly an attack on Pearl Harbor.

The Navy Department sent me various messages quoting from intercepted Japanese dispatches. I believed I was getting all such messages and acted accordingly. After the attack I found that many vitally important messages were withheld from the Hawaiian commanders.

I was never informed that Japanese intercepted messages had divided Pearl Harbor into five areas and sought minute information of the berthing of ships in those areas.

A Japanese dispatch decoded and translated on October 9, 1941, stated:

"With regard to warships and aircraft carriers, we would like to have you report on those at anchor (those are not so important), tied up at wharves, buoys, and in docks. (Designate types and classes briefly. If possible, we would like to have you make mention of the fact when there are two or more vessels alongside the same wharf.)"

On October 10, 1941, another dispatch was decoded and translated in Washington which described an elaborate and detailed system of symbols to be used thereafter in designating the location of vessels in Pearl Harbor.

A dispatch of November 15 decoded and translated in Washington on December 3, 1941, stated:

"As relations between Japan and the United States are most critical, make your "ships in harbor report" irregular, but at the rate of twice a week. Although you already are no doubt aware, please take extra care to maintain secrecy."

A dispatch of November 18 decoded and translated in Washington on December 5, 1941, stated:

"Please report on the following areas as to vessels anchored therein: Area N, Pearl Harbor, Mamala Bay (Honolulu), and the areas adjacent thereto. (Make your investigation with great secrecy.)"

A dispatch of November decoded and translated in Washington on December 6, 1941, stated the Japanese consul general in Honolulu had reported that in area A there was a battleship of the *Oklahoma* class; that in area A there were 3 heavy cruisers at anchor, as well as carrier *Enterprise* or some other vessel; that 2 heavy cruisers of the *Chicago* class were tied up at docks "KS." The course taken by destroyers entering the harbor, their speed, and distances apart were also described.

On December 4 a dispatch was decoded and translated in Washington which gave instructions to the Japanese consul in Honolulu to investigate bases in the neighborhood of the Hawaiian military reservation.

On December 5, 1941, a dispatch was decoded and translated in Washington which stated:

"We have been receiving reports from you on ship movements, but in future you will also report even when there are no movements."

In no other area was the Japanese Government seeking the detailed information that they sought about Pearl Harbor.

In the period immediately preceeding the attack reports were demanded even when there were no ship movements. This detailed information, obtained with such painstaking care, had no conceivable usefulness from a military viewpoint except for an attack on Pearl Harbor.

No one had a more direct and immediate interest in the security of the fleet in Pearl Harbor than its commander in chief. No one had a greater right than I to know that Japan had carved up Pearl Harbor into sub areas and was seeking and receiving reports as to the precise berthings in that harbor of the ships of the fleet. I had been sent Mr. Grew's report earlier in the year with positive advice from the Navy Department that no credence was to be placed in the rumored Japanese plans for an attack on Pearl Harbor. I was told then that no Japanese move against Pearl Harbor appeared "imminent or planed for the foreseeable future." Certainly I was entitled to know what information in the Navy Department completely altered the information and advice previously given to me. Surely I was entitled to know of the intercepted dispatches between Tokyo and Honolulu on and after September 24, 1941, which indicated that a Japanese move against Pearl Harbor was planned in Tokyo.

Yet not one of these dispatches about the location of ships in Pearl Harbor was supplied to me.

Knowledge of these foregoing dispatches would have radically changed the estimate of the situation made by me and my staff.

General Willoughby, in his book MacArthur, 1941–1945, quotes a staff report from MacArthur's headquarters:

"It was known that the Japanese consul in Honolulu cabled Tokyo reports on general ship movements. In October his instructions were sharpened. Tokyo called for specific instead of general reports. In November the daily reports were on a grid system of the inner harbor with coordinate locations of American men-of-war: this was no longer a case of diplomatic curiosity; coordinate grid is the classical method for pinpoint target designation; our battleships had suddenly become targets.

"Spencer Akin was uneasy from the start. We drew our own conclusions and the Filipino-American troops took up beach positions long before the Japanese landings."

If MacArthur's headquarters which had no responsibility for Pearl Harbor were impressed by this information, it is impossible to understand how its significance escaped all the talent in the War and Navy Departments in Washington.

The dispatches about the berthing of ships in Pearl Harbor also clarified the significance of other Japanese dispatches decoded and translated in the Navy Department prior to the attack.

The deadline date was first established by a dispatch decoded and translated on November 5, 1941, the date of its origin.

"Because of various circumstances, it is absolutely necessary that all arrangements for the signing of this agreement be completed by the 25th of this month. I realize that this is a difficult order, but under the circumstances it is an unavoidable one. Please understand this thoroughly and tackle the problem of saving the Japanese-United States relations from falling into a chaotic condition. Do so with great determination and with unstinted effort, I beg of you.

"This information is to be kept strictly to yourself alone."

The deadline was reiterated in a dispatch decoded and translated in the Navy Department on November 12, 1941.

"Judging from the progress of the conversations, there seem to be indications that the United States is still not fully aware of the exceedingly criticalness of the situation here. The fact remains that the date set forth in my message No. 736 is absolutely immovable under present conditions. It is a definite deadline and therefore it is essential that a settlement be reached by about that time. The session of Parliament opens on the 15th (work will start on (the following day?)) according to the schedule. The government must have a clear picture of things to come in presenting its case at the session. You can see, therefore, that the situation is nearing a climax, and that time is indeed becoming short. * * *

"Whatever the case may be, the fact remains that the date set forth in my message No. 736 is an absolutely immovable one. Please, therefore, make the United States see the light, so as to make possible the signing of the agreement by that date."

The deadline was again repeated in a dispatch decoded in Washington on November 17.

"For your Honor's own information.

"1. I have read your No. 1090 and you may be sure that you have all my gratitude for the efforts you have put forth, but the fate of our Empire hangs by the slender thread of a few days, so please fight harder than you ever did before.

"2. In your opinion we ought to wait and see what turn the war takes and remain patient. However, I am awfully sorry to say that the situation renders this out of the question. I set the deadline for the solution of these negotiations in my No. 736 and there will be no change. Please try to understand that. You see how short the time is; therefore, do not allow the United States to sidetrack us and delay the negotiations any further. Press them for a solution on the basis of our proposals and do your best to bring about an immediate solution."

The deadline was finally extended on November 22 for 4 days in a dispatch decoded and translated on November 22, 1941.

"It is awfully hard for us to consider changing the date we set in my No. 736. You should know this; however, I know you are working hard. Stick to our fixed policy and do your very best. Spare no efforts and try to bring about the solution we desire. There are reasons beyond your ability to guess why we wanted to settle Japanese-American relations by the 25th, but if within the next 3 or 4 days you can finish your conversations with the Americans; if the signing can be completed by the 29th (let me write it out for you—twenty-ninth); if the pertinent notes can be exchanged; if we can get an understanding with Great Britain and the Netherlands; and in short, if everything can be finished, we have decided to wait until that date. This time we mean it, that the deadline absolutely cannot be changed. After that things are automatically going to happen. Please take this into your careful consideration and work harder than you ever have before. This, for the present, is for the information of you two Ambassadors alone."

Again on November 24, 1941, Tokyo specifically instructed its ambassadors in Washington that the November 29 deadline was set in Tokyo time.

In at least six separate dispatches on November 5, 11, 15, 16, 22, and 24 Japan established and extended the deadline finally advanced to November 29.

After the deadline date a Japanese plan was automatically going into operation. It was of such importance that the Japanese Government declared: "The fate of our Empire hangs by the slender thread of a few days."

On December 1, 1941, Tokyo advised its Ambassadors in Washington,

"The date set in my message No. 812 has come and gone and the situation continues to be increasingly critical."

A dispatch on November 28 decoded and translated on the same day, stated:

"Well, you two Ambassadors have exerted superhuman efforts but, in spite of this, the United States has gone ahead and presented this humiliating proposal. This was quite unexpected and extremely regrettable. The Imperial Government can by no means use it as a basis for negotiations. Therefore, with a report of the views of the Imperial Government on this American proposal which I will send you in 2 or 3 days, the negotiations will be de facto ruptured. This is inevitable."

Not one of the Japanese messages about the "deadline" were supplied to me although the American commanders in the Philippines were supplied with this information as they were also supplied with all the information in the decoded Japanese intercepts that were denied to the Hawaiian commanders.

The commanders at Pearl Harbor were not kept informed of the progress of negotiations with Japan. I was never supplied with the text of Mr. Hull's message of November 26, 1941, to the Japanese Government which has been referred to frequently as an ultimatum. Mr. Stimson characterized it as Mr. Hull's decision to "kick the whole thing over."

Among other terms this note provided:

"The Government of Japan will withdraw all military naval, air, and police forces from China and Indochina.

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chunking.

"Both governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area."

The reply to this note was delivered in Washington within hours of the Japanese attack.

My information on this and previous exchanges between the two governments was obtained from newspapers and radio. I believe Washington newspaper correspondents and the editors of our leading newspapers were kept better informed than were the commanders at Pearl Harbor.

After receipt by Tokyo of the American note of November 26, the intercepted Japanese dispatches indicate that Japan attached great importance to the continuance of negotiations in order to conceal the plan that would take effect automatically on November 29, as evidenced by the Japanse dispatch of November 28:

"I do not wish you to give the impression that the negotiations are broken off. Merely say to them that you are awaiting instructions and that, although the opinions of your government are not yet clear to you, to your own way of thinking the Imperial Government has always made just claims and has borne great sacrifices for the sake of peace in the Pacific."

I never received this information.

Again the dispatches from Tokyo to Washington of December 1, 1941:

"To prevent the United States from becoming unduly suspicious we have been advising the press and others that though there are some wide differences between Japan and the United States, the negotiations are continuing. (The above is for only your information.)"

I never received this information.

Again in the transpacific telephone conversations and dispatches the same theme is stressed, be careful not to alarm the Government of the United States and do nothing to cause a breaking off of negotiations.

This information was decoded and translated in Washington on November 30 and was never sent to me.

The intercepted Japanese diplomatic dispatches show that on and after November 29 a Japanese plan of action automatically went into effect; that the plan was of such importance it involved the fate of the empire; that Japan urgently wanted the United States to believe that negotiations were continuing after the deadline date to prevent suspicion as to the nature of the plan.

What was the plan? Why such elaborate instructions to stretch out negotiations as a pretext to hide the unfolding of this plan? Anyone reading the Japanese intercepted messages would face this question.

No effort was made to mask the movements or presence of naval forces moving southward, because physical and radio observation of that movement were unavoidable. The troop movements to southern Indochina were the subject of formal exchanges between the Governments of Japan and the United States as evidenced by the communication which Mr. Wells handed to Mr. Nomura on December 2, 1941.

Other dispatches were received in Washington which gave evidence of the deepening crisis.

On the afternoon of December 6, 1941, a Japanese intercept was decoded which warned a 14-part message from Japan was

on its way to the Ambassadors in Washington. That the time for presenting this message to our State Department would be supplied later.

By 3 p. m. December 6, 1941, 13 of the 14 parts had been received. The decoding and translation was completed by 9 p. m. and distributed to the most important officers of the Government by midnight. Nine p. m. in Washington was 3:30 in the afternoon in Hawaii. At midnight it was 6:30 p. m. in Hawaii.

When the 13 parts were delivered to Mr. Roosevelt about 9 p. m., he remarked, "This means war."

The time of delivery message and the 14th part were decoded and translated by 9 a. m. December 7, 1941, the time for delivery was set at 1 p. m. Washington time which was 7:30 a. m. at Honolulu and 2 a. m. at Manila.

Yet not one word of the receipt of these messages which again clearly indicated an attack on Hawaii were ever given to General Short and me.

The story of the whereabouts of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations and their unaccountable lapse of memory has been publicized so much that it is unnecessary for me to repeat it.

I have written a documented account of Pearl Harbor. Other accounts which also tell the true story have been published by Charles A. Beard, Charles Callan Tansill, Frederic R. Sanborn, Harry Elmer Barnes, Adm. Robert A. Theobald, John T. Flynn, George Morgenstern, Walter Trohan, Percy L. Greaves, Jr., and many others.

I repeat to you once more, Mr. CANNON, the success of the attack on Pearl Harbor was not the result of interservice rivalries at Pearl Harbor. This success was caused by the deliberate failure of Washington to give the commanders in Hawaii the information available in Washington to which they were entitled. This information which was denied to the Hawaiian commanders was supplied to the American commanders in the Philippines and to the British.

Finally Mr. Congressman, the officers and men stationed in the Hawaiian Islands were fine, upstanding, and well disciplined young Americans whom the American people should ever remember with gratitude and honor. In the attack launched by the Japanese they showed themselves fearless, resourceful, and self sacrificing and I shall always be proud of having commanded such men but I cannot forgive those responsible for the death of the more than 3,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines who died for their country on the 7th of December 1941 nor accept your insinuation that hangovers from intemperance ashore on the night of December 6 may have contributed to the delay in opening fire on the attacking Japanese planes. As a matter of fact many antiaircraft guns on the ships were manned at the time of the attack and all antiaircraft guns of the fleet were in action in less than 10 minutes.

It is requested that you insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

HUSBAND E. KIMMEL.

The Record of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the cooperation which the Democratic 85th Congress has given to President Eisenhower is recounted in the following article by Rowland Evans, Jr, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 1, 1958. I commend it to our colleagues:

THE RECORD OF CONGRESS
(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

The President decided early this year not to keep books on Congress with the usual list of "must" bills and, all things considered, it's just as well.

Because if there were the customary "must" list, it would be quite unimpressive. In fact, except for labor-reform legislation, tax relief for small business, some odds and ends dealing with immigration and a few other items, the "must" list would look remarkably like a blank piece of paper.

That does not mean, of course, that every single "t" has been crossed and every "i" dotted on Mr. Eisenhower's bristling legislative calendar. But it does mean that the President has won from the Democratic-controlled Congress a remarkable degree of cooperation on the really important items on his program. It does also mean, in retrospect, that despite the President's somber warning of the danger of a "cold war of partisan politics," with the Democrats in control of Congress and the Republicans installed in the White House, the Federal Government seems to function reasonably well as a coalition of two parties.

If anything this session of Congress has erred more on the side of too much than too little and that is the administration's chief concern today. Too much antirecession spending, for example, is worrying the fiscal experts almost as much as the tumult in the Middle East is worrying the diplomats. But on the biggest of all antirecession proposals, the proposal for a substantial tax cut, the President's opposition was sustained by Congress.

It is no exaggeration to say that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Senate majority leader, and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN turned Congress last January away from the acutely partisan atmosphere of economic recession and Soviet sputniks and guided it into generally bipartisan achievement. If a symbol is wanted, it is the strange and fruitful alliance between the Treasury Department and the Democratic leaders that decided the matter of tax reduction.

The overall record of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, even though it has several more days to run, by any standard of measurement sums up well. These are the chief accomplishments:

Statehood for Alaska, something that both parties have been promising, and failing to deliver, for years.

Defense reorganization, whereby the President's blueprint for a more efficient command structure built around a more powerful Secretary of Defense, was approved by Congress, if not in every detail, at least in enough to draw his commendation.

An extension of reciprocal trade and renewed authority to lower the tariff. Of all the President's objectives, this seemed last January to be the likeliest casualty. Mr. Eisenhower asked a 5-year extension. He will get at least 4, the longest duration of any extension since the Trade Agreements Act was originally approved for 3 years in 1934.

A foreign aid bill shaved well below the President's original figure but, according to all the signs, ample to meet the urgent requirements growing out of the Middle East crisis. Congress always carves away generous portions of the annual foreign aid request but the vote in the House this year, owing largely to small-minded Democrats, cut far deeper than usual. The Senate, however, is now in process of doing what the House failed to do—face up to the endless obligations of free-world leadership. Odds-on bet: The President finally will get a satisfactory bill.

Farm legislation that finally modifies the rigid parity concept and moves toward the more flexible price support system that the President has made the keystone of his farm policies. This bill passed the Senate and is given a good chance in the House.

To these must be added the Federal scholarship program, now appearing on the brink of probable passage; the increase in the price of postage stamps, even though somewhat less than asked; the boost in military pay scale; the new space agency, a LYNDON JOHNSON special; extension of unemployment compensation; exchange of atomic secrets with Great Britain; full disclosure of welfare and pension funds; and many others.

Teamwork and Cooperation in Soil-Conservation Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of Congress a fine example of leadership in teamwork and cooperation for soil and water conservation. It is a summary of a statement made to soil conservation district supervisors of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming.

This statement was made by Don Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, at the annual meeting in June of the northern Great Plains area, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. It represents the type of dynamic leadership for which Don Williams was awarded the Department of Agriculture distinguished service award last spring.

This spirit of public service for soil and water conservation, I know, is helping farmers in Kansas to make rapid progress toward the level of permanent protection and improvement of soil that will insure our Nation's welfare.

The following is the summary:

1. Soil Conservation Service has but one major responsibility and one major objective—to provide farmers and ranchers sound technical help they need to carry out their planned programs of soil and water conservation.

2. Soil and water conservation is a complex operation, involving a number of related sciences and requiring consideration of many different soils, topographic and climatic factors. It requires not only a combination of such sciences as engineering, soil science, agronomy, forestry, biology and range management, but requires a skillfully planned combination of different practices, as well, as indicated by the physical conditions and needs of each piece of land and the plans of each farmer or rancher, To provide such services requires local conservationists who have been thoroughly trained and who have supporting services of specialists in the several related scientific fields.

3. The soil and water conservation job, to be fully successful, needs several other ingredients, in addition to technical assistance. It requires research, to provide a sound scientific base for practices. It requires education, to communicate knowledge of new methods as rapidly as possible.

And it often requires credit or cost-sharing help, to enable farmers and ranchers to install needed conservation measures without delay.

4. State and local government should participate in the soil and water conservation program as much as possible so as to keep the administration and character of the program responsive to the needs and wishes of local people. For this reason, the Department of Agriculture encourages and supports the creation of soil conservation districts, local units of State government created under State law expressly for the purpose of carrying out local conservation work with aid from the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, and any other agencies which have assistance available.

5. Nongovernmental organizations and groups have a responsibility and a big part to play in the progress of soil and water conservation. Evidence of this type of support for soil conservation districts is seen in the financial and other material and moral support which business and industry, educational and religious and other organizations provide in increasing volume each year.

6. We do not believe or propose that local soil conservation districts can or should assume the work of the ASC committees, which are in existence to carry out certain directly administered programs of the United States Department of Agriculture. And, since local soil conservation programs are in the hands of units of State government, the ASC committees cannot assume the work of the governing bodies of the soil conservation districts.

7. As a public agency, the SCS has its operations reviewed regularly by appropriate units of both the executive and legislative branches of Government. It constantly strives to improve its efficiency and service, and has gained recognition as one of the most efficient agencies in Federal Government. However, since soil conservation districts operate independently of SCS, alleged deficiencies in SCS operations are not a logical basis for abolishing any local soil conservation district.

8. Maximum conservation can be achieved only when each program, each agency, and each level of government plays its full part. SCS will continue to emphasize the importance of full teamwork between the component agencies of the Department of Agriculture, the ASC committees, and the soil conservation districts and other agencies or units of State government.

Bill Lee Proves It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of July 29, which reads as follows:

BILL LEE PROVES IT

Why is there so much racket picketing in and around Chicago?

In an editorial last Thursday, we said:

"Too many influential people didn't want it stopped. Even among the unions that have not practiced unabashed extortion, there were some that wanted freedom to compel organization of employees by attacking the employer instead of persuading the employees."

This was a mild understatement.

Yesterday, William A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, declared flatly that he would oppose any legislation to ban organization picketing.

It should be remembered that Lee isn't merely the president of the Chicago Federation of Labor. When Richard J. Daley became mayor, Lee was the first man he appointed to a high place in the city administration—the presidency of the Civil Service Commission. He had been a powerful backer of Daley's candidacy.

The proposed legislation against organization picketing attempts only one thing—to forbid the blockade of establishments where there are no labor disputes, no union members, and no employees expressing any desire to become union members.

We think Mr. Lee downgrades the unions when he says they couldn't get along without the privilege of doing what the legislation would forbid.

After Labor Day labor hearings will begin in Chicago and I hope sincerely that all those involved will cooperate fully with the committee so that sound and fair legislation can be drawn up and enacted.

World Order and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from Dr. Morris C. Robinson, president, Minnesota division, American Association for the United Nations, Inc., 1124 Metropolitan Building, Minneapolis, Minn., with resolutions adopted by the division concerning world order and peace.

The letter and resolutions follow:

MINNESOTA DIVISION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 29, 1958.

DEAR ROY: While the current crisis tends to absorb all of our attention at the moment, I believe the enclosed resolutions adopted by the Minnesota division, AAUN, are worthy of consideration and respectfully submit them as your representative of the thinking of Minnesotans deeply concerned for world order and peace.

Often our best thinking is done in times of relative calm and when this crisis is over we shall need to work toward the accomplishment suggested in these resolutions.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS C. ROBINSON.

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, MINNESOTA DIVISION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, INC., JUNE 3, 1958

1. RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

We urge the Congress of the United States to enact the draft legislation (H. R. 10368) proposed by the Administration to extend for 5 years the reciprocal trade agreements program. We believe such authority is essential to a consistent policy of encouraging the growth of international trade. Such encouragement is one of the major contributions the United States can make to economic well-being and progress and to the easing of international tensions.

2. ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

We believe that the United States should assume membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. We therefore urge approval of H. R. 6630 by the Congress of the United States.

3. DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

It is essential that this country should continue for some years to assist underdeveloped areas, primarily through technical assitance programs and by providing capital for long-range development programs. There are marked advantages in channeling such assistance increasingly through an international agency, for this removes any suspicion or possibility of economic imperialism and enlarges the pool of experts available for staffing technical assistance teams. We urge that the United States enlarge the proportion of its economic aid channeled through the United Nations and heartily endorse the recommendations to that effect made by Congressman WALTER JUDD. We also urge the need for making available substantial development capital to be allocated by an international agency competent to channel it into fruitful projects.

4. MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS

We urge the United States Government to use its leadership in the United Nations to:

(a) Press for the acceptance by the Arab States and Israel of an equitable plan for the division of the waters of the Jordan River in the interests not only of the States concerned, but also of the Arab refugees;

(b) Continue such measures within the framework of the United Nations as may be necessary to guarantee the present borders between the Arab States and Israel against violation by force;

(c) Recommend the acceptance of the principle of resettlement for both Arab and Jewish refugees and the adoption by the countries involved of the principle of compensation for abandoned or lost properties;

(d) Contribute to the creation of a Middle East Development Authority in which both the Western powers and the nations of the area should be invited to cooperate, which would open up vast new areas for settlement of refugees.

5. UNITED NATIONS PEACE FORCE

We believe that the United Nations Emergency Force has demonstrated the usefulness of a small international police and that availability of such a force can best be assured by direct recruitment by the United Nations of a limited body of men. With such a core of career personnel as a cadre it would be possible to draw in additional forces when needed by inviting the smaller states to contribute contingents pledged to such service. A modest beginning in this direction may provide very useful guideposts for the future development of international security police.

6. DISARMAMENT

Disarmament, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons, continues to be a problem of great urgency. We believe that negotiation should continue, preferably within the framework of the United Nations, to determine whether the principal powers are disposed to accept an effective system of inspection which will permit termination of armament production and progressive reduction of weapons by stages.

We note with approval the efforts made by our Government to secure consideration of the possibility of ending atomic missile testing in conjunction with a system of inspection, and the proposal made for an Arctic inspection area. These advances have not been accepted. Nevertheless, we believe our Government should continue its efforts to find a formula which will prove mutually acceptable.

7. CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE

Technical progress in developing rockets, satellites, and space vehicles capable of propulsion without atmospheric support has opened the alternative possibilities of extraordinary scientific advances through cooperative effort or a vast and dangerous extension of great power rivalries. The principle of national jurisdiction in superjacent airspace has already been established. National security may require its extension to include a contiguous zone within which missiles and low orbit satellites would operate. Outer space beyond this point should be placed under control of the United Nations and restricted to peaceful, scientific uses approved by it. We urge the authorization of a United Nations space agency for this purpose. We also suggest the immediate formualtion by scientific and legal experts representing the member states of a draft convention defining the legal status of a contiguous zone and outer space and delegating jurisdiction over the latter to the United Nations. We consider that the Soviet Union acted improperly in apparently conditioning its proposal for a United Nations space agency upon withdrawal of military forces from foreign bases, but hope that the proposal my reflect some disposition to accept United Nations control of outer space as a goal having independent value.

8. GENOCIDE CONVENTION

We urge that the Senate of the United States give its consent to ratification of the Convention on Genocide.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS

We express our sense of the value of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a standard which has influenced legal protection and education in many countries, and our earnest hope that the Government of the United States will give careful consideration to ratification of the two Covenants on Human Rights when these have been approved by the United Nations General Assembly and opened for ratification.

Tiger's Voice To Haunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the late Gen. Claire Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame, which appeared in the Boston Daily Record on August 1, 1958:

"TIGER'S" VOICE TO HAUNT

WASHINGTON.—Stashed away in the security of a law office vault here in Washington are 12 reels of tape recordings which will long haunt the friends of Communist China in our official circles.

They are recordings in the voice of the late fighting Gen. Claire Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame, made last February while the general was being hospitalized at Walter Reed Hospital here, in the last stages of his fatal battle against lung cancer.

As a friend and champion of Nationalist China, who fought the Institute of Pacific Relations' pro-Communist policy for China within the State Department, General Chennault knew the whole conspiracy behind the sellout of Chiang Kai-shek, in minute detail.

From memory and from notes, he knew the people and the parts they played, and the sabotage of the military aid program from the United States which had been ordered by Congress, but which never went through.

All this he recorded in his hospital room, with the help of his long time friend Edward B. Lockett, writer and former Hearst State Department correspondent, and at the instance of an even longer time friend and controversial figure in the Roosevelt New Deal, Thomas G. (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran.

Like General Chennault, Tommy Corcoran was and is a devout supporter of Chiang Kai-shek. It is he who will arrange publication of the Chennault memoranda, as soon as the 18 hours of aggregate tapes can be transcribed and edited.

There are additional Chennault papers, made in his last months, in the hands of the House Un-American Activities Committee as late as last April, which are of no less importance than the recordings.

These are the unexpurgated transcripts of an unpublicized consultation which the committe and staff members had with the general in his hotel room at the Willard Hotel, on which occasion he discussed the cause for the failures of American diplomacy over the world, not only in the Far East but elsewhere as well.

Part of this testimony has been published as a committee document, and is available to the public, but the most pointed and acrid of his analysis was off-the-record for personal reasons.

The kernel of it was that the United States Foreign Service is infested with incompetents and social dilettantes who overdrink, overplay, and overintrigue, and that the interests of the United States would be better served if we had no representation at all in many countries rather than the representation we do have.

He said also that what is true of the State Department Foreign Service is even more dangerously true of the International Cooperation Administration (foreign aid program) and the United States Information Service.

He described a system of post-hopping, in which personnel get themselves assigned for a few months to one country, then get themselves moved to another, and continue this process until they have enjoyed an around-the-world luxury tour at Government expense, never contributing any worthwhile service anywhere.

Could be that the general's ghost is more to worry about than the general himself, when he was alive. He had some qualms; the ghost does not.

Still No Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S. C., of July 30, 1958:

STILL NO FARM LEGISLATION

Congress is now turning its thoughs toward adjournment, and, to date, nothing has been done to help the plight of the farmers. Some type of legislation is urgently needed to insure that the position of the farmer—already poor—will not rapidly get worse.

Conceded that the problems of the farmer are complex, nevertheless we are surprised that congressmen haven't come up with some sort of general farm bill before this late date.

The only farm legislation passed during this session of Congress has been a resolution calling for a stay of any reduction in support prices of acreage allotments. The main purpose of this piece of legislation was to maintain the farmer's standard of living while work proceeded on measures of a more permanent nature, but nothing has come forth.

During the 5 years from 1952 to 1957, the deterioration of the farm position can be documented by the following facts, among others:

1. During the 5-year period, farm prices declined 16 percent.

2. Realized net farm income declined 19 percent.

3. The purchasing power of farm income declined 23 percent.

4. Farm population declined 12 percent from 24,283,000 in 1952, to 20,396,000 in 1957.

5. In 1957, the returns to all farm workers for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents per hour, while the average wage of industrial workers reach a high of $2.07 per hour.

Our farmers are not asking for a welfare program. They are only asking for a chance to stay in business and keep their homes, to maintain that portion of God's land which is in their trust, and to have the opportunity to earn a decent living.

Hon. John A. Burns, of Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body is more highly regarded by his colleagues than the distinguished delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS, and I am happy to join with the many others in commending the gentleman for a service that has been truly dedicated. He has set a pattern for industry and for faithful attendance to every call of duty that is nothing short of an inspiration. What is equally important is that he has made so many warm and enduring friendships. He has put upon the cause of Hawaii the touch of a warm personality, and as we all know so well the Congress is not lacking in the human response. Many of us, voting as a matter of conviction to give statehood to Alaska, nevertheless when we voted were thinking of Delegate BOB BARTLETT. So the 86th Congress, when again as a matter of conviction we vote to give statehood to Hawaii, we will be thinking of Delegate JACK BURNS.

I doubt if any Member in the history of this body has done as much for the cause of his heart in one term as the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii. I wish especially to commend him for his wisdom in assuring statehood for Hawaii by refraining from the grandstand tactics that might have been expected from one of lesser stature and that would have drowned all statehood hopes for at least another decade.

I was a Member of the 81st Congress when we tried desperately but without success, although with the wholehearted support of the Truman Administration, to get statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, wrapped in one package. I was honored by having my speech on that occasion singled out for editorial mention by the daily newspaper in Honolulu and the entire speech printed by that newspaper in three installments. So I am by no means a newcomer in the fight for statehood for both territories.

The fact is that there was not a chance in the world for the passage this year of a bill giving statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska, and everyone at all acquainted with the Congress and the political aspects knew that the Alaska bill had by far the better chance of winning out on a trial run and thus breaking down the opposition to admitting states that were not contiguous to the American mainland. By a grandstand play, demanding that Hawaii come first, the delegate from Hawaii would have upset the apple cart, accomplished what the opposition wished and killed statehood for both territories. As it is, Alaska already has been voted statehood, Hawaii is assured of statehood in the 86th Congress, and in all fairness much of the credit must be given to the outstanding statesmanship of the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS, the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii.

I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for yielding to me that I might join with him and others in tribute to a truly great legislator.

Prevailing Wage Rate Determinations in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for confusion and misunderstanding to arise out of the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act, particularly with respect to the Department of Labor's determination of prevailing wage rates for federally financed projects. I have recently received a letter from the Nebraska Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America, which illustrates this point. The letter, which follows immediately, contends that construction has been held up in specific instances by delays on the part of the Department of Labor in their predetermination of wage rates.

The Davis-Bacon Act represents an important facet of Government labor policy. Its enactment was a vital step in the progress that has been made and will be made toward recognizing the particular responsibility that the Government holds for leading the way in good employment practices. Constructive criticism is always valuable. But critical contentions which are not founded in fact could, in this instance, serve to undermine the public confidence in a policy that is vital to the continued strength and vigor of the labor force. In order to set the record straight, I include the complete correspondence that I have had on the subject in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

NEBRASKA CHAPTER,
ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 18, 1958.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives, House Committee on Labor Standards, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: Enclosed is an article from the Sunday Omaha World-Herald reporting on delays letting agencies here are experiencing with United States Labor Department predeterminations.

Also enclosed are two other articles about delays caused by Labor Department wage lists.

You may recall that proponents of Davis-Bacon provisions in the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act assured Congress that these requirements would neither hamstring nor delay the interstate program.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES CRITCHFIELD,
Manager.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of July 10, 1958]

LACK OF WAGE RATINGS HALTS IMPERIAL AIRPORT

(By James Denney)

The State aeronautics department Wednesday disclosed construction improvements at Imperial Municipal Airport are being delayed by failure of the United States Labor Department to supply a schedule of minimum wage rates.

Aeronautics Director Rolland Harr said Federal law requires that the Labor Department make a predetermination of minimum wages for the $60,000 project.

ASKED FOR 57

Financing of this job will include: Federal Government, $30,000; State of Nebraska, $15,000.

"We requested through the Civil Aeronautics Administration the wage rates for 57 job classifications for the Imperial construction May 27," Mr. Harr said.

"We received an answer June 19, giving us rates for only 20 jobs."

The director said construction cannot proceed until the Department provides rates for every job so that a contractor can bid.

ONE OF 17 CITIES

Among the jobs left off were rates for bituminous surfacing.

The difficulty apparently is similar to that faced by State Engineer L. N. Ress, who sought minimum wages for construction of Interstate Highway 1 interchange at 114th and L Streets near Omaha.

Mr. Ress said his office still has not been given a complete wage schedule.

Imperial was 1 of 17 Nebraska cities approved for local air service by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Seven States Area case.

SERVICE DELAYED

It is to be served twice daily by Frontier Airlines on a route from Denver to Omaha, including stops at Sterling, Colo., Sidney, McCook, Kearney, Hastings, and Lincoln.

Until the airport is completed, there will be a delay in Frontier service.

James Critchfield, spokesman for the Highway-Heavy Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of Nebraska, said the rates supplied "average about 30 cents an hour above prevailing rates."

USED WRONG DATA

He said it appears the Labor Department "inadvertently used rates on Bureau of Reclamation projects in Red Willow and Hitchcock Counties for its Imperial determination."

The incomplete minimum hourly rate schedule given the Aeronautics Department for the Imperial project:

Air tool operators	$1.25
Carpenters	2.05
Cement masons	2.00
Ironworkers, reinforcing	2.375
Laborers	1.25
Painters	1.75
Pipe layers	1.25
Air compressors	1.725
Blade graders	2.15
Cranes, derricks and draglines	2.30
Euclid load operators	2.30
Firemen	1.45
Oilers	1.65
Mechanics	2.15
Mechanics' helpers	1.65
Farm tractors	1.50
Tractors, 35-horsepower	2.15
Truckdriver, up to 4 tons	1.30
Truckdriver, 4 tons and over	1.40
Euclids and dumpsters, under 12 tons	1.60

[From the Lincoln Star of February 7, 1958]

WAGE LIST POSTPONES LETTING OF BIDS ON INTERSTATE

(By Betty Person)

Nebraska's first scheduled interstate highway project for 1958 has been deleted from the highway department's February 27 letting, State Engineer L. N. Ress said Thursday.

The project involved was a $1,300,000 interchange at 114th and L in Omaha.

The highway chief said the deletion was necessary because the Labor Department submitted only 20 wage predeterminations when 60 were requested, and that the wage rates on the 20 submitted "averaged 60 percent in excess of the average set by this (highway) department."

Ress had receive wage predeterminations on 19 classifications by long-distance phone call Tuesday, and received the official notification of 20 wage rates Thursday.

IMPOSSIBLE

"In discussing this situation with several Nebraska contractors, it was their considered opinion it would be impossible for a contractor to submit an intelligent bid on the basis of the limited number of wage rates and the substantial increase over rates currently in effect in this area," he continued.

Citing an example, Ress said the Nebraska Highway Department had submitted a wage predetermination of $1.35 an hour for the iron worker reinforcing classification, and that the Labor Department submitted its wage rate for this classification at $3.20 an hour.

The highway department "worked for months" establishing its wage predeterminations, Ress said, and had used as its basis the prevailing wages paid on all highway jobs in the Douglas County area in 1957 and late 1956.

MADE ADJUSTMENTS

He also stressed that the highway department had made adjustments to increase many classifications where it was warranted.

Ress said he had discussed the matter with a representative of the Labor Department by telephone late Thursday afternoon. "It appears that a considerable difference of opinion exists between the Department of Labor and this department as to the manner of arriving at the prevailing wage rates in the area," he added.

According to the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act, he said, the Secretary of Labor shall

consult with the highway department on wage rates required on 90–10 projects.

Ress declared the Department of Labor had not done this, but that he will write them Friday requesting them to furnish Nebraska with the information they used in making wage predeterminations.

THIRTY-DAY ASSURANCES

The State engineer also noted during hearings before Congress of the 1956 Highway Act, there were assurances that wage predeterminations would be made by the Labor Department in a period not to exceed 30 days.

Nebraska submitted its wage predeterminations December 14, Ress said, noting that it did not receive the official list until 54 days after the submission of the request.

The State engineer said negotiations will continue with the Department of Labor and that the letting of the Omaha interchange will be undertaken as soon as acceptable rates and a complete schedule of wages can be determined.

Noting that another interstate project is scheduled for the April letting, this one in the Lincoln area involving the Havelock interchange west to Highway 77, Ress said, "If they do the same thing on the Lincoln job as the Omaha job, the same thing will occur and the same differences prevail."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of July 13, 1958]

LABOR PAINS DELAY BUILDING IN NEBRASKA—DEPARTMENT SLOW TO SET WAGE RATES—HOSPITALS, HIGHWAYS, ROADS HELD BACK

(By James Denney)

Nebraska was suffering from United States Department of Labor pains Saturday.

The Davis-Bacon Act, which allows the Department to approve minimum wages for construction of projects in which Uncle Sam shares the cost, was blamed for delaying construction of new highways, hospitals, and airports across the State.

Three statehouse officials said the trouble lies in too much Washington redtape.

STARTED IN DECEMBER

They are State Engineer L. N. Ress, State Aeronautics Director, Rolland Harr, and Verne Pangborn, chief of the State health department's hospital division.

Mr. Ress' trouble started in December when he sought a wage predetermination based on prevailing wages in rural Douglas County for construction of the Interstate Highway 1 Interchange at 114th and L Streets near Omaha.

He wanted to advertise the project for bids in February. He finally was able to take bids in June.

NO APPRENTICE

Reason: "Delay in getting a wage schedule."

Mr. Harr's troubles came to light last week with a disclosure that runway improvements at the Imperial Municipal Airport are being held up "because the Labor Department will not supply us a complete list of wages."

And Mr. Pangborn revealed that for several years his division has had difficulty getting the Labor Department to recognize a wage schedule for apprentices because the Washington officials say there are no apprentice training programs in some Nebraska towns.

What do statehouse officials do to iron out their troubles?

SOLUTION OFFERED

They appeal to the Nebraska Association of General Contractors in Lincoln, which in turn appeals to its Washington office.

Eventually, this results in a wage schedule, sometimes not. All too frequently it ends with Washington officials ordering higher wages than the prevailing rates, statehouse officials say.

The solution?

Former Gov. Robert B. Crosby, attorney for the Better Nebraska Association, hopes that next year he can convince some congressional committee that it is time to investigate administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1958.

Mr. JAMES CRITCHFIELD,
Manager, Nebraska Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR MR. CRITCHFIELD: This is in reference to your letter of July 18, 1958, which enclosed an article from the Sunday Omaha World-Herald reporting on wage determinations issued by the United States Department of Labor to be included in contracts for highway construction in the Omaha area.

The data you submit indicates that the Department of Labor did not consult with the State highway department as required by the Federal-Aid Highway Act; that 60 wage classifications were requested and only 20 were set up by the Labor Department and that the delay in the bid lettings was due to the delay in the issuance of wage determinations by the Department of Labor.

Information furnished me from other sources, however, seems to indicate that an entirely different set of circumstances actually exists with regard to this matter.

I am informed that the Solicitor of Labor was in consultation with the Nebraska State Highway Department representatives, as well as representatives from your organization, for a full 2 days and that after such consultation representatives of various Nebraska organizations were personally interviewed by the Secretary of Labor. I understand that the evidence submitted by the highway department in substantiation of their recommendations for lower rates on this type of construction included out-State projects far beyond the immediate locality of the project at Millard, and that such evidence did not include the highway and bridge projects on which collective-bargaining rates had been paid. Further, representatives of the State highway department were interviewed by representatives of the United States Department of Labor when they made on-the-spot field investigations of this matter. It would appear that the United States Department of Labor had not only consulted with representatives of the State highway department, but had given the evidence furnished by them every consideration.

With regard to the number of classifications in the wage determinations issued by the United States Department of Labor, I note that the decision of the Solicitor of Labor dated March 22, 1958, contains 40 different wage classifications. I am informed that the successful bidder on the Millard project has expressed no dissatisfaction with the number of wage classifications available to him for performing this work. I, therefore, fail to see the materiality of this point.

With respect to the delay in award of the Millard contract, it appears from the record that the first wage determination for this work was issued February 4 and the second issued March 22, 1958, and that the delay in letting of the contracts until June was due, not to the failure of the United States Labor Department to issue a wage determination, but rather due to the dissatisfaction expressed by you and others with the wage rates predetermined by the Solicitor of Labor. I am informed that several disinterested representatives of the public outside the Labor Department examined personally the wage data on which these rates were predetermined, and that it was their opinion that the rates were fully justified by the facts as reported to the Department of Labor. It appears that in protesting these wage determinations the point was stressed that the same wage rates prevailed on highway-construction work in Douglas and Sarpy Counties as prevailed throughout the rest of the State. This is completely contrary to the views you expressed on page 59 of a hearing at Omaha, Nebr., on January 28, 1953. The excerpts furnished me indicate that you had omitted wage data on Douglas and Sarpy County projects because in your opinion the differential which existed between rates paid on building and highway construction in the rest of the State of Nebraska did not exist in Douglas and Sarpy Counties. I am informed that the United States Department of Labor actually made two field investigations of this wage matter, and that the decision of the Solicitor dated March 22, 1958, was made only after an exhaustive review of the report of these two field investigations and evidence submitted by all parties concerned. The United States Department of Labor could not have done much more than it did in this case. It is my opinion that we would have to go far to find a case which has had more impartial, exhaustive, and far-reaching consideration than the one you have referred to me here.

I have also had occasion to discuss this matter with some of my colleagues, and it has been pointed out to me that this whole matter is the result of some out-State Nebraska contractors trying to come into the Omaha area and freeze out the Omaha contractors from doing any interstate highway work. It seems to me if the rates applicable to work in the Omaha area were those paid by out-State contractors, such contracts could and would be awarded to contractors from out of the State of Nebraska entirely; and not only would the Omaha contractors and workers be deprived of the construction employment, but also the same thing could happen to the out-State Nebraska contractors. I am sure you are not in favor of such an eventuality.

I believe that the foregoing clearly shows the United States Department of Labor has in this case complied fully with all applicable laws and regulations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

South Dakota Publisher Hailed on 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of South Dakota's most distinguished citizens, Mr. R. W. Hitchcock, publisher of the Rapid City Journal, has just observed his 90th birthday. This event is all the more remarkable considering the fact that Mr. Hitchcock has utilized to the fullest these past 90 years. He has won the respect of all South Dakotans because of his vigor, his keenness of mind, and his personal integrity.

The editor of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader speaks for all South Dakota residents when he salutes Mr. Hitchcock in the following editorial in the August 1, 1958, issue of the Argus:

A GOOD CITIZEN OF SOUTH DAKOTA

A grand old gentleman of South Dakota—R. W. Hitchcock, publisher of the Rapid City

Journal—has just celebrated his 90th birthday.

Congratulations are in order—congratulations to him on his many notable achievements in a busy life and congratulations to South Dakota because it has been our rich privilege to have him as a citizen.

Hitchcock assumed control of the Rapid City newspaper in 1939, moving to that city from Hibbing, Minn. He was then 71 years old—an age at which most persons prepare for retirement. But not Hitchcock. He moved with vim, vigor, and dispatch into the fast-moving tempo of the Black Hills city and quickly became a part of it as well as of the State. Much younger men were left behind as he paced the procession of growth and progress for the exuberant metropolis of the west and promptly he left the imprint of his robust character, his forward look, and his eager interest upon his new home community and his new home State.

These years in South Dakota have been good ones for him and for us. We are happy that destiny turned his eyes in this direction and we hope that he will be permitted to continue his constructive activities for many years to come.

Statement by Representative Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, in Support of Legislation To Provide Assistance to State and Territorial Maritime Academies, House of Representatives, August 4, 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to me as a Representative from a coastal State to witness the concern of the House in acting favorably on S. 1728, a three-point program to make suitable training vessels available to the qualified maritime academies and colleges; to raise the limits on the annual grant to an academy which accepts out-of-state students, and to increase the annual subsistence allowance for each cadet.

In these closing days of the session, it would be easy to overlook such a bill. It is not dramatic, it cannot be rated as equal in importance to such matters as social security, defense appropriations, or major farm legislation. But, this bill is of great importance in maintaining the high standards of training established by our merchant marine academies and colleges.

We are very proud of the Maine Maritime Academy in Castine, Maine. Over the years it has made a great contribution to our merchant marine fleets, and in time of war, to our Navy. This legislation will enable academies like Castine to plan for the future, with stable programs designed to train the best possible merchant marine officers.

I earnestly believe that this legislation is an essential step toward our objective of meeting the needs of this vital branch of service to sustain the Nation's commerce and defense.

New Conservative Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence entitled "New Conservative Leadership," which is a thoughtful discussion of a program which should have wide circulation.

Judging by the views of constituents who have communicated with me, the program will find many supporters:

NEW CONSERVATIVE LEADERSHIP—ACA SUPPORTS UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, FREE ENTERPRISE, BALANCED BUDGET

Conservatives of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, as well as the many independents in the country who believe in the basic doctrines of conservatism, now will have an opportunity to combine their efforts for the cause in which they believe. This will be made possible through the Americans for Constitutional Action, the foundation of which organization has just been announced by Retired Adm. Ben Moreell, of Pittsburgh, and a number of other prominent Americans in the field of business.

Admiral Moreell, who won fame during World War II for his leadership of the Seabees—the Navy's big construction corps—will have associated with him as trustee both Democrats and Republicans.

The main purpose of the ACA program is "to support, regardless of partisan considerations" the causes and candidates conforming to objectives "which are essential to the preservation of the opportunity state created and preserved by our Republic." Here are the six main points of the platform of the ACA:

"1. Preservation of our Government as a Republic through the support and utilization of the guidelines established by our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and its Bill of Rights.

"2. Unqualified support and protection of free enterprise and private ownership, with its reward of merit system, as it functions within the framework of sound and workable two-party government.

"3. Adherence to government and economic concepts which will protect the principles of sound money, effective economy, taxation for revenue only, and to operate our Government within the framework of a balanced budget.

"4. Articulate and effective support of the constitutional provision guaranteeing that all powers not expressely granted to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people.

"5. Intelligent and energetic use of the secret ballot and the demonstrated desirability of an effective two-party political system in implementing the capacity of free men and women to control their own destinies.

"6. Active participation in the primary and political convention decisions within the political party of our own choice, so as to select appropriate nominees, and the determination to support—regardless of party affiliation—candidates for office who most nearly embrace and support the provisions of this policy statement."

Such an organization has long been overdue in American politics. The Americans for Democratic Action usually reflects the radical point of view in American politics, particularly that of the big labor organizations which create their own political committees in every campaign. They have been giving money for political literature or precinct-worker help in congressional as well as presidential elections, for the most part in support of the Democratic Party nominees in the North. The ACA will probably be supporting many Democrats, but primarily these will be conservatives from the South. This is a significant move because the northern radicals have begun to support radicals in the Democratic primaries in the South, and here and there have been successful either in electing their own men or in intimidating those who would otherwise remain conservative.

Ever since the close of World War II, Congress has continued in the main conservative or at least nonradical because of the presence of a coalition majority derived from both parties. Such a coalition has never been given the direct political help and financial support that the radicals, with their millions of dollars collected from unionized workers, have been able to give their spokesmen in Congress.

Admiral Moreell has recently retired as chairman of the board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Co. and is a natural for the leadership of the movement that has just been christened Americans for Constitutional Action. The new organization has the blessing of many conservative Democrats and Republicans in Congress who have been instrumental in helping it to get started.

U. N. Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S. C., August 2, 1958:

U. N. FAILS

The United States now finds itself on a precarious footing in the United Nations. Our situation is more delicate than it was when we ordered Army troops into South Korea to defend that nation against an attack from North Korea.

In that case, after President Harry Truman had ordered United States troops into battle, the United Nations stood firmly behind our action. This time, after President Eisenhower has ordered troops into Lebanon, many members of the United Nations, and most of the neutral members, are not going along with us.

This may come as something of a shock to those who have not followed the action in the United Nations closely. The key to it may be an announcement by Secretary Dag Hammarskjold, the day after Marines had landed near Beirut, that he had been successful in arranging with Lebanese rebels for inspection of the entire border area between that country and Syria.

At first glance this seems to be an impressive achievement, but it will be noted that this agreement was achieved after United States troops had been ordered into Lebanon. Had Hammarskjold been able to achieve this on his earlier tour into Lebanon, with his U. N. observers, then the United States might not have been faced with the decision to send troops in to aid the duly elected Government in Lebanon.

That is, if the rebels had not been furnished with so many supplies and so much

equipment prior to that time so as to have found themselves in a position to overthrow the Government.

The Coal Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of management and labor in the coal and railroad industries, and also speaking for other residents of coal communities and shipping centers, I should like to thank the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as well as the responsible subcommittees for reporting out the bill to establish a Coal Research Commission. While it is not in the precise form of the proposal which I introduced, I am confident that enactment of this legislation will go a long way toward reaching the objective we all hope to attain.

Because coal's vital role in a national emergency and in America's long-range fuels programs is generally understood. I shall not, in my remarks today, dwell on this phase of a coal research program. Having been raised in the coal regions, and speaking from experience as a coal operator, I should like to point out just a few of the potentialities that Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States may look to in the application of science and engineering to coal's production, transportation, and market problems.

We do not anticipate that creation of a coal research commission and subsequent fulfillment of its specified duties will bring new prosperity to our mining camps and adjacent communities. We do, however, detect latent advantages that will accrue to the long-range benefits of our mining people and to coal's customers as well.

Mr. Speaker, the district I represent in Congress does not by any means have a preponderance of mining families among constituents. Our manufacturing industries are highly diversified, and we also have a considerable number of farm families. There, at the foothills of the mountains, the arable soil is the exclusive provider of livelihoods for a good number of families. You will also find many truck gardens in the area; it is, as a matter of fact, unusual for a home owner not to have at least a small plot for vegetables and perhaps some fruit trees. We appreciate the progress in agriculture that has come about through research and development. The United States Department of Agriculture has led the way toward greater productivity, increased efficiency, and higher nutrition.

What the Department of Agriculture has done for the farmer and his consumer over the years, a Coal Research Commission can undertake to stimulate comparable progress in the mining industry. Methods of extracting coal from the ground have improved sensationally in the past decade. A better product and greatly increased efficiency of consumption have likewise been achieved.

The United States has by far the most efficient coal industry in all the world, yet it would be folly to rest on our laurels. Energy demands will continue to spiral upward at a progressively greater rate as population increases and standards of living improve. The coming decades will require such an enormous amount of energy that coal industry production will of necessity tend ever upward. Meanwhile the tools and the methods of recovering, preparing, and delivering this fuel need to be under constant study to assure maximum efficiency in every operation.

I remember very clearly how coal was mined in the 1920's and early 1930's. Most of it was produced by pick and shovel, and when it came out of the mine the bigger plants had picking tables so that slate could be thrown out before the coal went into the railroad cars or trucks. Cutting machines were coming into popularity in the bigger mines, but there was still very little mechanical loading. Immediately before World War II, hydraulically controlled loading machines and improved cutting machines were introduced. Eventually—along about 10 years ago—the continuous miner began to move up to the face of the coal seams and substitute for the normal mining cycle.

Today working conditions have been improved through the introduction of roof bolting, rock dusting, better lighting facilities, and more adequate ventilating systems. Outside the larger mines are preparation plants, which not only extract slate and other impurities, but also "launder" and sort the product into the sizes desired by consumers.

We have come a long way in a short time in the producing of both bituminous coal and anthracite, but there are so many more secrets to be revealed by the scientist and engineer for the welfare of the miner, the increased efficiency of his operations, and the conservation of this vital natural resource that the national interest demands that we undertake a research program as soon as possible.

I wonder how many of my colleagues recognize coal's role in the development of our railroads? Originally coal mines were opened near streams because erosion of their banks disclosed the whereabouts of coal veins. As a matter of fact, a map drawn up by Joliet after his expedition of 1673–74 listed a deposit of "charbon de terre" along the Mississippi River in northern Illinois. A few years later a member of the LaSalle expedition reported that coal had been observed along the Illinois River.

When the Nation was in its infancy, proximity to a waterway was a prerequisite in the planning of a community. Thus, with mines also located on streams, coal was transported almost exclusively by water. Then came the railroads with a horse-drawn line built in 1827 from the coal mines in Carbon County, Pa., to the Lehigh River. Carrying coal was big business in those days, just as it is at the present time. It is a major source of railroad revenue, accounting for in the neighborhood of 14 percent of all rail freight revenue in the United States. Moving coal brings in upward of $1 billion a year to the railroad industry in freight revenue.

To the trucking industry and the inland waterway system, coal is also vitally important. Trucks carry approximately 50 million tons of coal annually, and almost that much coal is loaded at the mine for shipment by water.

To carry coal from mine to market, railroads have developed larger gondolas and hoppers, larger barges are in operation on our waterways, and a host of innovations for loading, unloading, and transferring coal have been developed. Nevertheless, considerable more research must be continued in this field. The railroads are hopeful that the coal research program which I am advocating will be quickly enacted. Both the rail executives and members of the brotherhoods recognize that, even though new methods of transporting coal are expected to come about, an increase in coal freight is inevitable in the years ahead.

I am sure that most Members of Congress have heard about the coal-carrying pipeline that is now in operation between Cadiz and Eastlake, Ohio. The line is transporting upwards of 80,000 tons of coal a month to a generating plant of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. It is an outgrowth of an intense and persistent effort on the part of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. in cooperation with the public utility.

Yes; a research program will result in improved transportation methods, just as it will contribute to increased production efficiency and to the conservation of coal reserves. What is in store for us in the way of utilization is too wonderous for conjecture. Besides carrying out its primary functions to provide heat and power, coal has become the source of a wide variety of chemical products including sulfa drugs, nylon, plastics, explosives, perfumes, and fertilizers. I remind you that up until 1908—just half a century ago—almost all coke was made in beehive ovens. Thereafter, as chemists began to discover the valuable contents of coal gases and tars, the steel industry constructed by-product ovens so that there materials might be captured and converted into useful byproducts. The steel industry's use of coal not only offers new materials to be developed in the coking process, but it also provides a starting point for research into new methods of utilization in the actual steelmaking process. To supplement reserves of metallurgical coal, mixtures of other coals are in the experimental stage. Tests of this nature must be encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, there is no limit to what science and engineering may do for coal, for everyone connected with the industry, and for the millions everywhere who stand to benefit by what coal and its products may bring to them. I urge you to pass this legislation. The people of my State will be most appreciative, and in the years to come all America is going to benefit.

Where Are We Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my speech to the Cincinnati Rotary Club on July 31, 1958:

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to talk to this cross-section of the leaders of Cincinnati as represented in Rotary.

You may not recall it—but within a short time after I was elected to Congress for the first time in 1952, I talked to Cincinnati Rotary. I looked at that speech the other day and wondered if the applause I received at that time wasn't motivated by the same courtesy and kindness which the Members of Congress show to a freshman upon the completion of his maiden speech on the floor.

He gets—for perhaps the first and the last time—a goodly round of applause, no matter how bad his effort might be.

Today I want to comment briefly on a few of the issues with which the Congress and the Nation have been wrestling during the past number of years. I hope to avoid engaging in the political game of fence-straddling so that you will know where I stand. Of course, I always reserve the right to change my mind on any issue because, as you well may guess, I have found myself to be wrong on—well, I'll take the fifth on how many occasions.

Even some constitutents change their minds. Let me give you an example.

FOREIGN AID—FOR WHAT?

When I first went to Congress, there were a number of industrialists who, about as forcibly as they dared, insisted that I vote against foreign aid and the liberalization of our tariff laws. Lo and behold, this year these same gentlemen were just as strenuously urging that I support the multi-billion-dollar foreign-aid program and the free-trade policies. These men had reversed their stand and could not quite appreciate why I had not.

Of course, I could not quite understand their switch until I learned that they had invested a considerable amount of money in plants in Europe to take advantage of tax concessions and cheap labor. Naturally, they now want no tariff barriers so that they can more readily find markets in this country for their finished products.

The multi-billion-dollar foreign-aid program, which was a sin just a few years ago to these gentlemen, became a great Christian endeavor to aid the underprivileged peoples of the world so that they would not succumb to atheistic Communist ideology. I would not be so cynical as to suggest that some of these giant corporations which have plants and investments abroad have a more practical reason for now backing the foreign-aid program; namely, to protect and give greater assurance of success to their foreign enterprises.

I am not criticizing these coroprations for starting industries abroad and taking advantage of substantial tax concessions and labor costs that run as low as one-tenth of those for comparable services in the United States. Reuther and his crowd must share the responsibility, along with organizations like United States Steel, and excessive government spending for pricing ourselves out of markets, devaluating the dollar, skyrocketing taxes, and feeding the fires of ruinous inflation, all of which have started this migration of American industry. What concerns me is this unusual flow of American capital abroad for these reasons instead of its investment in the expansion of local plants and new industry so that we might cope with the unprecedented growth in our population and the coming influx of immigrants if the present agitation to destroy our immigration barriers is successful.

What happens to small business and industry—the backbone of this country—which cannot establish plants in Europe, which, in order to maintain our high standard of living, must continue to pay high labor costs, the 52 percent corporate tax, and even higher personal taxes to sustain this orgy of spending in which we are engaged?

What happens to small business and American labor when it will be compelled in the next 5, 10, and 15 years to compete with goods made abroad in American-owned factories and produced at a fraction of the cost of those made here?

Under our foreign-aid programs we have already given to the Japanese and many others the most modern mass-production machinery available—later models than many of those in American factories.

Yesterday the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported a bill which has already passed the Senate to pay subsidies in the amount of $650 million to sustain the mining industry. Why? Simply because our foreign-aid program, together with extremely liberal tariffs, has all but ruined that great industry in this country. With foreign-aid money we have helped to develop the mining industry of foreign countries and then permitted their minerals to be sold in this country below United States mining production costs. I predict that we are going to have more legislation calling for subsidy payments to more and more industries in this country.

RECIPROCAL TRADE MESS

Because of our high standards of living and high cost of production, most foreign countries can easily afford to enter into mutual tariff cuts with this country.

In many instances for concessions here they can afford to admit American commodities free of any duties because we cannot possibly compete in their markets. If our standards of living were anyway near comparable to those of foreign countries and our taxes and costs of production were likewise comparable, I would be a more enthusiastic freetrader than our mutual friend, Charlie Taft.

I realize that we are the leader of the free world, and that we have had thrust upon us obligations which we do not want but which we cannot avoid. I realize that there is miserable poverty throughout the world. There is no Christian, no sensible man, who does not want all people to have more of the good things in life.

I realize further that this is the greatest and strongest Nation in the world (although our leadership is being seriously challenged by the Soviets today), and that as such leader we have certain obligations to the less fortunate people of the earth.

But I also realize that we cannot carry the whole world on our back; that we cannot cure the poverty and wretchedness of the whole world; that we cannot buy loyalty and allies. We just don't have the ability to do it without eventually destroying ourselves. Our first duty is to keep America strong so that it can continue to stand, as we do today, as the only real obstacle to world domination by the Kremlin.

SPENDING, DEBT, AND CREDIT

I admit that the countries who are asking for aid or to whom we are giving it without their asking are broke—but so are we. The trouble is they admit they're broke, but we do not.

Our acknowledged national debt today is $280 billion dollars. We are this week being asked to raise the debt ceiling another $8 billion. There is now legislation pending in the Rules Committee such as the community facilities and distressed area bills calling for new and expanded activities of the Federal Government, which, if passed, will add $11 billion a year to our estimated $80 billion budget for next year. I am happy to say these are not this administration's proposals. Our deficit this fiscal year will be $12 billion, the greatest peacetime deficit in all history.

There are potential obligations of the United States which almost double the $280 billion. Even at the $280 billion figure, the debt of the United States is approximately $40 billion more than the total combined debt of all of the other countries of the world. Why do we not realize that it is only the credit of the United States which sustains our precarious position today?

There is a limit to that credit. Just exactly what that limit is no one can tell. But I'm worried that we are somewhere near the breaking point. In the operation of our homes, in the management of our businesses, the intangible and uncertain question always is and should be: How much will our credit stand? How much debt can we carry without courting disaster and bankruptcy?

Remember, one phase of the total offensive now being waged against us by the Soviets is economic. Obviously, such an offensive is directed toward the destruction of the economy of the United States. In fact, the Communist strategists have often said that one of the weapons they will use in bringing about our eventual capitulation is to have us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

Gen. Claire Chennault, who died this week of cancer, was one of the truly great soldiers of our time. He was the leader of the famous Flying Tigers and later commanded the United States Air Force in the Far East.

He was a man who understood the Communists because he had fought them for more than 20 years. The Committee on Un-American Activities wanted the American people to have the benefit of his experience and expert knowledge before he died.

General Chennault said in his testimony just a few weeks ago, and I quote:

"I believe the Communists will not take over a lot of Asia where they could. They want us to continue pouring aid into those areas, break us, build up a national debt—spend everything that we earn from day to day, month to month, and year to year, until our currency is no longer of any value. Then they will be ready to take the United States in turn."

Yes; we are learning day by day that we cannot buy allies, that they will act in their own self-interest when the chips are down, no matter how many American dollars have been poured into their economy. President Eisenhower made a significant statement the other day. When he sent the marines into Lebanon—and he had no alternative, as I intend to point out later—the West German Government said some mighty harsh things about his action. A leading German newspaper called him an idiot. The President asked: "Is this what we get for giving Germany $7.5 billion of aid since the war?"

We know that other recipients of American aid have acted similarly, and you and I know further that, when the showdown comes—human nature being what it is—self-interest and self-preservation will prevail.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who headed strategic planning for the Army in World War II, testified before our comittee. He said that, if we should get into an all-out war with Russia, we will never have the opportunity to use our air bases or missile-launching sites in Europe or North Africa because our current allies and friends have

a terrific fear—and properly so—of nuclear retaliation by the Soviets.

But for a few minutes let's get back to the precarious financial condition of the United States. It has been this precarious financial condition of the country—the more than $7 billion interest payment on its debt alone each year—coupled with the crushing burden of taxes which the American people and American business have been compelled to carry for three decades, that has controlled and dictated my attitude toward much legislation which has faced the Congress since I went there 6 years ago.

Long before the late Bob Taft suggested that I run to succeed Charlie Elston, those of us who follow the Taft-Byrd philosophy in Government complained and campaigned against the ever-increasing bureaucracy of the New Deal, the astronomical expenditures of the Federal Government, and the ever-increasing tax load on the American people and American business. I did not go to Washington to support programs and legislation which augment those evils. I did not go to Washington to participate in the dissolution of the economy or fiscal stability of the United States.

These things which we considered wrong when propounded and enacted by the new and fair deals do not gain respectability or soundness under the name of modern republicanism. Just remember, we are never going to get tax reductions that are justified and which do not adversely affect the economy of the United States until we put a stop to unbridled spending. Tax cuts without spending cuts lead to greater debt, move us closer to fiscal collapse, and, of course fan the fires of ruinous and uncontrollable inflation.

I have on occasion opposed new and expanded activities for the Federal Government which have merit and are desirable. There are two principal reasons, however, for my opposition:

First, because the program would further increase the indebtedness of the Federal Government, the tax burden on our people, and weaken the fiscal structure of the United States.

Second, because I felt that the project or program was one that should be carried on by local or State government.

Let me give you one or two examples.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Those who have opposed various Federal-aid programs for education have been charged with being insensible to the welfare of the children of the country, benefits for teachers, and education generally. Just the opposite, however, is true.

Everyone with a grain of sense knows that eventually any type of Federal-aid program results in Federal interference, domination, and control. To argue differently is to disregard the record completely.

Whenever you pour Federal money into local government, Federal control automatically becomes necessary if for no other reason than to see that Federal dollars are not wasted at local levels because somehow the impression is gained by many local governments that Federal money in some mysterious way is manna from Washington, and, therefore, its spending need not be scrutinized as carefully as State and local dollars.

Education is one of the last major activities that we have kept in the hands of the local authorities.

If the Federal Government takes over—and I predict it will if the present trend continues—you are going to have a department of education filled with hundreds of thousands of new bureaucrats that will dwarf all other departments of Government with the exception of defense. Your schools, your children, your teachers, and your curricula will eventually operate under mandate from Washington.

I believe our school boards, our school administrators, our teachers, and our PTA's can do a better job for Cincinnati schools with our own tax dollars than can some bureaucrat in Washington, just as I believe if Washington lets us use our own money that our city council, our planning commission and citizens development committee, and our metropolitan housing authority can do a better job at urban redevelopment, free from the red tape and dictation of Washington bureaucrats who have never seen fountain square. You know that for every educational and urban redevelopment dollar Ohio sends to the Potomac, in will be lucky if it gets 50 cents back.

I realize that the States and local governments would have an easier time meeting their financial obligations if the Federal Government did not siphon off so much of the tax dollar. That is one reason why the handful of conservatives in the Congress continue to oppose the ever-expanding activities and programs of the Central Government—so that we will not have to siphon off more and more tax dollars to the detriment of local government.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

One could hardly be talking about current government problems, particularly in Cincinnati, without mentioning the man who has perhaps the second biggest job on the Potomac. Ninety-nine and fourty-four one hundredths percent of those in both political parties agree that our fellow Cincinnatian is doing a terrific job as Secretary of Defense even though his honeymoon is now over. Of course, there are a few admirals and generals whom he has refused to soft-soap.

The President's and Secretary McElroy's Defense reorganization plan was long overdue.

It was a major step toward centralizing the control of the four branches of the armed services to eliminate much of the waste, inefficiency, duplication of effort, and rivalries which have plagued our defense setup for many years. The House, in my opinion, made a serious mistake in not going along in three instances with the President's recommendations. However, the Senate and the conference committee corrected most of these mistakes, and the President and Secretary of Defense now will get practically what they asked for.

Some people feel—but only whisper it—that the President's program does not go far enough—that we are not going to have real unification of the services with the most effective striking force, free of silly rivalries, until and unless we establish a modern "defense corps of the United States" in one uniform. I admit this is heresy. And my mail in the next few days will be bristling with some well-known army profanity for just repeating the rumor.

This rivalry and jealousy among the various branches of the service is so bad that even many Members of Congress have chosen up sides to the extent that they are labeled, stamped, and marked as Army, Navy, Marine or Air Force votes.

The fast-changing concepts of modern warfare have the four branches of the service confuse, upset, and at times angry as to their changing roles. As an example, not too many years ago the Air Force took away from the Army—principally the Artillery—the job of delivering projectiles to their targets.

The Army is now happy because, with the advent of the rockets and guided missiles, it looks as if that task will again return to the Army—over the Air Force's dead body, however.

Here is another example. There is not much dispute that the nuclear submarine—a moving target—will play an even more vital role than it has in the past, especially if we are prevented from using our overseas airbases and launching sites. Submarine warfare is an assignment carried out by the Navy. But antisubmarine warfare has radically changed. It lookes as if planes and helicopters will be able to deliver the best knockout punch against enemy subs. Both the Navy and the Air Force now claim this as their job. When teacher finally makes the assignment, one or the other is going to be most unhappy.

The answer may be, as has been suggested, a defense corps of the United States in one uniform. It is argued that it could carry out various fighting assignments, just as the Army today is comprised of the Infantry, Artillery, Tank Corps, etc. Each performing a different fighting function. I assure you, however, that if our friend, Neil McElroy, would push for one uniform at this time, his Hooper or Neilson rating, particularly at the Penatgon, would drop fast. There is a lobby that is a lobby.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Other than the Soviet threat, there is nothing of greater importance than the passage of effective labor legislation to bring to a halt the theft, fraud, extortion, blackmail, and the sordid abuse of power by certain labor bosses as revealed by the shocking testimony before the McClellan committee.

I will not attempt to review the long history of usurpation of power not only against the public interest but also to the detriment and cynical betrayal of the man in the shop.

The AFL–CIO, of course, acted wisely—and is to be commended—for expelling the corrupt unions. Expulsion alone is not enough. It is not the answer. Quite a few years ago the CIO expelled a number of the Communist-dominated unions after revelations by congressional committees. Such expulsion did not relieve the union and the rank-and-file membership from Communist domination and control, as was predicted. The fact is that today the Communist leadership in some instances has a greater stranglehold than before the CIO acted.

Neither has expulsion eliminated from labor's ranks the mobsters, racketeers, and men with long criminal records who have forced their way into positions of power in certain unions and businesses and preyed not only upon the public but especially upon labor's rank and file.

The expelled Hoffa-Beck Teamsters Union, the largest single union in the United States, is presently joining forces with the Harry Bridges', Communist-dominated, Longshoremen's Union and the corrupt east coast waterfront unions. In fact, a criminal background in the Hoffa and Bakers Unions and Communist Party membership in the Bridges' outfit appear to have been a prerequisite for a job and advancement in the union hierarchy. The strategic position and power of this unholy Hoffa-Bridges alliance under the present helpless status of the laws of this country is terrifying to contemplate. Our entire shipping and transportation system could be paralyzed in time of war or other internal upheaval upon the whim of 2 or 3 utterly corrupt and power-hungry men.

In the face of this possibility and many other factors, how can anyone say that big labor must not be made subject to the antitrust laws? Of course, even the responsible unions do not want this although it will not hurt or interfere with their operation any more than it does with industry which is willing to play according to the rules of the game. Labor unions have grown up; they have become big business. The overwhelming evidence indicates that they should be made subject to reasonable antitrust legislation.

Unfortunately this Congress in this election year does not have the courage to pass a labor bill containing such a provision and at least half a dozen other provisions needed

not only for the protection of the general public but in particular to free the man in the shop from those in both labor and management who would abuse him. One of these days some of us will learn that the smartest thing to do politically is to courageously do the right thing.

I have come to the conclusion that the rank and file members of the laboring force in this country want representatives in Congress who are beholden neither to the labor boss nor to management.

They are learning that their interests are not always necessarily the same as those of certain labor bosses or of some in management who would exploit them.

While the Kennedy-Ives labor bill, which has passed the Senate, contains needed provisions to correct some of the abuses with which we are all familiar, it is weak and totally inadequate to do the job. Actually the last section of the bill seriously weakens rather than strengthens existing provisions of the law.

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

I could not close this talk today without mentioning the issue which transcends and dwarfs all others—our struggle against the forces of international communism. Because of its importance and my identification and familiarity with at least certain facets of the problem, I should perhaps have devoted my entire talk to this subject.

Since the close of the Korean war, until the marines landed at Beirut on July 15, during a so-called period of peace, we have spent the staggering sum of $180 billion for the defense of this Nation and the free world against the conspirators of the Kremlin. This amount for defense alone in the last 6 years and, as I said, in a so-called period of peace, is more than 3 times the amount spent by this Government for all of its functions in war and peace from its founding in 1776 to and through the end of World War I.

If this expenditure and the fact that we have American boys stationed in 69 countries of the world did not convince some that this is the life and death issue of our day, then the current crisis in the Near East has wiped away all doubt.

I am certainly not an expert on this perilous and explosive situation in which we find ourselves today in the Near East. I do know, however, what the Committee on Un-American Activities has been trying to tell the American people for many years—about a general pattern of infiltration and subversion, recently called indirect aggression, that has happened and is happening, to a greater or less degree, in the Near East, in Africa, in Asia, in almost every country of the world, including the United States.

It comes from the testimony of countless witnesses, from ex-Communists, secret agents of the FBI, from those who suffered the bestiality and privations of Soviet labor camps, from experts such as Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, J. Edgar Hoover, Edward Hunter, Constantine Brown, Generals Chennault, Willoughby, and Wedemeyer, and dozens of others.

First, let me say that I do not believe—and I pray that I am right—that we are going to have an all-out nuclear war in the foreseeable future for two reasons:

First, because the firepower and destructive force of the East and the West is fairly well balanced and neither side is going to risk almost total destruction.

Second, because the Soviet Union, in the short span of 40 years of existence, has been incredibly successful in expanding its empire from a handful of Bolsheviks who took over Russia in 1918 to the domination and control of one-third of the land mass of the world and one-third of its people, with another one-third in the so-called neutral bloc fast drifting toward the Communist orbit.

NEW WEAPONS OF WARFARE

Russia has done this largely through the use of a new weapon of warfare which is more effective than the atom bomb or nuclear guided missiles and certainly less costly. It is the insidious and diabolical weapon of infiltration and subversion with which she has penetrated the countries of the free world, their peoples and institutions, and taken them one by one behind the Iron Curtain. So why should the Soviets risk the total destruction of their cities?

Those who today still think of war in terms of military aggression are living in a fool's paradise. Russia has abandoned the centuries-old concept of war.

This may come as a shock to you, but the Soviets do not want to destroy the cities of the United States or any of the cities of the free world if they can help it. And why?

Mr. Edward Hunter answered this question in his testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities a few months ago. Mr. Hunter is one of the great authorities on Communist psychological warfare, a newspaper correspondent, author, lecturer, and former officer in the O. S. S., a man who has spent more than 31 years in countries under various forms of Communist pressure and attack. Out of the wealth of his experience and firsthand knowledge, he said:

"War has changed its form. The Communists have discovered that a man killed by a bullet is useless. He can dig no coal. They have discovered that a demolished city is useless. Its mills produce no cloth.

"The objective of modern warfare is to capture intact the minds of the people and their possessions so that they can be put to use. This is the modern conception of slavery, that puts all others into the kindergarten age."

Hunter continued: "The United States is the main battlefield in this war. I mean specifically the people and the soil and the resources of the United States.

"They seek to conquer the United States in a manner so that it voluntarily falls into the Red orbit. If we have to be conquered by destructive nuclear-age weapons, it will be considered a setback by the Kremlin."

Of course, we don't have to take the word of Edward Hunter or the other experts. Way back in 1923, in outlining the steps the Soviets would take in bringing the world under the heel of the Communist apparatus, Lenin said:

"First, we will take Eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia; then the Near East; then Africa; then we will encircle the United States which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

And how do they say they plan to do this? Not by outward aggression, but by indirect aggression, by infiltration and subversion, by abduction and assassination, just as they did in the Near East this month. Oh yes, there are those who contend that this is purely an uprising of Arab nationalism, the throwing off of the last vestiges of European colonialism, just as they said that the revolution in China and the attack on South Korea were the uprising of agrarian reformers.

No one with a grain of sense will deny that Arab nationalism, anti-Semitism, oil, and half a dozen other complex problems are factors in the Near East crisis. But anyone who understands Communist techniques knows that the guiding and directing hand is that of the conspirators in the Kremlin. In the Lenin school of political and psychological warfare, the Communist agents are taught not only to foment strife and hatreds of every nature and description, not only to create contempt and ridicule for the established government and law-enforcement agencies of the nations which they are infiltrating, but also to support, promote, and augment so-called popular causes and revolutionary movements within those countries.

Nasser is the tool of Moscow, whether he knows it or not. Today Russia is hypocritically pretending to support the nationalist aspirations of all of the countries of Africa and the Near East. By the use of her vicious propaganda machine, she is beating the dead horse of European colonialism, while at the very moment she has her agents, her dedicated Communist followers, in key places in every one of those governments. At the proper time the Soviets plan to take over the African countries, not by outward aggression, but as she has most of the countries which are now behind the Iron Curtain, by gradually placing her agents and followers in key and sensitive positions.

It takes only a comparatively few highly trained and skilled agents and saboteurs to throw a country into the Communist orbit. The masses of the people have little to say or at least are powerless to do anything about it. The fact is that today in Russia and in her satellites only a small percentage of the people are dedicated Communists.

These few are the people, however, who occupy the positions of power and control; when they act, it does not make much difference whether the country and its people are poor or wealthy, whether they have had the benefit of the foreign-aid programs of the United States or not.

Iraq was considered the most stable and pro-Western government in the Near East. In the last few years she has received $60 million in economic and military aid. The pro-Western leaders were assassinated, a few key jobs changed hands, and the coup was accomplished quicker than a wink. How? We find the answer in an editorial in last Sunday's Cincinnati Enquirer, and I quote:

"The Baghdad coup was a masterpiece of stealth, plotted down to tiny detail in the Soviet Union's foreign espionage general headquarters at Bern, Switzerland."

It was this event in a long series that broke the camel's back and caused us to act on Lebanon's request for help by landing the Marines in Beirut.

The worldwide Communist propaganda machine charges us with being the aggressor. Actually we moved into Lebanon to stop the continuous indirect aggression and infiltration which the Soviets have been accelerating in every nation of the world, including the United States. Since we have never engaged in the diabolical use of infiltration and subversion as a means of aggression, it was necessary for us to send in the Marines and use the conventional means of stopping the Soviets and their puppets in their drive toward world domination.

To me the great tragedy is that there are so many people in this country who for one reason or another refuse to believe that the same pattern of indirect aggression, infiltration, and subversion is taking place here and now. I could talk to you for hours about those things which are happening in the effort to destroy us and every other free country from within. I could tell you about the more than 2,000 potential saboteurs working in defense plants today—about the identified Communists who work for Western Union and Radio Corporation of America and who have access to the nine transatlantic cables which carry vital secret messages to our Embassies and allies over the world—how they could sabotage those cables in a matter of moments.

I could tell you how there is being poured into the United States over 10 million pieces a year of clever, subtle, effective Communist propaganda to subvert selected and key groups. I could tell you that at the direc-

tion of the Kremlin there are people in the United States who are ready, willing, and able to engage in demonstrations and attacks similar to those of the Communist-directed mobs in South America against DICK NIXON. Again, in Sunday's Cincinnati Enquirer we find this significant statement, as it relates not only to the Nixon incident but also to Lenin's statement about encircling the United States which I just quoted:

"International communism seems to have chosen South America as one of its targets in the Soviet drive for world domination. The Soviets hope to first make South America neutral in the East-West conflict. Russia is working to pry Latin America away from its traditional friend, the United States. Once they have accomplished this the Reds think complete domination is just around the corner."

It is essential to our survival that all Americans understand the Communist technique—that all Americans realize that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system, that we are not merely faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so we may coexist with a different system of government.

We are now—at this moment—in a death grip with an enemy the likes of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy whom we can ignore, appease, negotiate with at summit conferences—only at the expense of our survival.

This, rotarians, is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We must either dedicate ourselves to it or face eventual slavery and destruction.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association Urges "Buy Canadian"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while we have been urging Americans to help strengthen the economy of other countries, our neighbor, Canada has urged its people to "buy Canadian." A publication, Industrial Canada, published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, has recently come to my attention. The title page reads "Buy Canadian—Keep Canadians Working."

So that my colleagues may better appraise the attitude of other countries toward the protection of their basic industries, I have prepared some excerpts from this interesting issue which I am including as an extension of my remarks.

It will be noted that our Canadian friends recognize the absolute necessity of strengthening their domestic economy as being the primary goal of their national economic policy. In my opinion, we would profit from a similar concern for the welfare of our own home industries, rather than bargaining away their markets to foreign producers, as we have been doing for a number of years.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From Industrial Canada of June 1958]

YOUR BEST BUY IS CANADIAN

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association is putting all its energies into a program designed to demonstrate to Canadian purchasers that their best buy is Canadian.

We are doing this because we believe that Canada's prosperity, on which the welfare of each individual citizen depends, hinges on the strength of its manufacturing industries. That strength depends, in its turn, on the support of the individual citizen.

His freedom to buy as he chooses is part of our way of life, and quality and price determine his choice. Our task is to demonstrate that when his choice lies between a product of domestic manufacture and a similar imported product, his best buy, provided the overriding considerations of price and quality are comparable, is always to buy Canadian. In so doing he will help to stimulate Canadian industry, encourage enterprise, create jobs, raise living standards, and keep his country strong.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association has urged Canadians to follow the principle behind this program for well over half a century. The current phase is an enlargement of the program. We seek the active support of all interested organizations, group and individuals and of government at all levels.

There's nothing new about the "buy Canadian" program. But there's a lot that's new in the present intensified phase of the program.

The new phase was formally announced to press and public on April 30, when President H. V. Lush released a statement that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association had launched an intensified "buy Canadian" program. But there were earlier indications—for example, in a speech delivered by the president on February 24 to the National Sales Executives' Association, and at other speeches given at various times in April—that a revitalization of the program was underway, and the nation's press was quick to pick up the story. Plans for the renewed campaign, urged by members from coast to coast, had, of course, been maturing for some weeks before the story broke.

The beginnings of the "buy Canadian" program antedate such recent activity by many years. In one form or another the program has been carried on by the association for almost 60 years, sometimes as the "produced-in-Canada movement," sometimes as the "made-in-Canada program," but always with a single aim: to encourage Canadians to buy Canadian products and services and in so doing to secure fuller employment for themselves and increased prosperity for the whole country.

In the earliest days emphasis was strongly on the promotion of industrial exhibitions, including some traveling ones. Some of the older hands among the members will recall the "made-in-Canada" train which toured the country under association auspices. Others will recall the "Produced-in-Canada Weeks" that were a feature of the period between the World Wars. Throughout this period there was a wide distribution of posters, placards, labels, leaflets and other publicity material, as well as special appeals to members through the association's circular service and Industrial Canada.

The program was conducted less insistently after World War II, but on the recommendation of a special subcommittee which met in 1954 emphasis was renewed in the association's monthly publications, Industrial Canada and Industry, and the "buy Canadian" message continued to find expression in presidential addresses.

When the "buy Canadian" committee met to consider an intensification of the existing program, it decided immediately that the association should seek the greatest possible measure of cooperation and active support from other national organizations having a direct interest in the program's aims. The benefits to be won by the purchase of Canadian goods and services, in preference to those of foreign origin, accrue to all Canadians: not alone to manufacturers and other industrial buyers, but to the consuming public, retailers, professional groups and governments. The greater the number and variety of participating groups, the greater the chances of success in establishing the "buy Canadian" principle as an accepted guide for Canadian buyers.

It was decided that the association's program would be offered to a wide variety of groups, such as trade associations, service clubs, and government departments. These would be requested to advocate "buy Canadian" principles in their respective fields and, wherever possible, to implement a program of activities similar to that which Canadian Manufacturers' Association members would be asked to adopt.

One of the "buy Canadian" committee's first concerns was to produce a distinctive symbol and slogan to identify the program. After numerous designs had been studied, a maple leaf was chosen as the identifying symbol, with the slogan "buy Canadian" incorporated in the design. A number of secondary slogans were selected for use with the principal slogan; among them "keep Canadians working," "protect employment," "a wise Canadian buy Canadian," and others which most members are now familiar with.

When the symbol and slogans had been selected, and a program outlined in detail, a formal report was made to the association's executive council, which approved the "buy Canadian" committee's recommendations. Details of the program were immediately released to members by circular, together with proofs of the maple-leaf symbol and instructions for securing electros for use in advertising and printed matter.

Response to the association's approach to other national organizations was encouraging, a number of these, representing labor, retail distribution and consumer groups, indicating immediate interest in the program. Governments, too, were quick to express approval: The personal endorsement of the majority of the Provincial Premiers, was added support for the Canadian Manufactuerers' Association program. As the program continues, the list of individuals and organizations whose cooperation is to be solicited will be expanded. Among these will be members of Parliament and of the provincial legislatures, mayors, reeves, daily and weekly newspaper editors and columnists, public-relations personnel, radio and television news editors and commentators, Canadian legions, and service clubs.

A CONTINUING PROGRAM

The "buy Canadian" program as envisaged by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is, above all, a continuing program, which should gain in intensity over the months and years. The response of the membership to the new phase has been highly enthusiastic; the amount of publicity accorded it by the press has been notably encouraging.

Though support for the program has been sought on as many fronts as possible, manufacturers have recognized their responsibility to put their own house in order. They have begun by reviewing their own buying practices to insure that as many as possible of their purchases are made from Canadian sources. Evidence of their efforts in this direction wil be found elsewhere in this issue.

[From Industrial Canada of June 1958]

THE WHY OF BUY CANADIAN

The best solution, of course, for our perennial woes would be an adequate tariff to protect our Canadian economy and our Canadian wage standards from the devastating effects of cheap labor and mass-produced imports.

Do Canadians realize that manufacturing today is Canada's biggest employer of labor? Do they realize that their wage rates are 3 times those of the United Kingdom and Western Europe and 8 to 12 times those of Asia? Do they realize that United States manufacturers can produce more cheaply than we can simply because they are geared to a domestic market containing 10 times as many people as we have in Canada? I confess to much doubt as to whether any of these things are realized.

And yet, if Canada's manufacturing industry is to continue to furnish employment for 1 out of every 4 gainfully employed persons as it does today, it must be permitted to operate in a business climate of fair competitive conditions.

Naturally, any policy of adequate tariffs should be abetted by enthusastic subscription by Canadians in all walks of society to a health-giving policy that would result in the replacement of a big slice of our imports from the production of our own factories.

Let us from the very outset leave patriotism and sentiment right out of this discussion.

We have got to show that buying made-in-Canada goods will bring prosperity to the family of the consumer to whom we are speaking and not just to some unknown family a few blocks up the street.

We have got to satisfy the Canadian woman in particular that, unless she buys the goods made by Canadians, other Canadian wives will not have the money with which to buy the goods made by her husband or, for that matter, any other Canadian worker.

We have got to establish in the minds of all consumers that their individual well-being, for the most part, is indivisible from that of manufacturing industry and that no one in this country can hope for personal prosperity if all do not work for national prosperity.

There is another group of people which should be particularly concerned with this "buy Canadian" program. I refer to the wholesalers and retailers. I know they must stock the goods their customers want, but surely they cannot imagine that they are any less dependent upon national prosperity than everybody else. Where will the Canadian women who frequent their stores get the money to buy their goods if Canadian men are out of work? And how can Canadian men remain employed if the goods they make are not sold?

There is still a lot more to this problem. We, as manufacturers, cannot ignore our own responsibilities. What right have we to demand that people buy our products and do nothing more about it? We are on weak ground if we hope to persuade customers to buy second-rate goods or to pay exorbitant prices. The responsibility of price and quality is ours.

We can meet it. Canadian craftsmen are just as good as those of other countries at producing quality goods. Canadian technicians and techniques are equal to competing in efficiency with any in the world. As manufacturers it is our duty to see that the "buy Canadian" symbol is synonymous with value for money.

Naturally, we manufacturers must apply the magnifying glass of efficient discontent to our own buying policies. We may well discover that materials we are importing could, in fact, be obtained from native sources and, quite possibly, on more favorable terms.

There is little doubt that reasoning commentators will ask this elementary question:

Since Canada is neither self-sufficient nor populous enough to consume all we produce, will not our selling to other countries suffer if we do not buy from them?

This question does not come within the framework of our "buy Canadian" program. We have never been foolish enough to suggest that the consumer buy blindly or refrain from buying what is not made in Canada. We have only argued that where two comparable products—one made domestically and the other made abroad—are displayed for sale, the shopper is acting in his own best interests by choosing the Canadian product.

At the expense of being repetitious, let me again say that the Canadian housewife, businessman, unionist, store and company managements, governments at every level, must all come to realize that they have a vested interested in exercising a definite preference for made-in-Canada goods.

I do not think that it is too strong to say that our very survival as a nation in fact as well as in name depends above all else on our willingness and ability as Canadians, corporately and individually, to do four interrelated things.

The first is to invest in the development of our own industries. The second is to process more and more of our own raw materials. The third is to enforce a realistic tariff policy reflecting our hopes for our country's future. The fourth is to consume our own manufactured products.

No, This Congress Will Not Dare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will not dare—and many State legislatures will not dare—to enact the right to work.

Not until those elements in society who want freedom and the right to work organize, will we have anything but a continuing take-over by AFL–CIO of greater control in the assemblies and in the Congress.

Not until there is a reversal of this trend will the right to work be restored in a majority of the States and in the Congress.

This is brought out very well by Earl Harding, vice president, National Economic Council, Inc., in an Economic Council Letter dated May 1, 1958, as follows:

NO, THIS CONGRESS WILL NOT DARE, BUT MORE STATES WILL DARE ENACT THEIR OWN RIGHT TO WORK LAWS

Will Congress dare outlaw compulsory unionism, apply antitrust laws to all forms of monopoly, and repeal Federal laws giving labor monopolies special privileges denied to others?

The answer to our questions, raised in Economic Council Letter No. 424, February 1, 1958, was foretold by Representative WINT SMITH when he introduce that Letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13. The plain-spoken Kansas Republican told Congress: "The union bosses have the power. The answer will be No."

The Senate began, on April 25, to confirm the accuracy of the WINT SMITH forecast. By 53 votes to 37 the Senate rejected Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND'S amendments by which he sought to convert a "be honest" welfare and pension bill into a bill of rights to protect all union members from the excesses of their new masters.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, whom the labor bosses tried many times to defeat while he was Governor of Ohio, was the only Democrat voting on April 25 to support a KNOWLAND amendment. LAUSCHE may be heir to the victorious defiance of union bosses by his predecessor, the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

ISLANDS OF FREEDOM

States where the worker doesn't have to join a union to get or keep a job: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia.

RIGHT TO WORK

Campaigning active in 1958: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Rhode Island, Washington.

Present prospect: As we reported in Letter No. 424, "Congress will talk much and do little or nothing about the corruption, racketeering, and abuse of trust and power mentioned in the Eisenhower-Mitchell message to Congress."

Even if the half-way reform measures sponsored by the President and his Secretary of Labor should survive the united assaults of big labor's bosses, their horde of lobbyists and their bipartisan allies in Senate and House, the strangling power of inflationary unionism will not be seriously impaired by this Congress.

The politically entrenched labor bosses will be allowed to keep their power to coerce depression-harassed employers into signing new or renewing old closed shop or union shop contracts. Workers thus caught in the trap of compulsory unionism will be compelled to support the labor monopoly or lose their jobs.

The only now foreseeable exceptions will be in the 18 islands of freedom—the 18 States with their own right-to-work statutes that outlaw compulsory union membership—and in the States where the constitutional right to work may be restored this year or next by pending legislation or, as in Kansas, by voters' ratification on November 4, 1958, of the pending amendment to the Kansas State constitution.

The Kansas amendment is typical. Its full text follows:

"No person shall be denied the opportunity to obtain or retain employment because of membership or nonmembership in any labor organization, nor shall the State or any subdivision thereof, or any individual, corporation, or any kind of association enter into any agreement, written or oral, which excludes any person from employment or continuation of employment because of membership or nonmembership in any labor organization."

The real test of the labor bosses' political power in Congress is not likely to come until the rank and file of dues-paying Americans realize what they have lost—their individual right of choice—besides $620 million a year they have been paying into 191 national and international unions.

More and more the thoughtful members of labor unions will, despite the propaganda in many labor publications, awake to the enormity of the conditions disclosed by the McClellan committee's hearings. The decent union members—and most of them are decent, useful citizens—will come to realize that so long as they cannot quit a racket-

ridden union without losing their jobs they are helpless to bring about a housecleaning. Sooner or later they will see that their right to work without paying tribute to a union boss is their most precious freedom. And they will hate the employer who has sold them into slavery.

THE MORAL ISSUE

More and more the immoral principle of compulsion in a free society is being recognized and is reshaping public opinion. Two Manion Forum broadcasts, April 20 and 27, 1958, have carried coast to coast on more than 80 radio stations, most of them on Sunday evenings, Catholic and Protestant spokesmen's analyses of the moral basis of the right-to-work laws now in force in 18 States. Printed texts of these broadcasts are obtainable from the Manion Forum, South Bend, Ind.

The Reverend Father Ferdinand C. Falque, a Navy chaplain in World War II, now pastor of the Diocese of St. Cloud, Minn., told the vast Manion audience:

"Right-to-work laws are aimed at taking away the sovereign right of compulsion from the unions and giving the right to join or not to join back to the individual where it belongs. * * * They do not impede unions in their legitimate purposes and growth. They do not prevent any worker from joining a union but they prevent unions, as collectivities, from enforcing membership against the will of workers and against their consciences."

Dean Manion's other clerical broadcaster, the Reverend Edward W. Greenfield, lived through the violence and near murder of a child in the wildcat strike in his Princeton, Ind., parish. In one of his published accounts of last year's labor war in his parish, Mr. Greenfield wrote:

"When the Governor of Indiana was faced with the question of signing or vetoing the right-to-work bill, he was warned by labor lobbyists that if he allowed it to become law 'accidents' would happen to workers, that recalcitrants would be 'persuaded' in back alleys to join even against their will. What an indictment of organized labor. * * * This tyranny is so flagrantly anti-American and anti-Christian that I am at a loss when I see citizens and clergymen failing to take an uncompromising stand against it.

"The right to work is no more and no less than the right to live as a free being, and there is no greater moral imperative than defending and demanding that right for every living soul."

Protection of this basic right to work was wrested in 1215 from King John by Magna Carta, which guaranteed that no Englishman should be deprived of his means of livelihood. The tools of the worker were exempted from seizure by any process of law. Decisions of English courts sustained that principle through the centuries and handed it down in the English common law to become the foundation of our basic law.

Only an uninformed and unsensitized public opinion would tolerate, without immediate and drastic reform, the violence, extortion, thievery, deceit, and disregard of law and decency in segments of the union-organizing business disclosed by the McClellan committee. Why, with an elected Congress, must the American people have to wait for relief by State legislatures enacting right-to-work laws? Here is one authoritative explanation:

Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Republican, of New York, said recently in a letter to businessmen that the top officials of the organized unions dominate Congress. He further said:

"One hundred and seventy-six Members of the House have benefited from union contributions, free campaign help, radio, TV time, advertising, extensive publicity in the labor press, scores of voluntary workers furnished by the unions, doorbell ringers, telephone brigades, and all the rest of it. * * * Our trouble is not that we don't know what legislation is needed. We don't have the votes to get it passed."

To what extent, then, are leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties responsible? Here are two flashbacks:

In October 1939 Franklin Roosevelt's Acting Secretary of the Navy requested permission for Navy men to cross a picket line and remove from the then strikebound Detroit plant of the Bohn Aluminum Co. Navy property—patterns and castings needed for national defense. The union's answer, reported in an official record, was emphatically "No."

And, also from the record: "No further action was taken by the Navy."

July 27, 1944, the Republican nominee for the Presidency, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, was given a memorandum urging him to promise publicly that if elected he would "stand for voluntary, and against compulsory, association of Americans of any group or class." Instead, Mr. Dewey delivered in Seattle the speech prepared by a top union boss promising that he would administer the already-hated Wagner Act more efficiently than the fourth-term candidate, F. D. R. I know influential Republicans who stayed home in 1944 because of that speech.

Now, while Walter Reuther, the early advocate of a soviet America, is moving up to capture the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1960, will the GOP leaders continue to imagine they can win the labor boss vote by a policy of compromise and appeasement?

Or will Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's Democrats imagine they can force compulsory unionization upon the South and still offer special advantages to the textile industries which union bosses drove out of New England?

Will the Democrats learn nothing from their past failures? The Dunn survey of political trends has shown these facts: The Democratic vote for President in 1936 was 27.5 million; in 1940, 27.2 million; in 1944, 25.6 million; in 1952, 27.3 million—despite the growth in population. Voters of both parties lost interest and stayed home because neither party offered any alternative. GOP "me-too-ism" offered only to administer more efficiently the socialism of the Communist-infiltrated New-Fair Deal.

Or will politicians of both parties learn from the forthrightness of lately enlightened industrial leadership, such as that of the National Association of Manufacturers, and insist upon attacking the disease of union lawlessness at its source—the excessive power of the labor monopolists?

WHERE COURAGE COUNTS

Newspaper readers who sometimes question the accuracy of labor news written and edited by members of unions should know the thinking on union monopoly by Mr. D. Tennant Bryan, of Richmond, Va., the new president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, as reproduced in Editor and Publisher, April 19, 1958. Mr. Bryan is publisher of both of Richmond's great dailies, the Times-Dispatch and the News Leader. The following editorial is from the News Leader:

"THE A B C'S OF UNEMPLOYMENT

"Congress is concerned today about unemployment.

"It is trying to decide between two things:

"A reduction in taxes, or increased spending in public works.

"But this is not the major issue.

"Unemployment today is the result of lowered consumer demand.

"Consumer demand is lower because of resistance to higher prices.

"Prices are higher because wages have gone up more than productivity.

"Wages have outpaced productivity because of union monopoly.

"Congress has created the union monopoly.

"So what we have today is unemployment created through excessive wage gains obtained by union monopoly.

"Instead of facing up to this directly, the Congress is thinking about ways to pump more money into the economic system.

"Whichever way is selected, the result is the same: deficit financing and more inflation.

"Thus the real decision of Congress is a choice between two courses of action:

"1. Eliminate union monopoly so that wages may be set by true collective bargaining; or,

"2. Preserve union monopoly at the cost of continued inflation and the risk of national bankruptcy."

Conversation With Hashim Jawad of Iraq

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following account of an interview between Hashim Jawad, Iraq's former representative at the United Nations, and Bushrod Howard, Jr., as it appeared in the New Republic magazine of August 4, 1958:

CONVERSATION WITH HASHIM JAWAD OF IRAQ

(Hashim Jawad was Iraq's representative at the United Nations until December of last year when he voted in favor of Greece on the Cyprus question and was recalled to Baghdad. He left Baghdad right after the revolution and is back as the U. N. representative—as yet unseated—of the new Iraq Republic. Mr. Jawad had been in Baghdad during the revolution and agreed to answer questions about old friends and his knowledge of recent events.)

1. Many say here that the revolt was inspired by President Nasser and some say it was inspired by the Communists.

You know that this is not true. The people in Iraq and Arabs everywhere, know that a revolution must be made by the Army. No one else could do it. No one knew when the revolution would come but the atmosphere was electric in Baghdad.

2. Why did the revolution occur in July 1958? Why not sooner?

There have been plots and discontent in the Army for some years. They have never succeeded or gone very far. A great number of Army officers were retired or transferred when they were suspected. The best estimate was that at least 10,000 secret police were in Baghdad alone. It was hard to make a plot. The opportunity came when General Qasim's brigade was ordered to Jordan. They had then a perfect opportunity. They were to leave on the 14th and so no suspicion was aroused when they traveled about.

3. The events at the palace seemed unnecessarily bloody to some.

I assure you that the Army went into the palace to demand a new cabinet and intended the king to be a constitutional monarch. Abdul Ilah ordered the guards to arrest the officers. They had to escape and return to fight it out. The king's body was never touched and Abdul Ilah's was rescued by the army very quickly.

4. When do you think the chance for peaceful revolution was lost?

When Nuri Said dissolved the Parliament of 1954 which had an opposition of less

than 30 out of 144, people realized that a revolution would be the only answer.

5. What will happen to those who served with Nuri Said? How many are in jail? Will any of the old politicians be able to participate in national politics?

Some must be brought to account. Only Nuri Said and Abdul Ilah were really hated. There are some 20 or 30 arrested now. Many prominent politicians who served with Nuri are free. For example, Nadim Pachachi and the former Prime Minister Mouktar Baban. I do not think anyone wants to have any vindictive punishment. A few may be tried. The question of the secret police will certainly be investigated. Some will just retire to private life because they have made illegal profits.

6. What of the civil service?

I do not think any or hardly any of the civil service will be changed. They are technicians and are as sympathetic to the revolution as the rest of the country. Certainly people like our friend Ibrahim Alussi, director of mines, is a technician and will not be affected.

7. What of the new government? What will their international policies be?

The present government is very moderate. The Sovereignty Council is even conservative. General Rubai is a very religious man and Muhammad Kubbah, the head of the Istiqlal (Independence) Party, and Naqshabandi are both conservative. The cabinet is representative and you know Muhammad Hadid, the deputy head of Kamil Chaderchi's party, and Joumar the foreign minister and Shanshal the minister of guidance. They are all Iraqis who have opposed Nuri for a long time but are reasonable and moderate men.

I am very interested in having trade unions and other associations. This will give us a chance to progress. Under the old regime there could be no associations of any kind—artistic, cultural, let alone political or trade unions.

8. What of the oil companies and concessions?

The oil company has done a very good job in social welfare, workers' housing and vocational training. We expect and hope to obtain greater production but we want the oil company to continue and for the oil to continue to go to the West.

9. What of foreign policy?

We want good relations with the United States and the West. Also Iraq lives next to Iran and we do much trade with her. Above all we need good relations with our neighbors and we also hope the United States will recognize us soon because people will not understand it otherwise.

10. Will you join the UAR?

I do not think so at this time. We shall have close relations on many matters—including economic, cultural, foreign and defense policies. Iraq has, as I said, special problems with Iran and Turkey that are important to her. The UAR does not have these relationships. We in Iraq must be considerate first of all of our neighbors.

BUSHROD HOWARD, Jr.

Telegram From George Meany Regarding H. R. 13507

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD, a telegram received from Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, expressing the views of that organization in regard to H. R. 13507:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 4, 1958.*

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

AFL–CIO urges you vote for the Teller bill, H. R. 13507, relating to public disclosure of health, welfare, and pension funds. While the bill does not meet all our objectives in this field, we believe it has sufficient merit to be passed by the House. However, any attempt to eliminate any plans from coverage as the Bosch and Ayres amendments propose should be resisted. Disclosure legislation is necessary to help prevent corruption in all funds regardless of who controls their administration.

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO.

Ninety-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the Army Navy Air Force Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention to the Members of the House to the forthcoming 95th anniversary of the founding of the Army Navy Air Force Journal.

The first issue of this venerable service paper was published on August 29, 1863. Its editor was Col. William Conant Church, an experienced newspaper man who had previously been a correspondent for the New York Times. Its original title was the Army and Navy Journal and it continued under this designation until the Air Force was established as a separate service under the Department of Defense.

Those of us on the Committee on Armed Services know how well this weekly paper has served the interests and welfare of the men and women who wear the uniform. Through all the ups and downs of the Nation's attitude toward its defense forces, The Journal has fought steadily for the maintenance of strong defenses and has kept up the spirit and morale of Service families during those long periods of neglect which have marked the treatment of the Armed Forces over our history.

We in Congress are particularly cognizant of the thoroughness and accuracy of its reporting on all defense legislation. Through the columns of the Army Navy Air Force Journal we are often able to learn the views and reactions of personnel in the field as opposed to the actions and official views of the Departments themselves.

The long life and steady growth of the Journal reflect the confidence and faith placed in it by generations of service personnel. As the services have progressed from horse cavalry and muskets, from wooden ships and sails, to missiles and aircraft, the Journal has kept service personnel abreast of the times. In fact, its success and growth over the years reflects its high devotion to national defense and to the welfare of service personnel.

Because it covers and serves all components of the defense team, the Journal throughout its 95 years has taken a broad view of military problems, concerning itself with the overall security of the Nation, rather than the restricted interests of a single service. It consistently, too, has called attention editorially to Congress' responsibility under the Constitution to provide for the national defense.

I congratulate the Journal on its long span of service in support of the Nation's defenses, confident that the years ahead will add to its usefulness and prosperity.

It Took 35 Years To Get Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article written by Peter Edson which appeared in the Boston Traveler on July 30, 1958, in reference to the long, hard, and difficult fight for the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, in which one of my predecessors in the Congress took a very sincere, active, and praiseworthy part as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and I refer to the late Hon. William P. Connery:

IT TOOK 35 YEARS TO GET LABOR LAW

WASHINGTON.—The Fair Labor Standards Act which gave the United States its present child labor law and provided for minimum wages and overtime to workers in interstate commerce is 20 years old this year. It's worth a backward glance.

For this wage and hour law, as it's called, was bitterly contested before it was passed.

From today's viewpoint, the surprising thing is that it took 35 years to get the law on the books. In oversimplified summary, the record went like this:

In 1892 Congress established the 8-hour day for laborers and mechanics employed on public contract work. In 1907 the 16-hour day was made maximum for railroaders.

A 1914 law establishing the 8-hour day and the 48-hour week for women in the District of Columbia—to protect their health and morals—was declared unconstitutional in 1923.

But in 1916—to prevent a strike—Congress established the 8-hour day for the railroads.

The National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 permitted minimum wages under the Blue Eagle codes. But in 1935 this law was declared unconstitutional.

Then in 1937 the United States Supreme Court upheld a Washington State minimum wage law for women. That paved the way for Federal legislation on wages and hours.

President Roosevelt asked Congress for it in May 1937. Senator Hugo Black of Alabama, now on the Supreme Court, and former Representative William P. Connery of Massachusetts, introduced legislation. But it took over a year to get it passed.

Even after passage, a huge public relations campaign had to be waged to educate and crusade for compliance.

The minimum wage was set at 25 cents an hour when the act first went into effect October 24, 1938. After a year it was raised to 30 cents. Even these low minimums gave increases to 950,000 workers.

When the minimum wage went to 40 cents in 1945 it gave a raise to 1.7 million workers. Another 1.3 million benefited by the raise to 75 cents in 1950, and 2.1 million more by the raise to $1 in 1956. This $1 rate was a compromise between 90 cents and $1.25.

Wage-Hour Division of Department of Labor now makes annual payroll inspections on about 6 percent of the 900,000 employers with 24 million employees in nonexempt industries.

From October 1938 to May 1958 nearly 4 million employees have received back-pay adjustments totaling over $180 million through enforced compliance.

Two provisions of the act not commonly associated with it restrict child labor and require overtime pay.

Sixteen years is set as the minimum age for general employment—18 years in hazardous industry—though children of 14 and 15 may be employed part-time outside school hours.

The act provided for time and a half minimum overtime payments after 44 hours in 1938–1939, after 42 hours in 1939–1940, and after 40 hours on October 24, 1940.

There is said to be no way to estimate how many American workers are now receiving less than $1 an hour.

Arkansas and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. David Lawrence, one of the Nation's outstanding journalists, on the Little Rock situation, and respectfully commend the reading thereof to the Members and the country.

The article follows:

ARKANSAS AND THE CONSTITUTION—FAUBUS VOTE HELD RETURN TO THE LAW AS WRITTEN, NOT AS INTERPRETED

Maybe it's a demonstration of "Arkansas nationalism" we are witnessing—though perhaps "statism" is a more fitting word—but for some reason not clearly understood in the North the people of Arkansas, by the biggest landslide in their voting history, have just assured a third term for Governor Faubus.

Isn't this the man, it will be asked, who "defied the supreme law of the land"? Don't the people of Arkansas know what the "law of the land" is, or have they come to the conclusion that maybe the "law of the land" is what the Constitution says it is and not what nine Justices say it is? For the Bill of Rights in the Constitution does say that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The people of Arkansas weighed all the arguments and decided to back the Constitution as it is written. They had listened for nearly a year to radio and television speeches of abuse and had read many articles in the press telling them they are lawless folks who don't obey the orders of the Federal courts. The Arkansas voters had protested in vain that critics in other States were oversimplifying the issue by saying that it was merely "that man Faubus" and a few zealots who were responsible for the crisis in the schools of Arkansas and that, if the present Governor were not in office, things would be different.

Now the people of Arkansas, in a free and fair election, have given their answer. They have voted by an overwhelming majority—about 70 percent of all ballots cast—to retain Governor Faubus. It's a break in tradition to give a third term to a Governor in Arkansas. It was, therefore, an electorate deeply stirred which threw precedent aside in order to say to the rest of the States of the Union that Arkansas craves the privilege of deciding for itself how it shall educate its children.

For, up to 1954, education was considered to be solely a State problem, with no right to the Federal Government to assign pupils to public schools, much less to send Federal troops to police the corridors of school buildings. But, while the Supreme Court 4 years ago vetoed "segregation," it has not yet prescribed a formula for integration. Other States besides Arkansas are struggling with the same problem of how to retain control of their schools and yet keep them from being interfered with by the Supreme Court's edicts.

There wouldn't have been any such rumpus in Arkansas or in any other southern State if the Congress, as specifically provided in the 14th amendment, had passed a law compelling desegregation. But for the Supreme Court suddenly to turn down its own 58-year-old order for "separate but equal" facilities in the schools by terming it now a violation of the 14th amendment—especially since the Court, itself, could not find the slightest bit of history to show that the framers of that amendment intended to take over control of educational systems of the States—is to arouse the people to demand that the "law of the land," namely, the Constitution, itself, be followed. The 14th amendment stipulates that "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." This never has been done. The Supreme Court, moreover, isn't supposed to exercise any legislative power.

It is significant that the two candidates opposing Governor Faubus in the Democratic Party primary in Arkansas expressed themselves in favor of segregation in the schools, although they differed on how the formula is to be applied.

There is no doubt that the renomination of Governor Faubus in the Democratic primary—which is equivalent to election because there is no effective Republican Party in the State—will be regarded in other Southern States as encouragement and moral support.

Every Southern State would vote on the segregation issue exactly as has Arkansas. The same American "liberals" who are so quick to recognize as legitimate the aspirations of the Arabs or the Algerians or other nationalities to autonomous rights seem to forget that even in the United States there are aspirations to self-government by units known as "the several States." When the Constitution was written, all the people were told that the States were never to be deprived of their sovereignty except under the means prescribed in the Constitution, itself, for amending that document. "States rights" have since suffered as the Federal Government has gradually centralized more and more economic power in Washington. But where questions of sentiment and customs are concerned, the doctrine of "States rights" is as alive and as virile today as it was when Thomas Jefferson first taught it.

It is time for a more constructive approach to the problem of "segregation" and "integration." It's an issue that can be resolved only by patience, reason and tolerance of lengthy debate—and certainly not by bayonets.

Foreign Trade and the Dollar Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on the extension of the trade-agreements program, proponents stressed the need to lower our tariff so that others could secure dollars to purchase more of our goods.

An examination of international financial statistics shows that the United States gold stocks have been falling. We are rapidly losing gold to the rest of the world. The May 5, 1958, issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, contained this illuminating statement:

The record of what has been happening is clear enough. For the past 25 years, the flow of gold into the United States has been so nearly constant as to produce an occasional embarrassment of riches. Only a few times has the long-term trend been interrupted, notably during World War II and the Korean conflict, when the United States drew down its gold stock rapidly in the scramble for raw materials and other supplies. The recent shift, then, represents a conspicuous departure from previous peacetime experience. Yet there is no disputing the evidence. During January 1957 the United States gained $310 million in gold; in March of this year, it lost nearly $250 million. Indeed, in the first 4 months of 1958, the outflow already exceeds $750 million. For the year as a whole, it easily could run as high as $2 billion.

The same editorial also shows that other countries in their borrowings from the World Bank have often used international credits to purchase goods elsewhere. The editorial said:

The dreary picture is highlighted by some World Bank statistics, pinpointing how the proceeds of its foreign loans have been spent. In the 7 years through June 1954, borrowers the world over spent no less than 65 percent of their funds for goods made in the United States. In fiscal 1955, that proportion dropped to 54 percent, and in the latter half of calendar 1956 to less than 48 percent. In the first quarter of this year, America's share plummeted to 33 percent.

Few Americans realize that the export of gold and currency actually means a decline in job opportunities for Americans. Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, economist for the Dow Chemical Co., at a meeting before the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, on June 10, 1958, clearly showed how jobs disappear when our international payments are not in balance. He said:

Foreign nationals have been increasing their dollar credits almost $2 billion per year. This represents $2 billion annually which was not spent in the American market and did not make jobs for American workers. At an average annual wage of $4,000, this represents a half million jobs in manufacturing industries. Today, half of our employment is in services; that is, in a sense, each manufacturing worker supports an additional worker in the service industries. To include the service workers we

should double our figure. This means that if our international payments were in balance, we would have jobs for an additional million workers in this country.

Now that we have extended the trade-agreements program, it is necessary for the Congress to closely observe the international payments position of the United States. It is our responsibility to suggest remedial action if our gold position continues to deteriorate.

Government-Enforced Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by Mr. Willard L. Gleeson, vice president of the National Health Federation, before the Richmond, Va., Organic Food Growers on June 3, 1958.

Mr. Gleeson through the years has made a great contribution to the welfare of the little people of America:

GOVERNMENT-ENFORCED MONOPOLY

(By W. L. Gleeson, vice president of the National Health Federation of Washington, D. C.)

The founders of the United States came closer to setting up in this country not only the ideal government but also the most smoothly running economy ever conceived by man.

The Government was blessed with a great domain on which its ever-increasing population could move on to and develop.

The economy was likewise blessed, in that the Government was so conceived that the individual citizen could go into business and develop that business to ever-increasing proportions without being hampered by anyone except his competitors, who, like himself, had no restrictions placed on them beyond that of being fair and honest with customers and competitors.

We greatly prospered under this arrangement, with but little dislocation other than an attempt now and then to corner the market on something.

When this happened, either a competitor smacked down the offender or the Government stepped in with its monopoly-busting powers, and the evil was swiftly corrected.

Our way of life came down through the years, building up steam, under these favorable conditions, until 1912, and in that year two things hapened. First, the great *Titanic* disaster came upon us, and this was the begining of sorrows. Second, we in this country set out in that same year to put into the hands of the American banker a complete monopoly of our money and the credit money system.

Congress abandoned its constitutional mandate to coin money and set the value thereof, and in the Federal Reserve Act, it handed over to the bankers the authority to create money and determine how much circulation credit the American people would be allowed to use, and the authority to set the value of it and the rate of interest.

When this monopoly was set up by the Government, for the bankers, the monopoly was enforced with the power of the United States; then and there a new concept of the American free competitive enterprise system came into being.

A system of private commercial profit money, a gambler's money on a national scale. Following this bankers monopoly a system of Federal and State enforced monopoly, similar to this banking deal, quickly developed throughout the whole Nation and its economy. Obviously others wanted to have the same system of protection the bankers had pressured for themselves.

There were several additional causes for this pattern which the bankers had created to be followed. It was speeded up, it seems to me because there was a breaking down about then of the political moral fiber. Politicians began resorting to the introduction of bills in the legislatures and the Congress to regulate certain industries.

These bills, in too many cases, were introduced to secure campaign contributions or shakedowns from those who would be most affected by the bill, or for the purpose of gaining free publicity.

When this shakedown bill racket became a regular feature of our lawmaking bodies, it caused the industries and professions affected, to form organizations to fight for their common cause.

After the bill situation was brought under control by the associations each of the associations had to find something to do, or go out of business, so they set out to do a little bill passing of their own—bill passing to protect their profession or industry from competition, and for the past 40 years or so, 90 percent of the legislation passed in our country is not for the people and their protection. It is passed at the instigation of some lobbyist or trade association for the benefit of the special interests represented in the associations. Since that time the people have gained little without being organized.

Today, just about every industry and profession and trade have their powerful associations to protect them from anything new that might become new or competitive and to pressure through the lawmaking bodies, laws to stifle these competitors, especially competition from individuals who are brazen enough to enter a business or profession, without the consent of the association or union.

So today everybody is represented before the lawmaking bodies, except the best interest of the people and their welfare. To prove this, just try to get a bill through for the people and all the associations jump on you.

This situation has developed, not only in our country, but it prevails universally.

Strangely enough, this condition was prophesied in the Scriptures, as happening in the end of this age.

The Scriptures called it a beastly system, and when we see some of the things it does, we must agree that it has become beastly.

The Scriptures said in the end of the age, you could not buy or sell, unless you first obtained "the mark of the beast." (We all know Scriptural reference to a "mark" means approval in writing to those having control.) "Mark" means to put the cross and seal of authority on a document and that is what you must obtain before you can do anything today. You have the "mark" of the beast.

Now, I ask you, Can you go into business, buy or sell, or set up a professional office anywhere on the earth today, without first obtaining the written approval of not only the government authorities but also the unions and associations that have set themselves up to police that business or profession?

No; you cannot, and remain in business very long.

Today the Federal and State governments, enforce the will of these monopoly organizations, against anyone who may dare to come up in opposition to them.

You too are faced in your work with this Government-enforced monopoly. In fact, I dare say you have already been up against it in some form.

There is a Government-enforced monopoly of labor, medicine, law practice, farm production and prices, banking, and every other activity you can name, and you cannot live without bowing to it.

Yet, it is mostly waste and of little real value to the life and happiness of the people and in many cases it is the cause of great damage to the people.

What we have is dictatorship by monopoly associations over our economy and dictatorship over our Government by minority group associations.

In the case of food, there are several trade associations busy at the job of having the Government enforce their adulteration of the food they make or market, so they can earn more profit on a more stabilized and regular basis, regardless of the people's health, and the Government will see to it that you do not have a chance to come into their field and market a product, that is not adulterated with preservatives, reenforcements or bug poison, similar to that made by the members of the monopoly protecting association, and the Government enforces it on the grounds it is not an accepted practice in that profession or business. Marketing of milk is a good example.

And did you know, even religion has fallen into this same rut.

Now, maybe you have never thought of it, but we have set up in the Federal and State government departments to look after the welfare and enforce the rules of certain industry organizations and professions.

What are the food and drug departments but the private agency of the medical profession and its allied groups, such as the druggist, his suppliers, hospital monopoly, and their suppliers; and tied to this are the State health departments and professional boards, and the medical departments of colleges.

It makes no difference how good your product is, or how well you serve your people, when one of these decree that you must go, they move to destroy you and they have the Government agency at their side doing the dirty work against you, using your own tax money to do it with.

Before I deal with the only possible way open to you to combat such a beastly monopoly condition in your life, may I ask your pardon in referring to some personal experiences as examples? For, we learn from example and from experience.

In my day I have managed quite a number of political campaigns, and to my surprise 19 out of 21 of them have been successful. It is this fact I think more than any other that led me to several conclusions about this monopoly field.

About 20 years ago, a friend of mine operating several optical offices and who advertised his eyeglasses found himself faced with the wrath of his profession's State association and their determination to put him out of business once and for all.

So they went to Sacramento and had a bill passed, saying a licensed optometrist could have his license revoked forever, if on his door, he used doctor as a prefix to his name, he could not use his degree of O. D. as a suffix to his name; if he used doctor as a prefix, he had to spell out optometrist after his name in prescribed size type.

This friend had 8 offices and before he could get a sign man to all the offices, to make the changes according to the new law, the board, at the request of the State association, had a horse doctor from Southern California visit the offices and make a photograph of the signs on the doors.

This horse doctor found two that had not been changed, so 5 days later, on a Friday night at about 6 p. m. the optometrist was

served with an order to appear within the next 5 days for trial before the State board for his violation of the new law, and they counted the Saturday and Sunday as part of the 5 days the law allowed him to prepare his case.

At the hearing in Los Angeles, which lasted all of one day, the board would not permit my friend's attorney to put one bit of evidence in the record in his own defense.

At the end of the day, the board asked the doctor, his attorney and me to leave the room while they decided his fate. Two minutes later they called us back and and stated his license had then and there been revoked forever.

On the way back to the doctor's home in Fresno, we decided the 8 offices would need to be transferred to the doctor's son, or else all the employed doctors in the 8 offices would be proceeded against and the 8 offices closed.

The doctor took on this job, while I worked on a counterattack to prove to these monopolists that two could play at their own game.

I secured a top optometrist from out of the State and had him and a nurse visit all the officers of the association and the members of the State board and have his eyes examined by them and to record all the conversations and all the acts of the doctors, while in their offices for professional services. Out of 100 cases called on, 61 were found to be violating the State laws governing their profession, 38 were chargeable with malpractice and 11 had committed criminal libel against my doctor friend; all three of the board members were guilty.

Just a few days after this report was in, my doctor friend's son was served a 5-day notice of hearing at Sacramento to revoke his license.

I called the president of the State association in Oakland and got a luncheon date with him for Monday, before the hearing on Tuesday.

After the lunch was over (I did not want to ruin his lunch by telling him what I was there for), I said, "Doctor, I see you people are going to try and take the license of my friend."

He said, "Yes; we will finally wipe them out."

I said, "Doctor, this is an election year. If you take his license tomorrow, on Wednesday following, I will start a statewide circulation of a petition, to take the optometrist laws off the statute books of California and in an election campaign I can say on the radio what I please, as the political reason for asking the people to vote to repeal the optometry laws; and doctor, you can take a look at this material I have as the reason for doing so. And what I can tell the people of California about you fellows."

The surprised president of the association thumbed through the book and read some of the reports. He found his own.

He said, "I can only reach two of the board members before the meeting."

I replied, "Two is a majority. So, if I do not hear favorably from you by 2 p. m. tomorrow, I will release news at that time, announcing our campaign and the reasons for it."

The call came through ahead of time and my doctor friend has had no further trouble since then, and we had the father's license restored in one of the most famous Supreme Court cases of this State.

You see, in our selfishness we have passed 3 million laws in our efforts to avoid living by the Ten Commandments. As a nation, we are now so entangled with laws that if you can afford it you stop your monopoly boys, by wrapping them up in the web they have spun in which to catch you and your money.

In my optical friend's case, the State monopoly, soon after losing the Supreme Court case, made one last attempt to gain their point. They induced their allied national manufacturer's association to place the doctor's factory on the retail list—that is, not sell him at wholesale for his raw materials. Luckily, I was in Washington, D. C., when they made their move and the doctor sent me all the evidence. I took it to Thurman Arnold and filed an antitrust action against the wholesalers.

Needless to say, he was back on the wholesale list in less than 12 hours and the antitrust 2 years later won its case we had started against the monopoly. So you see, while the Government enforces monopoly through one or more bureaus of the Government, there are two departments you can go through to counter the others.

Mr. Fred Hart, President of the Electronic Medical Foundation, has a real story which you can get in written form. His most unusual experience with the monopoly is in a full story, printed in Herald of Health.

It is only through learning from these experiences of others, first hand, that we can master the way to survive the onslaughts of the Government-enforced monopoly.

I have been in an 11-year fight in a case, where the Government took from me my television channel, after I had spent $306,000 in building my television station. It was taken in order to let a large monopoly have my channel in Los Angeles. This has possibly been the most epic case in the history of the Nation, and it too will require a full reading to tell you the interesting parts of it.

Now, before closing, may I tell you a bit about you and your problems and the service you can render to the long suffering public by standing up and educating the people about what is going on.

We, the people, are faced today with several real perils, such as war, economic collapse, famine brought on by the changing of the elements by man, and the poisoning of our food and water.

Now, of these dangers facing us, not the least is the danger we are bringing on ourselves from the junk we eat and the poisons we take.

Why do we do this thing to ourselves?

Strangely enough, we are born that way.

Adam and Eve had pure foods in their Garden of Eden home, life-giving foods in abundance, but Lucifer misled Eve as to the value of the foods that were not perfect, just as we find some adulterators of foods are misleading the people about their food products in the advertising mediums today.

Lucifer, in inducing one to eat poisonous foods, was not advertising. He was doing a direct selling job. Eve ate of the poisonous foods, given her by Lucifer, and she induced Adam to eat the foods she had eaten and from that day, until now man's bloodstream has contained poisons—that is, degenerating chemicals and mineral elements, so man dies therefrom. He spends billions of dollars on medicines in an effort to live longer, while taking into his system daily, poisons that are slowly degenerating him to death, and man has built his whole economy on death. Most of his tax load, now about 50 percent of his gross income is to buy new death-dealing instruments for war, or to pay for the past wars, both of course, dealing with death.

Man pours out his propaganda for funds from you for cancer drives, heart association and TB drives, to raise money to try and find a way to slow down the death rate, and the same mediums that carry these appeals carry the appeal to drink more and smoke more cancer-making tobaccos, and 90 percent of the programs on the television, radio, and in the theaters are educational features on murder—which is death.

Man spends millions to find a serum for polio, while stuffing his kids with white sugars, and products made therefrom, white bread and poisonous polio-creating junk in the form of candy and fizz drinks.

He spends millions to find the cause of heart attacks, when anyone with a little sense knows it is caused by the mess we eat, the fizz drinks, too much coffee, liquor, and other useless things we try to live on and cannot, while we are wasting our time and money on what we call good living. All our effort seems to be to cover up the effects of our sins, whereas the only cure is to give up our sins.

Even our automobiles are moral degenerators of our children, and kill our neighbors faster than do our wars, and all the while the fumes from them are slowly gassing and smogging all of us to death and changing the weather around us—against us.

Well, we can thank the Almighty, for we are nearing the end of the death cycle. We have His word for it—for, in spite of all the efforts of the human race to keep the death cycle going, the good Lord will institute life and the living cycle, and the health food people are the only commercially organized people I know of who are in the business of providing organically pure food and aiding this life cycle to get going.

This fact is, it seems to me, a great opportunity—an opportunity to set up a strong and effective organization, and through it to talk some sense into the people, regarding their food and eating habits and to carry on a much needed educational campaign, showing the people of this country how to work for life and living—and not for death and destruction for profits.

There will be of course much opposition from the dictators of the monopoly groups who have the government agencies organized to oppose such efforts, with the taxpayers money.

But, such a cause is worth the effort.

The monopolists are afraid of losing their hold and their monopolies. The little people have no such fears for they have no monopoly to lose, so this very fact is their greatest asset.

Here is how I mean that:

In 1942, while this Nation was in war, the medical monopoly and its State affiliated associations in California circulated petitions and put on the November ballot a constitutional amendment to set up in California a basic science board of five members. These 5 members were to be appointed by the Governor, 1 from each of the 5 medical colleges in the State and each had to be a teaching member in the medical school.

This basic science board would have been given authority to control all of the healing arts and professions in that State, including religious healing.

Had this bill passed, it would have ended the chiropratic, osteopathic, optometric, mental healing, and all health foods, health food stores, and all advertising of any of these.

At the same time the bar association had an amendment to be voted on, wherein you could not represent your own case before any board, body, or court in California without an attorney, and that the decision of all State and county boards were to be final, from which there were to be no appeals.

Do you realize what those monopolies were doing with these measures? They were setting it up so the people in the health business would pay for their own destruction, with their own tax money, so they would be rid of this competition forever as a danger to their monopoly; which proves that no one suffers as a result of laws that are not passed. We have not been harmed by these proposed laws being defeated. They did not get away with it.

I was drafted to manage the campaign against these becoming law by several of the groups that would be affected by the basic science law.

Now, I am not pinning roses on myself for helping defeat this thing, but I do become frightened when I think what could have happened had they been successful.

They tried to bribe me. This failing, they put two big burly thugs tailing me for the last 3 months of the campaign, trying to force me out of the campaign; they threatened me with dire results, if I did not give up the campaign.

I do not frighten easily. However, I told our people I did not see how we could win over the medical monopoly and all its allies, so I would need to find some other way than a straight political campaign to do the job.

After a week of arguing, I succeeded in getting approval of my way for doing it.

My way was the rough way—the way the monopoly plays while putting on the airs of angels.

I could see but two things we could do to win—one was to tie the campaign into defeating the lawyer's monopoly and the medical monopoly together and knock both out at the same time, tagging each with the weak points and the sins of the other's measure, thus forcing both into a defensive campaign all the way; secondly, find something as an issue to frighten off their allies. We found two of their circulators of the petitions who had committed election fraud, so we had them arrested and fully publicized and we found where the medical tried to and did, through their president at the time, coerce the druggist, hospital, and nurses association, so on this thing we had a monopoly charge.

We won 3 to 1, as we should have, in the interest of American freedom, unhampered by monopoly control, being further tightened over our government.

So, when these monopoly people take after you directly or through their government departments, just remember they are not lily white or they would not be a monopoly, so with courage and good sense, you can do as much damage to them as the proverbial mouse biting the foot of the elephant.

They cannot do you harm, if you attack them with courage and wisdom as the mouse takes on the elephant.

Then, to win your way in competition to these monopoly associations, you need to get similarly organized, change the laws they now have that are no good for the people and no good for you, and throw out the stooges in the Government, who, at your expense as taxpayers, do the bidding of the monopolies.

The National Health Federation is an organization you can use as a good ally in helping you do this job. It is ideally organized to help you protect yourselves.

In conclusion, may I urge you people who are in the business world, and professions, dealing with life and living, to step up your efforts and find what foods are best for fully supplying the exact nutritional needs of the human body and in exact proportions find what supplements are needed to be added to balance out these foods to replace elements lost by depleted soil.

Learn what sprays now used to kill insects are doing to the human race through the people consuming these poisons, in their diet and water.

Then organize your knowledge, through your associations and let us educate the people to these good items and just as boldly tell the people what is harmful and what is to be avoided.

And, when this is done, let's defeat any group or Government agency that, to protect their monopoly masters, try to stop us.

I mentioned at the start of this article the beginning of sorrows. The Scriptures tell us we can measure the end of this evil condition from the beginning of sorrows. Sorrows are caused by too many laws, restrictions, and too much taxload. We must keep our freedom—our freedom of action.

The need is for freedom—that is our fight, for freedom—to tell your story to the people without government interference and confusion. For when the affairs of men and the nations they form reach the extremity of confusion in their laws and human relations and in the information mediums and when the burdens of the people, resulting from such confusion and waste as we now have become too great, and it becomes unbearable.

Then the people in their distress need to and should turn for guidance and relief to the only laws divinely authorized for men and nations to live by, the divine laws of Jehovah, the Almighty God. Only when living by these laws will the human race and their nations find relief from the distress now upon them—a distress brought on by the very organized selfishness and monopoly and confusion of laws we have been discussing here.

Before it is too late, before the wrath of God comes upon us, let us go up to the house of the Lord and learn His ways, learn of His laws and of His foods, and let us live in conformity with His ways, let us learn of Him and teach His laws. Then we will have peace, prosperity, and happiness forever.

It is the only way to escape the great tribulation now faced by the entire human race, being brought on us by this selfish confusion of laws. Regardless of the ideologies and religions in which we believe the laws made by men, which are not in complete harmony with the divine laws of God are causing much of the trouble and burden now existing among men and nations.

This mass of law, with its waste and confusion, designed solely to serve special interests is bringing ever increased suffering to the peoples of this earth and destruction of those nations, whose laws are made by men, out of harmony with the laws of God.

Blessed is the nation and its people whose laws are the laws of God, both the laws that guide them in their conduct and in what they eat to live.

National Science Teachers Association Endorses H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which speaks for itself:

NATIONAL SCIENCE
TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1958.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: I am writing to indicate the support of our association for H. R. 13247 as a scholarship and special aid bill. This bill in its present form would provide Federal support for a number of items deemed to be essential for the improvement of science teaching in our schools.

In testimony given on various bills designed for this purpose, our association, with the approval of our board of directors, has advocated Federal support to provide facilities for science teaching, consultants for science in State departments of education, guidance and counseling, scholarships, and other items needed for strengthening and expanding the teaching of science in elementary and secondary schools.

We believe that the provisions of H. R. 13247 go a long way toward meeting needs that we consider essential and which are not now being met adequately in most places through local or State support. We hope that the Congress will pass H. R. 13247 and that you will give it your personal support.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. CARLETON,
Executive Secretary.

Extension of the East Front of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 months since I introduced my bill, H. R. 11113, to repeal the appropriation to extend the east front of the Capitol. The House Public Works Committee has chosen to ignore this and other similar bills.

It has been 4 months, also, since the Senate Public Works Committee voted out S. 2883, a bill identical to mine. This legislation still is pending on the Senate Calendar.

The days of this 85th Congress are on the wane. If we are to prevent desecration of our Capitol, it is necessary that legislative action be taken immediately. Public opinion and the Nation's architects have been all that have restrained commencement of construction so far. It is time that the Congress heeded that opinion.

Mr. Edward D. James, an outstanding architect of Indianapolis, Ind., has helped significantly to spearhead the fight to renovate and preserve the present front of the Capitol. Mr. James sent me a release from the American Institute of Architects, which I now request permission to insert in the RECORD.

I also ask, Mr. Speaker, permission to include an article from this morning's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald pointing out the outstanding job Tennessee has done in restoring her historic State capitol:

ARCHITECTURE IN THE NEWS

WASHINGTON, D. C.—John Noble Richards, newly elected president of the American Institute of Architects, today urged Congress to "heed the will of the American people and the advice of the Nation's architects" and enact legislation promptly to block alteration of the United States Capitol Building until expansion needs can be studied.

The statement of the prominent Toledo, Ohio, architect followed on the heels of the A. I. A. national convention last week in Cleveland, where delegates from chapters and State groups all over the Nation voted overwhelmingly to continue opposition to the proposed extension of the Capitol's east front. The vote was cast after a showing of plans and drawings of the extension project by several architects engaged to carry it out.

Richards also called upon members of the architectural profession throughout the country to "act in concert" with civic, service, and patriotic groups in their communities in urging Congress to expedite passage of the Smith bill in the United States Senate. The bill was reported out unanimously by the Public Works Committee several

months ago but has never been called to the floor by Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

The bill calls for a review of Capitol expansion needs prior to any extension of the east front as now demanded by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

"It is a sad commentary on our national political process," Richards said, "that the greatest legislative body in the world can be held in immobility by 1 or 2 determined persons, even though the fate of that body's legislative plant—which also serves the American people as an historic monument and symbol of patriotic faith—hangs on the issue."

Richards also called for reassessment of the title and duties of the Architect of the Capitol. The full text of his statement follows:

"For more than 20 years, a number of persons have attempted to place their personal mark on the United States Capitol Building. For the same length of time, the American Institute of Architects has sought to forestall such a move, and, instead, bring about a proper and comprehensive study of the legitimate expansion needs of Members of Congress.

"Legislation which would call for a judicious study of Capitol needs is now in the United States Senate, and the professional body representing the Nation's architects has just voted overwhelmingly to continue its opposition to such expensive and destructive piecemeal projects as the proposed east front extension.

"The purpose of this statement is to urge the United States Congress to keep faith with its constituents, heed the will of the American people and the advice of the Nation's architects, and enact without further delay the Smith bill (S. 2883) which is now pending before the United States Senate.

"The will of the public is clear. Extension of the east front of the Capitol has been opposed by nearly every major newspaper in the land—from the New York Times in the East to the San Francisco Chronicle in the West. A multiplicity of organizations representing all shades of citizen opinion—organizations representing such diverse views as the Daughters of the American Revolution and the International Bricklayers' Union—have banded together in common cause to halt this extension project. It would appear that everyone can appreciate the importance of protecting the Capitol from this unreasonably expensive and ill-considered alteration but the handful of politicians who would leave their mark on the Nation's more revered building.

"As the new president of the American Institute of Architects, I consider it my duty, and the duty of the professional organization which I represent, to present to the public the issues as they appear to us. I therefore ask that all professional architects and their chapter and State organizations act in concert with the civic, service, and patriotic organizations in their communities to make it clear to the Members of Congress that their constituents do care enough about the United States Capitol Building, the disposition of public tax monies, and the efficiency of the national legislative plant to raise their voices against the present extension proposal and seek passage of the Smith bill.

"The facts are these:

"1. The United States Capitol is our proudest possession. Any alterations made to it should be considered fully and openly in a manner which gives the public—the building's true owner—a voice in the discussion.

"2. The east front wall of the United States Capitol has been allowed to fall into a state of unsightly disrepair and should be restored immediately by the associate architects employed by the Architect of the Capitol, and, if necessary, with the aid of a restoration specialist. This would, by all current estimates, halve the expense of the extension project. According to the United States Bureau of Standards, the well is structurally sound. Many historic buildings here and abroad have been so restored. One example is the Tennessee Capitol Building, at Nashville, which was in far wore condition than the United States Capitol Building until the matter was put to rights by an enlightened legislature.

"The argument of extensionist politicians that a wall need be moved to be repaired is, to put it baldly, incredible nonsense.

"3. The slight overhang of the Capitol Dome has been called an architectural defect by those who want to move the east front. It is significant that the only fashion in which this could be shown to us was by means of a photograph taken from a helicopter hovering directly above the building. The defect, as such, is a myth.

"4. The present status of the Capitol alteration project is fundamentally at odds with architectural practice. Design cannot be legislated. It is a creative process dependent upon free and searching study. Yet, today, we have a situation in which a political person bearing a professional title has handed over to several professional architects a set of outdated design instructions with an accompanying order to carry them out. This is utterly improper.

"The piecemeal nature of this project is seen in the statement that only the east front alteration is being considered at this time. The east front, moved a distance of 32 feet, would accomplish nothing but the creation of a handful of offices and a small dining area—this at a cost of $10 million. Yet even this substantial expense would be but a tiny down payment on a vast series of further alterations and these, according to the admission of the Architect of the Capitol, would cost well over $100 million. This little-discussed series of further alterations would eventually convert the Capitol into a totally different building. The east-front project is only the first in a series of involved and severe changes. These plans have not been tested against the realities of a present-day study of space use within the Capitol. According to Senator RALPH FLANDERS, of Vermont, himself an engineer, there are offices located within the Capitol that need not be there. It is also known that there are a number of unlabeled rooms within the building.

"A space-use survey of Capitol facilities should be undertaken immediately. In conjunction with this should be an examination of the duties and title of the Architect of the Capitol. The present Architect of the Capitol is not an architect and has never been trained as an architect. He is a former Congressman and excontractor who functions as a maintenance and administrative employee. If this post is to involve architectural duties, it should be filled only by an experienced and licensed professional architect. If architectural duties are not to be involved, the title should be changed in keeping with those duties actually performed so as to avoid confusion and misunderstandings.

"5. There is undoubtedly room for expansion of the United States Capitol Building, should a proper study show that it is necessary. But it is not to the east, where there is room only to move a well enough to destroy a graceful design and create a thin sliver of space at a prohibitive cost of $200 per square foot of space. Should proper study demand expansion, the American Institute of Architects feels that the physical needs of Congress can be amply met in harmony with the desires of the American people and the architectural profession to retain the Nation's most important historic building and, at the same time, guard the interests of the Nation's taxpayers."

STATE CAPITOL, BEFORE AND AFTER

(By Elsie Carper)

The Tennessee State Capitol at Nashville, a century-old limestone monument to Greek revival architecture, has been carefully restored at a cost of $2 million.

The restoration project undertaken by the State government is fast nearing completion under the direction of the architectural firms of Woolwine, Harwood & Clark and Victor H. Stromquist.

There are many parallels between the Nashville restoration and what would be involved if Congress should vote to repair the historic central section of the United States Capitol rather than wall it in with a 32½-foot annex.

Legislation to halt the $10.1 million United States Capitol extension project, while a restoration study is undertaken, was reported out unanimously by the Senate Public Works Committee in March but the Senate leadership has not yet brought it to the floor.

Unless some action is taken, Congress may adjourn leaving the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol to go ahead with construction.

Tennessee considered replacing its capitol but because of the historical importance of the building decided instead to restore it. Plans to reface the building in marble likewise were discarded.

The Tennessee capitol was designed and the construction supervised by architect William Strickland, who was trained by Benjamin Latrobe.

Latrobe was the architect who carried out the original design of the United States Capitol and planned the renovation after it was burned by the British in 1814.

Like the more famous United States Capitol, the Nashville building is constructed with two thicknesses of stone. Between these two stone walls is a sand and rubble fill held together with lime mortar.

The floors are supported by brick arches that thrust outwardly against the walls. The foundations and footings also are of brick.

In the restoration, approximately 45 percent of the stone was replaced, according the architect John Howard Clark.

"We regarded every stone as sacred," Clark said, "but where it was in poor condition we replaced it."

The building remained in use during the entire period that the exterior work was in process.

The original stone for the Nashville building was brought from nearby stone quarries by prison labor.

Cornices, entablatures, intricately carved columns, and capitals were replaced. Stones as heavy as 13 tons were lifted into the cornice.

The building now looks as it did when completed in 1855.

Congratulations, Pat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S. C., July 30, 1958:

CONGRATULATIONS, PAT

Pat Moss, of York, may not have been the most beautiful gal in the Miss U. S. A. con-

test—although we'll argue the point—but she's certainly one of the most sensible beauty queens in a long time.

Pat was picked among the top 15 in the national contest—a tribute to her loveliness.

Equally impressive is her friendly, level-headed commonsense and her ability to keep her feet on the ground despite a flood of fanfare and publicity.

Some quotes when 19-year-old Pat returned Monday from the Miss U. S. A. competition in California:

On marriage:

"That isn't going to be for a long time—I'm too young and it's too much responsibility."

On a movie contract:

"Oh, I wasn't interested in anything like that."

On her plans for the future:

"I'm going back to school in the fall." (She'll be a sophomore at the University of South Carolina, where she's studying for a career as a high-school English teacher.)

On coming home:

"It's wonderful."

Because of her beauty, Pat Moss has found the limelight. Unlike many another beauty queen, it has not distorted her sense of values.

That is a credit to her—and to her rearing—and of far greater worth than a pretty face.

The National Security Clause in the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the act extending the trade agreements program, H. R. 12591, provided new criteria to define the point where imports may imperil our mobilization base. Section 8 (c) reads as follows:

oFr the purposes of this section, the Director and the President shall, in the light of the requirements of national security and without excluding other relevant factors, give consideration to domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements, the capacity of domestic industries to meet such requirements, existing and anticipated availabilities of the human resources, products, raw materials, and other supplies and services essential to the national defense, the requirements of growth of such industries and such supplies and services including the investment, exploration, and development necessary to assure such growth, and the importation of goods in terms of their quantities, availabilities, character, and use as those affect such industries and the capacity of the United States to meet national security requirements.

Many of our strategic industries vital to our national defense have been affected by import competition. I propose to make sure that the provisions enacted by the Congress to preserve our mobilization base will have meaning and substance.

At the present time the aluminum industry is experiencing great difficulties. Meetings have been held between representatives of the entire industry and the State and Commerce Departments. The chemical industry, particularly manufacturers of synthetic organic chemicals vital to our national security, have presented evidence of injury in their testimony before the Congress. Producers of heavy electrical equipment used by public utilities and manufacturers must be in a position to promptly meet emergency demands for spare parts so that there will be no interruption to our power supply.

I expect that concerted efforts will be made to determine whether the provisions adopted by the Congress will provide the necessary security for these vital industries. If they do not, the Congress must take further steps next year to provide real protection for our mobilization base.

In an address to the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association on June 10, 1958, Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, economist for the Dow Chemical Co., said:

I need not remind the members of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association that dye imports have cut heavily into dye markets. Less well known, however, is the fact that petrochemicals are coming in in sizable quantities. In 1956, about 23 million pounds of trichloroethylene were imported; in 1957, this had jumped to more than 41 million pounds. Since 1950, imports of trichloroethylene have increased almost thirtyfold and now represent about 20 percent of United States sales. Trichloroethylene, of course, is one of those mass-produced petrochemicals that the United States chemical industry is supposed to have unchallenged superiority at producing. In the past 8 or 10 months, there has also been a rapid increase in the importation of carbon tetrachloride and perchloroethylene. Those of you who have seen the reports on imported chemicals know that there are literally hundreds of individual products entering our ports every month. Imports are particularly prone to give competition in the small-volume, expensive specialty chemicals field, but are not confined to these products. In addition to the chlorinated solvents, one can add products like polyvinyl chloride, aniline, mono and trichloroacetic acids and their salts, indigo, and then even heavy inorganic chemicals such as calcium chloride and magnesium sulfate.

Our mobilization base is dependent upon the availability of many materials. Our experience during the Korean emergency clearly shows that even basic minerals such as copper, lead, and zinc were unavailable to us, although we were carrying the major portion of the military burden.

This is the time for us to determine that the legislation we have adopted will at least maintain the sinews for our national defense.

Bipartisan National Defense Education Act of 1958, H. R. 13247

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I issued the following statement:

After consultation with a number of Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor who are proponents of the national defense education bill, I have been authorized to announce that we will support amendments on the floor of the House to reduce the number of scholarships to 10,000, and to provide that they be awarded to individuals with the requisite ability on the basis of financial need only.

This agreement was arrived at in the light of certain suggestions with respect to the scholarship title of the bill expressed in President Eisenhower's letter dated July 7, 1958, to Congressman STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, and in the light also of the similar views of some of the members of the Rules Committee.

These amendments will bring the committee bill fully into line with the President's recommendations. I am confident that their adoption will assure solid bipartisan support for the bill on the floor of the House.

Today the following members of the House Committee on Education and Labor have authorized me to associate their names with the foregoing statement: Majority members: CARL ELLIOTT, CARL D. PERKINS, ROY W. WIER, LEE METCALF, EDITH GREEN, JAMES ROOSEVELT, HERBERT ZELENKO, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., STEWART L. UDALL, ELMER J. HOLLAND, LUDWIG TELLER, GEORGE MCGOVERN, JOHN DENT. Minority members: STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, HARRY G. HASKELL, JR., JOHN A. LAFORE.

Faith on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is probably the most cosmopolitan district in the country. It is populated by large segments of nationality groups, among whom are the Slovaks, the Italians, the Irish, the Hungarians, the Spanish, the West Indians, the Germans, and others. Each group has distinctive customs and traditions which form part of our American way of life.

Recently the Slovak nationality group living in my area demonstrated their religious faith by a pilgrimage to New York from the adjoining States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and eastern Pennsylvania. They celebrated a religious feast at the Bohemian National Hall in my area where prominent religious leaders delivered inspirational messages. A newspaper report of the pilgrimage will prove of interest to freedom loving peoples who decry the enslavement of religious leaders by the Communists:

TWO THOUSAND PILGRIMS FROM FOUR STATES HONOR SAINTS CYRIL AND METHODIUS

More than 2,000 pilgrims from four States—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and eastern Pennsylvania—made the annual pilgrimage in honor of Saints Cyril and Methodius, patron saints of the Slavonic nations July 6. The pilgrimage was sponsored by the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

The program started with the procession to St. John Nepomucene Church, 66th Street and First Avenue, Manhattan, where the Most Reverend Philip Furlong, auxiliary bishop of New York, representing His Eminence Cardinal Spellman celebrated pontifical mass. He was assisted by prelates and priests, who were welcomed by the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen J. Krasula, pastor of the host parish. The Reverend John F. Murcko, of Bridgeport, Conn., preached in Slovak on the life of the two apostles who brought Christianity to the Slovaks more than 1,000 years ago.

Bishop Furlong commended the Slovaks for their fealty to the Holy See. Later, at the dinner at the Bohemian National Hall, 323 East 73d Street, the bishop spoke on the faith and its importance in our lives.

A talk on the Slovak customs in religious and civic life was given by the Right Reverend Monsignor Andrew J. Romanak, director of Pope Pius XII diocesan high school, Passaic, N. J.

The Reverend Joseph Baran, of Lansford, Pa., reviewed the history of the Slovak Catholic Federation since its founding on February 21, 1911, by the late Rev. Joseph Murgas, priest, scientist in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and its catholic action.

The pilgrims welcome the Reverend Doctor Francis Skoda, professor in Rome, who is visiting his aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel V. Skoda, of Astoria, Long Island, members of St. John Nepomucene choir.

At the dinner the group adopted a series of resolutions read by the Reverend Theodoric Zubek, OFM, professor of Seton Hall University. Among the resolutions was one which protested the enslavement of the Most Reverend Michael Buzalka and the Most Reverend Jan Vojtassak and Paul Gojdic, by the Communists in Bratislava. All were sentenced to life imprisonment January 15, 1951. Closing remarks were made by Martin Kopunek, of Lansford, Pa., president of the eastern district of the federation.

The Small Farmer and National Decay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in this month's issue of the Progressive Farmer, one of our outstanding agricultural publications, there appeared an editorial which I consider of vital importance to every Member of the House of Representatives. The editorial deals with the migration of our Nation's small farmers from the land and the current plight of the independent agriculturist. With the thought that the editorial would be of interest to the Members, it is my pleasure to include same herewith:

THE SMALL FARMER AND NATIONAL DECAY

History may have some words of counsel for America in this era when small farmers are leaving the land in such great numbers and when so many even in agriculture are saying, "The day of the small farmer is gone."

In the seventh and eighth centuries B. C., Old Testament prophets were thundering out warnings to the Jewish people. Open your Bible to Isaiah 5: 8: "Woe to those who join house to house, who add field to field, until there is no more room, and you are made to dwell alone in the midst of the land." In Amos 8: 4 we find the sheepherder upbraiding those "who * * * bring the poor of the land to an end." These prophets and others in their group fall in the period broadly of 800 B. C. to 695 B. C. Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jews taken away into captivity in 587 B. C. The Kingdom of Israel was carried away into captivity in 721 B. C.

In Rome, around 133 B. C., Tribune of the people Tiberius Gracchus sought to stop the depopulation of the land and the decline of farming. He proposed to divide up state lands, mostly controlled by powerful patricians, into small farms. Not only did he lose his life in the attempt; 9 years later his brother Gaius perished as well in pushing these and other reforms. The reforms achieved little success, and people continued to pour into the cities. A hundred years later, in 31 B. C., the Republic was dead and a dictatorship established.

In England in the 16th century (the 1500's), the fight between powerful interests taking up more and more land and small farmers being driven from their holdings by the thousands reached unbelievable levels. Those gobbling up the land and causing unemployment actually got through Parliament laws permitting mutilation and hanging of vagrants.

Fortunately for Britain, the discovery of the New World released the pressures of land hunger and of conflict for over 150 years. In the 1700's trouble began building up again. A generation before 1800, Oliver Goldsmith had written in the Deserted Village:

"One only master grasps the whole domain,
And half a tillage stints thy smiling plain.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

A time there was, ere England's grief began,
When every rood of ground maintained its man.

But times are altered; trade' unfeeling train
Usurp the land and dispossess the swain;
Along the lawn, where scattered hamlet rose,
Unwieldy wealth and cumbrous pomp repose."

Again, if it had not been for new lands overseas and the tremendous growth of British world trade, the results might have been disastrous. World War I and near starvation finally brought England to her senses. The lesson was further emphasized in World War II. Yet England as the world's No. 1 power is no more.

No one who knows history would presume to say that the squeezing of small farmers off the land will of itself bring a nation to disaster. But it can be said with emphasis that the forcing of small farmers off the land is one of the sure symptoms of a highly complex disease that leads to national disaster. America needs to awaken to some of these symptoms while there is yet time to cure the disease.

Department of Chemistry, the University of Tennessee, Endorses H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which speaks for itself:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
Knoxville, July 30, 1958.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLIOTT: I hope you will lend your support to the passage of H. R. 13247.

Very sincerely yours,

C. A. BUEHLER,
D. A. SHIRLEY,
H. A. SMITH,
Department of Chemistry.

Distinguished Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a distinguished citizen who is observing his 70th birthday today. He is Hon. George A. Garrett, former Ambassador to Ireland and currently president of the Federal City Council. The council is a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization dedicated to promoting the economic, social, and cultural growth of our Nation's Capital. As its head, Mr. Garrett is playing a unique, bipartisan role of leadership in helping guide and spark a vast program of physical improvement and better planning designed to transform Washington into a truly great Capital City of the free world.

This is an effort in which all Americans should take a keen interest. Our first metropolis belongs, not only to those citizens who reside here, but to your constituents and mine. Washington should exemplify our highest American standards for urban development. But like most cities, it shares vast problems of economic, social, and political change. Americans everywhere can be glad that leaders such as Ambassador Garrett and the other members of the Federal City Council are helping to meet this challenge.

I have had the privilege of working with Mr. Garrett on several major projects designed to improve our Capital City. My admiration and respect for him have been kindled by his statesmanship and vision, and his exceptional grasp of this city's basic difficulties. His remarkable ability to mediate civic differences is due in no small part to the high esteem in which he is held by top governmental and congressional leaders of both parties.

It was in recognition of Ambassador Garrett's talent for mediation that President Eisenhower appointed him White House emissary in 1955 with the task of expediting redevelopment of Southwest Washington. This gigantic $400-million program is designed to clear 600 slum acres within the shadow of the Capitol. It is easily the largest single redevelopment program ever launched. However, it has stumbled on several occasions when serious roadblocks developed. Mr.

Garrett has played a lead role in resolving official differences which threatened the program's success.

Only last December the Ambassador helped negotiate the $5,800,000 loan for construction of the first units in pilot area B. At that time, the Washington Daily News commented editorially:

Without awarding it exclusive credit, which it would be the first to disclaim, the Federal City Council under Mr. Garrett's presidency can take a bow for this triumph over the local interia that permitted this valuable section of Washington to retrogress. The FCC has made a valuable contribution to the Capital * * * in moving the rehabilitation plan for Southwest Washington toward reality.

Ambassador Garrett has personally guided the ambitious program of civic development voted by council members ever since the organization was formed in 1954. In addition to southwest redevelopment, this ranges from the recommended creation of a Metropolitan Authority for dealing with Washington's metro problems, to agreement on a compromise site for the city's proposed cultural center. In a recent statement, Mr. Garrett summed up the purpose of these activities as follows:

We who compose the Federal City Council share a deep concern for the economic future of our people * * * a future that has been endangered with vast suburbanization, changing land uses, and deploying populations. We have full and abiding faith in the capacity of our public and private institutions * * * free and democratic * * * to cope with the central problems which confront us. But we are convinced too that through citizen action we can help in great measure to mold vital urban trends.

Mr. Garrett's concern over the future of the Nation's Capital is deep-rooted and long-standing. He has been a resident of Washington for nearly 50 years. His civic achievements also include outstanding service as president of Washington's Emergency Hospital, as vice president and director of the National Symphony Orchestra, in key roles with the American Red Cross, and in leading many other worthy causes.

During President Truman's administration, he served as Minister to Ireland and, later, as our first Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland. He was appointed by President Truman as a member of the District Redevelopment Land Agency in 1947.

The salient facts of Mr. Garrett's life include the following:

He was born in LaCrosse, Wisc., on August 5, 1888. He obtained his schooling at Cornell University and the University of Chicago—in the intervening years, the Ambassador has received honorary degrees of doctor of laws from Trinity College in Dublin, and doctor of humanities in "Humane Letters" from the Clarkson Schol of Technology.

Mr. Garrett began his Washington business career in 1912 as vice president of the Dupont National Bank of Washington. Since 1940 he has served as general partner with the investment banking firm of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith.

Today, the Federal City Council is presenting its first distinguished service citation to the Ambassador. This congratulatory plaque reads as follows:

The Federal City Council presents this distinguished service citation to the Honorable George A. Garrett on the occasion of his 70th birthday, with warmest congratulations and in recognition of his distinguished leadership as president of the Federal City Council since its inception in 1954, and his unflagging devotion to the present and future development of the Nation's Capital City as a significant symbol of civic achievement in the free world.

We honor George Garrett today in sincere appreciation of his dedicated service, his practical vision—and for his outstanding example which is a continuing source of strength and inspiration to us all.

The distinguished service award was signed by each officer of the Federal City Council in behalf of the 75 members of the council's board of trustees. The following men were the signatories: Francis G. Addison, Jr., chairman; William J. McManus, vice president; Louis W. Prentiss, vice president, project planning; Edward C. Baltz, vice president, finance; Bruce Baird, secretary; Frank J. Luchs, treasurer; James C. Wilkes, general counsel; G. Yates Cook, executive director.

I am pleased to include editorial tributes to Mr. Garrett from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star and the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 5, 1958]

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The selection of George A. Garrett as recipient of the Federal City Council's first distinguished service citation comes on a felicitous occasion—none other than Mr. Garrett's 70th birthday.

There is no need to review in detail the contributions to a better life in his community which have brought Mr. Garrett this recognition. To mention but a few, he has been president of the council since its formation in 1954. He has played a leading role in the Southwest Revelopment project. He participated actively in the recommended creation of a Metropolitan Authority to deal with area problems. He has served as president of Emergency Hospital, as vice president and director of the National Symphony Orchestra, and in key positions with the American Red Cross. With all of this, he is a good friend and a congenial companion. We would like to express our hearty endorsement of the council's choice for its first distinguished service award.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 5, 1958]

CITATION FOR SERVICE

The first distinguished service citation of the Federal City Council could not have been conferred by its trustees upon a more deserving citizen of Washington than George A. Garrett, the council's president since its founding 4 years ago. Much of the council's success in expediting such projects as the Potomac bridges, rezoning and Southwest Washington redevelopment has been due to the patient persistence of Mr. Garrett, aided by Council Chairman Francis G. Addison, Jr., and other prominent men from the city's business and professional circles who have given generously of their time and talent to these public enterprises. The award to Mr. Garrett coincides with his 70th birthday today, and we are pleased to join with his friends in extending congratulations and best wishes.

The Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article on the Middle East situation:

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 3, 1958]

RUSSIANS NOT READY TO FIGHT, SWIFT MIDEAST SHOWDOWN INDICATES

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 2.—One fundamental fact emerges from the swift showdown of the last 3 weeks which transcends everything else that has happened in the Middle East or is likely to occur at the summit.

It is this: The Soviet Union is not yet ready for world war III.

If it were, this and millions of other commentaries would never have been written. But the astonishing thing is that such a starkly significant fact has been generally ignored in the preoccupation of pundits, amateur and professional alike, with the moral and legal aspects of the United States landing in Lebanon, whether Nasser is a Communist or Brigadier General Kassem is a Nasserite, the subtleties of De Gaulle's notes and when shall we all meet again in New York or Geneva.

Fortunately, it can be confidently reported that President Eisenhower and his top advisers in the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the policymaking echelons of the State Department have kept their eyes on this crucial point: The Soviet Union is not ready to fight now for any real estate, resource or revolutionary movement beyond its own borders or those Communist-controlled territories immediately adjacent.

This has been the prevailing assumption in Washington for some time, though it has not been tested since Korea, and it was not perfectly proved then. In 1950 there were two layers of satellite insulation, North Korea and Red China, between United States fighting forces and the Russian homeland. Furthermore, there was nothing the Soviets wanted or needed in the whole Korean peninsula.

But what on July 14 was a good guess is now a demonstrated truth, not only here but in every world capital, large and small, where worried men constantly calculate the balance sheet of power. There is precious little moralizing in the inner councils of any government where survival is concerned. For all but the two contending giants the rock-bottom consideration is which way to lean or to jump. More simply, who's winning?

There is little doubt that President Eisenhower's patient and persistent talk of peace, at home and abroad, misled the cynics in foreign chancelleries to conclude that the United States, for all its power, would never use it except to repel an attack on its own soil. His consistent, though historically debatable, decision to stop the British, French and Israeli attack on Egypt in 1956 seemed to confirm this, as did the passive United States reaction to the kidnaping of American servicemen by East Germans and Cuban rebels.

SUEZ RECALLED

At the time of Suez, Khrushchev rattled his intermediate range ballistic rockets and

practically panicked London and Paris, along with the rest of Western Europe. This was the genesis of our NATO allies' clamor for another summit conference, on the one hand, and a share in United States missiles and nuclear know-how on the other.

Before the current Middle East crisis was a week old Khrushchev was again brandishing his intercontinental missiles and whole arsenal of atomic weapons. But this time nobody was much alarmed because the United States had acted. They knew that if Khrushchev intended to use his missiles he would already have fired them at Turkish airbases and the United States 6th Fleet off Beirut.

Mr. Khrushchev has been cut down to size, in the opinion of United States strategists, and the Soviet Union has lost tremendous "face" all over the world where the bald facts of his bluff calling are known and where the realities of power are recognized.

CALAMITY HOWLERS

Right now many sincere, patriotic citizens are howling that the United States faces a terrible defeat in the propaganda war whether or not there is a summit meeting between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev. The fact is, if we only back away from Baghdad and Beirut long enough to look at the global battlefield, we have already won half of a momentous propaganda victory.

We have demonstrated (to President Nasser among others) that the Soviet Union is not ready yet to fight, for all its sputniks and scaremongering, and that the United States will risk war for its friends and is capable of moving formidable forces halfway around the earth in a matter of hours.

Now, if we can remove our troops promptly (having already proved they could come back on short notice) and confirm our contention that we have no colonial designs before anybody gets shot, United States prestige will rise as Russia's falls.

Khrushchev's best bet always has been to keep American troops in the Middle East forever or until we get as sick of the whole affair as we did Korea and leave the job half finished, hated by the people we tried to help.

ONE ALTERNATIVE

His alternative hope is to make any United States withdrawal appear to have been forced by Soviet wrath and threats of counteraction. This is becoming less credible every day. One peril point remaining is the chance that Khrushchev in desperation might try a limited military move to upset the slowly stabilizing situation.

Otherwise, whether the argument is conducted at a summit meeting or at long range as it has been thus far, it is essentially a post mortem. The main point stands: the Russians aren't ready. We are.

What pseudopsychological warriors so often overlook is that propaganda is not and never has been a substitute for physical force. If this were so, we could have more preachers and no policemen, and the United Nations, or for that matter the League of Nations, could indeed guarantee world peace.

Propaganda is a valuable and relatively cheap supplement for force. It sometimes has temporarily held off superior forces (as Hitler did while rearming, as Churchill did when Britain stood alone, and as Khrushchev and his predecessors have been doing for 40 years) but it has never won a battle alone.

OPEN CRITICISM

—There is ample reason to criticize the clumsy efforts of United States propagandists, but the deed and not the word is what really matters. It was not Moscow's boasting that impressed the world when the first satellite went into orbit, it was the launching itself. President Truman's dire hints of devastating weapons did not bring Japan's surrender, but two atomic bombs did.

The Communists are exceedingly good at propaganda, but are perhaps more aware than we are of its limitations. Certainly they never neglect physical force.

Marxist ideas got nowhere until the Russian Navy and Army came under control of the Bolsheviks, and the practical necessity of keeping power has prevailed over doctrine within the Kremlin ever since.

In short, the best-informed and clearest-thinking American officials and observers with whom this reporter has talked throughout this hectic period have this outlook for the future: We don't have to be afraid of losing this propaganda duel. All we need to worry about now is losing our nerve.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am reporting herewith the results of my latest poll of public opinion on 12 major issues. I hope my colleagues in the Congress find them interesting and informative.

As background, I might point out that I have been taking these polls since first coming to Congress in 1939. They are in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple "yes" or "no" answers, and they are mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of political party. The district is almost evenly split between Republicans and Democrats.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries, and some very fine farmlands. The district includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small residential towns in northern Allegheny County.

The returns to this questionnaire were exceptionally good, and the total response virtually constitutes a referendum of the district.

The questions and the percentage replies follow:

1. Do you believe that the Federal Government has done about all it should do to end the recession? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

2. Would you favor giving the President the necessary funds and discretionary power to provide economic aid to Communist nations other than Russia and China? Yes, 26 percent; no, 74 percent.

3. Would you vote for the main objectives of the President's reciprocal trade program as against stronger tariff protection? Yes, 76 percent; no, 24 percent.

4. Do you agree with the President and the congressional leadership that there should be no major tax cut at this time? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

5. In your opinion, can we safely cut the size of our Army, National Guard, and Ready Reserves? Yes, 25 percent; no, 75 percent.

6. Do you believe that labor unions should be compelled by law to ballot secretly on strike issues, election of officers, and union dues? Yes, 93 percent; no, 7 percent.

7. Are you generally satisfied with the administration's conduct of foreign affairs? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

8. A major church in a recent policy statement declared that we must learn to coexist with the Russians or face coextinction. Do you agree? Yes, 34 percent; no, 66 percent.

9. Would you favor a pension of $100 per month for every World War I veteran over 65 years of age? Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

10. Would you have the United States quit testing nuclear weapons, regardless of what other nations do? Yes, 9 percent; no, 91 percent.

11. Do you believe that inflation is a greater threat to our welfare than recession or depression? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

12. Are you satisfied that the United States is making adequate progress in conquering outer space? Yes, 65 percent; no, 35 percent.

New Solo Record Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to a previous article entered therein, on Monday, July 14, 1958, entitled "Long Distance Record Sought for United States of America." This article described the efforts of Capt. "Pat" Boling, of Palo Alto, Calif., to establish a new international record for long-distance flying. On last Friday, August 1, 1958, Captain Boling successfully completed his efforts in this direction. The article set forth below describes same:

BOLING SETS SOLO NONSTOP RECORD

PENDLETON, OREG.—Capt. Marion (Pat) Boling, who said "I'm sorry I couldn't take it farther," landed his Beechcraft Bonanza here at 11:52 a. m. Friday after flying 6,873 miles across the Pacific Ocean from Manila to shatter the record for a solo, nonstop flight in a single-engine plane.

The veteran United Airlines pilot left Manila at dawn Thursday (2:06 p. m. P. s. t. Wednesday) and flew over the North Pacific and northwestern North America to Pendleton in an unofficial time of 45 hours, 46 minutes. His bright orange plane consumed 401 gallons of gasoline on the flight. "I feel remarkably well," Boling said when his Beechcraft touched down at Pendleton Airport. "I'm sorry I couldn't take it farther."

On hand to greet Boling when he landed were his wife, Joyce, and their 9-year-old son, Kevin. They had been waiting at Boise, Idaho, where Boling originally planned to land. He changed his plans when his fuel supply began to dwindle and told the Civil Aeronautics Administration at Seattle he would set down at Yakima, Wash. However, he decided to press on another 67 miles to Pendleton. Mrs. Boling and Kevin flew to Yakima in a plane supplied by the Beech Aircraft Corp., and then returned to Pendleton 5 minutes before Boling landed. They also have two daughters, Kerry, 4, and Jullian, 2.

The 43-year-old Palo Alto, Calif., pilot told newsmen who pressed around him when he stepped from his plane that he had subsisted on dried fruit and fig newtons. "I

hope I never eat another fig newton," he commented.

Boling bettered by some 1,600 miles the former single-engine plane distance mark of 5,273 miles set in 1949 by the late Capt. Bill Odom.

Boling's route from Manila took him over Japan to the Aleutians, over Vancouver Island off the Canadian coast to a landfall east of Seattle, then southeast to Pendleton in the northeast corner of Oregon.

He told newsmen, photographers and well-wishers that all went well on his long, lonely flight but that for a time Thursday night "I was afraid I was going to have to set it down in the cold, blue Pacific." He said the engine threatened to quit because of icy conditions. But as the roughness smoothed out he was able to continue the flight without incident. He said he had about 3 gallons of gasoline left when he landed here.

Along with the welcoming crowd here was a customs official who had dogged Boling's path from Seattle as it appeared that the light plane would not be landing at an official port of entry.

Goodbye to a Dollar a Barrel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Bushrod Howard, Jr., as it appeared in the New Republic of August 4, 1958, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues.

Before his recent return to the United States, Mr. Howard headed the Middle East legal department of the Iraq Petroleum Co. at Tripoli—1948–52—and had responsibilities for government and concessionary relations for Socony Mobil Oil—1952–57. He represented Socony Mobil Oil on missions at the United Nations and was an observer at the first London Conference on Suez in August 1956. Since 1957 he has served as a consultant to the Middle East Institute and to various oil companies in Washington:

GOODBYE TO A DOLLAR A BARREL—A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW OIL POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Bushrod Howard, Jr.)

"What Mr. Dulles and Mr. Lloyd have apparently agreed upon is a policy of encouraging the development of independent Arab States that will be free to continue oil commerce between the Middle East and the West. The British have made clear to the Soviet Union in the past * * * that this is essential to the security of Britain and that Britain will fight, if necessary, to prevent those oil resources from being denied to Britain by a hostile power. The new factor is that the United States is now apparently backing that policy." (James Reston, the New York Times, July 21.)

"The Western governments say that they are interested in using oil and other raw material resources in this area of the world. But the nations of this area do not deny this opportunity to the Western Powers. They demand only one thing: That this problem should be solved on an equitable and mutually profitable commercial basis—which is the most reasonable principle." (Nikita Khrushchev, message to President Eisenhower, July 20.)

In my opinion it is not yet too late to win Arab agreement on equitable terms for a guaranteed flow of oil to the West. But it is indeed too late for any lasting agreement based on the old definition of "equitable." Do we want to assure a place for western oil companies in the Middle East? Do we want to avoid economic blackmail at the hands of Arab governments? Then far-reaching and fundamental reforms are necessary in the oil companies' pricing policies and patterns of corporate organization. What Arab leaders—including the new Iraqi regime—are saying publicly and privately has reinforced my belief that most Middle East leaders would presently accept, in their own interest, long-term arrangements conceding a place to the oil companies in the Middle East—providing the companies can be made to accept important changes in their relations with each of the Arab governments.

The need for reform turns on 2 facts: 8 private oil firms, 5 of them American, are today free to put unconscionable prices on—and take unconscionable profits from—Middle East oil without answering to any public authority; and, most of these firms are vast international combines embracing companies and interests spread over a number of rival countries.

Let us consider why these facts are so crucial; what workable reforms should, as a consequence, be considered, and why these reforms are preconditions for any successful Middle East regional development.

I. A PRICE ARBITRATION PLAN

At the outset it is necessary to dispose of the often-heard argument that the West can, after all, call the tune in the Middle East insofar as oil is concerned. Fortune magazine, for example, recently assured its readers that "the Middle East must do business with the West, for only the West can use and pay for its oil." Most reassuring. But such statements ignore the uncontested fact that the West has no substitute for Middle East oil. Europe and much of Asia must either get their oil from that area or they will not get oil in the amounts needed. Even if the Western Hemisphere could supply Europe for more than an emergency period, which is doubtful, the price would be bankruptcy: the cost to Europe for its oil would at least double. To say, therefore, that the Middle East must do business with the West is the equivalent of saying that monopoly must sell to consumers. It is true in one sense, but the unanswered question—and crucial one—is under what conditions and at what price?

The Middle East has 170 billion barrels of proved reserves which were discovered by drilling less than 1,500 oil wells. (By comparison the United States drilled 1,638,000 oil wells to discover 94 billion barrels, of which all but 30 billion barrels have been consumed.) Today the Sheikdom of Kuwait at the head of the Persian Gulf has 60 billion barrels of proved oil reserves—twice as much as the United States. But such figures are not the sum of the oil deposits in the countries bordering the Persian Gulf, for the Middle East seems to be an almost unique geologic province. There marine sedementary deposits, which are the ones that produce oil, lie in great depth and are combined with large, relatively unbroken foldings which result in accumulations of oil that measure 10 to 150 miles in length and that contains 5 billion to 30 billion barrels of oil. Although there are encouraging indications that major discoveries may be made elsewhere, notably the Sahara and offshore United States, the chairman of a major American oil company expressed the universal belief of oil experts in saying that "on the basis of nearly a century of experience, the odds against finding another oil province on this earth comparable to that around the Persian Gulf are too great to make such a hope a sound basis for the free world's long-range planning."

Presently this oil province is being exploited by 8 major international companies: Standard Oil (New Jersey), Standard Oil (California), Texas, Gulf, Socony, and Royal Dutch Shell, British Petroleum (55 percent controlled by the British Treasury), and Compagnie Française des Petroles (the French Government company). The major oil-producing countries of the Middle East are the Sheikdom of Kuwait, a British-protected state with 2,000 square miles of territory, 200,000 population, a production of 1,350,000 barrels a day, and an oil income of better than $375 million a year; the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, population 6 million, production 1,050,000 barrels per day, annual oil income $300 million; Iraq, population 5 million, oil production 700,000 barrels, oil income $250 million; Iran, population 20 million, oil production 850,000 barrels a day, oil income $275 million; the Sheikdom of Qatar, population 20,000, production 150,000 barrels a day, oil income $50 million a year.

In my view, since there is no practical alternative for Europe and most of Asia to using Middle East oil, the insistence that the price of this oil continue to be set by private oil companies is indefensible. It makes no sense to argue, as does a leading oil economist, that price is determined by the economic fact that when oil becomes too expensive Europe will turn to low-grade coal or other energy sources such as atomic power. This is like telling the householder that if electricity becomes too expensive he can always use candles. Middle East oil is the cheapest source of energy available to the European consumer for his increasing needs. Therefore, Middle East oil prices must eventually be regulated on the same basis as that of any public utility.

If the oil companies could—by leaving present arrangements undisturbed—assure the continued supply of Middle East oil to consumers, perhaps it would make sense to go on paying them their average of a dollar per barrel in after-tax profits. But the trouble is: present arrangements will not endure, and while sufficient unto the day may be an adequate maxim for a business venture, it should not be the rule that guides the United States Government.

Actually, if the companies are realistic, they will be willing to settle for regulation under national and international controls in preference not only to nationalization but to sweeping schemes for internationalization. At the time of the London conference on Suez in 1956, an influential British weekly, the Observer, proposed that Middle East oil resources be transferred to an international public corporation representing both the local States and those providing the capital, which after payment of compensation would use the profits for the joint development of the region. Such proposals involving compensation unfortunately run aground on the fact that the companies would claim payment for their assets and future profits, not just the payment for the capital value of their installations; and since, combined, they can expect to earn about $170 billion in the next 30-odd years as after-tax profits, at the anticipated dollar per barrel average, any agreement on the amount of compensation due would be impossible. This impossibility has been used by Washington to justify maintenance of present private arrangements—no matter what the corresponding political price and even at the risk of war. But between continuing the dollar-profit-a-barrel policy and compensating the companies in the amount of $170 billion, there is an alternative.

On the surface it might seem that the Arab Governments themselves stand to gain.

along with the companies, from high prices and consequently larger oil royalties. But this ignores the old economic truth that high prices keep down sales, sales which should—given sensible pricing policies—increase on an astonishing scale of progression. Oil is not only essential to Europe today but is the only major reserve for a world whose rising population requires rapid industrialization. The United States will be using 40 percent more oil in 1967 than in 1957. Europe's demand for oil will, at the least, double every 8 years. The less-developed areas of the world will have an even greater demand for oil, Asia and particularly India depending on the availability of cheap energy for their industrialization.

Already the new Iraqi regime has made clear—without yet threatening nationalization—that it will insist on greater revenues from its oil. Increased revenues for Iraq can be accomplished, it goes without saying, through price increases by the Iraq Petroleum Co. accompanied by new concession terms giving Iraq a greater share of the profits. But why should this happen when, in the long run, everyone would be better served by lower prices?

To take another example, how can Kuwait, with a production cost of less than 5 cents a barrel, justify a price of $1.85?

I propose that the producer and transit states of the Middle East, the oil companies (financing and operating) and the consumer states all submit themselves to compulsory jurisdiction of an international arbitration board—under the tutelage of the U. N. General Assembly—empowered to resolve disputes on prices and other matters between companies and governments (i. e., producer, transit, and consumer governments). The board would arbitrate price disputes, not fix prices. Revision of price, or refusal to allow price changes, could only come as a consequence of a complaint to the board by one of the interested parties.

In the absence of this, or a similar price arbitration mechanism, the price of Middle East oil will remain administered (i. e., not based on the market) by companies which are often at one and the same time sellers and producers, refiners, and marketers. Under existing policies, the price they set takes into account the price of oil in the United States as well as the demands of producer and consumer states and of other potential troublemakers who are not direct parties—such as the United States Department of Justice, the United States Congress, and domestic producers. In the past nearly all price conflicts have been resolved against the consumer, i. e., a higher cost to the user has been the answer.

There are, to be sure, certain dilemmas implicit in any reduction of the price of Middle East oil. The world needs more oil and more venture capital to find the oil: the profit must be high enough to attract such venture capital. Also, our domestic producers—those advocates of "no governmental interference"—want ironclad quotas to prevent any flooding of the United States market with Middle East oil which even now is cheaper—delivered to the United States—than domestic oil.

Neither of these dilemmas need defeat us. A tariff could be levied on Middle East oil imported into the United States, set at the difference between the United States price and the delivered cost of Middle East oil. The revenues from this tariff could be used to buy shut-in production (i. e., discovered fields) for a United States national petroleum reserve. To encourage new exploration in the Middle East, the present 50-50 formula—splitting half and half, between company and producer country, the difference between cost and so-called posted price—could be amended to 66⅔ percent for the company and 33⅓ percent for the country for the first 500 million barrels, and 33⅓ percent for the company and 66⅔ percent for the country thereafter. The price of Persian Gulf oil should be reduced 20 percent from an average of about $2 a barrel to about $1.60 a barrel. The present concession holders in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Kuwait would, of course, get less profit—but even half of what the Kuwait owners now get annually ($375 million)—would not be a bad profit after taxes.

This would be a reasonable proposal for the United States to put to the producing countries of the Middle East. The producing countries could well agree to such new price levels because their unit profit would remain the same and with a lower price their production, which is to say markets, would rise appreciably.

Saudi, Iraqis, and Americans with whom I have discussed this proposal raise an important related question: The companies would, they say, hike their prices indirectly beyond the control and even knowledge of the producing countries—through refinery, transportation, and other charges. This fear seems to me groundless. But it leads to my second proposal.

II. A NEW CORPORATE STRUCTURE

It is a fact of profound political importance that the small Middle East state feels powerless before the major integrated oil company. Standard Oil (a term once used to describe any major American oil company) and Anglo-Iranian (the pre-Mossadegh British company in Iran) are now replaced with the epithet "the oil companies." The memory of some of the rather questionable practices of the oil companies in influencing internal affairs of the various Arab countries is ever present. The possibility of sincere reformation of the oil companies is simply not believed. Kamil al-Chaderchi, the leader of the National Democratic Party of Iraq (one of the parties represented in the new regime) once said in talking to an AP correspondent:

"Iraqi public opinion regards the oil companies as usurpers, the latter having conspired with the British Government to rob the country of its most vital resources. The British Government has exploited Iraq's weakness, as in the case of the Mosul region which the Turks once claimed unrightly fully for themselves, and whose maintenance as part of Iraq the British said they would not uphold unless the Iraq Government was most indulgent with the oil company, failing which the Mosul region would go to the Turks who would readily grant the oil company the concession.

"Whether or not the British warning was meant as such it caused the Iraq Government to grant the concession to the company on a long-term basis and at a very cheap price."

This charge is true, and the defense that it happened in 1925 is not adequate in Iraq—even in 1958.

In Saudi Arabia, too, officials and intellectuals chafe at their helplessness in dealing with a group of integrated major companies. The Director General of Oil Affairs in the Saudi Government, Sheikh Abdullah Tariki, has said that the parent companies of Aramco—Standard Oil (New Jersey), Standard Oil (California), Texas, and Socony—encompass many interests opposed to those of Saudi Arabia. He feels Aramco should be an independent company doing business only in Saudi Arabia. It is being recognized to some extent—and indeed, it seems to me self-evident—that government-owned or controlled companies—such as British Petroleum or Compagnie Française des Petroles—will not be tolerated for long in the Middle East (government-controlled companies are not permitted in most Latin American countries). But it is not recognized at all that the Arab governments will never fully trust the major integrated international company and want instead companies with interests restricted to each national jurisdiction.

What the Arabs want, in short, is what the United States courts wanted when Dupont was ordered to divest itself of General Motors. In the case of Aramco, many Arab suspicions would be removed if the parent companies were to distribute their shares in Aramco to their shareholders. Aramco would then be a new and independent entity with economic interests more parallel to those of the Saudi Government. The Saudis would then have less reason to feel—as they do now—that some of the owners sell other oil before they sell Saudi oil. If an independent Aramco decided on a reduction in price, its decision would be trusted as one made with long-range Saudi interests in mind.

To encourage the companies to disperse their stock I would favor legislation exempting such a "spin-off" of stock from capital gains taxation. This might seem to constitute a windfall, but if the oil companies could, by this means, be made to consider fundamental reorganization, I believe this would be a small price to pay for the attendant political benefits. Such a breakup of the operating companies would, moreover, help keep within bounds the ever-increasing political power of the integrated oil companies.

As a general rule I propose that ways be explored to restrict holdings by integrated companies to those foreign producing companies which export less than 200,000 barrels per day.

III. KUWAIT AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

With these two proposals as the basis for a new approach to the Middle East, we can proceed—and should proceed—to realize the full economic benefits of our reforms. We should move on toward the often-discussed regional development fund into which surplus oil revenues would be channeled. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY is one of the many who have pressed for such a fund—under U. N. auspices—to serve as a capital reservoir and technical planning body for Middle East development.

To establish such a fund the revenue surpluses of Kuwait would be essential—this year, for example, Kuwait could contribute $250 million—and here joint action with Britain becomes necessary. With its production of 1.3 million barrels per day and its population of only 200,000 Kuwait has had enough surplus income (despite lavishness if not extravagance) to become the largest single provider of new capital to the London money market. Kuwait has exported three-quarters of a billion dollars of capital to Britain since 1950 and this year is expected to export at least $200 million more. Needless to say this fact is known to Nasser, who is also aware that with capital-poor Egypt's rapidly increasing population he must obtain surplus capital for economic development unless Egypt is literally to starve. The increase in Egypt's population, now 23 million, is at a rate of close to 400,000 a year. That, not Israel, is Nasser's major problem.

A regional development fund financed by surplus revenues would do more than anything else, it seems to me, to assure a continuous flow of oil. Given such a fund, the transit countries—Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon—would have a strong vested interest in keeping the oil coming from the fields through the pipelines to Western and Asian consumers.

As matters stand, in the absence of a fund, the knowledge that so much surplus capital is leaving a region that is in such need of capital enrages Arab nationalists. It has seemed to many that the British have compromised their position as a trustee by overeagerness to obtain the Sheikh of Kuwait's funds. The State Department, when asked

if it had considered advising the British to have some of this sum invested in the Middle East, replied that the Sheikh of Kuwait insisted on his money being invested in London. I am informed that this is the view generally held by State Department Middle East experts: it isn't up to us, they say, to tell the Sheikh of Kuwait where to invest his funds. But since Kuwait exists only by virtue of British protection, American acquiescence in this channeling of massive amounts of capital from an underdeveloped region to a highly industrialized United States ally is interpreted as American indifference to the welfare of the Middle East. Far from acquiescing, the United States should, on the contrary, be prepared to help underwrite the loss to Britain of Kuwait investment capital.

While Nasser confers with the Sheikh of Kuwait, our State Department tells us that regional development plans are impractical. There is some talk in the Department that transit dues might be raised (this to pacify for a time Arab owners), but this sounds suspiciously as though only another charge is to be passed on to the consumer. Less radical proposals than the diversion of Kuwait's surplus have been made recently by former British Minister of State Anthony Nutting, by the Lebanese politician-pipeline builder Emile Bustani, and by the Foreign Minister of Italy. They envisage contributions by oil-producing governments and by the oil companies of 5 to 10 percent of their profits to a Middle East Regional Development Fund. But all such ideas have fallen on barren ground. On at least one occasion a plan of this nature was submitted to authorities in Washington by an oilman with the knowledge and approval of his company; the company was willing to have the plan discussed but not willing to sponsor it. State Department officials sympathetic to the project privately advised, however, that it would get nowhere unless it was sponsored by the companies. (Investigation confirmed that this was correct.) The project remains undisturbed in the archives of the Department.

I hold no illusions that any of the parties concerned will rush to adopt the proposals which I have set forth. But I submit that these are realistic suggestions. Certainly a clinging to the status quo can only lead to a succession of new losses by the West in the Middle East. The immediate goal of United States policy must be to avoid nationalization until we can have internationalization.

The order of priority of those who must be persuaded to accept these proposals (and, also, in my view, the order of difficulty) is the administration, the American oil companies, the foreign oil companies—last, the Arabs.

LOW-COST, HIGH-PROFIT OIL

The immensity of Middle East oil fields permits extremely low production costs, ranging from less than 10 cents to a maximum of 30 cents a barrel for oil that is sold for $2.12—an average profit per barrel of from $1.75 to $1.90. This, together with low exploration costs, results in astronomical profits, as it takes only 5 feet of drilling to discover the same amount of oil in the Middle East as is discovered by drilling 1 mile in this country.

This year the oil companies and the producing States will split a profit of more than $2.5 billion. In 1966, by which date the Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that the present production rate of 4 million barrels per day will increase to 8 million barrels per day, the profits under present prices would be $5.5 billion. By 1974, production will again double for a profit of $11 billion.

Meat Price Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the current high price of meat to consumers has, for some time, been of concern to the Consumers Study Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman. We have been surprised, as I am sure have most Members of the House, to witness the paradox of meat prices climbing to record levels at a time of unemployment and economic recession.

The March, the subcommittee issued a brief report, Trends in Efficiency in Meat Processing and Distribution. That document considered efficiency trends in the meatpacking industry from 1947 to 1954.

The problems of meat prices and efficiency in meat processing and distribution have continued to intrigue me. I have, therefore, continued to study them beyond the scope of the subcommittee's report. As a result of this study, I have found much additional material concerning these important problems.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, here are a few of the findings I have made:

First. Prices received by farmers for livestock have increased in recent months, but these prices are still below those of previous peak periods. The increases in livestock prices reflect the temporary shortage in the marketing of hogs and cattle. This shortage is primarily the result of the following factors: (a) The drought in 1957 reduced cattle stocks, and (b) high feed ratios appear to have brought on more extended feeding periods for livestock.

The shortage of hogs and cattle is temporary and there is reason to expect that some reduction in livestock prices paid farmers will occur before the end of the year, especially in hog prices. In other words, scarcity again will prove only short-term support to farm prices and an illusory prop to farm income.

Second. When livestock prices go up, these changes reflect in the wholesale and retail meat prices, but when livestock prices fall, retail meat prices do not march in step. Obviously, the margins between the prices paid to farmers for livestock and the prices paid by consumer for meat have been widened. Meatpackers and retailers have a greater power to protect their price margins against price trends than do farmers have the power to stabilize their price structure.

Third. Many of the devices by which the major meatpackers used to control or influence livestock markets in former years are no longer operative. The packers complain, on the other hand, that food chains are able to bid on their output on a take-it-or-leave- it basis. Competition certainly exists in the food retailing industry. But the meatpackers complain that the buying power of the chains guarantees that margins between wholesale and retail prices do not disappear and that substantial profits are made. The meatpackers claim that they are increasingly becoming mere subcontractors for big chains.

Fourth. In large measure and at some saving in total economic cost, food chains have taken over the earlier functions of major meatpackers in the distribution of meat from the packinghouse to the retail store. The complicated and extensive distribution networks which gave major packers a firm control over markets have been duplicated by chains.

Fifth. The meat industry is currently undergoing a technical change. It is being promoted with substantial investment by major packing companies, who see in it rebuilt competitive strength vis a vis the food chains and hope for a rejuvenation of profit margins. It can result in lowered retail prices if savings are passed on to consumers. However, such changes will also have social costs in that they will (a) probably reduce the number of small independent meatpackers, (b) result in the displacement of workers in the meatpacking industry and (c) reduce job opportunities to farmers who are forced to leave their farms and seek employment in nearby cities.

Sixth. Efficiency gains in the meatpacking industry have been close or equal to those in most American industries. This productivity increase has offset wage increases and avoided any substantial increase in labor costs per unit of production.

Currently, wage costs of producing a pound of meat is 3.5 cents, as compared with 3.4 cents in 1952 and 3.2 cents in 1951. During these years the processing of meat has increased. When this increased processing is computed, then labor productivity in the meatpacking industry becomes quite considerable in recent years.

Seventh. Workers in retail meat markets appear to have made comparable gains in efficiency. Retail wage costs per pound of meat has dropped from 6.1 cents in 1953 to 4.2 cents in 1956. When the labor costs in a meatpacking plant and retail store are computed together, labor cost per pound of meat amount to less than 10 cents a pound. This is a drop from 1953. In fact, even if workers could be persuaded to work for nothing and if companies passed on to consumers every penny so saved, the price of meat today would remain higher than it was in 1956.

My studies have also led me to suggest two additional recommendations. These are:

First. That the Livestock Research and Marketing Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Service be broadened to include representatives of consumers and labor organizations.

Second. The social cost of technological programs should be estimated, budgeted, and balanced off along with direct economic cost of new investment.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I

should like to include my additional views on trends in efficiency in meat processing and distribution:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON TRENDS IN EFFICIENCY IN MEAT PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION

RETAIL MEAT PRICES

In the closing months of 1957 and the first 4 months of 1958, retail meat prices paid by consumers over the country have steadily mounted.

The latest BLS index of retail meat prices (April 1958) reports average meat prices at a level of 21.5 percent above the average of 1947–49. This represents a 30-percent gain over prices prevailing in April 1956, and a 16-percent gain over April of 1957.

Retail meat price trends in recent years are highlighted in the following table:

Retail meat prices (1947–49 average, 1951, 1956, 1957, and current months)

Year:	Price per pound (in cents)
1947–49	59.2
1951	70.7
1956	57.9
1957	64.3
1958:	
January	68.1
February	69.1
March	70.3
April	71.9

Source: Average price paid per pound of meat by all United States households as reported in Food Consumption of Households in the United States, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report No. 1, pages 66–70, adjusted by BLS index of retail meat prices.

These increases in meat prices have come at a time of general economic decline. Inevitably, therefore, they have become the subject of public question and comment. Many have pointed to the paradox of rising prices on meats at a time of declining income and buying power for millions of our Nation's families.

Livestock prices

Prices paid by consumers for meat are close to or above their highest points in history.

Prices received by farmers for livestock, despite substantial increases, are below previous peak periods. In April livestock prices were 17 percent below their 1951 peak.

At the same time farmers in April received prices for livestock which were 38 percent above the low points of late 1955 and early 1956.

Such levels appear to have continued through May and June.

Livestock quotations in April compared as follows with earlier dates:

[In dollars per hundredweight]

	Choice steers	Canner and cutter cows	Hogs, 240 to 270 pounds
April 1958	$29.37	$17.19	$20.54
December 1955	20.30	8.25	9.55
1951 average	35.89	20.89	21.12

Source: BLS and Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

This is a record of price fluctuation to be found in few other sectors of the Nation's economy. And from 1951 through to the middle of 1957 it had been a record of steadily declining income for farmers.

Recent increases in livestock prices reflect current temporary shortages in marketings of hogs and cattle. This has cut slaughter rates reported for federally inspected packinghouses in the period from January 1, 1958, to April 5 by 8.3 percent under the comparable period of 1957. Beef output in the same period showed a 10 percent decline and pork, a drop of 5 percent.

Such shortages of livestock have sharply raised prices received by producers. There has been a full reversal of the situation of early 1956 when adequate marketings of meat animals drove livestock prices down 40 percent below 1947–49 averages. Current relatively high prices have come only after reductions in national meat supplies from an average of 166 pounds per capita in 1956 to 159 pounds per capita in 1957 and to an annual per capita rate of 145 pounds in the first quarter of 1958.

It would appear that when livestock supplies begin to be adequate for the American people, farm producers suffer heavy losses. Only when supplies dwindle sharply below the apparent needs of our expanding population do prices received by farmers come close to a fair parity ratio.

Today's rising livestock prices are not evidence that the recurrent cycle of brief feast and long famine has been broken for American livestock raisers. Such prices invite strongly increased production and subsequent price declines. No stabilization of livestock prices at levels of supply adequate to the needs of an expanding population has been attempted by Department of Agriculture officials.

Livestock marketings in 1958 have been reduced by two factors: (1) Following last year's break in the drought which had reduced cattle stocks over the Plains States, ranchers began a long range program of rebuilding herds. This rebuilding has sharply curtailed marketings of cows and heifers. (2) High feed ratios appear to have brought more extended feeding periods. The hog-corn ratio for the week ending April 5 was 17.6 as compared with 13.9 in the comparable week of 1957. In February and March, it had reached even higher levels. This price ratio encourages longer feeding periods and the transformation of more low-cost feed into high-priced pounds of livestock. The Department of Agriculture, for example, reported the number of cattle and calves on feed, as of April 1, 1958, to be 12 percent higher than on the same date in 1957.

Current shortages are temporary. An estimated 6 percent increase in this spring's pig crop is expected. Cattle marketings are expected to rise somewhat above first quarter levels, although full year totals will remain below those of 1956 and 1957. Accordingly, there is reason to expect some reduction in livestock prices before the end of the year. This is likely to be most true of hog prices.

Scarcity again will prove only a short-term support to farm prices and an illusory prop to farm income.

Wholesale and retail meat price trends

When livestock prices go up such price changes have always reflected themselves quickly at wholesale and retail levels. Between 1947–49 and 1951, for example, livestock prices rose 19.9 percent. In the same period retail meat prices rose 19.5 percent.[1] But when livestock prices fall, retail meat prices no longer march in step. Then consumer prices fall slowly, if at all, even while farm prices are dropping precipitously.

This is shown by the following comparison of changes in livestock, wholesale and retail meat prices after 1951:

	Livestock	Wholesale meat	Retail
Percent change:			
1951 to 1956 average	−40	−34	−18
1951 to 1957 average	−31	−24	−9
1951 to April 1958	−17	−8	+1.7

Source: BLS indexes of wholesale and retail prices.

Footnote at end of speech.

By 1957 prices received by farmers had fallen more than three times as fast as prices charged consumers for meats—31 percent as compared with 9 percent.

As of April 1958, livestock prices were still 17 percent below the 1951 peak. But retail prices were 1.7 percent above 1951's high level.

Obviously margins between prices received by farmers for meat and prices paid by consumers have been widening. This is true even though statistical devices so far developed to measure this trend cannot give any sure measure of its extent.

There can be little doubt that the power of meatpackers and retailerst to protect their price margins against downtrends is greater than the farmer's power to stabilize his own price structure. There has been no charge that competition has been eliminated in the food retailing industry. No food chain has the power to set and maintain a monopoly price far above a free market place. However, competition among food chains appears to be limited by pricing formulas which protect profit margins.

The chain's buying power at wholesale and their ability to control retail prices certainly do not protect against considerable fluctuations in profit margins. They do guarantee, however, the margins between wholesale and retail prices do not disappear and that substantial profits are made under any and all circumstances.

Farmers who sell their livestock in "free" markets are paid prices over which they have individually no control. They must sell at a "market price" whether or not it brings a return on labor and investment or a net loss. They are subject to the unchushioned impact of supply and demand.

Packer influence

It is true that many devices by which meatpackers controlled or influenced livestock markets in former years are no longer operative. There is substantial competition among packers for available stock, especially at times when supplies are inadequate. At times of "surplus" packers appear to succeed in driving prices down sharply.

Current trends in marketing are in fact strengthening the position of livestock buyers. Increasingly cattle sales are direct from large feed-lot operators to packers. This by passes the central stockyards where a fair competitive price for livestock is presumably established. Thus, the livestock producer is tending to become a subcontractor for the packer. There is fear among small livestock producers that integration, as in the poultry industry, may emerge as a controlling pattern.

Many packers, on the other hand, complain that they are increasingly becoming mere subcontractors for the big chains. (The economic disadvantages of such relationships have been often described by parts suppliers to major automobile producers.)

Many packers also complain that the prices they receive at wholesale from major food chains are in effect buyer-administered prices. Increasingly, they say, food chains bid for the output of meatpackers on a dictated price, take-it-or-leave-it basis. Many operate their own packinghouses as yardsticks on prices for occasional sales at less than costs of production.

Retail chains have strengthened their position also by promoting their own brands of meat at the expense of packer brands and labels. This means added freedom to shift orders from packer to packer in a drive for continued price advantage.

This, too, accounts for the concentration of packer research and development programs on processed meats which can be merchandised under the packer's own brand. Profit returns on such processed meats are clearly higher than on carcass or dressed meats. Packinghouse corporations which have concentrated their output on such

meats have consistently reported higher profit levels than those wholesaling traditional cuts for the retail-meat counters.

A further indication of these economic relations shown in the following tables showing percentages of profit to net worth for meatpacking corporations and retail food chain corporations in key past periods:

[In percent]

	11 meatpackers	51 food companies combined
Average 1935-39	3.6	7.4
1947	11.0	13.4
1951	5.1	8.5
1956	7.0	10.5

Source: The Marketing and Transportation Situation, July 1957, United States Department of Agriculture.

Full data for such interindustry comparisons covering 1957 are still not available. However, the following table comparing profits of 3 major retail chains with 3 major meatpackers, is significant.

	3 retail chains [1]		3 meatpackers [2]	
	Profits	Percent on net worth	Profits	Percent on net worth
1947	$47,989,000	15.1	$57,734,000	8.4
1956	74,710,000	11.8	35,025,000	5.4
1957	91,809,000	14.6	21,830,000	3.5

[1] A. & P., Kroger, and Safeway.
[2] Swift, Armour, and Wilson.

Changes in distribution

In large measure and at some saving in total economic costs, major retail food chains have taken over the earlier function of major meatpackers in the distribution of meat from the packinghouse to the retail store. The complicated and extensive distribution networks which 30 and 40 years ago gave major packers a firm control over markets have been duplicated by the chains. Branch houses, sales units, and fleets of refrigerated cars by which packers brought their meats wholesale to the smallest communities have been made in large part obsolete. Now in the era of the large food chain, the supermarket, and the truck, much of this system of distribution has become an economic handicap to the big packer. Shutdowns and consolidation of such outlets have been frequent in recent years, although they retain a major economic function in supplying meats to independent retail and institutional buyers.

EFFICIENCY TRENDS

Under the conditions of imperfect competition existing in the meat industry, as suggested above, it is difficult to predict the consequences of technological progress. What impact this dynamic factor for change will have on the industry cannot be foretold. Increased efficiency and lowered costs may bring lowered retail prices or higher income for farmers and workers—or the lion's share of such gains may be taken as profit to swell corporate dividends and earned surplus accounts.

Such progress, too, may bring losses which do not appear on corporation income accounts. These include social costs flowing from the displacement of thousands of workers now in the meatpacking industry. Included with this also, must be the loss of potential industry employment to thousands who are now being displaced on American farms. The packing industry, concentrated in Midwest farm areas, has drawn largely on the farm population for its past labor force. The consequences of reducing job opportunities in farm areas will not be light.

Change underway

Meanwhile, in the meat industry technological progress—the development of new machines, new processes and new methods—is taking place. It is supported on all sides as unlocking the door for new opportunities. It is being promoted with substantial investment by major packing corporations, who see in it rebuilt competitive strength vis-a-vis the food chains and hope for an early rejuvenation of profit margins. Also much progress is looked to as a means of reducing the number of small independent packers who have entered the industry in recent years. This latter goal was urged on the industry at the 1957 meeting of the American Meat Institute by an automation engineer of the Ford Motor Co. He pointed out that newer and smaller packers, lacking the capital required for automation, could be quickly outdistanced by the industry's leading producers.

The present situation

It is true that technological progress made so far in the industry has not been sensational. Often old and established ways of doing things in the industry—the first in the Nation to establish assembly line techniques—have blocked the path to needed innovation.

Special difficulties do exist. The industry deals with a live and unpredictable raw material, which unlike spark plugs or strips of sheet steel, is not uniform in dimensions or in quality.[2] It turns out thousands of special products in accordance with differing recipes and procedures.

Nevertheless, efficiency gains of the packing industry have been close or equal to those of most American industries even in recent years of speeding technological change.

The subcommittee's report of March 10 pointed to a 24 percent gain in output per man-hour in meatpacking between 1947 and 1954. Other data show an additional gain of more than 10 percent between 1954 and the first quarter of 1958. This is a 37 percent increase in output per production worker man-hour in a 10-year period, or 3.7 percent a year.

This means that output per man-hour measured in live-weight pounds of animals slaughtered and processed rose as follows:

Year:	Pounds per man-hour
1947	88.9
1954	110.2
1957	117.8
1958 (Jan.-Mar.)	122.1

Source: Derived from Department of Agriculture and Census production data and BLS man-hours.

This has served to offset wage increases and to avoid any substantial increases during recent years in labor cost per unit of production.

Currently, the wage cost of producing a pound of red meat is 3.5 cents. This compares with 3.4 cents per pound in 1952, and 3.2 cents in 1951.[3] This includes the added costs of the greater processing of meat that has come in recent years. More meats than ever before are being frozen, canned, and elaborately packaged before they reach retail outlets. Output volume of frozen precut meats, for example, increased more than 500 percent between 1951 and 1956. Thus, figures based on an increase of 24 percent in man-hour productivity between 1947 and 1954 * * * or 37 percent between 1947 and 1958, seriously understate the true gain in efficiency.

They are based on output measured not in terms of end products but in pounds of raw materials consumed. Necessarily, they must fail to give credit to workers for the added processing of meat done in the modern meatpacking industry. How great this distortion may be is indicated by figures from census reports of the meatpacking industry. These figures show value added by manufacture per man-hour of work rising in meatpacking by 56 percent between 1947 and 1954.

This is more than double the productivity gain of 24 percent shown by the cruder measure of pounds of livestock slaughtered. It suggests sharply that the rise in meatpacking industry labor productivity has been very considerable in recent years. Labor cost estimates used in this statement are all based upon the cruder measure of productivity which admittedly ignores an important part of its actual increase.

Workers in retail meat markets appear to have made comparable gains in efficiency, although complete data on this question have not been developed. This is suggested by a report in Supermarket Merchandising (August 1957) of a survey of meat-market operations in 28 retail food companies operating a total of 741 stores. According to this source, trends of labor cost in meat markets were as follows:

Year:	Cents per sales dollar
1953	9.27
1954	8.47
1955	8.88
1956	7.16

Expressed as cents in retail wages per pound of meat, this record is as follows:

Year	Price per pound	Retail wage cost per pound
	Cents	Cents
1953	65.5	6.1
1954	65.1	5.5
1955	59.9	5.9
1956	58.3	4.2

Wage payments

Wage costs per pound of meat at retail, including labor in retail stores and in packing houses in recent years have moved as follows:

[In cents per pound]

Year	Packing Labor [1]	Retail labor	Total
1953	4.1	6.1	10.2
1954	4.3	5.5	9.8
1955	4.3	5.9	10.2
1956	4.3	4.2	8.5

[1] Labor cost per 1.25 pounds red meat at wholesale.

Current figures for labor costs in meat packing already cited show no substantial increase. Although data for 1957 and 1958 costs in meat retailing are not currently available other evidence indicates efficiency gains in line with 1953 to 1956 trends.

Clearly the combined labor costs for a pound of meat at retail amounts to less than 10 cents per pound. The increase in the price of an average pound of meat since 1956 amounts to 14 cents a pound (from 57.9 cents to 71.9 cents in April 1958) or more than the total packaging-retail wage bill.

Even if workers could be persuaded to work for nothing and if employers passed on to consumers every penny so saved, the price of meat would remain higher than it was in 1956.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are proposals supplementary to those contained in the subcommittee's previous report:

1. Changes in Advisory Committee Membership: The livestock Research and Marketing Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Service might well be broadened to include representatives of consumers and of labor organizations in the meat processing and distribution fields.

Such representation will bring not only new approaches to basic problems under

Footnotes at end of speech.

study, but will serve to bring urgently needed support to programs developed from all those concerned with the welfare of the meat industries.

2. Labor-Management Educational Program: Labor relations in the meat industries have been generally constructive in recent years. Wage increases have been offset by increasing output per man-hour of labor. Although precise measures are difficult, it would appear that the average packinghouse worker today receives less real wage per pound of meat produced than 5 years ago or 10 years ago. The buying power of the wage received per pound of meat has shown no perceptible increase.

Any effort to create suspicion and hostility between the men who labor on farms to provide livestock for the industry and the men who labor in packing plants or behind retail meat counters to bring meat to the public must be decried.

Many workers in the industry do fear the impact of technological change. This fear is not baseless. In an industry where there is either a slowly rising or a static volume of total output such changes do reduce total employment. In times of declining volume and rising unemployment, fears multiply powerfully. For the workers made jobless—for the young men who find the employment doors of an industry closed—technological changes to carry the impact of individual or family disaster.

Research and educational programs to speed technical progress can succeed, therefore, only if they give consideration to the total employment problem of the packing industry. They must recognize that the social cost of such change must be estimated and budgeted and balanced off along with direct economic costs of new investment.

Unions in the industry have given evidence of willingness to cooperate for its progress. That willingness should not be disregarded by the employers of the industry.

---

[1] About 70 cents of the retail meat dollar at that time went to livestock raisers. Hence, a 1-percent increase in livestock prices could have been passed on to consumers as a seven-tenths of 1 percent increase in meat prices. In fact, retailers took 1 percent or more. A 14-percent increase at retail would have been more than sufficient to cover higher prices to farmers.

[2] In the same general way farm efficiency in the production of livestock has not kept pace with the gigantic overall efficiency gains made by American agriculture as a whole. Current Department of Agriculture figures show a gain in man-hour efficiency in livestock raising of 25 percent for the period, 1910–56 * * * years in which the output per man-hour in all agriculture rose by an astounding 196 percent.

[3] Pounds, red meat produced per man-hour divided into BLS average hourly earnings in meatpacking.

"Fishbait" Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, last April I received a letter from a gentleman in St. Louis, Mo., asking for my favorite fish story. Upon hearing the word fish, I immediately thought of our always willing and helpful Doorkeeper—and sometime television star—"Fishbait" Miller.

Under permission of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD my reply to the gentleman in St. Louis about our inimitable "Fishbait" Miller and my private candidate for the congressional TV Oscar:

Mr. LESLIE G. KENNON,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. KENNON: Thank you for your letter dated April 11, regarding fish tales.

Members of Congress are exposed almost daily to fish tales of one sort of another. These tales usually have nothing to do with fish, but are usually offered to the Representatives of the people as supporting evidence for one legislative cause or another. I am sure that is not the type of fish tale you want. Being a Congresswoman—or gentlelady as weare sometimes called—I don't go for fishing with quite the same enthusiasm as some of my male colleagues. So I can't really offer you any genuine fish tale of that sort either.

However, here is a story—a true story. One which should lend dignity to your collection of fish tales. The Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives—one of the finest people I know, an efficient, noble, and chivalrous gentleman, of old school teaching—is a Mr. "Fishbait" Miller. "Fishbait" has hooked the hearts of all Members of Congress, and no lobbyist or fisherman can make that claim.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

COYA KNUTSON.

Fate of the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill Shows Need for Presidential Item Veto Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the independent offices appropriation bill demonstrates anew the crying need for Congress to act on item veto legislation. Because of the present state of the law, the President was forced either to sign the whole money bill, or veto it entirely.

As it is, a number of important agencies of the Government could be hamstrung unless Congress provides them with funds. Yet the President had no choice because of his strong opposition to the provision relating to the civil service retirement and disability fund. Now, the closing days of the session will be further clogged and delayed because we must reconsider the appropriation bill all over again.

The logical, efficient, and economical way out of such tangles is to give the President power to veto individual items in appropriation bills. Such vetoes could, of course, be overridden by two-thirds vote of Congress.

I have sponsored legislation along those lines for a number of years. Probably a constitutional amendment is the proper approach, as embodied in House Joint Resolution 343.

In any case, America's taxpayers could be saved literally millions each year if the President were allowed to pare individual items from money bills, rather than often having to hold his nose and sign the whole thing rather than let important functions lie fallow due to a veto of the entire measure. It has worked well when actively and prudently applied in the States and could be the soundest budgetary reform possible on the national level.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this latest veto will spur the 86th Congress to zero in on the item veto proposal as a first order of business when it convenes in January. It would solve the whole problem of unnecessary wasteful provisions in money bills and yet not upset the essential balance between legislative and executive fiscal responsibilities.

Mr. Adams Is Due an Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., relating to the charges and countercharges in the Sherman Adams case:

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 14, 1958]

MR. ADAMS IS DUE AN INVESTIGATION

Surely the sanctimonious air so often assumed by the Eisenhower administration will be a little less pronounced now that Sherman Adams, the President's right-hand man, has admitted that a Boston industrialist has paid hotel bills for the Presidential assistant amounting to almost $2,000 over the past 4 years.

On top of accepting such generous hospitality, apparently without qualm, the man who has had almost as much to do with the running of the country as President Eisenhower during the last 6 years, says it is also true that he has intervened on behalf of this particular benefactor three times before Federal agencies. And the inference is clear that these appearances were not in opposition to anything his friend sought.

Adams' admission to all this came about as a result of evidence produced by a special House subcommittee in its investigation of regulatory agencies to determine if they have been subjected to undue outside influences. This subcommittee made news earlier this year when it fired its chief counsel, Dr. Bernard A. Schwartz, New York University law professor and one of the country's top experts on administrative law. It was Dr. Schwartz' disclosures that led to the forced resignation in March of Richard A. Mack, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, after evidence showed that he had received financial aid from the successful applicant for a television station license in Florida.

Dr. Schwartz charged that he was fired because he wanted to determine whether the FCC and other Federal agencies were being treated as puppets of big business and the White House. The former chief counsel of the committee was particularly desirous of investigating the activities of Sherman Adams.

Since the dismissal of Dr. Schwartz, the subcommittee reports it has received allegations that Bernard Goldfine, the man who paid Adams' hotel bills, has received preferential treatment from the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission by virtue of Goldfine's close friendship with Adams.

Of course, as far as President Eisenhower is concerned, Sherman Adams no doubt will come out of this as clean as a hound's tooth, just as RICHARD NIXON did in 1952 when it was disclosed that he had accepted gifts amounting to $18,000 from well-to-do Californians to supplement his salary as a United States Senator.

But the House subcommittee need not be so tolerant of Mr. Adams' indiscretions. It can and should follow Dr. Schwartz' lead, and make a thorough investigation of White House pressures that Sherman Adams apparently has exerted upon various Federal regulatory agencies.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 17, 1958]

NOW HOW FAR BACK SHALL WE GO?

As was to be expected, our friend of the afternoon has come boldly to the defense of Sherman Adams, presidential assistant and sanctimonious condemner of all that smacks of indiscretion and corruption in government. The leader makes a great to-do about the use of the word "intervened," denying that Mr. Adams "intervened" with any Federal agency from which his well-heeled friend, Bernard Goldfine, sought help.

Mr. Adams, in a letter to the head of the investigating House committee, stated that on two occasions he contacted heads of Federal agencies with which Mr. Goldfine was involved, and either asked for information or arranged an appointment. Mr. Adams emphatically stated that he did not ask special favors for his friend, and we accept that statement at its face value. But face value also must be considered as including the assumption that when the "Assistant President" calls about a matter, little doubt exists in the mind of the listener as to which side he is on.

The leader would do far better to admit that Mr. Adams acted in a stupid manner, and join with Senator KNOWLAND and other Republican leaders in asking that all the facts be disclosed. Charges have been published that in addition to the approximately $2,000 in hotel bills which Mr. Adams admits were paid by Mr. Goldfine, the woolen manufacturer also gave his friend a $2,400 rug and a $700 vicuna overcoat. It is a simple matter for Mr. Adams either to deny or admit the truth of these charges. If there were other substantial gifts it might be well to announce them now, or deny their existence. People will feel better about the whole affair if Mr. Adams will but make a clean breast of the whole ugly mess; otherwise all the wool produced by Mr. Goldfine's many mills will not be enough to pull over the eyes of the prying voters come next November.

The Leader suggests that the Herald, in its newly acquired concern about honesty in the Federal Government, should take a glance backward, and then revise deep-freeze and fur-coat scandals attributed to the Truman administration. We gladly would glance backward, but care must be exercised else the roving eyes go back too far and hit dead center on the Harding regime, with its Teapot Dome and other scandals, none of which ever was touched in magnitude by any later administration.

The Herald condemned extravagances and favoritism in the Truman administration, as it did in the Harding regime. The fact that both the Vice President and Assistant President have been called upon in recent years to explain certain embarrassing or stupid actions does not mean that because they were Republicans their indiscretions should be hushed up or condoned. Vice President NIXON rushed across the Nation to cry out his indiscretion in accepting $18,000 from supporters in California, and apparently was forgiven by the voters as he was by Mr. Eisenhower. So far, Mr. Adams hasn't even put in a telephone call to explain his untenable position.

The editorial statute of limitations has not run out on shady dealings of either the Harding or Truman administrations, and we condemn the derelictions of these eras with all the invectives at our command. We wish that the Leader would join with us and call upon Mr. Adams to come clean and tell the American people everything. We have no confidence that he will listen to us, but he might follow that newspaper's suggestion, knowing full well that it still will defend him in spite of anything that might be disclosed, even though it must for want of sound argument go back to that childhood chant that everything you say about me goes back on you, double.

The Talented Student: A Priceless Resource for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the demands of the times in which we live require bold decisions. A continued waste of our precious human resources and our inattention to the needs of America's educational system could result in a national calamity. If we are to meet this challenge to our Nation's security we must make certain that all our citizens have ample opportunity to attain the highest level of their capacities.

This is vital—

As a witness emphasized during hearings before our committee—

because a major key to our Nation's future development and progress, whether in relation to peace or to defense, is our supply of well-educated manpower. Our natural resources are not likely to be our major bottleneck; our main limiting factor will be brain power. Therefore, as a nation we must help every young person develop his potential to the full.

The level of the civilization of a society is determined by the extent to which the talents of its members are developed. The more complicated the society the more imperative the need for the maximum development of every talent of every member of that society. Implicit in the last sentence is the simple fact that the Nation's current needs are so compelling that we can no longer leave the development of talent so largely to chance as we have done in the past.

For several generations we have made provision for equipping every member of our society with certain fundamental skills. In recent months we have had a profound shock and we have suddenly come to see what only a few saw before—that our national needs require us to pay a great deal more attention to the development of the talents of our young people than we have hitherto thought necessary.

This is a time for fact finding and fact facing. First, we have got to find out what material we have to work with. Second, when we know what we have to work with we will have to decide what we are going to do.

Individuals and groups all over America have been busily engaged with these matters for many months past. Their labors have been fruitful. For example, let me discuss with you for a few minutes facts which they have dug up dealing with the alarming rate of school dropouts: Throughout all levels of our educational system there is an increasing annual loss of potentially highly trained talent. One out of 4 high school graduates goes to college; 1 out of 5 college graduates study for a master's degree and only 1 out of 7 students go beyond this to the doctor's degree.

Moreover, studies demonstrate that annually approximately 200,000 superior high-school graduates do not enroll in college, while still another group of about 52,500 high-school students with intelligence scores in the top 25 percent of ability do not even finish high school.

Mr. Speaker, it is plainly evident on the basis of these facts that a very substantial proportion of our young people finish their formal education years before their talents could possibly have reached their full development. That is our problem. This waste of talent which is not developed is the measure of the most appalling shortcoming of our age.

The Committee on Education Beyond the High School said:

Talented young people are our most valuable national resource. The loss both in humand and in social terms that results from failure to identify, inspire and assist able young people for further education and training is incalculable.

Dr. Ralph F. Berdie, professor of psychology and director, office of the dean of students, student counseling bureau, University of Minnesota, reported to the subcommittee of the House:

Thus, almost all of the persons who are at least as competent intellectually as the average college graduate enter high school, a very large proportion of these graduate from high school, but slightly less than one-half of this total high ability group enter college. Of every 100 persons who most likely have more than enough ability to do college work, 56 do not enter college.

If we concern ourselves with a more selected group intellectually, those with scores on the Army general classification test of 130 and above, presumably indicative of enough ability to do advanced graduate and professional work in universities, about 99 percent enter high school, 97 percent graduate from high school, 53 percent enter college, and 46 percent graduate from college. (In 1954, the upper 15 percent of the estimated 1,356,000 high school graduates of that year consisted of 203,400 pupils. If one-third of these did not enter college, 67,800 pupils of ability failed to obtain higher education.) Thus, of our very bright people, only slightly more than 50 percent enter college and slightly less than one-half obtain an undergraduate degree. These estimates, often quoted since they were first published in 1954, are descriptive of the United States as a whole.

Speaking of the situation as it exists in Minnesota, Dr. Ralph Berdie reported:

The conclusion must be that the figures for Minnesota are not much different from the figures found for the entire country. About two-thirds of Minnesota high school graduates do not attend college, or of those in the upper 15 percent about 1 out of every 3 high school graduates do not attend college.

Today, with 40,000 Minnesota high school graduates a year, we can safely estimate that of the 6,000 who most certainly have sufficient intellectual ability to do satisfactory work in almost any college, only about 4,000 actually will attend college. This leaves a group of approximately 2,000 pupils each year who have more than adequate ability to do well in college and yet who never attempt higher education.

A conservative estimate would be that at least 67,800 American high school pupils each year graduate from school with sufficient ability so that they compare favorably to the upper 25 percent of college freshmen, and yet these pupils never matriculate.

Dr. Kenneth Little, director of institutional studies and professor of education, University of Wisconsin, reported for that State:

A preliminary analysis of the plans of Wisconsin's topranking high-school graduates for spring 1957 shows that about 3 out of 4 of the boys and 2 out of 3 of the girls who ranked in the top 25 percent of their graduating classes were planning to continue their education. Of those who ranked in the top 10 percent, about 9 out of 10 boys and 8 out of 9 girls were planning to continue school.

Nevertheless, these figures suggest that about 750 boys and 2,000 girls who ranked in the top one-fourth of their graduating classes were not planning to continue their education. Of those who ranked in the top 10 percent, about 175 boys and 525 girls were not planning to continue schooling beyond high school. (Estimated total number of spring graduates of Wisconsin high schools equal 36,000.)

The alarming box-score showing this loss of talent has been prepared by the New York State Higher Education Assistance Corporation, as follows:

Fortunately, we have one limitless natural resource which can be harnessed to solve any problem. That's the human mind, and we aren't beginning to realize its possibilities. Nearly half of our most promising students are not going beyond high school. Recent figures in New York State (a leader in education) underscore this situation:

Out of 120,000 high-school graduates for the year 2,760 from the top 10 percent of the class did not go to college, 9,300 from the top 25 percent did not go to college, 24,000 from the top 40 percent did not go to college, and the numbers grow larger every year.

Testimony along this general line could be continued ad infinitum. Our witnesses before the committee were all but unanimous in agreeing that a very high percentage of our able young people are not continuing their formal education to the level warranted by their capacities. Faced with this fact one question comes to mind, Why? Why do so few students complete high school? Why do only 50 percent of our very bright youngsters enter college? Why do only half of our college students finish college? Why do so few go on to graduate school?

This is a problem that has been the object of searching study for many months past and the results are persuasive and convincing. We now know at least part of the answer to these challenging questions of why. A large part of that 1-word question is a 1-word reply—money. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in its report of July last year wrote:

Of those who do not continue their education and training, it appears that most are deterred by one or more of the following: lack of money, motivation, and accessible facilities. * * *

For a large number of capable students, finance is the key question to their further education. By 1952–54, the median total expenditure of college students was already $1,462 per academic year—double what it was in 1939–40. However, the expenditures of even the middle 50 percent of students ranged from $800 to $1,700. The cost today is higher, and still rising.

Dr. Kenneth Little, of the University of Wisconsin, reported for that State that:

About 10 percent of the graduates ranking in the top one-fourth indicated a belief that their families had incomes or wealth below the average of other families in their communities.

When asked how much money the family could contribute toward college expenses (if they were to go to college) 35 percent of these graduates reported less than $500 and 63 percent less than $1,000. Nineteen percent reported that their families could provide all of their college expenses.

It is clear * * * that with the average cost of attending college being estimated at approximately $1,400 per year, a percentage of the top-ranking students would require outside financial assistance to attend college.

It is also probable that many of these students are planning to attend nearby schools which do not have the programs of study which they want and are best qualified for, but which are the only schools they can afford to attend.

Dr. Walter Ludeman, president of the Southern State Teachers College, Springfield, S. Dak., reported for his State:

Something like 50 percent of the upper quartile of high-school graduates do not enter college at all, mostly due to lack of funds.

College costs are rapidly mounting both at private and public institutions and many low-income families with bright children cannot afford college for them. Fully one-half of the families in this area in which we live are low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, aware of the fact that many of our talented young people do not continue their education for reasons other than lack of money. This is true of many young women who marry and have families. The House Committee on Education and Labor has also gathered data indicating that many young people are not motivated to continue their education when it appears that they possibly or even probably have the means to do so. The factors lying behind this are many and complex. It is probable that one of the most important explanations of this fact is simply the lack of adequate guidance. That is one reason the committee, under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, would provide for more adequate guidance, counseling and testing in the Nation's schools to identify and encourage able students. It is a demonstrated fact that adequate testing, counseling, and guidance can make significant contributions to the identification and educational development of all high-school students, but particularly those in the more able category. Since not more than one-half of the high-school students in the Nation are currently provided with the services of a well-rounded counseling program a large number of our capable manpower resources are not identified. This further compounds the Nation's annual loss of talent.

These then are the facts: First, a very large percentage of our able young people do not continue their education; second, society suffers from the loss of talent; third, the talent is lost largely because of lack of money. The solution to the problem is close at hand and our duty is clear. We must expand our educational system to make it possible for the talent of every young person to be developed to its fullest capacity. This is a time for bold decisions and it requires our decisive action.

Extension of Scope of the Espionage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the jurisdictional limitations on prosecutions under the espionage laws. The purpose of this bill is to extend the prohibitions of the espionage laws to actions committed against the United States by persons while residing in a foreign nation.

At present, the espionage laws apply only to actions within the United States or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and on the high seas. It no longer makes sense to limit the protection of the United States from espionage in this manner. The Nation's military and civilian personnel as well as its tourists are scattered throughout the world. There is no point in limiting our security from espionage on the basis of whether the offense occurs within or outside our geographical boundaries.

The bill I am introducing is based on recommendations of the Department of Justice. It will eliminate the present illogical restrictions on prosecution of espionage perpetrated abroad. This will be accomplished in the bill by the repeal of the present provisions of the Federal Criminal Code limiting the scope of the espionage laws. Under a leading Supreme Court case the effect of this repeal will be to make the espionage laws applicable without regard to locale.

Early consideration of this measure is particularly important because of the increasing difficulty of controlling travel abroad. The authority of the Department of State to withhold passports from suspected subversives and other security risks has been drastically curtailed by recent Supreme Court decisions. This

poses an increasing danger of subversion by such persons overseas. Under the law as it now reads, there is nothing we can do to combat such nefarious activities. This makes imperative the enactment of an amendment to the espionage laws which will protect this country from traitorous conduct wherever it is uncovered.

This measure represents a minimum requirement for dealing with the dangers to this country arising from the fact that the Department of State cannot now exercise any effective supervision of such travelers. I hope this measure will receive prompt study by Congress.

Where Is Truth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Bruce Biossat which appeared in the Hazelton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of August 1, 1958:

WHERE IS TRUTH?

(By Bruce Biossat)

As you read the utterances of Soviet Premier Khrushchev and Egyptian President Nasser in the current Middle Eastern muddle, you see at work a technique of politics which by its very nature is destructive of good faith in international relations.

Both these men belong to the school which decrees that, in the interest of your political objectives, you may say anything, no matter how false, wild and irresponsible. But at the same time, they do not expect to be held accountable for these indulgences in verbal violence.

In other words, because they look upon words as tools of war on every level, they regard them with a kind of detachment. And they are considerably astonished when politicians of a different breed insist on viewing their utterances as authentic representations of their character and personality.

Khrushchev, for example, will mount the platform to shout that the Russians will bury the capitalist democracies. He is surprised thereafter when at least a few of the free world's diplomats decline his invitation to a jolly Communist cocktail party. Or when they question his sincerity in proposing disarmament and peace plans.

Nasser's Cairo radio can, as it has, incite Adabs to murder and riot, inflame the passions of the fanatics, blare false reports of fighting in the hope these accounts will touch off the real thing. Yet Nasser expects to be accepted in diplomatic exchange as if he were a sober, wise, responsible and far-seeing leader of Arab nationalism.

It would be about the same if a fellow got your job by malicious scheming against you in the office and then professed to be stunned because you didn't show up for the old bridge games you all used to love so well.

Demagogues there have always been and presumably always will be. And that means we shall always have to contend with the reckless use of words as a device in the struggle for political power.

Decent free men of good will may not be able to stem the flow of violent utterance. But at the very least they can let the demagogues know that they are held accountable by the world for everything they say, that their wild verbal gyrations are not forgiven and forgotten when they decide it is time to smile, shake hands and sit down to talk "in good faith."

They cannot be allowed the luxury of having two voices. They, like everyone else, speak with only one voice. If it is evil, ugly and inflammatory, the world must know it. It cannot be disguised with the fraudulent overtones of good will.

Food Additive Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, labored long and hard to bring to the House floor a food additive bill. The subcommittee held 11 days of hearings on 9 bills and these hearings included 2 days of testimony by a panel of outstanding scientists and experts selected by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the subcommittee to give the subcommittee the scientific background with regard to the testing and evaluating of the safety of food additives. The subcommittee also heard witnesses from industry, labor, and consumer organizations, and representatives of the Food and Drug Administration. The chief judge of the third judicial circuit appeared on behalf of the judicial conference of the United States to testify on the judicial review provisions contained in this legislation.

The job of producing a bill acceptable to the Food and Drug Administration and the affected industries seemed insuperable. Nevertheless, the subcommittee went ahead and after prolonged efforts it reported unanimously to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 13254. The full committee unanimously reported this bill with certain amendments, primarily of a clarifying nature, which were made after consultation with the Food and Drug Administration and the affected industries.

It is my hope that the great efforts which have been made first by the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics—better known as the Delaney committee, named after its chairman, Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY—and the efforts of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, will not have been made in vain and that the bill, H. R. 13254, in the form in which that bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will be acted on during this session.

Certainly, it seems that the present state of the law fails to protect the health of consumers because it fails to require manufacturers of food additives and food processors to protest any potentially unsafe substances which are to be added to food. Furthermore, present law fails to make possible advances in food technology by permitting the use of food additives at safe levels. Thus, the proposed legislation would greatly benefit the public interest and should be considered a great advance in food and drug legislation.

The bill has the support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Food and Drug Administration, the American Bakers Association, the Millers' National Federation, the National Canners Association, the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, American Butter Institute, American Dry Milk Institute, Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, National Cheese Institute, and National Creameries Association. The letters received from these organizations in support of H. R. 13254 read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, July 11, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: We note with gratification that the Health and Science Subcommittee of your committee has reported favorably a chemical food additives bill based essentially on H. R. 6747. We appreciate your great interest in this bill.

The subcommittee revision is acceptable to this Department.

Because of the urgent public-health need for legislation requiring adequate testing of additives before they are used in food, we hope your committee can give favorable consideration to the new bill, H. R. 13254, in time for it to be acted upon by this session of Congress.

In view of the urgency, this communication has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for advice in accordance with the usual procedure on reports.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

AMERICAN BAKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1958.

The Honorable OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Bakers Association wishes to advise you that it supports H. R. 13254, which would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require adequate pretesting and prior approval of new food additives by the Food and Drug Administration.

Bakery products are consumed in practically every home in the Nation. We have, therefore, a sincere and serious interest in the safety of every ingredient which goes into our products.

Food technology in the years since World War II has advanced at an incredible pace, and problems of testing new additives have arisen faster than the present food and drug law can handle them. The baking industry as a manufacturer of basic foods believes the consuming public is entitled to assurances that all the ingredients used in the preparation of food it consumes have been adequately tested for safety.

Therefore, the American Bakers Association several years ago adopted a statement of

principles urging the passage of legislation embodying these requirements.

The problem has been complex as the record of the hearings attests. The achievement of the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Congressman WILLIAMS in developing a bill which adequately protects the public interest and appears to provide a workable regulatory system for the affected industries as well cannot be minimized.

In accepting the fundamental conditions of adequate pretesting and prior approval, coupled with an acceptable appeals procedure, H. R. 13254, in our opinion, represents a reasonable compromise of the many divergent approaches to this problem. It is our sincere belief that the public interest will best be served if Congress can pass this bill during this session. To that end, we are communicating these views to you and the other members of your committee.

In supporting this bill, we further support the amendments in the committee print of July 22, 1958, which, in our opinion, improve the bill.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. CREED,
Counsel.

MILLERS' NATIONAL FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, representatives of the milling industry have appeared before your committee on several occasions in support of legislation dealing with the subject of food additives. We have supported a number of bills introduced by Representatives O'HARA, the latest of which was H. R. 366 in the 85th Congress.

We noted with interest the introduction of H. R. 13254 on July 1, 1958, by the chairman of the Health and Science Subcommittee, Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS. This bill apparently represents the conclusions of the subcommittee following extensive hearings and study. The chairman and the subcommittee are to be commended for developing what appears to be a reasonable approach to workable legislation and, with a few modifications, could be supported by government and industry alike.

The modifications to which I refer are contained in the committee print of H. R. 13254 dated July 22, 1958. We believe the adoption of these changes will improve the legislation.

While we still feel that H. R. 366 would be the ideal approach, we feel that H. R. 13254, with amendments, represents a reasonable compromise on which industry and government can agree. We, therefore, recommend favorable action on the amended bill by your committee so that congressional action can be completed in the present session of Congress.

In addition to the modifications contained in the committee print, we would like to recommend the deletion of those sections of the bill dealing with advisory committees. They do not confer upon the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare any new authority to consult with experts which he does not already have in the existing Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. There appears to be no desire or interest on the part of any of the supporting industries for this provision, nor does the Food and Drug Administration seek it. Furthermore, the advisory committee procedure set forth could give rise to serious legal questions in the event of an appeal to the courts.

I hope you and the members of your committee will give favorable consideration to the views I have expressed.

Kind regards.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN FAKLER,
Vice President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1958.*

Mr. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: The Subcommittee on Health and Science over a long period of time has given careful and intelligent consideration to a number of bills which would amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act so as to regulate the use of new food additives.

The Dairy Industry Committee, composed of the following national trade associations: American Butter Institute, American Dry Milk Institute, Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, National Cheese Institute, and National Creameries Association, has supported amending the basic act in this regard. On behalf of the Dairy Industry Committee the writer testified on April 15, 1958.

We have had the opportunity of examining H. R. 13254. This bill, in our opinion, meets the necessities of the situation very adequately. It has the support of the Dairy Industry Committee.

I trust that the distinguished committee, of which you are chairman, has an early opportunity to consider a favorable report.

Sincerely yours,

DAIRY INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
C. M. FISTERE, *General Counsel.*

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, July 29, 1958.

Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and Science, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: You and your subcommittee are to be complimented for the fine job that has been done in reconciling the differing views on the subject of food additives. We also wish to commend the work of your subcommittee counsel, Mr. Kurt Borchardt.

Although the measure approved by the full committee does not meet all the objections raised by this association to the original administration proposal, it does satisfy a number of the major points. Recognizing that the democratic process is one of give and take, we are pleased to advise you that the bill, H. R. 13254 as amended, has the full and unqualified support of the National Canners Association.

We hope that it will receive prompt House action in order that it may be considered in the Senate prior to the adjournment of this Congress.

Sincerely,

CARLOS CAMPBELL.

MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you this letter as president of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association to recommend that H. R. 13254, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, be enacted into law at the present session of Congress.

The Manufacturing Chemists' Association comprises some 170 member companies which produce more than 90 percent of the chemical output of this country. The research and products of this industry have made great contributions to the purity, convenience, and nutritive value of America's food supply. From our interest and experience in this important field we believe, as we have testified before your committee on two occasions, that there is a very real need for modern amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify and augment the procedures under the act so as to achieve greater protection for the public health, and at the same time to permit scientific development of further improvements in the Nation's food.

Congress has been considering this complex problem during the past 8 years. Members of congressional committees, of regulatory agencies, and the majority of producers of food and chemicals have all felt strongly the need for amendatory legislation. The complex chemical and biological problems to be dealt with have made difficult the reaching of complete agreement regarding the method of Government control which should be embodied in such legislation.

Let me emphasize that it is the view of this association that adequate protection of the public health is and must be the primary consideration of all.

As you know, reputable chemical manufacturers have over the years tested food additives exhaustively before those additives are offered for use and have made it a practice to discuss the results of such tests informally with the Food and Drug Administration. We have, moreover, long favored the incorporation of this procedure in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The new bill does not conform to a number of recommendations made by our witnesses before your committee, which we continue to believe would make possible the most workable law and one which would afford no less protection to the public health than H. R. 13254. However, we understand that H. R. 13254 was drafted by the Health and Science Subcommittee after the completion of its thorough hearings on this subject, and we wish to commend Chairman WILLIAMS and each member of that subcommittee for working out a measure which will provide adequate public protection under a generally acceptable regulatory system.

We favor the immediate enactment of H. R. 13254 at the present session of Congress for three principal reasons. First, because it is in the public interest to clarify the existing procedures at the earliest possible time. Second, because several years are needed to accomplish the pretesting of food additives, it is important that the procedures be settled in order that the scientific development of further improvements in the Nation's food may progress without uncertainty as to future legal requirements. Third, because the interest being manifested by State and local health officials could readily lead to greater consideration of State and municipal regulation of food additives, which recently occurred in Utah, New York State and New York City. The enactment of State or municipal legislation on this subject could take a variety of forms and provide for a variety of sometimes conflicting procedures. The enactment of a Federal law at this time will set a pattern for State and municipal legislation just as the present Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act has set a pattern for State food and drug acts in the past.

The amendments set forth in the committee print of H. R. 13254 dated July 22, 1958, would, in our opinion, improve the bill, and we would support the incorporation of these amendments in the bill.

Sincerely,

J. E. HULL.

Retail Dairy Prices Show a Slight Drop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress a very pertinent item regarding the dairy situation. In this item, from the August issue of Successful Farming, we find the fallacy of Mr. Benson's philosophy graphically pointed out.

At the time Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced that he had decided to drop dairy supports there were some of us who stated then that this action would hurt the farmer, would not create a condition whereby more dairy products would be used, and that the consumer would not benefit from a reduced price. What we pointed out then has been proved correct according to preliminary official reports.

The item from the August issue of Successful Farming follows:

RETAIL DAIRY PRICES SHOW A SLIGHT DROP

One of the big arguments for cutting 1958 dairy supports was that retail prices would drop—and consumption go up.

How has it worked out? According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics—which collects city prices—retail dairy product prices declined in March and April (when support was cut 6 percent). But April 1958 retail prices were somewhat higher than April 1957 prices.

Also, BLS says that while consumer spending for dairy products was up about $13 million this April over April 1957, farmers received about $14 million less—with about the same milk production in both months.

It apparently is working well for someone.

Antarctic Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very timely letter appearing in the July 18 issue of the Wall Street Journal. House Joint Resolution 184, referred to in the letter, is a resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent. I introduced it in this Congress, just as I have introduced similar resolutions in previous Congresses. It is unfortunate that it was not acted upon several years ago. Our interests in Antarctica would have been better protected.

ANTARCTIC CLAIMS

Editor, the Wall Street Journal:

Apropos the present interest in Antarctica, it seems as if it would be a good idea for the press and other public mediums to make available to the public a listing of those civic and patriotic organizations which have expressed themselves upon whether or not the United States should claim its rightful territory in the Antarctic.

It would seem pertinent also to list those foreign groups and organizations which have expressed themselves regarding disposition of Antarctic territory.

Partly due to being extremely busy during the past in developing the land between the Atlantic and the Pacific on the North American Continent and to attending to the five major wars, United States citizens have been somewhat lax in attention paid to the Antarctic. Since 1929 United States explorers have done magnificent work on the continent, in contrast to the Soviets, for example, who never landed on the Antarctic Continent proper until 1956 and who base claims upon an expedition of 1819 to 1821 which may or may not actually have seen the mainland and which did not make a territorial claim, on paper.

So, actually the "new" subject of Antarctica is not so new after all, and it behooves 1958's United States citizens to make known their desires as to whether or not we should claim the territory that our expeditions have explored, mapped, and/or occupied. One measure in Congress since 1951, now numbered House Joint Resolution 184, would cover this matter.

This is not to say that mere paper claims can handle the situation. Occupation is the main thing. If we cannot arrange for the modicum of occupation that is needed to establish proper claims, we should probably fold our tents and retire from world leadership.

E. A. KENDALL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

An Answer to Un-American Attacks Against a Patriotic Farm Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by far the largest and most influential farm organization in the State of South Dakota is the South Dakota Farmers Union. This group of nearly 20,000 farm families, has for many years defended that basic American institution—the family farm. Its members are a cross section of a wholesome, religious-minded rural society. Many of them serve as school board members, church trustees, college board directors, 4–H leaders, and in a wide variety of other civic and humanitarian causes.

Doubtless in an organization with this many members there are a few bad citizens—just as there are a few poor members in every other large organization no matter how fine its general membership may be. But the vicious efforts that have been made in some quarters to cast reflection on the Americanism of the Farmers Union ought to draw the indignant wrath of every decent citizen.

It is for that reason that I have been disturbed by the senseless and unscrupulous smears directed at the Farmers Union by one Glenn Martz, a Washington writer of sorts who edits a newsletter on farm affairs, which he very appropriately calls the Lowdown. Its chief purpose seems to be lowdown attacks designed to discredit the leadership and the purpose of a great farm organization—the Farmers Union.

The Lowdown editor, Mr. Martz, has been at the business of low-level shooting for a long time. As a matter of fact some years ago he filed a story in a prominent daily newspaper in my State which promptly involved this fine newspaper in a libel suit that cost them many thousands of dollars in damages.

Recently Mr. Martz took issue with me in the Lowdown because I informed one of my fellow South Dakotans that this gentleman's efforts to equate the Farmers Union with Communist infiltration were entirely unfounded.

Several months ago the Lowdown editor was sponsored by somebody on a speaking tour of South Dakota. I was shocked to learn that among other assignments he was the featured speaker of the Lincoln Club, the Republican Party organization of our State employees at Pierre, S. Dak. Certainly, Mr. Martz' line has no resemblance to the great spirit of our beloved President, Abraham Lincoln.

Two excellent answers to the Lowdown attacks on the Farmers Union include a sparkling editorial by Mr. Robert Lusk, editor of the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, December 29, 1957, and a pamphlet prepared by the National Farmers Union entitled "Smear: The Price of Success." I include both of these articles at this point:

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Plainsman of December 29, 1957]

THE PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Bob Lusk)

SPEEDUP

In this age of speedup there now appears what might at first blush be regarded as a greatly accelerated method of producing Communists.

There has been for more than a hundred years the traditional Karl Marx method, which, for most people and including this newspaper, has been fast enough.

Now, however, comes a much, much more rapid method. It might well be called the Glenn Martz method.

The Karl Marx method, according to figures put out by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has produced less than two-score of Communists in South Dakota, for instance.

But the Glenn Martz method would make this figure look positively infinitesimal.

As we see it, given a dime's worth of evidence, Martz can produce a thousand dollars worth of Communists with the twist of a tongue or the click of a typewriter key.

Martz gave a demonstration of his technique in a speech at a meeting of the South Dakota Farm Bureau Federation here in Huron. He also distributed copies of and subscription blanks for a small periodical he publishes in Washington, D. C. This he calls The Lowdown, and it seems most appropriately named for it is, indeed, the lowdown approach to journalism.

Glenn Martz is a former South Dakota newspaperman. And when we mention this, let us make it clear that we are not doing it in a bragging way. Our purpose is purely informational.

WHAT HAPPENS

So much for technique and background. So what happens?

According to Martz, the Communist Party is "launching an underground offensive in the upper Midwest to strengthen its drive for State socialism." Also, according to Martz, the "Communist drive" in South Dakota enjoys a "close affiliation with the National Farmers' Union."

Under the Martz method, the plot spreads out fast. For example, as for those Volga farmers who tossed eggs at Secretary of Agriculture Benson, "the lowdown has no way of knowing the political affiliation of the men responsible for throwing the eggs.

but 10 to 1 the Reds were nudging them on."

Plunging along thus in high gear, the Martz technique sideswipes some of the most unexpected people. In the case of a United States Senator with a long and unbroken record of anticommunism, many, many people would be greatly surprised. But these people just don't know Martz.

According to Martz, the Senator refused to comment on the egg-throwing episode. That is the dime's worth of evidence. What does it prove? Obviously, his refusal to comment carried the implication that he might have been in sympathy with those responsible. You will recall that 10 to 1 those were Red nudgers.

HISTORY

Nor does Martz limit himself to the contemporary scene. He goes back into history. For example, the Farm Holiday Association of the early thirties was a Communist front organization.

And so it goes under the Martz technique. And if the Martz method of producing Communists is valid, let us try it out for ourselves and see what we can produce with it.

Let us, for the moment, take Martz' word for it that the Farm Holiday Association was a Communist front.

Looking back through the Daily Plainsman's bound files for the period, we discover that on July 28, 1932, a meeting was held at Mitchell at which the constitution of the South Dakota Farm Holiday Association was adopted. And whom do you supose were listed as the principal speakers on that occasion? They were Tom Brisbine, president of the South Dakota Bankers' Association; and H. B. Test, president of the South Dakota Farm Bureau Federation.

That same day they elected officers for the association. Barney McVeigh, speaker of the South Dakota House of Representatives, was chosen president. And the directors included, in addition to W. C. Lusk, president of the South Dakota State Chamber of Commerce; E. H. Everson, president of the South Dakota Farmers' Union; J. J. Martin, president of the South Dakota Grange; the same H. B. Test, president of the South Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, Martz' host at the recent Huron convention.

This, then, is Martz' "Communist front" organization as it was established in South Dakota. Does this mean that the bankers were Communists, that the Farm Bureau was Communist? How asinine can you get?

The Martz technique of producing Communists on the gallop may make some cents for Martz but it makes no sense to anyone else.

As for our part, we will limit our concern to those Communists produced by the Karl Marx method.

[From a National Farmers' Union Pamphlet]

SMEAR—THE PRICE OF SUCCESS

(The story of smears against the families in the Farmers' Union, and how smears have developed as our opponents come to realize the need for a strong farm program. Also the story of praise received by Farmers' Union for its fight in behalf of that program.)

1. THE BRIDGES SPEECH

On September 7, 1950, Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire, former county agent, former secretary of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau, and then a director of his State Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co., rose on the floor of the Senate and launched a 2-hour tirade against the Farmers' Union.

The Senator from New Hampshire accused the Farmers' Union of being a "Communist dominated" organization.

The rebuttal from Senators who know Farmers' Union (BRIDGES has no members in his State) was instantaneous and dramatic. Seldom has any organization been so eulogized in Congress, if ever. Here are samples from the 79 pages of defense in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (September 7, 12, 23, and 24, 1950):

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota Republican: "The program of the Farmers' Union * * * is one of the greatest bulwarks against communism."

Senator KARL MUNDT, South Dakota Republican who was formerly a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities: "I think I have known all the State presidents of the Farmers' Union of South Dakota across the period of the last 15 years, perhaps, and they have been consistently a fine, representative group of South Dakota farmers."

Senator MILTON YOUNG, North Dakota Republican: "This great organization, the Farmers' Union, has probably fewer Communists in it than probably most any other big organization in the United States."

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrat (then a Republican): "In my opinion, Mr. Patton, the president of the Farmers Union, is as loyal a citizen as there is in the United States. * * * I deplore the growing tendency in the Senate to use the floor of the Senate as a forum for accusing fellow citizens of disloyalty to their Government and offering not a scintilla of proof in support of such charges."

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Minnesota Democrat: "I ask, in all conscience in all honor, how in the name of commonsense can anyone get up on the floor of the Senate and brand a man like Mr. Patton a fellow traveler or as one duped by the Communists, or his organization as being a Communist-front organization?"

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, the Wisconsin Republican who was making headlines by chasing Communists, also stated his confidence in Farmers Union. Referring to the president of Wisconsin Farmers Union, Kenneth W. Hones, Senator McCarthy said: "He has the reputation of being militantly and intelligently anti-Communist."

2. THE UTAH CASE

Senator BRIDGES was careful to shield himself from a libel suit by wearing the cloak of congressional immunity. But some of his fellow Farm Bureau members in Utah were not as cagey. They paid for their mistake.

In 1950 the Utah congressional campaigns were underway. Up for reelection was Walter K. Granger, a liberal, forward-looking Congressman. In the previous session, Granger had introduced a bill which would have divorced the Farm Bureau from the extension service whose county agents, in many States, were performing Farm Bureau chores at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Utah Farm Bureau set out to beat Granger. As part of its campaign it circulated rumors that Granger was being supported by the the Farmers Union which was, the Utah Farm Bureau leaders whispered, a "Communist dominated" organization.

The bureau leaders, Secretary Frank Shelley and Vice President A. V. Smoot, circulated their charges against Farmers Union in printed form to newspapers and the newspapers printed them.

Farmers Union promptly sued for libel. A Utah Federal court jury decided that no proof existed that could even remotely link Farmers Union with communism.

It ordered the Utah Farm Bureau to pay Farmers Union $25,000 in damages.

The Utah trial brought out some interesting facts. First, that BRIDGE's speech on the Senate floor had been written by one Robert Cruise McManus, a writer of sorts who has made a living by his attacks on Farmers Union. BRIDGES agreed to make the ghost-written speech after the late Senater Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, refused. Wherry was quoted by Drew Pearson as saying, "I was too smart for that. I let STYLES BRIDGES make that speech."

What inspired BRIDGES' attack on Farmers Union?

The author of the speech, Robert Cruise McManus, frankly told the Utah Federal court that "politics was involved." McManus, who then lived in Hopewell, N. J., said he was writing a book on alleged Communist infiltration of agriculture when an unnamed friend dropped by and suggested that McManus write a speech for a United States Senator to deliver against Farmers Union. McManus wrote the speech and with his friend went to Washington where they finally peddled it to Senator BRIDGES—a Farm Bureau executive and staunch member.

During the week-long Utah trial, the American Farm Bureau Federation rushed to the aid of its State organization by hiring ghost-witer McManus to act as counsel for the Utah Farm Bureau's lawyers.

Prior to the trial, the Utah Farm Board tried to apologize and settle out of court, but it quickly canceled its offer after hearing from the national officers of American Farm Bureau Federation.

McManus' counsel failed. Federal Judge Willis Ritter called some of the Farm Bureau's evidence "ridiculous" and continually admonished its attorneys to produce some facts. The principal proof which the bureau attorneys had to support their charges was that Farmers Union was a strong advocate of cooperatives.

When Farmers Union won the Utah trial, the Farm Bureau appealed to the 10th circuit court of appeals, composed of three Federal judges. This high court unanimously sustained the Farmers Union judgment against the Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau was forced to pay $25,000 in damages plus $3,000 in costs, and Farmers Union was completely vindicated.

3. THE HOLLAND SMEAR

Six years after the BRIDGES attack, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, smeared the Farmers Union viciously by associating it pointedly with the Communist program.

Again, Senators jumped up to reply to the attack. When the rebuttal was over, 20 Senators from both parties had risen to defend the Farmers Union. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1956.)

HOLLAND is a featured speaker at American Farm Bureau Federation conventions. There are practically no Farmers Union members in his State.

He referred to Farmers Union advocacy of 100-percent price supports for the production from family-sized farms and declared that "the announced program of the American Communist Party happens to be pegged" on those planks.

Here's the reply of a Republican Senator, KARL MUNDT, member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and former member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities: "It certainly does not follow that simply because the Communist Party believes in the law of gravitation, that anyone else who is subject to that law is influenced by Communist Party doctrine."

A Democrat, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, put it this way: "The same situation obtains with respect to every piece of progressive legislation we have enacted during the past 20 years, including social security, unemployment insurance, wage-and-hour legislation, old-age assistance, and many fine programs which the Senator (HOLLAND) has vigorously supported. Most of these programs have been aped by the Communist Party."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, replied by quoting Edward A. O'Neal, former president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as demanding in 1941 "a program which will assure full parity not only to

the five basic crops but to all American agriculture."

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota Republican, said: "I myself, time and time again upon this floor have stated that I am in favor of 100 percent of parity. I am proud of that fact * * * certainly I cannot be charged with being sympathetic any more than any 1 of the 37,000 farmers in North Dakota can be charged with being sympathetic to the Communists."

WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrat, referred particularly to the family-farm aspect of HOLLAND's attack: "The cutoff idea that drew the charge of communism from the Senator from Florida is as American as apple pie. Even the President's farm message contains this philosophy. If National Farmers Union's fight for a farm program is communistic, then I presume by all the rules of logic that President Eisenhower, Secretary Benson, and all the policymakers of the administration are also communistic."

Other Senators who rose to testify to Farmers Union's loyalty and service to family farming in America included: Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Carlson, Republican, of Kansas; Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana; Case, Republican, of South Dakota; Young, Republican, of North Dakota; Thye, Republican, of Minnesota; Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon; Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Lehman, Democrat, of New York; Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois; Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas; Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennesese; Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina; and Wiley, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Occasionally, in various parts of the Nation, Farmers Union's foes find some gullible person or group to carry on their scurrilous attack.

Every decent person, of course, deplores these tactics. But there is evidence that the enemies of the strong and effective programs farmers have built are continuing to resort to such tactics.

Recently, a new type of attack has been spread by two sources, both inspired by the Farm Bureau as a device for smearing the Farmers Union program rather than debating its merits.

The Glenn Martz newsletter

Several years ago, a member of the staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Washington, Glenn Martz, resigned and moved down the hall to start a newsletter using his own name. He calls it The Lowdown on Farm Affairs from Washington and fills it with long quotations from Communist documents, sandwiched in between quotations from people he chooses to attack, such as Senator Karl Mundt, Senator Milton Young, and NFU President James G. Patton. His stock in trade is guilt by association, viciously handled by distorted imagination to please subscribers.

Farmers Union doesn't have enough time to reply to the scurrilous attacks of Martz, and it refuses to get down into the gutter with him. In most areas, all a farmer needs to know about Martz is that he has been an agent of the Farm Bureau.

"Glenn Martz has joined the AFBF's staff in the Washington office as assistant director of information. The story of the appointment of the former United Press writer appears on this page." (Reprint of announcement below Martz's picture in the Official Newsletter of the Farm Bureau, January 14, 1952.)

Recently, so-called lectures by Martz have been sponsored by the Farm Bureau in several states—Virginia, South Dakota and Illinois. Some of these have coincided with Farmers Union organizing drives, but the smear tactics have failed thus far—just as their negative program for agriculture has failed.

The Philbrick story

Similarly, early in 1957 several lectures were delivered in the Midwest by Herbert A. Philbrick, best known as the author of I Led Three Lives. The book recounted his experiences as an informer for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A film series based on the book has had long runs on television. Philbrick has made many paid lecture appearances as an expert on communism.

Certain groups and persons, including Farm Bureau, arranged for Philbrick to appear in the rural areas of Iowa and Minnesota during the early months of 1957. The misunderstandings, rumors, and outright lies about Farmers Union that resulted from those appearances caused National Farmers Union to decide to sue Philbrick for slander. The intended suit was dropped when Farmers Union received the letter which is reproduced at the end of this article.

Philbrick has also instructed his lecture agent to halt the use by members of Iowa Farm Bureau of sound recordings made of his Iowa appearances.

National Farmers Union President James G. Patton expressed gratification that Mr. Philbrick has agreed to set straight a record which has damaged the reputation of our 55-year-old farm organization in its vigorous fight for the family farmers of America.

Patton also pointed out that the Philbrick lectures coincided with a membership drive to charter Farmers Union in Iowa and that they were sometimes sponsored—as Philbrick's statement notes—by another farm organization.

"This retraction should put an end to the use of smear and innuendo by rival groups," Patton said, "although we must be prepared for more of the same so long as some people refuse to discuss the farm issue on the basis of fact instead of fiction.

"Farmers Union will go right on fighting for the family farmers of this country, the great bulwark against communism, fascism, or other enemies of our democratic institutions. We will not be detracted for a moment from that most important job because of any smears, whispering campaigns, or other low blows.

"I think the American people realize that the real subversive danger to our country is the attempt to tear down and undermine institutions like the Farmers Union, dedicated as it is to the great pattern of family farming.

"Agriculture is in a depression, and farmers need organization and bargaining power like they have seldom needed them before. Farmers Union offers vigorous leadership in this cause."

OCTOBER 15, 1957.

Mr. JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. PATTON: During the months of January and February 1957 I delivered a series of lectures in the States of Iowa and Minnesota on the subject of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. Some of these lectures were sponsored by the American Legion, others by various schools, and still others by the American Farm Bureau Federation or some local subdivision of that organization.

I wish to state for the benefit of those who were present at any of these lectures, and particularly for those who were not present and may have read or heard erroneous reports concerning my lectures, that I never stated either in my speeches, my remarks during the question periods, or my press conferences, that the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of American, commonly known as the National Farmers Union, was a Communist-front organization or Communist dominated, or that its president, James G. Patton, was a Communist or Communist sympathizer; nor do I believe that the National Farmers Union was or is a Communist-front organization or Communist dominated, or that its president, James G. Patton, was or is a Communist or Communist sympathizer, nor do I believe that Mr. Patton has allowed himself or his organization to be used as a Communist tool.

So far as I know, the National Farmers Union has never been listed as a Communist-front organization by any department or agency of the Federal Government, and has never been so identified by any committee or persons authorized to issue reports on behalf of the Congress of the United States with respect to such matters.

In answer to questions from the audience at certain lectures I did read excerpts of the sworn testimony of William H. Hinton given in 1954 in hearings before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Judiciary Committee without drawing any conclusions on what he said or refrained from saying, but I did not intend to convey the impression to my listeners that I placed any confidence in the veracity of William H. Hinton, nor that I knew that he ever worked for the National Farmers Union or any lawfully constituted or authorized component or subdivision thereof. This is equally applicable to the testimony of Benjamin Getlow in the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from which I read.

I have made a study of the activities of the Communist Party in the United States and know that they have made many attempts to infiltrate farm areas of America. These attempts have been dismal failures and I have so stated in virtually every lecture I have made. Membership in the Communist Party in the farm States is the lowest in the entire country.

It is my belief that the National Farmers Union is a bona fide farm organization with a history of service to the farmers of America for more than 50 years. In May of this year the organization and its president were commended by President Eisenhower for giving voice to America's determination to stand firmly against the menace of international communism.

Yours very truly,
HERBERT A. PHILBRICK.

Association of College and Research Libraries Supports H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Columbus, Ohio, July 28, 1958.

Subject: National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: The Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association, represents the needs and interests of college, uni-

versity and other types of research libraries in the United States.

The association has studied the provisions of H. R. 13247, known as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, with great interest and general approval. It is our conviction that this bill would strengthen education in this country at a time when it desperately needs stronger support. We endorse the measures provided by this bill and urge you to give it your strong support in debate and to vote for it should it reach the floor this session.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS C. BRANSCOMB,
President.

Not Role for Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exten my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of Dallas, Tex., Tuesday, April 16, 1957. Here is a succinct and, I believe, an accurate description of the role of Federal Government in business.

NOT ROLE FOR GOVERNMENT

Regulation of business in somebody's favor is always bad unless it is in your favor.

That can be written down as the basis of nine-tenths of business and industrial regulation asked of State legislatures and Congress. Business believes in the capitalistic system. Business believes in the laissez faire relationship between Government and itself. But while advocating noninterference by Government, it is business and industry that invariably come up to the lawmakers with bright ideas of how to interfere with somebody else in the same business.

We have come rightly to the theory that Government has a proper role as an umpire in the business operations of the Nation. Government properly protects against monopoly, fraud, agreements in restraint of trade that act as a cover for price-fixing. Government rightly fosters competition by protecting the business field against these elements calculated to destroy it.

But it is not the proper function of Government to handicap efficiency or sound business methods merely to protect a competitor. No Government should make legal acts illegal under the specious contention that it is protecting competition.

Government itself forbids price-fixing. Government should not even as a nonpartisan indulge in price-fixing. It is difficult to draw the line between monopolistic methods which by price-cutting may destroy competition and legitimate effort to undersell a business rival. It is still wrong to legislate against such traditional and useful sales devices as the loss leader, the bargain lure, the premium gift.

Government's primary responsibility is to protect the public and fair competition. In the long run the public is the best judge of the business with which it deals.

This criticism of price-fixing as not the role of Federal Government is particularly relevant now in view of the fair trade bill just reported by the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee to the full Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill called mistakenly fair trade is simply Federal permission to manufacturers to forget antitrust law and fix prices for retail sale. Price fixing would destroy competition and private enterprise—so the stakes are great as I see it.

The time has come for all Members of Congress to become familiar with the terms of this bill.

Most unfortunate and paradoxical is the fact that in practice, this bill, aimed at helping small retailers could be their epitaph. It is absolutely self-defeating and contradictory to the best interests of the retailers.

The Excellent Work of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress and the President have seen the wisdom of making the Small Business Administration a permanent Federal agency, and given to it additional authorities for providing service to the Nation's more than 4 million small-business firms, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the outstanding leadership of the Administrator of that agency, Mr. Wendell B. Barnes of Tulsa, Okla.

It has been my privilege to work with Mr. Barnes on programs of vital importance to small firms in my district, and it has been a refreshing experience to see how this young and energetic executive gets the job done. He has likewise instilled in his staff—both in Washington and in the field—a keen desire to serve small firms fairly and quickly, and I believe the results speak for themselves.

During the past fiscal year, the agency approved a record number of loans to small businesses, it helped to reserve for exclusive award to small concerns a new high in proposed Government contracts, and far surpassed its previous efforts in providing management and technical assistance to small businesses.

In addition, it launched new types of valuable services, such as developing special directories to help small firms participate in missile subcontracting and in Government research and development work.

Space does not permit a more lengthy description of the progress the Small Business Administration has made in all its activities since Wendell B. Barnes became head of the agency in 1953.

Mr. Barnes is a member of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business, the Defense Mobilization Board, and the Interagency Committee for Rural Development Program.

Born in Ponca City, Okla., August 23, 1909, Mr. Barnes is a graduate of Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind.; Brown University, Providence, R. I., and the law school of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He received his law degree in 1935.

From 1935 to 1939 he was assistant attorney for the Oklahoma Tax Commission in Oklahoma City. In 1939 he moved to Tulsa, where he became a partner in the law firm of Gavin & Barnes. From October 1941 to June 1946, he was general counsel for the Tulsa plant of Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc. Much of his work involved Government procurement procedures, negotiation of prime contracts with the Air Force, and supervision of purchase orders and subcontracts for supplies for small businesses.

Before entering Government service, he was a practicing attorney in Tulsa, and as an adjunct to his law practice, Mr. Barnes organized and managed several small businesses. He served in the house of representatives of the Oklahoma Legislature from 1950 to 1952.

He is a member of the Oklahoma bar, the bar of the United States Supreme Court, the American Bar Association, and the National Council of the Federal Bar Association. He is a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, the Society of the Cincinnati, and Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity.

One of the Small Business Administration's most valuable programs is one which, in cooperation with colleges and universities, it makes it possible for small-business owners and managers to attend management extension courses to brush up on management practices. This program is carried on at no expense to the taxpayers, and to date more than 12,000 persons have taken these courses in all parts of the country.

As a part of this program, Mr. Barnes addressed a meeting of the National Council for Small Business Management Development, held June 24 at the University of Pittsburgh.

The following excerpts from his address there contain a number of valuable suggestions for improving business management:

I see great possibilities for improved management by the way in which big business directly helps small business. Big manufacturers sell through many—sometimes thousands—of smaller firms. At the same time, they buy equipment, parts, and supplies from many smaller firms. The relationship between the bigs and smalls at this point of contact can be so sound and friendly that it would be possible for the larger, more experienced firm to pass on in a number of ways management information of great value to the smaller ones.

While I am talking in this general area of the relationship patterns between large and small units of enterprise, I would like to share with you some thoughts from which I have drawn some definite conclusions. If these conclusions have merit, I offer them particularly as something to which we, as well as the top policymakers of our leading bellwether companies, might give some serious current attention.

For years we have been aware of, and have given lipservice to, the fact that big business could not develop, grow, or even function without the members of smaller enterprises who are their suppliers, subcontractors, dealers, and agents in one way or another.

This is an old truth which is steadily becoming more vitally true and significant as the patterns of our total economic effort

become bigger and more complex. Now, from this broad fact, I have drawn some specific conclusions which, if I were a top executive in any big company, I would begin to think about and to do something about.

For instance, I would recognize that every one of my dealers, or my subcontractors, or my suppliers was, for all intents and purposes, just as vital to the total overall productivity and good will of my company as is any one of my direct employees. Therefore, I would be concerned and do some things to make sure:

That those small companies, essential to the profitable operation of my company, are themselves making a profit and growing.

That these small-business allies of mine knew as much about my company as our own people did.

That they understood our policies and standards and spirit of craftsmanship, service, and quality, and that they identified themselves with them the same as we did.

That when they sold or serviced our products, they gave the final customer a feeling that both they and we stood behind the sale.

In short, that their small company and our big company were a real team, because in actual fact that's what we have to be if we and they are to grow and prosper—if nothing else, such a policy of mutual loyalty and cooperation would cut down on the buck-passing and bad liaison that prevails all too often between manufacturers and the firms from which they must have complete loyalty, their dealers, the sellers of their products and services.

You have all heard the wisecrack, "There is no reason for this, it is just company policy."

It is bad enough when this attitude exists within a company; it is far worse when the dealers or distributors of a company's products show such an indifferent attitude since they are out on the retail firing line presumably selling and servicing the customers whose good will is essential to both the maker and the seller of the product.

* * * * *

No later than last week I was talking with a dealer who sells a product for one of American's biggest and most respected companies—one which has recently introduced an addition to its product line. I got the impression that this dealer almost hoped that the new product would fail, not realizing that such a failure might harm his own economic interests right along with those of the major company involved, and that its success would add luster to the product he handled and permit the manufacturer to give him better services.

There is no need for this kind of attitude. The large company must maintain effective policies in this most important area of modern industrial relations and a few such failures can deteriorate its competitive position. There are enough natural economic problems in our complicated economy today without creating new artificial problems through oversight and neglect of everyday human relationships. We hope the large manufacturers will remember that loyalty in their dealer relations is a two-way street.

"Time does not allow me to go into all of these relationship patterns in detail. However, in passing, I should like to give emphasis and perspective to this timely fact. We have moved into such a dynamic era—one marked by automation; by new demands on research, financing and administration; by new population impact on market patterns, product design and merchandising; by new techniques of distribution; by intense competition—that it now becomes absolutely essential, in my opinion, to have a market place review now and continuously of the entire set of human and economic relationships between the big and small units of enterprise in our society. And, as I said, if I were a top policy man in any large company today, I would put this challenge high up on my list of things to think about with an eye to doing whatever is necessary to bring my company's relationship into step with our life and times.

When I see so much uproar and discussion being generated by new ideas and arguments about economic and human relationships—from guaranteed annual wages and industrywide bargaining problems, to discount houses and drive-in automated selling—these are storm warnings to me that forewarn of change. All of us—whether we identify ourselves with big business or small business—had better examine everything we are doing in both policy and practice to be sure that we are in step with these new forces. And nowhere is the impact of change more critical than at those many points of two-way relationship between the big units and the small units which must work together if this marvelous economy of ours is to go forward.

This idea of mutually helpful relationship between large and small companies that I have been talking about is already in operation in a few instances known to me. For example, there is one large petroleum company which has a staff of management experts who are available at all times to consult with wholesale and retail customers of the firm on their management problems. When it was found out that this advice was given freely, with no hidden gimmick, and that profits often did increase as a result, more and more customers took advantage of the service. The net result has been one of advantage to the big company as well as to its dealers.

When it is more fully realized by big and small business alike that they are interdependent and that the success of one is dependent upon the success of the other, these isolated instances will be the rule, and not only will all business benefit, but the position of the consumer will be enhanced as well.

Needless to add, such observations are themselves an editorial comment on the essentiality of the very kind of meeting, and of the type of creative leadership, which is reflected by your agenda today.

Schedule of Courthouse Visits in 13th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, the legsilative activities of the 2d session are rapidly drawing to a close, and the work of this 85th Congress will soon be concluded. This has been one of the most active sessions of Congress in recent congressional history.

I look forward to returning to Ohio during the coming months to meet with as many of the residents of the 13th district as possible. Through these personal meetings I am better able to acquaint myself with their problems and beliefs, and thereby am in a better position to serve them more effectively.

As in the past year, I have again, through the gracious cooperation of local public officials, been able to arrange for office space during my tour of the district in the courthouses of the four counties of Lorain, Sandusky, Huron, and Erie. I will be at these locations on the following dates:

September 15, 16, and 17: Lorain County Courthouse, Elyria.

September 18 and 19: Huron County Courthouse, Norwalk.

September 22, 23, and 24: Sandusky County Courthouse, Fremont.

September 25 and 26: Erie County Courthouse, Sandusky.

Following this tour of the district, I will again be available at the following two offices for further conferences with 13th district constituents: 206 Felck Building, Sandusky, Ohio; 209 Sixth Street, Lorain, Ohio.

Man of Convictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Patent Trader, of Mount Kisco, N. Y.:

MAN OF CONVICTIONS

The basic principles of a political party, no matter how constant, inevitably become stirred by the differences in the thinking of the men who believe in these principles. Ironically, while all members of such a party are basically united on the theorems embracing these principles, the source of great division is the attempt to define, reinterpret, and translate them into action.

Such has been the case in the Democratic Party through its history and, more so, in recent years. Fundamentally a party with a credo of liberalism, it finds itself from time to time embroiled in angry and almost irreparable differences over the interpretation of the principles of liberalism. This is a normal course of events, for liberalism is change, and change invariably generates differences.

On Saturday night of last week this fact was highlighted once again on the American scene. Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, past national party chairman and now a candidate for the United States Senate nomination, struck out angrily at critics within his own party who have rejected and opposed his candidacy because they do not think he is a liberal. The occasion was the annual dinner of the Putnam County Democratic Committee at Bear Mountain Inn.

Mr. Farley first outlined the history of liberalism in the Democratic Party from Jefferson down through the 20th century of Wilson and then Roosevelt which was, as he put it, "where I came in." He reminded his audience of the broad social reforms of the New Deal, all with the brand of liberalism.

He quoted Webster's definition of a liberal: "One who is liberal in thought or principle; one who favors greater freedom in political or religious matters, specifically in politics * * * favorable to reform, not bound by orthodox."

Mr. Farley added tersely: "That's good enough for me."

Mr. Farley's presence on the political scene once again brings into sharp and sometimes poignant relief memories of the exciting days when the Democratic Party was under his leadership. Now he finds himself enough of a stranger on so broad a front

of his own party's political scene that he angrily and justifiably sees fit to strike out at his critics and challenge them to match their records against his.

It is ironic and regrettable that a man of the stature, prominence, and influence of Mr. Farley should find himself standing aside from the flock in such familiar pastures. It is because of this position that his fight for the nomination will be all uphill against tremendous odds.

Here again are revealed the differences in interpretations, shadings, and thought and the routes to be followed in the interest of liberalism in action. Here is the paradox of allies believing in the same thing, fighting for its possession; a paradox that offers no solution until one side has overwhelmed the other. Surely Webster's definition of the liberal would elicit the same ready reply from Mr. Farley's critics: "That's good enough for us, too."

Opponents of the former New Deal leader would do well from the standpoint of their own interests, but more so from those of their party, not to view Mr. Farley as a figure from the past with no place in the present scheme of things.

This vigorous, astute, and able man has a reputation among the people that his word is his bond. This applies among the generation that appeared on the public scene almost at the time he voluntarily withdrew from it. Apply this reputation to the man's firm faith in the basic principles of his party and you have a combination that can readily be traded for public support based on trust and good will. These are commodities any political party should covet.

The United States senatorial candidate is capable of bridging the gap of time from his once great position in this Nation to the present, for men of strong convictions are greatly needed in the service of their country now and at any time.

Wilson Versus Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of August 3, 1958, which comments on the controversy between former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, United States Army, retired:

WILSON VERSUS GAVIN

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, now retired, is as fallible a human being as any of us. So he may be wrong in some of the bleak and unflattering judgments he has set forth in his new book. In effect, the book warns that our country's present military position is for from good, and it blames former Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson for having made bad decisions that are primarily responsible for that position.

Since this is a field of controversy in which opinions differ very markedly, even among those best qualified to talk about it, the average layman would be foolish to take sides in a dogmatic fashion. Still, General Gavin is unquestionably one of our most distinguished military men, and what he has to say merits respectful attention. Certainly, considering his exceptionally fine record, his views deserve something much better than Mr. Wilson's comment: "I know Gavin and he is just another overly inflated Army officer with an exaggerated regard of his ability. He's just trying to sell his book."

General Gavin, needless to say, is not just trying to sell his book. On the contrary, right or wrong, he is trying to alert the Nation to a situation which he believes to be full of exceedingly grave potential danger, especially so if the Russians actually are as far ahead of us in ballistic missiles as some reports indicate. The former Defense Secretary has not helped to clarify the true status of our position by his slurring comment on General Gavin.

A Transportation System Between the House Office Buildings and the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly today the growing need for a transportation system between House Office Buildings and the Capitol. We all agree, I am sure, the need will become more rather than less acute with the completion of another House Office Building.

Most of us, and certainly Dr. Calver's office, are familiar with the number of heart attacks suffered by Members in recent years. Among us are some Members who have difficulties with limbs, and other incapacities brought on by war, accident, illness and age. Moreover, the increasing tensions which we all feel as a consequence of long hours we devote to our work in committees, on the floor, in our offices, in our home districts and in campaigning, tax and aggravate our physical capacities for the jobs we are trying our best to do for those back home who send us here to the House of Representatives.

Members must now rush long distances to the floor of the House to answer roll calls which, as we all know, seem to come more frequently. As one who suffered a heart attack 2½ years ago, and spent 9 weeks in Bethesda Naval Hospital, I can honestly say that I feel the strain of making hurried dashes to the floor. I know that I am not alone. Those of us with heart conditions have been advised repeatedly by our doctors not to rush over long distances at fast paces.

Mr. Speaker, the construction work on the additional House Office Building now speeding along prompts my remarks today. I am sure this new building will be connected by one or more tunnels. Perhaps so many as 3 tunnels will be available between the 3 House Office Buildings and the House of Representatives. Certainly we should use the existing tunnel. But they will not mean any less transportation; in fact they could well mean, dependent on location, more walking.

There have been reports that such tunnels would be equipped with little trolley cars similar to those on the Senate side of the Hill. I think we all, if a vote were taken, would be unanimous in our belief that such trolleys simply will not work on the House side of the Hill. We all know that pedestrian traffic—Members, visitors, secretaries, clerks, service personnel, and others—on our side of the Hill runs many times the volume of that on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, what we need, and shall need desperately in the future, is a safe, continuous type of transportation. The kind in which there can be no buildup of traffic entailing long waiting periods, or additional personnel to keep tourists off the conveyance so that Members can get to the floor without delay.

Last year the Carveyor transportation system was demonstrated in the Congressional Hotel. Possibly a third of the Members of the House saw this model exhibit and, generally, so far as I can determine, are still enthusiastic about and desirous that such a system be installed.

Basically, the Carveyor transportation system consists of a number of small passenger-carrying cars riding on conveyor belts. This system provides a safe, continuous, no-waiting, no-crowd build up, transportation service. The existing tunnel could, for example, handle a—four persons in a car—Carveyor system which probably would be installed and operating in the present tunnel by next spring.

Mr. Speaker, with this conveyance I am informed the present tunnel between House Offices and the Capitol could be traversed by members in about 1 minute from the time they step on to the Carveyor to the moment they step off in the Capitol or vice versa.

The Carveyor transportation system is versatile and flexible. Its basic principle, the slowly moving platform which is used to enter the cars, has worked flawlessly and economically in a railroad station tunnel, a steel plant, a baseball park, an airport, a subway station, a coliseum.

Here is a transportation system which, I submit, would be the answer to our transportation—safe, no fumes, no noise, no side sway, no vibration, no bumping and, best of all, never any waiting. Also, I believe the Carveyor could be installed at a cheaper cost, and by maintained more economically, than any other comparable transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that every member carefully study this matter. It is not only to our advantage, but it is imperative in view of current construction work on the House side of Capitol Hill to examine most carefully our transportation problems. The Carveyor system merits a thorough examination and consideration.

Kelvinator To Close Area Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last week the following appeared in the Detroit Free Press. The area-redevelop-

ment bill now in the Rules Committee, if enacted into law, would assist another industry to locate in this area and therefore assist the some 400 workers and their families that are directly affected:

KELVINATOR TO CLOSE AREA PLANT

American Motors Corp. will discontinue the last of Kelvinator Appliance Division manufacturing at its Plymouth Road plant before the end of the year, it was disclosed Monday.

About 400 workers will be affected, the company said.

A spokesman said the manufacture of compressors for Kelvinator refrigeration appliances would be shifted to the main appliance plant at Grand Rapids.

The move is part of an integration program that has been in progress for several years, the spokesman said.

Several years ago, the company moved home-freezer and ice cream cabinet manufacturing to Grand Rapids.

At present, only the compressor line is operating.

Employees will be informed of the move officially Tuesday. There was no indication how many might be able to get jobs at the Grand Rapids plant.

Much of the space at the Kelvinator plant at 14250 Plymouth is devoted to experimental engineering and office and warehouse space. The building also houses AMC's executive offices.

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newburgh News of July 29, 1958:

AS WE SEE IT

In what he described as the harshest statement he ever made in public life, Big Jim Farley has struck back at so-called liberals in the Democratic Party who have attacked the Farley liberalism.

The man who directed the first two campaigns for Franklin D. Roosevelt (the most successful ones, too, from the viewpoint of election results) charges that those who try to cast doubts on Mr. Farley's liberalism are either grossly and inexcusably ignorant or are deliberately untruthful, or both.

Speaking at the annual dinner-dance of the Putnam County Democratic committee, at Bear Mountain Saturday evening Mr. Farley reminded those critics that F. D. R. would never have named the Democratic aspirant for the United States Senate this year as his Postmaster General or backed him for national chairman if Mr. Roosevelt had not been convinced of the Farley liberalism.

There are some today who feel one cannot be described as truly liberal unless he is ready at all times to defend anyone accused of Communist leanings or activities, regardless of the merit behind such charges.

Where there is no merit to such charges, we are sure, Mr. Farley will be among the first to rally to the defense.

Where there is merit to such charges, we are equally sure, Mr. Farley will not rise in opposition.

Such a position is a truly American position and one of which both Democrats and Republicans may be proud.

If the time has come when a man must automatically endorse anyone who favors communism in order to enjoy the liberal tag, then we doubt if Mr. Farley would want to wear the label.

We doubt if any responsible citizen would want to wear it and we are inclined to think that any alternative condidate proposed in lieu of Mr. Farley this year should make his position very clear in that respect.

Invitation to Crater Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Crater Lake, Oregon's only national park, borders the district which I have the honor to represent. It is a place of unique beauty, and I highly recommend a visit there to my colleagues and others who have an appreciation for tall trees, high mountains, white snow, tangy air, and unspoiled grandeur.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include an article about Crater Lake which appeared in the Eugene Register-Guard for Sunday, July 27, 1958, and was written by Donn Bonham, the city editor of the Register-Guard:

DEEP BLUE WATERS OF CRATER LAKE FASCINATE 380,000 EACH YEAR—EASY SIDE TRIPS TAKE TRAVELERS TO OTHER SIGHTS

(By Donn Bonham)

Pictures of Crater Lake, with its deep blue water surrounding Wizard Island, appear in travel magazines and geography books and are used as calendar art and framed for display the country over. The lake is a must on the itinerary of virtually every out-of-State tourist and annually attracts some 380,000 visitors.

From Eugene, Crater Lake is an easy 3-hour summertime drive (136 miles). Thus, a 1-day outing to the lake is entirely within reason. But for those desiring a more leisurely trip there is an excellent weekend loop that takes the traveler, first, from Eugene to Crater Lake, then to Medford or Gold Hill, to Grants Pass, Roseburg, and back to Eugene.

The loop trip measures 475 miles, counting short side trips from Crater Lake to Diamond Lake and from Gold Hill to the House of Mystery. All roads are excellent and sightseers are amply rewarded along the entire route by Oregon's majestic scenery.

PLEASANT BREAK

Taking the Willamette Pass (Highway No. 58) from Eugene, a stop at Salt Creek Falls affords a pleasant early break. The falls, about 70 miles from Eugene, are only a few hundred feet off the highway and may be reached by two trails, one leading to the base of the waterfall and the other to a point across from the top.

After reaching Highway No. 97 (Klamath Falls-Bend), it is only 14 miles to the turnoff, or north entrance, to Crater Lake. The 25-mile drive in to the lake is straight save for one 90-degree turn and a few curves on the far end.

At the lake, Rim Village is the hub of tourist activity and accommodations. A concessionaire, working under a lease agreement with the National Park Service, operates Crater Lodge, a cafeteria and store, sleeping cabins, rental rowboats, and sightseeing launches. The park service, with headquarters 3 miles south of the lake, maintains the park and provides a staff of rangers for protective purposes together with a staff of ranger-naturalists who furnish free guide service and information about the famous lake, park, wildlife, and natural history.

Crater Lake, the focal point of Oregon's only national park, was created 7,600 years ago when Mount Mazama erupted, collapsed, and formed the crater that became one of the world's most beautiful bodies of water. Deceptively large (21 square miles), the lake is surrounded by towering walls 500 to 2,000 feet above the water, and is accented by rugged prominences such as Cloud Cap and Liao Rock. The great depth (1,996 feet) of pure snow water makes the lake an exceedingly deep blue that perfectly reflects the clouds and the rich colors of the rim.

INACTIVE CONE

Wizard Island, an inactive cone, and the Phantom Ship are two islands which further enhance the lake's interest and beauty. The Phantom Ship is so named because it resembles a ship under sail.

An elaborate vantage point is provided Crater Lake sightseers at Sinnott Memorial, a building at Rim Village perched 40 yards down the rim and accessible by stone steps. Telescopes are focused on points of interest and lectures are given here five times daily by the ranger-naturalists. Inside the building are exhibits that explain the geology of the park.

Numerous other vantage points are provided at Rim Village to afford easy sightseeing and photography. Rim Drive, a 35-mile trip around the lake, has numerous turnouts for automobiles, and 6 of the turnouts are provided with picnic tables. Each day at 10 a. m., there is a guided bus trip around the lake.

Guided trips afield (the Park Service does not like to call them hikes) may be taken to Garfield Peak and Discovery Point. Both are 1½ miles from Rim Village. Other trails lead to Mount Scott (2½ miles). The Watchman (1½ miles) and to the water's edge of Crater Lake. The lake trail is 1.6 miles, with 19 switchbacks down the side of the crater.

LAKE STOCKED

No fish are native to Crater Lake, but the lake is stocked with rainbow trout and Sockeye salmon. A fishing license is not required. There is a 10-fish daily limit, but this poses no handicap to most anglers; the lake is not very productive.

The park abounds with birds and blacktail and Rocky Mountain mule deer. Black bear are common, and the ever-hungry ground squirrels and chipmunks can easily be coaxed to eat from your hand. In the interest of safety, it is unlawful to feed, tease, or molest the bears; many people have been painfully clawed. The bears may seem tame, but they are not.

Two large areas are set aside for picnickers, one at Rim Village and the other at Cold Spring, which is about 12 miles south of the lake. There are four campgrounds in the park, with trailer space provided. The most elaborate of the four is at Rim Village, where there are washrooms and showers.

Throughout the park there is evidence of Mission 66, a National Park Service program designed to (1) correct the deterioration that occurred at the various national parks during World War II, and (2) provide additional development to meet the needs of ever increasing use. The 10-year program is to run until 1966 (hence its name), the 50th anniversary year of the National Park Service.

PLAN IMPROVEMENTS

For Crater Lake National Park, $5.75 million has been budgeted under Mission 66 to restore and improve park facilities. This

includes road improvements, work on existing campgrounds and construction of at least two new ones, reconstruction of existing trails and the creation of others, construction of a visitors' center building that will house a museum and auditorium, a loop road to reach the vicinity of Union Peak, and installation of interpretive signs throughout the park.

Crater Lake Park Supt. Tom Williams said that the Rim Village concessionaire, H. C. Smith, also is participating in the improvement program. Smith, who with his son, Harry, operates Crater Lake Lodge, the sleeping cabins and the cafeteria-store, is modernizing his present facilities and plans to construct a new trailer park just outside the south entrance to the park.

Noncampers have three choices of accommodations at Crater Lake: (1) Sleeping cottages, with cold running water only; (2) deluxe cottages, with hot and cold running water and private bath, and (3) Crater Lake Lodge, with modern appointments found in any good hotel. For a family of four, the cost runs $5.50 for a sleeping cottage, $9 for a deluxe cottage and $12 for a room at the lodge. Reservations should be made at least 1 week in advance.

POPULARLY PRICED

Meals and short orders are popularly priced in the Rim Village cafeteria, while prices in the lodge dining room run somewhat higher. Again, the family of four can eat dinner in the cafeteria for roughly $5, but the tab will be $10 to $12 in the lodge. Lodge dinners vary between $3 and $4 for adults and a child's plate is $1.85.

While visiting Crater Lake, a measure of diversion may be gained by taking a short side-trip to Diamond Lake, only 15 miles away. This mecca for fishermen has picnic areas and campgrounds, boat launching facilities and a boat dock, stores, a lodge, cabins, and a public swimming area.

Beginning the second half of the loop trip, back to Eugene, travelers should go south to State Highway 62, which follows the beautiful Rogue River much of the way. You may elect to go on to Medford, 89 miles from Crater Lake, but a shortcut is available that will take you through Sam's Valley to Highway 99 at Gold Hill.

Eight miles north of Gold Hill, a right turn off the highway leads to the Oregon Vortex, with its House of Mystery. This is a commercial enterprise that its owner claims attracts 120,000 visitors annually. The 4-mile trip in from the highway and the 60-cent admission price (30 cents for children) are well worth while, for the visit provides a unique experience. In this small circular area, nowhere do you stand normally erect; inevitably the visitor assumes a posture that inclines toward magnetic north. When facing south, you appear to be appreciably shorter than when facing north. A golf ball or a bottle will appear to roll up hill.

Once back on Highway 99, it is only 163 miles north to Eugene—3½ or 4 hours driving time filled with more gorgeous scenery and allowing ample time to reflect on an adventuresome weekend trip.

Quality Regulation of Imported Agricultural Commodities

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 11056 which, if enacted will result in another increase in prices to the American consumer.

The argument that failure to pass this legislation will result in contaminated products being foisted on the public does not hold water, in my opinion. Are the proponents saying that the Food and Drug Administration, the agency now inspecting these products, is passing produce unfit for human consumption? I do not for 1 minute believe this is true.

I think the membership of the House should have the benefit of the views of the Department of Commerce and the Department of State on this bill. We are advised that they oppose enactment of this bill, but we are not given an opportunity to study their reports.

Mr. Speaker, because of my interest in holding the line on prices, I urge defeat of H. R. 11056 in its present form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on atomic energy indemnity.

House debated debt limit increase bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14772–14809

Bills Introduced: 9 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4229–4237; and S. Res. 356.

Page 14774

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 781, to make retirement benefits available to certain persons who rendered active Federal service during the Korean conflict (S. Rept. 2188);

S. 4232, to extend the Mexican Farm Labor Program for 1 year (S. Rept. 2189);

H. Con. Res. 295, favoring the establishment of a Hall of Fame for Agriculture (S. Rept. 2190);

S. 2142, to extend restrictions on imported products to include specific citrus fruits, with amendments (S. Rept. 2191);

S. 3333, to facilitate insured loans for farm ownership and soil and water conservation (S. Rept. 2192);

H. R. 11800, relative to conveyance of certain U. S. lands to the city of Clifton, N. J. (S. Rept. 2193);

H. R. 6542, authorizing conveyance of certain land in Wyoming to the town of Dayton, Wyo. (S. Rept. 2194);

S. 4151, to establish uniform provisions for transfer of acreage allotments from land from which owner is displaced by agency having right of eminent domain, with amendment (S. Rept. 2195);

S. 3858, authorizing Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase flour and cornmeal and donating same for certain domestic and foreign purposes (S. Rept. 2196);

H. R. 7466, to provide for the establishment of a facility of the Vicksburg National Historical Park, with amendments (S. Rept. 2197);

S. 3648, authorizing construction of the Navajo Indian irrigation and San Juan-Chama projects, New Mexico, with amendments (S. Rept. 2198);

S. 2658, to amend the Merchant Marine Act so as to encourage construction of vessels and maintenance of shipyards, with amendments (S. Rept. 2199)—referred to Committee on Finance;

S. J. Res. 188, a private bill (S Rept. 2200);

S. 3224, to improve opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts, with amendments (S. Rept. 2201);

S. 1887, authorizing construction of San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, with amendments (S. Rept. 2202);

S. 3534, authorizing conveyance of certain lands at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo. (S. Rept. 2203);

H. R. 13192, fiscal 1959 appropriations for mutual security, with amendments (S. Rept. 2204);

H. R. 6894, amending the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings (S. Rept. 2205);

H. R. 11346, to include Massachusetts among the States which may divide their retirement systems into two parts—employees desiring social-security coverage and employees not desiring such coverage, with amendments (S. Rept. 2206); and

S. 654, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, with amendment (no written report). Page 14773

Bills Referred: Numerous House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 14772, 14839

Bills Placed on Calendar: Two House-passed bills, as follows, were ordered to be placed on calendar: H. R. 4142, relative to construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and H. R. 11581, relating to poisoned seed wheat.

Pages 14772, 14839

Vessels—Alaska: Senate disagreed to House amendment to S. 1798, regarding certain vessels carrying freight for hire on inland waters between Alaska and Washington, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Magnuson, Pastore, Lausche, Butler, and Cotton. Page 14787

Federal Aviation Agency: Senate disagreed to House amendments to S. 3880, to establish an independent Federal aviation agency to regulate effectively the uses of airspace over the U. S., agreed to hold conference requested by House and appointed as conferees Senators

Appendix

The Condition of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "While Many Railroads Slash Service, Mopac Courts Riders Harder," published in the July 31 issue of the Wall Street Journal. The article exemplifies what leadership and the management of a railroad can accomplish if they will aggressively endeavor to improve their services and lower their rates, in such a fashion that they will attract passengers and business.

I should like to add my personal commendation to Mr. Russell L. Dearmont, president of the Missouri Pacific, who, in endeavoring to meet the challenge which all railroads face, is showing what can be done through lower rates and through public service.

I should like to quote from the concluding paragraphs of the article, which read:

What does Mopac's crew think of all this? Chat with Thrift-T-Sleeper porter Robert D. Steward, who makes his home in St. Louis and who's been working on the railroad for 29 years: "I think these economy moves are the only answer to the trains' problem. We've got to get the people back on the trains and this looks like the way to do it.

"Tips? Tips from people who ride the Thrift-T-Sleeper are smaller, yes. Smaller to nothing," Mr. Steward says. "That's okay with me. If it weren't for this economy car, I wouldn't be working."

James Mathews, secretary of the Dining Car Employees, Local 354, in St. Louis, says, "We've had no complaints from our members on the Mopac. The men have been very grateful that the road has made a firm attempt to increase its business—more work and more security on the job."

Mr. Mathews estimates that since January 1 about 30 men who hadn't been working are now employed in Mopac meal cars because of increased business.

Mr. President, I believe that demonstrates that even the brotherhoods are greatly concerned with whether the railroads can operate successfully, because when they do not operate, obviously, men lose their jobs, there is no security, there is no increase in pensions, and there are no tips. The important thing is to have the railroads run efficiently and economically and with vigor, so that jobs will be available for the men who work on them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE MANY RAILROADS SLASH SERVICE, MOPAC COURTS RIDERS HARDER—LINE WHACKS FARES, SPRUCES SERVICE, REPORTS IT PAYS OFF IN INCREASED TRAFFIC—OTHERS MEET ON FARES TODAY

(By Roger B. Rowand)

ABOARD THE COLORADO EAGLE.—This sleek Missouri Pacific streamliner, scooting across the countryside toward Denver, has one feature that distinguishes it from many American passenger trains: It's full of passengers.

While mounting passenger losses are leading many railroads to slash service, the Mopac is speeding full throttle in the opposite direction. For the past several months, the road has been slashing fares, offering cut-rate sleeping accommodations, sprucing up service and dishing out low-cost meals to coach passengers.

This fully loaded Eagle is one symbol of the early success of the Mopac campaign. Mopac is pulling passengers from competing railroads, buses and even airlines in its mid-America area.

RAILMEN ASSEMBLE

Its example is at least partly responsible for a meeting in Chicago today; representatives of 80 railroads are assembling there to consider revision of passenger fare schedules. A likely result: A one-fare system, which would toss out the present differential between first-class and coach ticket prices. Mopac already has taken this step on several sections of its line; passengers, of course, still pay extra for sleeping accommodations.

Rail officials are quick to admit the Mopac program has given them something to think about. After recounting lower June passenger revenues, an official of the Wabash Railroad says, "The Mopac's hurtling us." The Wabash and the Missouri Pacific compete directly in some areas.

"We're giving it a real try, not just a lick and a promise," says the Mopac's silver-haired president, Russel L. Dearmont. His eventual goal: To make the Mopac's passenger operation self-sustaining.

LIMITING THE LOSS

For this recession year, however, Mr. Dearmont hopes only to hold the size of his road's passenger deficit to about last year's $17 million level. "As a result of our program," he says, "passenger business this year will be hurt less by generally adverse business conditions than it would have been."

Overall passenger figures for the road so far are of little significance, since the passenger-boosting program is so new and has been initiated piecemeal on various sections of the line. But the results of some of these early moves have been dramatic enough to encourage Mopac officials to push ahead.

In May, for example, Mopac cut the round-trip coach fare on its Houston-to-Brownsville, Tex., run to $15.78 from $20.10 and its first-class fare to the same figure from $28.45. Pullman charges were cut as much as 43 percent. The result: In the first month passenger revenues jumped around 20 percent above a year earlier. And the gains are continuing.

The size of the railroads' passenger problem has been growing steadily. Last year, United States railroads reported a $723,500,000 deficit on passenger operations, up from $696,900,000 in 1956. This year, despite a good deal of strenuous cost cutting, the total loss may run even higher. Such losses, of course, are figured on the basis required by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Some rail critics charge this results in inflated figures. The ICC, for example, requires railroads to allot part of their track maintenance costs to their passenger divisions; these costs would continue, the critics point out, even if the railroads abandoned all passenger service.

REVENUES FALL

Passenger revenues last year totaled $1.2 billion, down 3.5 percent from 1956, and this figure also seems sure to be even lower this year. Last year's figure was down one-third from the record high reached in the World War II year of 1944.

In an effort to trim operating costs, most railroads over the past year or so have been eliminating the heaviest money losers among their passenger trains.

The Pennsylvania, the Nation's largest passenger-carrying road, dropped 36 intercity trains from its schedules in 1957, and has dropped 11 so far this year. The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy's trains traveled 8 percent fewer miles in the first 5 months of this year than they had a year earlier, reflecting the elimination of some trains; the road admits the cuts are at least partly responsible for a 9 percent year-to-year drop in passenger revenues in that period.

The Mopac, by contrast, dropped no trains in 1957 and none so far this year. Nor is it now seeking to drop any trains.

LIMITING OUTLAYS

Mopac officials are quick to admit that their efforts to boost passenger revenues are limited almost solely to plans that require little or no added outlay of the railroad's cash on new equipment.

Typical of such cost-conscious efforts is the Thrift-T-Sleeper. There is one here on the Colorado Eagle as it travels from St. Louis to Denver. It is an old but reconditioned Pullman car. For a relatively small additional charge, a passenger who pays the equivalent of coach fare can get sleeping accommodations. The charges on this run: Upper berth, $2.50; lower, $6; bedroom, $12; drawing room, $15. Comparable costs on a standard Pullman: Upper, $8.65; lower, $11.45; bedroom, $21.70; drawing room, $38.35.

Mopac officials believe the Thrift-T-Sleepers primarily attract passengers who otherwise would ride in the coaches. R. J. McDermott, general passenger traffic manager, says the railroad last month carried about the same number of regular Pullman passengers that it did a year earlier. "The Thrift-T-Sleeper business," he says with conviction, "is plus business."

Since July 10, the railroad has been honoring coach tickets in regular Pullmans between Little Rock and New Orleans and between New Orleans and Houston. Passengers still must pay Pullman fares, and the latter have not been changed on these runs. But the passenger saves the difference between the cost of a coach ticket and a first-class ticket.

An innovation now offered on many Mopac trains is the travel tray, a low-cost meal

served to travelers at their seats or, as on this Colorado Eagle, in a "coach diner," a car without the frills, linen, and service of a regular diner.

These Mopac meals are served in compartmentalized trays. A typical dinner: Salisbury steak with mushroom sauce, creamed corn, mashed potatoes, bread, butter, sliced peaches, and choice of coffee, tea, or milk. The price: $1. The same meal on a regular Mopac diner would cost $2.35.

In January, the first month the travel trays were offered on the Colorado Eagle, dining-car crews served 427. Last month, the total jumped to 3,372.

Other railroads, to be sure, have been offering cutrate meals, but few have gone as far as the Mopac. Few, for example, are even considering serving full meals at coach seats.

Pillows rented aboard the train have long been the coach passenger's chief defense against stiff neck and insomnia. The Mopac in May cut the pillow rental fee from 35 cents to 25 cents in another move to encourage passenger travel.

Reduced coach fares have been given to large parties traveling in groups for years, but ticket sellers on most lines have had to contend with varying rates for many different definitions of what constitutes a group. For instance, there is a student fare, a civic-group fare, and an excursion fare. Mopac says it resolved this situation in March for its harried ticket force by establishing one uniform schedule of reduced fares for groups.

What does Mopac's crew think of all this? Chat with Trift-T-Sleeper Porter Robert D. Steward, who makes him home in St. Louis and who's been working on the railroad for 29 years: "I think these economy moves are the only answer to the trains' problem. We've got to get the people back on the trains and this looks like the way to do it."

"Tips? Tips from people who ride the Trift-T-Sleeper are smaller, yes. Smaller to nothing," Mr. Steward says. "That's O. K. with me. If it weren't for this economy car, I wouldn't be working."

James Mathews, secretary of the Dining Car Employees, Local 354, in St. Louis, says, "We've had no complaints from our members on the Mopac. The men have been very grateful that the road has made a firm attempt to increase its business—more work and more security on the job."

Mr. Mathews estimates that since January 1 about 30 men who hadn't beep working are now employed in Mopac meal cars because of increased business.

Private Nursing Homes—A Shameful Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate has already passed its omnibus housing bill and I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will soon approve such legislation.

There are many provisions of the omnibus housing bill that are desperately needed. I am confident that we shall pass a housing bill before the end of this Congress and I am hopeful that the President will approve it.

One of the more important provisions of the bill is one of the least publicized. However, it is designed to fill a need that has become critical. I refer to the provision authorizing FHA insurance on loans to proprietary nursing homes.

The Evening Star in an excellent editorial entitled "Shameful Situation," which appeared in its August 5 edition, points out the serious need for proprietary nursing homes in the District of Columbia. This is exemplary of a nationwide situation.

Mr. President, I believe that we too often overlook the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of people, primarily elderly people, who live permanently in these nursing homes. The homes constitute a very grave national housing problem and a national need.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 5, 1958]

SHAMEFUL SITUATION

The appalling conditions revealed by a District Medical Society survey of private nursing homes call for strong corrective measures by public and private agencies. Although an investigating committee agreed that no immediate solution could be suggested, the situation as described in the report to the society is such as to warrant a prompt, concerted effort by District authorities and other groups and individuals to improve conditions.

The problem is complicated by the shortage of facilities to care for the aged and chronically ailing in the Washington area. Badly operated homes can be and have been closed by health, fire, or building inspectors—but inevitably great difficulty is encountered in finding other quarters for the displaced patients. The District's Home for Aged at Blue Plains is filled to capacity and has a waiting list. And District General Hospital cannot accommodate all the patients still confined in nursing homes considered by health experts to have serious shortcomings.

According to the committee of doctors, some of these homes are dirty, gloomy, unsafe, inadequately staffed, and carelessly run. Equipment is insanitary, food poor, and supervision virtually lacking in the more deplorable homes. Yet they continue to operate—with or without licenses. Why? Because, according to Health Office Finucane and other officials, there is just no place to send the patients if, as the inspectors often recommend, the places were ordered closed.

Dr. Finucane, welfare officials, and others are properly concerned about this dilemma and apparently are doing what they can to solve it. But they need a lot of help from the community. They have enlisted the aid of the District Health and Welfare Council in a citywide survey to find families which would be willing to take care of 1 or 2 aged or infirm persons. For patients unable to pay, the Welfare Department will contribute up to $110 a month for such care. This plan is modeled after the foster home program for children. The Jewish Social Service Agency already has such a program under consideration. Other organizations could help to relieve the nursing home situation by similar efforts to enlist public cooperation.

Officials say the trouble centers in the proprietary type of nursing homes—those run for profit. The nonprofit homes, usually operated by churches or other organizations, are not a problem. The nonprofit homes, incidentally, are eligible for Federal building and improvement funds, under the Hill-Burton Act. The proprietary homes, however, cannot receive such Federal aid. Many of the profit-making homes are well operated and above criticism—and their fees range from $300 to $400 a month and up. Many patients cannot afford to pay such fees, however. And the lower the charge, the greater the shortcomings.

District authorities say that the worst of the faulty homes have been denied licenses. It was implied that others would be closed if the affected patients could be moved elsewhere. It is evident, therefore, that every governmental and community agency concerned with this problem ought to accelerate its efforts to find suitable places for as many victims of these bad conditions as possible. And the offending nursing homes ought to be shut down at the earliest practicable date.

Proposed Retirement of the United States From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Get Out of the U. N." from the Indianapolis Star of August 2, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET OUT OF THE U. N.

The United Nations has never done the United States any good. The U. N. has served communism well in the past, it serves communism even better today. The past should have prepared us for the present, when we are being pushed toward a summit meeting that could not be held at a worse time nor under more adverse conditions.

United Nations defenders claim Korea as a star in the U. N. crown. But what are the facts? The United States acted on its own to send troops into Korea when the Communists swept south. Had it not been that the Soviet Union was then temporarily boycotting the Security Council, the U. N. would not even have given belated sanction to our act. Having done so, however, it exerted every pressure at its command to deny us victory—and succeeded. We were more thoughtful to preserve the United Nations than we were to defend liberty, so North Korea is a Communist slave state.

So it has gone. The U. N. has scrupulously avoided any action to drive the Kremlin out of East Germany. Half of Vietnam went to the Communists, with U. N. approval. The utter shame to the U. N. and to us on account of Hungary is too fresh to need review. India seized Kashmir, and the U. N. did nothing. A million refugees camped on the Palestine borders, and the U. N. would not even talk of settling their claims. It found Algeria too hot to handle.

Today United States troops are in Lebanon and British troops are in Jordan, and again it was through no act of the United Nations that they went there. The U. N. did not send them. Neither did it stop them. To this minute it has not approved, nor has it disapproved. Instead it busies itself preparing a stage upon which the United States can play no other role than that of fool and villain.

The situation could scarcely be more ridiculous. The U. N. in the person of Hammarskjold is trying to arrange a meeting we do not want, but which Khrushchev wants. And what prevents us from saying we do not want it? Our official dedication to the theory that the U. N. must be preserved, even if all else goes by the wayside. So here we are trying to use the U. N. to prevent something the U. N. wants to bring about. If Dulles can bring it off, he rates an immediate position in the magicians' hall of fame.

The U. N. complicates and hamstrings U. S. foreign policy. In fact, it makes a sensible foreign policy impossible, because by slavish devotion to the U. N., we let everybody but Americans formulate our policies. The world is not better off because we do this. It is worse off. Ask the people in North Korea, ask them in Hungary, ask them in the Middle East. They will tell you the United Nations holds no hope of freedom for the world, not unless it changes its ways.

There is not much chance it will change. The realistic alternative is to get out of the United Nations and start running our own affairs again.

Tennessee Valley Authority Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good News for Friends of TVA," published in the Louisville Courier Journal of August 1, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD NEWS FOR FRIENDS OF TVA

The House Public Works Committee has approved the bill giving TVA authority to finance its future operations by issuing revenue bonds to be retired from power revenues, and if it can get past the Rules Committee it should become law before Congress adjourns. This is good news. The self-financing measure is a fair one, and it's been a long time coming.

The fight for the bill by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER was, of course, gratifying to friends of TVA, including the thousands of Kentuckians in the 26 counties that get power from the agency. But perhaps the most encouraging note in the battle came from the TVA Board of Directors. The Board is composed of 3 men, 2 of whom have worried TVA supporters by their apparent anti-TVA attitude, and valley citizens were understandably worried about the stand these men would take toward the self-financing bill.

They must feel better today, for during committee hearings on the bill, the Board sent a wire, expressing the unanimous support of the Board for the Kerr-Cooper bill passed last year by the Senate, without any of the amendments that the Bureau of the Budget, the Eisenhower administration, or other foes of TVA have been seeking.

This is a most significant development. It indicates that the men who direct the operations of TVA have, at least in this instance, broken with the anti-TVA forces around President Eisenhower and with the private-utilities lobby whose influence has seemed so powerful in TVA headquarters in recent years. It indicates that the men in charge have recognized their responsibility, and have decided to run TVA rather than run it down. If this be true, as it seems to be, it will be the best news the friends of TVA could have.

A Farmer's View of Farming: It Is a Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, when one of South Dakota's leading publishers, Ted Burges, went on vacation, he opened his personal editorial column to several of the prominent residents of the community. Ted Burges publishes the Clear Lake Courier, weekly newspaper in Clear Lake, S. Dak. His action in presenting this new feature is typical of his activities as an editor, for his newspaper has been the recipient of several awards for outstanding newspaper achievement, and he also has been honored by his fellow publishers, holding the office of president of the South Dakota Press Association a number of years ago.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article entitled "The Farmer Today," written by John Gauger, of Clear Lake, S. Dak. Mr. Gauger is one of many outstanding farm operators in Deuel County, and provides us with an interesting report and valuable insight concerning the role of the American farmer in our complex society. Too often, in the hectic rush of modern life, we view man as a seeker after only material things, who hungers after the almighty dollar. I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues this fine article, pointing out so splendidly the contrast that is often found in our "men of the soil," who demonstrate frequently the proper perspective in which they place their evaluation of the materialistic and that which is spiritual.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER TODAY

(By John Gauger)

When asked by the editor, Ted Burges, to act as a fill-in, in the editor column and to choose my own subject, I finally thought a farmer should present a subject along farm lines.

Farming is one of the oldest and most necessary occupations of mankind. It is perhaps the most important, also, in the economic welfare of a nation. Without the production of foods in this day and age, mankind could not exist.

Early pioneers of this and other Great Plains areas of the Nation settled as homesteaders to supply the necessities of life for their families and perhaps little did they realize that some day all the possible agricultural land would be used to supply foodstuffs for humanity and become agricultural land.

Great changes have taken place in agriculture in the past decade. It has grown from a small family venture for existence to an industry which now, directly or indirectly, employs more labor than any other industry. As agriculture moved across the Nation, the whole Nation moved with it, making necessary the building of railroads and highways, machinery to erect such roads, employed many men to manufacture and erect. As necessity to produce more crops, new methods and more economical methods spurred man on to inventions to accomplish this purpose, the results our modern methods and machinery. Then came the depleting of soils even in our fertile fields that early farmers thought inexhaustible and man again found a new industry in the production of fertilizer, each of these employed more people. Farmers also, because of their necessity to travel the highways and transport crops and stock, buy their share of cars and trucks. Now the call for water to increase production warrants irrigation systems. Although farmers may not wish Government assistance to control and distribute our crops and stock, it, too, becomes a national problem and employs people everywhere. I could go on telling the importance of agriculture nationally.

What qualifies a farmer and cattleman today? These qualifications have certainly changed. From an uneducated to a highly skilled all around efficient people. He must have certain personal qualifications, above all he must have faith in God to reward his labors in the production of crops as he has no control of the forces of nature. He must be a trusting soul that all other industries are charging a fair price for the things he buys. He must trust the buyer of his products that he is giving him fair weights and tests.

The farmer today must be a mechanic and able to study efficiency of machinery he operates. He must be a stockman, a veterinary, milkmaid, showman, and seller of his products and stock.

He must be strong in mind and body to stand the long hours of toil in rush seasons.

He, too, must take his place in community affairs and education. Also today he must be a bookkeeper and stenographer [unless he marries a bookkeeping wife], because the day of just living is past. The tax collector is ever on his trail today. He also must have finances or credit to set himself up in an efficient farm operation. If you don't think so you'd better sit down and study the situation.

Why do farmers continue to farm? I think it a most honorable profession. We like the wide open spaces, the variety in our daily work, the people we come in contact with. The work with nature in a big way as we till the soil and watch nature unfold its handiwork. The satisfaction one has as he leaves a well-tilled field at the end of the day. I like the dust, dirt, and grime as we harvest the crops and come home at night and the satisfaction that comes as we clean up for the night, feeling we have accomplished something at the end of the day.

The breeding and improving of livestock has no end of interest as we watch the gangly young things take their first steps and develop according to our plans.

I like the privacy we can experience at our choosing, or the visits to the cities and towns. Or the pleasure we have in showing what we have accomplished to our friends and neighbors from near and far.

Farming is a good life and with our modern farm homes of today even the farm wife can enjoy every convenience of our city friends and have the pleasure of constant companionship and a place to rear the family with nature. What more can we ask in life?

Recession Lesson—Government Aids Find United States Economy Can Rebound Without Big Federal Hypo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Wall Street Journal of August 6, 1958, under the heading "Government Aids Find United States Economy Can Rebound Without Big Federal Hypo."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECESSION LESSON—GOVERNMENT AIDS FIND UNITED STATES ECONOMY CAN REBOUND WITHOUT BIG FEDERAL HYPO

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has relearned a new set of economic lessons from the recession they believe hit bottom back in the spring.

The biggest, or at least the most specific, lesson is that taxes don't necessarily have to be cut every time business suffers a setback. The second lesson is that the economy has the basic strength to absorb a severe jolt without sliding into a depression, and right itself without the need for large-scale Government tinkering at the controls.

Administration officials now date the low point of the recession as coming as early as April, and see no present probability of a relapse. Indeed, the bottom was reached—if in fact it was—somewhat earlier than had generally been expected. And the pace of the comeback up to now, while not dramatic, has been a pleasant surprise.

EASED CREDIT

This is not to say the Government sat back and let the business slump burn itself out.

The administration, pushed by Congress, poured money into housing and made the terms to home buyers easier. It stepped up the placement of defense contracts, and speeded up Federal buying of supplies and services. The Federal Reserve Board, in comparison with past actions, eased off rapidly on credit.

And despite the so-called antirecession steps it did take, the Government did not move nearly as far in this direction as many lawmakers and others wanted it to. Just a short time ago, Democratic lawmakers were drawing up schemes to pump billions into a massive public-works program. Some frankly labeled it a WPA-type approach, covering everything from town sewers to huge dams. Faster spending by the administration was urged on military and civilian programs already underway. Lawmakers and others kept up a running fire on the Federal Reserve for not freeing more billions in credit. Tax cuts ranging from $5 billion to $10 billion were demanded.

The administration's firm and successful stand against a general tax reduction seemed to be in defiance of established economic theory that taxes should be lowered in the face of a business decline.

Strangely, the Eisenhower administration itself embraced and helped perpetuate this tax cut theory. In 1955, the President's economic report credited the tax reductions of 1954 with helping to end the 1953–54 recession. When the 1957–58 business slide got seriously underway, the theory that taxes should be cut in a period of falling business activity was presented as a necessary step if the recession was to be halted short of a possible depression.

This view came from all sides, both in and out of Government. Government economists at the working level were almost unanimous in favor of a reduction. Former President Truman and Dr. Arthur Burns, former chief of President Eisenhower's Council of Ecoonmic Advisers, both urged a sizable tax reduction before it was too late. The issue finally split the President's official family, with such high officials as Vice President NIXON, Labor Secretary Mitchell and others lining up in favor of the cuts.

Even those who had their doubts about how much good a tax cut would do were saying privately that the next big step the administration took would be to push for tax reduction. But this step was headed off by Treasury Secretary Anderson who, more than any other official, influenced the President against it on the grounds it would deepen the Federal deficits and add to inflationary problems in later years.

Mr. Anderson's master stroke in opposition to the tax-cut pressure was a unique alliance with Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON which, in effect, put the lid on the move.

"Had we cut taxes this winter or spring," one top official now asserts, "there's no doubt that step would have gotten full credit for ending the recession."

Instead, administration policymakers are citing the lack of a tax cut as proof that taxes don't need to be cut for the economy to work its way out of a recession.

"If there's one thing this recession has taught us," flatly asserts one high official who was inclined toward a tax cut, "it's that you can hold back on a tax cut and not wind up looking like an irresponsible boob."

Officials don't contend that the antirecession steps that were taken turned the recession around. But they do claim that what the administration did not do during the business setback was perhaps more important than what it did do. These policymakers cite the record of the recession as evidence that the basic strength of the economy was the main factor in bringing the slump to a halt.

DOWNWARD FORCES FIZZLED

"Looking back," claims one White House adviser, "it was largely a matter of some of the downward forces just fizzling out." Another gives credit to the fact that consumers kept up a relatively heavy rate of spending all through the decline. In short, policymakers now contend that what turned the recession around was not what the Government did. Instead, they argue, the recovery has resulted from the private decisions of millions of businessmen and consumers.

Old lessons—particularly those relating to tax cuts and public works—die hard. But the lessons from the 1957–58 recession have provided some fresh ammunition for those who, like Mr. Anderson, believe the Government should refrain from rushing off in all directions.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, editorial comment continues to pour in from across the Nation concerning American policy in the Middle East. One of the most thoughtful and constructive yet provocative editorials I have read to date appeared in the Huronite and Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak. The editor and publisher of that fine daily newspaper is Mr. Robert D. Lusk. The editor has laid down clear criteria and standards for the development of a Middle East policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION FALLS SHORT OF MINIMUM STANDARDS

By sending United States military units into Lebanon, Secretary of State Dulles assumed a posture of boldness and firmness in a sudden, even precipitate, action.

And in so doing he risked global war, along with embarrassments, harassments, frustrations, and other less important consequences.

Boldness and firmness are desirable in American diplomacy and so is the willingness to take risks.

And the United States long has needed a more farsighted, less vacillating policy for dealing with its problems throughout the world.

However, boldness is not brashness; firmness is not bullheadedness; the willingness to take risks is not foolhardiness.

Any bold new foreign policy must be predicated on a carefully considered long-term program which follows a coherent line of reasoning to an obtainable goal.

Furthermore, any new policy should be based on a set of principles which is consistent with the historic moral position of the Nation. Any bold new policy should be undertaken only with proper justification and preparation beforehand.

Then there is the matter of risks.

Risks always are necessary but they should be considered risks, based on a thorough knowledge of the conditions as they actually exist.

Finally, the risks undertaken should be in proportion to the importance of the goal sought and/or the issue at stake.

When measured against these criteria, Dulles' bold new policy—if that is what his action in Lebanon is—has fallen far below the minimum standards which this great Nation should insist on being observed by its Secretary of State.

The Case of Paul Bang-Jensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "These Are Americans?" from the Indianapolis Star of August 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ARE AMERICANS?

The Honorable James J. Wadsworth, deputy United States representative to the U. N. has issued a statement on the case of Paul Bang-Jensen. Bang-Jensen was fired from his U. N. job chiefly for refusing to give up a list of names of Hungarian freedom fight-

ers who testified before the U. N. Hungarian committee. He promised not to disclose the names to anyone because many would not testify unless assured that only he would have their names. He was never asked for the list until more than 4 months after the report was issued condemning the Soviet Union.

Wadsworth's statement repeats what Ambassador Lodge said in part. He says there was no reason not to trust Hammarskjold and his secretariat to keep the names secret. He says the list has been burned anyway. And he says that the United States cannot interfere because this is an internal matter for the U. N. Secretariat. But worse, he goes on to say, "I believe that Mr. Hammarskjold's letter shows that he was fully justified in dismissing Mr. Bang-Jensen."

This is almost incredible. If we did not know that Lodge and Wadsworth were Americans we would think, from what they say, that they came from some cooky-pushing embassy of one of the captive states.

First, in answer to Wadsworth there is this fact: There are hundreds of employees in the Secretariat from Communist countries. It is just plain nonsense to say that it would be impossible for one of them to get hold of these names once they were deposited in the Secretariat files.

Second, it is true that the list was burned. But it was burned because Bang-Jensen refused to surrender it, not because of anything the United States delegation did or said. If Lodge and Wadsworth had had their way it would not have been burned.

Third, Bang-Jensen charges that two witnesses refused to testify unless assured that Hammarskjold himself would not see their names. This is a fact that ought to be investigated thoroughly for it indicates that Hammarskjold himself may be serving Communist interests.

Fourth, Wadsworth says the affair is entirely internal and he cannot interfere. The United States delegation has already interfered. It interfered when it demanded that the charges against Bang-Jensen be released to the press, which was done. It again interferes when Wadsworth states that he approves of Hammarskjold's action. If he could approve it, why would he not also have authority to disapprove it?

There is something very peculiar about all this evasion and pious claptrap. Here is a man, Bang-Jensen, who served many years in responsible capacities in and out of the U. N., who suddenly is savagely attacked and fired for only one clear reason, he refused to surrender the names of the Hungarians testifying against the Soviet Union. He is denied due process. He is fired in violation of U. N. regulations. He is not allowed to see the evidence against him so that he can conduct his own defense. He is smeared with the accusation, based on no evidence at all, that he is mentally ill. He has answered the charges against him and made serious accusations against the Secretariat which he says the documents in the Secretariat will prove. Yet the United States delegation to the U. N. supports his dismissal, refuses to distribute his answer, but does distribute the charges against him, and ignores all of the irregularities and smears involved in the attacks upon him.

What kind of people do we have representing the United States in the United Nations, anyway?

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee should find out. There is something very wrong, something very dark and suspicious behind this aberrant conduct of American representatives in this matter. Certainly Americans expect something different from those who are supposed to represent them in the U. N.

Mr. Bang-Jensen says he hopes the U. N. will conduct a thorough investigation of everything involved in his case. We are pessimistic about the chances of that when even the representatives of the country supposed to be devoted to fair play, common justice and decency fail to see the need for it.

It appears that his only hope is in the Senate where enough of the facts can be brought before the eyes of the world and perhaps shame enough delegates from the free world into taking the proper action.

Expansion of Communist Strength in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the most recent issue of News Focus, prepared by Charles Bartlett, the editor.

Mr. Bartlett's penetrating report and analysis point to serious dangers in Venezuela. The political vacuum and Communist drift described in this article deserve our most serious attention, dependent as we are on this source of oil in case of a shutdown in the Middle East.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGERS CLOSE BY

While world attention centered on the continuing tautness of the Near East, United States and Latin American observers noted with growing concern an impressive expansion of Communist strength in the closer republic of Venezuela, which shocked the Western Hemisphere in May with its mob attack on Vice President NIXON and seems now to many to be inviting Communist domination.

Such a development, if it followed the Guatemala pattern, would be extremely serious. With Nasser emerging as a threat to the Near Eastern oil, Venezuela will be regarded as an alternate source. Some $3 billion in United States capital is invested in developing the country's oil and iron resources.

The Communist drift, moving in the vacuum of the ouster last January of Dictator Perez Jiminez, was underlined last week by the abortion of a conservative effort, led by the Defense Minister Castro Leon, to force the ruling junta to change its policy and crack down on the extreme left political groups. The failure of Leon's move to catch fire has been interpreted as a tender of the strength of the Communists who are credited with stirring student and labor mobs against him. Leon was forced to take a job in Washington on the Inter-American Defense Board.

The country has been run since January by a seven-man junta headed by Rear Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabel and elections have been promised in 1959. Communists are in the junta and Larrazabel has declined to take any action against their encroachments. His friends say it is because he wants to avoid actions of an oppressive nature and his critics say it is because he is running for president. The latter derived some comfort when he declared Tuesday that he is not a candidate from a hope that he may now make a belated move.

The Communists are reported to be the best organized party in the nation and to be rapidly infiltrating the largest political group, a labor party named the Accion Democratica. gravure press from behind the Iron Curtain. They are the only party with a firm program for the country. They now have 15 publications, 1 with 100,000 circulation and a roto- and many of the government departments and agencies advertise in these organs. None of the non-Communist papers express opposition to the Communists and the present disposition of the anti-Communist elements is far from unified. The police and security forces, discarded with the dictator, have not been reestablished.

The problem is that the junta, reflecting the national satisfaction at the overthrow of Jiminez' 10-year yoke seems obvious to the Red threat, which is felt in Washington to be extremely real and even imminent.

The Tariff Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, three editorials which have appeared recently in the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind. These are entitled "Fitful Trade Winds," "Let's Be Free Again," and "Still Time To Stand Up."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FITFUL TRADE WINDS

The needs of American trade require that Congress make a job of reviewing the tariff situation and the tariff policy. The difficulties with which an extension of the trade agreements program was accomplished in the present session were simply a reflection of the fact that there is no clear concensus either on where the program is taking us or on where we want to go.

The pressure for protective tariffs is not fading away as low-tariff advocates would like to see it fade, because the conditions on which protectionist arguments rest are advancing rather than retreating. American business seems to be firmly committed to persistent inflation. Growth of the Government debt is the rule rather than the exception. The making of a labor contract without periodic rise in wages seems to be unthinkable. Since no concerted effort is made to maintain a stable relationship between the rise in wages and the rise in production, the result is that wages persistently rise faster than production. The annual rise in the wage earner's purchasing power therefore is only partly satisfied by increased production. The rest is satisfied by rise in prices.

This persistently rising price trend makes United States markets increasingly attractive to goods imported from other nations. The higher American prices go in relation to foreign prices, the easier it is to sell foreign goods in the American market. For the exporter, the effect is opposite. The higher American prices go, the harder it becomes to sell American goods in the world markets. Congress is torn between the two. The greater becomes the disparity between American and foreign prices, the more potent is the plea of the protectionist. But the greater this disparity becomes, the greater is the volume of imports required to sustain a trade balance under which American goods can be sold abroad.

Government itself contributes strongly to the inflation. Besides the mounting debt, high and still rising taxes are an unmalleable item in determining prices. Federal aid funds are used in part to bridge the unfavorable trade balance, but the taxes to sustain these expenditures help to make the domestic-foreign price gap wider. Which shall come first? Shall trade policies be tailored to fit the objectives of government? Or shall government be adapted to the requirements of trade?

The trade-agreements program is an attempt to serve both. This is a difficult assignment when the two pressures conflict. Consequently the program, in moving toward lower tariffs, has not moved toward more free trade—free in the sense of being unhampered by restriction by various governments. Tariff is only one method of restriction. Import quotas, export licensing, and currency regulations are equally effective. The development of a broad system of interlocking trade treaties emphasizes these other controls even while the level of tariffs has been lowered. Continuance of the program may bring further tariff cuts, but unless there is a change in philosophy it will not bring a reduction of political interference with trade.

Congress cannot in any case irrevocably delegate its tariffmaking powers to the executive branch. The next Congress can always alter or cancel any such delegation. These other factors make long extensions of tariff-cutting power even less palatable to Congress.

The sooner Congress tackles the problem of making its own revision of tariff policy and the tariff structure, the better. The Smoot-Hawley Act is still the basic tariff law. It hardly fits the mood or the circumstances of the present. Congress neither will nor can abdicate its tariff powers; it ought, therefore, to exercise them. In doing so it might be able to make the firm decisions of trade policy which do not get made by merely extending the Trade Agreements Act from time to time.

Let's Be Free Again

Why are we agreeing to a summit conference with the Soviet Union? Every American knows in his heart that no lasting good, no workable agreements, no benefits of any kind to our own country can come from such a meeting. Why then have we agreed?

It is odd, and frightening, to read the speeches and editorials throughout this once great Nation accepting with resignation the inevitable necessity for a summit meeting. Our allies want such a meeting, we are told. The neutral nations want it. The Soviet Union wants it. The United Nations wants it. Everybody wants it but America. So American must agree.

As the Wall Street Journal put it, much to our surprise, "So we reluctantly go to the summit. Things being as they are, it is probably a better course. But plainly it is a chastening reminder that what we do next must be tempered, if not shaped, by Foreign Offices of other nations.

"The fact is that, whatever it may be, we are no longer master of our own foreign policy."

As we go to the summit, like good little boys, that is the exact truth. We, the most powerful, the richest, the most productive Nation the world has ever seen are no longer master of our own foreign policy. How the mighty have fallen. And we have fallen by our own hand.

But it is still possible to become our own masters again. It is still possible to take the reins of our destiny out of the hands of others and grasp them in our own. It will take boldness and decision.

We must do two things. First we must withdraw from the United Nations which has hung a paper rope around our necks that has strangled our freedom to act in our own interest. Second we must begin to run our own foreign policy show. Let us call our own conferences with those whose destiny is intertwined with our own. Let us make our own proposals and our own plans with friend and enemy alike.

If we wish to settle our affairs with the Arabs let us talk to them face to face with the cards on the table. If we wish to settle affairs with any nation or group of nations let us take them one by one and deal with them, keeping in mind one single principle—what is best for the people of the United States?

We have tried the United Nations course and it has failed us every time, from Korea to Lebanon. We have tried collective security. Yet today our security is less than at any time in our history and those with whom we have shared collective responsibility have failed us in every crisis from Korea to Suez. We have put the best interests of our own people second to the interests of other peoples, pouring out our treasure and skill everywhere in the world and we have reaped only humiliation, insult, disrespect for our flag and our leaders.

It is time for us to cut ourselves loose from those who are the masters of our foreign policy. It is time for America to issue another Declaration of Independence from the U. N. and from friends and foe alike. It is time to put only Americans on guard over America's future and America's present. It is time to acknowledge the plain truth that the policies we have followed year after year since World War II have produced nothing but gains for the Soviet Union and losses for the United States.

The United Nations is rapidly becoming the instrument of Soviet power right here inside our own borders. It is draining away our treasure and preventing us from acting in the interests of our own people. We should abandon it before it abandons us.

Our alliances have become millstones around our necks preventing us from doing what we know is best for our country and our allies. We should begin to disengage ourselves. Our beloved America, once the hope and inspiration of free men everywhere, is becoming the docile milk cow for two-thirds of the world, including even our Communist enemies in Poland and Yugoslavia. We are being sucked dry and left weak by our foreign-aid program. And the beneficiaries of our largess are refusing to support us in any crisis, sneering at our vacillation, and insulting our emissaries.

Cannot our United States shake itself loose from the coils of U. N. intrigue and entangling alliances. Can we not once again seek to become what we once were, the envy and inspiration of all men everywhere who love liberty and justice, honor, and peace?

Cannot our leaders speak again in the thundering tones of past American heroes, "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead," or "Pedecaris alive or Rasuli dead" or "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Wouldn't it be fine to feel, when our country speaks, like W. W. Wollcott felt when he wrote:

"I am a 100 percent American.

"I am, by damn, I am."

Still Time To Stand Up

There has been some comment on the number of Congressmen and Senators whose terms expire this year and who are not seeking reelection. The number is the largest in contemporary times. Maybe it's because Congress isn't the ruling body it once was.

All through this session the Senate has had in its hopper the Jenner-Butler bill to undo some of the mistaken legislation which has been decreed by the Supreme Court. The bill would straighten out the authority of a congressional committee to ask questions, the authority of States to enforce their sedition and anti-subversion laws, the authority of school boards to enforce anti-subversion regulations, and the authority of the executive branch of the Federal Government to dismiss security risks. It would remove State bar qualifications from the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The Jenner-Butler bill is an assertion that Congress is capable of enacting the Nation's laws, as the Constitution empowers it to do, and that it is capable of enacting the laws it wants enacted. It would be a rebuke to the Supreme Court for its invasions of the legislative field.

Where is the Jenner-Butler bill? It still reposes in the Senate, waiting for action. In a day of more forthright action, this bill would have been swept through both Houses within weeks after it was introduced.

There is still time for Congress to stand up and assert itself by passing the Jenner-Butler bill. There is still time for the Senate to pass also the bill to restore to States the power to enforce laws in fields where there are Federal laws, as long as there is no conflict with those Federal laws. This also is an action made necessary by a legislative decision of the Supreme Court.

Congress should make sure that these measures are enacted before it adjourns. By doing so it could restore some of its own stature.

Kennedy-Ives Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Last-Minute Union Reform Efforts," written by John Herling, and published in the Washington Daily News of August 5, 1958.

The editorial refers to the efforts being made by Representative GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, and other Members of the House to secure the passage of the labor reform bill. Representative McGOVERN deserves the thanks of all in the country who are interested in this vital proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last-Minute Union Reform Efforts

(By John Herling)

The great story here in Washington this week is the staging of the last minute rescue of the union-management reform legislation.

Last week, the union reform bill—which includes measures to reform certain questionable management practices exposed by the McClellan committee—was tied to the railroad tracks and about to be run over by the locomotive of congressional adjournment.

This week all is changed—if not saved. The legislative mood has switched from a belief that the Kennedy-Ives union-management reform bill was about to be crunched to death into cautious active optimism that the K-I bill will yet pass the House. The legislative transition has been rapid, amazing, and excites the disbelief of disillusioned men who count their casualties before they occur.

In the House, the positive, persuasive voice of war hero Representative GEORGE Mc-

GOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, has helped shape the strategy of rescue, aided by Congressman STEWART UDALL, of Arizona.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, veteran of 45 congressional years, has now signalled his mighty arm and eloquent eyebrow in behalf of the passage of the bill.

The events leading up to the growing conviction that the Kennedy-Ives union-management reform bill will pass, after all, run as follows:

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, last week blasted the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and the American Retail Federation for misleading Congress through a series of misrepresentations as to the intent of the Kennedy-Ives bill. Senator KENNEDY charged that if the bill dies, the employer groups must take the major blame. Chief ally of these groups, he said, is James R. Hoffa, president of the Teamsters Union, main target of the McClellan rackets investigating committee.

Next day, Labor Secretary Mitchell, drawing a long needle, expressed mock surprise that NAM and such groups had such decisive influence on the Democratic Congress, especially on Speaker RAYBURN. As for himself, Mr. Mitchell disclaimed any ability to persuade the NAM or the Chamber of Commerce to call off such attacks. He insisted that if the House leadership is truly interested in legislation it could get it out.

Speaker RAYBURN remarked that Mr. Mitchell was becoming the politician of the Eisenhower administration. He added a few words to indicate that his attention was now thoroughly engaged.

Representatives of organized labor who had recently been fairly inactive on the bill—giving prior attention to the pension and welfare disclosure bill—began to stir their stumps. Despite some misgivings about some language in the bill, the AFL–CIO leadership has signalled all-out support for the Kennedy-Ives bill. Some rail unions oppose the bill because they prefer to operate exclusively under the Railway Labor Act.

In the meantime, some Republicans profess to believe that the Democrats have dug themselves into a pit because of the delay in handling the bill in the House Education and Labor Committee, headed by North Carolina Congressman GRAHAM BARDEN. Other Republicans fear opposition to bringing up the bill for passage would be hard to explain in the coming campaign.

Mr. RAYBURN has begun to maneuver the House machinery into lifting the Kennedy-Ives bill off the tracks. Through a paraliamentary device known as the suspension of rules, Mr. RAYBURN could signal the union-management reform bill to be brought before the House of Representatives. A two-thirds vote is required.

In that way, noses will be counted—Democratic and Republican. The issue will then be made simple, the line drawn. Those who want union-management reform legislation would vote "yes." Those opposed would have to vote "no."

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution dealing with statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Territory of Alaska has heretofore been approved for statehood by the Congress of these United States; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has long been overlooked by Congress in receiving the due recognition it deserves; and

Whereas several bills are now pending in Congress to give statehood to the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce do hereby urge all action possible by Congress in giving the people of the Territory of Hawaii statehood as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Representatives and Senators of North Dakota in Congress.

Internal Revenue Service Ruling on Private Power Company Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post there was published an editorial attacking the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service that public utilities could not deduct as business expenses the cost of propaganda against public power. The Saturday Evening Post editorial is so full of errors and so lacking in understanding of the facts that I felt it necessary to reply to the editor.

What is perhaps most shocking about the editorial is the revelation that the utility advertisers and the Post itself have worked as a team to oppose public power. The Post argues that the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service imposes censorship on the utilities, an obvious misstatement of fact, but says nothing about its own responsibility to bring the facts and various sides of an issue to the public's attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and my letter of reply to the Saturday Evening Post editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 21, 1958]

SHOULD THE POWER TO TAX INCLUDE THE RIGHT TO CENSOR ADVERTISING?

Few taxpayers know the extent of the authority that has been conferred on the Internal Revenue Service and even less of the added authority which that Bureau has assumed for itself by means of administrative rulings and regulations which Congress probably never thought of.

For example, it is hard to believe that the Nation's lawmakers meant to give tax collectors the right to decide that American business or industry should be penalized for stating its case and defending its right to exist, in the face of Government-sponsored competition, by means of paid advertisements. But that is what the tax authorities are doing, acting under a new interpretation of one of their own regulations, which declares that money spent on advertising for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation or for the development or exploitation of propaganda cannot be considered ordinary and reasonable expenses deductible for tax purposes.

The victims of the most recent interpretation of this ruling are a group of public-utility companies which call themselves America's Independent Light & Power Cos. These companies have for many years sponsored institutional advertisements—mostly in magazines, including the Saturday Evening Post—which promote the wider use of electric power and occasionally indicate a preference for investor-owned utility companies as against Government-owned plants supported by the taxpayers. Most of the advertisements indicate in some way the advantage of being served by an independent power company. If this is propaganda, it certainly represents an attitude acceptable to some millions of Americans.

Nevertheless, the companies participating in this advertising campaign are being informed that they may not deduct its cost from their taxable incomes. As Senator ESTES KEFAUVER put it, "They can continue to propagandize as much as they want in their advertisements. * * * They can no longer charge the taxpayers and the rate payers for their own brainwashing."

Of course, this does not mean that the taxpayers will be relieved of the cost of being brainwashed by TVA and public power generally. Inasmuch as public power pays little in taxes and indeed is supported out of taxes, deductibility is a small matter. The net of the IRS's ruling is that the private-utility industry, already forced to meet tax favoritism and vast public appropriations for public power, must jump over another hurdle.

Supposing that all the advertisements in the series dealt with the public-power issue, it is difficult to equate them with an effort to influence legislation, or to lobby, or, if propaganda is the charge, to do more than defend what has long been considered the normal way for Americans to do business. Surely if an electric power company may engage in propaganda against competitors who sell gas, or coal, or atomic energy, it ought not to be penalized for defending itself against competition which threatens its ability to stay in business at all.

This editorial will arouse the ire of public-power advocates, who will be quick to point out that the Saturday Evening Post has a financial interest in the matter. This is true, although the amount received by the Post from these advertisements constitutes much too small an interest to justify courting the lambasting we shall probably get for intervening in the controversy.

But the principle involved requires a frank statement of what such rulings can mean to freedom, not merely for public-utility advertising, or even advertising in general, but for freedom to express any views which tax bureaucrats—perhaps stimulated by political demagogs—decide to penalize.

This is the crux of the situation. We have tax authorities, who are assumed to be raising money for public needs, undertaking to dictate to individuals and corporations how they shall carry on their businesses.

Nor is this threat confined to public-utility companies. Other types of business live in jeopardy from the same ukase, including one company which undertook to explain its side of a threatened strike by means of newspaper advertisements.

Like many other aspects of the income-tax law, this effort to censor free expression calls for clarification by Congress. If the people think American corporations and individuals require governmental supervision of the way

they state their case in open advertisements, the way to accomplish that desirous objective is to pass a law—not to pass the buck to the Internal Revenue Service.

AUGUST 1, 1958.

Mr. BEN HIBBS,
Editor, the Saturday Evening Post,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. HIBBS: Your editorial Should the Power To Tax Include the Right To Censor Advertising? contains several misstatements as well as a rather fundamental misunderstanding of the situation upon which you have chosen to comment.

In the first place, the editorial seriously misrepresents the purpose and content of the series of electric-power-company advertisements which the Internal Revenue Service has found not to be chargeable as "ordinary and reasonable expenses" deductible for tax purposes.

You describe the advertisements of the electric companies advertising program (ECAP) as being designed to "promote the wider use of electric power and occasionally indicate a preference for investor-owned utility companies as Government-owned plants supported by the taxpayers." Actually the opposite is indicated by any study of this program: the advertisements "occasionally" promote the wider use of electricity. My authority for this statement is the Saturday Evening Post, which last year issued a promotion booklet reprinting some 169 ECAP advertisements.

The introduction to the Saturday Evening Post booklet contained this explanation of these advertisements: "By the end of 1956, the Post had carried 169 ECAP advertisements—more than any other major publication. They are reprinted here to show how one industry, advertising its cause consistently and persistently, has been able to help shift the great weight of public opinion. * * * ECAP advertising is designed to win public supoprt for the independent electric light and power companies. Most people 15 years ago favored Federal public power. Today, the balance has swung in favor of the electric companies.

"In the August 19, 1950, issue, the Post warned editorially, 'we can't salvage free enterprise without a battle.' The advertisements which follow have been used in the battle along with the editorial comment to help turn the tide of public opinion."

Following the reprints of the advertisements, the Saturday Evening Post booklet adds, "This continuing campaign by the Electric Light and Power Companies is classic proof that advertising can mold public opinion as well as increase the sale of products and services."

Thus, the Post itself defines the purpose of these advertisements in such terms as "to help shift the great weight of public opinion"; "designed to win public support for the independent electric light and power companies"; "turn the tide of public opinion"; and "mold public opinion". Nowhere did the Post mention your observation that the ads "promote the wider use of electric power."

Despite the disclaimer in your editorial about the amount of advertising involved, I was interested to note that the Post had carried more of these ads than any other publication. I also was shocked to find that "The advertisements * * * have been used in the battle along with the editorial comment." I find this teaming of editorial commentary and advertising alarming, if not scandalous, whatever the "battle."

With the hope that this wedding of editorials and advertising does not bar discussion of issues, I want to take exception to several points in the editorial.

I vigorously protest the use of the word "censor" in connection with the Internal Revenue Service ruling relating to "propaganda" advertising. As you quoted from my public statement, the companies "can continue to propagandize as much as they want in their advertisement * * *. They can no longer charge the taxpayers and the ratepayers for their own brainwashing." It seems to me that your editorial ignores the very great distinction between censoring—saying "You can't do that"—and simply saying that you can't deduct it as a business expense and therefore a deduction from taxable income.

You also choose to ignore completely the important distinction between competitive private enterprises—such as the Curtis Publishing Co.—and the privately owned electric power companies which are public utilities. Utilities are generally held to be entitled to charge their ratepayers for their costs plus what is referred to as a reasonable rate of return upon their investment. When these costs include advertising designed in the Posts' phrase, to "mold public opinion," the taxpayers and ratepayers are, indeed, paying for "their own brainwashing," without having the democratic right to determine whether they wish to do so or not.

To the extent that the Internal Revenue Service ruling encourages regulatory bodies to disallow propaganda advertising in utility rate basis, it will result in a desirable reform.

It seems to me that the issue becomes one of subsidy rather than censorship. No one questions the right of the power companies to advertise their views.

Your statement that the ruling "does not mean that the taxpayers will be relieved of the cost of being brainwashed by TVA and public power generally" is not only unsubstantiated but, so far as I am aware, completely inaccurate. TVA and public power generally do not conduct advertising campaigns denouncing the privately owned electric companies. Most of the material issued by TVA and other public power agencies which I have seen has been in the nature of reporting on the conduct of public businesses, a function which I believe we can agree is essential.

In connection with references in your editorial to Government-owned plants supported by the taxpayers, public power pays little in taxes and indeed is supported out of taxes, and tax favoritism, let me cite the record of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, incidentally, is the largest taxpayer in my State of Tennessee. TVA pays State and local taxes but it does not pay Federal income taxes because it is owned by the Government, by the people of the Nation, the taxpayers. But before we accept the contention of the power companies' advertisements, or even your editorial, concerning such matters as tax favoritism, let us look at the facts.

In the first 23 years of operations, TVA's power system revenues were sufficient to cover all of its operating expenses, depreciation, the cost of money to the Government and $41 million in State and local taxes and earned an additional $183 million for the Government. A private power company in this same period would have paid the Government only $140 million in taxes. Thus, TVA's power system, while selling electricity at rates among the lowest in the Nation, made for the taxpayers $43 million, over and above what a private power company would have paid in Federal taxes.

Compare this record, if you will, with a recent report of the Electric Consumers Information Committee which shows that the private companies participating in the ECAP program, will receive a subsidy over a 33½-year period of more than $3 billion as a result of the use of rapid amortization and liberalized depreciation provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (sec. 168 and similar provisions of previous laws and sec. 167, Internal Revenue Act of 1954).

While I agree with the thesis of your editorial that Congress must continuously review the application of our tax laws, you do not appear to be cognizant of the great amount of work being done in this field by the Members of Congress and particularly the members of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee.

Accepting the premise that advertising should be regarded as a necessary business expense, deductible for tax purposes, we do violence to our premise if we permit all advertising to be deducted and do not provide against abuses.

It seems to me that mediums such as the Saturday Evening Post, advertising agencies and advertisers all have an important stake in protesting abuses which jeopardize the prestige and standards of advertising. The Saturday Evening Post promotion booklet referred to above lists seven rules for "How to be a successful advertiser," including "5. Advertise truthfully and in good taste." In my opinion, the ECAP ads can be shown to be neither truthful nor in good taste.

The Saturday Evening Post's description of the design and intent of the ECAP advertisements, as stated in the promotion booklet, confirms my belief that the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service in this matter was entirely proper and that the provisions of the tax law under which the ruling was made are just.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Roots of the Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, Roots of the Middle East Crisis, which appeared recently in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOTS OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS—FULL REEVALUATION OF POLICY SINCE 1914 HELD NECESSARY TO AVERT DISASTER

All my life I have been involved in the fate of my country and of mankind, both greater than the fate of any individual amongst us. The so-called crisis in the Middle East has added another dimension of pain and anxiety.

I say so-called crisis because what has occurred and drawn our country into a trap, from which there is no advance but disaster and no retreat but political defeat, is not something that happened when President Chamoun of Lebanon sent an ultimatum to the United States and President Eisenhower sent the Marines to support his embattled government; nor did it occur when the King of Jordan called on Britain to send military aid to his government and, as I write, is threatening to restore order in Iraq, whose lawful government has been overthrown by a military coup.

Nor did it occur when Gamal Abdel Nasser seized the Suez Canal and when Israel, France and Great Britain invaded Egypt.

These are but flashes of revelatory lightning in a sky where dark clouds have been

accumulating for the West since World War I, as the result of solemn promises then made for opportunistic war reasons.

British agents, most notable among them Lawrence of Arabia, raised the first anti-colonial revolt in the Arab world, against the Turkish empire with which Britain was at war, with the promise of freedom and independence for the whole Arab world.

For the same reasons of war, Britain during World War I gave a contradictory but ambiguous promise to world Jewry (with which international Zionism has always identified itself) to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine, Zionist pleaders having argued that this would cause the defection to the allies of the German Jews.

Subsequently every wartime promise to the Arabs was broken, the Arab world was partitioned and eventually the Jews in Palestine drove the British out by an insurrection using every instrument of terror.

The withdrawal of the British Army and police in the spring of 1948 left the Palestinian Arabs totally unprotected against the Zionists who, though they constituted but a small minority of the population, possessed of a regular army in the "Haganah," plus two armed terrorist bands, the Stern Gang and the Irgun, and were bent on driving first the British and then the Arabs from the country and possessing their lands.

Insurrection and war had thrown the issue into the United Nations, whose General Assembly at the end of November 1947, approved the recommendation of a special committee that the British mandate be terminated and the area divided into a Zionist and Moslem state, linked by economic union, and with an internationalized Jerusalem.

From then on, the British lost all authority in Palestine. In March 1948, Senator Austin, United States delegate to the U. N., suddenly asked for a revised policy that would put a partitioned Palestine under a U. N. trusteeship. Not the most elementary instincts of protection for the Arabs influenced Harry S. Truman, but advices he had received that otherwise Western oil supplies might be endangered.

The Zionists, who possess the most efficient propaganda organization in the United States, immediately raised an outcry from coast to coast, and Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican leader, took advantage of it to woo the Jewish vote. The question was thus thrown into the 1948 Presidential election campaign, with Republicans and Democrats vying with each other for Zionist support—the most disgusting and cynical subjection of honor, decency, and American interest to vote grabbing in my recollection.

On May 14, when the British mandate expired and the U. N. Security Council still was discussing trusteeship, Ben-Gurion of Israel proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel, and President Truman immediately recognized it. This, again, was totally without precedent. The action was taken for purely internal political reasons.

The Palestinian war had ended in a truce wholly to the advantage of the new Israel which had extended its territory far beyond that included in the U. N. plan. The frontiers of Israel had been fixed by coup de force. Almost the whole Arab population had been dispossessed and become wretched refugees in surrounding states, chiefly Jordan. Every provision of the original U. N. plan had been defied by Israel (and has been, ever since), and the United States had made itself the first champion of this dubious and unreckonable state and its subsequent protector and leading supporter.

This initial American action and those that followed, dictated, I repeat, by the most sordid party-political competition for votes, destroyed the hitherto unsullied reputation of American among the Arab masses and their intellectual leadership, gave the most powerful impetus to pan-Arabism it had yet received, led directly to the army revolt in Egypt, made this latest one in Iraq inevitable, and leaves the West with a toehold in Lebanon and Jordan, fighting, like King Canute, against a tide, bearing upon its crest a new world identity.

Now, if we are not to advance to disaster or retreat to defeat—and we need do neither—we must make a total reevaluation of our Middle Eastern policy, and this demands fearless exposition of long-suppressed facts.

The Case for a Standing U. N. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine for Sunday, July 27, 1958, there was an article written by Sir Leslie Munro, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, entitled "The Case for a Standing U. N. Army." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR A STANDING U. N. ARMY—THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ARGUES THAT THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST PROVES THE NEED FOR THE U. N. TO HAVE A FORCE PERMANENTLY AVAILABLE FOR EMERGENCY DUTY

(By Sir Leslie Munro)

During these critical days in the Middle East, all thoughtful men and women reflect, in an unhappily divided world, on the ways in which peace may be preserved. I believe that they are ready to take out an insurance policy to avert a cataclysm. I further believe that the insurance policy is a permanent United Nations force.

Reflect on this: On July 15 the United States landed a force of marines in Lebanon for these purposes as expressed by President Eisenhower—"to protect American lives * * * and by their presence to assist the Government of Lebanon to preserve its territorial integrity and political independence." The President went on to say that he hoped "the United Nations would itself take measures which would be adequate to preserve the independence of Lebanon and permit of the early withdrawal of the United States forces."

In other words, Mr. Eisenhower asked for a United Nations force to replace the American marines now in Lebanon. Moreover, the United Kingdow landed forces in Jordan which it is ready to withdraw as soon as the Security Council is in a position to insure the protection of the political independence and territorial integrity of Jordan. Surely these developments raise once again the question whether there should be a permanent United Nations Emergency Force in being.

I think, first, that it is a matter of urgency for the General Assembly to have at its disposal a permanent corps of observers ready at our headquarters in New York to go to any part of a disturbed world at the request of a government threatened with aggression or subject to subversion. Secondly, I believe that the Assembly should consider the establishment of a force which would be immediately available on its authority, or on the authority of the Security Council, and at the request of a sovereign government whose territories are in jeopardy.

This force would be under the immediate direction of the Secretary General, subject to the overall authority of the Assembly (if the Assembly created the force) or of the Security Council (in the unlikely event that the force was the creation of the Council, where the Soviet Union would probably veto its formation). I do not suggest that the international force be stationed in one place. Member states should agree to provide contingents immediately available for stationing in areas where tension has arisen.

How large should such a force be? The United Nations emergency force in Egypt is close to 6,000 men. The marines and other forces in Lebanon number 9,400 at the time of writing. There may be other areas requiring in the future a force of a size similar to those now in Egypt and Lebanon. I would think that at a minimum the nucleus of a permanent force would be 20,000.

Until such a force were called on, its cost would be borne by the various member states holding contingents available. When called into use, then the United Nations would have to discharge considerable costs, which in the case of the United Nations emergency force amount to approximately $20 million a year.

I doubt that the force could be made up of troop contributions from the great powers. The differences among the great powers are, unfortunately, too serious to allow them to contribute except indirectly, perhaps by way of supply. I would hope tht the small powers, which have played so great a part in the pacification of the Gaza strip, could now decide, through the Assembly, to make components available for a permanent force to be effective in any part of the world disturbed by a crisis.

The purpose of such a force would be to stand as a symbol of the United Nations and to act as a deterrent. It would assure the inviolability of frontiers: There are few aggressors who will flout public opinion in an area where an effective U. N. force is either functioning or is about to function.

One concept of this force was set forth in that valuable book, "Strengthening the United Nations," a report of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace: "If UNEF were to be made permanent, and continued to enjoy the power of world moral opinion, it might become a deterrent to local hostilities or to the spread of such conflicts into global catastrophes. It should remain lightly armed, and would in no case be a combat force. It could not be used to fight a war to stop a war, but it would have certain peace-preserving functions.

"A permanent force of this kind could be used for observation, patrol and guard duty in troubled areas. It could patrol ceasefires, armistice demarcation lines and demilitarized zones maintaining a separation of the parties and preventing breaches of the truce.

Lester Pearson of Canada, who played such a prominent part in the creation of the UNEF, has made the following suggestion in respect to a peace supervision force: "By its very nature such a force would not be expected to fight its way into a country. Indeed, since it would be deployed upon recommendation of the United Nations, it could enter a country only with the consent of the government of that country. This consent would normally take the form of an agreement between the Government concerned and the Secretary-General, acting on behalf of the United Nations.

In a case of direct aggression, especially if it were one of magnitude, probably in the first instance forces of the great powers would be immediately involved and it would be only later that the permanent international force would be used.

But the democracies have been much more successful in repelling direct aggression than they have in resisting subversion. The situations which can arise in respect of indirect aggression are numerous and cannot be defined in advance. In fact, the very definition of aggression has proved one of greatest difficulty and controversy.

A government may have been subverted and overthrown with startling rapidity. The question may then arise and be fiercely disputed as to whether what happened is a matter of purely domestic politics. I could imagine the Assembly being reluctant to call the emergency force into use in a matter where there was a question whether it was domestic in character and where the Assembly would have to weigh the international consequences of an intervention which might lead to a third world war.

In the case of Lebanon, had a permanent force been in being, and had its use been requested by the Lebanese Government, then I think the Council or the Assembly, as the case may be, would have made the force available. This seems to be an inevitable conclusion, since the Council did prove ready to send an observer corps to Lebanon.

The question of a U. N. force is as old as the U. N. itself. In the words of the charter, the Security Council may "take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." But because of the opposition of the Soviet Union and its power of veto in the Council, that body has been unable to create an international force disposable at its direction.

As long ago as 1947, the Assembly of the U. M. considered the question of keeping order in Jerusalem. My predecessor as New Zealand Ambassador, Sir Carl Berendsen, said most forcefully, then and later, that whether the Assembly decided to create a trusteeship of Jerusalem or open a special temporary regime in the Holy City, the Assembly would require means of enforcement of law and order, just as the enforcement of law and order is an essential requirement in every city of the world, however calm, however peaceful. Apparently and unfortunately, Sir Carl was in advance of his time in suggesting an international force to preserve the peace in and around Jerusalem. But in the light of subsequent events in that area, who can doubt that he was right?

It is true that, following an aggression by North Korean troops in 1950, the Security Council did condemn this attack, and forces under the leadership of the United States and consisting of men from 16 nations successfuly repelled the aggression. These forces formed a great fighting unit, but they were not representative of the United Nations as a whole although they truly represented its ideals and purposes. Their cost, which was great, was not paid by the United Nations. Their commander in chief was not subject to U. N. direction.

Then came the Suez crisis of 1956. The force created subsequent to the intervention of the Anglo-French troops in Egypt and now famous as UNEF, was not one provided by the permanent members of the Security Council. It came from the smaller powers, as I believe a new permanent force would have to come.

The work that UNEF has done and continues to do is of far-reaching importance. Through its supervision as a police force—not a fighting force—it has preserved peace in two most contentious areas of the Middle East—in the Gaza strip and the area of Sharm el Sheikh. Fortunately UNEF still remains in these areas.

Several difficulties arise in respect to supervisory forces like UNEF which are created by the Assembly and not by the Security Council. In the first place, the normal presumption appears to be that they can remain in the country where they are established only so long as the Government of that country thinks fit. One can respect this presumption because a sovereign state is entitled at will to have its territories free of all foreign troops. But in the modern world and in situations such as that of Suez, it seems that we may have to revise our notions of sovereignty. Certainly it was the view of my Government in 1957 that the departure of UNEF from Egyptian territory should be a matter for the Assembly to decide—by a two-thirds majority—not Egypt or any other country.

A second difficulty is the cost of forces like UNEF, which is very considerable. But considerable as it is—the yearly cost of UNEF is roughly half the annual budget of the United Nations—this cost is a trifling insurance premium against the risk of war. It was not without some trouble that the Assembly last year passed a resolution, opposed by the Communist bloc, whereby the expenses of UNEF are to be borne by the members of the United Nations in accordance with the scales of assessments adopted by the General Assembly for the financial years 1957 and 1958. Th passing of this resolution insured that the maintenance of UNEF should be a collective responsibility, resting on the full membership of the United Nations.

This is the principle of financial responsibility which I would advocate if a permanent United Nations force were to be established by the Assembly. The reluctance of many nations to meet the bill for a permanent international force is, I am afraid, one of the greatest difficulties in the way of its establishment.

Even if a permanent international force were established, there would be critics who would say that the United Nations would not act with sufficient speed to use it. There is, of course, much substance to this criticism. Prime Minister Macmillan, in the House of Commons, said that his Government, in sending troops to Jordan could not wait for the United Nations, which in any case had no available force. On the other hand, under the impact of urgency and crisis, the United Nations did act with great energy and speed in the Suez situation.

For all the criticisms and all the difficulties, I still think that the attempt to create a permanent international force and a permanent team of observers must be made. I respect the view of those who say that the U. N. should proceed on an ad hoc basis, dealing with each crisis as it arises and calling for contributions to an international force as it is required. But have not the crises in Lebanon and Jordan shown this attitude to be unsound?

Perhaps when this article is published a special Assembly will be in session. Such a session can deal only with the matters for which it is summoned. Thus, the special Assembly could not set up a permanent force. But the regular Assembly, which will meet in September, will have before it from the Secretary General a study of the experience derived from the establishment and operation of UNEF. This study could serve as a basis for Assembly action.

The next regular Assembly faces an immense responsibility, in which leadership will be expected from the great powers on the establishment of a permanent force on something like the lines I have proposed. The need is great. The time may be short.

Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges on the subject of pornography.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO MAKE A REPORT ON THE SUBJECT OF PORNOGRAPHY AND DECLARING IT TO BE THE POSITION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE COURT JUDGES

The following statements are either quoted from or derived from the interim report of the Senate Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquecy. This interim report (No. 2381) deals with pornographic and obscene literature and juvenile delinquency. This report is based on a large number of books and reports from various scientific bodies concerned with this subject, as well as the testimony of several outstanding national authorities in the field of medicine, psychiatry, education, and law enforcement:

"1. It is apparent, from the testimony and evidence presented to the subcommittee in hearings held in every corner of the Nation, that many of the unscrupulous racketeers and degenerates, when driven out of the horror comic field, transferred over to the lucrative business of peddling and selling pornographic material.

"2. From information on hand the subcommittee estimates that this has become a $500 million racket in this country; and similarity of pornographic material gathered in from all over the Nation indicates a central source of supply or wide exchange of material.

"3. As a result of our observation there is no doubt on the part of the subcommittee that a large percentage of the pornographic literature produced in the United States reaches the hands of juveniles.

"4. While the traffic has been growing, sex crimes have increased with almost unbelievable rapidity.

"5. Most of the pornographic material gathered and studied by the subcommittee is devoted to a display of the various sex perversions unspeakably filthy and bestial in character. This is highly traumatic material for children and youth, and particularly for those predisposed to sex deviation or basically unstable and suggestible.

"6. The most diabolical, devastating, and far-reaching evil effects of this material on the minds, emotions, and morals of children and youth is that it tends to create the belief that these loathesome and bestial types of perversion are not only acceptable, but the proper form of sex practices. A greatly increased number of perverts and homosexuals result from this misdirection of the basic sex urge."

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact pertinent legislation designed to cur-

tail the production, distribution, sale, and possession of indecent, lewd, and obscene material in interstate commerce. * * *

"2. That State laws and municipal ordinances be reexamined and reevaluated in their respective jurisdictions to assure modern, effective, and stringent laws which will deter the production, sale, and/or possession of pornographic material.

"3. * * * that it is respectfully recommended that the judicial branches of the Federal, State, and local governments reevaluate the matter of punishment for said violations in the light of the facts and evidence adduced at the subcommittee hearings and similar State legislative hearings on the subject.

"4. * * * it is recommended that a National Advisory Crime Commission be established as a clearinghouse of pertinent information on violations of laws relating to pornography, narcotics, etc., so that as such a crime is committed it will immediately become available to every peace officer in Federal, State, and local jurisdictions.

"5. * * * The subcommittee therefore recommends that religious, civic and service groups provide the aggressive leadership needed in forming public opinion and inspiring the public in the fight against pornography as they did in the fight against crime and horror comics and lurid magazines and books."

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PORNOGRAPHY FROM THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE COURT JUDGES

"In view of the foregoing data and statements which seem to clear with and be supported by numerous other studies and data available on the subject, your committee recommends:

"1. That the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges commend the Congress of the United States, working through the Senate subcommittee, for its thoroughgoing survey, analysis, and presentation of the insidious threat of pornography to the health, minds and morals of our children and youth.

"2. That the members of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, and all other judges exercising jurisdiction over children, be urged to accept the responsibility of warning the parents and those others having charge of children of this undercover effort of the pornographers to use children and youth as their prey and victims in their highly profitable business.

"3. That all judges of children's courts cooperate with all good citizens and organizations, in combating this insidious threat against our children, by every legal and effective means, and through every medium of communication available to them.

"J. P. GOSSETT,
"Judge, Probate and Juvenile Court, Gooding, Idaho.
"W. S. CRISWELL,
"Judge, Juvenile Court, retired, preparing and presenting the report for Chairman Clark, in his absence, and at his request.
"THOS. TALLAKSEN,
"Judge, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Minneapolis, Minn.
"A. A. WOLDMAN,
"Associate Judge, Juvenile Court, Cleveland, Ohio.
"W. T. SCOGGIN,
"Judge, Third District Court, Las Cruces, N. Mex.
"RULON W. CLARK,
"Judge, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Salt Lake City, Utah, Chairman, Committee on Pornography, NCJCJ."

The resolutions committee believes that the foregoing report expresses the feelings and opinion of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; And therefore

Resolves, That the report of the committee on pornography be accepted as the statement of the official position of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

This resolution was adopted by unanimous vote at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., June 19, 1958.

The Constitution and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story entitled How Supreme is the Court? written by Mr. Walter Leckrone, and published in the Indianapolis Times, Indianapolis, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SUPREME IS THE COURT?
(By Walter Leckrone)

Indiana has a law, written into our constitution, that forbids the State to go in debt.

For the 100 years and more that it has been in effect it has kept Indiana entirely free from State debt, a fact that seems constantly to amaze some of the folks from other States which have borrowed and spent and so owe vast sums of money. True, it has ocassionally exasperated a few impatient Hoosiers who wanted to spend money the State did not have but in general it has worked well for Indiana and we like it.

The subject has not come up in this connection and does not seem about to rise, but I, for one, would not give an old revenue bond for its chances if it ever came into dispute before the United States Supreme Court.

The Congress of the United States has passed a good deal of legislation on the subject of public debts, enough so far to mortgage the future of the great-great-grandchildren of all of us now living.

If the Supreme Court ran true to form it would hold that a State has no right to have a law on public debt because the Federal Government has laws on the subject.

That, in its simplest form, is its doctrine of preemption.

The Court has held, not once but a number of times lately, that when the national Congress passes a Federal law on any subject it thereby preempts that whole field and that thereafter no State statute or constitutional provision is valid in that whole area of law.

To cite another possibility, most States and all cities have laws regulating speed on their roads and streets. It has lately been proposed several times that the Federal Congress also pass a law regulating traffic on the highways, particularly on those about to be built partly with Federal funds.

If Congress did pass such a law, under the Court's doctrine of preemption that would automatically repeal all State and local speed laws, if, of course, the Court was consistent in its decisions, which on the record you can hardly count on with much assurance.

Where its new doctrine has been asserted most vigorously, though not exclusively, has been in the field of subversion. In a whole series of decisions in the past 2 years the Court has in effect repealed all the laws on this subject of 42 of the 48 States and the then Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. It has ruled, in case after case, that since there is Federal law on the subject there can be no State law, even though no record appears that any State law was in conflict with Federal.

Taken as a whole the group of decisions represents the most devastating attack on State and local government in United States history. Followed consistently the "doctrine" on which all are based would shortly destroy virtually all State and local government, substitute a fascist-type "nationalism" for local autonomy in local affairs. The "doctrine" is purely an invention of the Supreme Court, without foundation in law or Constitution or custom.

Last week Congress reacted vigorously to halt this trend, move the Nation's highest Court a step back toward its constitutional powers and functions. The House passed (241 to 155) a bill to overrule its "doctrine of preemption" in matters of subversion and restore State laws it had in effect repealed.

It was the third measure recently passed by the lower House similarly reversing various phases of the Court's nationalistic trend, all now awaiting Senate action. The Senate still had not voted on the Jenner-Butler bill further limiting the Court's activities to judicial rather than legislative functions.

The New York Times, a publication I can always count upon to set me right on any erroneous reactionary old notions I may pick up to the effect that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin possibly did not have the best type of government that could be devised, takes, naturally, a very dim view of this House action. Last week it called this measure "as weird a piece of legislation as could be imagined" foolishly devised to "protect alleged States rights," and demanded its "immediate unceremonious burial." The only reason the paper advanced against the bill was its statement that it would "unsettle a large body of existing law" and so create "indescribable confusion."

The truth is, of course, that about all the existing law that has or will be unsettled by this action is law that has actually been enacted by the United States Supreme Court itself, much of it in direct violation of some of the plainest language in the Constitution of the United States. In the past couple of years this Court has, in fact, reversed more decisions of United States courts at every level, some of which had been standing for 50 years and more, than all previous Supreme Courts had upset in the whole 169 years of United States constitutional government. Where no laws it considered desirable existed it has simply, in the guise of a court decision written a new one.

Contrary to widespread lay oppinions the United States Supreme Court is by no means as supreme as it sounds.

Most of the powers it exercises are not, actually, bestowed upon it either by Constitution or statute, but merely decisions of the Supreme Court itself. The Constitution which created the Court and which is its only real authority for existence, specifically listed, and sharply limited, the kinds of cases it could hear, both directly and on appeals, leaving the way open for it to hear appeals of others with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The very first United States Supreme Court 170 years ago hardly had is bench warm before it began reaching out for more powers so flagrantly that the first amendment to the United States Constitution, after the original Bill of Rights, was adopted within 10 years, placing still further limits on its jurisdiction and powers. Successive Courts have, however, reached steadily for more and more, supporting their claims to them by their own decisions, although none so swiftly nor so extensively as the one now sitting.

The doctrine of pre-emption contradicts the plain language of the Constitution itself, which first carefully lists the powers of the Federal Government, which are not, surprising though it may seem these days, very numerous, and the fields within which the Congress may pass laws. Then it states, unequivocally, that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It was, as I recall it, Justice Felix Frankfurter to whom was attributed the remarkable statement that "just because a law says something in plain language it is not to be construed that that is what it means."

Reports from Capitol Hill last week seemed to indicate that even the learned Justices may ultimately discover that the Constitution does mean what it says.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our citizens, no less than Members of Congress, to know the facts about the proposed fair-trade legislation recently passed out of the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As a further effort to so inform Members and the citizenry, I am including a statement by Stanley N. Barnes, made when a Fair Trade Act for the District of Columbia was being considered in 1954. These facts are as appropriate today as the day presented.

It is my hope that this statement will shed light generally on the subject of the fair-trade law for those interested in this controversial subject.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF STANLEY N. BARNES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BEFORE THE SENATE DISTRICT COMMITTEE ON S. 3297, FAIR TRADE ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, JULY 15, 1954

I am glad to appear before this committee in response to its request to present the views of the Department of Justice with respect to S. 3297, a bill to provide so-called fair trade for the District of Columbia.

As was made clear in our report of June 3, 1954, to the chairman, the Department is opposed to the enactment of this bill. Under so-called fair trade, a contract between a manufacturer and a single retailer fixes the price of a commodity for all other retailers within a State. Price competition among retailers is thus largely eliminated. Without competitive pricing, the form of competition may remain, but the substance is lost. That is why price-fixing has long been unlawful per se.

The legislation presently under consideration goes far beyond the earlier enabling statutes and would place Congress on record as affirmatively favoring insulation of certain segments of the business community from the rigors of competition. The Miller-Tydings Act exempted from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act vertical minimum price-fixing contracts (1) which involve trademarked or branded commodities, (2) which are in competition with other similar commodities, and (3) when such contracts are valid under the State law of the place of resale. The McGuire Act, following the Schwegmann decision, permitted the binding of persons not parties to the contracts. Both acts, however, were described as merely enabling legislation, which "does not commit the Congress to a national policy. * * *"[1] The House Commerce Committee's report on what became the McGuire Act stated that the bill "would permit the several States to experiment further with fair-trade legislation."[2] The sponsor of the bill, Mr. McGuire, stated on the floor of the House:

"This bill is merely an enabling measure. * * * All we are doing is to make it possible for States which believe in the principles of price maintenance to enact appropriate legislation.[3]

It is apparent that Congress did not intend at that time to do more than permit the States to effectuate their own policies.

The suggestion has been made that this resale price maintenance system permits competition at the manufacturing level where it belongs, the implication being that retailers should be insulated from competition. Experience has richly demonstrated, however, that competition at all levels of our economy is in the national interest. Competition has kept our free enterprise system strong and viable. Its suppression by either governmental regulation or private agreement is inconsistent with basic American principle.

How does suppression of competition result from so-called fair trade? It is obvious that price competition on fair-traded items is eliminated among retailers. What is perhaps less obvious is the fact that competition at other stages of distribution is also impaired. While the so-called fair-trade laws ostensibly prohibit horizontal agreements, the same result is achieved on the manufacturing or distributing level when competing manufacturers or distributors sign similar fair-trade contracts. Parallel vertical contracts make superfluous horizontal agreements not to compete.

While great emphasis is placed on protection of the manufacturer's goodwill, the fact remains that the great impetus behind so-called fair trade comes from retailing groups, not from manufacturers. Fair trading has, in fact, been most effective in those fields in which trade associations are strong enough to persuade manufacturers to fair trade. The Department of Justice has in the past brought criminal cases against a number of trade associations for activities going beyond those contemplated by the Miller-Tydings exemption to the Sherman Act. Defendants in these cases were charged with conspiracies to raise, fix and maintain prices and with persuading producers to enter into agreements to fix prices at a level to give retailers a desired margin of profit. Methods of persuasion included boycotting noncooperating manufacturers. Pleas of nolo contendere were entered in each case and fines were assessed against the defendants.

Under so-called fair trade, price-fixing arrangements are entered into by private parties without public regulation or supervision. The public interest is not represented at any stage of the negotiations. The result, of course, is higher prices for the consumer. While fair trade proponents refer to statistical studies purporting to show that prices are lower under fair trade, it is suggested that the use made of these studies is of questionable validity. For instance, a witness before this committee has implied that a study showing this result will be based on the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It should be pointed out, however, that the Consumer Price Index gives by far the largest weight (approximately 71 percent) to items which are not fair traded. Frequent reference is also made to surveys by A. C. Nielson, but the report of the survey itself, so far as we can determine, has never been made available.

So far as we know, a complete survey of fair-trade and non-fair-trade prices has not been made. It may be noted, however, that at the time of the hearings on the McGuire Act in 1952, price comparisons placed in the RECORD showed that the consumer paid higher prices in so-called fair-trade States than in non-fair-trade areas. A comparison of prices of drugstore items in April–June 1954, obtained from the advertisements of drugstores in the District of Columbia, showed that on 736 items of ordinary drugstore business the fair-trade price totaled $2,241.10 and the non-fair-trade price on the same items totaled $1,602.44, or a saving of 28.4 percent. In the appliance field, a similar comparison of so-called fair-trade prices and the prices of a low-markup outlet in the District on 245 items showed a total of $6,142.33 under fair trade and $4,442.69 for the same items under the latter's prices, or a saving to the consumer of 27.7 percent.

The retailers selling at the lower price are not using these items as loss leaders; even at the lower price they are taking their markup and making a profit. For instance, a certain mixer costing retailers $29.70 in 1952 was fair traded at $46.50, while non-fair-trade retailers sold it for $34.79. Certain razor blades have a gross margin of about 58 percent as compared with a non-fair-trade margin of about 26 percent. A certain vacuum cleaner shows a gross margin of 93.4 percent, as compared with 29 percent for non-fair-trade areas. The list could be extended, but it is evident that there is a considerable area for price competition below so-called fair-trade prices and above retailer cost prices.

It is evident that fair trade does not benefit the consumer. At the same time it deprives a businessman of his right to decide whether he shall compete by lower prices and less service or by higher prices and more elaborate service. By fixing the price high enough to profit the less efficient, it takes away the incentive of the more enterprising businessman to increase his efficiency.

It has been noted that among the proponents of so-called fair trade for the District of Columbia are representatives of national organizations. Obviously, so long as the District of Columbia is outside the fair trade orbit, it affords consumers a basis for price comparison and makes it a little more difficult to increase markups under fair trade, so it is not surprising that business groups outside of the District are anxious to eliminate this basis for comparison.

In closing, I would like to reiterate the views expressed in the Department's report of June 3, 1954, concerning S. 3297:

"Enactment of this bill would give immunity from the antitrust laws to a segment of the business community. It would further place the Congress on record as favoring elimination of price competition among retailers, with (1) resultant higher prices to consumers; (2) the throttling of initiative of retailers, who would be deprived of the choice of whether to take a small markup and make their profits in volume sales and low overhead rather than in higher markups on fewer sales; (3) advantages to the chains and other large outlets, which can market their private brands below the prices fixed on the fair trade goods of their smaller competitors; and (4) opportunities for boycotting and other coercive tactics to insure cooperation.

"Because this legislation is (1) inconsistent with the basic philosophy of the antitrust

Footnotes at end of speech.

laws, (2) is susceptible of use as a cloak to hide general price-fixing activities, and (3) impairs competition at all levels of production and distribution, the Department of Justice is opposed to its enactment."

[1] S. Rept. 2053, 74th Cong., 2d sess. See also H. Rept. 382, 75th Cong., 1st sess.
[2] H. Rept. 1437, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 5.
[3] 1951 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 13671.

H. R. 10, the Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, farmers, doctors, writers, lawyers, ministers, small-business men—there are some 10 million of these self-employed in the United States.

They cannot understand why millions of corporate employees are covered by retirement plans at low cost to themselves and their employers while the self-employed are denied these advantages under present law.

It is true that many of the self-employed come under the old-age and survivors insurance program, but so do the vast majority of employees. Millions of employees, however, supplement these benefits from their participation in private qualified pension plans.

Remember that the self-employed invariably serve a long apprenticeship of education and austerity experience before their earning power develops. They find themselves far behind the employees who began acquiring social-security and coverage under private pension plans, in some cases as early as their 18th year.

During his shorter though more lucrative earning period, the self-employed should be permitted to set aside savings for additional annuity revenue in his retirement without being discriminated against taxwise.

H. R. 10 will remove this inequity.

It will give the self-employed, including the dentist, the accountant, the local druggist, the corner grocer, the tax deferment advantages that will encourage and enable them to build up their own voluntary retirement funds.

It will restore them to equality with the millions of their fellow Americans who look forward to additional security in their old age by their participation in company retirement and pension plans.

H. R. 10 will make it possible for the self-employed who have the courage, initiative, and self-reliance which inspire and energize the American way of life to provide for their retirement from their own funds, without having to pay income tax on the money they put aside until the funds start to pay them back in the form of retirement or survivor benefits.

H. R. 10, popularly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, will authorize for the self-employed a tax exemption on contributions to a retirement fund of as much as $2,500 per year until such time as the fund builds up to the limit of $50,000.

It is essential for us to pass H. R. 10, not only for the relief and the encouragement of the self-employed but in so doing to establish the precedent that will lead to the gradual inclusion of everyone and provide them with the incentive to save for the future through participation in private pension plans.

I congratulate our colleagues who have given earnest study to the formulation of this bill. Their perseverance, animated by logic and jusitce, has brought this problem to the attention of the Nation.

I consider it a privilege to support H. R. 10 without reservation and to express my sincere hope that it will be enacted into law this year.

Increase in Public Debt Limit

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, the arguments used in support of the increase of the public debt limit provided in H. R. 13580 are very valid but not entirely conclusive. It is true that if the Congress continues its spending policy without any thought of curtailment then the only alternative is an increase in the public debt limit.

The accompanying result of such a spending program and a consistent increase in the public debt limit will mean unlimited inflation. We have had sufficient experience with inflation in our own country where we have found the dollar diminishing in its purchasing power. Fortunately, the present administration has been able to check this inflationary spiral but still it has continued and, apparently, will continue as long as the Congress insists on spending more and more of the taxpayer's dollars.

The other alternative is to reduce expenditures and begin to live again within our income. I join with the other Members of the Congress in the desire to eliminate unnecessary expenditures and to reduce other expenditures to a point where we still can maintain national safety, a progressive economy, and a solvent program. My votes for appropriation reductions or cuts each year have averaged between $6 billion and $9 billion. If these votes had been followed by the majority of the Congress, I feel confident that at the present time, we would have stopped the spiraling inflation and also that we would have been able to reduce the public debt and cut the resultant taxes that have been imposed upon the people.

It is on this basis that I felt it necessary to oppose any further increase in the debt limitation. It is my sincere conviction that in this manner relief can be given to the American public.

Individuals and Incentives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and timely addresses of recent weeks has just come to my attention. It was made by Robert E. Wilson, retired chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co., at Colorado College, Colorado Springs. I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may also enjoy reading it:

INDIVIDUALS AND INCENTIVES

(By Robert E. Wilson, retired chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo., June 2, 1958)

President Benezet, members of the graduating class, and their many friends and relatives, it is a particular pleasure to be at Colorado College today. This fine audience reminds me very much of those at the College of Wooster, whose commencements I have been attending for over 50 years.

In speaking to you today, I shall avoid two approaches which many businessmen employ in speaking to graduating classes. In the first place, while I recognize that you graduates, like all of us, face many uncertainties in these troublous times, I do not think you either desire or deserve any sentimental sympathy when you have had the opportunity, given to only one in a hundred in this war-torn world, of getting a first-class college education in a free country. After all, the only difference between you who are being graduated today and us who were graduated in peaceful 1914, or those in prosperous 1929, is that you know there is likely to be trouble ahead, and may thereby be better prepared to meet it than we were.

In the second place, I do not share the belief, too common among businessmen today, that our universities and colleges are hotbeds of communism or socialism. I do not share it because I know it is not true. There is, to be sure, a healthy belief among our college students that the world can be improved, and some impractical idealism which I hope will never disappear. I do hope, however, that as you gain experience, the impractical part will fade before the idealism does.

One thing that does give me concern about our students, and it was just as true in my day as in yours, is that they are too inclined to take for granted the wonderful advantages which they enjoy. Possibly these advantages came too easily to most of us—we forget the lives and treasure given by our forefathers to win our civil and religious liberty, the sacrifices made by our parents and by those who built our colleges and churches, the hard work and savings of millions who have provided the many material

things which we consider merely normal and natural today. We intend to consider those things as something due us, instead of as something for which we are all deeply in debt. Even though you cannot yet do much to repay that debt, you should begin to appreciate it and resolve to do your part to pass these things along to your children, enriched by your own work and your own sacrifice.

The other, and somewhat related, cause for concern about the situation in our colleges and universities is the fact that so few seem to emerge with real enthusiasm for the American way of life and its amazing achievements. Does our cherished right to freely examine and criticize our leaders and our institutions necessarily result in such lack of enthusiasm? Have we lost our faith in the ability of free men to solve their future problems as they have those of the past, with a minimum of compulsion? Or do we merely dislike to parade our deeper feelings about our country?

Whatever the cause, the all-too-prevalent lack of enthusiasm for our American system is especially disturbing at a time when the Communists seem to have found a way to distort the truth and progandize whole generations of their youth into apparently enthusiastic support for dictatorships which enslave the individual, glorify brute force, decry idealism, and deny the existence of a Supreme Being. Must we plaster our windows and walls with pictures of our leader and turn our schools into propaganda mills in order to match the apparent enthusiasm of their youth? God forbid; but we must do more at all levels of education to better understand what we have, how we got it, and what we must do to preserve it. And we must make sure that our schools build ideals as they build knowledge—there is nothing more dangerous in the world today than high intelligence coupled with low ideals. This point is emphasized by the startling proportion of university graduates among those who have been unmasked as traitors to our Nation.

In order to appreciate our economic system better, let's give a little real thought to some of the problems involved in building and maintaining a happy and productive society. In stressing these two factors of happiness and productivity, I do not mean to say that we should overlook other desirable things, such as freedom, security, leisure, education, equality, etc.; but one of the things we learn in this world is that we can't have everything in equal measure, and I do think that happiness and high productivity must be the primary aims of a really good society. Freedom is, of course, essential because we cannot have a really happy society that does not afford a maximum of individual freedom—not freedom from work or even freedom from worry, but maximum possible freedom from external compulsion in our daily lives.

But how can we get really free individuals to do the work that must be done in such a society? Did you ever stop to think how you would solve that problem, starting from scratch? Let's see "what makes the wheels go round" in a free society.

Some of the forces which act on individuals and help to determine their behavior are internal in nature or what we may term convictions; others are external in origin, which we may call incentives. The best organization of society is that which gives its citizens the convictions and the incentives which will spur each individual to devote his best efforts, be they intellectual, manual, or artistic, toward the work of the world.

Consider first the question of convictions. What are some of the constructive ones? A few of those which seem important to me are:

First. That you have a real chance to achieve and that your success will depend mainly on your own efforts and ability.

Second. That there is no substitute for work, and in the long run a life devoted to useful work is more enjoyable than any other existence.

Third. That not only is honesty the best policy for the individual, but by and large the American people and American business are honest.

Fourth. That our American system of democracy and free enterprise, with its emphasis on the freedom and dignity of each individual, is the best yet devised, even though it should, and will, continue to evolve and improve as it has in the past.

Fifth. That merely making money and achieving power will not give enduring satisfaction unless they are coupled with abundant and unselfish service to your fellow men, and a realization that your life should fit into the master plan.

A young man or woman armed with these convictions, plus enthusiasm and reasonable ability, is well on the road to success.

Systematic attacks on such beliefs are the worst and most subtle form of sabotage; yet one which is being widely practiced by the enemies in our midst. I cannot imagine a young man less likely to succeed, or to be happy, or to be a useful member of society, than one who has let himself be led to believe that success depends largely on pull or luck, that most business is crooked, and that our American system is merely an out-of-date scheme for benefiting the few.

On the other hand, we elders cannot expect you younger people to adopt certain beliefs merely because they, like spinach, are supposed to be good for you—we must be able to convince you that they are true. However, if your training here has not already imbued you with these beliefs, I am not optimistic enough to expect to change your course of thinking by virtue of a brief address. Nevertheless, I do urge, with all the seriousness at my command, that if you are not prepared to enter upon your career with the general outlook I have been commending, you give serious thought and study to these matters before starting out with the heavy handicap of the contrary point of view.

Consider next the external forces or incentives, the other group of influences which largely determine the actions of individuals. In classifying incentives as external forces, we must not forget that what constitutes an incentive to one man may leave another cold, so while incentives are external in origin, they still depend to no small extent on the same internal background of attitude and belief which I have been discussing. Americans working abroad are surprised to find that incentives which appeal to an American worker often fall flat when offered to a native worker.

For example, you may have read about the labor trouble of a small American concern in Panama which employed numerous native girls. Investigating a strike, the management found no complaint as to wages, hours, or working conditions, the trouble being merely that the girls had all the money they wanted and were tired of working. American enterprise solved the problem by making available several Sears Roebuck catalogs, with explanations as to how to use them. Incentives were quickly restored, the girls went back to work, and the economic system, which had momentarily tottered, again began to click.

A scientist making an appraisal of the efficiency of the incentives in any given society naturally favors the practical test of success or failure rather than the endless discussions of the theorists in the field of economics. Even the practical test has its difficulties, however, because we must first define what we mean by success or failure. We must also remember that temporary success for a few years, or even for a generation, does not prove that a given form of organization is free of fundamental weaknesses which will sooner or later undermine it.

If we were to judge a society by the magnitude of its forward steps in philosophy and artistic endeavor, the civilizations of ancient Greece and Rome would stand favorable comparison with any subsequent form of government; yet we know that while the wealth and leisure of the few were largely responsible for their achievements, these were acquired mainly at the expense of slave labor resulting from military conquest, and did not yield either material comforts and happiness for the average man or an enduring base for further progress. Since that time, other strong military powers have played large parts in the spread of what we call civilization, and in the development of science and industry, but too much emphasis upon military might and conquest has always seemed to carry the seeds of eventual destruction.

To provide adequate quantities of goods for a happy and productive society, two principal things are necessary: First, the ability and willingness of the individuals to work hard to produce the necessary goods; and second, the provision and maintenance of adequate tools, facilities, and power to multiply the output of the individual worker without requiring excessive human effort. Both of these essential elements require the proper incentives to insure their continued functioning.

Let us consider first the problem of getting continued and intelligent effort from the worker. Many solutions have been tried. As long as each family produced most of its own food, clothing, and shelter, as in the case of primitive man, or even our own pioneers, the relation between effort and reward was so simple and obvious that the maximum productive effort was made by almost everyone. The right of any individual to own land in fee simple, so strange and wonderful to those coming from Europe, also proved to be a powerful incentive to our pioneer Americans. Our nearness to those pioneer days and their tradition of looking up to those who work, rather than to an aristocratic leisure class, is, to my mind, one of the greatest sources of the strength of our country. We must never lose sight of the fact that the nearer we can approach a clear and direct relationship between effort and reward, the better will be the individual effort. Basically, the best incentives are those most fairly proportioned and closely related to effort and ability.

As more division of labor and more power and tools became necessary in order to increase the total productivity of man's efforts, complications entered which have never been entirely solved. Slave labor was one approach but it not only went against the deepest sensibilities of the human race, but also proved to be an inefficient method of getting work done. The fear of punishment has never been an adequate substitute for the hope of reward.

The broad communistic idea has been written about for centuries and has had its appeal for immature idealists in every generation. The pioneer American settlements at Jamestown and Plymouth both started out on this basis, but soon abandoned it as a failure, due to its lack of incentives. Capt. John Smith wrote shortly after the abandonment:

"When our people were fed out of the common store, and labored jointly together, glad was he (who) could slip from his labor or slumber over his task he cared not how; nay, the most honest among them would hardly take so much true pains in a week, as now for themselves they will do in a day; neither cared they for the increase, presuming that howsoever the harvest pros-

pered, the general store must maintain them, so that we reaped not so much corn from the labor of 30, as now 3 or 4 do provide for themselves."

Isn't it amazing how little human nature has changed since then?

The same basic facts explain why America with only 10 percent of agricultural workers, is worried about food surpluses, while almost all the communistic countries devote 50 percent of their labor to agriculture and still suffer from shortages.

But the idea of equal sharing still had its appeal, and something over a hundred years ago a considerable number of cooperative communities were set up in this country in an effort to escape some of the difficulties inherent in the division of labor. If this basic idea were ever to succeed, it should have succeeded among some of those groups whose backgrounds were similar, whose ideals were high, and whose wants and capital requirements were very modest. In a matter of months or years, however, the lack of adequate incentives to stimulate the efforts of each individual always showed its debilitating effects. The inherently lazy and inefficient began to take too much advantage of their free ride, while those with vigor and ambition were not long content to support the slackers by their efforts. The real workers soon decided either to take things easy themselves or to seek a place where they felt their ability and energy would receive a more just reward. Equality lapsed into dull mediocrity. This lack of appeal to the more ambitious younger generation, and the tendency to retain in the enterprise only those least fit, were the major causes of their failure.

While Soviet Russia naturally comes to mind as an example of communism, it is, of course, not truly communistic, but is a gangster-type dictatorship based on repression, propagandizing, and a communistic lingo. It has apparently succeeded in forcing people to work hard by policing them even more effectively than did the czars. The hammer and sickle are indeed appropriate symbols of the back-breaking labor which results when a nation decides to forswear the incentives for saving which are necessary to provide the power and tools to increase productivity and reduce human effort. However, unless the Slavic spirit is utterly different from the Nordic, I believe the Soviet's rigid repression of the many by the few, its antagonism toward religion, truth, and individual freedom, and its extremely low standard of living will eventually destroy the dictatorship. The Kremlin's desperate concern, and the primary reason for the maintenance of the Iron Curtain and the repression of free speech, is to prevent the Russian people from learning the truth about life in a free country, and to keep them believing the propaganda which is fed them from childhood unto death.

Using as a criterion the freedom and the material and spiritual welfare of the common man, there can be no question but that our own Nation leads the world by a wide margin. Its century and three-quarters of rapid progress and stable government is a tribute both to the sound plans of the Founding Fathers and to the honesty and ability of most of their successors. We have 7 percent of the world's population, yet we give high school and college educations to more people than the rest of the world put together. However, I am sure that I need make no defense of our democratic form of government before this audience. The question to which I would address myself in the time remaining is whether the form of organization of business, usually referred to as our capitalistic system, is fundamentally sound and adapted to the modern world.

I think the worst handicap of this economic system is its customary name, which, together with the usual cartoon image of what is supposed to be a capitalist, starts the system off at a disadvantage in the popular mind. The name is inaccurate if it implies that a return on capital is either the main purpose or the main result of the system. Neither is true. The primary functions of capital are to make jobs, to expand production, and to supply the tools and power to supplement human energy. To show the importance of just this last item: a hundred years ago human and animal energy did 94 percent of the work in this country. Today this country uses about 24 times as much work energy as we did then, but now men and animals together supply less than 6 percent, instead of 94 percent, of the total. As another example: In Italy, 53 million people, hampered by inadequate capital, few tools, and little freedom, turn out only about as much manufactured product as General Motors with only 600,000 employees.

Capitalism should certainly not be judged by what Karl Marx wrote 100 years ago about the European type of capitalistic system then prevalent. That system bears no real resemblance to modern American competitive capitalism, or peoples' capitalism, as it has evolved under generally enlightened and socially conscious leadership. Marx predicted that capitalism would concentrate more and more wealth and income in fewer and fewer hands, with the improverishment of the masses, whereas the exact opposite has taken place in America. In 1941 only 4 percent of the families had incomes of $5,000 or more, while in 1956, only 15 years later, approximately 50 percent of all families had incomes in excess of that amount.

Some would call our system the profit system, but that might seem to imply that profits to capital were guaranteed. I think the most accurate name for our system is the hope-of-profit system. On the average, venture capital really earns surprisingly little—well below 10 percent per annum—after deducting taxes and the losses from unsuccessful ventures; but the holding out to capital of a reasonable chance for a good profit is the best and, in the long run, the cheapest way to get risks taken and new industries built. The guaranty of a fixed return equal to this average figure would be less of an incentive and yet would cost society much more because it would have to subsidize so many unsound ventures.

The Socialists talk about "production for use" as something vastly superior to our system of production for profit, but the real difference is that under socialism the planners try to estimate what the public should use, and if they guess wrong, the public still has to pay. Under the system of production for profit, the individual consumer is the boss, and if the producers guess wrong, it is their loss. And production for profit means that in the long run both the producer and the user must profit from the article, or demand drops off and productive effort is automatically diverted to something the consumer really wants. No better way to really insure production for use has been devised than our hope-of-profit system. And the average cost of the capital is only about 6 percent of the sales dollar.

I think an apt illustration of how our system gets results is the old-fashioned peanut hunt which was a pleasant feature of children's parties when I was a boy. You doubtless remember the scrambling which began when the announcement was made that peanuts were hidden around the house or yard, that each youngster could keep all he found, and that there would be a prize for the one who found the most. It must be admitted that there was some duplication of effort and waste of energy, but the peanuts were found, they were found in a hurry, and best of all, everyone had a good time. Now suppose we substitute a planned economy under a dictator who decides just where each child must hunt, and orders him under threat of punishment to bring in and surrender all his peanuts. If the dictator is a good planner and has enough secret police to force obedience, the peanuts may eventually be found, but I will wager that the total man-hours required, including that for planning and enforcing orders, would be doubled—and all the fun would be gone.

Still less efficient would be the result under a socialistic plan, which would set up committees among the children to decide how to proceed, and particularly just how the peanuts were to be divided after they were found. The Socialists always seem to be interested more in division than in multiplication. Working on this basis, I will wager that half of the peanuts would never be found, and the only participants who would have any fun would be those who got to be nasty little bureaucrats and requisitioned the peanuts from those who did the hunting.

The past few years have fortunately seen a considerable change in the trend toward socialism, both in our Nation and in our educational institutions. We are gradually realizing that so-called governmental subsidies do not come from the Government, but merely involve its taking $2 from Jones in order to give a dollar to Brown, and using the other dollar for the costs of the bureaucracy which must police it all. Private enterprise is the force which really creates productive jobs and improves the standard of living for all who are willing to work.

However, the continued success of our hope-of-profits system will depend upon its ability to maintain a fair and reasonable balance of incentives for labor, management, and capital. Workers must be well compensated in proportion to their abilities, efforts, and output, and the possibility of still greater rewards must always be kept before them. The opportunity to get ahead is the great incentive for the average American, and without decrying the value of a reasonable amount of social security, it will be a sad day for America if it ever puts mere security ahead of opportunity.

Unfortunately, some of the tendencies of actual and proposed legislation during the past quarter century strike at the very roots of the incentives of all classes of society. The incentive for capital to take risks and its opportunity to grow have been greatly reduced by heavy taxation, on both corporations and individuals, and particularly by the double taxation on corporation earnings distributed as dividends. The incentive for management is reduced by heavy income taxes and growing restrictions and regulations on almost every form of business activity. The incentive for labor to work hard and get ahead tends to be reduced if the worker comes to feel that his future welfare is dependent more upon seniority, or his union, or the Government, than upon his own efforts and ability. Even desirable plans, such as old-age pensions and unemployment benefits, when carried too far, reduce the incentive to work. As the colored couple said when offered work on the plantation: "We'd ruther stay on relief and be independent."

Even the incentive to our inventors has been threatened by proposed legislation which would greatly reduce the value of a patent. It seems amazing that such an act of national hara-kiri could be seriously urged in a country whose progress has been so largely due to research and invention and to the rapid development of these inventions made possible by our patent system. As Abraham Lincoln has said, our patent system has added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius.

One of the principal responsibilities of management is to work out and maintain proper incentives for the entire personnel of business. This is not an easy problem. Fair wages are, of course, the first fundamental, but money is by no means the only important

incentive to the average American worker. As Clarence Francis has well said, "You can buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour, but you cannot buy enthusiasm, you cannot buy initiative, you cannot buy loyalty." Good, safe working conditions, pleasant associates, fair and intelligent supervision, and an understanding of how each one's work fits into the whole business, all help to stimulate interest, enthusiasm, and loyalty in an organization.

Management must also be particularly careful to see that all workers, up and down the line, are treated fairly, that grievances are handled sympathetically, and that hard work and ability are recognized. The higher positions should be filled from within the organization whenever possible.

Management, too, is entitled to proper rewards and incentives. Salaries of top executives are sometimes criticized as too high, but don't forget that 91 percent tax on the top bracket. In most industrial companies executives salaries are primarily the result of the law of supply and demand. Where the top positions are recognized as being open to any employee of energy and ability, and not earmarked for a few favorite sons, good executive salaries are a relatively cheap stimulus and incentive to the whole organization. As the poor man's philosopher, Benjamin Franklin, once said in answering some current criticism of luxury as being a great evil, the hope of one day being able to purchase and enjoy luxuries is a great spur to labor and industry.

Finally, adequate incentives for capital must not be overlooked. Timid capital, demanding security above all else, is these days content to work for as little as 3 or 4 percent per annum. However, courageous or venture capital, willing to take risks and incur losses, is what we need for progress. If the return on those ventures which happen to be successful is held down to any arbitrary percentage, or is too heavily taxed, it not only drives capital into riskless and unproductive investments, but it stifles the regeneration of the venture capital which is badly needed to to offset the losses from the many ventures which are not successful. Excess profits taxes and proposals to limit the earnings of a business enterprise to an arbitrary percentage on the capital employed ignore the factors of enterprise, research, and invention, and other manifestations of brains which are certainly as much entitled to a return as money invested in mere bricks and mortar.

When we stop to realize what capital has done in this country to develop new industries and to put such remarkable amounts of power and such amazing tools in the hands of the average American worker, we realize that there must be an end to the long downtrend in the incentives to capital, or the standard of living of all of us will ultimately suffer. It takes an investment of about $20,000 to make a new job in industry today, and we must create more than 800,000 such new jobs each year if we are to take care of our growing labor force. Our Government should be actively encouraging the entry of new capital into industry. This administration has taken some modest steps in that direction, for which it has been unjustly criticized in some quarters. If you and those who follow you are to get good jobs, we need more, rather than less, encouragement of risk capital.

At the outset of my talk I spoke of the importance of enthusiasm. I want to emphasize that again in closing. It has always seemed to me that our hereditary instincts are sadly deficient in that, while they spur us to almost superhuman efforts to avoid the loss of a finger or a toe or other relatively unimportant physical member, we seem to have no instinctive sense of the preeminent value to us of that spirit of enthusiasm which is fortunately so characteristic of youth. In many individuals it gradually atrophies or withers away as middle age approaches, with small effort to nourish it and little notice of its disappearance. Yet how greatly we admire the trait when we see it preserved in some men clear up to a ripe old age, and how much it has to do both with the attainment of success and the enjoyment of life. Guard that treasure as you would your life—if you cannot be enthusiastic about your line of work or the company you work for, after a fair trial, change your work or your company. If you cannot be enthusiastic about our country, try another for a while. If you are critical about some situation in your business or your community, instead of merely complaining, get enthusiastically behind some reform you feel is needed. In such efforts, however, you must learn to expect obstacles and rebuffs, and will need patience and tolerance as well as enthusiasm, if you are to win your point instead of merely antagonizing those who make the final decision.

The unique and vital nature of enthusiasm has long been recgonized—indeed, its very name, from the Greek words "en" and "Theos," literally means "God within." Again I say, guard that divine spark as your greatest asset, temper it with judgment and patience, and your rewards will be both material and spiritual.

Promoting the United Nations Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on promoting the United Nations emblem, which was printed in the July 12, 1958, edition of the Brooklyn Tablet.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMOTING THE UNITED NATIONS EMBLEM

DEAR SIR: Something called the United States Committee for the United Nations—at 45 East 65th Street, New York—is launching a very overambitious program to promote the United Nations and the U. N. emblem.

Already the United Air Lines is carrying the U. N. emblem on their planes, and all airlines in the United States (so they say) will eventually do the same. According to Mr. Roger Enloe, who is promoting this scheme, the plan will include placing this U. N. emblem on all transportation in the country—trains, buses, and boats. He says many New York stores have promised to use the emblem, and big business and industry will soon use it on their stationery. They are issuing a fancy blue-and-white folder—The Air Lines and the United Nations—including an article from the United Nations News for June (reprinted in June 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) telling the whole story.

Where is our national emblem in all this? If you do not wish to see our emblem—Old Glory—so replaced and disrespected, it will be well to help in stopping this before it goes any further. Obtain these folders, and then voice your objections. Already, many letters have gone in to Mr. W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines. And a public relations man in New York stated if enough such letters were received, it might change their tactics.

We believe this plan to put the U. N. emblem on airlines and elsewhere in America is a violation of our flag code, passed as an amendment in 1953—I quote: "No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations."

Planes are not in the air all the time. When on the ground at our airports, this display of the U. N. emblem in place of ours may be considered a flag violation. At least, it seems unthinkable that any United States businessmen would be willing to promote such a scheme which is most aggressive and an attempt to replace our own national emblem.

The elaborate folders are given to each person who boards a plane, and are being widely distributed, promoting the idea of the United Nations. Symbolically this means, the United Nations over America, as emblems are symbols. Should our United States mail be carried on planes under the U. N. emblem? Give this a little thought, then do your share to stop this one-world scheme, and demand proper respect to the national emblem of America.

HELEN P. LASELL,
Chairman, United States Flag Committee.
JACKSON HEIGHTS.

Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution dealing with increases in social-security benefits.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF STATE, COUNTY,
AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,
STATE HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES No. 1441,
Jamestown, N. Dak., June 27, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, only 310 members of the 185,000 members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees employed here at the Jamestown State Mental Hospital are virtally interested in the passage of H. R. 9467 which will provide sane and sensible increases in social-security benefits for our employees.

We, most heartily and sincerely approve the passage of H. R. 9467 known as the Forand bill.

May we ask your support for and in favor of this vital bill, H. R. 9467.

Most sincerely yours,
DEANE L. CHAPIN,
Secretary, Local 1441.

Effect of the Recession on Automobile Dealers Throughout the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of yesterday contains an article on the effect of the recession on automobile dealers throughout the country. It is apparent that the present slump in business is driving many automobile dealers out of business. They are forced either to give up entirely, be bought out by the automobile companies, or combine their franchise with some other dealers. The National Automobile Dealers Association estimates that 3,500 dealers will go out of business, go bankrupt, or switch franchises this year. So far this year the rate of dealer bankruptcies is double that of last year.

We see that the recession, inflation, and monopoly power tend to work hand in hand. Prices that are higher than necessary have helped to reduce demand; the lack of demand has caused distress to many of these small dealerships; this distress causes many of them to go out of business, resulting in a higher degree of concentration in the industry. The recent rise in steel prices will only make this serious situation more difficult to solve.

I hope the Members of the Senate will read this article so they may be informed about what is happening in this critical segment of the economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO DEALERS' RANKS THIN AS SLUMP BRINGS CLOSINGS, MERGERS, WEEDING OUT BY MAKERS

Auto dealer ranks are being thinned amid the slowest car sales year since 1952.

Some of the pruning is the work of the auto companies themselves—as under the General Motors Corp. program, announced early this year, of buying out dealerships in what are deemed by the company to be obsolete locations.

But bankruptcies and voluntary closeouts also are taking a toll.

And some companies are changing tack in their moves to strengthen and enlarge their distribution systems.

An example is Ford Motor Co.'s setup for marketing the Edsel, which came out in 1957 and ran into a generally rocky market for so-called medium-priced 1958 model cars. Sales of cars in this range totaled 660,000 in the first half of 1958, some 36 percent below a year earlier.

Many Edsel franchises that started out as exclusive dealerships are winding up under the same roof with Lincoln and Mercury.

FEWER EXCLUSIVE FRANCHISES

Although there are currently some 1,200 Edsel franchises, up from 1,150 at the start of 1958, according to James J. Nance, Ford vice president and general manager of the M-E-L division, the number of exclusive Edsel vendors has dropped to 600 from 900 at the beginning of the year.

Is there a policy now of combining the Edsel franchises with Lincoln-Mercury?

Mr. Nance says there isn't. He states the division's dealerships are being realined to get the strongest representation.

He also disclosed some other plans for Edsel: The line, offered in four series when the car made its bow last September, will be curtailed in the 1959 models, says Mr. Nance. He explains "The line was too wide," but gives no details of what the production plans are.

Edsel and Lincoln-Mercury dealers, however, speculate it will be trimmed to reduce conflict with the Mercury price class. These dealers guess that the highest-priced Citation models will be dropped and perhaps the next highest Corsair series, also.

Chrysler Corp.'s program to build up single-line outlets and reduce the percentage of its dealers who handle two or more Chrysler makes also has slowed. The company had particularly hoped to set up exclusive Plymouth dealers to put Plymouth merchandising on a similar basis as that of the Ford car and G. M.'s Chevrolet. But where Chrysler established over 100 exclusive Plymouth outlets in 1957 it has added only a handful in 1958. It now has only 200 exclusive dealerships for Plymouth with over 7,500 Plymouth franchises in all.

Most Chrysler Corp. dealers handle Plymouth plus another of the corporation's car lines.

STRONG DEALERSHIPS VITAL

Auto company officials regard maintenance of strong dealer organizations as a vital part of their business. "We can't even afford to lose one really good dealer," one has been quoted as saying. Over the last 20 years the number of dealers for American makes has trended downward despite the uptrend in auto sales as dealships have grown larger and some makes of cars have disappeared.

After declining some 5,000 between 1941 and 1955 to just over 40,000, the number of dealers in American makes rose to over 41,000 in early 1956. The rise was largely a result of heavy recruiting by auto companies in anticipation of further lush years such as 1955, when 7.2 million cars were sold. But such years did not come and normal attrition dropped the number to just over 38,000 by the beginning of this year. With 1958 sales expected to fall to 4.6 million, the lowest since 4.2 million in 1952, auto companies indicate they've aided the weeding out process to help more promising dealers.

The National Automobile Dealers Association estimates that 3,500 dealers will go out of business, go bankrupt or switch franchises this year. The National Automobile Dealers Association has no estimate of what net loss will be. Dealer bankruptcies in the first half, at 147, were about double a year earlier.

General Motors provides no figures on how many dealers it has bought out but some of the results can be seen in Detroit. Seven Buick dealers have dropped out in that metropolitan area this year out of a former 21, and, according to an unofficial source, 2 quit under the close-out program. Of 5 Pontiac dealers who dropped out to reduce the total to 16, 1 was bought out by General Motors, according to this source. Four of 23 Oldsmobile dealers closed, of which 2, it's understood, were bought out. One Chevrolet dealer was closed by General Motors and no Cadillac changes were reported.

One Detroit Buick dealer estimates his sales in the first 20 days of July were up 50 percent from the like period in June because of the closing of 2 competing Buick dealerships.

DROP IN DEALER FORCE

Chrysler Corp.'s dealer force is expected to drop to around 7,800 to 8,000 this year from 8,600 at the start of the year. Chrysler says it is attempting to reduce the number in an orderly way, rather than let economic forces do the job, so as to retain dealers and locations it wishes to keep.

"If you let economics do it, you don't always lose the right ones," says Byron Nichols, Chrysler's vice president, automotive sales. "Sometimes it hurts. Dealers in strategic areas may fold or go over to a rival." Thus, he says, Chrysler is trying to select dealerships it wishes to close. Former 3-dealer towns are being designated 2-dealer territories, for instance.

Wall Street Journal contacts with dealers around the country indicate that consolidations have been proceeding apace in the Edsel and Lincoln-Mercury lines.

In Salem, Oreg., Edsel dealer Harold Agnew is turning over his franchise to a Lincoln-Mercury retailer and says the Mercury-Edsel-Lincoln plans to tie the two franchises together "rather than have two separate dealers go broke or quit from discouragement."

"We've been approached by Ford Motor Co. with an offer to combine our Edsel dealership with the Lincoln-Mercury outfit," says Bernie Goldstein, owner of Fort Worth's Lone Star Motors. The idea is appealing to Mr. Goldstein. "With Lincoln, Mercury, Edsel and the English Ford under one roof we'd have a good outfit. We'd have one overhead instead of two."

Stanley Steward, vice president of Dan Holahan's combined Mercury-Edsel-Lincoln dealership in Flint, Mich., reports that the Edsel was added April 23.

Richard Hart, assistant Edsel manager for the Greater Boston district, says his office is now approving Lincoln and Mercury dealers for Edsel franchises but will leave some Edsel dealers exclusive. A check with the Ford regional office at Los Angeles showed that of 48 Edsel dealers in southern California last fall, only four are still exclusively Edsel.

Some Edsel dealers, however, reported they are happy with the lone car. Arthur Brady, an exclusive Edsel dealer in Hingham, Mass., said he is not dissatisfied with the Edsel, having sold 10 in May and 12 in June. "I made good money in those months," he said. Other Edsel dealers reported they have been unsuccessful in getting a Lincoln-Mercury franchise to dual with the Edsel, usually reasoning that it was because of a strong Lincoln-Mercury or Lincoln-Mercury-Edsel dealership in a nearby territory.

According to Mr. Nance, the teaming up is being done on a selective basis and will continue to "depend upon the individual circumstances."

He recently announced formation of new general sales organization in Dearborn for the Mercury-Edsel-Lincoln division, which he termed part of a reorganization in preparation for marketing the division's 1959 line of cars. Mr. Nance said that the 1959 Mercury "will be completely different than any previous models in this line, with a fresh and new styling concept."

"Retail auto sales in recent weeks show a definite improvement and the dealer organization handling our products will balance out their 1958 stocks in a very orderly fashion and will wind up the model year with very low inventories," Mr. Nance commented.

C. E. Bowie, former sales manager for the Lincoln and Mercury sales office, was named by Mr. Nance to the newly created position of general sales manager of the division's consolidated sales office. George S. Coats, Mr. Bowie's former assistant, was appointed assistant general sales manager.

Sales managers for the separate car lines in the division were also named. N. K. Vanderree continues as Edsel sales manager, R. F. Williams was appointed Mercury sales manager, E. F. Coll will head Lincoln and Continental sales and H. O. Lund will continues as manager of imported car sales.

Interpreting ADA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who enjoys the respect of all Members of this body and with whom I have served many years, extended his remarks in the RECORD to disagree with my comments about Americans for Democratic Action 3 days earlier.

Certainly, we all respect the great wisdom of the gentleman and agree that on most subjects he is both articulate and knowledgeable. It is unfortunate that he, like so many of those he considers truly patriotic Americans, have a blind spot in their thinking about this group which first infiltrated and then took over the Democrat Party.

It is with considerable regret that I must correct the gentleman, but I feel he will be the richer because of what I say and the people of our great State of New York will be benefited by the replacement of propaganda with facts.

First, the gentleman feels that the policies of greater spending and less revenue, as proposed by ADA will bring a speedy end to the recession into which the Republican administration has plunged this country.

The national center of this so-called recession seems to be Detroit, where the economic dictates of Walter Reuther prevail. Mr. Reuther, who wrote from Moscow, "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America," is one of the principal financial angels of ADA, as well as of the Democrat Party. His economic views, as put into practice in the center of unemployment, can hardly be blamed on this administration.

As for the ADA recommendations that the Government slash its income and spend more money, I can say only that I have never heard of this policy restoring economic stability in the home, in business, or anywhere else. Perhaps the gentleman can tell me of an instance where this formula was effective.

ADA Board Member Reuther apparently preaches this doctrine but does the opposite when the shoe pinches his own badly chewed foot. Recently, to meet the effects of hard times within his United Auto Workers Union, Reuther cut salaries, fired people, and did everything except apply his antirecession formula for government.

The gentleman also objected to my remarks about ADA because many of its officials, such as Eleanor Roosevelt, David Dubinsky, and Robert Nathan—are, as he quaintly put it, "zealously devoted to the cause of democracy in this country."

To this statement, I can answer only that their brand of democracy is far removed from that envisioned by the framers of our Constitution. Otherwise, I am sure, they would not be clamoring so constantly for change.

The gentleman denies that the ADA finds Russian accomplishments greater than our own, but in the next breath says ADA statements to this effect are but to call this Soviet threat to our attention.

The gentleman also denied that ADA has recommended economic aid to Red China and its admission to U. N.

To correct this erroneous impression, I refer him to the annual platforms of this self-professed anticommunistic organization.

For years the ADA has urged that Red China be recognized. Even as late as May of this year the ADA issued a statement which, when the backing and filling is removed, says, "ADA urges immediate negotiations toward diplomatic recognition of the Peking regime."

The gentleman from New York quotes me incorrectly when he says I claimed the "ADA is devoted to a program of full and steady employment." What I said was "the ADA, through its program, promises full and steady employment and production." The inference is quite different. A promise by the ADA is icing on an unbaked cake.

In reading the remarks of the gentleman from New York it is obvious that he has misinterpreted statements concerning the ADA which I made on the House floor, on Monday, July 21. Perhaps he has made this same mistake in evaluating and supporting the program of the ADA.

De Seversky Gives United States 3 Years To Catch Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we should have listened to Mr. de Seversky years ago.

The following article tells the story:

DE SEVERSKY GIVES UNITED STATES 3 YEARS TO CATCH RUSSIA

NEW YORK, August 3.—Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, military analyst and aviation pioneer, said today that the United States has 3 years to prepare to match Russia's armed strength or face possible enslavement or atomic ruin.

The Russian-born former air ace and founder of Republic Aviation Corp. said this country has made very little progress in military preparedness since the Soviet sputniks were launched.

He called the concept of limited war "military nonsense and military trash," and said the armed services must stop their negative missile rivalry and become integrated into a single military force operating as part of a Department of Air and Space.

De Seversky appeared on a filmed and recorded survival-and-freedom interview conducted by Mike Wallace on the American Broadcasting Co. network. The program was produced on ABC in cooperation with the Ford-financed Fund for the Republic.

"We are facing the situation where the enemy has equal, and in some instances superior, capacity," he said. "The only thing that holds him at bay is our Strategic Air Command today."

He said the strides made recently in military preparedness have been insignificant, and certainly not commensurate with the dangers we face.

He predicted that if United States and Russian military progress continue at the present rate, by the end of 1961 the United States Strategic Air Force will be utterly insufficient—about 25 percent of what it should be. The United States will lag behind the Russians in intercontinental ballistic missiles, he said, and the Russians will have a jet bomber force four times greater.

De Seversky said it will be some time before Defense Secretary Neil McElroy will have enough military knowledge to express his own views on preparedness. He said that President Eisenhower, although a veteran military man, does not have the necessary technical knowledge, either, to handle the situation because experience in World War II will have very little value in fighting world war III.

Booklet Has Information on Scholarships and Loan Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 20:

BOOKLET HAS INFORMATION ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOAN FUNDS

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

COLUMBIA.—College-bound youngsters who are long on ability but short on funds should latch onto a small booklet called From High School to College if they are interested in obtaining scholarships or loan funds.

That little 41-page booklet is a veritable gold mine of information and it might well prove to be a mine of gold for students who find it the key to open financial resources they did not know existed. The publication is jammed with factual, practical information which tells the would-be college student how to go about getting a scholarship or a loan, and it lists scores of specific opportunities for such assistance.

For example, every State institution in South Carolina is enumerated with a paragraph explaining the scholarship or loan funds available at each. Another section lists the private colleges and universities in the State, giving the same information for them. And, in all categories, opportunities for Negro as well as white students are listed, and junior colleges are included as well as the senior institutions.

Another section lists 13 separate loan funds which are available to South Carolina students, and suggests where still additional loans might be obtained. There is a listing of 20 specific scholarships available for students who wish to attend college in South Carolina, plus a listing of 31 other scholarship sources which are not restricted to use in this State.

Scholarships and loan funds sponsored by business and professional firms or associations are listed, along with indications as to the qualifications required and the procedures to be followed in obtaining such financial assistance. More than 38 South Carolina firms are itemized as affording

financial assistance to children of their employees, or to unrestricted groups of high-school students.

But along with these invaluable listings, representing the best single compilation of scholarship opportunities yet prepared in South Carolina, is some valuable advice to high school youngsters and to their parents.

Students are told to begin planning early if they wish to attend college, to maintain high academic standing throughout high school, to survey the field of college courses and opportunities to determine where their interests and their prospects for financial assistance lie, and to develop good habits of study, research, library use, and other skills.

The booklet also gives sound advice on means whereby enterprising students can help themselves financially by working their way through college, in whole or in part. Ambitious youngsters are urged to develop skills and services such as typing, operating business machines, waiting on tables, handling switchboards, and similar tasks which enhance their value as part-time employes.

Credit for preparing this helpful aid goes to two agencies, the South Carolina division of the American Association of University Women and the State department of education. A special AAUW committee, headed by Miss Ada M. Moser, of Columbia, compiled most of the scholarship and loan fund data, and worked it into printed form with the help of department of education officials. The department handled the publication problems and has on hand ample supplies of the booklet.

Copies may be obtained by writing to Miss Ellen Lyles, supervisor of guidance services, or to Miss Elizabeth Ketchin, editor of publications, at the State department of education, Columbia, S. C. Their advice to youngsters, and to parents, is to obtain the booklets in advance of school openings, and to begin planning early in a child's academic career, preferably along the 8th, 9th, or 10th grade levels. They, and the booklet itself, point out the increasing difficulty of gaining admission to college, and they urge long-range planning.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday, August 5, 1958, there appeared a full page ad, signed and paid for by certain newspapers in the Tennessee Valley region. It is a very fine statement as to the importance and the urgency of completing legislation on the TVA self-financing program which the Senate passed last year, and which is now pending in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement, together with the newspaper signers, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE BALL, WILL CARRY

(The newspapers of the Tennessee Valley signed below have lived with the Tennessee Valley Authority for 25 years and have watched at firsthand the unfolding of its works. The following statement about TVA, and the situation of the people of the valley with relation to TVA, is from that close acquaintance. It is given earnestly and purposefully in hopes that our valley, which has progressed far with TVA, may be permitted the means of continuing this progress.)

The use of electric power in the Tennessee Valley grows steadily and rapidly. The adequacy of its power supply is, of course, vital to the valley's development and to its value to the Nation. To service the mounting demands of defense agencies as well as of civilian consumers, TVA now is using current earnings to finance additions to its power system. This method obviously will not suffice: no great utility attempts to finance its expansion program out of current earnings. Unless a better method is provided for TVA, the valley demand for power will exceed the production capacity of the TVA system within the next few years.

A better method is being sought. There is now before Congress a plan for TVA to meet its future power needs by going into private money market for funds.

The Senate approved this plan last year by a large majority; the question will soon come to a vote in the House.

Under this plan, TVA would issue revenue bonds to finance new generating plants.

These revenue bonds would be paid for solely and directly by the users of TVA power; would not be obligations of the Federal Treasury and would not add to the national debt; would be subject to Federal income taxes; would stand on their merits with any other bonds in the private money markets.

The people of the Tennessee Valley believe this is the best way available for TVA to provide for normal future power needs. Users of TVA power are entirely willing to have spelled out in law their responsibility to pay, through their power bills, for this method of future financing of TVA's power system.

Although the revenue-bond plan would turn the job of financing future power expansion over to the people of the Tennessee Valley, the Nation will continue to own TVA. TVA will continue as a Federal corporation and all its properties will be part of the national wealth. Its tremendous power plant will continue to add to the strength of the Nation for defense and to the overall strength of the national economy.

It is the consensus of the newspapers of the valley that the plan for TVA financing now before Congress is fair and workable. We urge objective appraisal of it by the press of the Nation and favorable consideration of it in the Halls of Congress.

Twenty-five years ago Congress shaped TVA to the job of controlling the Tennessee River (1) for navigation, (2) against floods, (3) to produce electric power. Its success at this assignment is today a top American showpiece, universally admired and widely copied.

The Government has to date invested about $2 billion in the water control and power facilities of TVA, the total divided 8 percent to navigation, 9 percent to flood control, and 83 percent to power.

The navigation investment has added 627 miles to the Nation's inland waterway system and is amply justified by savings in transportation costs.

The flood-control investment is justified by savings from destruction in the valley itself and in the valleys below.

The power investment is being paid for by the users of TVA power.

TVA powe. is distributed in the cities and countrysides of the valley by 152 locally owned systems, including 2 small privately owned systems, at exemplafy rates which have brought about lowered power rates in all the areas surrounding the valley.

The TVA power system is now the country's greatest. All of its net proceeds belong to the Government. Up to last year, the Government thus had realized from its TVA power investment $413 million, representing an average annual return of 4 percent.

FIRST CALL, LION'S SHARE

The Government itself takes more than half—56 percent—of all TVA power. The power is used for defense purposes. The atomic plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah use twice as much power from TVA as is used by the city of New York. The mammoth wind tunnels at Tullahoma use more power than the city of Atlanta. A large block of TVA power goes to the Redstone (rockets) Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala. Others go to heavy industries in the valley closely allied with defense production. A savings of millions of dollars in power costs thus accrues to the Government and all of the people.

The combined load of this ponderous Government demand and the rising needs of civilian users crowds perilously on the heels of the supply. Additional powerplants must continually be planned and provided to meet the demand of the future.

The power users of the valley are willing to pay for this additional capacity through their monthly bills. They are asking that TVA be authorized to obtain capital for new construction by issuing revenue bonds, to be sold in the open-money market.

In sum, the people of the valley are asking for a means of financing TVA's new powerplants outside of the Federal budget, on their own responsibility. They understand that in paying for the necessary additional capacity on the TVA power system they are adding to the value of a great enterprise owned by the Nation.

Signed and paid for by these newspapers of the Tennessee Valley region: The Advertiser, Haleyville, Ala.; Alabama Courier, Athens, Ala.; Ashland City Times, Ashland City, Tenn.; Bedford County Sun, Shelbyville, Tenn.; Belmont Tri-County News, Belmont, Miss.; Camden Chronicle, Camden, Tenn.; Carroll County Democrat, Huntingdon, Tenn.; Catoosa County Times, Ringgold, Ga.; Choctaw Plaindealer, Koselusko, Miss.; the Citizen, Cookeville, Tenn.; Citizen Times, Scottsville, Ky.; Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, Clarksville, Tenn.; Cleveland Daily Banner, Cleveland, Tenn.; Clinton Courier-News, Clinton, Tenn.; Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.; Community News, Madison, Tenn.; Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.; Crossville Chronicle, Crossville, Tenn.; Cullman Democrat, Cullman, Ala.; Cullman Times, Cullman, Ala.; Daily Herald, Columbia, Tenn.; Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala.; Democrat-Union, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; Donelson Diary, Donelson, Tenn.; Dunlap Tribune, Tracy City, Tenn.; Florence Herald, Florence, Ala.; Florence Times, Florence, Ala.; Franklin Citizen, Russellville, Ala.; Franklin County Times, Russellville, Ala.; Fulton Daily Leader, Fulton, Ky.; Gallatin Examiner, Gallatin, Tenn.; Goodlettsville Gazette, Goodlettsville, Tenn.; Green River Republican, Morgantown, Ky.; Hartselle Enquirer, Hartselle, Ala.; Hickman County Times, Centerville, Tenn.; Humphreys County Democrat, Waverly, Tenn.; Huntsville Times, Huntsville, Ala.; Itawamba Times, Fulton, Miss.; Jackson Sun, Jackson, Tenn.; Jasper Journal, Jasper, Tenn.; Kentucky New Era, Hopkinsville, Ky.; Knoxville, News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn.; Lauderdale County Enterprise, Ripley, Tenn.; Ledger & Times, Murray, Ky.; Lexington Progress, Lexington, Tenn.; Limestone Democrat, Athens, Ala.; Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times, Maryville, Tenn.; McNary County Independent, Selmes, Tenn.; Memphis Press-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn.; Monitor Herald, Calhoun City, Miss.; Moulton Advertiser, Moulton, Ala.; Nashville Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn.; New Albany Gazette, New Albany, Miss.; North Georgia News,

Blairsville, Ga.; Oak Ridger, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Okolona Messenger, Okolona, Miss.; Paducah Sun-Democrat, Paducah, Ky.; the Panolian, Batesville, Miss.; the Parisian, Paris, Tenn.; Paris Post-Intelligencer, Paris, Tenn.; Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky.; Parsons News Leader, Parsons, Tenn.; Pontotoc Progress, Pontotoc, Miss.; Pulaski Citizen, Pulaski, Tenn.; Roane County News, Kingston, Tenn.; Rockwood Times, Rockwood, Tenn.; Savannah Courier, Savannah, Tenn.; Southern Standard, McMinnville, Tenn.; Springfield Herald, Springfield, Tenn.; Stewart-Houston County Times, Dover & Erin, Tenn.; Sumner County News, Gallatin, Tenn.; Sumner County Star, Hendersonville, Tenn.; Todd County Standard, Elkton, Ky.; Tribune Democrat, Benton, Ky.; Tri-Cities Daily, Florence, Ala.; Tri-City Reporter, Dyer, Tenn.; Tullahoma News, Tullahoma, Tenn.; Union City Daily Messenger, Union City, Tenn.; Upper Sumner County Press, Portland, Tenn.; the Vidette, Iuka, Miss.; Wayne County News, Waynesboro, Tenn.; Weakley County Press, Martin, Tenn.

Who Killed Cock Robin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. I commend the Chicago Tribune's phraseology, "Who Killed Cock Robin?" in getting to the cause of the delay in considering labor legislation in sufficient time to take some positive steps in this Congress.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 10, 1958]

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?

Senator JACK KENNEDY, giving a good imitation of heartbreak, arose in the Senate to blubber that the Kennedy-Ives labor "reform" bill was dead and that the National Association of Manufacturers had killed it.

This allegation caused Senator MUNDT, a Republican, to inquire since when Representative SAM RAYBURN, Democratic Speaker of the House, had become an agent of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. MUNDT observed that Mr. RAYBURN had kept the bill bottled up for 41 days before submitting it last Monday to the House Labor Committee. This long delay, added to the time required by committee hearings, had the effect of insuring that the House would not act on the bill before Congress adjourns.

Republicans have the impression that, despite Senator KENNEDY's histrionics, the Democrats are glad to see the last of the bill, and that burying it is part of a deal worked out by Democrats with union bosses in return for support in the November congressional elections.

Our own feeling is that Milton Lightner, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who replied to KENNEDY's charge, was correct in appraising the bill as "woefully inadequate" and an example of "bad legislation." The bill pretended to regulate internal corruption in unions, especially in the handling of welfare funds. It did not strike at major union abuses, such as the exercise of monopoly power, coercive boycotting, or racket picketing.

Little noticed in the bill were some provisions drastically limiting freedom of speech and action by employers. These required reports by employers on attempts to "influence" or "affect" employees in their decision whether or not to join a union. The provisions were sufficiently ambiguous so that voluntary employer action to confer wage increases, fringe benefits, recreation opportunities, and the like could be interpreted as attempts to influence employees by making them so happy they would not want to joint a union.

The principal objection to the bill, however, was that it promoted the idea that Congress had "dealt" with union abuses when only the surface had been scratched. Passage of this legislation would have given Congress an excuse for lying back and saying that no further consideration need be given for an indefinite period to union problems.

On this basis, we cannot share in Senator KENNEDY's grief that the bill is dead. And, if it is dead, it is his own party which killed it. The voters ought to be capable of the simple addition of these facts to arrive at the conclusion that the Democrats again have played matters the way the union bosses wanted them played.

Chicago, my hometown, has had a major role in hearings conducted by the Senate's Labor Rackets Subcommittee. Yes; even my district, Illinois' Third, was represented by restaurant owners who testified.

When rank-and-file labor members want remedial legislation, based on need, it is a sad day when delaying tactics are permitted to be the order of the day.

I am, by background, sympathetic to labor. My father was a member of organized labor in Chicago in the days of Samuel Gompers. Since then, labor has risen to a position of dignity, respect, and great responsibility. However, the past few years, there have been certain unscrupulous leaders whose actions have made all labor the target of severe criticism. As long as human beings govern men, we will know the injustices, inequities, and disappointments the innocent suffer because of the unscrupulous activities of some of the individuals holding positions of power and authority. This is life, but it does not mean that we should not be constant in endeavoring to correct and ameliorate condtions. known to be detrimental to the majority.

The rank-and-file members of organized labor are fearful for the future of the labor movement, and so am I. I have received a great number of letters besieging me to urge Congress to act on labor legislation this session. Many communications are from members of organized labor.

It is lamentable that the most important lawmaking body in the world has not accomplished something in the labor area this session. We must have legislative tools designed with accuracy and precision if we are to protect the future and safeguard personal security of millions of loyal Americans in organized labor.

Both labor and management can work shoulder to shoulder to meet the needs of the future to guarantee America's security.

If all of those in strategic positions of authority would say, we have thrown off the coat of political considerations and we will come forth with proposals based on justice and equality, there is no doubt in my mind that it could be done and would be. The result would bring a new respect and confidence in our labor movement and our Congress.

California Water Development Progress and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, water is not exclusively a California problem because in recent years water has become a nationwide concern. However, because of California's rapidly increasing population and expanding industry I believe that California's problems are more serious and are closer at hand than those in other parts of the Nation. Certainly one of the most important issues facing California, if it is to continue to grow and prosper, is the successful resolution of the many problems relating to the development and control and use of its water resources. These problems are not insurmountable, but they are difficult and if they are to be resolved successfully the State of California must provide positive leadership.

One of the outstanding water authorities in California is Mr. James K. Carr, assistant general manager of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. Mr. Carr has literally grown up with California water problems, has been connected with water development throughout his professional career, and has a broad understanding of the many factors that enter into the California water program. I am including an excellent talk on California water development made by Mr. Carr recently before the Oroville, Calif., Rotary Club:

CALIFORNIA WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. President and fellow Rotarians, Your program chairman has asked me to give a talk on California water development progress and problems. He has given me approximately half an hour to do it. The subject, as you know, has occupied months—even years—of debate in the legislature and elsewhere. As a former Butte County resident and one who worked closely with you on the early studies of the Feather River project, I am pleased to be with you again and to discuss some ideas I have on the subject. Because of the limited time available, I hope you will pardon me if I tend to oversimplify some of the problems. At the outset, let me make it clear that I surely don't have and don't claim to have the answers to many of the complex problems facing us in California's water development. For what they are worth, I am willing to give you my personal views on a few facets of this very broad and complicated subject. I assume you want me to speak frankly and not just tell you the things you might like to hear.

This community followed the headlines on activities of the State legislature in the last session more closely than many other parts of California because of your interest in Oroville Dam. There was very heavy emphasis on appropriations for State construction of water projects. In the rush of events a

person might have easily gotten the impression people were practically dying of thirst, and we were headed for immediate disaster if the State legislature didn't appropriate funds for construction immediately. It would be quite reasonable from some reports to get the impression that all water development in California had come to a standstill.

That is not the situation. The water development program in California is Federal, State and local in character. When it is reviewed in its entirety it is evident progress is being made, but there is a need for a larger contribution through construction of projects by the State.

If you as businessmen were going to sell a product, you would want to determine a few things first. Among these you would want to know the need for the product and the market for it. You would want to know what amount of the product is presently available and how much more could be sold without saturating the market. You would want to know who could produce the product; how much it would cost; whether you could sell it at a price that would repay the cost.

Therefore, if California is going into the water business, we should take a business-like approach to the problem. We should obtain answers to some of these fundamental questions: What area or areas need water now or in the immediate future—say in the next 5 years? What amounts of water are needed in these areas? How can we get the water from its source to the areas of need? How much developed water is presently available for sale and use in these areas in wet years, in average years, in dry years? What flood control is needed? What other uses need to be served? Who owns the water? How can the project works be financed? What agencies can do the job? What will the works cost? Who can pay the cost? Who is willing to pay the cost?

This, I realize, is something of an oversimplification, but essentially, these are some of the questions that need to be asked of the appropriate agencies. The answers need to be fully and widely publicized. In my opinion, the State legislature and the general public do not have the answers to these questions, particularly the amounts of developed water supplies available for use in the next few years. Nor do we have the State's needs for the next few years spelled out as clearly as they should be.

Briefly, here are some observations that I should like to enlarge upon:

1. The State should take positive leadership in establishing and coordinating the total California water program—Federal, State, and local.

2. The State should construct only those projects necessary to meet the requirements which cannot be met from Federal or local projects, both public and private.

3. We are now placing too much emphasis on the California water plan and detailed planning for projects which are several years in the future.

4. We are placing too little emphasis on a California water program, our immediate needs for water, and the amount of water now available from completed storage reservoirs or those under construction.

5. The California water problem is not really a water problem as such, but is essentially a financial problem.

On the question of State leadership in the establishment of a total program: Only recently has the California Water Commission taken a really active part in advocating in Washington projects for irrigation as well as flood control. The commission should take a more active part in pressing the State's views on Federal legislation affecting State water development. No State body to my knowledge, legislative or executive, has in public hearings nailed down the proposed programs of the various construction agencies—Federal, State, and local—particularly the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. This would be a first step in a State determination of the jobs that can be done by other agencies.

There are those who don't want the Federal Government, especially the Bureau of Reclamation, to construct any more California water projects. To me, they are not realistic. We are aware that Federal funds don't come from Santa Claus. The fact remains, however, that the State of California pays $7 billion annually into the Federal Treasury in taxes. Some small part of this money finances the Federal flood-control and reclamation programs. We have reason to believe that these programs will not be stopped for the other States, and if they aren't stopped for the other States, and if we help finance them through taxes, then California is entitled to its rightful share. Inasmuch as it is unlikely the Federal Government will abandon these national Federal flood-control programs and reclamation programs, I think there is a continuing obligation on the part of the State to say what projects would best meet the State's water needs.

On the second point, if the State is going to construct those projects needed, but not constructed by Federal or local agencies, then we must determine what is in prospect by those agencies. To illustrate the points I wish to make in the few minutes available, I shall take the Central Valley Basin as an example. Let's take Federal projects first.

The Corps of Engineers is working on a program that will enable them to start construction in the next 2 or 3 years on Black Butte Dam on Stony Creek, New Hogan Dam on the Calaveras River, and New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River. Iron Canyon Dam on the Sacramento River is already authorized and is a possibility for early construction.

The Bureau of Reclamation is completing a feasibility report this year and legislation is pending before the Congress to authorize construction of the Auburn Dam and related works on the American River. It would create a lake as large as Folsom. The Bureau is also preparing a report on the Nashville Dam on the Cosumnes River and another on the Bullards Bar Dam on the Yuba River.

As for local agencies, there are significant projects being constructed or about ready to start. Close to home you have the Oroville-Wyandotte Irrigation District's project being pushed forward in cooperation with the PG&E.

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District, by which I am employed, has started construction of a project that will include 9 dams and 4 powerplants. It will harness water on the south fork of the American River and some of its tributaries. The PG&E has been working to obtain better regulation on the Kings River and developing additional power resources on the Feather River.

The State is also constructing a dam and reservoir 5 miles north of Madera. It is being built under the auspices of the Wildlife Conservation Board. It is a fishing reservoir which will have a capacity of about 5,000 acre-feet. There is quite a difference between this recreation reservoir and the $1½ billion Feather River project whose principal dam alone will cost nearly $500 million. The total Feather River project will cost nearly twice the amount of money that has been spent on the Central Valley project in the last 22 years. We are talking about several other multi-million-dollar projects for State construction in addition to the Feather River project.

In substance it boils down to this: We can't, as a State, assume the total job of water development or in fact a very large part of it all at once. Therefore, we need to establish a total program to meet the needs for a given number of years and subtract from it those projects which can be built by Federal or local agencies. The balance will represent the job the State must do to keep pace with the State's water requirements.

The third point I make is that we are now placing too much emphasis on the California water plan and detailed planning for projects which are many years in the future. The California water plan has been prepared over the past several years and published as an official document of the State. It is a good overall plan. It brings up to date the State water plan as published in 1931. There has been at times heated debate in the legislature and a lot of time has been devoted as to whether the plan should be officially authorized by the State. The California water plan has not been adopted by the legislature and possibly it never will be in all its detail. Inasmuch as it will serve as a guide for State water development to bring about optimum use of the State's water resources, it is probably not necessary that it be adopted or authorized as an overall plan.

As each individual project in the plan reaches the construction stage by either Federal, State, or local agencies, there is nothing to prevent us from scrutinizing the proposal at that time to see how it conforms to the overall State plan. That should give us sufficient protection as we go forward developing the State's water resources.

There appears to be a great deal of effort on detailed planning of projects which cannot possibly be financed for many years in the future. Circumstances will doubtless bring about further changes before these projects are constructed. We should not try to resolve all these problems in every detail too far in advance.

The fourth point I make is that too little emphasis has been placed on immediate needs for water and the water that is now available from completed reservoirs or those under construction. First as to need: Doubtless the San Diego area is more in need of water than other areas in southern California at this time. Noted authorities have differed on the date when additional water needs to be available in other southern California areas. Some have said 1970—others have said 1975. In the Central Valley Basin, the west side of the San Joaquin Valley appears to be the area most in need of a supplemental water supply. This is the area that would be served by the San Luis Canal and Reservoir. It is reported that in an area where they depend upon pumps, the groundwater table is dropping at the alarming rate of 25 feet a year on the average. In some areas water is being pumped as far as 600 feet. The San Luis area is an area that is desperately in need of supplemental water if the State is going to protect the huge gross agricultural production of that area which so vitally affects the San Joaquin Valley. It is reported that other areas of lesser size on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley also are in immediate need of supplemental water supplies. In short, we need to pinpoint those areas that need water in the next 5 years. There is also a need for determining the amount of water now available from completed storage reservoirs or those under construction. To my knowledge, there is not any public statement by the State or the Federal agencies which shows how much water is presently available for use in the Central Valley in average years and dry years.

The Corps of Engineers have indicated that the New Hogan Dam and the Black Butte Dam will add another 100,000 feet of water annually to the regulated supply. But more to the point, Folsom Dam is constructed and operating on the American River. It was estimated to have an annual yield of more than 1,000,000 acre-feet per year. Although a commitment has been made for future

use to the City of Sacramento, the fact remains that developed water supplies at Folsom are not being sold. Canals to use this water were proposed from Folsom North, from Folsom South, and in Alameda County and the Santa Clara Valley. None of these canals has been authorized. The Monticello Dam on Putah Creek, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, is now filling. Its entire yield is not yet fully used. Taking into account present use, it appears that over 100,000 acre-feet of water is available for subcontract by the contracting agency. Another 1 million acre-feet will be available when the Trinity River Dam now under construction is in operation. The nine reservoirs of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District will produce additional annual regulated water supplies of about 100,000 acre-feet. This, coupled with purchases from Folsom Reservoir in relatively small amounts, will meet the needs of the Sacramento area for the next 75 years.

As I said, we don't have the specific figures, but it appears clear that at the present time there is a possible million and a half or two million acre-feet of regulated water annually in average years available above the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which is not now being put to use. The more important question is, How much water is presently available if we have a return of dry years as in 1930 and 1931? Going back to my question about businessmen who want to sell a product, I said we surely want to know what amount of the product is presently available and how much more can be sold without saturating the market. A reserve is necessary, but we should know what it is at this time.

I am not unmindful that the Federal and local programs of water development may not be enough to keep pace with the State's growth in the future. From a cursory examination it appears the State will have to step in and pick up some share of the construction load. But the first thing we need to do is establish the need, determine what water is presently available to meet those needs under average and dry year conditions, and then outline a program of projects, stage by stage, that will permit the State to keep pace with the growing needs.

Obviously, the most pressing problems we face at the moment are flood control on the Feather River and authorization and construction of the San Luis Canal and Reservoir to put to use water that is now wasting in the Pacific Ocean. This amount of wasting water will increase as soon as the Tinity River project is completed. The San Luis Canal and Reservoir should be so planned and developed that it will without a doubt fit into the growing program for serving water to the upper San Joaquin Valley and southern California.

The fifth point I make is that California's water problem is not really a water problem as such, but is essentially a financial problem. The State department of water resources and its predecessors have made extensive studies over the years which show the State has sufficient water within its boundaries to meet the probable needs for years and years to come. Engineering plans have been worked out which will transport the water from the areas of origin to the areas of deficiency. In several areas of origin these works will develop water for use locally. Everyone is in favor of water development and is in general agreement on it until we get down to the part of the program that raises the question as to who will pay for it. As a State, our big problem is more one of money than total water supply. Mr. Alan Post, the legislative analyst, has estimated we will have a State deficit of about $250 million. The "rainy day fund" will have been used. The needs of schools, highway construction, hospitals, and other obligations of the State make it clear that we need to raise additional revenues. Financing water projects is and will be our most difficult job. The engineering as compared to the financing is relatively simple.

In addition to these five points, I want to discuss another subject of importance to you. There was, naturally, a great disapointment in the Oroville area and other areas when the legislature failed to appropriate funds to start construction of Oroville Dam. This brings up a point that I think needs to be put out on the table. It is one of the difficulties to be faced in getting stared on the dam itself. It was one of the factors that had a bearing on the legislature's decision not to appropriate funds. That is whether the main Feather River Dam should be built at the Bidwell Bar site or closer to Oroville. In the last few hours of the special session a Senate resolution was passed calling for a study of this problem.

Some of you will recall that in 1949 we had a meeting in this hotel and announced agreement by the State of California, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation on the Oroville site if the Feather River was to be completely controlled. A year or so after that decision the Bureau of Reclamation engineers discovered an alternative plan and notified the State engineer they were studying it. The implication was the Bureau could no longer give unqualified approval of the Oroville site. Recently the Weber Foundation has reported that substantial savings can be made and the primary objectives can be achieved if the Bidwell Bar site is used instead of the site by the State highway bridge for construction of a dam near Oroville. The Weber Foundation says that studes show the 218,000 second-foot peak in 1955 flood at Oroville could have been reduced to 100,000 second-feet with the large structure near the highway bridge. The same flood could have been reduced to 130,000 second-feet with the Bidwell Bar Dam. This is a difference of 30,000 second-feet in flood control, but a dam at either site would have prevented the Yuba City disaster. The question is whether this little extra flood control and the extra conservation storage is worth the extra cost at this time. As long as this question is unsolved, it will be a continuing struggle to get construction started on a large storage reservoir near Oroville.

The California Water Commission or an appropriate committee of the legislature can perform a real public service by getting the facts out on the table, by bringing out in public meetings the views of the State department of water resources, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and any other interested parties so that it can be determined conclusively which is the best course to follow at the present time in view of present needs, present water supplies, available funds, and sound economy. I, for one, don't have the answer. Like most others, I don't have the full facts.

With the emphasis I have earlier placed on available water supplies, you might easily assume I would favor deferring construction of a large dam on the Feather River. That is not the case. We need to proceed with construction as soon as possible to prevent the angry flood waters of the Feather River from repeating the devastation of December 1955. Your neighbors below have piled enough sandbags. It appears to be an appropriate job for the State to build a large dam on the lower Feather River. In specifying the reasons for proceeding with construction now, we only have to look at Shasta Dam. It was built fortunately before the war at a great saving in dollars by today's standards. The powerplants were on the line and assisting late in the war effort and for some years thereafter it was operated primary as a flood-control and power project. The irrigation demands have been slowly increasing, but in those early years of operation, substantial revenues were obtained from the sale of power. This helped build up a surplus in the repayment program. It also earned its way from flood protection as did the Folsom Dam when it protected the Sacramento metropolitan area even before it was completed. Unfortunately we have continuing inflation. When all of these factors are considered, the State will be well advised to proceed as fast as it can on the contsruction of a large storage dam near Oroville. It won't get any cheaper.

You may think it odd that I have skipped the so-called water rights conflict between the north and the south, the so-called areas of origin, and the areas of deficiency. There just isn't time to discuss them. Suffice it to say that the areas of origin are not as well protected as some people think. I recommend to you for reading a copy of a talk that was given by Mr. William R. Gianelli, principal engineer of the State Department of Water Resources, on April 15, before the Sacramento section of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Mr. Gianelli goes into this subject in a very celar way. I will drop that item with a recommendation to those of you who are interested that you obtain a copy of Mr. Gianelli's talk.

In conclusion let me summarize. First, we have certain fundamental questions that a businessman should ask as we go into the water business in California. In addition, I repeat, the State should take positive leadership in establishing and coordinating the total California water program—Federal, State, and local. The State should construct only those projects necessary to keep pace with our needs which cannot be met from Federal or local projects, both public and private. We are placing now too much emphasis on the California water plan and detailed planning of projects which are many years in the future. We are placing too little emphasis on a specific short-term California water program, the immediate needs for water and a determination of the amount of water that is now available from completed storage reservoirs or those under construction. Lastly, the California water problem is not really a water problem as such, but is a very difficult financial problem. The financial problem requires that we face up to all the difficulties of allocation of costs, the pricing of water and power, the laws giving preference to public agencies, the establishment of "basin accounts" and all the intricate problems of repayment of the cost of water projects. Also, it will require that we determine the values to our fishery resources and the value of the outdoor recreation possibilities that will be created by water development. Some of these costs doubtless should be "nonreimbursable" as far as the water and the power users are concerned.

I believe we can make some sense out of California's water problems if we will put the difficulties out on the table, draw on the experience of all interested agencies, debate the issues fully and publicize the various views widely.

In closing, I call your attention to a quotation that is inscribed on the wall of the House of Representatives above the Speaker's chair in the Nation's Capitol. It should be a constant reminder and a challenge to those of us who are concerned with water problems.

"Let us develop the resources of this land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Revenue-Bond Financing for the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the statement of Mr. Philip Sporn, president of the American Electric Power Co., before the Committee on Public Works of the House during hearings on S. 1869, to provide revenue-bond financing for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Sporn is a pioneer in the electric-power industry in this country. Furthermore, he is recognized internationally not only as a topflight industrialist but also as one of the world's outstanding electrical engineers.

His testimony in opposition to S. 1869 is a crystal-clear presentation of the compelling arguments against this legislation, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress, particularly those among us who still retain our fundamental belief in the free, private-enterprise system.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF PHILIP SPORN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER CO., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON S. 1869, TO PROVIDE REVENUE-BOND FINANCING FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, JULY 1958

My name is Philip Sporn. I am an engineer by profession and president of American Electric Power Co. The American Electric Power system provides electric power in parts of seven States—Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

The entire physical plant of the American Electric Power system is closely integrated. The plant consists of a number of strategically located, large generating plants of the most modern design, a high-voltage transmission network which ties these plants together, and distribution systems which bring power to homes, commercial establishments, factories, and farms. The boundaries of our system's service area are contiguous to those of TVA in some places—particularly in northern Tennessee and southwestern Virginia—and very close to TVA for substantial distances in other places. We are, therefore, directly affected by S. 1869.

I requested the opportunity to appear before your committee in order to express my opposition to this bill.

The extensive territorial expansion of TVA since its establishment in 1933 goes beyond anything represented or envisioned by its original sponsors and has naturally been a matter of serious concern to me. Its conversion from a hydro system to what is now predominantly a steam system—a development originally disavowed by TVA—has intensified my concern. The original conception of TVA as a hydro system, marketing power which was supposed to be a by-product of navigation works, was self-limiting in that the number of available dam sites is limited. The conversion to steam and the assumption by TVA of the responsibility for supplying virtually all power needs of the territory it has come to serve confront us today with a situation which, in my opinion, would not have been endorsed by the initial sponsors of the undertaking. The TVA generation and transmission system and the associated distribution systems now comprise the largest electric power system in the United States. TVA is 2½ times as large as our own system—which ranks next in order of size.

The radical departures from the original conception of TVA provide good reason for our apprehensions that it could develop into an institution that would seriously damage other utilities and their security holders.

Despite our continuing concern about TVA, American Electric Power Co. and TVA have a long record of cooperative arrangements for interchange of power and for assisting each other in emergencies. I think, too, TVA would not quarrel with the statement that the knowledge obtained in the pioneering work which American Electric Power Co. has done on higher temperatures and higher pressures, with consequent economies in steam generation, has been made freely available by our companies to TVA and has been used profitably by the Authority in developing its own steam plants.

I want to go clearly on record that I do not believe that in matters of this sort we can turn the clock back. Whatever my apprehensions about the Authority, past and present, the fact is that it is now relied upon to furnish electric power throughout an extensive area of the country. As an engineer familiar with utility economics, I know that such power requirements can best be supplied by a central system of strategically located large generating plants integrated through heavy transmission lines. The cost of the new capacity, which must be installed to keep ahead of demand, requires more money, in the long run, than can be derived from operations alone. For many years the extra money needed for TVA expansion has been obtained by appropriations. Now the committee has before it a measure which would enable TVA to finance its expansion by issuing its own revenue bonds. I fully recognize the need to establish a sound legislative policy to enable TVA to install sufficient new capacity to supply the requirements of its existing service area. But I oppose S. 1869 because I think it does not establish a sound policy.

The question of revenue bond financing for a federally owned commercial operation—and that is what TVA is—is a matter which I have studied seriously for a long time. For a variety of reasons it is my considered opinion that revenue bond financing for such activities of the Federal Government is unwise and can be dangerous.

TVA has a virtual monopoly on power supply in the part of the country it serves just as our company has in its service area. In most segments of our economy we can rely on competition to assure efficiency and the best product for the least money. But duplication of facilities is too costly to be permitted in an industry like ours where enormous capital investments are required in proportion to revenues. In the case of the utilities, we are subject to an elaborate system of Federal and State regulation to make sure that the privilege of monopoly is not abused. Our own system is regulated by seven State commissions, the SEC and the FPC. Detailed regulation of business by the Government is not an easy condition to live with. In the utility industry we recognize that it is necessary.

TVA, however, is an unregulated monopoly except for the supervision through the budgetary process of the Government and congressional controls of the purse strings. I am convinced that the dangers which exist in monopoly are not eliminated simply because the monopoly is exercised by Government rather than business. So it seems to me that the traditional process of budgetary controls and congressional controls, is at least as necessary in the case of TVA as the system of Federal and State regulation of utility companies. Generally speaking, these are the considerations that have led me to the conclusion that revenue bond financing is unwise and probably dangerous. Inevitably revenue bond financing will loosen executive and congressional supervision of TVA because it will lessen congressional control of the purse strings. Long experience with unregulated monopolies has taught us that it is no idle fear to be apprehensive about their abuses even when enterprises are administered by well-intentioned and competent men. We have every reason to be afraid that such abuses are likely to occur in proportion to the loosening of congressional control over TVA.

I am opposed to revenue bond financing for TVA. I am aware, however, that the Congress may decide in the end to adopt this device. Because of this possibility, I have addressed myself to the provisions of S. 1869 for the purpose of submitting my views about the worst features of it.

When TVA was originally set up, it was given an autonomy for which there was little precedent in the management of Federal agencies. S. 1869 would greatly extend the already autonomous character of TVA. In the interest of protecting consumers, the public at large, and other utilities from abuses of monopoly, this bill should at least preserve existing measures of congressional control. If TVA is to be given the still further independence that accompanies the revenue bond authority, it ought, in the interest of good government, to have its budget reviewed annually by the Bureau of the Budget. And it ought, also, to be subject to some form of annual review of its operations equivalent to the review now existing in the appropriations process of the Congress and its committees. These two supervisory devices assure that TVA cannot cut loose from executive and congressional control and follow instead the unsupervised and unrestrained control of a 3-man board, each of whom is appointed for a 9-year term. Even with revenue bonds, provision can and should be made to subject TVA to the same supervision as other independent agencies under the Government budgetary procedures and congressional authorization and appropriation measures.

The arguments advanced to support the repeals of existing controls are based on the asserted need for flexibility by TVA in its operation. It is understandable that the agency concerned would urge the elimination or loosening of existing controls. But the original sponsors of TVA certainly thought that they had given TVA all the necessary—and, indeed, a unique—flexibility at the time the agency was set up. The best evidence of the fact that TVA can operate effectively under existing executive and congressional controls is that it has done and is doing so at the present time.

The second essential feature, as it appears to me, if any revenue bond plan is adopted by the Congress, is provision for defining specifically the area which TVA may serve. Only through such action by the Congress will it be possible to avoid the danger of unlimited extension of what is already by far the largest power system in the country.

It is not a difficult matter to draft language that would define the TVA service area, especially since spokesmen of the TVA have said repeatedly over the years that the Authority has no intention of making any except the most minor territorial expansions. A provision in the law which merely codifies in effective legal terms the assurances that TVA spokesmen have given, would go a long way toward minimizing the dangers in the bill before this committee.

S. 1869 does provide that facilities financed with bond proceeds or power revenues should

not be used for the sale or delivery of power by TVA outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the drainage basin or TVA's existing service area. Exceptions to this provision include service to Federal agencies or interconnection arrangements with other utility systems. There is also a proviso to the effect that any distributor receiving TVA power shall confine the resale of such power within the counties described above and such additional areas—not more than 5 miles from such boundaries—as may be necessary to take care of the growth of communities receiving TVA power. The proponents of this bill have reported the intention of the provision to be to confine TVA to its existing service area with only minor flexibility.

Whatever the intention of the draftsman, a study of the map of TVA's present system quickly reveals that the effect of this provision in S. 1869 would be to permit, and indeed, invite, expansion of TVA's service area into an additional area of some 25,000 square miles—more than 30 percent expansion of TVA's existing service area. The 25,000-square-mile figure is made up of the sections in the Tennessee River drainage basin now served by other utilities and the remainder of the counties now served in part by TVA and in part by others. (The 5-mile further allowance would add to this figure.) A substantial portion of this 25,000-square-mile area in northern Tennessee and southwestern Virginia is now served by two of our operating companies.

Moreover, the expansion permitted under S. 1869 could readily take place over a much wider area than the 25,000 square miles which can be spotted by even casual examination of maps. For example, S. 1869 would permit the use of existing facilities or new facilities financed otherwise than with the proceeds of bonds or with power revenues, such as customer financed lines, to expand TVA's service without any limitation at all. And except for the proviso which refers only to a distributor, the bill does not prohibit the purchase of power within the service area for use outside. There is, for example, nothing in the provision to prevent an industrial customer from taking delivery of power within the loosely defined area and using it outside. Power may also be sold or delivered to a Federal agency wherever located. It is not clear whether the priviso against resale by a distributor would apply to a Federal agency. If it did not, the right to sell TVA power to such Federal agencies as Southeastern Power Administration and Southwestern Power Administration for resale would also permit unchecked expansion of the area in which TVA power could be used.

In sum, the effect of the so-called territorial limitation in S. 1869 is to invite TVA to serve at least another 25,000 square miles of territory in which other utilities are now operating and, because of the looseness with which the provision is drawn, the bill could be construed in such a way as to permit unlimited expansion beyond such 25,000 square miles.

When one recalls TVA's disavowal of any intention to build steam plants, followed a decade later by insistence by TVA that it had to build such steam plants, it is not fanciful to speak of the territorial expansions which I have just described.

I must stress that I am not suggesting that TVA should not expand its capacity within its present service area as fully as may be required by the needs of that area. I am not even suggesting that there may not be occasions where minor territorial expansion might be justified—although I know of none today. I am urging only that, if and when TVA wants to extend its area geographically, it should be required to justify its plans to the Congress and secure specific congressional authorization before it proceeds.

I feel that now in particular great and unjustifiable harm would be done to our company if TVA were permitted to serve that part of southwest Virginia within the Tennessee River drainage basin that we now serve. Some years ago we undertook a development in that section which is costing close to $100 million. The Clinchfield Coal Co. and the Norfolk and Western Railroad are participants in the program. Our company is spending more than $65 million of the total. The immediate result will be a modern 450,000 kilowatt new steam electric plant built by us at Carbo, the development of a 20,000-ton per day new coal mine by the coal company, the building of a new concrete aggregate plant by the same company and the completion of extensive additions and other works by the railroad. We confidently expect other industrial enterprises, stimulated by our work, will establish plants in the area. We provide good electric service in this area. We are leading the area to an industrial awakening. We are making an immense investment for that purpose. It is hard for me to believe that this committee or the Congress would approve a bill that would allow TVA to serve this area. But S. 1869 is just such a bill.

In my testimony I have concentrated on two features of the bill before this committee, namely, the abolition of effective congressional control over TVA and the failure to define the TVA territory in such a way as to prevent unchecked expansion without further reference to the Congress.

These impress me as the worst dangers in the bill. There are other features however which I strongly believe should be changed if the revenue bond financing idea is to be adopted.

The bill relieves TVA of the requirement of Treasury Department approval of its bonds. It is argued that such Treasury control is unnecessary because the revenue bonds are not to be obligations of the Federal Government. But TVA is a Government agency and its obligations and credit are inevitably related to the obligations of the Federal Government; indeed, Senator KERR and other sponsors of the legislation have expressly stated that as a practical matter the credit of the United States will stand back of TVA's bonds. The underlying basis for Treasury approval now necessary under the Government Corporation Control Act is that the obligations of a Government corporation will necessarily affect the fiscal and financial position of the Government. Since the Treasury Department has the primary responsibility for the Government's fiscal and financial policies, the terms of any such corporation's obligations should be subject to supervision by the Treasury. There is no good reason why existing requirements for such supervision should be made inapplicable to TVA revenue bonds.

The bill under consideration would repeal the existing requirement for the 40-year amortization of TVA's appropriation investment which amounts to some $1,200,000,000. The bill would make the Government's investment junior in all respects to the claims of revenue bondholders. It would provide for the payment of an annual return, measured by the average interest rate paid by the Government on all of its obligations—including short-term, low-interest debt. This annual return on the appropriation investment would be supplemented, by payment of $10 million a year to repay such investment. This repayment would thus take a minimum of 120 years. The bill gives no recognition whatever to that part of the Government's investment, amounting to well over $400 million derived from income accumulated by TVA, over the past years as a return on the Government's appropriations—but which has been reinvested in TVA—not paid over to the Treasury.

The effect of these provisions is to provide TVA with the equivalent of a 120-year serial loan of some $1,200,000,000 (the appropriation investment) at a lower interest rate than the Government itself must pay on its long-term obligations and with a permanent grant of well over $400 million (the retained earnings) on which TVA will pay no return or interest at all. At the very least, the requirement of existing law for 40-year repayment of the appropriation investment should be continued and TVA should be required to pay interest or a return on that portion of the total Government investment which has not been repaid. And such interest or return should be at a rate which is at least equal to the interest which the Government has to pay on its long-term obligations.

It will be argued that the measures of control which I urge should be retained will unduly hamper TVA. I submit to the committee that the net effect of the suggestions I have made would produce for the TVA a system of supervision no more onerous than the system of Federal and State regulations with which utility companies must comply. They are measures of control under which TVA has, in fact, operated successfully for many years.

Seely-Brown Will Defeat Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I predict the reelection of my colleague, Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., who so ably represents the Second District of Connecticut, and the defeat of his opponent, Chester Bowles.

The Second District of Connecticut as presently constituted has never elected a Democrat to Congress in an off-year election, and it will vote Republican again in 1958.

The voters will prefer HORACE SEELY-BROWN, their hard-working, conscientious Congressman. He keeps in personal contact with thousands of his constituents, helps them with their problems, knows how they feel on national issues and votes accordingly. He takes his job seriously for the service he can render his constituents.

In contrast, the congressional nomination is just a consolation prize to Chester Bowles after his failure to obtain the senatorial nomination. He probably regards it as a mere stepping stone to some more glamorous position.

His past history does not recommend him to the voters.

As OPA Director he was responsible for the sorry mess of national controls and rationing. He messed up this job so badly that Connecticut went Republican by 100,000 votes in 1946.

As Ambassador to India, he gained himself a lot of personal publicity, but failed to make Nehru our friend in world affairs.

In both domestic and foreign affairs he has consistently followed the left-wing line of the Americans for Democratic Action, who advocated repeal of the Smith Act which provided for the

conviction of those who would overthrow the Government by force or violence. Bowles served as ADA vice chairman.

As Governor of Connecticut he advocated higher taxes and tried to have an income-tax law enacted. As Governor for a single term he played havoc in 2 years with the traditions of Connecticut attempting to abolish ancient and honorable commissions on which our dedicated citizens serve without pay or emoluments of any kind. There is nothing more dangerous than a little knowledge, as the old saying goes. With little knowledge of State affairs, of State politics he created a situation in Hartford that made even the Democrats welcome his defeat.

When the Democratic Party of the State of Connecticut rejected him for Senator, he had his friends steamroller him into the nomination in the Second District thereby creating a split in his own party and forcing himself down the throats of helpless Democrats.

For the good of the State and Nation, Chester Bowles must and will be defeated as a candidate for the House of Representatives from the Second District of Connecticut.

I am confident that the voters will reelect HORACE SEELY-BROWN, their family type Congressman, dedicated to high principles, a statesman with the personal touch.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Connecticut newsman Jack Zaiman which appeared in the Washington Post, August 5. It is entitled "Bowles Must Defeat Off-Year Tradition":

BOWLES MUST DEFEAT OFF-YEAR TRADITION

(By Jack Zaiman)

HARTFORD, CONN., August 4.—Chester Bowles, who wanted to run for the Senate but wound up running for the House, finds himself in the position of not only having to fight a Republican opponent but also history.

For the Second Congressional District, the largest in the State from the standpoint of geography, has never gone Democratic in an off-year. The Second District, as presently constituted, dates from 1912.

There is some evidence that Bowles, when he agreed to run for the House after his defeat for the Senate nomination, was not aware of the Democratic off-year jinx. He knows about it now, however. He promises to wage the most energetic Democratic campaign in modern election history.

The Republican incumbant is Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., who has held the seat—except for a 2-year gap—since 1946. SEELY-BROWN is a tall, handsome former private schoolteacher who now is a farmer. His specialty is doorbell ringing and the distribution of potholders to housewives.

MANY SMALL TOWNS

There's plenty of room for such house-to-house activity. For the district covers 64 towns, most of them of the smallest variety. There are 169 towns in the State. The area covers all of eastern Connecticut, which is a depressed textile area in the north, a farming area in all sections, and a Long Island Sound beach resort in the south.

If history is to be followed, Bowles cannot win.

But more than history is involved. There is a feeling that Bowles will break the jinx and become the first of his party to go to Congress in a year when a President isn't being elected.

The extraordinary feature of the statewide election is the strength of Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, who is seeking his second 4-year term on the Democratic slate, and of Thomas J. Dodd, the senatorial nominee who defeated Bowles and his former advertising partner, William Benton.

Dodd was born in Norwich, which is in the heart of the Second District, and has lived in other towns in the area. Ribicoff has done well in the district. And the Democratic nominee for lieutenant governor also comes from the Second District. He is Mayor John Dempsey of Putnam, a popular figure who could have had the congressional nomination if he wanted it.

This Democratic strength over east, as the Second District is known, is expected to give Bowles the extra punch he needs. For, in the 1954 election, SEELY-BROWN just squeaked in by 1,980 votes out of more than 150,000 cast. And the Democrats on the State level are regarded as a lot stronger this year than in 1954, the last off-year election.

A switch of about 1,000 votes in the district would give Bowles the victory—on the basis of the 1954 results.

But the Republican nominee for Governor, State Comptroller Fred R. Zeller, of Stonington, also lives in the Second District. And his presence on the ticket may help SEELY-BROWN somewhat.

Bowles has been in Maine since before he was nominated last month in a contest with a young Rockville lawyer, Leo Flaherty, Jr. Flaherty has promised Bowles his support.

FOREIGN POLICY ISSUE

Bowles is expected to make foreign policy one of the features of his campaign. But he has told friends he won't ignore the regional problems of the district—farming, attraction of new industry, new highways, the textile depression, new employment.

Some State Democratic leaders say that Bowles, if elected, will try for a seat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and that gestures to Democratic congressional leaders already have been made along this line.

Just what made Bowles change his mind about running for the House isn't known. Twenty-four hours after his defeat for the Senate on June 28, he told a reporter flatly: "I'm not interested in the House."

Forty-eight hours after that, he was running for the House nomination in absentia. Perhaps it was a telephone conversation with Governor Ribicoff, who urged him to take it. Or perhaps his own advisers urged it on him. In any event, what was "no" one day became "yes" within a short time, and the contest between Bowles and SEELY-BROWN looms as one of the most interesting in the State.

A Cultural Center for the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am enthusiastic in my support of the proposed Cultural Center in Washington, D. C., as provided for in H. R. 13017.

The city of Washington is the focal point of world interest. It is a meeting place literally of hundreds of thousands of tourists. Consequently, the need for such a center for the performing arts is obvious.

Witness after witness of unquestioned integrity, including distinguished Senators, architects, a newspaper editor, and interested citizens, have testified with impressive unanimity that there is a great demand for this worthy enterprise.

I support the measure and hope for favorable consideration from this distinguished body. The Cultural Center which will rise if the Fulbright-Thompson bill is enacted into law will add immeasurably to the well-being of the people of our Nation. It will be an inspiration and a beneficent motivating force for the youth of our country. It will be a symbol of our dynamic democracy, a center for the peaceful arts, and a lasting memorial to the deep sense of appreciation which the American people have for the finer things of life.

A Tribute to Capt. John T. Ferrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last August I had the privilege of witnessing an amazing demonstration of precision flying by the Minute Men, the precision jet flying team of the Air National Guard.

This unit appeared at the conservation sports tourney in Davenport, Iowa, sponsored by the Davenport chapter of the Izaak Walton League in conjunction with the Buffalo Bill area council of the Boys Scouts of America.

I had a chance to meet each member of the team at that time. I was impressed by these fliers and proud of the fact that men of this caliber and fitness were a part of our first line of defense.

On June 7, of this year, Capt. John Ferrier, "slot" position pilot on the team, was killed during an airshow at Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. It is the belief of all who witnessed the accident that Captain Ferrier sacrificed his life to protect the people in the residential section adjacent to Patterson Air Force Base. Although he had ample opportunity to successfully eject himself from the crippled aircraft, he obviously elected to stay with his jet until the last possible moment to divert its course into a nonpopulated area. He was successful in doing so, but in the process was forced to wait too long to have sufficient time to escape.

In an editorial, the Denver Post has called this the highest brand of heroism. I would like to quote a few lines of the editorial which eloquently express the tribute due Captain Ferrier:

It was the kind of heroism that keeps the fine traditions of our fighting forces fresh. Nothing replaces a living father; but Captain Ferrier's children will grow up knowing their father passed the test of heroism as gloriously as anyone has ever done.

The Davenport area will long remember Captain Ferrier. His memory is to

be perpetuated in the Capt. John T. Ferrier Memorial Award Trophy which will be presented to the scout or explorer having the best character, sportsmanship, leadership, and highest score in this year's tournament scheduled for Davenport August 10. Such an award will become a feature of all succeeding sport tournaments sponsored by the Izaak Walton League and the Boy Scouts of the Davenport area.

It pleases me to see this action taken. Captain Ferrier was the prototype of every young American's ideal airman. His heroism will inspire youngsters for generations to come.

Economy Heading Upward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of August 4, 1958:

ECONOMY HEADING UPWARD

Although the recession headache has not been completely routed, there are signs that the sharpest pains are gone and the economic patient is getting better.

The situation might be described as cautiously optimistic. The bottom of the recession was reached in April, 1958, making it the shortest on record. Recovery began 9 months after the onset of the economic downturn, putting it 2 months ahead of the 1949 recession and 4 months ahead of the 1954 business slide.

Among the plus factors present are these:

Farmers' income in the first half of 1958 was up 22 percent from the first half of 1957.

Personal income is running at only $300 million below the peak reached last August when the recession began.

Factory payrolls are up, and the April-June spurt in industrial production was much more vigorous than is customary in the early stages of a recovery.

Another encouraging sign is that consumer confidence has remained strong. The stock market's health is good, an indication that investor confidence is strong.

Economists expect that an expanding population and an expanding money supply will provide the basic supports for a rise in business activity in the months ahead.

There are soft spots. Business appears to be waiting to see which way the wind blows before embarking on great new expenditures for plants and equipment. Questions about better times for hard goods may be answered when the 1959 autos appear in the fall.

Machinery, radio, television, paper products, chemicals, aircraft, missiles and rubber products are making a comeback. Construction has remained strong, as have oil, steel and government spending.

Other plus signs may appear when the railroads begin to realize help from beneficial legislation just passed by Congress.

Meanwhile, the economy is preparing to expand on the gains it has registered on the road back from recession. If the economy can stay ahead of galloping inflation, the future looks bright.

What's Most Important?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Marshall Daily Messenger of August 1, 1958.

On several occasions I have called the attention of my colleagues to the contributions made to public understanding by the editorial pens of our country editors. Without the burdens and pressures of big-city life, our country and small-city editors demonstrate an unusual ability to understand and evaluate the basic problems of people.

The editor of the Marshall Daily Messenger is such a man. Donald J. Olson is a young man who demonstrates in some of his editorials a wisdom and understanding far beyond his years and experience. In the editorial I am including in the RECORD he has made the best case for soil and water conservation which has yet come to my attention.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and hope that every conservation journal in the Nation sees fit to bring its clear purpose to the attention of other readers:

WHAT'S MOST IMPORTANT?

Right now it seems most people are thinking of the proposed watershed district as a flood-control plan. Certainly the picture of water flowing knee deep down normally dry streets makes a dramatic and frightening impression. And whatever losses that are sustained in flooded homes and stores are felt suddenly and immediately. That, probably, is the reason last year's heavy June rains are connected with floods, flood control, and watershed districts.

But, in the long run, there are a couple of other aspects to the proposed watershed district that are important to the overall welfare of this community.

We are thinking about soil conservation and water conservation.

An operating watershed district with all of the necessary conservation practices definitely will hold topsoil. This is an economic gain for any agricultural community. Last year's flood moved topsoil in this area in such staggering quantity that it was described in terms of train carloads.

It has often been said that it takes 100 years for nature to manufacture 1 inch of topsoil.

An operating watershed district benefits a community also during the years when there is the exact opposite of a flood: when a drought hits. Shortly after the State of Texas was severely damaged by excessive rainfall a year ago, a short-term drought hit that same area.

On the land that had good soil and water conservation practices, the drought meant little because the earlier rainfall had sunk down to bedrock. On the "untreated" land, the earlier rains had run off the cropland (causing the flood) and had sunk down only a few inches.

Iowa State College has been reported as saying that 3 extra inches of rainfall during the crop-year may mean at least 10 extra bushels of corn if the moisture sinks into the ground and is available to the plants.

If water conservation practices could save three inches of rainfall, holding it on the land, this area could expect higher corn yields. In a dry year it could be tremendously important to each individual farmer.

On a communitywide basis, the benefit could be amazing.

Upstream from Marshall, on the Redwood River watershed, there are about 250,000 acres of land. About 80 percent of that figure is cropland and about 50 percent of the cropland is in corn each year.

Extend these figures and it's easy to see what the impact of this additional wealth could mean to this area.

A program designed to hold topsoil on the land and conserving moisture for use during drought lacks the glamour and drama of giant flood-control works. But just the same we believe the conservation of our basic resources—our farmland—is the most important aspect of the watershed district program.

Fair Trade Is Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the Texas Legislature, as in every session since the midthirties, a price-control bill ostensibly aimed at fair trade reared its head.

Editorial cries of outrage from every corner of the State properly shouted down this latest effort of the price controllers.

While these editorial comments were directed toward a State-level offspring of the sort of fair-trade bill currently being pushed in Congress, the comments are pertinent and appropriate to both bills equally, and I submit some of this editorial opinion to you at this time.

The Austin American-Statesman:

The principle of price regulation by law is contrary to free enterprise and free competition. The result of the policy of legislation, whether reached by the first step of preventing price competition indirectly, or by the statutory fiat of fixed markup, is to raise prices.

The Houston Press:

Fair trade has been carried to its ultimate conclusion in England where all sorts of agreements, cartels, price fixing and restrictions are a major part of business life. More than any other one factor, we believe, this has been responsible for England's ills.

San Antonio News:

In practice, we do not think the small grocers would benefit substantially from passage of those bills. Those stores serve a useful and profitable distribution function, but they simply cannot compete directly, in the same area of trade, with the more efficient and economical mass-distribution outlets, which are highly competitive among themselves. And any attempt to make the independents artificially competitive by law is an indefensible disservice to the consumer, who has the economic right to buy wherever he wants to and at the lowest price he can find.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

This is a negation of free enterprise, under which the owner of an article may dispose of it as he pleases. And no one can argue convincingly that it is in the interest of the customer.

Seguin Enterprise:

We believe in the good old-fashioned American custom of letting prices seek their own levels through the interaction of healthy competition. And there's no kind of whining that will change the fact, or alter its validity as an answer, that the "big guys" we know right here in Seguin started out just as small and just as broke as anybody, and not very long ago. Those bills are not to protect us, the customers. They are to protect the businessmen who are not sufficiently efficient to meet good competition. Good competition means better prices for you and me. So let's keep it that way.

Corpus Christi Times:

Unless there is some affirmative showing that the practice violates unfair competition regulations, the right of a merchant to sell his products at a loss or at a profit should not be infringed. In any event, in the competitive business society we live in, every businessman should have the privilege of going broke. The market place will inevitably take care of the incautious or imprudent merchant.

Fort Worth Press:

In years past, The Press has consistently taken the editorial position that price-fixing, by any other name, works to the detriment of the consumer. This bill is no exception and needs to be defeated.

Denton Record-Chronicle:

Fair trade legislation, under any guise, is damaging to the consuming public.

Miss Anderson to U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of August 3, 1958:

MISS ANDERSON TO U. N.

President Eisenhower's appointment of Miss Marian Anderson, the world-famous contralto, as an alternate delegate to the United Nations deserves applause. Her recent good-will tour of the Far East for the State Department showed that she has a great and warmhearted talent for making friends among other peoples. As our TV columnist Paul Molloy commented on a TV report of her seven-country tour:

"Miss Anderson made it clear to me that a lot of people love us—not because of what's left of our money, but because this country has a lot of fine people like Miss Anderson."

At the U. N., the personal element is more important than the casual observer might suppose. The chance for making friends and influencing peoples by personal contact is always present.

Miss Anderson, born of poor Negro parents in a humble house in south Philadelphia, is at home with royalty as well as commonfolk. As a child she scrubbed steps to earn spending money. She now commands $2,500 for one performance. She is a wonderful example of the American success story, and her appointment is a fine answer to Communist propaganda about the lot of Negroes in the United States.

Another good U. N. appointment was that of Irving Salomon, retired president of the Royal Metal Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, who now lives in California. He is well remembered here as an active civic worker, who after his retirement was appointed head of a United States delegation to the 1953 Paris meeting of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Close to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, appearing in the National Grange Monthly, and written by Herschel D. Newsom, the master of the National Grange, says something that many of us have felt needed saying. Mr. Newsom says it clearly and briefly.

We have gone overboard on the theory that a public official is contaminated or dishonest if he acts like an ordinary human being. If he has friends, if he is helpful, if he tries to be of service to his community, he is accused of taking bribes and of being a crook.

This is carrying suspicion and cynicism altogether too far. If we are going to believe that every kind deed is done with an ulterior motive, that every gift is a bribe, our public life will have reached a new low and very few high-principled men or women will want to go into it.

CLOSE TO THE PEOPLE

Years ago my grandfather resigned as postmaster. He resigned because Federal restrictions made it next to impossible for him to maintain his normal friendly relationships with individuals. Even in that day, grandfather discovered that a public servant must somehow be arbitrary and cold, and he wasn't interested in even trying to meet that requirement.

Attempts to substitute rigid restrictions on individual behavior, for reliance on individual integrity of persons carrying public responsibility is dangerous. Most Members of Congress and individuals in the executive branch of Government know and recognize the difference between right and wrong. They are basically honest, and no rules or regulations can be substituted for a sense of values, honor, and integrity.

To conclude that one must suddenly insulate himself from established and normal friendships upon taking a public post, is to assume that from positions of authority and responsibility, favoritism, or undue influence will automatically flow. This is an unfair assumption that may be vicious.

TREMENDOUS POWER

Our concern must be continually to keep the Federal Government close to the people. Government must be responsive to individuals—and to all segments of society. This is difficult because our Federal Government is now big, complex, unwieldy, and has tremendous power over our lives and property.

Often upon the decision of one official hinges the destiny of an individual, his business, or his whole life.

To insulate public officials and employees from their friends, and from all of the rest of us is to make it extremely difficult to question a decision or finding. It is to short-circuit the right of appeal by pushing the Government out of the reach of you and me.

To be able to complain or make suggestions to your Congressman, Senator, or to the President himself, is a national tradition—a democratic privilege. It is our insurance against unfairness, protection against being pushed around by powerful public agencies, commissions, or persons—a safeguard against abuse from Government; a part of our system of checks and balances.

Let's not be stampeded into a situation whereby a Congressman or Senator or someone at the White House cannot pick up the phone and make inquiry concerning a decision. This need not mean that the inquirer is asking that the decision be changed or reversed. It may well mean that he wants to know the reason for the decision and the background leading up to it.

This is the way to reduce autocratic decisions to a minimum. This is the way to help preserve responsive and responsible government. Public servants must be above legitimate suspicion but they must not be so far above the rest of us that we cannot reach them.

Retirement After 47½ Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, 47½ years of service with one company is an unusual record, but that is what has been accomplished by one of my constituents and good friends, John A. Rupp, of Baltimore. He retired on August 1 after having spent all of these years in the accounting department of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. I am confident that the loss of his faithful and valuable service will be keenly felt by the company.

How does one feel after working in one place for 47½ years and leaving it for retirement? Mr. Rupp has expressed his feelings in a statement written on the eve of his retirement. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert his valedictory in the RECORD, and to take this opportunity to wish him a long and healthy life and a well-deserved happy retirement:

VALEDICTORY: WHAT RETIREMENT FROM B. & O. MEANS TO ME

(By John A. Rupp, former corresponding clerk, Baltimore, Md.)

The day of severance from B. & O. I consider with commingled feelings of joy and sadness, because for 47½ years I have been associated with their accounting department, sharing its many problems and spending every spare moment over and above the required time, but time, tide, and ticker tape wait for no man.

With B. & O. I have been attuned to the practice of courtesy, sobriety, and loyalty. To younger employees in B. & O. service I would emphasize that railroad business like any other business is a living thing, perpetually changing and offering the highest awards

to those of creative minds who are resiliant and resourceful.

A fine railroad has to have fine executives and those who report to them, and the B. & O. has both. I found this condition evident in the accounting department as a synonym for cooperation.

I thank God for having allowed me to work for such length of time in the railroad industry, thus to gain valuable knowledge and information. Books can reinforce native intelligence by buttressing it with facts, but cannot supply the spark of intelligence itself. In other words, actual experience counts most in life. It is also a measure of satisfaction now that I am leaving, that the railroads are getting legislative aids so necessary for their surviving.

In conclusion I quote from an article by Dr. Thomas L. Hawkins, of Helena (liaison representative of the Montana Medical Association to the American Medical Association) reading as follows:

"There is no valid reason why old age should not be the best years of human existence. Instead, we find today that millions of our aged are being shelved as a surplus commodity. We feel we should offer the aged hope for a better life, not a crutch. We should offer them a return to usefulness and self-respect, not a one-way trip to isolation and limbo. Because of recent advances in the control of diseases which shorten life, a greater number of Americans than ever before, have survived into retirement years. We are beginning to learn that there is rarely such a thing as true senility."

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN A. RUPP.

BALTIMORE, MD.

(Written on the 31st day of July 1958 (eve of my retirement).)

Hon. John A. Burns

SPEECH

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the commendations our colleagues are making of the splendid services being rendered to his constituents, his beloved Territory of Hawaii and his Nation by the Hawaiian delegate, Mr. BURNS.

On more than one occasion I have heard our Speaker comment that the House of Representatives is the most critical audience in the world. By this, I think he means among other things that a man cannot deceive his colleagues who serve with him, day in and day out. One's colleagues are apt to know one another's depth and sincerity.

By any test that may be applied, JOHN BURNS has won for himself the respect of those of us who serve with him. He is deeply honest, as all of us know. He has brought to these halls a sincere devotion to Hawaii and the causes of Hawaii. We have observed and admire his ability as Hawaii's spokesman.

Above all, I think we have learned to appreciate JOHN BURNS because there is absolutely none of the demagog in him. He will not stoop to making those idle and meaningless gestures which might superficially appear to those at home to be serving their cause but which, in reality, would hinder their cause in Congress. He is a true and able servant of his people and his country.

Raising the Debt Limit Is Entirely the Result of the Fiscal Irresponsibility of Congress

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, today the Congress is called upon to increase the debt limit of the United States for the second time within a year. As I cautioned this House back in January, if we had followed a course of fiscal prudence we would not be faced with this issue today. As a matter of fact, throughout the 1st session of the 85th Congress, every Member of the House of Representatives should have known our fiscal situation well enough to have avoided even the first debt limit extension by being sensible in the conduct of our fiscal affairs.

Fiscal prudence is not always politically expedient because one who voted along the lines of sound Government economy is certain to alienate many groups seeking special benefits of one type or another. As has been said many times in the past, Government economy is generally popular except when it deprives some individual or group of a pet project or benefit.

Yet, no one can deny that had a general policy of sound Federal spending been followed throughout the last session of Congress and again in 1958, we could have balanced our budgets and we would not be in a position of having to vote two debt increase bills in 1 year. The situation we now face, in view of the already staggering national debt of $276 billion, is indeed a sad one.

To appease every segment of the voting populace in the interest of political expediency, Congress has become so adicted to the policy of spending more and more money for new schemes and programs that we may well be heading down the "road of no return."

It seems to me that it is about time to lay the cards right on the table. It is time that we give the American people the truth about Federal spending and the cold facts regarding deficit spending. Perhaps even now it is too late—but the fact of the matter is that every dollar the Congress appropriates must be paid by the taxpayers of this country—and the future taxpayers of the next generation. The idea that there is a bottomless pit from which we get money for Federal spending here in Washington is in reality nothing more than a fantasy of bad psychology. Even in the face of the so-called cold war and the repeated emergencies, Government must live within its means. Fiscal responsibility must be returned to Washington as a demand upon both the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Even the big spenders in Government know full well that deficit spending must stop somewhere. If we were to live under the illusion that the astronomical national debt is immaterial, then we have no business taxing the American people at all. To carry this point further, we could further assume the position that we can operate the Government entirely in the "red" and eliminate taxes completely. Obviously, this is ridiculous.

Government is run by money furnished by the United States Treasury. The only place from which this money can come is taxes. When the Treasury runs into debt, it must borrow money to pay its bills or go bankrupt. It is as simple as that. When the Treasury borrows money, it must eventually tax the people to pay this money back. And while it is operating on borrowed money, it is paying interest which again becomes a burden to the taxpayers.

In order to borrow money, the Treasury Department enters the money market to secure a loan. Then inflationary pressure mounts and once again we find this nibbling-away process in operation as the dollar becomes less and less valuable.

Many of us were amazed by stories of the inflation that followed World War I in Germany which became a definite factor in the situation which led to nazism. We were also amazed by stories of inflation which struck Greece and France after World War II. I can recall pictures of men shoveling millions of drachmas into the fire to destroy currency because of inflation in Greece.

And all this boils down to what? Simply that there was never a greater demand upon elected public officials to face the reality of a dangerous situation—a situation which is today worse because we must pay the fiddler for being expedient rather than practical in the handling of Government affairs.

I often wonder how we can impress upon the people of this country the seriousness of deficit spending in Government. How can we impose the philosophy of self-restraint in the interest of preserving the sound internal security essential to the greatness of a nation? The whole matter is disturbing, to say the least—particularly when one views the burden that will be placed upon the shoulders of our children in the generations ahead. Just what good will all the Government-sponsored programs and services be to them if they fall heir to a nation that is tottering on the brink of national bankruptcy—if not already falling into the abyss?

Yes, there are those who contend that this type of fear is something that we never have to worry about. In fact, there is an apathy toward the symptoms of our fiscal sickness. Perhaps even all the facts and figures may fail to dent this apathy or maybe some folks just do not care about the future as long as the doles are served today. If the ma-

jority of the people feel this way, it will be reflected in the attitude of their elected representatives. But, if we continue along the road we have been traveling in the past 30 years, I can only say, "May the Lord help us as a nation."

Aside from the aspect of fiscal disaster, the tremendous expansion of the Federal Government has other implications which may well be destructive to the foundation of free enterprise upon which this great Nation was established.

The only honest way to meet the problem of Federal spending is to let the American people know that each program the Government assumes is going to come directly out of their tax dollars. Going into debt is a way of not only saddling each taxpayer with an obligation for future payments but likewise automatically reduces the value of everybody's dollar. When the Government spends money, it should face up to the fact that it must tax the people to do so. When the Government spends more money than it derives from taxes, it should increase taxes to meet the overspending rather than run into debt. But prudence in the conduct of Government demands that we keep expenses at a minimum and within the confines of good judgment so that taxes may likewise be kept at a minimum. Hence, instead of the Government spending the individual's money in many cases, folks would have more of their own money to spend themselves.

Because I have voted consistently in a manner that would result in the balancing of our Federal budget during both sessions of the 85th Congress, I voted against the increase in the debt limit today. As I pointed out on the floor of the House yesterday, the majority of the Members of Congress, who supported by their vote the many programs which created spending beyond the bounds of our national income, are morally obligated to vote for extension of this debt limit today since the situation we now face is their responsibility.

Dr. Lee A. Du Bridge, President, California Institute of Technology, Endorses H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following telegram from Dr. Lee A. Du Bridge:

PASADENA, CALIF., *August 4, 1958.*
The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
Care the House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The national defense education bill, H. R. 13247, is of great importance to the welfare and progress of higher education and to the training of future scientists, engineers, teachers, and other leaders. Urge your active support of this measure.

LEE A. DU BRIDGE,
President, California Institute of Technology.

The People Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence which is contained in the August 8, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

Mr. Lawrence in his usual clear and forthright manner has presented incontrovertible truths pertaining to the right of self-government to which the people of every State are entitled. His editorial on the problem of mixing the races in public schools is replete with sound and practical expressions. The text of the editorial is as follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK

It was no mob incited by agitators that went to the polls last week in Arkansas.

It was no small group of zealots determined to defy the supreme law of the land that voted overwhelmingly to assure Governor Faubus a third term—unprecedented in more than half a century.

It was the electorate of Arkansas, expressing in a calm and deliberate manner its belief that the wording of the Constitution of the United States must be accepted, rather than any fortuitous ruling by the Supreme Court deviating from the Constitution.

The electorate of Arkansas reiterated by its vote a belief that the 14th amendment should be enforced not by bayonets but by a law of Congress. Such a law has never been passed even though the amendment specifically says:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

What is the provision that has been deemed pertinent by the Supreme Court? The 14th amendment says that "no State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

For decades past equal protection has been construed by the Supreme Court to mean that equal facilities for education may properly be provided by the States through separate schools.

Ever since the founding of the Republic, education has been considered solely within the right of the States to administer. Nowhere in the Constitution is the word "education" mentioned, and certainly the debates in Congress when the 14th amendment was adopted do not reveal a scintilla of evidence to prove that the amendment was intended to give Congress the power to take away from the States the right to control their own educational systems.

There is nothing in the Constitution, therefore, which prohibits the States from assigning pupils to public schools on whatever basis the State feels will give the best education to the children of its citizens.

From the very beginning of our history—confirmed indeed by a specific decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in 1850—the right of a State to set up separate schools for different races has been upheld. In 1896 the United States Supreme Court formally recognized the custom when it said that "separate but equal facilities" do not violate the 14th amendment.

The people of Arkansas have as deep a respect for the Constitution as the people of any other State of the Union. There would not have been cast for Governor Faubus last week the largest percentage of votes ever polled by any candidate in a Democratic primary election in Arkansas—70 percent of the total vote—if the people had not wished to assert their right to interpret the plain words of the Constitution as they are written.

The people of Arkansas have refused to uphold the usurped right of the nine Justices in Washington to say that modern psychology or emotionalism is more important than the letter of the Constitution itself. The people of Arkansas reserve the right to control their own emotionalism, especially inside the schools.

The people of Arkansas have been abused on the radio and on television and in the northern press as lawless. They have been told that their action—in controlling their own educational system—is a blot on America's record before the world, especially in Soviet Russia.

But the free election last week is, on the contrary, a dramatic example of freedom of choice. Nowhere in the Soviet Empire could there be such a vote recorded in opposition to the policies of the Central Government.

Arkansas has not merely upheld its Governor. It has gone beyond any question of personalities. It has upheld a great principle—the doctrine of States rights which Thomas Jefferson gave us.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution declares: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The problem of mixing the races in public schools cannot be solved overnight. It is one that is rooted in the customs and habits of the people.

This writer was enrolled for 12 years in integrated public schools in the North and never has had any personal objection to integration. The people of every State, however, are entitled to their right of self-government. If it was intended by the Constitution that there be uniformity of law throughout the States, then, logically, the Supreme Court long ago should have declared invalid all those laws which vary from State to State in different fields of human relations.

The people of Arkansas have spoken. They have said that the Constitution itself is the only "supreme law of the land." By their virtual unanimity, they have advised the Supreme Court to halt its usurpations and to follow the Constitution itself.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose an editorial from the Peru (Ind.) Tribune dated August 1, 1958. This is a reprint from other editorial pages and thus it is evi-

dent that there are many sincere-minded Americans who are thinking in the same manner that Newsweek, the Peru Tribune, and many other publications are thinking:

FROM OTHER EDITORIAL PAGES

This year the Tennessee Valley Authority celebrates its 25th birthday. Writing in Newsweek, Raymond Moley reviews TVA's activities and purposes, and concludes: "If this is not socialism, then Socialists at home and abroad who have hailed it as a great first step to the abundant life are badly fooled. Certainly to call the TVA 'democracy in action,' as its adherents hail it, is a misnomer because the directorate responsible only to the President and Congress has plenary power—a power that has grown with the years."

The Desperate Need for Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably one of the most challenging legislative subjects that has faced this Congress, and several preceding ones, is finding ways and means through which the Federal Government can reasonably and sensibly extend desperately needed assistance to the several States to advance their educational standards and provide adequate educational facilities.

It is true that many Members of Congress have entertained deep and sincere convictions in opposition to most of the educationl aid proposals that have been suggested. It is equally true that the administration itself has not demonstrated any great enthusiasm or exercised energetic leadership in the matter.

All of this in spite of the almost unanimous declaration of educational authorities that the plight of our educational system nationally amounts in substance to a national emergency.

However, the dramatic Soviet demonstration of scientific achievement has inspired, I think, a more responsive mind and attitude to this problem, both in the Members of this body and the general public. It would seem that the time has come for us to resolve our differences on such a vitally important national necessity and fulfill our legislative responsibility.

In my opinion, an excellent opportunity to do so is presented to us in the form of the measure I understand is being today reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee, H. R. 13247.

In summary, this bill is designed to provide Federal scholarships and also student loan funds to enable superior students without finances to attend college. Its emphasis is placed upon the teaching and study of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It would improve testing and counseling in secondary and elementary schools and it would help train more college teachers.

No matter on what other phases of the problem we may have some differences, I believe that there is no single Member of the Congress who would question the foundation importance of education to a progressive future for this great Nation.

I most earnestly hope that both the Congress and the administration will join their efforts toward the enactment of the substance, at least, of this bill as a united action in concern for the basic welfare and continuing development of this country.

Pollution Board Asks for Stronger Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John W. Stepp which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 1, 1958:

POLLUTION BOARD ASKS STRONGER FEDERAL AID

(By John W. Stepp)

The Federal Water Pollution Advisory Board has thrown its weight behind efforts to strengthen, rather than strangle, the Federal aid program to help clean up the Nation's interstate streams.

In a report released today by the United States Public Health Service, the board asserted its firm conviction that the Federal Government has a nationwide interest and responsibility in the quality and quantity of water.

"We believe," the group of nationally known leaders in the field added, "that Federal responsibility includes national leadership of the highest degree in water-pollution control, with particular emphasis on research, technical assistance and consultation. We recommend the continuation and even strengthening of this leadership."

GREAT ASSISTANCE

The pollution abatement-aid program to date was characterized as having proved of great assistance and stimulus to communities interested in building waste treatement facilities. The board noted that already long unmet needs for pollution abatement are being steadily compounded by the surge of pollution, industrialization and urbanization.

The Board's recommendation runs directly counter to the Eisenhower administration's urgings that the grant program be abandoned outright. This, according to the report, aroused misgivings in some of the members. But despite concern that the Board, having been appointed by President Eisenhower, may be officially bound to concur in his recommendation to kill the program, the majority decided to speak out for continuing and strengthening Federal help.

Since the Board's meeting in Washington last May, several bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve that goal. The first of these was offered by Representative BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, author of the first construction-aid feature in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. It would double the present $50 million annual-grant figure, and would also permit two or more communities to pool their grant money to help build waste-treatment works beneficial to both.

In three other resolutions made public today, the Board urged—

1. That industry, too, should receive financial incentives from the United States to encourage efforts to reduce the amount of industrial waste entering streams. Toward this end, legislation was recommended to permit rapid tax amortization, over a 5-year period, of industrial waste-treatment facilities.

SUPERVISION RECOMMENDED

2. That any antirecession Federal-aid legislation that involves construction of waste-treatment plants should be placed under supervision of the Public Health Service in the interest of maintaining a well-integrated nationwide program. Public Health administers the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

3. That the same agency expand virus research and epidemiological studies involving streams. This would lead to more authoritative guidance for health and waterworks authorities in assuring adequate protection of water supply and public health in all communities.

The Board further, as it has before, stressed an essential need for a fully developed public-awareness program to inform people from school age on up of the serious water-pollution problem in this country.

American Library Association Recommends the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution of the American Library Association in support of the National Defense Education Act of 1958:

RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958, ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, JULY 17, 1958

Whereas the American Library Association has an established policy in support of Federal aid to public education without Federal control in order to assist the States and their subdivisions to establish and maintain adequate educational facilities; and

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958 aims to provide scholarship loans to individuals for study at institutions of higher education; grants to the States to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in schools; a substantial program of graduate fellowships to encourage individuals to train for a teaching career in our universities and colleges, and authorizes an annual appropriation for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes; and

Whereas the broad program encompassed by this legislation has wide implications for the libraries whose interests it touches at every major point: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the American Library Association at their annual conference at San Francisco, Calif., on July 17, 1958, recommend to the 85th Congress, sitting in its second session, that it enact the

National Defense Education Act of 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to all Members of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the United States Commissioner of Education.

Reconveying the Lands Acquired for Burke Airport to the Former Owners

SPEECH
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10045) to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this will conclude the debate on this bill after which we will vote to determine whether or not we are going to try to undo what I think was a very unfair thing perpetrated by our own Government in a rather unfortunate situation.

Now, as others have stated, I do not know any one of the parties involved, but I do not think it is the proper thing for the Government to move in and take over the homes and the property of individuals who have lived there for years and years and then not utilize it or even pretend to use the property for a public purpose and then hold it, deprive the people of the property, and if there might be some advantage because of what transpired in the ensuing years, the Government get the benefit of it.

Now, you talk about principle. Yes, there is a principle involved here. There was 68,000 acres of land taken by the Government out of the heart of my district during the war. I know what it means for a family, neighbors, your own people, to lose their homes that they had owned for generation after generation. And, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan you cannot take a piece of property from a person who has maintained it as a home for a generation and satisfy him on the basis of what little value might have accrued. Sentiment prevails in the minds and the hearts of those people. Yes, there is a principle involved here, and that principle is Should the Government walk in and by condemnation proceedings deprive the people of their own homes and never use it for such lawful purpose?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio. He has not had an opportunity to say anything about this yet.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I just wonder if the gentleman would care to enlighten us on why the Government did not utilize it after condemning it.

Mr. HARRIS. Because, as events subsequently transpired, the Congress would not permit the construction of the airport there because controversy developed. Everybody got into the act, so a Presidential commission study was requested and selected Chantilly for the site of another airport for Washington.

Now, let us do justice to these people and let them have the property back. They paid capital gains taxes on it. Let us let them have it back for what they paid for it, a fair and reasonable thing to do.

The Cedars of Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Carolina Israelite, May–June 1958 issue:

THE CEDARS OF LEBANON

Several years before Israel was recreated a sovereign state by the United Nations, Hon. Moshe Sharrat (later Foreign Minister of Israel) told a private audience here that of all the states in the Middle East, Lebanon would eventually become the ally of the Jewish state.

There have been many developments in recent years to indicate that this observation was based on fact. Indeed, it is precisely because of this development that the Nasser-Arab-pro-Soviet bloc wants to overthrow the existing Lebanese Government.

The development of political friendship between Christian Lebanon and Israel is not based solely on current politics and the struggle for Middle East power between the East and West. Basically, Lebanon, like Israel, is a western nation, certainly a Mediterranean nation, rather than part of the Arabian world. In fact, the Lebanese have always considered themselves Europeans, and this goes back to the very beginning or recorded history.

This was Phoenicia with its great city of Tyre and King Hiram, the friend of both King David and King Solomon.

The Phoenicians were the great craftsmen of the ancient world—textiles and metals; and Phoenician craftsmen helped build the Temple of Solomon.

Along about 800 B. C. Phoenicia reached the height of its power. Its sailors had made a virtual Phoenician lake out of the Mediterranean, and beyond. There is ample evidence today that the Phoenician seamen had ventured through the Gates of Hercules into the Atlantic and established settlements on the west coast of both Europe and Africa.

The Phoenicians, like many other creative peoples, did not know how to keep an empire together. They were seamen and craftsmen, but they were no colonizers, bookkeepers, or empire builders. And they were particularly lousy soldiers. Most of their colonies broke away by merely saying "boo" to the mother country, but the colonies themselves fell in their own turn because of this same tradition—trade, no fight. Carthage was destroyed for this very reason. No great nation can survive if it has to go out and hire outside soldiers to fight for them. What Phoenicia (and its blood-brother Carthage) overlooked was the fact that while they were in pursuit of commerce and new ideas in building construction, the "have nots" were thinking of only one thing—to take away from the "haves." And so the Phoenicians stretched their seaports through the entire length of the Mediterranean, but the whole business had a very short life span. The Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Romans, and the Greeks under Alexander the Great, each took a wallop at them, almost at will, and with very little resistance from the Phoenician sailors, artists, engineers, craftsmen, scholars, and lacemakers.

Why did the Phoenicians disappear, and why didn't the Jews disappear? This is a big subject. Whole books can be written on it. I think one of the reasons was the process of Hellenization. The Phoenicians lost themselves within the Greek culture. And we can well understand the temptation. Faced with the same development, the Jews said, "No." But it was not all that simple. The Jewish intellectuals were all for it, of course. The chances are that I would have gone to that temple of Zeus myself. Mattathias would have killed me first. But now I am glad that this fellow was such a fanatic about the law, for the maintenance of the Covenant.

This Mattathias must have been quite a fellow to have won a victory against such odds (the young Jews were enchanted by the prospect of becoming Greeks). Many of the young Jews began to appear in the arena in sacerdotal nakedness with artificial foreskins in an attempt to out-Greek the Greeks.

The Phoenicians had no Mattathias and so they fell like a ripe apple off the tree, although many thousands "expressed" their resistance by entering the Jewish world. I have seen the Phoenician forehead and dangling ear lobes on thousands of my fellow Jews in the subway in the Jewish country clubs of Charlotte, Atlanta, Rochester, and Los Angeles (just as I have seen thousands in the same places with the square shoulders of the Egyptian).

The Crusaders finished the remnant of Phoenician culture; the Phoenicians became converts; they were very ardent in their Christianity and suffered for it terribly after the Ottoman Turks took over control of the entire Middle East. In recent years the echo of this age-old culture became the independent state of Lebanon.

There was close communication between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, and the alphabet which the Phoenicians gave to the world differs very little from the Aramaic and the Hebrew. The Phoenician religion was based on the cult of Adonis (Adon), and ritual and terminology were in many respects similar to the Hebrews.

And this ancient affinity between the two cultures appeared to have been on the verge of a revival in these tumultuous 1950's, and because of the possibility that Lebanon and Israel might come together as "brothers of the Mediterranean" (rather than as Arabic states), the Egyptian Nasser and his pro-Soviet allies seek to pull Lebanon away from its centuries-old "European" attitudes. If Nasser succeeds, it would pose an added problem for the security of Jewish Palestine, and for the peace of the entire Middle East.

Jim Farley in North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of Wednesday, July 23, 1958:

JIM FARLEY IN NORTH

James A. Farley came to northern New York on Tuesday in the interests of his Democratic bid for the United States senatorial nomination. The former Postmaster General and once the Democratic National Committee chairman made a brief stopover in Watertown and then proceeded to Ogdensburg, Massena, and Tupper Lake.

Mr. Farley received an enthusiastic reception from the Democrats all along the route, some of whom had not been visited or consulted by party leaders in years. Mr. Farley is concentrating his attention on the traditional Democrats. He is a Democrat, first, last and always.

Mr. Farley is "Mr. Democrat" himself. His long association with the party from childhood to the present has instilled him with a spirit of complete loyalty under one banner. He feels that the traditionl Democrats hold the key to his success and have throughout the years.

Whether Mr. Farley is successful in his effort to win the Democratic nod at the August convention is uncertain. But at least Mr. Farley is carrying his fight to every corner of New York State and renewing friendships with Democrats who have been completely bypassed by candidates in other campaigns. The Democrats of northern New York welcome the attention that they are receiving from Jim Farley, long respected and admired for his political astuteness and friendly spirit.

A Fable: The Vicuna and the Mink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD a poem which appeared in the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., relating to the Sherman Adams case:

A FABLE: THE VICUNA AND THE MINK

The Andes vicuna and the pastel mink,
Met at a stream for a cooling drink;
Said the shy vicuna to his tough old friend,
"I've got a problem and don't know the end;
Just what do you make of this Washington mess?
Sounds pretty bad, I must confess,
But you've had experience along this line,
As I recall, 'twas 'round forty-nine.
Wasn't your relative involved up there,
In some barter of influence affair?
One of my kinsmen, I have just learned,
Into a fancy coat has been turned.
He's now in the White House, wishes he weren't,
Reports say fingers show signs they're burnt."
Said the pinkish-gray mink to his vicuna friend:
"Times sure have changed, for they now defend
These gorgeous gifts they once deplored,
(I guess it depends, whose ox is gored.)
But what I don't get," said the mink with a grin,
"How come a vicuna coat taking's no sin?"

—THE EDITOR.

The Ports of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is truly a national organization devoted to the proper development of the water resources of the Nation, with members in each State of the Union. The 45th national convention was given a most informative address by Rear Adm. David H. Clark, executive director, Virginia State Ports Authority, and I present it for the reading of the Members of Congress:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. DAVID H. CLARK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, VIRGINIA STATE PORTS AUTHORITY, TO THE ASSEMBLED DELEGATES AT THE 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL ON MAY 15, 1958

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow delegates to the 45th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here today and have the opportunity of addressing briefly this distinguished gathering.

When the ports of Virginia are mentioned, practically everyone immediately thinks of Hampton Roads. It is a fact that Hampton Roads is one of the largest and best natural harbors in the United States. In Virginia, we say it is the best. It is a fact that the combined tonnage of foreign waterborne commerce handled by Hampton Roads ports—Newport News, Norfolk, South Norfolk, and Portsmouth, has for the past two years exceeded that of any other United States port. In the calendar year 1957, the ports of Hampton Roads handled just under 60 million tons of foreign waterborne commerce, and the port of New York, which includes Jersey City, Hoboken, Newark, and Yonkers as well as the borough cities comprising New York City, was next with just over 40 million tons. Export coal accounts for approximately 85 percent of Hampton Roades foreign waterborne commerce, and overshadows the significance of the 9 million tons of traffic in other commodities.

The river ports of Virginia are also important to the economy of the Commonwealth and neighboring States. They could be more important if served by wider and deeper channels. Richmond at the head of navigation on the James River provides the western most deep water terminal on the North Atlantic. Richmond and Hopewell (also situated on the James River) handled last year almost 400,000 tons of foreign waterborne commerce, consisting primarily of import sugar from Cuba, newsprint from Canada, and export steel scrap.

Alexandria, situated at the fall line of the Potomac River, is the natural port for the Washington metropolitan area. During the 18th century Alexandria ranked among the six leading ports of the country. Last year Alexandria handled about 100,000 tons of foreign waterborne commerce, mostly newsprint; and nearly three times as much domestic commerce, three-quarters of which were petroleum products.

The Washington metropolitan area is the largest in the world located on tidewater not having adequate regular ocean transportation services. This is believed due to channel limitations. A study is now underway by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to determine the economic benefits of increasing the Potomac River channel depth from its mouth to Alexandria from its present 24 feet to a proposed 35 feet depth. The VSPA last year completed a survey to determine the shipping potential through the port of Alexandria. Several thousand questionnaires were sent out to firms in the Washington metropolitan area, and adjacent territory. The survey revealed that 90 firms now importing goods through other ports could save 61 million annually if they could use the port of Alexandria. It also revealed 248 firms that might export some 550,000 tons, and 176 firms that might import more than 500,000 tons through the port of Alexandria if adequate ocean transportation were available. In addition it brought to light 207 firms that might ship or receive from the Pacific coast a million and a half tons of domestic commerce.

In the past 25 years the Washington metropolitan area has nearby trebled its population, and now numbers about 2 million people. The area is unique, in that it is what you might call depression proof. This, because a depression or recession, when private spending is reduced Federal spending as an antirecession measure is usually increased. Despite this, there are relatively few industries in the area. We, of the VSPA, believe that a deepening of the Potomac River channel to permit the transit of large, deep draft vessels would not only benefit the importers, exporters, and consumers in the Washington metropolitan area but would also result in industries locating plants along the Potomac River below Washington, to the benefit of the area and the Nation.

All I have said is preparatory to extending you and your ladies an invitation for a trip by boat from Washington to Mount Vernon and return, as guests of the VSPA. This will afford those attending this Congress the opportunity to see the facilities now at Alexandria, and to visualize the possibilities for the future. Arrangements have been made for this Congress to adjourn within the next few minutes until tomorrow morning. There will be an announcement above the arrangement for this boat trip, and the visit to Mount Vernon where a ceremony is scheduled at the tomb of George Washington to which all are invited. This is particularly fitting because, in addition to being the Father of Our Country, Washington was assuredly the father of our country's system of inland waterways. The Authority, by the way, is not your host at Mount Vernon.

It is hoped that this trip will convince you that the Potomac River could be one of the important waterways of the country for ocean shipping and that the banks of the Potomac River, both the Virginia and the Maryland sides, offer important opportunities for industrial development. And, as I said earlier, Alexandria is the logical port for the Washington metropolitan area.

I thank you.

Renewal of the Wool Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, this action the House has taken on the farm bill this

afternoon places the woolgrowing industry of the United States in jeopardy. The Wool Act of 1954 expires at the end of this marketing season and this industry which was dying until Congress enacted that Wool Act cannot survive unless this Congress takes action. I believe there is overwhelming support for renewal of the Wool Act but at no time has either House had an opportunity to vote on that one subject alone. This is the second time that a measure to renew the Wool Act has come before this House tied in with other general farm legislation.

The committee knows the woolgrowers stood shoulder to shoulder with the other commodity groups who sought today to pass this bill through a suspension of the rules. Now that this body has turned down that avenue, I would like to express the sincere hope that the committee will seek an immediate rule and bring this measure back to the House, even tomorrow if possible, so it can be debated and a farm bill acceptable to the members can be adopted and we can secure a renewal of the Wool Act before adjournment.

But Jim Farley Could Get Votes Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Yonkers (N. Y.) Herald-Statesman of July 29, 1958:

BUT JIM FARLEY COULD GET VOTES HERE

We don't pose as an unbiased adviser of the Democratic Party in Westchester. We wouldn't dare to presume to be such. For, frankly, we don't support candidates of that political party often enough to warrant any such presumption or to justify ourselves in any such role.

But we do believe that our Democratic friends consider us abreast of political happenings and aware of partisan trends. And it is on that basis we suggest to leaders of the Democratic organization in Westchester that they seem to be unjust to one of the greatest contemporary figures of their party.

We refer to James A. Farley of Nyack, former State and national chairman of the Democratic Party, former Postmaster-General under F. D. R., and now announced aspirant for nomination as his party's candidate this fall for the United States Senate.

If ever there was a man in this State to whom the Democratic Party owes an unlimited debt that man is Jim Farley. If there be any single individual who links effectively the past and the present State party organizations, it is Jim Farley. If there is any man who more than all other Democrats deserves a show of gratitude and a vote of confidence, that one is Jim Farley.

Yet the Democratic organization here in Westchester is reported strangely indifferent to its opportunity to advance Mr. Farley's political fortunes. Attempts to give him endorsement have been squashed, reportedly on the theory that such endorsement might "embarrass" party leaders in the country in efforts to grab off a place on the State ticket for some county resident.

That seems awfully petty and shortsighted to us. After all, isn't it the primary function of a political organization to select as candidate the qualified man or woman most likely to roll up a big enough vote to get elected?

And is there any leader of the Democratic Party who actually believes that some stranger named Dickinson or Finletter could ever roll up here in Westchester a vote even close to what Jim Farley would surely get?

Maybe yes, somebody says? And maybe the Hudson is full of prune juice, too.

Association for Higher Education Urges Support for the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Dr. Russell M. Cooper, president of the Association for Higher Education, and assistant dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts of the University of Minnesota:

ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1958.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: As president of the Association for Higher Education (AHE), I want to call your attention to the need for passing the Elliott bill (H. R. 13247), currently before the House Rules Committee. Among other services this bill provides for a national scholarship program involving some 20,000 high-school graduates a year for 4 years.

The Association for Higher Education is an organization of more than 14,000 members from over 1,500 of the Nation's publicly and privately supported colleges and universities. Included in the AHE membership are administrative officers of every kind and faculty members from every academic field.

Since 1945 the Association for Higher Education has been on record as strongly favoring the types of services which are embodied in H. R. 13247. As an example in point, the results of a poll of AHE members, made as recently as 1957, revealed an overwhelming interest in a national scholarship program. Further interest on the part of the association in such a program is evidenced by the testimony which Charles C. Cole, Jr., associate dean of Columbia College, Columbia University, a former member of the AHE executive committee, presented on behalf of the association before the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, March 24, 1958.

In addition to a program of Federal scholarships, the Association for Higher Education is very much interested in other features of the Elliott proposal, such as title V, foreign language development; title VI, graduate education and fellowships; and title VIII, new educational media.

On behalf of the association, therefore, I strongly urge you, in light of the increasing need for expanded educational opportunities for college-age youth, to do everything within your power to secure passage of the Elliott bill in this session of the Congress. The membership of the association will be deeply grateful to you for any steps which you personally can take to secure these much needed services for the college-age youth of America.

Respectfully yours,
RUSSELL M. COOPER,
President.

Tanker Transportation in Relation to Rivers and Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 45th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, held in Washington, D. C., had the privilege of hearing an address by Mr. C. A. Newland, division manager, Esso Standard Oil Co., on tanker transportation. This speech gives those of us who are interested in our waterways much to think about and to keep in mind in our future planning. It is as follows:

TANKER TRANSPORTATION IN RELATION TO RIVERS AND CHANNELS

(A speech by C. A. Newland, division manager, Esso Standard Oil Co., before the 45th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 15, 1958)

When the term "supertanker" was coined about 10 years ago, it referred to vessels in the 25 to 30,000 deadweight tons range. Already, these earlier supertankers have been dwarfed by the very large tankers now in service. An item that appeared recently in our newspapers graphically illustrates the tremendous increase in tanker size that has taken place in the first decade of the supertanker era. It describes the use at Philadelphia of a 32,000 deadweight tons vessel as a lighter for the Harold H. Helm, an 854 foot behemoth capable of carrying 85,000 tons of cargo.

The trend toward tankers of greater carrying capacity and speed has been sparked in part by the increased demand for tonnage. In a larger sense, however, the highly competitive nature of the oil industry has underscored the need for efficient and dependable tanker capacity with ships of a size and technical design best suited to the present and anticipated future needs of the business.

The economic advantage of the very large, fast tanker being readily apparent, the question arises as to how large and how many of these big supertankers may be used. The answer will be found by determining where they can be used or, more specifically, what oil ports will be able to accommodate them and make efficient use of their greater draft and carrying capacity.

A good example of the adaptability of the supertanker to a particular operation is reflected in the movement of petroleum from the Middle East to the United Kingdom and western Europe. Crude oil, loaded at deepwater ports in the Persian Gulf or eastern Mediterranean, is delivered to refineries situated on excellent harbors in England and

on the Continent. These conditions make possible the maximum use of low cost carriers.

In this hemisphere—North and South America—we are not so well situated to make use of the very large supertankers. This is because we have to work with crude terminal and refinery locations which, for the most part, were established many years before the advent of the supertanker. For example, one of our major refineries and ocean-tanker, crude-loading terminals is located on the Mississippi River, 220 miles above the head of the passes.

Some of the very large tankers coming to United States and South American ports spend as much as 6 days in the discharge port. This is due to the necessity for lightering before moving to a discharge berth and to the necessity for awaiting the most favorable tidal and weather conditions for navigation over the bar and in restricted channels. These restrictions can be tolerated in the long-haul trade because the economies to be gained from large size more than outweigh the cost of delays encountered at the loading and discharging ports.

However, in the United States coastwise and nearby foreign service with voyages of about 5 days each way, such delays would soon eat up any advantage gained by using very large tankers. Therefore, in studying the economic advantages to be gained from increasing ship size for these trades, it has been found advisable not to exceed the maximum vessel size which can make efficient port turnarounds, using existing port facilities or foreseeable improvements in such facilities.

As previously mentioned, port limitations in the east coast, United States gulf and Caribbean area are more severe than for most trades originating in the Middle East. With shorter voyages, such limitations have a more pronounced effect on the overall transportation savings to be gained. On the other hand, the generally higher operating costs for United States flag vessels provide a greater incentive for exploring all possible avenues for increasing ship size.

It would be safe to say that the competitive position of the United States tanker industry and of the individual tanker company a decade hence will depend on two factors: first, an effective program for securing new and improved tanker terminal facilities and economically justified harbor improvements. Secondly, imagination and foresight in designing new tankers which will be able to take advantage of foreseeable harbor improvements over the life of a vessel but which, from the time of delivery, may be used efficiently within the limitations of port and harbor facilities then existing.

It is highly important, therefore, that the designing of new tankers by naval architects go forward hand in hand with an active program for study and improvement of harbor and terminal facilities.

A decision as to the maximum length and beam of vessels that can safely navigate in restricted waterways, of course, cannot be determined by any set formula. Instead, it must be based on the experience and judgment of the best qualified people in the field. Esso has on order five 47,400 deadweight ton vessels, scheduled for delivery in 1960 and 1961. In making the decision on the 47,400 deadweight ton size, nearly 10,000 deadweight tons larger than our largest ships now in service, Esso was fortunate in having masters and docking pilots with 8 years of experience in handling 27,000 deadweight ton ships and several months' experience with the first 35,500 deadweight tons vessel in our service. The experience of this gradual approach to large tankers has been a most valuable asset in our planning of the 47,400 deadweight tons building program.

The fact that supertankers can safely navigate the entrance and harbor channels of a great many of our ports is a tribute to the foresightedness of the United States Army Corps of Engineers and also to the efforts of trade associations and, in many cases, of devoted individuals who have worked to show the need for improvcements which are now a reality. The Corps of Engineers has the job of making a fair appraisal of each proposal, determining the cost-benefit ratio and preparing a comprehensive report and recommendation which subsequently forms the basis for congressional authorization and appropriation bills.

The tanker industry has traditionally worked with other segments of the shipping industry through the American Merchant Marine Institute and other trade associations to provide the United States Army Corps of Engineers with needed facts concerning the size of present and projected merchant vessels, tonnages to be moved and the economic benefits to be gained by proposed river and harbor improvements.

Aside from the limitations of improved harbors and channels, the continental shelf imposes a severe natural limitation on the ultimate size of vessels which may use United States Gulf and East Coast ports. The depth of water needed in the approach to a harbor depends on the amount of up-and-down motion which might be expected due to a vessel's pitching in long waves or swells. Also, for a vessel with a 100-foot beam, each 5° roll from the vertical increases the draft by about 4 feet.

A keel clearance of 10 to 12 feet would be desirable for large vessels in the open water prior to reaching the lee of a breakwater or protected channel. However, in many cases, this clearance is not now available and supertankers entering and leaving port are navigating open water with a 6-foot keel clearance or even less in some locations.

For example, one of the principal gulf loading ports—Baytown, Tex., on the Houston ship channel—is reached via Bolivar Roads and Galveston bar channel. Here the outer bar is dredged to 38 feet. This would have to be increased to 44 feet to provide 6 feet of keel clearance for a 40,400 deadweight tons vessel at its maximum draft of about 38 feet. The existing outer bar of 44 feet would require dredging another 1½ miles out to sea.

Again using Galveston bar as an example, dredging for 60,000 deadweight tons, vessels of 41-feet draft would require a total of 4 miles dredging to reach natural depths of 47-feet, whereas for 85,000 deadweight tons tankers of 46-feet draft, 11 miles total dredging would be required beyond the existing channel terminus to reach natural water depths of 52 feet.

However, draft is not the only limitation on the size of vessels which may be used. Large tankers must be able to navigate the restricted channels leading to and from some of the principal terminals. Baytown on the Houston ship channel, Baton Rouge on the Mississippi River and Bayway on the Arthur Kill are examples of Esso terminals reached through long and winding channels in which there is 2-way traffic, including barge tows as well as other large vessels. In deciding the maximum size vessel that can safely transit these waterways, the overall length and beam and maneuvering characteristics must be considered in relation to channel widths, radius of bends in the channel and availability of turning room.

Relatively few ports provide channels of sufficient width to permit the turning of the large vesseles now building or planned, yet most harbors are affected to some extent by tidal currents. To help overcome this problem, we have equipped our 35,500 and 37,800 deadweight tons with stern anchors and the means for handling and stowing them. Similar installations are planned for the 47,400 deadweight tons class vessels.

The concept of a stern anchor is not entirely new. However, in the past vessels so fitted have usually been provided with a stream anchor of relatively light weight which did not meet the full requirements of safely holding the vessel under normal conditions. Our vessels have a stern anchor and chain of the same weight and size as the bow anchors. Thus, they can anchor at the bow, stern or both, as safety dictates.

Since the 37,800-deadweight-ton vessels entered the United States Fleet last year, 2 have reported using their stern anchors on 6 separate occasions, each under a different set of circumstances. In each instance, the master has expressed complete satisfaction with the results. It is our opinion that we have hardly begun to explore the potential of the stern anchor. As more experience and confidence in its use is obtained, we expect that more conditions will be found where its use will render an invaluable service to the vessel and its personnel.

This morning I have attempted to show that the development and use of large tankers must go hand in hand with the development of adequate terminal facilities and channels of adequate depth and width; also, that these factors have a particular importance in the coastwise service where port arrivals and departures are relatively frequent. In our case, a stepwise increase in size of vessels over the past 10 years has assured an efficient functioning of a combination of these factors so that new, large vessels have been brought into service smoothly and without difficulty.

Reconveying the Lands Acquired for Burke Airport to Former Owners

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10045) to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has recommended an amendment which I think is in keeping with the precedents established by the Government Operations Committee and the subcommittee that is handling many bills of this nature today. I think if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, we can have a fair solution of this problem. Perhaps it would not do everything the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] would like, or the committee would like, but I think from all that has been said, the previous cases that have been cited, this amendment should be adopted because it will be a very satisfactory solution of the problem and will preserve the precedent that has been established in handling the sale of Government property as it has been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ike Holds Secret Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Hearst newspapers on August 3, 1958, entitled "Ike Holds Secret Weapon," which was the editor's report written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief, which warrants the reading of our colleagues on a matter which is of grave importance to the American people:

EDITOR'S REPORT: IKE HOLDS SECRET WEAPON

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Ike and Foster certainly have their troubles coping with a crazy world that can't seem to straighten itself out, but they have one thing going for them for which they should be grateful.

They have a secret weapon on their side which always makes them look good just when it seems critics of the administration's foreign policy are about to be proved right.

Their friend-in-need is none other than Nikita Khrushchev, the Moscow penpal whose aggressive, abusive letters are in marked contrast to the sober, reasonable communications of our President.

Maybe the rise in postal rates will put a crimp in Nikita's epistolary output, but if he keeps up at his recent rate we'll soon have most of the non-Communist world rooting for us.

It must be granted that the Kremlin held the diplomatic initiative in the days following the Marine landing in Lebanon and that Khrushchev moved swiftly to exploit it.

We were on the defensive before large sections of world opinion, and the Russian Premier emerged in his first letter as a champion of peace eagerly seeking an across-the-table agreement.

But his tone of address to Ike, who is known as a man of decency throughout the world, was so insolent and overbearing that, in my opinion, he generated sympathy for the President even in quarters critical of American policy.

And his statement of the facts was so twisted and insulting to the intelligence that reasonable men everywhere punched holes in its contradictions.

Even so, Khrushchev still held a pretty good hand of cards. But as the letter writing continued, the Kremlin's advantage began to disappear. Pen-pal Nikita was laying it on too thick.

The climax came this past week when he bluntly charged that "Mr. President, you do not work for peace," an insult resented by practically everybody. The evidence was much too strong in the opposite direction.

In addition, the Kremlin's man of letters continually shifted his ground, first demanding a summit conference of five big powers, then seeming to go along with a U. N. Security Council meeting with invited guests, then veering right back to his original plan as if he had never advanced his second suggestion.

And on Friday Ike seized the initiative, it seems to me, by accepting August 12 as a definite date for a meeting of the Security Council with the heads of government present.

It was a put-up-or-shut-up maneuver concurred in by Great Britain, our principal ally, and carrying the support of an overwhelming number of nations.

You may suspect, if you read these columns occasionally, that my well-known admiration for President Eisenhower influences me to say his latest move topped Khrushchev's artful dodging.

But let me quote Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Democratic whip, on the same subject. The President, he said, had "grabbed the initiative and is now running with the ball."

"His new positive approach will meet with favor throughout the world and will bring strong support from both sides of Congress and from the American people," the Senator said.

Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island, chairman of the influential Foreign Affairs Committee, joined MIKE MANSFIELD in nonpartisan praise of the President.

"He wisely reminded Mr. Khrushchev on two fundamentals of international life which the Russians and we long ago pledged to support," said Senator GREEN.

"We both agreed to confer on the United Nations Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"Mr. Khrushchev's proposal that the big powers alone settle the Lebanon situation derogated from that principle.

"The permanent members of the Security Council also agreed to safeguards so that the interests of small countries, as well as large, would not be disregarded."

This support from both sides of the aisle is one of the most heartening developments of the present international impasse.

The Communists are undoubtedly under the impression that they can capitalize on the normal political disagreements between our two major parties, not realizing that in America politics ends at the water's edge.

And I think the Red leaders are also deluding themselves into believing they can translate normal differences of opinion between the Western allies into political capital. Right now they seem to think they can use General de Gaulle's independent stand as a wedge against Western unity.

In my opinion General de Gaulle's independent judgment is to be welcomed. He has a keen, historical mind and a lucid way of expressing himself. We don't want stooges or satellites—we want vigorous allies.

Let's not be too upset if Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier de Gaulle assert their own ideas in a crisis as difficult as the one now confronting us.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers for H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mrs. James C. Parker, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
Chicago, Ill., August 5, 1958.

To: Members of the House of Representatives, 85th Congress, Washington, D. C.
From: Mrs. James C. Parker, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Re the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

It is my understanding that an education bill—H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958—is presently under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The executive committee of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, meeting here last month, would like you to know of its considered interest and that of many PTA members all over this country in a bill that will make provision for the educational future of many of our more able youth. This is not only a defense measure but a contribution to a higher level of trained citizenship in our country.

We urge immediate action. It will indicate that this session of Congress is aware of its responsibilities to youth.

Thirty-sixth Anniversary of the Recognition of Lithuania As an Independent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have extended my remarks regarding the valiant country of Lithuania. I have the good fortune of having many Lithuanians in my district, and whenever it is possible I join them in observing an occasion important to them and important to all Americans who love freedom. Wherever one finds Lithuanians assembled together, one may know it is for the purpose of recalling the days when they were an independent nation and reminding themselves that though Lithuania is now enslaved by the Communists, the love for and conviction about freemen is still emblazoned in their hearts.

With the Middle East in such a turmoil and the Communists accusing and threatening the United States, it is well for us to recall actions taken by the U. S. S. R. in Lithuania.

The United States continues, and I am sure will continue, to recognize Lithuania as an independent state and a partner with us in the battle to safeguard and sustain the only principles upon which man survive. These are recognition of God, the dignity of man, and freedom of choice and expression as to form of government.

It has been a great pleasure for me to meet the consul of Lithuania in Chicago, Mr. Petras Dauzvardis. Lithuanians can be proud of the work he is doing for them here in the United States.

Mr. Dauzvardis addressed the 36th anniversary of our recognition of Lithuania as an independent state at a banquet in Chicago on July 23. His remarks are thought provoking and timely, as is his statement pertaining to the Middle East situation and the Russian demands. I hope every Lithuanian-American can read them. I am fully confident that Ambassador Lodge will continue to keep the plight of Lithuania and her sis-

ter Baltic Republics prominently in mind in his efforts to again enable these nations to be full-fledged members of the family of free national of the world.

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, AT THE LITHUANIAN ALLIANCE OF AMERICA CONVENTION BANQUET, JULY 23, 1958, HOTEL SHERMAN, CHICAGO

Your 50th convention and this great banquet are taking place in a month that is historic for both America and Lithuania. The independence of the United States of America was declared on July 4, 1776; the treaty of peace between Lithuania and Soviet Russia was signed on July 12, 1920. In addition to these significant events, the United States recognized Lithuania de jure on July 28, 1922; on July 21, 1940, the Soviet puppet diet in Lithuania passed a made-in-Moscow resolution to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union; on July 22 Minister of Lithuania at Washington Povilas Zadeikis lodged a protest against the Soviet acts and designs with the Department of State; on July 23 the Department of State denounced these Soviet acts of aggression in and against Lithuania—labeled them with their true designations as predatory acts and devious processes, whereby the Republic of Lithuania, together with Latvia and Estonia, were to be deliberately and premeditatedly annihilated by the Soviet Union.

These diametrically opposed acts of the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. concerning the three Baltic States are of great moral and legal international meaning. They denote the contrasting philosophy and policies of two great world powers in respect to international law, human freedom, and sovereign rights of other nations. The United States respects and defends international law and the independence of other nations, the Soviet Union violates international law and her own pledges—she forcibly seizes and enslaves independent nations.

The outstanding and most vivid illustration of this point is the case of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Yet here is a case, however, that has not yet been fully comprehended, evaluated, and exposed to the world, especially to that part of the world which at times is inclined to embrace the Soviet Union as a friend. The case and the plight of the Baltic States and their peoples should be presented in its fullest exposure to these people—starting with the conclusion of the treaties of peace and nonaggression and ending with the perpetration of aggression and genocide by the Soviets.

The present time, when the Soviets are attacking the West, even as they are proposing a nonaggression pact with the West, is an opportune time to do some remembering, to recall their pacts of nonaggression with, and seizure of, the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The duty of reminding the world of this Soviet infamy falls primarily upon the free people of the Baltic States and their friends; in fact, upon all friends of justice and freedom. Let this task be started right here, at this convention of the Lithuanian Alliance of America—the oldest and greatest Lithuanian organizaton in America.

Now, when the Soviets are demanding the withdrawal of United States and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan—where they have been placed for the protection of the independence of those countries—we cannot refrain from stating that the Soviet demands are hypocritic. If the Soviets are such great defenders of the security and independence of small nations, as they claim they are, why don't they restore independence to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whom they forcibly and treacherously deprived of their independence, and whose territory they seized and continue to occupy. We, in turn, demand that the Soviets withdraw their troops, police, agents, and colonists from Lithuania, which they occupy by force and are methodically destroying as an independent state.

STATEMENT BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DE JURE RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

At the present time, when the dictator of the Soviet Empire is vilely attacking the United States of America, accusing them of aggression and violation of international law, I feel it timely and fitting to bring up the case of Lithuania, which so vividly illustrates the hypocrisy of the Kremlin and the contrasting philosophies and policies of the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America.

By the treaty of peace signed on July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia recognized Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition, and in a spirit of free and good will renounced for all time all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her. Nineteen years later she broke the solemn pledge.

The United States recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state on July 28, 1922, and continues to recognize it as such.

Soviet Russia, in violation of the above peace treaty and the nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, entered into a conspiracy (on September 28, 1939) with Nazi Germany, to divide and annihilate Lithuania. In June 1940 she invaded and occupied Lithuania without any invitation, provocation, or justification; arrested the members of the legal government of Lithuania and disbanded its duly elected parliament, replaced them with an illegal Soviet puppet government and parliament, and on July 21, 1940, proclaimed the sovietization of Lithuania and that Baltic country's incorporation into the Soviet Union. The United States of America on July 23 denounced these treacherous Soviet acts, labeling them with their true designation as "predatory acts" and "devious processes" whereby the Republic of Lithuania, together with Latvia and Estonia, were to be deliberately annihilated by the Soviet Union. The United States refused to recognize the forcible and wholly illegal incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R., and continues to recognize Lithuania as an independent state. The Minister of Lithuania in Washington and the Lithuanian consuls in New York, Chicago, Boston, and Los Angeles are functioning as heretofore with full rights, powers, and privileges.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, continues to annihilate Lithuania and its people. The prewar population of the present territory of Lithuania was over 3,200,000; the present population is a little over 2,700,000, of which the local and imported Communists do not exceed 40,000, or approximately 1½ percent; over 98 percent of the population are non-Communists—they are virtual slaves of the Communist occupants, without human rights and freedom. If this is not colonialism and slavery, it is difficult to imagine what colonialism and slavery are.

If the dictators of the Soviet empire are honestly demanding freedom and independence for the countries of the Middle East, they should simultaneously propose and grant freedom and independence to the middle east of Europe, beginning with Estonia and ending with the Balkan States.

Lithuanians demand that the Soviets get out of Lithuania with their troops, police, agents, and colonists, and enable them to choose their own government and establish such a political, economic, social, and cultural system as they see fit and appropriate to their desires, without any interference from abroad.

JULY 28, 1958.

What Do the People of Russia Think of Nikita S. Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Mr. J. Anthony Marcus for the following letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Marcus informs us from personal experience how we should treat Nikita S. Khrushchev if he should come to the United States for a summit conference. He also gives us firsthand knowledge of what the people of Russian think of this dominating, arrogant, disgusting dictator who did not hesitate to boast that "We will bury you."

I recommend that all Members of Congress and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD read Mr. J. Anthony Marcus' letter carefully. In my opinion, I think he has done us a great service:

HOW TO HANDLE KHRUSHCHEV

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

If Nikita S. Khrushchev attends a U. N. summit meeting, it is imperative that we do not come out of this conference cheated and defeated as has been our fate in dealings with the Soviets since 1933.

And if Khrushchev does come to America, how should our press, radio, and television handle the event? Indeed, how would the Russian masses, at least 90 percent of them, want us to treat this unwelcome guest on American soil?

As a native-born Russian who has had extensive experience in the Soviet Union as representative of leading American industrial corporations and in close touch with happenings in Russia since 1917, I know that when the Kremlin mouthpieces Pravda and Izvestia laud a foreign government or people, the Russian masses consider them as mortal enemies of theirs. When the Soviet regime condemns President Eisenhower, Dulles and anyone else in the United States, the average Russian is glowingly happy and considers them as his true friends. American tourists can never hear this from the Russian people who hate and fear their tyrants.

Many a time during my business sojourns there, even high executives in the Soviet Government have said to me: "Why do you Americans come here to deal with our rulers? You are only enhancing their prestige and tightening the noose around our necks?"

En route from Minsk to Moscow in a sleeping compartment with a three-man Russian commission, one of them angrily said to me: "You foreigners fill your mouth with water when you reach this country. You are afraid to see our bitter life for what it is." His colleagues begged him to keep quiet for fear he might be overheard by some agents swarming the sleeping cars and all of them would have had to pay for it.

On the basis of personal experience in the Soviet Union over a period of several years, I would therefore counsel all United States organs of communication to clamp down the tightest boycott of Khrushchev and his entire entourage. There must be no interviews, no TV time at any price. We should ignore them completely. This has been the fate of our diplomatic representatives in Russia since 1933. Let us repay the compliment. We should shun them like the plague, for

they are the carriers of the red plague. This would be the bitterest blow to Khrushchev in his own country. This is the only sensible way to handle the man who has warned us: "We will bury you."

And if we do this from now on and for all time to come, the Russian masses will bless us; they will rejoice and will regain courage to carry on the 40-year war with their oppressors. It is to our vital interest that this should be so.

What should our Government representatives do when facing in the U. N. the leader of the savage war against us?

Since the founding of the U. N. we have suffered endless abuse and insults at the hands of Gromyko, Vishinski, Malik, and the Suslovs. Our delegates have never known and do not know today how to handle them. They lack the necessary Russian background to put up with the Soviet delegates.

Therefore, President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, Ambassador Lodge, and their aids must come with ample ammunition. There is plenty of it in the Library of Congress and in the State Department. Most of all, there is priceless material in the reports by the House and Senate committees which have been investigating the Soviet barbarians for two decades. Let us use it on this important occasion, and effectively expose these gangsters before the whole world.

When Khrushchev talks about American imperialism, let us lay bare at the U. N. meeting the history of Soviet murderous imperialism in the once independent nations they have since enslaved, the millions of men, women, and children they have slaughtered. Let us remind them and the world of the 10,000 Polish officers they had buried alive in the Katyn Forest in Russia, the thousands of brave Hungarian fighters for freedom they had shot down and still are torturing in slave-labor camps in Siberia; the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, etc., they have enslaved and exiled. All that and more should be flung into Khrushchev's face over and again. We must never permit them to forget this, and most of all we must not permit the so-called neutralists to forget lest all of us be engulfed by this Red conflagration.

This is how the Russian peoples would want us to act on the occasion of the U. N. meeting and on all other occasions. For years some of us have been urging this course, but to no avail. Our failure has helped embolden the enemy and has frustrated our friends behind the Iron Curtain.

There are plenty native people among us who are indulging in wishful thinking about the possibility of coexistence. This can never be our fate. Not even if we gave them half of the United States and all the gold at Fort Knox would they deviate from their goal—the communization of the entire free world. The tragedy is that the people in this country who have most at stake are the very ones who are helping dig our freedom's grave out of ignorance, stupidity, and either unwillingness or inability to understand the true nature of the Soviet beast.

Our back is now to the wall in all international arenas. There must be no retreat, no appeasement and no defensive action. We must go on the offensive, determined to carry on until victory is won. In this struggle there need be no American blood shed. The fighting and the dying will be done by the enemies of communism within the Soviet empire, if we will only show some backbone and imagination and stop hobnobbing with the tyrants, stop drinking toasts with them. The Red leopard can no more change his spots than the jungle leopard.

Let us not tremble about Kruschev going to war with us at this time. He is far more afraid of his own people if he starts a war and puts guns into the hands of the Russian masses than he is afraid of our nuclear weapons.

This is the message the Russian masses, the silent people, would want every one of us to have. Let us remember that the Russian people have never made peace with their illegitimate regime, have never recognized them, even though governments of free nations have made the blunder of the 20th century by becoming diplomatic bedfellows with the Soviet Communists.

J. ANTHONY MARCUS,
President, Institute of Foreign Trade.
NEW YORK CITY.

The Hour Is Late for the Survival of Small Business—Let Us Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, since the time I have been privileged to be a Member of this legislative body, one of the subjects about which I have heard a great deal of discussion, with proportionately little action, is the extending of reasonable Federal assistance toward the survival of small business.

The urgent need of Federal aid to small business has been practically unanimously recognized, but we are still working on the legislative accomplishment of the help we know is vital to their continuing existence.

The basic requirement for the preservation of our traditional acceptance and encouragement of small business is a means of providing them with equity capital and long-term credit, which commercial banks and the Small Business Administration are not in any position to grant.

This essential need is adequately met in the substance of S. 3651, while at the same time preserving the full structure of our free-enterprise system. Free enterprise has nothing to fear from this bill, and there is certainly no danger inherent in it of Federal control or favored competition.

The provisions for the extension of equity capital and long-term credit are contained in the basic idea to create small business investment companies, fashioned after the accepted establishments of national farm loan associations, the land bank system, the farm cooperatives, and so forth, all of which, in their inception were financially assisted by the Federal Government. A good many of these are now wholly owned by private interests and others are in the continuing process of liquidating Federal ownership.

The independent study contained in a Rockefeller report emphasized the needs of American small business in this advancing economic age by this language:

> The need is primarily for long-term equity or loan funds. As a result of the inability to obtain capital funds, the opportunity for establishing a new firm, or for expanding an established firm, is often lost. Often the established firm merges with a larger enterprise that can command the necessary resources. The past few years have seen a wave of such mergers. Such a condition is neither conducive to vigorous competition nor to economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any one in this body who does not earnestly desire to strengthen free competitive enterprise in the United States and preserve the healthy traditions and contributions of small business in our historical progress in prosperity. I most earnestly hope that the Senate will consider the House amendment in the near future and that a sensible conference agreement will be soon approved so that this Congress will not pass without discharging its duty to the small-business interests of the country in their most desperate hour.

Our Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Dominican Republic, that great island nation which has for so long constituted the bulwark which has protected our southeastern sea frontier from atheistic communism, has vigorously protested to our Department of State about some remarks made on the floor of this House concerning some of the high officials and military men of that nation.

In these times of great peril which confronts the free world, I believe it to be our duty to not only take cognizance of these protests, but to determine if they are justified. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite easy to shrug off the matter by simply saying "So what?". I must confess that if such protests came from one of the great powers, I would feel like doing exactly that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Dominican Republic, although not a world power, militarily or economically, is, nevertheless, a sovereign nation, and one that has demonstrated over many years that it is our firm friend and our loyal ally. And, of even more importance is the fact that the Dominican Republic is an American nation. All of these circumstances make it imperative that we examine closely the relations that exist between the Dominican Republic and our own country. These circumstances include not only the geographical position of the Dominican Republic in relation to us, but also the ancient and traditional principle of noblesse oblige.

And even more important, Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of our own welfare and the welfare of the Western Hemisphere, are the continuous and vicious attacks that have been for so long leveled against the Dominion Republic and its high officials. This

constitutes something much more than mere coincidence. It is quite evident to all thinking Americans that there exists some central authority which has determined that our loyal ally, the Dominican Republic and its Government, so long established and so long friendly to us, must be eliminated. It is even more surprising when we remember that this state of things and all of this senseless vituperation has been launched against a small and valiant country, one that has always been our dependable friend and ally; that no such insulting vituperation has been unleashed against any Latin American nation that has, unlike our faithful Dominican ally, failed to openly and continuously condemn atheistic communism and those who support it for the conspiracy of bandits and murderers that they are. We must never forget, also, that it was not in the Dominican Republic that our Vice President, the man who holds the second highest elective office in our land, and his wife, the second lady of our Nation, were mobbed, attacked, spat upon, and ridiculed. On the contrary, when our Vice President and his wife visited the Dominican Republic, they were accorded the most friendly and cordial welcome. Indeed, there is no record of abuse being heaped upon any official visit by any dignitary of our Nation who has visited the Dominican Republic. The Dominican Republic has at all times demonstrated that it is, in fact and not in theory, a good neighbor in the very best sense of that term.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Dominican Republic has objected, specifically, to the attacks made upon Gen. Rafael Trujillo, Jr., who is the highest military authority in his country, and who, in the past few months, has shown a propension to carry on a friendship with and associate himself with the highest circles of society existing on our west coast. Unfortunately, some of these attacks have shown a tendency to use language that is, to say the least, of questionable taste, if not downright vulgar. I do not intend to imply, nor shall these remarks be construed as criticizing any of those who have commented. On the contrary, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that those who have engaged in such castigation have had nothing more on their minds than the expression of the saving grace of humor. Be that as it may, in the face of the serious and grave world situation which threatens the very existence of our Christian civilization, the propriety of such humor is also questionable. Such speeches under the conditions now facing us tend to reflect upon the dignity of this country and hold it up to ridicule.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been alleged that General Trujillo, Jr., has been guilty of the awful crime of spending some $50,000 a month on certain west-coast actresses, and that this sum is equal, give or take a little, to the amount of foreign aid extended to his country. Those making such statements simply have not bothered, or have not had the time to acquaint themselves with the facts. While I am only one humble Member of this great and important House, I have made it my business to ascertain the facts. Those facts are that we have not made any loan or gift to our friends of the Dominican Republic, nor have the people of that friendly nation participated in any way in the vast foreign-aid program under which we have for so long been distributing the bounty of our own Nation among the other nations of the world. On the contrary, the Dominican Republic, our stanch friend and valiant ally for so long, is and has been one of the few countries which has proudly stood upon its own feet, asking and accepting nothing from us. Actually, all the funds that we have spent in the Dominican Republic, and are spending in that proud and sovereign nation, have been, and are, to pay for our own technical installations there and to pay the salaries of the personnel there. Let us never forget that our guided-missile program, upon which our very survival may depend, is being continuously tested at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and that our testing range extends from Cape Canaveral through the Caribbean and into the South Atlantic. In order to insure the success of this vital part of our Military Establishment, we must have military establishments, or tracking stations in the Caribbean, and we must have them in a nation that is our firm friend and our dependable ally, a nation which has demonstrated its stability and ability to cope with those evil international Communists who are so desperate to infiltrate all of our most secret defense activities and thus warn and enlighten international communism in advance as to what may be expected from us in case the free world is involved in a holocaust which might well mean the end of our Christian civilization in the Western Hemisphere. In this respect, maintaining friendly and amicable relations with the tried and true Dominican Republic may well be absolutely necessary to the survival of our own great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it quite clear that I ask none of my colleagues and none of my compatriots to approve or pardon the activities of General Trujillo, Jr., in connection with his alleged activities in Hollywood. I am, quite frankly, concerned only with the welfare and survival of our own country. On the other hand, I firmly believe that it is incumbent upon all of us to refrain from vilification of this young man, the commander of the military forces of his nation, a nation which, to us and to every nation in the Americas, occupies a paramount position concerned with the very survival of our Nation, and even our hemisphere. His nation has long been a good neighbor to us. The least we can do is to be a good neighbor to his own country. Being a good neighbor is a two-way street. And, Mr. Speaker, in this instance, as selfish as it may sound, our very survival may depend upon it. And, even beyond that, decency and good manners require that we respect our friends.

Mr. Speaker, it has been alleged that the conduct of General Trujillo, Jr., has offended some of our traditional precepts and morals. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that even granting, for the purpose of this speech only, that such is the case, such conduct would have been quite impossible without the active cooperation of many of our own compatriots? The alleged exaggerated hospitality of this high ranking military man from a friendly nation, now so vital to us, would have been quite impossible without the willing cooperation of citizens of our Nation, or at least permanent residents. Thus it is that if we single out General Trujillo, Jr., upon whom to cast aspersions, we must of necessity castigate also citizens of our own country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues will agree that if, as has been alleged, this young military officer from our friend and ally, the Dominican Republic, is spending some $50,000 a month in our country, we should all be very happy. For more than a decade now, we have been scattering our resources over the world—excluding, I am sorry to say, the nations of Latin America, to any substantial extent, and especially the Dominican Republic—and our riches have been depleted accordingly. We are in the process of becoming a have-not nation. It is only a matter of time until we must ourselves seek economic assistance here. Certainly we would be fortunate indeed if we had a host of rich young men from other countries who would spend large sums in our country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask only that my distinguished colleagues and my compatriots concern themselves with the welfare of our country and do not become embroiled in absurd attacks upon our friendly neighbors. Every attack made upon the Dominican Republic can benefit only Moscow and Peking. I earnestly suggest that every one of my distinguished colleagues who has not already done so, read the remarks of our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman WITHROW, which appeared in the RECORD on the 19th of June, under the title "The Interest of International Communism Has Been Served."

Mr. Speaker, my first objective is the welfare of our own great Nation, and the second is the welfare of our sister nation of the Americas. Only when those objectives have been achieved can we have any legitimate concern with the welfare of the rest of the world.

Mounting Debt Plunges Nation Into New Monetary Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the statistics quoted by Leslie Gould, financial editor, in the following article which appeared in the New York Journal American of August 4, 1958, are worthy of the attention of our colleagues.

The Republican administration's failure to control inflation is shown by the growth of debt, both public and private:

MOUNTING DEBT PLUNGES NATION INTO NEW MONETARY INFLATION

(By Leslie Gould)

The country is heading into another kind of inflation.

For the last 2 or 3 years, it has been a wage-price inflation. That continues, as evidenced by the just-announced steel price increases to offset the July 1 rise in wages.

Now, the country is plunging into a monetary inflation. Federal, State and local debts are going up. Spending is going up. Deficits are going up. So is money in circulation.

This is why the stock market has been going up in the face of slack business, lower earnings and dividends, while bonds, particularly governments, have been going down.

PREFER EQUITIES TO CASH

People would rather have equities than money or its equivalent—that is Government bonds. This, even though many stocks are selling far too high in relation to current earnings and dividend returns as well as prospects in the next year.

There is a flight from the dollar.

Here is the picture:

The Federal Government is going to spend $80 billion in the current fiscal year. In the fiscal year just ended it was $72 billion and in the previous year $69.4 billion.

There will be a deficit of $10 to $12 billion, maybe more this year, depending on how much tax receipts from business are off. In the year just ended the deficit was $2.8 billion against a surplus of $1.6 billion the year before.

The Federal debt limit is going up permanently $10 billion to $285 billion, plus $3 billion additional for a limited period. This is only a starter if the present free spending continues, due to the cold war and the pressure to spend for prosperity.

THRIFTY SHUNNING BONDS

State and local spending is rising as is that debt load, now $52½ billion, against nearly $16 billion at the end of the war and $20.3 billion prewar.

In this flight from the dollar, individual savers and institutional investors are turning away from Government bonds. For some time now cashing in of United States savings bonds has been exceeding sales. Individual holdings of United States savings bonds have slipped from $50.3 billion in June 1956 to $48 billion now.

Mutual savings banks, which held $12 billion of Government bonds in 1947 had reduced this investment to $7.6 billion this year, even though deposits have gone in the same period from $15.3 billion to around $33 billion.

Life insurance companies which held $20.6 billion in governments at the end of 1945 now report $6.9 billion, although total life insurance investments have gone from $27.4 billion prewar to $46.4 billion in 1946 and now are close to the $100 billion mark—$96.6 billion to be exact.

Federal Reserve holdings of Government bonds have gone up in the last month $900 million, totaling $24.9 billion for the latest week.

The Treasury has bought and retired since June $456 million of a long term issue publicly offered the first of that month, and additionally bought $133½ million for Treasury investment accounts.

Commercial banks now hold around $63 billion of Government bonds against $55.8 billion in June of last year.

A rise in commercial bank as well as Federal Reserve holdings of Government bonds is inflationary. This is a form of printing press money. It inflates the money supply about twice the amount of bonds placed with banks.

The United States Treasury 4 to 6 years ago missed the boat, when, instead of converting a major part of the debt into long term bonds for investors, it financed with short term securities. Long term securities could have been sold then.

HALF DEBT INFLATION

Today, the Treasury can sell only short terms, as it found out in June when it tried to sell a long-term issue. The Government bond market broke and in 3 weeks the Treasury had to step in and buy back—at lower prices—about half of its long-term offering.

On top of the staggering Federal debt—soon to exceed $285 billion—there is the $52½ billion State and local debt. At the close of the war the Federal debt was $259 billion, compared to $42 billion prewar. The State and local debt was just over $20 billion prewar.

This inflation of the Federal debt—about half of the war debt was due to the Government's failure to control inflation then—is reflected in the tremendous cost of servicing it—interest. The interest cost of the present Federal debt is $7.6 billion and it won't be long before it tops $8 billion. Prewar it was around $1 billion.

Here is the rest of the debt picture:

Consumer credit is now around $43 billion against $27.4 billion 6 years ago, $8.4 billion at the end of the war, and $7.2 billion prewar.

Nonfarm mortgage debts total around $132 billion, compared to $32½ billion at the close of the war and $25 billion prewar.

DEBT NEARING TRILLION

Corporate debt amounts to about $235 billion now against $93.5 billion at the end of the war and $73.6 billion prewar.

To recapitulate, the public debt is between $327½ and $337½ billion and private debt—individual and corporate—around $450 billion.

Today's dollar is a 62-cent one compared to what it was at the end of the war in purchasing power and a less-than-50-cent one compared to what it would buy prewar.

Inflation is becoming more and more a way of life here as it has been so long elsewhere, such as in South America.

Letters From Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Edward A. Collins which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 5, 1958:

LETTERS FROM READERS—DEMOCRATS BELIEVE FARLEY WOULD ADD DIGNITY TO SENATE

(By Edward A. Collins)

At the turn of the century, the American system of elections had sunk in public esteem to such low ebb that it was described as that legal process by which the American people were permitted to elect to office the previous illegal selections of party leaders.

That such cynical definition is obnoxious to the dignity—to say nothing of the sovereignty—of the American people is apparent from the opprobrium attached to the smoke-filled room of the notorious 1920 manipulations. But the evil of the smoke-filled room was not the aroma of tobacco; it lay in the asphyxiation of the will of the American people.

The fact is the people of New York may witness just such an outrageous operation in this campaign. Indeed, if Democratic Party leaders succumb to what are reported to be heavy temptations, and, of course, pressures, the exercise of their powers of party leadership against the candidacy of James A. Farley will amount to just that.

The smoke-filled room technique is distinguishable from a putsch, as one writer recently characterized the current movement to bypass Farley, only to the degree of physical force used. There is no difference in the application of moral principles; both are used to defeat a decision which would prevail by orderly constitutional and democratic process.

Democrats throughout this State believe that because of his broad national and international experience, Mr. Farley will add dignity to the United States Senate, honor to New York and all its people. Moreover, his record of public service is such as to command the respect and support of a very considerable body of citizens regardless of party affiliation.

Supporters of Farley are now entitled as both a legal right and as a moral duty to advance their reasons for such support. Indeed, it is incumbent upon them, as I find it now incumbent upon me, to persuade those responsible that Farley adherents are well in the majority in the Democratic Party in New York State, that interference with or frustration of the majority will is abhorrent and dangerous.

MANHATTAN.

Our Water Resources as Seen by Senator Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 45th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was honored by having Senator MIKE MANSFIELD welcome the members to Washington. While he extended the members a warm and most cordial welcome, he gave the meeting vitally important information on our water resources in his brilliantly delivered speech. I feel all the Members of Congress will be interested in reading his remarks, which I present below:

WELCOMING SPEECH OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, MONTANA, 45TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 15, 1958

It is indeed a pleasure to be here this morning and I bring to all of you the greetings of the Senate of the United States for a most succeeful 45th convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

During this session of Congress the House and Senate have given considerable time and deliberation to the best and most immediate means of combating the recession which has engulfed the Nation. The Rivers and Harbors Congress has and can continue to do a great job in helping to meet this challenge through its efforts in behalf of water resource development. This Nation's water resources are now recognized for their worth and if this value is to be fully realized it will require a coordinated plan of development and protection.

President OVERTON BROOKS and Executive Vice President William H. Webb are to be highly commended for effective guidance

and counsel in developing our water resources.

The public works programs being considered by Congress as antirecession measures include flood control, rivers and harbors construction, watershed programs, water-pollution control, and reclamation, all of vital concern to you folks.

Water requirements for this country will be much greater in the future than they are today. Water use for domestic and industrial purposes has increased 50 percent in the past 10 years. In many areas supply has not kept pace with the demand and this problem will become more difficult in the next few years.

Rivers and harbors projects are naturals in any antirecession program, they provide employment, they provide a stabilizing influence on local economy and provide multipurpose benefits. The continued growth of our population and the expansion of industry along our waterways are intensifying flood, stream pollution and power problems. This organization can be of inestimable value in assisting the Federal Government and the individual States in meeting these numerous problems. We know that our natural wealth is not endless and this organization has helped and will continue to help guide the policy of the Government in water-resource development.

I do not want to appear to be preoccupied with construction of power project and navigation projects for I fully realize the attainment of our goals in water resource development will require a variety of conservation practices. Among these is the prevention and control of water pollution and the regulation of runoffs to even out stream flows. In addition, we must give consideration to the preservation of our recreation facilities.

I would like to comment briefly on the international aspects of America's water resource development. It is not news to anyone here that the nations of the free world are not only competing with the Communist world on a military and ideological basis but we are also competing with the Soviet Union and her satellites for industrial supremacy, which has definite relationship with the development of rivers and waterways for power and navigation.

In the past year several startling reports have been issued in the Senate pointing up the tremendous progress made in the Soviet Union on the development of their water resources.

A report issued by the Senate Committee on Interior indicated that Russia and China are driving forward river and water resource development programs that are overtaking those of the United States.

After ALLEN ELLENDER, the senior Senator from Louisiana, returned from his most recent trip to the Soviet Union he stated that "As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development they are inching ahead of us and in some areas of the tooling industry they are very close to our own standards."

HENRY JACKSON, the junior Senator from Washington made a trip to the Soviet Union in 1957 and he reported that he was particularly impressed by the Soviet advance in the field of hydroelectric power—"one of the vital bases for industrial growth and strength." Senator JACKSON inspected a dam at Stalingrad on the Volga River which, when completed in the near future, will have a generating capacity of 2,310,000 kilowatts—far greater than that produced at Grand Coulee Dam. The Soviet Union already has in operation at Kuibyshev on the Volga a dam larger than Grand Coulee. It is the world's largest single producer of hydroelectric power. Its generating capacity is 2,100,000 kilowatts.

This is only a small sample of what the Russians are doing in the field of water resource development. They have not accomplished what we have in this country with free enterprise, but we cannot be overconfident. We must go on to greater things in the field of water-resource development, so that we can maintain this leadership. We cannot do this standing still and the Rivers and Harbors Congress can be instrumental in seeing that we maintain this lead.

I was indeed sorry that the President saw fit to veto the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Over 90 percent of the projects included in this general authorization measure were approved in Federal Government surveys and studies. The bill included many Army engineer projects of vital importance to every section of the country, flood-control projects, harbor projects, and multi-purpose power projects.

This legislation has been referred back to the Senate Committee on Public Works and I am confident that the committee will recommend that the Congress override the Presidential veto. An additional year's delay in authorizing these projects will have grave consequences, especially at this time when stimulants and new sources of employment are so badly needed.

The Rivers and Harbors Congress is nearing its half century of service to the Nation in preserving and developing our water resources. Water has been taken for granted for far too many years and largely through the efforts of this organization we in America are becoming water conscious, a major factor in the growth of the United States.

The Senate is truly indebted to the Rivers and Harbors Congress for its advice and counsel. Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana, JAMES E. MURRAY, and the entire membership of the Senate join me in welcoming the Rivers and Harbors Congress to the Nation's Capitol.

Loophole in Law Permits Food Chains To Escape FTC Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter that the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has received from Chairman John W. Gwynne of the Federal Trade Commission, in regard to a serious loophole in our laws that has been construed by the courts as permitting chain food stores, or any other business for that matter, to escape Federal Trade Commission scrutiny of unfair trade practices by the simple expedient of buying a minority interest in a small meatpacking plant.

The Senate has passed legislation to close this loophole and to bring the wholesaling of meat, so far as unfair trade practices are concerned, under the concurrent jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission. At present the Department of Agriculture has sole jurisdiction in this area. Since the Department of Agriculture lacks the experience, and judging from its lack of activity, the will to discharge its responsibility, I believe it is important that Congress complete action on this legislation before we adjourn.

Joint hearings on various proposals to accomplish this objective were conducted by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Commerce and Finance Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, and the Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. These joint hearings resulted in a determination that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had jurisdiction in this field, and our committee reported favorably H. R. 11234. The House Committee on Agriculture also reported a bill on this subject, H. R. 9020.

The latter bill was cleared by the Committee on Rules and is now on the House Calendar. I urgently request my colleagues in the House to give serious consideration to this important measure and recommend a thorough study of the views expressed by Chairman Gwynne in the following letter:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, August 4, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With the 2d session of the 85th Congress rapidly drawing to a close, the Federal Trade Commission desires to call your attention to a most serious and pressing legislative problem which has been constantly increasing and which, in the absence of remedial legislation in this session, could jeopardize a substantial part of the Commission's antimonopoly program.

As you are aware, by reason of the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended, the Commission has been deprived of jurisdiction over those corporations which qualify as packers within the meaning of that act. Among the corporations so qualifying and by reason thereof completely exempt from the provisions of various statutes enforced by the Commission, are the Nation's seven leading food chainstore organizations.

In a recent examination of our records, we found that we had 36 cases in the investigational stage which involved firms either listed as packers or claimed to be packers under the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

During the last 60 days, there have been closed or recommended for closing 6 cases on the basis that the proposed respondents were packers. Four of these involved charges of price discrimination or receipt of discriminatory prices by retail grocery chains. One involved a cereal and flour manufacturer allegedly engaged in price discrimination. Another involved one of the largest fruit and vegetable canners in the United States.

Increasingly, other corporations are claiming the same exemption or are taking steps to qualify. In one litigated case a large chain recently purchased 100 shares of stock in a packing organization and immediately filed a motion for dismissal.

At present, we are investigating a buying group engaged in the purchase of frozen foods through a subsidiary which acts as a broker and collects brokerage on purchases made for this group. We recently received a letter from the attorney representing both the buying group and the broker advising us that the buying group had purchased 10 shares of stock in 1 packing company and that the broker had purchased 10 shares of stock in another packing company. The total value of both purchases is less than

$300. In the letter advising us of this stock purchase, the attorney made the following statement:

"Moreover, we think it proper to advise that it is our considered legal opinion that as of this date the Federal Trade Commission has no further jurisdiction or control over either of the respective operations of [the buying group or the broker] since each is now under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture by virtue of having become embraced under the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act."

In seven cases the Commission's Bureau of Litigation has returned to the Bureau of Investigation files containing a recommendation for complaint, for further investigation to determine whether the Commission has jurisdiction under the Packers and Stockyards Act. Several of these cases involve some of the Nation's largest business organizations.

The Federal Trade Commission appreciates your continued interest in the success of our work, and we earnestly hope you will do all in your power to secure passage of appropriate legislation which would avoid the frustration of a substantial segment of our antitrust laws.

By direction of the Commission.

JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman.

Address of Secretary of State Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report and speech delivered by the Secretary of State of New York, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, on July 30 at the Washington Irving High School in New York City. Several hundred members of the civil defense of the borough of Manhattan applauded the utterances of Mr. De Sapio.

SECRETARY OF STATE DESAPIO LAMBASTS THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION FOR FAILING TO TAKE ACTION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF FALLOUT SHELTERS, CLAIMING THAT THERE IS NO NATIONAL CIVIL DEFENSE PLAN IN EFFECT—ADDS THAT ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE IS VITAL, NOT ONLY AS PREPARATION FOR ANY EMERGENCY, BUT ALSO AS A DETERRENT TO AGGRESSION

At the special award ceremonies honoring civil defense volunteers who have been presented with 5-year service certificates, held at the Washington Irving High School, 16th Street and Irving Place, Wednesday evening, Secretary of State Carmine G. DeSapio, representing Gov. Averell Harriman, criticized the Eisenhower administration for failing to take action in the construction of fallout shelters.

Mr. DeSapio declared that the international situation in the Middle East had shaken the American people out of their complacency and had made them more fully cognizant of the "capabilities and readiness of our civil defense forces."

Mr. DeSapio, in indignant tone, charged the Federal administration with adamant irresponsibility, adding that "there is no national civil defense plan in effect today, much less the means of carrying out such a plan in the event of attack."

Mr. DeSapio's speech follows:

"I am very happy to be here this evening and to participate in these ceremonies honoring a group of my fellow-citizens of Manhattan who have earned the respect, the admiration and the gratitude of every New Yorker.

"Governor Harriman has asked me to extend to each of you ladies and gentlemen his personal good wishes and his very warmest appreciation for the remarkable job you have done, here in one of America's most critical defense areas, to protect our city against the threat of attack.

"There probably is not a man or woman in New York who has not wondered at some time during the past 3 weeks if the terrible moment of war might not be imminent. Surely, there are few of us who can honestly say that we have not asked ourselves what would happen if, suddenly, without warning, the terrible weapons of modern warfare were to come hurtling down upon us from the skies.

"Indeed, the international events of the past few weeks have shaken most Americans out of the complacent attitude which has prevailed for many months, and have brought to each of us a much fuller and immediate personal concern for the capabilities and readiness of our civil defense forces.

"I pray to God that these forces never will be called upon to perform the services for which they have been trained. But, certainly, it is reassuring to know that they stand ready to spring to action at a moment's notice, if necessary.

"Perhaps only as such critical times as these do we truly realize the debt of gratitude which each of us owes to the volunteer workers who man our city's defense system, and to whom civil defense is a matter of personal concern at all times.

"For these are the men and women whose volunteer efforts, and whose dedication to the safety of their fellow citizens, have built in New York State the largest, the best equipped and the best trained civil defense organization in America.

"The members of this vast organization serve entirely in the public interest, without pay or allowances. Their only reward, and I can assure you that it is a considerable one, is the personal knowledge and satisfaction of having accepted a formidable task and having fulfilled their self-imposed responsibilities capably and with distinction.

"The Civil Defense Corps of New York City offers a particularly fine example of the spirited and unselfish devotion that has brought this complex statewide organization into being.

"Under the very able leadership of Maj. Gen. Robert E. Condon, our city has developed a civil defense program which has given training and experience to more than 520,000 civil defense workers, including 325,000 volunteers.

In the past, our civil defense preparations have been seriously limited by the refusal of the Federal Government to recognize and to accept primary responsibility for setting up an adequate civil defense establishment.

"The rule has been 'Every State for itself,' and this, in many areas, means virtually 'Every man for himself.'

"As a result of this adamant irresponsibility, there is no national civil defense plan in effect today, much less the means for carrying out such a plan in the event of attack.

"For 3 years, as chairman of the special committee on civil defense of the Governors' Conference, Governor Harriman has been prodding the Federal Government into recognizing and fulfilling its responsibilities. Largely through his efforts, Congress has passed legislation which establishes joint responsibility between the Federal and State Governments, and provides for Federal contributions to the costs of State and local civil defense organizations.

"This is an important step in the right direction, and one in which every New Yorker may take special pride.

"The Federal Government has refused, however, to recognize any obligation for the construction of fallout shelters. According to reliable press accounts, the Gaither report called for the immediate commencement of a nationwide shelter program. The Eisenhower administration suppressed that report and twice has refused a request by Governor Harriman's committee to release the portion dealing with fallout shelters, so that we might know the dangers facing us. This is but another example of the attitude of certain officials in Washington who seem to feel that the true facts of the world situation are too alarming for the American people to be properly informed about them.

"With such an attitude prevalent among the high officials responsible for the defense of our Nation, it is time that recognition was given to the men and women who have seen for themselves the dangers our country faces, and who have done something about it by offering their services to civil defense. This spring Governor Harriman inaugurated the program of awarding certificates of public service to all civil defense volunteers who have served for 5 years or more. It is the first time, anywhere, that such recognition has been offered.

"Tonight's awards come at a time when it is especially clear to all of us that an adequate civil defense is vital, not only as preparation for any emergency, but also as a deterrent to aggression. These certificates of public service, which have been signed by the governor, and to which he has affixed his privy seal, are presented in acknowledgment of the services rendered in countless hours of emergency, danger, and need when civil defense proved its value in peacetime, and demonstrated its readiness for a vastly greater emergency which, I believe, can still, and can only, be avoided if we are prepared to meet it."

The President Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the high point in recent meetings of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been remarks from the President. At the 45th national convention, held here in Washington, D. C., this year, we were honored by having the speech from the President delivered by Maj. Gen. J. S. Bragdon, special assistant to the President of the United States. The President in his remarks recognized the importance of river and harbor and water resources development. General Bragdon gave us a short, but vitally important speech on his own be-

half and I take pleasure in presenting herewith these two addresses:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. J. S. BRAGDON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1958

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the President asked me to convey to you his personal regards and to present a message to all in attendance at this conference. It is a great privilege for me to do so:

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR OVERTON: Please give my greetings to those attending the 45th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

This annual meeting demonstrates the widespread interest of our citizens in the use and conservation of our country's water and land resources. Here too is convincing evidence that there must be the broadest possible participation and cooperation in the development of our resource projects.

This work takes time and skill. It is a real application of Amercian democracy; with all voices heard, all needs fairly weighed.

We begin with a host of problems: the growing competitive uses of water, the thirst of our complex metropolitan and suburban areas, the sometimes overlapping and conflicting responsibilities of Federal, State, and local agencies. In trying to answer these problems there are bound to be honest differences of opinion, but every effort must be made to move forward to new achievements in the public interest.

Our plans should be comprehensive to keep in balance all types of public construction according to their relative urgencies.

Legislation for the 12 interstate compacts recently enacted by the Congress is a good example of the way water resource plans can be hammered out by enlisting the abilities of all concerned. Then as all join in vigorous preliminary participation, there is good reason to believe they will continue to share in the actual development, operation, and maintenance of works of improvement. This healthy process is well known to the members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress who have long played an active part in this demanding field.

In this spirit, I am delighted to send best wishes to you for another fine convocation.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The President emphasized, as you have noted, what we believe to be one of the fundamental prerequisites for securing the kind of water resource development from which we all can receive lasting satisfaction—broad participation, cooperation, and willingness to share responsibility.

Since time began, man has had to deal with the plain but stubborn fact that his wants are infinite while the resources available to satisfy them have specific limits. History is replete with examples of how societies down through the ages have organized themselves to match resources with needs. Success in this effort has insured survival, as with Switzerland. Failure to do so resulted in decline and ultimate decay as with ancient Syria.

In the United States, we have traditionally recognized the right of freedom of action of individuals. But, in George Bernard Shaw's language, "Liberty (freedom) means responsibility. That is why most men dread it." So the right of each community to enjoy its water resources carries with it also participation in their development—responsibilities which include cooperative action and compromise when necessary for the overall good.

Our public works needs have pyramided. Count the needs of your children and grandchildren and those of your neighbors. In ever-increasing amounts they require additional public facilities, including water supply, water transportation, and all the other blessings that result from the best uses of water.

Their needs are augmented by greater wants for better living, a better car, wider streets, and better lighting. We want our children's standard of living to grow.

When our citizens become cramped in our cities and want the fresh air and greater space of the suburbs, they get on the move. And Mr. Tom Jones, citizen, expects his public servants to provide additional public facilities for him to do so. We believe the expectations reasonable.

These not-so-unreasonable needs, wants, and growth movements have expanded to such gargantuan proportions that our resources have become taxed and we must choose between them. We must determine the relative urgencies of these demands. We need a sound method for this determination.

In a particular sense, when a region's citizens count up their natural water and related land resources and consider their future, should they in an arid region say, "We shall make steel here," or in the midst of the Rockies, "We shall raise cattle here." Should they not rather inquire, "What can we best do with what God has given us? What water resources have we? Are they limited? Can we augment them? Can we use them to transport materials to us and to carry away what we make? Shall we farm, mine, raise cattle, or manufacture? Finally, in view of all factors, what various alternatives have we to choose from to best guide our immediate future and the longer range future of our children?"

We believe a sound answer is that the best path of growth is that which nature dictates with all her assets weighed together. It is not a unilateral approach which springs from a study by any one agency which has been charged with one major function. We believe any region has a right to consider all possible alternative choices for its future growth.

We believe simply that the principles, choice, and selection of "the best for the region," "the best for the basin," "the best for the State," and 'the best for the Nation" should be applied to all planning before decisions are made. And all the folks of the region, basin, or State should have a voice in this planning from the beginning.

Comprehensive planning connotes not only a coordination of the functional planning of agencies and the harmonizing of the efforts of all levels of government, but aggressive participation by those primarily concerned. We have only to look at the $12-billion plan of the great State of California for an outstanding example. Think of it—a $12-billion plan for one State. It is their plan. Of course, they have cooperated with Federal and local agencies in its development and desire the benefits of such Federal assistance as the laws provide. But California has a plan based on California's conception of California's future.

The great State of Texas is, I understand, developing a long-range plan which, too, will be Texas' own plan as Texans see their destiny.

I believe you in this Rivers and Harbors Congress agree in wanting the best plan, not the next best. The recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, submitted to the Congress of the United States in January 1956, contained policies and principles with attendant organizations to make our water-resources-development programs the best.

They mark out a coordinated course of action whose sole objective is to attain the best.

Our water policies, to a degree, have, like Topsy, "just growed" in a somewhat piecemeal fashion. This was only natural, since the Federal Government has at different historical periods responded to the most prominent pressure of need of the people of that period. Emphasis on functional development through programs of specific agencies with specific duties was natural. But as the country has become more and more closely knit together, and its needs have grown in diversity, complexity, and size, these functions have overlapped and impinged on each other in many regions.

Some years ago a friend of mine told me of the expansion of his company in the food line. It absorbed many smaller food businesses, some of which in turn had several lines which competed with those of other divisions of the mother company. This overlapping took place not only in type of product but soon in the regions served geographically. The law of diminishing returns came into play and earnings fell. Management then had to reexamine their resources and objectives and do some pruning. No major divisions were eliminated but collaboration was secured through establishment of definite policies and a rearrangement of the organization to assure their carrying out.

The need for coordination of our water resource development through adoption of a broad national policy with effective organization to follow up is greater today than ever. We need some more definite charts and guides to follow as programs and projects multiply.

I would like to recall for your consideration a point made by your able President, the Honorable Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, in his statement before the House Public Works Committee several years ago. It is even more applicable today. He stated that the matter of providing a sound policy for the conservation and development of our country's water resources is of broad national interest involving the Federal Government, the States, the political subdivisions, corporate entities, and individuals.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been traditionally a leader in the water resources development of our country. We can take comfort in the knowledge that your organization will continue to advance the common effort for better balanced, more economic, coordinated public construction in which all citizens can participate and from which all will benefit.

Lincoln High School Band Rates Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln High School Band of Vincennes, Ind., is a very outstanding organization. This is not just my opinion; it has been confirmed in the State band contests for the last 8 years, in which the Lincoln band has been among the first division class A leaders in each instance. Two years ago it was chosen as one of two bands to appear before the National Musical Education Association. It is a band with an impressive tradition, a

tradition which is being carried on this year.

On August 23, the Lincoln High School Band will be the featured band at the Chicagoland Musical Festival, demonstrating their marching and playing ability at (in) (on) Soldiers Field, Chicago. This is an honor richly deserved for this fine organization. But even this is not what truly distinguishes this group in my mind.

It costs money to send a band on special trips. The Vincennes community has responded to the needs of the band on several occasions. For this Chicago trip, the band members decided they would not ask the people of Vincennes for additional money, but each would pledge to earn at least $15 to turn over to the general expense fund. As a consequence they offered their services for car washing, lawn-mowing, cleaning and other chores and raised the money on their own.

To me, this kind of spirit and self-reliance are what we most want to see in our young people. It demonstrates the kind of qualities that go into producing the finest American citizens. These boys and girls know how to work together to achieve the things they want, and this ability is not limited to their musical performance. I know Indiana will have good reason to be proud of them when they appear in Chicago.

The Christian Science Monitor Appraises the Work of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, recently published a series of excellent articles by Vartanig Vartan analyzing the antitrust policy and action of the Eisenhower administration. These articles plainly show that the antitrust laws have been enforced with vigor, but that at the same time the program has been fair and well balanced. It is to the credit of Judge Hansen, the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and his predecessor, Judge Barnes, that this work has won such high praise.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this fine series of articles:

WASHINGTON PARADOX—ZEAL FANS ANTITRUST MOVES

As business sails into the second half of stormy 1958, executives pace the deck, fretting about wage contracts and prices, sales, and profits. But they share the conviction that the coming months—give or take a half dozen—will calm the churning waters.

Today, the biggest lingering concern of the businessman is not the economic outlook but the long antitrust arm ("You can run but you can't hide") of the United States. It can dart, quicker than a lashing typhoon, out of a calm sky.

Nary a mention of this ogre creeps into the stately, soothing words of the company annual report, but to his confidants the executive mutters darkly about the ghostly arm from Washington.

PICKLE PACKERS, TOO

The ghost has taken form to reach out recently for such giants as Gulf Oil, Radio Corporation of America, Bethlehem Steel, Continental Can, Procter & Gamble, Foremost Dairies, and dozens of other major firms.

The small fellow is safer but scarcely immune. The Justice Department has moved against waste-rag sellers in St. Louis, pickle packers in New York, and live lobster distributors in Maine.

The antitrust ghost casts a chronic shadow over General Motors, and United States Steel takes infinite care to see that its steelmaking capacity stays below one-third of the industry total.

The corporate Ulysses must hold a firm hand on the sales-and-profit tiller but keep glancing over his shoulder at the shifting antitrust winds which blow from Washington. There is no warning when old laws may receive new interpretations and the businessmen abhors this sort of uncertainty.

A political paradox clouds the sky. The Republican administration of President Eisenhower has hotly patrolled the antitrust lanes in a manner that puts to shame past Democratic regimes.

"What," the businessman cries out, "gives?"

SOME SAY "RED HERRING"

Some observers say the intensified antitrust action constitutes a convenient "red herring" for the administration, which wants to escape any stigma of favoring big business.

This philosophy may pay off at the polls (the Justice Department usually manages to file a well-publicized suit just before the November election). But the procedure scarcely wins the heart of the company executive who often feels that antitrust laws persecute him for superior performance.

The Government's chief trustbusters, interviewed in their paneled offices in Washington, tell reporters they simply seek to enforce the statutes. They deny any veiled plans to shackle business giants and spring the votes.

However, the Nation's Capital is a city where nothing beyond the weather report is issued without some shade of political significance. (Wall Street, for one place, never can quite get this fact through its head.)

Certainly, the Eisenhower regime in its 5½ years, could have gone easier in its antitrust endeavors. Herbert Brownell, Jr., who helped to produce the storm as Attorney General before he returned to his old New York law firm last October, ranked as one of the Cabinet advisers closest to Mr. Eisenhower.

ZEAL EXCITES NOTICE

But there exists another factor in the groundswelling of antitrust activity more important that bold political motives. This factor, which never sees the light of public print, is the zeal of a large corps of lawyers and economists employed by the Justice Department. Attorneys who have watched the inner workings of this mechanism use such terms as "missionary dedication" in describing this zeal.

The Justice Department employs nearly 250 lawyers, and a hardy group of them, coupled with the economists, delight in the pursuit of suits which business claims are aimed to bring big business to its knees.

In fiscal 1952—the year before the Republicans won the White House—the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department filed 30 cases. The number of new proceedings, growing steadily to 55 in fiscal 1957 and the total for the newly ended July-to-June year runs nearly as high.

Antitrust law seeks to promote competition in the open market. It is as distinctively American as the hot dog or the cowboy movie.

CREDO ENUNCIATED

Victor R. Hansen, a mild and kindly faced man who looks like everybody's favorite uncle, is charged with the responsibility today of enforcing the antitrust laws in his post as Assistant Attorney General. He is a former superior court judge in California and has served in his present capacity since July 1956, under appointment by President Eisenhower.

In a speech earlier this year he set forth the following antitrust credo:

"The antitrust laws are designed to preserve the competitive system of free enterprise which is perhaps the country's proudest boast. We reject socialistic schemes of state planning, and a business life dominated by restrictive cartels and regulations. We believe that a large part of the material gains achieved by this country stem from our system of free and open competition under private enterprise.

"We are sure that in the final analysis, a free economy is best for all. And the antitrust division seeks to preserve that free economy through the enforcement of our country's antitrust laws."

CLIMATE OF FREE MARKETS

Mr. Hansen (he is called Judge Hansen by his staff) denies that the administration takes a stand against business—big or small. "Our goal," he says, " is to promote a climate of free markets in which all business can prosper and grow."

He points out that the current administration has brought suits against lead producers, shrimp dealers, airlines, trailer operators, labor organizations, shipping firms, and linen suppliers.

"Antitrust has moved against restraints on the manufacture of eye glasses, false teeth, and vitamin pills," he adds. "It covers the theater and arts as well. Thus, we have proceeded against restraints by the New York City Theater Scenery Haulers as well as the International Boxing Club; and blending theater with sport, as well as with a sense of humor, we have attacked restraints on commercial wrestling."

TOUGH OPPONENTS FOR WALL STREET'S BEST—ANTITRUST LAWYERS HIT HARD AT BIG BUSINESS

The pay scale for trial attorneys in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department starts at $7,570 and ends at $11,610. When he leaves Washington to try a case in court, the Government lawyer receives $12 a day for all expenses.

"We lose money on these trips," an antitrust lawyer confides. "We get a hotel room for $5.50 a day and we eat in second-rate restaurants. In the end we put out our own money."

When he appears in court, the trustbusting attorney may find his opponent is a top partner in a Wall Street law firm, a man whose pretax income can hit $200,000 in a good year. And these are good years for corporation lawyers whose clients are distressed by antitrust jitters.

FULL BACKING OF UNITED STATES

The salary scale may suggest that the Justice Department attorney begins his court battles with the odds heavily against him. But there is one point in his favor, and nobody—even the Wall Street lawyer—ever forgets it: the might and majesty of the United States Government stands in back of the antitrust attorney. Moreover, the Government is the Nation's biggest banker, landlord, insurance agent, and job giver.

The simple act of filing an antitrust case (the labors are not so simple; in one suit the Government interviewed 2,000 service station operators in its field preparation) places a tremendous pressure on the corporate defendant.

"There's another thing, too," remarks a corporation lawyer. "The Government attorney keeps his job even if he loses the case." Company counsel are not always so fortunate; an official of Madison Square Garden Corp. admits that the Garden switched lawyers after its law firm—a prominent New York brace of names—lost an antitrust case.

Highly paid and highly trained corporation lawyers are articulate men and, in off-the-record discussions, they level some of the more telling criticism at the current trend (lawyers call it "thrust") of antitrust endeavor.

MERGER MORALE SHAKEN

Some see a gathering assault on big business per se. This would follow the reasoning that bigness is tantamount to badness. The Justice Department denies any such course, but many a legal specialist remains skeptical.

The Supreme Court decision last year, that Du Pont violated antitrust laws with its 23 percent stock ownership in General Motors dealt a staggering blow to corporate merger morale in general. This started out as a Sherman Act case, but the decision hinged on a Clayton Act violation. What use the trustbusters will make of this decision remains to be seen, but it certainly strengthens the hand of the administration in antitrust attacks.

"It is very interesting," notes a top corporation lawyer, "that the Union Carbide complaint was issued about a month after the Du Pont-General Motors decision." The Federal Trade Commission entered this action, charging that Union Carbide's acquisition of Visking Corp. either will lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in the field of polyethylene (the fastest growing plastic and that squeeze bottle miracle) and synthetic sausage casings.

NEW TARGETS LOOM

Today, the FTC and the Justice Department are hammering away at big corporate mergers, citing violations of the Clayton Act as amended in 1950. Within a few years, particularly if the Government loses the key cases, the antitrust guns will swing onto other targets.

The Securities and Exchange Commission might enter the act, too, through a side door. Possible targets the Government may strike at in future years include insurance firms and investment companies.

Observers point out that any growing attack on bigness per se would run counter to the broad swing of economic events. Our population is expected to rise sharply in coming generations. This will demand greater efficiencies in production, marketing, and distribution. The bigger companies are better able to handle this job, its defendants argue. Whether we like it or not, the sweep of economic reality is leading the Nation toward greater uniformity in the manufacture and use of consumer goods.

Just how ecective are the current antitrust actions? Which groups do they help, and which groups do they ignore?

SMILE ON SMALL FIRMS

Some lawyers who have studied the Eisenhower administration's approach to antitrust actions in the past 5½ years argue that big business and the average consumer basically are left out in the cold while small business and medium-size business bask in the warmth of the House.

In virtually every major antitrust case, corporate attorneys say, the Government is concerned about the effects on the small-business man. The American public, these lawyers maintain, has gotten little practical benefit—particularly in terms of lower prices for the products it buys—from all the frenzied antitrust activity.

Victor R. Hansen, Assistant Attorney General, is one man who believes otherwise. In a recent speech he declared: "Many of the actions instituted by the Antitrust Division during the past year have been aimed at conspiracies to fix the selling price of commodities which are of vital importance in the budget of every consumer."

PRICE FIXING CHARGED

As examples, Mr. Hansen points to an action in Oregon concerning a conspiracy to fix prices on milk and to cases in New England in which the Government claimed contractors for concrete form work conspired to boost the cost of building a typical house by $100.

The Government also has charged price fixing on such consumer items as kitchen appliances, hardware, gasoline, and housewares. But it evidently feels the need for selling its antitrust program to the public, a rather puzzled group of some 172 million persons watching prices creep up on virtually every item it buys.

When William P. Rogers held his first press conference last December after taking office as Attorney General, he outlined plans to show the public that trustbusting today helps to keep the cost of living down.

He was asked what form the policy line on antitrust cases will take and he replied: "We will follow pretty much the same policy in the antitrust field as in the past. * * * I do think, maybe, we ought to explain the work of the Antitrust Division more than we have done in the past."

SECTION 7 RENOVATED, TIGHTENED—ANTITRUST DRIVE GETS NEW TEETH

Lawyers speak of old section 7 and new section 7 in somewhat the same manner housewives talk about their old ice box and their new refrigerator.

What is section 7, that vague term that sounds to the layman like an errand somebody forgot to run?

It is the main weapon wielded by the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission in their current campaign to batter down business mergers.

The existence of new or amended section 7 of the Clayton Act provided important antitrust ammunition for the Eisenhower administration. The FTC and the Justice Department, in effect, could replace smoke shells with high explosives, thanks to a stronger statute.

The Truman administration filed only a single section 7 case (in June 1952 against Pillsbury Mills for acquiring firms making family flour and flour-base mixes). By mid-1956 the Eisenhower trustbusters had filed a baker's dozen of antimerger cases. By mid-1958 the total ran up to the 30 mark.

MERGERS CONTESTED

Every one of the cases contested a merger or acquisition by some substantial company. The list of defendants reads like a Who's Who in industry. It includes Crown Zellerbach, General Shoe, Owens-Illinois Glass, Union Bag & Paper, A. G. Spalding & Bros., Fruehauf Trailer, Borden, Brillo Manufacturing, and International Paper.

American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., in a Justice Department action, was cited—among other things—for the potential manufacture of steel bathtubs.

Some of the cases (e. g., Farm Journal and General Shoe) were settled by the ordering of limited divestiture. Others like Hilton Hotels and Union Bag gave rise to consent decrees.

But the bulk of the cases are pending. And their fate—as finally decided by court trials and appeals to the Supreme Court—will determine in the immediate years ahead the success of the broadside attack against mergers in this decade.

When the Supreme Court in 1950 approved the acquisition of Consolidated Steel Corp. by United States Steel the weakness of the Sherman Act of 1890 as a standard in preventing mergers became apparent. With its 1950 amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act, Congress sought to strengthen prior limitations on mergers.

LOOPHOLE

New section 7, also known as the Celler-Kefauver amendment, was broadened to cover corporations acquiring the assets, as well as the stock, of another company. This was designed to plug a loophole in the former statute.

Here is the heart of amended section 7: "Nor corporation * * * shall acquire * * * the stock * * * or * * * assets of another corporation * * * where in any line of commerce in any section of the country the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly."

With tooth-comb care the forthcoming antitrust court trials will transform the wording of the new section into the hard reality of specific decisions.

BETHLEHEM CASE CITED

The most important section 7 case went to trial this spring and a Federal court judge will issue his decision in the fall. This Justice Department suit concerns the proposed acquisition of Youngstown Sheet & Tube by Bethlehem Steel. At stake is the consolidation of 2 steel giants with more than $3 billion in assets, the biggest potential merger in business history.

Victor R. Hansen, the administration's chief trustbuster, said in an interview earlier this year that "the Bethlehem case comes closest to what Congress had in mind in amending section 7."

"This case will be a guidepost—one way or the other," he noted. "Even an adverse decision—to the Government—will clarify the law.

"We file cases that we think violate the law. But also we're responsible to try cases that help to clarify the law."

At present, a huge boiling pot of uncertainty confuses the public—and even distinguished lawyers—as to whether the amended section 7 contains teeth, or merely gums.

Declared a prominent attorney last autumn: "One of the few things I may safely say with regard to section 7 is that the extent of its application is not definitely settled."

DUAL ADMINISTRATION

The antitrust horse carries not one Government white knight but a double saddle. Riding along with the Justice Department is the FTC. Both of these administration knights are charging, lances lowered, against corporate defendants in section 7 cases.

The FTC, for example, charged last October that Procter & Gamble (which makes Ivory soap that is lauded as "99⁴⁴⁄₁₀₀ percent pure") was something less than 99⁴⁴⁄₁₀₀ percent pure in acquiring Clorox Chemical Co., described as the Nation's largest seller of liquid household bleach.

This merger, the FTC complaint said, "may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly." Thus, the Government antitrust knight rides hard in the battle of soapsuds.

VARIETY OF ACTIONS

In addition to its merger suits, the FTC this year has brought such varied actions as a case claiming a New York firm made misrepresentations in the sale of mail-order merchandise and that a Cleveland company used false advertising in the sale of candy vending machines.

In other suits it charged a Holyoke, Mass., concern with failing to reveal that a household detergent is dangerously flammable and a nationwide clothing chain with making

false price claims and misbranding its garments. False labeling on fur and wool garments is another field that catches the FTC eye.

Since the FTC and the Justice Department are given the dual administration of antitrust laws, there can arise some perplexity as to which agency will mount the battle.

Sometimes it boils down to a case of which one gets there first. This has led to a joke among lawyers in Washington that one agency opens its office half an hour earlier than the other so that it can get first crack at the mergers announced in the morning papers.

CONSENT DECREES AID TRUSTBUSTING

Antitrust activity in the Eisenhower administration has placed reliance in some of its most far-reaching cases on a legal device called the consent decree. This provides for the settlement of a suit—legally binding on both the Government and defendant corporations—without the protracted delays, notriety, and expenses of a trial.

In 1956—an election year—the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department closed 54 cases, 22 of them by consent decrees.

The finest flowering came early in the year when within a month's period the Justice Department blossomed out with consent settlements in a quartet of big suits. The defendants were American Telephone & Telegraph, International Business Machines, Hilton Hotels, and General Shoe.

IBM AGREES TO SELL

The strategist in effecting these settlements was Stanley N. Barnes, the tall, husky ex-judge who was Victor R. Hansen's predecessor as Assistant Attorney General. In his college days after World War I, Mr. Barnes had starred in the football forward wall at the University of California and performed in two Rose Bowl games.

The Tournament of Roses, though, never got the kind of headlines triggered by the 1956 set of defense decrees.

IBM agreed to begin selling its electronic machines (instead of only renting them, as in the past), to cut its part of the tabulating card business, and to make available many of its patents on a royalty basis.

A. T. & T. was hardest hit of all the defendants. True, it escaped the shattering aim of the antitrust suit filed in 1949. That complaint had charged A. T. & T. and its manufacturing arm, Western Electric, with conspiring to monopolize the manufacture and distribution of telephones and equipment. The suit sought to separate the two units.

Earlier this year, in testimony before a congressional committee looking into consent decrees, an A. T. & T. executive declared that one patent provision in the settlement "will result in a loss of royalty revenues of between $3 million and $5 million a year over the next 10 years."

Antitrust officials have hinted that the decree represented a better settlement than Uncle Sam could have obtained if the A. T. & T. case had gone to trial.

Critics of the A. T. & T. consent decree, however, have suggested that Western Electric, in effect, was given court approval to dominate the telephone equipment business. Said one critic: "The Government has extended the idea of a regulated monopoly from utilities to manufacturing."

This simply shows that consent decrees (like cases tried in court) fail to make all parties happy. Take, for example, the matter of antitrust and color film.

Eastman Kodak used to sell its undeveloped color film at a price which included a charge for processing, a procedure that limited the business of processing effectively to the firm's own laboratories. The Justice Department filed a complaint and, subsequently, a consent decree barred Eastman from this marketing arrangement.

The decree opened up a field of endeavor for many small firms in a new industry ringing up annual sales estimated at $100 million. Thousands of photo-finishing firms sprang into the new field to perform the service done previously by a single company. But to the camera-fan consumer the results were disconcerting; processing prices actually rose as the neophyte companies tried to master the techniques.

"However," a Justice Department trustbuster said last month, "there can be no doubt that ultimately the competition between this group of rival companies will produce a better service at a fairer price."

Some critics who fail to be captivated by the current antitrust drive like to point out that the post-World War II divorcement of movie producers and exhibitors played right into the hands of that fast-growing giant, television, and accounts for part of filmdom's financial dilemma today.

From the defendant's point of view, the consent decree (it's called a "church-step settlement" when reached just before a trial opens) helps to forestall future law suits by rival companies.

The Clayton Act permits plaintiffs seeking triple damage awards to introduce a court judgment as prima facie evidence, which throws the burden upon the corporate defendant. Exempt from this provision however, are pretrial consent decrees.

PUBLICITY UNFAVORABLE

Already in 1958, the consent decree has figured in antitrust settlements affecting the consumer's palate, if not his pocketbook. One settlement in New York ended a restraint of trade in the sale of sauerkraut. Another ordered Boston-based United Fruit Co., charged 4 years ago with monopolizing the banana business, to form a competing company out of its own assets. But United Fruit has until 1970 to put the plan into effect, after the courts approve.

One thing that bothers corporation lawyers about the consent decree is that these settlements are invariably heralded by the trustbusters as Government victories.

But a development of far greater concern is the growing trend in 1958 for the Justice Department to invoke criminal as opposed to civil suits.

Grand jury indictments this year have leveled the antitrust finger at 29 oil companies, RCA, 3 natural gas firms, and 5 manufacturers of polio vaccine, all in separate cases.

"We don't usually file criminal cases unless we feel there is a willful violation," explains a Justice Department official. "If we don't feel there is a willful violation, we file civil cases." Criminal cases, which can carry heavy fines on conviction, are more onerous to companies than civil suits.

Among concerns which have felt the recent lash of both civil and criminal antitrust cases going against them is Safeway Stores, the Nation's second largest grocery chain.

But the favorite antitrust target these days seems to be RCA, an electronics giant dedicated to preserving its patent system. The Government, in opposition, is equally dedicated to bringing about revisions in this system.

David Sarnoff (who in 1921 supervised the reporting of the Dempsey-Carpentier championship bout by wireless telephone from Boyle's Thirty Acres in Jersey City) made a speech last February 20 at Atlanta.

The RCA board chairman cited the pressing need for clarifying the legal rules of the game in business, particularly as they apply to antitrust action. He said that in the antitrust field "conspicuous achievement in the competitive economy too often becomes suspect."

By coincidence, the next day in New York City, a Federal grand jury—after 11 months of hearing evidence—handed down a four-count indictment. It charged RCA with monopolizing radio, television, and electronic patents.

Dempsey won his fight in 4 rounds—on a knockout. The Justice Department figures the RCA criminal suit may not reach trial for another year or two.

A Tribute to Dr. James L. Hagerty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, next month, on September 11, marks the first anniversary of the death of Dr. James L. Hagerty, late professor of philosophy and world classics at St. Mary's College of California, a man who made a tremendous contribution to the intellectual growth of thousands of Americans.

I should like, at this time, to pay commemorative tribute to this great man. It is customary, when eulogizing one who has passed on, to bring out all the laudatory adjectives at one's command. This is a very human and praiseworthy trait. But it makes it difficult, when the occasion comes to pay tribute to true greatness, to find words that will not sound trite and hackneyed. Yet the effort must be made, for this man was not only truly great—he achieved greatness in a field where that quality occurs all too seldom, and is most sorely needed. He was a great teacher.

To Jim Hagerty, teaching was a dedicated job, and he quite literally devoted his existence to it. He graced the faculty of St. Mary's College for over a third of a century and justly earned the admiration, the respect, and the affection of his faculty brethren, his students, educators throughout the country, and the community at large.

For Jim Hagerty was no sterotype of the ivory-tower professor A man of brilliant intellect and profound knowledge, he constantly challenged and explored ways and means to best educate the young men who came within his influence. Tradition, taboo, and curricular fetishes fell before this passionate seeker of the truth.

Dr. Hagerty believed, with intensity, that the function of the educator was to teach young people to think, to develop the essential skills of the growing mind necessary to draw forth its fullest power, to divert the student to the free exercise of his intellectual talent—a view of education more fundamental than studying any subject matter.

As long ago as the 1920's, he rejected the lecture technique of teaching in favor of the seminar method—the classroom equivalent of the bull session. He would gather his students about him in one of the seminar rooms on the campus, toss them a gambit, and then sit back

to watch the sparks kindle and fly from the young minds—adroitly guiding, never stifling. It was the method first established by Sophocles in early Athens, when he would gather a small, informal group of his followers about him to discuss the problems that have always puzzled mankind.

Out of this came the revision of the liberal arts curriculum at St. Mary's in 1942—a revision which resulted in making the study of world classics—the great books and great ideas which have molded our Western civilization—compulsory for all undergraduates at the college, regardless of their major field of study.

Essentially a quiet and gentle person, the only times Dr. Hagerty became belligerent was when the Great Books idea was under fire. He was a member of the executive commission of the Great Books Foundation and assisted in organizing Great Books groups and training leaders throughout the greater bay area. He was always willing to become excited over Great Books because, as he said a few years ago:

> At a time when the American way of life is being challenged, it is a service to intelligent citizens to present to them the ideas fundamental to our political and social system, as well as those competing for the domination of the world.
>
> At a time when government, law, freedom, and the very value of life itself are in doubt, a reading of some of the great ideas that have influenced our civilization may serve to enlighten the future decisions of a democratic society.

Hagerty graduated from St. Mary's College in 1919 and spent his entire teaching career at his alma mater, which is operated by the Brothers of the Christian Schools. In 1950, the teaching order which he served so long paid him the most distinguished honor of naming him a benefactor of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. It was the first time in the history of the college that any layman had received such an honor. It was, in fact, the first time in the history of the Christian Brothers in California that the title had been conferred.

Cultural and religious activities in the bay area found in him an enthusiastic supporter. He was a member of the board of advisers of the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies, the Philosophy Society of America, the Philosophy Society of San Francisco, founder of the western branch of the American Catholic Philosophical Association and chairman of that organization from 1939 to his death last year.

He served as editor of the famed Moraga Quarterly from 1930 until 1942, associate editor of the New Scholasticism in 1953, and was a contributor to magazines on educational and philosophical subjects.

At his untimely passing at the age of 58, leaders in all walks of life—business, civil, social, and religious—paid tribute to Jim Hagerty for his accomplishments, which remain as a priceless legacy of one who served education faithfully and well.

Val King, writing in the San Francisco Monitor, said:

> Jim was that man of contemplative character who could, and did, get things done. * * * He was a cultured gentleman, who imparted his own love and respect for the beautiful to everyone privileged to have any part of his company. * * * Our times are a bit too swift, too strident, too strenuous, to produce authentic gentlemen. But to me, at least, Jim Hagerty remains the image not only of a gentleman, but of a Catholic gentleman. * * * Yes, he was a gifted mind, an inspiring teacher, a warm and generous friend.

Last spring, the St. Mary's College undergraduate honor society, Alpha Pi Gamma Upsilon, which he founded, established a memorial forum in his honor. Participating on the panel were honor students from eight bay area colleges, with Dr. Mortimer Adler, director of the Institute for Philosophical Research, San Francisco, as moderator. It was supremely fitting that the subject chosen by the students for this first annual forum was, What Makes a Great Teacher?

The college to which he devoted his life has created the James L. Hagerty Memorial Chair of Philosophy to perpetuate the work and the name of this great educator whose concern as a teacher went beyond the textbooks to the ethical and spiritual needs of those whose expanding minds were in his charge.

Perhaps all that Jim Hagerty was, as a man and a teacher, was best summed up by one of his former students, Father Stanley F. Parmisano, O. P., the young priest to whom fell the task of delivering Dr. Hagerty's funeral sermon.

He believed in the workings of the human mind and its capacity to reach the truth of things. And so he was philosopher and teacher. He believed in the love of the human heart, and see what a warm and generous and faithful friend he could be, and was to so many of us. He believed in the dignity of the human person, and see the gentleman he was, never forcing himself or his faith or philosophy on another; wanting to hear what his students found in a given book or life situation rather than tell what he himself found there; wanting them to grow from within rather than be stretched and hammered into misshape from without.

Representative Burdick on Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appears in the August 9, 1958, issue of Labor, entitled "Why Millions Cannot Afford Medical Care":

WHY MILLIONS CANNOT AFFORD MEDICAL CARE

"I soon would be as poor as a starved turkey if I patronized hospitals much longer." That said comment came last week from Congressman USHER BURDICK, Republican, of North Dakota. An oldtime fighting progressive, BURDICK has been in poor health for a number of months. Now 79, he's retiring at the end of this session of Congress.

His statement provided emphatic confirmation of the need for enactment by Congress of national health insurance legislation, which the labor movement has long advocated, but which the doctors' lobby—the American Medical Association—has repeatedly blocked.

Drawing on his own experience and that of many others, BURDICK declared that "the greatest need of the present day is reasonable hospitalization." Lack of such a plan, he added, "is one of the great failures of our Government. What can a world-renowned government amount to finally, without protecting the health of the huge majority of the people."

In his own case, BURDICK said, "In one hospital a doctor looked at me twice and charged me $500, and the second look was more of a squint than a look. Hospital rooms cost all the way from $19.50 a day to $29. Nurses charge from $1.50 an hour to $2. When you add to this the X-rays and doctors' fees you can see that the people with a fund even as high as $5,000 for sickness would find themselves stripped clean in a comparatively short time.

"The private system of medical care," BURDICK concluded, "is all right as far as the well-to-do are concerned, but the system does not reach the average citizen, of which there are many more millions than can be found in the well-to-do class.

"The public health of the Nation demands a different deal from this," he added. "At least an average citizen should have recourse to health improvement that does not make a pauper of him, or the alternative of going without medical care and dying before his time.

"I have always been of the opinion," BURDICK said, "that a public-health bill can be written by Congress that will give the poor man a chance for his life. If we cannot do that we have dismally failed in our legislation.

"Is not this Nation concerned with the general health of the Nation?" he asked. "Shall we abandon the millions who need medical attention just to preserve the present medical system? What is money compared to the results of nonattention to the health of the Nation?"

BURDICK is manifestly right. Moreover, his stirring appeal—and similar ones made by other liberals in Congress—can get results if voters next November will elect progressives with sufficient gumption to resist the selfish medical lobby and to fight for the interests of the people.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Polish Pioneers in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Congress, a little-known but important event in our history.

It was on October 1, 1608 that the first Polish pioneers came ashore at Jamestown, Va., more than 12 years before the *Mayflower* brought the Pilgrims to Massachusetts.

Capt. John Smith, founder of the Virginia settlement, had visited Poland before setting out for America. He was impressed by the skill, the industry, and the reliability of the Polish people. When the new colony at Jamestown was

threatened with failure, he sent an urgent plea to England for Polish workers. They came, and established the first actual factory in the new world.

From that day to this, succeeding waves of Polish immigrants have taken part in the building of the United States.

Our development and progress as a free nation owes much to their character and ability. The spirit of these fine citizens is summed up in the old Polish saying: "A Pole shall never be a serf."

God-fearing and devoted to freedom, they have made contributions to our way of life that should be known and honored.

For this purpose I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the illuminating document titled "Americans From Poland" that was originally published by the Polish Women's Alliance of America.

It will be a well-merited recognition of the 350th anniversary commemorating the arrival of the Polish pioneers in America:

AMERICANS FROM POLAND

(Published by the Polish Women's Alliance of America in observance of the 350th anniversary of the arrival of Poles in America at Jamestown, Va., October 1, 1608)

The story of immigrants in America—one of the greatest stories ever written—shows how the many people of many lands helped build the greatest nation on earth. It is mainly a chronicle of common people, common but honorable, and always dedicated to the principle that man was created by the Almighty to be free.

Perhaps one of the most interesting chapters in this great chronicle of America's immigrants is to be written about those who have migrated here from Poland. For from the very first days of this rich nation's struggle for independence and progress, the Poles have left their names imprinted on the indelible sands of time.

POLISH PIONEERS

It is impossible to enumerate all of the nameless and fearless Polish pioneers who came to America, toiling endlessly, clearing away forests, laboring the virgin soil, withstanding brutal Indian attacks and massacres, struggling and praying that their efforts could in part contribute to a rebirth of faith in the dignity of man on these barren shores of a new land in the Western Hemisphere.

Yes, among the millions of pages of American history written by the great—and not so great—the dauntless spirit of Polish immigrants can always be found. They came here to pave the way for the future economic and cultural development of the United States.

It would be difficult for us today to mention even all of those Poles in America who have risen above the anonymous crowd and left indelible traces of their activity in the United States. Time would not permit a chronicling of their events, for there are tens of thousands of dedicated Poles who during the past 350 years came here as fearless trappers, brave soldiers and great pioneers of culture.

This booklet is by no means intended to present the full story of Poles in America, for the full story has yet to be written. Instead, we hope through this simple booklet to arouse curiosity to whet the appetite of historians and to inspire among our students of history a rebirth of determination toward chronicling a more detailed story of Poles in America. It is a beautiful story—a rich story—a story of a gallant people whose brave deeds reach down into the very roots of American history.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF OUR HERITAGE

We hope also that the young, and the old, will have a better understanding of their own heritage as Americans of Polish descent. It is our earnest hope that during this great jubilee year observing the 350th anniversary of the arrival of Poles in America, all Americans will better understand that their neighbors of Polish ancestry are not a new phenomenon in this country, that they are not a foreign element which only in recent years has found expression, but that Poles have played an integral part in the very birth of these great United States and have contributed to their growth and progress for generations dating back to 1608.

If through these efforts we succeed in doing nothing more than getting all Americans to understand better the very stimulating history of Poles in America, we shall consider this jubilee year a huge success. We shall try—through the cold pages of history—to bring warmth into your hearts.

JAN Z KOLNA

Some of the writers who have tried to tell the story of Poles in America actually go back to 1475, 17 years before Christopher Columbus discovered America. That year one Jan z Kolna, a Polish seafarer and explorer in the service of the King of Denmark, was supposed to have bumped into Labrador and then sailed down to the mouth of the Delaware River. But scholars find no convincing proof of this extraordinary voyage, about which there is a persistent tradition in Polish lore. We will have to leave to more persistent research the task of proving more convincingly whether Jan z Kolna did in fact first discover America.

Our jubilee year begins with the first landing of Poles in Jamestown in 1608. For here we are on firm historical ground. The indisputable personal diaries of Capt. John Smith—founder of the Virginia settlement at the very birth of the 17th century—duly record the great contributions of Polish immigrants in establishing the infant colony's first industry. It is to Captain Smith that we can be grateful for documenting the first authentic description of the early arrival of Poles in America.

CAPT. JOHN SMITH ASKED FOR POLISH WORKERS

An orphan and pretty much on his own since early childhood, Captain Smith had traveled extensively through Europe. During his many journeys, he had visited Poland and learned firsthand of the industrious nature of the Polish people. He had marveled at their skills in lumbering, wood carving, glass making, and the production of tar and pitch—a sticky substance made from the by-products of tar and used for roofing and waterproofing buildings. Shortly after his arrival here in 1607, with a group of vagabond gentlemen, wearing silk and shunning work, Captain Smith quickly realized that without skilled workers the newly formed colony could not long survive. Smith sent urgent pleas to his home office in England to send him workers, particularly Poles because there were larger tar and pitch swamps within a stone's throw of the new Jamestown colony.

Smith recalled how industrious the Poles were. It is no surprise, then, that when he found himself in difficulty, he turned to the Poles.

HISTORIC DATE

The first group of Poles arrived October 1, 1608. As they made their way up the shore from the two ships that brought them through a treacherous voyage from England, their voices rang out with song and joy—they had come to the promised land, where even the air had a new breath of freedom.

While some historians attempt to list the first group of Poles who landed in Jamestown by name, intensive research on our own has failed to confirm these names. It is for this reason, therefore, that we shall satisfy ourselves for the time being with Captain Smith's own references to the Polonians—as he called them—without resorting to their respective names.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

This first group suffered the same handicap that hundreds of Poles who came to America after them in ensuing years, the language barrier. Few, if any, had the slightest knowledge of English, and this factor more than any other—made their early life in America difficult. But, according to Captain Smith, they were skilled and determined, and besides, they turned out to be excellent fighters against the Indians.

Captain Smith lost no time in putting them to work, and he duly credits them with starting the first actual factory in America—a glass works near Jamestown, Va. Today, in that historic American shrine, stands a replica of this first American industry manned by the skillful Poles.

POLES RECEIVE CREDIT

In his memoirs Captain Smith credits the Poles with saving the economy of the infant colony. But after he left the colony, the early English settlers regarded the Poles, and other European laborers as foreigners and inferiors. They were in the community, helping it to survive, but they were not considered of it.

For 12 years, while the settlement swung between success and failure, the Poles worked hard at their jobs, but they were barred from participating in civil affairs and had no political rights. While actually helping the young colony survive these Poles were in effect little better than serfs. This intolerable situation brought violent reactions from the Poles. For there is an old Polish saying which has survived as the very battle cry of Poles since the birth of their brave nation 1,000 years ago—"Polak nie Sluga"—"A Pole shall never be a serf." By 1619, their pride spilled over and the Poles, yearning for equality, went on strike—the first strike ever staged in the New World.

FIRST STRIKE

It is significant, perhaps more significant than would be immediately discernable, that this first strike was not staged by the Poles for economic gains. Instead, they demanded the right to vote, full equality with the others, and the right to own property. In the tiny community, this was equivalent to a major rebellion. It was the first political upheaval in America, for the purpose of extending democratic rights to the common man. Here was the first manifestation that America shall be a haven for the oppressed, a sanctuary for the free, and a bastion against the tyranny of serfdom.

REAL FREEDOM

The future of the Virginia colony—and perhaps the future of America—swung on the outcome of this strike. We know too little yet about how the strike was handled but it is safe to assume that the leading people of Jamestown realized that the community could not survive very long without the goodwill of their most skilled workers. The strike was quickly brought to a successful conclusion. The Poles' grievances were heeded by the first parliament in America, the House of Burgess in Jamestown. According to a contemporary record, "it was agreed that the Poles shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitants there whatsoever." In order to perpetuate the Poles' techniques in making pitch, tar, and glass, it was further agreed that "some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge therein, for the benefit of the country hereafter."

Who, then, is to say today what course the newly born nation on the eastern shores of America would have taken if not for the

gallant action of these determined Poles. We see from the record that the early colonists—the aristocracy which first came here with Captain Smith—had every intention of recreating in America the very system of vested gentry and castes which the common man had left Europe to escape. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that perhaps the very essence of our democratic system, as we in America know it today, may never have been realized if not for the dogged determination of these early Polish immigrants. No measure of praise or glory can adequately describe their unselfish contribution to this Nation's early beginnings, for it was these Poles who with their bare hands and stubborn determination laid the very foundations on which freedom for all men was born in America.

In the middle of the 17th century, perhaps after hearing how valuable the Poles were to the British colony in Virginia, the Dutch settlers of New Amsterdam persuaded others to come here from Poland to help them grow food and fight the British of New England. These immigrants were also very hardy, industrious, effective; Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, of New Holland, was quite pleased with them.

FIRST ACADEMY FOUNDED BY POLE

In 1659, a Polish scholar, Dr. Alexander Kurcyusz came to New Amsterdam on the Hollander's invitation and founded an academy, the first institution of higher learning in what is now New York City. In the history of American education, he is now known as Dr. Alexander Curtius.

By 1662, an exiled Polish nobleman named Albert Zaborowski—later known as Zabriski—came to New Amsterdam. He later moved across the Hudson River to New Jersey where he became one of the first judges of the State and subsequently the owner of considerable land holdings along the Passaic River. Today, the multi-billion-dollar industrial centers of New Jersey stand on land developed by Zaborowski. Today, also, some of the elite families of the eastern seaboard—ranking high on the list of society—number him among their ancestors.

Poles also settled in the Delaware Valley as early as 1650. Pennsylvania archives show them to have been a part of that colony in the days of its founder, William Penn. There was a thin trickle of Poles into Pennsylvania and Virginia for the next 100 years.

The whole world knows the legendary story of America's famous explorer, Daniel Boone. Every American child has seen movies and television shows relating his heroic exploits. But how many of these same American youngsters know that a Polish immigrant played perhaps the most important part in Boone's future fame?

JOHN ANTHONY SADOWSKI

In 1736, John Anthony Sadowski pushed into the wilderness beyond the Allegheny Mountains. Driven by a native curiosity, Sadowski's restless spirit would give him no peace until he could discover for himself what lies beyond the towering mountains. Braving the Indians and wild beasts which roamed throughout this virgin territory—never yet visited by white men—Sadowski pushed westward. He established an outpost on the Ohio River which a century later became one of American great industrial towns—Sandusky, Ohio, for that is how the great name of Sadowski had been changed on English-speaking American tongues.

Sadowski was killed by the Indians in Virginia. Then his son, John, and particularly his son Jacob, carried on the pioneering tradition of their father and distinguished themselves as aides to Daniel Boone in the settling of Kentucky. They were cofounders with Boone of Harrodsburgh, the oldest town in Kentucky. There is a passage about their immeasurable help to Boone in Theodore Roosevelt's book: "The Winning of the West."

Yes, history has played a cruel trick on the Sadowski family by omitting their names from the illustrious pinnacle it has awarded Boone and other American explorers.

And there were many other Polish explorers who distinguished themselves—time and again—in America's infant days.

FIRST RELIABLE MAP

The first reliable map of the coast of New England—a notable and extremely useful document in its time—was drawn by a Polish surveyor, Karol Blaszkiewicz.

Somewhere in the South, a man named Paul Mostowski, of Warsaw, tried unsuccessfully in 1776 to found a New Poland. Scarcely anything is known of this attempt; most likely the rebuffs and obstacles which he had to overcome as a would-be Colonist in the New World were too much for him. We mention this fact only because it indicates there must have been a sizable number of Poles in America at that time.

They played a considerable role during America's Revolutionary period.

The shot at Bunker Hill must have been heard around the world for soldiers and fighters for liberty came from several foreign countries to the aid of the embattled revolutionaries of the 13 colonies.

KOSCIUSZKO: FATHER OF AMERICAN ARTILLERY

A young Polish engineer, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, was among the first to arrive and offer his services to General Washington. "What can you do?" asked the American Commander. "Try me," said Kosciuszko.

The victory at Saratoga was credited to plans which Kosciuszko had worked out. He fortified Fort Ticonderoga and West Point. He was soon made a brigadier general and chief of engineers, but he also excelled in other branches of the military art; in fact, he earned the title "The Father of American Artillery." His friend, Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, said: "I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty which extends to all not alone the rich."

Kosciuszko's superior officer, General Gates, considered him "the only pure republican. He is without any equivocation on the subject of freedom."

CASIMIR PULASKI: HERO OF TWO CONTINENTS

In July 1777, another determined son of Poland arrived at Washington's headquarters with a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin, who represented the year-old United States of America in Paris. This handsome Pole was Count Casimir Pulaski, a young Polish nobleman essentially aristocratic in manner and lacking Kosciuszko's genuinely democratic character and personality. Franklin described Pulaski as an officer "famous throughout Europe, for his defense of the liberties of his country." Rising to the rank of general, during the next 2 years—crucial ones in the history of the American Revolution—Pulaski participated with distinction in the Battles of Brandywine, Warren Tavern, Germantown, Trenton, and Haddonfield near Camden. Then he organized his own Polish Legion, which fought at Little Egg Harbor and Charleston. This dedicated apostle of freedom—the hero of two continents—whose very name threw terror into the hearts of tyrants—was mortally wounded at Savannah on October 9, 1779. He died 3 days later.

There were thousands killed during the running battles of the American Revolution—all dedicated to the fundamentals of freedom. But the death of Pulaski drove a deep void into the ranks of the American Revolutionists. Historians agree Pulaski had an uncanny genius for inspiring men into battles against hopeless odds. It was indeed this kind of battle at Savannah that brought death to Pulaski. But he died as he wished to die—in a running battle for freedom. Pulaski was buried with the highest honors a grateful but struggling nation would bestow upon one of its sons of liberty. It is little wonder that thereafter, Americans everywhere have showered him with tribute which is well known to all of us here. Sprinkled liberally throughout the map of America are villages and towns, skyways and byways, monuments and plaques, dedicated to this gallant warrior.

HIGHEST PRAISE FROM GENERAL WASHINGTON

Of both these great Polish warriors, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, General George Washington repeatedly wrote the highest words of praise to the Continental Congress. For through their unselfish contributions, they had helped lay the foundations which today make the United States a symbol of freedom and dignity to mankind throughout the world.

Kosciuszko, perhaps more so than Pulaski, laid down the first principle of equality in America when he instructed Thomas Jefferson to prepare a will in which the Polish warrior instructed that all of his assets in this country—and they were sizable—were to be used for the erection of an institution of higher learning for the American Negro. To this day, the first educational institution built with Kosciuszko's money for American Negroes stands in New Jersey. It would be wise for those who might be tempted to bemoan so-called intolerance among Americans of Polish descent to ponder this historical fact.

MIGRATION TO AMERICA

With the end of the American Revolution, a beleaguered but determined America began building a new continent which would soon attract thousands of refugees from the four corners of the globe seeking freedom. They came here to work and build—and among them again were the Poles. They saw in the American Constitution a document written by honorable men—a document filled with hope and protection for the dignity of man—a document which was to endure time and guide a growing nation on a path of development never before witnessed by man. In contrast to the oppression and persecution which millions were suffering in Europe, America was the dream of the entire world. It is no wonder then, that in this great contingent of oppressed people seeking freedom were also the Poles. The Napoleonic Wars, the uprisings throughout the European Continent, Poland's own ill-fated attempts at freedom, were all a contributing factor for the ever-increasing migration of Poles to America * * * for here truly was the promised land.

FIRST POLISH COMMUNITY: PANNA MARIA, TEX.

In 1854, the first authentic and wholly organized Polish community was established in America when Father Moczygeba and his followers—a group of peasants from Silesia—arrived on the shores of Texas. It was indeed an inspiring sight as this dedicated son of the cloth—an apostle of Christ—led his ill-clothed and nearly famished group of Poles into the sunny but dusty valley of Texas to found Panna Maria—which only a few years ago observed its 100th anniversary. Father Moczygeba and his followers brought with them crudely packed clothing, bedding, carpenter tools, books and yes—the carillon from their church in Poland. It was here in the heart of Texas—some 86 miles southeast of San Antonio—that Father Moczygeba and his colony settled and built the first Polish Roman Catholic church in America. To these hearty pioneers who braved famine and rolling seas went the thanks of a grateful America—anxious to see her turbulent Southwest settled and developed. Father Moczygeba's brave expedition served as an inspiration to thousands

of Americans in eastern States who feared migration to the West because of terrifying attacks by raiding Mexican armies. This determined Polish priest—who had seen his religious teachings being crushed by the Prussians in his native Poland—pioneered a new chapter of heroism not only among the clergy but among oppressed people all over the world.

CIVIL WAR

For almost 75 years after the American Revolution, America's valiant effort to weld into one nation people of many poltical outlooks, religious beliefs, and economic standards underwent a series of crucial tests until 1861, when terror struck the entire Nation; the South clashed with the North over the question of freedom for the American Negro. In the darkest moment of her brief but glorious history, America teetered on the verge of self-destruction. The Civil War struck with all of its fury, pitting brother against brother, man against man, and ideology against ideology. A solemn but dedicated President stubbornly resisted all efforts at compromise, for the principle of equality burned too deeply in Abraham Lincoln's heart to allow for compromise. In his many inspiring messages, one theme flowed from the beleaguered President's lips: America cannot long endure half free and half slave. It was a principle which had inspired Poles through decades of Poland's partitions and suppressions by her warring neighbors. Lincoln's inspiring words fired the imagination of freedom-loving men throughout the world. It is little wonder, then, that in America's darkest moment of history, when survival hung in the balance, that thousands of Polish immigrants flocked to President Lincoln's tragic appeal for help.

While Kosciuszko and Pulaski have won perhaps the widest acclaim in America for their efforts in behalf of this Nation's fight for freedom, two other Polish generals—seldom if ever mentioned in history books—distinguished themselves in this country's tragic struggle for survival. We hope that history will correct this injustice and ultimately place them among the ranks of America's great sons.

GENERAL KRZYZANOWSKI HERO OF CIVIL WAR

Wladimir Krzyzanowski came to America in the 1850's and completed his engineering studies here. He assisted in the construction of three railroads in the Middle West, then settled down as a businessman in Washington. At the outbreak of the Civil War he joined the Union forces organizing a militia company which included many other Poles and quickly expanded into a regiment under his command. He was made a colonel. Known as the Polish Legion the outfit distinguished itself in several battles, among them those of Cross Keys and Bull Run. President Lincoln appointed Krzyzanowski brigadier general but the Senate did not immediately confirm the appointment because none of the Senators was able to pronounce his name. Krzyzanowski's reputation as a leader and fighter increased after the Battle of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg and in minor battles in Tennessee. Consistently democratic, sharing danger, hunger, and fatigue, he was beloved by the Legionnaires who at the end of the war gave him a beautiful sword with an affectionate inscription. Even the Confederates liked him. When he left the occupation garrison at Bridgeport, Tenn., the residents bade him farewell with regret.

POLE—FIRST GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

After the Civil War, Krzyzanowski became the first American Governor of Alaska. He died in 1887. His grave, in Brooklyn, was long neglected but in 1937 his remains were transferred to Arlington Cemetery. President Roosevelt, speaking at the ceremony, expressed beautifully the depth of feelings, linking together Poland and America. The President said:

"Throughout centuries and storms, no matter if the sun was shining or obscured by temporary clouds, Poland forever thought to carry high the light of liberty. As we treasure in common the same idea of liberty, our friendship with Poland was longstanding and uninterrupted. It is an honor and privilege to bear witness how the United States is indebted to people of Polish blood. We acknowledge the merit of the fearless heroes, fighting for liberty, of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, whose very names became the watchwords of freedom. General Krzyzanowski today joins their immortal ranks."

GENERAL KARGE OF UNION ARMY

Joseph Karge was another Pole who rose to the rank of general in the Union army. He made a name for himself in operations against "Stonewall" Jackson in Virginia and in the defense of Washington. Two serious wounds received in 1862 almost compelled him to retire, but he saw the war through. Toward the end he was assigned to cope with guerillas in the South. After the war he was given command of a cavalry unit in Nevada.

Krzyzanowski and Karge were part of the large Polish emigration from German, Austrian and Russian partitioned Poland that began after the ill-fated uprisings—against the rule of the three most powerful emperors in Europe. The several thousand Polish refugees who came to the United States during this period were almost exclusively revolutionists seeking escape from imprisonment or death.

LAND OF PROMISE

The second period, beginning in the seventies was mostly a matter of relatives following the refugees, then of the relatives' kin coming to join their families in the land of promise. For a while, a good many people in countries like Poland really believed that the streets in America were paved with gold. Polish immigration increased annually, until its peak in the year 1912–13 when nearly 175,000 Poles were admitted to the United States.

During the big migration at the turn of the century, the new arrivals in America were astonished that Polish spirit and culture virtually flowed in American streets. In 1893—during the Columbian Exposition in Chicago—the Polish Day held at the exposition grounds attracted 100,000 people. Polish language newspapers flourished, services were being held in the Polish language in many churches and practically every organization had a Polish choral or dance group among its members. To many of the new Polish immigrants America looked like a segment of their native Poland.

BIG MIGRATION

Between 1880 and 1910 many of the Polish newcomers were very poor; landless farmers and urban workers whose earning power in the old country was so low that it kept them hanging on the verge of starvation; others fled from political oppression. Many young Poles emigrated to avoid serving in the German, Austrian, and Russian imperial armies.

Some Poles emigrated to America intending to earn enough dollars to go back home and buy a piece of native Polish soil. But the great majority, whatever their plans were on arrival, never returned. Hundreds of thousands settled here and sent for their wives and children, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles and cousins.

The majority went into industry—foundries and mines and forests, garment and shoe factories and textile mills. Of the rest, perhaps one-third of the total Polish immigration went into farming; some in the Middle West, some in Texas, others all over the Northeast. In New England, beginning early in the present century, they started taking over farms abandoned by Yankees, abandoned in the belief that the soil was exhausted. Using the instinctive understanding of the land and food-growing skill bequeathed them by the old country, they have rescued hundreds of thousands of apparently hopeless acres for high-grade agriculture.

How important Polish immigrant workers have been for many decades now in steel, coal mining, lumber, and textiles is too well known to need restating.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS

A small percentage of the Poles who came over late in the 19th century went into business and professions. The qualities and achievements of some of them merit attention. There were Col. Casimir Stanislau Gzowski, an engineer who was mainly instrumental in building the first bridge at Niagara Falls; Joseph Turkolski, surveyor of Louisiana and Utah; Capt. Karol Radziminski, who had a hand in establishing the United States-Mexican boundary; Leopold Bocek, reputed to have started the first polytechnical school in America; and the educators Arthur Brabowski and Joseph D'Alfons.

In their day most of these men were famous not only in their own communities, but in other cities as well. A few of them nationally. Their accomplishments, now nearly forgotten, added much to the totality of American life; they also carried on the Polish tradition in America which began in Jamestown back in 1608 and which has helped the bulk of recent immigrants and their American-born children, who together now number upward of 7 million, to feel at home in America.

WORLD WAR I

Great that America is, it has won its greatness only through many bitter and often bloody sacrifices. And so it was again in 1918—when the world's youngest democracy—struggling against time to establish firm roots in a world constantly torn by strife—was called upon for still another sacrifice. World War I struck with all of its fury. And again the Nation's peace was shattered; men had to take up arms to preserve their freedom.

As in previous struggles, Americans of Polish descent were in the forefront—eagerly enlisting in the ranks of the expeditionary force. There wasn't a roll call in the hasty army being formed on American shores that didn't ring with Polish names—frequently badly mispronounced and not too infrequently, boldly changed by a gruff First Sergeant who didn't have time to struggle with a difficult name.

Perhaps one of the great epochs of America's dedication to freedom was mobilization of a Polish Expeditionary Force recruited in America and trained in Canada. The Polish Army volunteers expeditionary force wrote a heroic chapter unparalleled in this country when they first joined the ranks of the allies to crush the Kaiser and then—as if they had not sacrificed enough—plunged against the Bolsheviks under the magnificent leadership of General Haller. Here was the supreme test of loyalty—not only to America—a nation which had embraced them—but to their native Poland in her greatest hour of need.

FREEDOM FOR POLAND

It was perhaps in gratitude for the inestimable service of Poles in America—since 1608—in helping preserve for this Nation the virtues sought by the entire world, that prompted President Wilson to respond agreeably to Ignacy Jan Paderewski's impassioned pleas for restoration of freedom to Poland after the first World War.

The great Polish pianist—virtually crushed by his relentless struggle for liberation of his native land—had implored President Wilson to come to Poland's defense at Versailles.

And, as if with the aid of providence—he succeeded. It was through Paderewski's inspiring efforts, that President Wilson told the Senate of the United States on January 22, 1917: "No peace can last or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignity to sovereignty as if they were property. I take it for granted, for instance, if I may venture upon a single example, that statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent and autonomous Poland, and that henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed all people."

It was this profound pronouncement by President Wilson that led to his 14th point at Versailles and Poland again was restored as a full-fledged member of the family of free nations.

PADEREWSKI'S CROWNING GLORY

This was Paderewski's crowning glory. It was America's way of saying thank you to the thousands of Poles who, in the years past, steadfastly fought for liberty and democracy in the new land.

Paderewski himself paid a tribute to President Wilson which time shall never erase when he said: "I hope I may be permitted to say that as the years pass, my reverence, my admiration, my love, my gratitude for President Wilson constantly grow. And so, too, the feelings of my people who almost unanimously regard him as the greatest benefactor of their country and the father of their liberty."

God grant that the world should again see men of such indomitable courage and dedication as Ignacy Paderewski and Woodrow Wilson.

CONTRIBUTION OF POLES TO UNITED STATES

The main body of Polish immigrants and their native American sons and daughters who are forging steel, digging coal, making motor vehicles and planes and tanks and locomotives and farm machinery, or raising food, ought not to feel any special need of hooking onto the Polish tradition created by men like Kosciuszko, Pulaski and Krzyzanowski; for their own day-to-day collective achievement is so great and so necessary that in itself it should make them feel part of America. Their contribution to the present-day United States is as proportionately substantial as was that of the Poles in Jamestown. The common man is apt to be modest, however, and unconscious of his own direct value and contributions. He is often impelled to grasp at something bigger and older than himself, at something hallowed by history, to help him feel comfortable about his place in the American scheme of things. A Polish-American farmer near New Jersey, who is very successful so far as profits from his land and labor go, finds the deepest satisfaction in the sign, Kosciuszko Road, which some years ago he nailed up at the entrance to the lane connecting his farm with the highway. He has spent a lot of time and energy teaching his non-Polish neighbors the pronunciation of the name and telling them the hero's dramatic story which, incidentally, is the partial reason for the high esteem he enjoyed in his community.

SIZABLE PROPORTION OF POPULATION

Most immigrants from Poland are naturalized citizens. Every year many more take out their final papers. In some large cities they form a sizable proportion of the population and are politically important. In Chicago, there are close to 800,000 Americans of Polish descent. They are numerous also in Buffalo, Detroit, Milwaukee, Toledo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Boston, and several smaller New England towns; they are more or less thickly scattered outside the big urban centers of Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, California, and Florida.

Over 50 towns in the United States bear such names as Pulaski, Warsaw, Cracow, Polonia, Poland, New Poland.

Polish Americans have about 10,000 fraternal, dramatic, literary, musical, social, religious and athletic societies all over America. A good many are affiliates of the Polish American national organizations whose total membership runs into hundreds of thousands.

NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY CHURCHES AND MISSIONS IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The vast majority of Poles are Catholics. There are 990 Polish Roman Catholic parishes and 80-odd Polish Roman Catholic missions in the United States with over a thousand priests, along with 14 orphanages, 3 seminaries for men, and 3 for women. There are 500 Polish Roman Catholic parochial schools with about 400,000 pupils and over 5,000 teachers. Perhaps one-third of Polish American youngsters go to these parochial schools run largely by Catholic priests and nuns, the other two-thirds to public schools.

There are some 50 Polish language newspapers and magazines, including 7 daily papers, many of which are published by various organizations. Some were started way back in the '70's and '80's. The majority are conservative about American and Polish affairs.

GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, EDUCATION

Americans of Polish descent play an important role in our Government and in politics. This is especially true in Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Buffalo, and parts of New England. Ten Congressmen now in Washington are of Polish extraction, as is a member of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Governor of Maine.

The first book printed in English west of the Rockies was written by a Polish American, the famous California pioneer, Dr. Felix Wierzbicki. And there is a growing number of American wriers of Polish descent. In other spheres of contemporary American life, in arts and science, there are significant outstanding Polish names, too numerous to mention here.

Several hundred thousand Americans of Polish descent served in the Armed Forces during World War II. Scores have graduated from West Point. Americans all. But all naturally concerned about the future of Poland whose rich heritage, her gallant sons and daughters gave to the United States during her long march to glory.

Use and Control of Airspace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and a statement and recommendations from the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., concerning air traffic:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., July 31, 1958.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Enclosed is a copy of a letter, statement and recommendations of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh to Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, offering the support of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh in enacting legislation for the establishment of a common air traffic control agency.

It is our sincere belief that the future operations of the airlines, private and corporate flying, as well as nontactical military flying, depend largely upon the effectiveness and adequacy of our air traffic control system.

Any assistance that you might offer in gaining the proper legislation to achieve this goal will be appreciated.

Respectively,

SHERMAN P. VOORHEES,
Executive Director.

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., July 31, 1958.

The Honorable OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRIS: Due to the increasing amount of air traffic, both civilian and military, the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh has become increasingly aware of potential hazards to the air traveling public as the result of the lack of any common air traffic control agency.

Attached is the statement and recommendations of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh on the use and control of airspace, and it is respectfully requested that every effort be made during this session of Congress to enact immediate legislation to establish effective common control over all air traffic, including non-tactical military flying, and to enforce all flying rules which will limit to the greatest possible extent the hazards of collisions in the air and to maintain the highest possible degree of air traffic safety.

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh heartily supports the proposed legislation now before Congress. Your cooperation will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully,

SHERMAN P. VOORHEES,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH ON THE USE AND CONTROL OF AIRSPACE

INTRODUCTION

Recent midair collisions of civilian and military aircraft, and the increasing incidence of near-misses have served to highlight a serious situation requiring immediate remedial action.

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh representing a potential air traffic volume of more than 2 million people is vitally concerned with the effectiveness of air traffic control methods. The chamber, along with many individual citizens, believes that the safety of the air traveling public and the future development of a sound air transportation system is being jeopardized by present traffic control methods.

PRESENT CONDITIONS

At the present, the control of air traffic is divided. Civilian flights are controlled by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; military flights by the military. There is no unified control of airspace. Under certain

weather conditions and in certain areas, civilian aircraft may be flying under CAA instrument flight regulations; in other words, controlled by CAA, while military flights are operating under visual flight regulations, observing only the general rule of the pilot's ability "to see and be seen." This has resulted in chaotic and dangerous conditions.

INCREASED GROWTH OF AIR TRAFFIC

Civilian aircraft in the United States increased from a little over 11,000 in 1938 to more than 85,000 in 1956, the last year for which data are available. Thus in 18 years the number had multiplied almost 8 times. While figures for military aircraft are not available, it is well known that beginning with the war and continuing in later years military planes and flying have increased tremendously. In addition, the advent of jet planes has raised the speed of aircraft beyond anything contemplated just a few years ago.

NEED FOR GOOD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Recently published figures indicate that in the 10 years ending with 1957 there have been 159 midair collisions of which 77 had fatal results causing 402 deaths. In 1958 other collisions have occurred, including the recent Las Vegas, Nev., and the Brunswick, Md., catastrophes in which airliners on airways have been hit by military jets, graphically illustrating the results of divided control of flight operations.

In the same 10 years 971 near misses have also been reported. Any of these, plus the unknown number that have not been reported, could easily have resulted in disasters. Thus the need for direct control by one Federal agency has become more and more pronounced.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL PLANS

After the recent Capital-military jet collision, President Eisenhower placed five restrictions upon military flying. These are:

1. Military student pilots flying near civil airways are to be placed under the control of the CAA.

2. Military jets will not descend or operate under 25,000 feet near civil airways.

3. Jet proficiency flying will be conducted away from civil airways.

4. So-called itinerant jet flights will file flight plans with the CAA and be subject to flight clearance.

5. All operational training flights must be made under the immediate control of the CAA or must comply with Instrument Flight Rules.

Another measure to improve the problem of our airspace has been the creation by the Civil Aeronautics Board of so-called superskyways. Effective June 15 all flight operations between 17,000 and 22,000 feet on the corridors from Los Angeles-San Francisco to New York-Washington will be conducted under absolute ground control along three separate 40-mile wide transcontinental skyways. The absolute ground control will include specific separation regardless of weather, thus each flight will be in its own "cocoon of space" protected by ground monitoring and separated from other aircraft at least 1,000 feet vertically and 10 minutes flying time horizontally. Plans are underway to extend the number of skyways to meet the conditions of the overall flight pattern as soon as CAA's control capacity can be increased.

The commercial airlines have announced that their pilots will submit voluntarily to ground control in all operations above 10,000 feet and the airlines have endorsed the plans proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Department of Defense has also endorsed the plan, but no information is available as to where ground control will take over on military flights.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COMMON CONTROL OF AIR TRAFFIC

Due to the increasing number of midair collisions and near collisions, the aeronautics committee of the chamber is most concerned for the safety of the air traveling public. Although legislation has been proposed in Congress and the military have taken some voluntary action, divided control with the proven hazards inherent therein still exists.

Therefore, the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh requests Congress, with the assistance of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Department of Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration to enact immediate legislation to establish effective common control over all air traffic, including nontactical military flying, and to enforce flying rules which will limit to the greatest possible extent the hazards of collisions in the air and to maintain to the highest possible degree of air safety.

Life Under the Trade Agreements Act or the Escape Clause—A Case History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles which depict life under the administration of reciprocal trade:

[From the Columbus Dispatch of July 29, 1958]

COLUMBUS VIOLIN MAKER ATTRACTS NATIONAL EYE IN FIGHT TO LIVE

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

An American who doesn't know when he's licked is fighting tooth and nail to preserve a 43-year-old business, the only commercial violin factory in the United States.

The story of the struggle of F. L. Daniel, of Columbus, Ohio, is calculated to evoke cheers from other Americans who admire grit and courage. It is certain to rouse them to fury, too, at the Government's indifference to American rights.

In July 1954, the Jackson-Guldan plant in Columbus was being closed because of extreme foreign competition. In the belief that this artistic craft is important to American culture, and that a country as rich as the United States should be able to support such an endeavor, F. L. Daniel bought the unique and vital equipment and retained the old artisans.

Early progress was gratifying, Mr. Daniel says, and for a while it seemed that the art of violin making in the United States was going to be preserved. However, such was not the case, and things went from bad to worse.

On March 20, 1958, after a futile 3½-year fight against the preferential tariffs which favor foreign products at the expense of American-made goods, Mr. Daniel had to discontinue operations and let 30 skilled workers go.

He had tried every means he could think of to fight the ruinous foreign competition. Cheap, European-made commercial violins come into the United States under such low duties that they can be sold for much less than the American products.

Mr. Daniel did not quit easily. When things began to go bad he tried selling violins as planters for greenery in the homes. And he turned to making guitars. But he was no sooner launched on this promising new line than tariff-favored Japanese-made guitars began to come into the country in quantity. Once more, his valiant efforts came to nothing.

He renewed his appeals to Washington for relief from the low tariffs on foreign-made instruments which discriminated against his product. He was determined to hold out until he had not a hope left, for once the unique equipment in the factory was scattered or sold for salvage, violins of the type used by students could no longer be made in this country.

So Mr. Daniel kept on fighting and hoping for a better day. He could not go on as he had before. He reduced his operations to a shop-type business, and recalled 10 of the 30 production employees.

These good people donated anywhere from 2 to 4 hours of work a week to get things underway again. They also accepted a reduced rate of pay. Mr. Daniel moved the office to his home and does the paperwork at night. "We felt we just had to hold on and fight," he said.

The GATT bill (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) is in the Senate Finance Committee now. F. L. Daniel and his brother, C. F., have asked for permission to testify. They have also asked their Senators to sponsor an amendment to GATT, which would increase duties on violins and violas to the rates recommended by the United States Tariff Commission on January 29, 1957.

President Eisenhower ruled against the higher tariffs at that time and there the matter stands.

What the Daniel brothers are asking is very little. They want only what the Tariff Commission recommended a year and a half ago, that "duty on violins and violas valued at not more than $25 each be increased to $1.87½ each plus 52½ percent ad valorem."

This increase they say, will make it possible for them to resume full production of a fine quality, low-priced instrument.

It's becoming increasingly difficult, even impossible, for certain American industries to exist against the inroads of cheap labor costs abroad and the preferential tariffs.

The American bicycle, watch, ceramic, and toy businesses are just a few of the industries which have been hit by our overgenerous treatment of foreigners, our indifference to the fate of so many American firms.

The United States citizen has not one but 36 strikes against him. There are 37 member nations in GATT. Since each GATT member has 1 vote, the 36 other nations can decide what our tariffs should be and get their hands on our rich American market.

More and more, Washington officialdom seems to favor foreign countries and individuals. Sometimes it seems they couldn't care less about American interests.

[From the Columbus Dispatch of Friday, June 20, 1958]

VIOLIN FACTORY BACK IN BUSINESS

The Nation's only violin-making factory is back in operation.

F. L. Daniel, president of Jackson-Guldan, Inc., said 10 employes are producing about 60 guitars and 25 to 30 planters and violins daily at 165 West Main Streeet.

"We just can't stop. We are at it again," said Daniel, who suspended operations last March after a 3½-year battle to keep going.

The crowning blow at that time was a decision not to increase tariffs on cheap violin imports.

Key employees, however, returned to the plant about May 15 to work without pay in an effort to keep the industry going, Daniel said.

Since then, product has been improved, output has beeen expanded, not a shipment date has been missed, and the chances of survival are good, the executive said.

With back taxes paid and optimism high, Daniel this week penned letters to Ohio Senators JOHN W. BRICKER and FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

He asked them to sponsor an amendment to the general traiffs and trade agreements bill that would permit raising the duties on violin and viola imports to the schedule recommended last January by the United States Tariff Commission.

Currently, he told the lawmakers, a $4.50 German violin pays duties of only $1.52; a $2.85 Japanese violin pays $1.23.

"Because the recommended duty would apply only to violins costing less than $25 to produce," Daniel explained, "the recommended rates would aid the fine European handmakers of violins.

"They also would help us compete with labor that costs 15 to 30 cents an hour," he said.

He foresaw no problem in foreign relations through the tariff increase on low-cost violins.

Dollar volume is extremely low, he said. For example, 98.9 percent of all violins imported in 1956 cost less than $15.

Daniel said he has asked permission to testify before the Senate Finance Committee on the issue.

[From the Columbus Dispatch]

JULY 7, 1958.

VIOLIN FIRM STILL HOPES

FROM VIOLIN COMPANY'S FOUNDER

To the EDITOR:

I have noted with interest your articles about the efforts to keep the Jackson-Guldan violin factory open. This brings to mind some similar problems that we had in the early days of the factory.

In 1915 I started the factory, then known as the Guldan Co. As with any new venture, the early days were difficult, but progress was rapid, and soon we employed over 50 violin makers.

In the early part of President Harding's administration we were turning out between 250 and 300 violins per day. At that time we employed from 60 to 75 workers.

Later on we had only 15 employees, due to foreign imports; but 6 months later, after $1 tariff each violin, we were able to employ between 70 and 80 people, and could scarcely fill the demand.

Now we find ourselves in a position as we did in the early part of Harding's administration. So, we can now imagine what the higher tariff would mean to us.

GEORGE GULDAN.

COLUMBUS.

COLUMBUS, *June 25, 1958.*

To the EDITOR:

For the past 3½ years we at the Jackson-Guldan Co. have been waging a battle to maintain the cultural and artistic craft of violinmaking in the United States. It has been our conviction that a country as great as ours can support at least one violinmaking factory.

On March 28 production was stopped at our factory.

On May 15 production was resumed with a very small force working hard to preserve the craft. One possibility remained.

The bill for the extension of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was in the Senate. A letter was addressed to Senator BRICKER and Senator LAUSCHE asking them to sponsor jointly an amendment to that bill.

The amendment to specify that the tariff on imported violins and violas be set at the rates recommended by the United States Tariff Commission on January 29, 1957, recognizing that only with this protection will violins continue to be made in the United States.

The $4.50 German violins presently cost $6.02 after all duties; the $2.85 Japanese violins, $4.08. (Add 10 percent for freight.)

The same violins at the recommended rate of duty would cost: German $9.71; Japanese $7.19. Because the recommended duty would apply only to violins costing less than $25 the recommended rates would aid the fine European handmakers of violins.

In 1956, only 1.1 percent of the 45,000 violins which were imported cost $15 or more.

The dollar amount of the total imports could have no possible bearing on United States foreign relations. The increased rates would not affect the price to the American consumer, but would take up some of the slack between the makers and the final purchaser.

With a domestic producer on the scene a quality standard is set through the competitive process. The violin is a blind item and the average purchaser is at a complete loss to know quality.

In addition to our letters to the Ohio Senators we have asked the Senate Finance Committee for permission to testify concerning our experience with the foreign made violin and with the provisions of the escape clause of the present law.

We have been aware of the interest that the people of Ohio have in the only violinmaking factory in this country.

We wanted to take this opportunity to let them and the staff of the Dispatch know that we are still hanging on and fighting hard.

F. L. DANIEL.

GATT ILLEGAL?

JULY 3, 1958.

To the EDITOR:

Mr. F. L. Daniel of the Jackson-Guldan Co. seems to have the wrong idea about the cost of foreign-made violins and violas, in relation to the cost of their American-made ones, and the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Treaties).

In the United States the average hourly earning in industry is $2.08. In Germany it is $0.55. The German violins cost $6.02 in the United States. In Japan the average hourly wage is $0.22. Their violins cost $4.28 in the United States.

It is not important that foreign countries can undersell United States products in the United States due to their sweatshop labor. It is not important that GATT and its tariffs favoring foreign countries at the expense of America, caused the American woolen and worsted mills to go out of business, that the United States pottery business is failing, and that the United States violin business is almost gone due to GATT.

What is important is that all the foreign nations get all the rich American markets that they desire. The safety and protection of our industry does not matter at all.

Recognizing what is important we have dropped our tariffs from an index of 15.8 to 5.4 (while England and France have raised theirs from 21 to 30 and 18.5 to 25.3).

In such a momentous thing as worldwide trade, the United States must step aside. This task of stepping aside is made much easier by GATT.

There are 37 members in GATT. Each nation has only one vote. Thus the other 36 nations can decide on what our tariffs should be. In this way they can get their hands on our lush American markets.

If Mr. Daniel, or someone like him, tries to raise our tariffs and to protect American business and industry, then the 36 to 1 vote of GATT will take care of that. There is no place for people like Mr. Daniel in the one-world scheme.

It does not matter if the United States Congress has never accepted GATT, and that GATT is unconstitutional in that it delegates the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign-controlled group (GATT). What is important, I repeat, is that foreign nations get our lush markets, at the expense of our American industry.

In the one-world scheme there is no room for a sovereign nation. Since our leaders will not withdraw from GATT and our people will not demand our withdrawal, Mr. Daniel had better look for a new job.

JOE HACKETT,
Columbus.

Have Cases of Abuse Occurred Under Level-of-Benefits Plans?

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, charged in Senate hearings three cases of abuse under level-of-benefits plans. The three cases involved the Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway Co., General Electric Co., and the Reed Glass Co., Inc. The Senate subcommittee staff upon subsequent investigation of the Massachusetts Railway Co. found that—

This inquiry did not develop any illegal action on the part of the railway or insurance companies or their officials * * * (but that) by failing to disclose * * * (the company) laid itself open to the misunderstanding and criticism contained in the Meany testimony." (United States Senate Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Plans Legislation hearings, May–July 1957, op. cit. p. 210.)

The charges against the General Electric Co. were also found to be without support, thus leaving only the Reed Glass Co. case, which involved a bankrupt company which had not made payments into its plan prior to the actual date of its bankruptcy. Disclosure cannot prevent bankruptcy. These are the only cases of abuse under level-of-benefit plans which the Senate hearings revealed.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The New Research Professorship in the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the Tuesday, August 5, Madison Capital-Times of a new research professorship in the humanities as a part of a new Institute for Research in the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin.

The chair is to be supported by a grant from the Johnson Foundation, of Racine, Wis. It is named for H. F. Johnson, chairman of the S. C. Johnson & Co., of Racine, and a director of the University of Wisconsin Foundation.

Mr. President, this new Institute for Research in the Humanities is unique in the United States. The institute will serve as a center for scholars in humanistic research, particularly in the areas of history, philosophy, language, and literature.

All too often, in this technical age of earth satellites, jet planes and the like, we forget that man's oldest heritage, his most treasured heritage, is the humanities. It is by these things of the spirit that man truly lives and communicates and expresses his highest ideals.

Man's history is not only the reflection of his past; it is an index and a guide to his future. Man's philosophy is the star by which he reckons his course in this kindergarten which we call life, itself, where we are forever learning more and more in the school of experience.

Man's language is the tool by which he communicates with his fellow man.

Man's literature is the repository of his ideals, his aspirations, his conceptions.

Far more could be said of the humanities, and, thanks to the institute, far more will be done to advance the humanities.

On many occasions I have commended research at the University of Wisconsin into the physical and biological sciences. But part and parcel of the university's tradition is its great contribution in the social sciences and in the humanities. That contribution will now be expanded manifold.

I may say that I am particularly delighted at this new professorship because it comes about through the generosity of a great company, and a great American. Hib Johnson is the finest type of businessman of whom I know. He is a credit to Racine; he is a credit to his State and to his country. He is a success in private business. He worked splendidly in Government, in important assignments in the Foreign Operations Administration. He is generous of his time, his talent, and his resources in the service of his fellow man.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Capital-Times article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR JOHNSON GRANT—HUMANITIES CHAIR ESTABLISHED AT UNIVERSITY

Establishment of the H. F. Johnson research professorship in humanities as a part of the new Institute for Research in the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin was announced today.

The chair is to be supported by a 5-year grant of $75,000 at $15,000 annually from the Johnson Foundation, of Racine, and is named for H. F. Johnson, chairman of S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., and a director of the University of Wisconsin Foundation.

The institute, approved by University of Wisconsin regents in May for activation in September 1959, will serve as a center for scholars in humanistic research, particularly in the areas of history, philosophy, and language and literature.

University President Conrad A. Elvehjem, expressing appreciation for the grant, said: "The H. F. Johnson chair is a significant contribution to the advancement of research in the humanities as it represents the first gift to the institute from outside the university. It will result in bringing to the campus men whose scholarship is of the highest caliber."

Prof. Marshall Clagett, chairman of a faculty organizational committee for the institute, said his group now is canvassing distinguished scholars in the humanities all over the country, and hopes to recommend sometime this fall the first appointee to the Johnson chair.

The commitee has described the institute as "an organization unique in the United States." Establishment of the institute is designed to strengthen Wisconsin's position in the humanities.

Johnson, one of the Nation's leading industrialists and philanthropists, said, "The success achieved in advancing the American way of life by adequately training tomorrow's leaders will depend in large part on the quality of the Nation's institutions of learning and the opportunity for young men and women to use them. As our society becomes more complex, research continues to grow in importance in the social sciences and the humanities as well as in the natural sciences."

A graduate of Cornell University, the Racine man is a trustee of Cornell, of Northland College at Ashland, Wis., and of Asheville (N. C.) School. He has been prominent in industrial and business organizations, and has been a leader in civic groups in Racine. From September 1954, through June 1955, he served as director of the Office of Industrial Resources, Foreign Operations Administration of the United States Government.

The Johnson Foundation, a philanthropic, nonprofit trust created in 1937, has contributed substantially to educational, health, welfare, religious, civic, and business organizations and individuals.

The foundation donated 61 percent of its total grants of $400,807 in the 1957 fiscal year to schools, universities, and students for higher education. A total of 242 young men and women received nearly $100,000, an average grant of about $400, to attend college or take postgraduate work.

The foundation's principal contributor is the Racine firm which manufactures wax products and other chemical specialties.

Address by the Secretary of the Army on the 183d Anniversary of the Army Chaplaincy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, on the occasion of the 183d anniversary of the Army chaplaincy at Fort Myer, Va., July 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, 183D ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMY CHAPLAINCY, FORT MYER, VA., JULY 27, 1958

Chief of Chaplains, Major General Ryan; General Lemnitzer, Chaplain Tobey, Colonel Edwards, Dr. Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate; ladies and gentlemen, I congratulate General Ryan, and all of the members of the United States Army Chaplains Corps, and I wish you well in the years to come. It was on that fateful day of July 29 of 1775, just 6 weeks after George Washington had been entrusted with the command of the United States Army on June 14, 1775, that the Chaplains Corps was founded. Since that time, 284 chaplains have given their lives in battle. At the present time, over 1,100 chaplains are rendering service in the United States Army under the direction of the Chief of Chaplains. These chaplains are giving direction and purpose to life. In the midst of battle and turmoil they furnish that quietness of spirit which keeps our soldiers going. They encourage the man who is almost ready to quit, to go on, and to remember his home and family. They look after the dependents, the wife and the children, wherever they accompany the soldier. They take care of the thousands of things that we soldiers understand, because only soldiers can truly appreciate what it means to have a good chaplain in their midst. And so today, on this 183d birthday, the United States Army is proud to take time out to

honor all the members of the Army Chaplains Corps.

It is very fitting that the color bearers and the color guard we see today should be wearing the uniform of the Revolutionary Army of 1775 when the Chaplains Corps was founded. This uniform is worn only by the color bearers and color guards of the Honor Guard of the President of the United States, the First Battle Group of the 3d Infantry. Today all of us, soldiers, laymen, men and women and little children, look up to and admire, revere, and venerate the members of the United States Army Chaplains Corps. May you always retain the affectionate regard of the people of the United States, and those whom you serve so well.

The Supreme Court Decision on School Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when Patrick Henry went to the Continental Congress he said he would speak no longer as a Virginian but as an American. I have tried to emulate him in that respect, and even when I have advocated measures of particular concern to my own State, I have tried to retain perspective and relate my position to fundamental principles concerning the welfare of our whole Nation.

That attitude has applied in particular to statements I have made about problems resulting from the Supreme Court's decision on school integration. David Lawrence correctly stated in his editorial in the August 8 issue of U. S. News & World Report:

Ever since the founding of the Republic, education has been considered solely within the right of the States to administer. Nowhere in the Constitution is the word education mentioned, and certainly the debates in Congress when the 14th amendment was adopted do not reveal a scintilla of evidence to prove that the amendment was intended to give Congress the power to take away from the States the right to control their own educational systems.

There is nothing in the Constitution, therefore, which prohibits the States from assigning pupils to public schools on whatever basis the State feels will give the best education to the children of its citizens.

From the very beginning of our history—confirmed indeed by a specific decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in 1850—the right of a State to set up separate schools for different races has been upheld. In 1896 the United States Supreme Court formally recognized the custom when it said that "separate but equal facilities" do not violate the 14th amendment.

I am convinced that, while the problems involving attempted racial integration of our schools are at the moment primarily those of Virginia and other Southern States, the principle of judicial destruction of States rights should be of deep concern to every part of our country.

It was gratifying, therefore, when I received recently from a Vermont Republican a letter commending a statement I made last year on the use of Federal troops at Little Rock. The writer of this letter professed a faith in the principles advocated by Thomas Jefferson and George Mason with which I am wholly in accord.

I have obtained approval of the writer, Mr. Albert B. Congdon, to publicize his letter, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANBY, VT., *July 27, 1958.*

To the honorable SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You may think it strange for an old Vermont Republican to write you, but my niece sent me a U. S. News & World Report, which printed your speech of October 11, 1957, and I wish to express my appreciation and approval of it, and to say that you are on the right road.

I am an oldfashioned Vermonter, living in a little town my folks have lived in for 193 years. My folks were the Green Mountain boys, and Col. Ebenezer Allen who wrote the emancipation proclamation of the Green Mountain boys 1777 was 3 times my great uncle.

My father's folks lived neighbor to Judge Theophilus Harrington when in 1801 he made that famous decision, refusing to return a runaway slave to his master without a bill of sale signed by the Lord Almighty.

To the people of our Northern States, the Dred Scott decision by the Supreme Court was a direct violation of our States right, and the war between the States was the worst calamity this country ever had, and we now realize that after the war those poor Negroes needed much more than constitutional amendments to make them good, reliable American citizens, but in the years that have passed since the war they have made great progress and deserve much credit for it, but they do not deserve all of the credit. They could not possibly have done so well without help from their white friends and neighbors.

Thomas Jefferson was our smartest President. He was Ambassador to France when Washington was elected President and came back to become our first Secretary of State. The French then had two political parties they called Royalists and Republicans. Jefferson brought the name Republican back with him and called his party the Democratic-Republican Party, so now both parties can claim him.

Evidently Jefferson believed in States rights, for he said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon want bread, and if we were not already divided into States and the States into towns or parishes, it would be necessary to do so, so that each in its turn could do that for itself which it can do so much better than a higher branch of the Government could do for it."

George Mason, another noted Virginia, said "he would rather cut off his right hand than sign the United States Constitution without the Bill of Rights" which was afterward added as the first amendments.

The problem of the two races living peaceably together is a big one and very difficult, but it is one of those things which the States themselves and the people of each community can do so much better as Jefferson said than a higher branch of the Government can do for them.

We need to restore and preserve the original balance of power between the people, the States, and the Federal Government. As the Constitution says, "We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution." The power, therefore, came from the people, and the 10th amendment says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people"; and the 9th amendment says, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

This shows the Court had no right to construe the Constitution so as to increase their power or the power of the Central Government.

But the Supreme Court has so ruled as to abridge or nullify much of the Bill of Rights, especially the 4th, 6th, 9th, and 10th amendments. The fourth amendment says "the rights of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizure shall not be violated and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath."

Now, Federal officers claim they do not have to have any warrants.

Five years ago I was doing some carpentering work for a friend in New York State when four FBI men pushed open the doors of the house when the family were at morning prayers, arrested my friend without a warrant at his own breakfast table. Two other men came with trucks. They searched the house and carried off anything they wanted.

I read of a proposed States Right Party. I think we need something more. The right of the people should come first, then the rights of the States, and after that the Federal right. The old Bill of Rights was not quite specific and clear enough. We need amendments to strengthen it.

I do not like the way things were managed at Little Rock. We have some things in our Northern States that are not what they should be, but we would resent it if a Federal bulldozer was sent to clear the weeds out of our garden.

With best regards, I am,
Yours truly,

ALBERT B. CONGDON.

Labor Bill Kept Bottled Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Bill Kept Bottled Up," published in the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion for July 30, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BILL KEPT BOTTLED UP

Weeks of investigation and hearings by a congressional rackets committee at Washington long ago exposed flagrant abuses, malfeasance and other misdoings of certain leaders within the American organized labor movement that produced big newspaper headlines all across the country. The news made shocking revelations. The congressional investigation and hearings were for the purpose of securing information for guidance in drafting legislation that would safeguard the country and American labor, itself, against these abuses. This purpose of Con-

gress, as it seemed to be reflected in the operations of the McClellan investigation committee, was quickly reflected, also, in a wave of popular demand.

Now, it appears that all this preliminary work which resulted in such a positive showing for the need of remedial legislation, is to come to naught. At least this will be the case if the observation of the Associated Press news analyst, James Marlow, whose column appears regularly on this page, proves correct.

With Congress now hoping for a mid-August adjournment to get home for the fall election campaign, Marlow wrote that "Congress seems certain not to pass a general labor bill. The Senate did but the House is likely to ignore it."

And if this proves true it will bear out a fear voiced by South Dakota's Senator KARL MUNDT back on July 2, when he pleaded for referral of the Senate-adopted Kennedy-Ives labor bill to the House Committee on Education and Labor in time to permit hearings, proposed amendments and the debate, revision and adoption of this legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives in keeping with the American tradition of democratic parliamentary procedures.

The labor bill was adopted in the Senate way back in mid-June. But rather than being then referred to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives for consideration, amendment or revision as is the customary procedure, it has been kept bottled up. The strategy of this maneuver appears to have been to either delay the legislation so long that it could be allowed to die for lack of time for its proper committee consideration or to bring it to the floor of the House under a suspension of the rules and compel a rollcall on the Senate version without opportunity to consider or adopt amendments.

Senator MUNDT'S July 2 speech placed responsibility for this treatment of labor legislation in the House on the Democratic party control of Congress. After reference to the refusal to refer the labor bill to the House committee, Senator MUNDT said "this would therefore confront us with the ugly un-American alternative of either having no labor bill at all, * * * or, under alternative No. 2, it would mean that the House must vote upon what we in the Senate have enacted on labor legislation without making amendments of any kind. While either of these alternatives would of course be acceptable, and either also favored by certain labor bosses in this country, I am certain Mr. President, that neither of these alternatives would be pleasing or acceptable to the general public, whom it is our duty to try to represent."

MUNDT continued: "If there ever were a warning sign larger than a camel-shaped cloud that labor already has control of the Democratic party in this country, you see it now, and you see it here, and you see it in what is happening to the so-called Kennedy-Ives labor bill over at the other end of the Capitol."

MUNDT, as a member of of the McClellan committee, shared the conviction of many others that the Kennedy-Ives bill as passed by the Senate did not meet the needs for reform brought out in the committee hearings. But he, as did many others, hoped the situation could be remedied when the bill came before the House. "To force the House of Representatives," he said, "to take S. 3974 as it is or to take no labor legislation at all does not seem to me to be compatible with either the record of the House or with the desires of the American people."

The this-or-nothing ultimatum has met strong opposition also from many sources outside Congress, including the National Manufacturers' Association, United States Chamber of Commerce and others. The Rockford Morning Star sums it up this way: "The racket hearings have strongly indicated that the country needs a labor-reform bill. But what was produced under lobbyist influence in the Senate and is now offered on a this-or-nothing basis to the House is at the opposite pole of what the country demanded. At this late hour in the session, there is but one possible course—to vote it down. Let's have a fair, honest piece of legislation or none at all."

Federal Aid To Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the proponents of Federal aid to education, having failed to sell their program to Congress and the Nation by other means, have taken a new approach. The latest argument is that Federal encroachment on this local responsibility is necessary to national security.

This approach is also fallacious. Congress would do well to examine any such program to determine whether it is a program of general Federal aid to education in disguise.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an enlightening editorial discussing this point entitled, "Same Purpose—New Approach" which was published in the Aiken Standard and Review of Aiken, S. C., on August 4.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAME PURPOSE—NEW APPROACH

One thing you may be sure of, the proponents of Federal aid to education will never stop trying. The new gimmick—following repeated failures to force congressional passage of bills to pay teachers and build schools—is to dress this Federal encroachment on local responsibility in a dashing military cloak.

H. R. 13247, entitled "National Defense Education Act of 1958" will be up for a vote in the House very soon. And considering the gentlemen's preoccupation with the political chores waiting at home, they might admire the soldierly cut of this garment and not look to see what's under it.

But the council of State chambers of commerce, which has made a thorough analysis of Federal aid to education, 1958 style, thinks that in these times of rising Federal budgets and growing deficits, taxpayers should expect Congress to find better uses for their money than an unneeded and undesirable Federal scholarship program.

Eugene F. Rinta, research director of the council, who directed and prepared the study, said of H. R. 18247: "Its passage in this session of Congress would become the opening wedge for future enactment of the kind of program the National Education Association and other proponents of Federal aid really want; that is, a program calling for the Federal Government to become a major participant with the communities and the States in financing the public schools."

Such a program, said Mr. Rinta, contemplates annual Federal expenditures for public education several times the size of the $940 million 4-year cost of H. R. 13247. He noted further that even though any possible defense benefits that might result are years in the future, the gimmick of the cloak seems to have fooled a lot of people in and out of Congress who have been traditionally opposed to Federal efforts to control the schools. Nor have many stopped to realize that the fact that scholarships in the very subjects the bill proposes are going begging now.

Whatever is spent on education must still come out of local pants pockets and pocketbooks and cookie jars. And it will be spent more thoughtfully at home than in Washington. Whether Washington proposes to buy scholarships or schoolhouses, to pay teachers or lend money to colleges, the ultimate purpose remains just what it was—to federalize education.

Last Unsurrendered Confederate Battle Standards Rest in Rio Grande

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, though this country's interest in the episodes of the Civil War has never waned, the approaching centennial of that great conflict is sure to cause even greater study of the circumstances surrounding that great period of national crisis.

An interesting article by Mr. V. H. Torrance in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of July 27, 1958, points out that the last battle standards of the Confederacy were not lowered until 3 months after Appomattox, and this event took place in Texas on the banks of the Rio Grande.

Then, as now, this country was vitally affected by events taking place elsewhere in the world. France's ambitions for a New World empire were causing the United States Government grave concern.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article, which describes the disbanding of the last Confederate unit on the banks of the Rio Grande, and the international complications of the time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST CONFEDERATE UNIT DISBANDED IN CEREMONY ON BANK OF RIO GRANDE

(By V. H. Torrance)

Copiously annotated works of history tell us the southern Confederacy shut up shop and went out of business at Appomattox April 9, 1865, but do not tell us it was on the bank of the Rio Grande at Eagle Pass 3 months later that the last free, unsurrendered, unreconciled combat element of the Confederate States Army lowered its battle standards forever.

It was a ceremony of proud and scornful men; grim, bitter, and desperate men. It was rather terrible, but it had something of sublime beauty, and it was a ceremony entirely in keeping with the somber history of the Great River.

The scene was set in the Tuileries, where Napoleon III in 1862, using Mexican debts to France as a pretext, sent an army to Mexico. Mexicans thoroughly mauled that force at Puebla May 5. (Now you know why Mexicans observe el Cinco de Mayo—the 5th of May.)

Napoleon sent 30,000 more troops and put an Austrian archduke, Maximilian von Hapsburg, on an emperor's throne in the Halls of Montezuma.

This seriously vexed the United States; it ran contrary to the theme of a letter President Monroe wrote in 1823. It would require an army to persuade Napoleon to read that letter carefully, and at that time, you'll remember, the United States Army had other engagements—and was losing most of them.

Washington could only hope President Pablo Benito Juarez might be able to handle the matter.

Juarez was a Zapotec Indian and a great American. As a barefoot waiter in a Chihuahua posada he had served Santa Anna. As Governor of Oaxaca he refused to permit Santa Anna, who had offered the French his services, to rest overnight within his state. Benito Mussolini and the city of Juarez were named for him.

After Lee surrendered, Napoleon knew he would have to deal with the mighty, veteran Army of the United States; Custer was soon to be in Texas ready to jump with 26 regiments. Napoleon withdrew his support from Maximilian.

Then it appeared that the phony emperor might get some sure-enough help from another source.

Appomattox had no force in Confederate armies west of the Mississippi. Some, as units or as individuals, surrendered when the proximity of Federal troops made it practical. Most of them simply called it a day and went home.

Gen. Joseph O. Shelby's cavalry division neither surrendered nor went home. With their arms, and their bands, and their worn battle standards, they marched to Texas and camped a few miles north of Austin. Shelby made no secret of his intention of going to Mexico, as hundreds of Confederates were doing, but he was painfully reticent about his plans for after he got there; painful, that is, to Washington.

The situation in Mexico was such that Shelby's hard and salty veterans might make the difference one way or the other. If he planned joining Juarez * * *. Need anything, General? Horses? Arms? Rations? But if he intended throwing his weight behind Maximilian * * *. The United States had no great hankering to resume the war by throwing Custer across his road to Mexico.

While Washington worried and fumed, Shelby marched his division to Eagle Pass, and on the bank of the river at sunup July 4, 1865, the Confederate States Army conducted its last formation.

Color Sergeants stood front and center. The drums were darkly omnious, as war drums always are, and the trumpets were arrogant and challenging as four colonels stepped forward and took station at the general's back.

The five officers moved slowly down the line of standards, and Shelby reached up and ripped each faded, ragged emblem from its staff. The colonels received them reverently in their arms, then the officers weighted them and lowered them into the muddy water of the river that has washed so many hopes and dreams down to the gulf.

The division went to Mexico, but as groups and as individuals. Some went one way, some another, and some returned home soon. Those who went to Maximilian were too late to help him. He was captured, and the Zapotec Indian, a gentle, sensitive man, sadly and reluctantly nodded his assent. On the Hill of the Bells musketry riddled the last emperor of Mexico.

The Empress Carlota had gone home to weep for help in the chancelleries of Europe. She went entirely mad, but she lived until 1927. When you are in Austin you can see her said-to-be perfect mirrors in the Driskill Hotel.

And the unsurrendered standards of Shelby's cavalry division are deep in the mud of the restless river.

Tribute to Capt. Laurance F. Safford Retired Navy Cryptographer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "East Wind, Rain," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 26, 1958. The editorial pays tribute to Cap. Laurance F. Safford, a retired Navy Cryptographer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST WIND, RAIN

President Eisenhower has signed a bill approving the award by Congress of $100,000 to Capt. Laurance F. Safford, retired Navy cryptographer, for his invention of a score of code systems which were impervious to enemy attempts at code breaking during World War II. Because of security regulations and the fact that his work was done on duty, Captain Safford could not profit by patenting his devices.

The interesting thing about this recognition of merit is that Captain Safford made himself highly unpopular during the Democratic investigations of the Pearl Harbor disaster by his sworn testimony that there was no excuse for the successful Japanese attack. Information available to the highest offices of Government and of the military commands, he said, left no doubt that war was imminent, and this knowledge imposed a responsibility to place American outposts on a full alert against enemy action. This was not done at Pearl Harbor, where our forces were completely surprised.

If anyone was competent to pronounce this kind of judgment, it was Captain Safford. He was chief of radio intelligence in the Office of Naval Communications at the time of Pearl Harbor. Although he has at last been rewarded for giving his country unbreakable means of transmitting its own secret messages, it is not emphasized that his contributions to breaking the Japanese code long before Pearl Harbor were of equal value. So successfully did he and his associates perform that machines duplicating those used by Japan were built by the United States as much as 16 months before Pearl Harbor.

Captain Safford, of course, knew what Japanese secret messages were intercepted by these and other means, for it was a part of his duty to see that they reached high American officials, starting with President Roosevelt, the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, and going down into the command echelons of the services.

Safford was convinced by the temper of these Japanese messages that war was coming soon. On December 4, 1941, 72 hours before the Pearl Harbor attack, his group plucked from a fake Japanese radio report on the weather, transmitted by prearrangement with Japanese diplomatic agents throughout the world, the coded declaration that Japan would go to war with the United States, Britain, and the Netherlands Indies, but not with Russia. When this intelligence was circulated, no one in Washington had any excuse for further ignorance, yet no unqualified warning was dispatched to the commanders in Hawaii.

This was the famous "east wind, rain" intercept. Its existence was testified to many times in secret service investigations during the war. It became a cardinal principle of policy on the part of agents of the Roosevelt administration to discredit the existence of any such message and to prevail upon those who had already testified to its receipt to change their sworn stories.

By the time of his appearance before the congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor after the end of the war, Captain Safford was the only witness still prepared to swear that the message had been received and had been fully understood. As a result, the captain did not commend himself to the Democratic majority of the committee, or to his superiors, who were responsive to political influence. He was never promoted to flag rank.

For his honesty and courage alone, Captain Safford deserves the reward Congress has voted him. He also deserves the gratitude of all Americans not only for his great services to his country but for his dedication to truth, whatever the consequences.

Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent international events have clearly pointed out that the United States and the free world must face for years to come, a continuing struggle.

The principles of our life and Government are under constant challenge. Every moment of disinterest and relaxation will be capitalized upon as the time for a forward encroachment by international Communists and their followers.

The United States has just adopted the largest military budget in our peacetime history. We are all agreed we must be militarily strong to withstand any aggressive action.

Yet the most distressing gains against the free world in recent years have not been made by direct military attacks. The gains have been achieved by indirect means.

We in this country must marshal the forces and efforts of the free world to effectively combat the Communist nonmilitary and indirect methods.

It has been my belief the first place to consolidate and strengthen our mutual efforts is close to home—Latin America. A strong and effective Western Hemisphere will provide leadership and strong moral support for the rest of the free world.

In Florida we have been very conscious of this, particularly in my district.

We know that the Communists have been hard at work in Latin America for years. What have they been doing? How effective are they?

Our two outstanding newspapers, the Miami Herald and the Miami News, are doing a series of stories on this whole situation. I earnestly recommend that my colleagues read these reports:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

ARGENTINE EDITOR IS LEADER—COMMUNISTS SPREAD WORD RAPIDLY IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Al Neuharth)

(This is the first of several articles about the extent of Communist activity in South America.)

BUENOS AIRES.—If you doubt that the Communists mean business in South America, come with me to a bustling newspaper office here for an eyeopener.

The place is near the center of Buenos Aires, but the talk and the atmosphere is strictly from Moscow. You get the idea quickly when the Red hammer and sickle greet you from a big street sign.

The boys and girls on the job here talk passionately about their purpose—to rally South Americans to do their part in spreading world communism.

This is the home of La Hora (the Time), South America's only daily Communist newspaper and the mouthpiece for the Reds on this continent.

We walked in unannounced on the office of Ernesto Giudici, La Hora's chief editor. The Reds don't get many Yankee capitalist callers, so we took the place by surprise.

Ernesto is a mustached, 50-year-old intellectual who preaches the Red ideology in a manner which must make his Moscow comrades proud.

We asked him some pointed questions, and Ernesto gave it to us straight.

"Our purpose is to take over Argentina for the Communist Party. Our party line is the same as that in Moscow," he emphasized.

Do he and his comrades actually expect to realize the goal of running this country? we asked.

"Certainly," Ernesto replied. "It is only a matter of time. We are getting stronger every day."

You'd like to pass that off as Red propaganda. But the man has some figures that stop you.

La Hora began publication just 3 months ago. Ernesto and his boys claim they already have over 80,000 circulation daily. They also publish a weekly Red periodical, Nuestra Palabra (Our Pledge).

The Reds audit their own books, so that circulation figure isn't open to inspection.

But you'll find La Hora on sale at most newsstands in this city. It sells for one peso (about 2½ cents), the same price as all other Buenos Aires dailies.

Dardo Cuneo, press relations chief for the Argentine government, insists La Hora has almost no circulation and no real readership. Cuneo, the Jim Hagerty of Argentina, echoes the feeling of most government officials here that the Reds are nothing to worry about yet.

They point out that in a city of 5 million like Buenos Aires, this Communist activity has no great influence.

But many local newspapermen who get around express concern. Some of them estimate La Hora actually may have 50,000 or more daily circulation.

It's not a small-time operation. And there's obviously some big money behind it.

Ernesto says he has a staff of over 60 employes. About 30 newsmen and women were on the job when we called.

It takes money to run that kind of an operation. We asked Ernesto where he gets it.

"It is subsidized by the party," he explained. "We have a deficit of several million pesos a month, but the party is happy to pay the bills," Ernesto said.

We asked him if Moscow picks up part of the tab.

"Unfortunately, not yet," he smiled. "But maybe soon."

Ernesto is no dummy. He was educated at the University of Buenos Aires, has traveled in the United States and lived for a while at Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

A couple of years ago, the boys at Pravda invited him to spend a month and a half in Moscow, to teach him how to spread the party line.

They did a good job.

Ernesto claims his Communist party now has more than 100,000 card-carrying members in Argentina.

He called in three or four lieutenants and a couple of reporter-photographers as he proceeded to tell us about his paper, his ideology and how he and his comrades are going to get the job done.

Helping Ernesto here are a collection of Latins and Europeans who make an impression. Most of them are college educated. They are smart. They are dedicated.

We chatted for more than an hour, while Ernesto's girl, Katherina, served coffee and he and lieutenants took turns talking.

They brought the Red menace disturbingly close to home.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

REDS TAKE KEY ROLE IN JUNTA DECISIONS

(By Larry Allen)

CARACAS.—With incredible speed the Communists have moved into position in Venezuela where they often dictate the acts of the junta that overthrew a dictatorship last January.

Their organization is close knit, speedy and precise. Unless their tactics are halted soon Venezuelans may awaken one day and find control of the oil-rich nation in Red hands.

The Communists are respected. They have equality with all other political parties. They are consulted by the government. They quickly and easily command the power to whip up tremendous demonstrations.

There are Communist Party members in all the key trade unions, in businesses and industries, in civic and student organizations, and in the offices of government.

The Communist Party is small. But its agitators are descending upon cities, towns, and villages in every strategic sector of Venezuela, enlisting party members. They incite and enforce strikes.

Communist membership might reach 100,000 by the end of the year. At the moment the party rolls show 26,000 to 30,000.

Apparently because the number sounds small, the provisional government, headed by Rear Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, waves aside any suggestion the Communists constitute a threat to Venezuela's "new democracy."

Larrazabal said recently Venezuela's Communists were patriotic and nationalistic, and not the byproduct of Moscow's international communism.

As he spoke, two kingpins of the Venezuelan party were in Moscow, presumably getting their orders.

In Larrazabal's views, the Communists helped to overthrow the 10-year-long military dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez last January 23 and therefore are democratic.

But outside of Larrazabal's governing five-member military-civilian junta, there is rising alarm over the Red riptide, particularly within the army.

That might crystallize into actions, long before national elections expected in November. There are deep rumblings of discontent among some top army officers and talk the Communists must be stopped.

This already has exploded into one abortive coup.

Gen. Jesus Maria Castro Leon, defense minister in the junta, led a conspiracy July 23 aimed at toppling the government. One of his chief aims was an immediate crackdown on the Reds.

But the Communists—and their sympathizers in the far left Accion Democratica—numerically the strongest political party in Venezuela—got wind of the conspiracy.

They immediately mustered more than 100,000 Venezuelans. They chanted for Castro Leon's death and the eradication of all conspirators. Castro Leon was forced out and exiled to a job in Washington. Fifteen other top-ranking army officers also were banished.

While Communist Secretary General Gustavo Machado rides high, the Communist shadow has sealed the lips of many Venezuelans.

The average man fears to say anything critical or to suggest any action against the Communists. It means attack from most of Venezuela's newspapers.

Even the Roman Catholic Church, often the spearhead against communism, is highly cautious in Venezuela. Only occasionally is there the mildest reference to Venezuelan Communists in the church's organ, La Religion.

It is a great change from 7 months ago when the Communists were outlawed, hunted, and generally ignored by the Venezuelan people.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News]

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, No. 1—SOVIET TRADE HITTING LATIN SOFT SPOTS

(By Hal Hendrix)

(Throughout the world the Soviet Union has launched an economic offensive which is considered an entering wedge for later political penetration. The economic campaign has touched parts of Latin America. Several weeks ago, the Miami News asked its correspondents in Latin America to report on this Soviet offensive and its shape and size. Their reports on this extremely dangerous development will be published during the next few days.)

In the last year, several informed Americans have expressed increasing concern regarding the rising tide of Communist economic influence in the free world.

There is evidence at every turn that the much-heralded Soviet economic offensive has reached into Latin America.

The penetration has been in varying degrees in the 20 Latin Republics. Some of the nations have nibbled at the Red bait, some have taken a fairly good-sized bite, some have turned away.

The dollar value of all the Soviet transactions is relatively small. Soviet business in Latin America, for instance, amounted to $131 million in 1956. United States sales in the same year were nearly $4 billion.

UNDERLYING SIGNIFICANCE

Roughly 2 percent of Latin America's trade was with the Soviet bloc. Although that is not a large figure, there are at least two reasons for not assuming that it is completely insignificant.

First, Soviet bloc trade with Latin America has been growing about 40 percent a year since 1952.

Considering the very low level from which it started, the net gain still is small. But it points up an intensified economic drive in Latin America.

Second, the Soviet Union is directing its trade offensive primarily to soft spots in Latin America—countries that, because of various economic problems, have experienced difficulty in disposing of their exports at declining world prices.

FRIEND IN NEED

The Soviets are thereby able to make an effective show of helping out nations in trouble. There is no doubt that behind the

trade screen the chief purpose is political penetration.

Latin America has been increasingly anxious to find new markets, and the anxiety has grown in recent months due to the depressed free world market in most commodities.

The Latin nations posses some of the raw materials in short supply in the Soviet bloc. They have a large demand for some of the products the bloc has in surplus.

All reports indicate that trade between Russia and its satellites and Latin America will show another gain this year. Red trade missions have been extremely busy in soliciting Latin purchasers and offering to buy Latin products.

TOO LARGE TO IGNORE

If Red trade in the Latin area should increase at the possible rate of 20 percent a year, in 10 years it would amount to about $1 billion. This still would be considerably below the United States volume in Latin America, but too large for the United States to ignore.

A strong and growing Soviet trade offensive in Latin America presents a serious challenge to the West in general and the United States in particular.

For as the Soviet Union's trade grows in the Western Hemisphere, so does its political penetration and influence.

Hugh Scott Urges House Conferees To Improve Bill Protecting Welfare and Pension Beneficiaries

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House passed by voice vote yesterday H. R. 13507, the welfare and pensions plans disclosure bill—legislation which means well but which badly misses its mark.

I voted for this bill because it was the best thing that was offered to the Members of the House. But I strongly urge the House conferees to exert some leadership for the protection of union labor and of its membership, as has been suggested by Eisenhower administration supporters.

The welfare and pensions disclosure bill was supposed to protect the working man and woman from the outright looting and larceny that is being perpetrated against some private welfare and pension funds; most of such funds are honestly administered. But because of the technical bumblings and fumblings in the bill, we are offering up legislation that opens the door to fraud and confusion.

The bill we passed yesterday requires administrators of private pension and welfare plans to disclose the form of the plans and how they are administered. As far as it goes, that is a good thing.

However, there are penalties for willful violation of the act, but they are too light. There is no criminal penalty for making a false statement. There is no provision for uniform reporting. The bill is vague on independent audits. It is contradictory on the kinds of information required. It fails to recognize plan variations from State to State. It does not give the Department of Labor the right to investigate wrongdoings. And there are no criminal penalties for embezzlement, kickbacks, and other skullduggery on the part of persons who manage the funds of employee-benefit plans.

The net effect of these and other loopholes could be scandalous.

Since there is no requirement for uniform reports, the working man and woman might get a report that is so full of technical verbiage and intentional misrepresentations that they would be better off not to have requested the report. Stockholders have the benefit of report requirements laid down by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Are not the beneficiaries of welfare and pension plans entitled to the same protection from the Department of Labor?

A beneficiary has the right to sue if he does not get a copy of the plan or annual report. But if he makes such a request and then retaliatory action forces him out of his job, he has lost the right to sue.

The reporting requirements are so vague that the honest administrator is going to have to search his soul to determine whether his report is fully in compliance with the law. It is like asking a man to file an income-tax return without giving him an approved tax form to fill out.

The unscrupulous administrator will have too many advantages in this legislation. Since the penalties for willful violation of this act are so light, it will encourage some administrators to take their chances with this penalty rather than subject themselves to more severe punishment if they made a full disclosure of their nefarious operations.

We all know of the frauds and outright piracy that has occurred among some private pension and welfare plans. Labor will want to keep its house clean; and working people demand it. The Senate and House have held hearings on the subject for about 4 years. The administration and its spokesmen have urged a real reform law.

I urge the House conferees to keep these facts in mind when they sit around the table with Senate conferees to draft legislation which we will have to live with for many years.

United States Unpopularity in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Milwaukee Journal put its perceptive editorial finger on a prime reason for the futility and failure of our foreign policy.

The Journal editorial writers resourcefully checked the recommendations which have recently been made by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, after his 20 day study trip to Latin America, with the recommendations made by the same Milton Eisenhower in July 1953, after a similar trip to South America. As the Journal points out, the recommendations in 1958 are almost exactly the same as the recommendations made in 1953. The point is not, Mr. President, that the recommendations have been repeated. The point is that in 5 long years this administration has failed to take any action whatsoever on any of the recommendations made by an outstanding American, who undoubtedly has the closest possible access to the President. As the Journal concludes:

Maybe this kind of business—words and studies but no action—is one reason for the present unpopularity of the United States in Latin America.

Now let me say, Mr. President, that this kind of business—words and studies, but no action—is the reason why it was necessary for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to make his brilliant criticism yesterday of our foreign policy. Lack of constructive, peaceful, consistent action to achieve carefully thought-out foreign policy objectives is a lethal weakness of this administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "Brother Milton Reports Again," be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHER MILTON REPORTS AGAIN

President Eisenhower's brother, Milton, is back from a 20-day study trip to Latin America. He has already made a preliminary report to the White House.

He said the United States must shore up its policies and programs with respect to Latin America. He said there was an imperative need for bankable loans. He said the United States must respond to our neighbor's need for more stable relationships between raw commodity prices and prices of manufactured products. He called for action to clarify United States policies, purposes, programs, and capabilities to the Latin Americans.

All this sounded very familiar, so we asked the Milwaukee Journal library to do some research.

And it did turn out to be familiar. Back in July 1953, the same Milton Eisenhower, brother to the President, made an extended tour of South America. He returned to make a long report to the President. He recommended, among other things, almost exactly what he is recommending in 1958.

This is not to say that what he is recommending now, or what he recommended 5 years ago, is not right.

It does seem fair, however, to ask what happened to the proposals brother Milton made to the administration in 1953. And to wonder whether they will fare any better in 1958.

Maybe this kind of business—words and studies but no action—is one reason for the present unpopularity of the United States in Latin America—as demonstrated by treatment given Vice President NIXON on his recent tour.

Outlook Shifts for Both Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article entitled "Outlook Shifts for Both Parties," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

OUTLOOK SHIFTS FOR BOTH PARTIES

HYANNIS, Mass.—Political leaders and strategists of both Democratic and Republican Parties are taking a new look at the situation and the issues. Election day, November 4, is still almost 3 months away and much can happen in that period—just as it has since the beginning of the year.

Earlier the Democrats were riding high, wide, and handsome. The big issues which they counted on to make big gains in both Houses of Congress and to elect Democratic governors of States have somewhat faded. First there was an uproar over the Russian sputniks. The Democrats claimed the Republican administration had permitted the United States to fall far behind the Soviet government in the matter of scientific discovery and accomplishment; that this country was in imminent danger of becoming a second-rate power militarily.

But now we have successfully launched four earth satellites of our own. In addition, and most important from a national defense point of view, we have just had remarkable success with an intercontinental missile, designed to hurl a tremendously destructive hydrogen warhead more than 5,000 miles.

RECESSION MEASURES

Second, according to Democratic prophets earlier, this country was on its way to a depression that would rival that of the early 1930's. All kinds of panaceas, costing billions of dollars, were proposed in Congress.

President Eisenhower and his advisers, however, refused to be stampeded into these huge spending programs. The administration went to work on a saner course. It declined to recommend a reduction in taxes which some of the Democratic economists demanded, too. The economy has taken a distinct turn for the better. And most unexpectedly from the Democratic standpoint, American farm income has gone up and up, until in the first half of this year the net income of agriculture has increased about $3 billion. The Democrats may have to make a new estimate of their party's pulling power in the agricultural States of the Midwest, the East, and South.

Also, earlier in the year, and, indeed, more recently, President Eisenhower's foreign policy was under heavy fire from the Democrats.

They charged that the President was exerting no leadership; that things were at sixes and sevens, and that we had lost both prestige and all our friends, if we had ever had any, abroad. The sudden further development of the Middlee East crisis, however, brought prompt and immediate action by President Eisenhower, who ordered the marines into Lebanon. Even after he had taken this necessary step, he was harshly criticized for imprudence which might hurl the world into a third world war. But that, too, has changed. The Communist nations have taken no steps toward armed conflict, although Khrushchev ordered military maneuvers on the borders of Iran and Turkey, in a further effort to frighten the nations of Europe and the United States. It did not work. The British sent their troops into Jordan.

U. N. SITUATION CHANGES

Now there is strong likelihood of a special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on the Middle East issue, possibly attended by heads of governments. Should such a meeting be attended by a measure of success in settling the Middle East problem and the world can breathe easier, much of the credit will go to President Eisenhower—and another Democratic issue for the closing campaign will have faded into insignificance.

Since this country became immersed in the Middle East situation, the Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine incident, rated by the Democrats as a first-class issue against the Eisenhower administration and the GOP, has assumed more correct proportions. The House investigating committee has tried desperately to tar Mr. Adams, the President's first assistant at the White House. But it has failed to show any corrupt action or attempted action by Mr. Adams.

Mr. Goldfine, the Boston industrialist and the giver of many presents to many men, Democrats as well as Republicans, is still under strong attack. However, Mr. Goldfine has testified that he contributed even more liberally to Democratic campaign funds than to Republican.

So far the Democratic attempt to prove there is a mess in the Eisenhower administration has not progressed. Undoubtedly the House committee will keep at it. Up to date, what it has disclosed is a pale picture as compared to the mess in Washington during the last Democratic administration, when even the head man in the Internal Revenue Bureau was found to have transgressed.

The Republicans who were down in the dumps—far down—a few months ago have plucked up courage. Democrats are wondering if everything is as rosy as they had believed. Early in 1948 and far into the summer the Democrats seemed in for a terrific defeat at the polls. Things changed in the last few weeks of that campaign. It could happen again.

The Need for Individuality in a World of Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Lubbock Evening Journal of July 24, 1958, which asks the following question in its title, "Has Culture a Place in the Modern World?"

The editorial is based on the writings of Lon Tinkle, a fine Texas man of letters, who only recently wrote an excellent book about the history of the Battle of the Alamo.

The challenging question which Mr. Tinkle asks, and which others have in recent years become more aware of, is whether we are dulling our sense of individuality through emphasis on sociability. Differences in opinions and manners are suspiciously regarded.

An outstanding educator put the difference in words like this:

There is a difference between the honest heretic and the subversive.

Through every area of our taste and opinion, there is a need for greater diversity, and this thoughtful editorial is another call to awaken.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS CULTURE A PLACE IN MODERN WORLD?

Lon Tinkle, book critic of the Dallas News, calls attention to what looks like a one-man crusade to keep alive something which meant much to our ancestors, but which has drawn the disdain of many moderns—culture.

In reviewing a book by Ashley Montagu, British-born and American-stationed anthropologist, Tinkle says: "It takes a brave man, say a social scientist, to dare talk about culture these days, much less write a book about it. Who will not jeer and scoff (especially those who are civilized) at a volume calling itself The Cultured Man?

"Didn't the phrase die out with Victorian furniture and manners, with the passing of the genteel tradition? Most of us belong, age-measured, to the lost or the beat generation."

In recent years, culture has come into disrepute in many circles because it, somehow, seemed connected with Victorianism, with obsolete traditions and discarded life patterns. Just as the so-called young intellectuals look down upon everything connected with the Victorian period, so they scorn the old concept of culture which seemed to set some men apart from others because they possessed a higher appreciation of the true, the beautiful, and the good. Today, anyone who dares stand apart from the crowd, or refuses to follow the herd, is looked upon as antisocial. The accent is all upon the group, and woe to the person who wishes to retain his individualism.

But Montagu thinks there is as much need for individualism today as there was in the past, if not more. In the past, people who pursued culture usually were those who had leisure time in which to indulge in it. They were the leisure class against which socialistic writers have inveighed so heartily.

Today, however, everyone has more leisure than his forefathers had. When the Declaration of Independence was signed, the average workweek was 90 hours; today it is 40, and in the future may drop to 30. What will Americans do with that spare time?

Montagu suggests that they might spend some of it acquiring culture in its true sense—not just a veneer, but a deep appreciation of the worthwhile things of civilization.

This will not happen so long as the molders of public taste—the novelists, popular entertainers, and others—continue to cast derision on people who seek real culture, calling them squares and long hairs. There is little place for the genteel tradition in a world which prides itself on its toughness.

Seniority Is Valuable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had opportunity to read an excel-

lent editorial from one of Indiana's most respected newspapers, the Madison Courier. The editor commented, most logically and thoughtfully, on the necessary qualifications of an effective Member of Congress. His emphasis on the value of a Congressman's seniority to his Nation, his State, and his district constituency is well taken. I commend this editorial very highly, and I herewith offer it for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SENIORITY IS VALUABLE

Indiana now has 2 Senators and 11 Congressmen with a total of more than 150 years of composite service in the United States Congress—a figure unexcelled by many States of Indiana's size and population. These are statistics provided by the United States Library of Congress.

The importance of such congressional seniority for a State was noted recently by one of the oldest veterans of Congress, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, who is now the top-ranking Republican of the House Ways and Means Committee. He said:

"A new Congressman is not worth much to his district under 2 or 3 terms. The longer a Congressman stays in office, the more he can accomplish."

It was further pointed out that Congressmen do not gain high-ranking stature on the major committees, such as Appropriations, Ways and Means, and Rules until they have attained a seniority of at least 10 years. Until that time, the best a Congressman can expect is merely membership on such committees—he does not become a spokesman, a subcommittee chairman, or a top-ranking member of the minority. His influence is relatively negligible.

An example of the power of seniority in Congress can be found in the case of the late Senator Alben Barkley, of Kentucky. Due to his long tenure, his know-how of congressional procedure and his countless contacts among his colleagues and Government officials in Washington's upper strata, Mr. Barkley was able to do more for Kentucky than could have been done by a score of new and inexperienced Members.

Similar influence is exercised by 3 Indiana Members of Congress: CHARLES A. HALLECK, with 23 years of service; EARL WILSON, with 18 years of service, and RAY MADDEN with 16. Mr. HALLECK now is a minority leader in the House and a top ranking member of the powerful House Administration Committee.

Congressman WILSON is a top ranking member of the all-powerful House Appropriations Committee through which all Federal appropriations must clear. He is the top-ranking Republican on the House Subcommittee for the District of Columbia Appropriations. Mr. MADDEN occupies a major influence position on the important Rules Committee.

Statisticians point out that only 1 member of Indiana's delegation has served fewer than 8 years. That exception is Congressman NIMTZ who is now in his first session. The seniority of Hoosiers through the present 85th Congress is shown as follows:

Representative HALLECK, 23 years; Representative WILSON, 18 years; Representative MADDEN, 16 years; Senator CAPEHART, 14 years; Representative HARVEY, 12 years; Senator JENNER, 12 years; Representative HARDEN, 10 years; Representative ADAIR, 8 years; Representative BEAMER, 8 years; Representative BRAY, 8 years; Representative DENTON, 8 years; Representative BROWNSON, 8 years, and Representative NIMTZ, 2 years.

Orders To Fight in Lebanon Touched Off Iraqi Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by Col. Talbot Patrick, editor and publisher of the Rock Hill (S. C.) Herald.

On Monday, July 28, I had inserted into the RECORD Colonel Patrick's views on the revolt in Iraq and this is a continuation of his analysis of the situation in the Middle East.

ORDERS TO FIGHT IN LEBANON TOUCHED OFF IRAQI REVOLT

(By Talbot Patrick)

(This is the second of three stories by Talbot Patrick, editor and publisher of the Rock Hill Evening Herald, on the revolution in Iraq. Now in Paris, Patrick wrote the following story in Rome shortly after he was evacuated from tension-ridden Baghdad by plane on Wednesday. Patrick arrived in Baghdad 2 days before the Iraqi Government was overthrown. Here, Patrick gives an authoritative report of the spark that set off the revolt.)

ROME.—The revolution in Iraq was executed by troops ordered to go by airlift to Lebanon to support the government of that country.

"We were ordered to fight against our brother Arabs," commented one army officer who participated in the revolution. "Rather than that, when our units were on the way from the base toward northern Iraq, we stopped in Baghdad and asked the king to abdicate and the prince regent to give up his power.

"They fired on us from the palace. We returned the fire. Finally, when they came out from the burning building, they were shot."

It was after announcement of the successful revolution over the Iraqi Government radio, which is monitored in neighboring countries, that American Marines were ordered to Lebanon.

The fact that (Iraqi) orders to go to Lebanon were the spark that set off revolution was not a secret in Baghdad. But I would have hesitated to be so definite about something that Iraqi newspaper acquaintances as well as others told me if I had not been able to confirm them through an individual with unusual contacts.

For his own future protection in the Middle East, I must keep secret the identity of this man. But I can say that for years he has had intimate contact with members of the former government, as well as with leaders of the then opposition which has supplied many officials of the new Iraq Government. And in addition he has had close contact with foreign diplomatic sources, not only in Iraq but elsewhere.

He was absolutely definite about the order. He had talked with men who received it and then rebelled.

"I should not have been surprised," he said, "but I hadn't expected it so soon, even though there had been previous signs that it would come."

At the time that Iraq and Jordan were being joined together, he said, one division planned some sort of action against the Government. But levies of other troops and of tribesmen supporting the Government were sent to camp on either side of the division.

"The leaders in the division suspected that someone had gotton wind of their plot," my informant said, "so the day set for a revolt passed without any action."

On another occasion, he said the king and the prince regent went to inspect army maneuvers. Two artillery shells landed near the royal tent, one quite close. A court-martial was told it was all a mistake. But the king and prince regent hastily left the maneuver area for a return to Baghdad.

"Things had reached such a point," said my informant, "that most of my friends in the Government were trying to ease out—before something happened. Men who once were government supporters had reached the point of themselves being disgusted with the way things ran.

It was said in business and Government circles that if you wanted to start a business of any size the prince regent had to be given 60 percent of the stock before you could start in business. A small clique ran everything for the members personal benefits and the nation and its people got very, very little.

At least at this time, in his opinion, the great mass of the Iraqi people as well as an overwhelming majority of the educated and more advanced groups in the country support the new Government and the ideas for which its spokesmen have said it stands.

Resolution Commending the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the executive committee of the Republican State Central Committee of Georgia, the Federation of Young Republican Clubs of Georgia, and the Fifth District Republican Executive Committee, That the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and especially its subcommittee investigating Communist infiltration into the South, be commended upon holding public hearings in this area so that the spotlight of public attention can be focused upon this very real and present danger to the South, and to the Nation. The hearings in Atlanta this week, while conducted with great dignity, have revealed a situation which is of deep concern to every patriotic American, regardless of party, and which should stimulate us all to a deeper appreciation, and defense, of our American system of free enterprise and individual liberty. For this job well done the committee and its subcommittee have our sincere thanks; be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the

House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

W. B. SHARTZER,
Chairman, Executive Committee, Republican State Central Committee of Georgia.

McCREADY JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Georgia Federation of Young Republican Clubs of Georgia.

CHARLES G. MOYE, Jr.,
Chairman, Fifth District Republican Executive Committee.

Veterans' Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some letters about hospitalization for veterans who need hospitalization and about helping those veterans to obtain compensation who are not physically able to work.

It is my opinion the American people favor hospitalizing veterans when hospitalization as shown by competent medical evidence is needed for the veterans of the wars in which our country has engaged. Frequently the delays which transpire before veterans can be hospitalized can mean the difference between getting well and not getting well. Moreover, no sick veteran should be put in a jail if hospitalization is what he needs, and it is not right, fair, or just to compel his family and their relatives to spend their lifesavings while awaiting a bed in a Government hospital. In my opinion this is not what the American people want, and I hope this Congress will proceed immediately to correct the problem faced by veterans along this line.

Not one of us would deprive a service-connected veteran of hospitalization. By the same token it is only fair that any 1 of the other 19 million, when he needs hospitalization, should be hospitalized.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1957.

To LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference your wire September 17, we have contacted Dr. Harrington concerning hospitalization for Carbon Frank Capps, CMM C-5 764 08. Bed situation precludes transfer to VA hospital. We have 2 veterans in jail, 24 emergencies, as well as 118 on regular waiting list seeking hospitalization. Have recommended that Dr. Harrington advise family to seek hospitalization in State institution.

ACTING MANAGER,
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Dallas, Tex.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
March 12, 1958.

DEAR SIR: I quote the pertinent part of a letter I received several months ago:

"My husband had a nervous breakdown in July 1957. We kept him in the city hospital for 2 weeks, and in Beverly Hills Sanitarium for 6 weeks. I have been carrying him back for out-patient treatment since that time and he has had a total of 19 electroshock treatments, the last one being given February 8, 1958, in Dallas at the Beverly Hills Clinic.

"We are completely without funds and have filed application, with the help of Ralph Connally, veteran's service officer of Gregg County, with a P–10 to the veteran's hospital in Shreveport for treatment there. This application was received March 5. Today, Dr. Carl Nichols of Gladewater called Dr. Floyd McCullum, admitting doctor, explaining that Mr. Abbott needs hospitalization. The doctor said that they do not have a bed and have no idea when a bed will be available. Dr. Nichols feels that additional treatment is necessary, as my husband has been breaking out in a rash of hives for the last 3 weeks, due to his nervousness."

Any assistance you can give in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

JULY 17, 1958.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to previous correspondence in regard to Mr. Truman D. Knox, Route 3, Canton, Tex., being in need of hospitalization for a paraplegic condition due to a recent swimming accident.

The adjudication division of the regional office, Dallas, Tex., has made a determination in this case which is as follows: "It has been found that service connection is established for hemorrhoidectomy incurred in peacetime; however, such condition is shown to be less than 10 percent disabling. Fracture, left cervical vertebra, with paraplegia and lamenectomy C–4, 5 and 6 vertebrae and old fracture both ankles and collarbone were not incurred in or aggravated by your military service. Residuals of contusion, thoracic spine, acute, were not found on your last examination."

Existing regulations state that a peacetime veteran must have a compensable disability to be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration. Mr. Knox had only peacetime service; therefore, he is not eligible for admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital. His application has been canceled as legally ineligible, and he was notified of this action.

Your interest in this veteran is appreciated.

Yours very truly,
W. H. BUCKHOLTS, M. D.,
Manager.

MARCH 25, 1958.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We appreciate the concern expressed in your letter of February 1, 1958, for veterans in need of hospital care who are awaiting admission.

Veterans who require treatment for service connected disabilities and medically emergent cases are provided prompt hospital care. Within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities nonemergent non-service-connected veterans may be admitted after the needs of the service connected and emergency cases are met.

The placing of a veteran's application for hospital care on a waiting list is a sound operational method of obtaining maximum utilization of available beds. Nominal waiting lists at hospitals are essential to provide for an even flow of admissions, particularly to even out the seasonal peaks and valleys of demand for hospital care. Except for a few areas, waiting lists for general medical and surgical care are nominal and entirely within the range to insure maximum utilization of beds with a minimal waiting time for the veterans.

In the field of psychiatry, there is a shortage of trained physicians within and without the Veterans' Administration. Most of the more than 20,000 veterans on waiting lists at Veterans' Administration hospitals require care for mental conditions. More than half of these veterans are presently hospitalized in State, county, and other public or private hospitals. These patients are offered admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals as beds become available.

A reduction or discontinuance of compensation benefits to veterans may result from a finding that the original grant of service connection was erroneous or, more frequently, where it is shown by medical examination that the condition has improved. No reduction or discontinuance of compensation is made as an economy move nor is it ever based on a lack of funds.

Where a veteran is unable to obtain employment because of disability, evidence of this fact should be presented to the Veterans' Administration regional office nearest his home. This evidence may result in an increase in service connected compensation benefits or in a finding that he is entitled to non-service-connected pension benefits.

As you requested in your telephone call, of the 22,710,000 veterans, 3,700,000, or about 16 percent, have established service connection for one or more disabilities.

Sincerely,

SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
Administrator.

Anthracite Coal Industry Is Vital for National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Arthur A. Schmidt, managing director, Anthracite Information Bureau, which appeared in the Letters to the Editor column of the Wilkes-Barre Record of August 4, 1958:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

ANTHRACITE'S SPACE HEATING BID IMPROVED

To the EDITOR:

We were surprised to note a letter in the July 14 Voice of the People signed "Old Timer." We believe it reflects certain misconceptions as to anthracite's ability to compete as a heating fuel for commercial and public buildings, and the intent of legislation proposed by Representative DANIEL FLOOD to insure consideration of anthracite, along with other fuels, in new Federal buildings.

With all respect for the writer's 50 years of experience in anthracite mining, it would appear from his comments that he is unaware of recent equipment developments and how they have improved anthracite's competitive position in the commercial space heating field in recent years.

As has been frequently reported in your newspaper, the introduction of new types of completely automatic anthracite equipment with automatic coal and ash handling has resulted in a steady growth of installations in schools, apartment houses, and public buildings of all types. This is confirmed by the fact that sales of this equip-

ment have more than tripled since 1955 and figures for the first 6 months of 1958 are 30 percent ahead of the same period in 1957, despite the recession.

With an obvious interest in the anthracite industry, the writer will be glad to know that anthracite is competitively priced in markets quite distant from its source. Actually, anthracite has a price advantage over all other competitive automatic fuels in more than 90 percent of its primary marketing area, the Northeastern States.

Interestingly enough, this new equipment, with pneumatic coal and ash handling, has eliminated previous disadvantages in custodial costs. No manual handling of either coal or ash is required—coal is piped to the firing box of the boiler and ashes are removed in the same manner through sealed pipes.

That these advantages in terms of economy and automatic convenience are being widely recognized is evidenced by the fact that anthracite equipment is going into schools and buildings of the most modern design in distant points in New England and New York State. Engineers of Federal and State agencies are also selecting it with increasing frequency for remodeling and new construction. For example, the United States Post Office Department and the New York City public school system are engaged in programs which call for the installation of new automatic anthracite equipment each year.

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD'S remarks in support of his proposed legislation were made with full awareness of the above. As such, they reflect a justifiable concern for Government economy and respect for the taxpayer's dollar.

Unfortunately, many architects (like Oldtimer himself) are not yet fully informed about this new equipment and its advantages, since it has been in general distribution throughout the marketing area for only a few years and comprehensive performance data is only now becoming available. In some areas where modern anthracite would have distinct advantages in economy, not only in fuel costs but also in initial equipment cost and maintenance, architects who might still be thinking in terms of old-fashioned coal installations might not investigate or ask for bids on modern coal equipment.

Congressman FLOOD'S proposed legislation would insure the fact that before money is spent on public buildings architects would secure estimates on modern anthracite, as well as estimates on other locally available fuels, for impartial comparison. If this were done, it could result in millions of dollars of savings for the Government, since each new plant will continue to use the fuel selected for a period of years.

We should also like to call to the attention of Old Timer that Congressman FLOOD'S concern about shortages of fuels other than coal in the event of a national emergency is shared by many others in Government, including the directors of Civil Defense. In New Jersey, New York, and other States in the marketing area, Civil Defense departments have requested the assistance of anthracite retailers in their programs. Public buildings heated by anthracite have been designated as shelters in the event of a hot war, and anthracite homeowners will be asked to provide shelter for their neighbors. In any shooting war, as many people remember from World War II, supplies of fuels other than coal were sharply curtailed.

Despite Old Timer's concern about the reduction of mining facilities, the anthracite industry is today maintaining adequate supply and meeting the fuel requirements of more than 2½ million families and thousands of public buildings. With retail sales of approximately one-half billion dollars, anthracite is still an important factor in the economy of the Northeast. Industry reserves in eastern Pennsylvania adjacent to this market are sufficient to meet present demands for almost 200 years. In the event of any emergency, the industry has proved in the past that it has the capability to increase production and meet emergency demands.

ANTHRACITE INFORMATION BUREAU,
ARTHUR A. SCHMIDT,
Managing Director.

Curbing the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I need not remind the House that our colleague, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, is one of our most alert and effective defenders of the constitutional lawmaking function of the Congress and of the powers reserved to the States and to the people by the charter of our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, however, I include a tribute to Judge SMITH'S leadership in defense of State laws appearing in the syndicated newspaper column of Mr. Raymond Moley, released through United Newspapers:

CURBING THE COURT—HOUSE BILL PROTECTING STATE LAWS AGAINST THEORY OF FEDERAL PREEMPTION BEFORE SENATE

(By Raymond Moley)

By a decisive vote, in which the conservative Republican-Southern Democratic coalition prevailed, the House of Representatives recently passed a bill limiting the power of the Supreme Court to strike down State laws under what is called the doctrine of preemption. This bill with some changes, has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and should reach the Senate floor in the final days of this session. Some such legislation has been urged ever since the Supreme Court, in a series of decisions 2 years ago, reached far into the field of legislation and seriously impaired the constitutional powers of the States to protect their interests, notably in the fields of antisubversive activities.

The terms of the House bill (H. R. 3) are simple. Its first section provides that "no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

Then, apparently to nail down specifically the right of the States on the subject of sedition, a further provision is added on that subject.

The Senate Judiciary Committee's bill as approved limited itself to the latter section of the House bill, but the chairman asserted that members of the committee might offer the more sweeping provision of the House bill in the shape of an amendment on the Senate floor.

Since the Supreme Court went far beyond beyond State laws on sedition in its wholesale emasculation of the powers of States, it would seem the better part of wisdom for the Senate to make the terms of the curb general. For under the impetus of the almost fanatical zeal of a majority of this Court to limit the powers of the States and to extend Federal power, no one can know where it will strike next. To provide in every act of Congress that Federal preemption shall not apply would seem to be a cumbersome way of putting into effect a power clearly within the jurisdiction of Congress. The Constitution clearly gives Congress power to define within certain limits the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and it specifically provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Since the amazing invasion of the rights and authority of the States began 5 years ago, innumerable lawyers whose capacity is just as great as that of any of the present members of the Court, and much, much greater than that of some members, have condemned the reckless course of decisions. In the Nelson case especially, the term "jail delivery" was quite generally used.

A far greater jurist than any of those now sitting, Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone, said of this theory of preemption, now asserted by the Court, in a case in 1942:

"Due regard for the maintenance of our dual system of government demands that the courts do not diminish State power by extravagant inferences regarding what Congress might have intended if it had considered the matter, or by reference to their own conceptions of a policy which Congress has not expressed and is not plainly to be inferred from the legislation which it has enacted."

It is a bit difficult for the layman to understand the reasoning of a Court which interpreted a Federal law on sedition as having excluded the States from legislating on the subject when the original sponsor of that Federal legislation is still alive and able to tell what was in his mind and what he knows to have been in the minds of his colleagues when they voted for it. But that is the precise situation now, and fortunately that sponsor, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, is mostly responsible for the salutary curb of the presumptuous Court which is now before the Senate.

S. 1869, the Proposed Expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York would like to preface his remarks concerning the proposed territorial and capital expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority by affirming that he is not opposed to public power projects per se. There are circumstances in which—under our economic system of so-called private enterprise—they fill a definite need.

The TVA as it stands today is a prime example of such a case. Currently it supplies electric power to an area embracing 80,000 square miles, and serves a population of over 5 million. Through

the medium of 151 municipal and rural cooperative distribution systems, power is delivered at wholesale rates to over 1,400,000 customers. TVA has made an undeniable contribution to certain important Federal enterprises which directly and indirectly affected the well-being of the country as well as the posture of our defense.

All of which is well and good. But the question now before us is, "Are we to expand this power system into a monopolistic colossus, covering an area of 105,000 square miles—threatening the very existence of no less than 11 investor-owned companies, and establishing a precedent in fiscal affairs that might well have far-reaching and very damaging effects on the economic system under which we live?"

What may I ask is the justification for this proposed expansion? Reliable witnesses—men of position and substance—have testified before the Public Works Committee on which I am privileged to serve, that there is presently no justification for such expansion. These witnesses to whom I refer have publicly avowed that the TVA currently generates sufficient power in kilowatts to meet all its requirements and still have a substantial unexpended power surplus.

If S. 1869 is enacted into law we will witness the implementation of a proposal to permit a Government-owned corporation to operate independently of any regulatory governmental supervision, either by the Congress or by the executive branch of the Government.

Unless amended, S. 1869 would exempt the TVA from the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act, and this would be a most perilous precedent.

As one of the Representatives of the Empire State which, I might interpolate, assumes annually some 13.98 percent of the national tax burden, I am interested in seeing that the present investment of, I believe, $1.2 billion of Federal funds is in no way jeopardized. And this tremendous sum of money—enough, if stretched dollar to dollar, to go around the world five times—would be jeopardized if the proposed changes in TVA's status materialize.

Naturally, New York is concerned with this proposal to extend the territorial limits of the Authority beyond the original intent of Congress and to create additional competitive problems for those companies in our State who provide thousands of job opportunities. It is my humble opinion that this viewpoint is not confined to the State among whose Representatives I am numbered, but is characterstic of many other States which are largely dependent on industrial employment. Yes, all too many industries have and are eyeing enviously the cheap subsidized power rates of the TVA.

If S. 1869 is passed by this House in the same form as passed by the other body, and three-quarters of a billion dollars of revenue bonds are issued, the exising inequites of TVA's tax and interest benefits, inequities which result in unjust discrimination between electric customers using TVA power and electric customers of investor-owned companies, will be multiplied many times.

Further, the declared intent of the bill as expressed on page 11, line 25, and page 12, lines 1 through 9, which I respectfully suggest deserves your close scrutiny, remains the same, namely, to aid TVA in discharging its responsibility to assure an ample supply of electric power in the area in which it conducts its operations. I know of no constitutional or statutory mandate which requires TVA to assume the responsibility of furnishing present and future power requirements in the area served by TVA, nor do I believe that the Federal Government should assume such a responsibility as provided in S. 1869. I do not believe that the Federal Government should engage in any proprietary business, including the electric-power business, where taxpaying businesses are willing and able to do the job.

May I recall that TVA was originally projected as a navigation and flood-control project. If I read correctly, its proponents at the time vigorously denied that there was any intention of embarking the Government on a program having as its ultimate objective the expropriation of private power undertakings. But once TVA was established, its sponsors repudiated their earlier avowals and boldly stated that it had become a power project, and nothing else. Today TVA is the largest electric facility in the entire country. And right now it looks bound to increase its area of operations by no less than 31 percent.

The gentleman from New York need not tell you that he is not an expert in the field of public power. He has both deep affection and high regard for the able and distinguished members of the Public Works Committee of the House who supported and motivated this important measure. But he finds it difficult to reconcile their position with that of the long line of witnesses who so vigorously opposed this bill.

The only spokesman he heard in favor of S. 1869 was one of its co-authors whose name does not appear on the printed form.

Repeatedly witnesses stated—and I thought quite irrefutably—that the private power companies are in a position to supply the area with all the electricity that is needed. In other words, the proposed expansion would simply mean a duplication of already existing facilities in order to provide subsidized rates.

If the right thing be done, TVA will be confined to its present area of operation, will meet the needs of that area, and will pay back to the Government in 40 years—as originally agreed—the money due it.

I strongly urge the defeat of S. 1869.

What's Our Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian of Tuesday, July 29, 1958, on the subject of the ballistic missile programs of the United States:

WHAT'S OUR GOAL?

Wernher von Braun, technical director of the United States Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., wrote recently in the American Weekly that he heads the greatest rocket development team in the world.

This is not braggadocio; it is a fact. Von Braun directed the German rocket program in World War II, which yielded the V–2, a weapon far advanced over anything similar in the allied arsenal. After V–E day he and his expert missileers came to this country, and Von Braun has become a loyal and valuable United States citizen.

At Huntsville, Von Braun and his team have developed the only successful United States rockets capable of carrying warheads over intercontinental ranges. When the Navy's Vanguard satellite program went sour, Von Braun quickly modified his Jupiter-C rocket and restored American prestige by shooting the Explorer I into space. Explorers III and IV since have followed it into orbit.

In view of these proofs of ability, one would think the Defense Department would do all in its power to facilitate the work of the Huntsville team. But that is not the case. Rather, determined efforts are continuing to choke off ABMA funds and center missile development efforts elsewhere, under less experienced leadership.

Civilians may regard this as a dangerous and foolish thing to do, and they will be right. But it is being done, and here's why:

The Army thinks of the ICBM simply as a very long range type of artillery. It is trying to develop better rockets at Huntsville to improve its firepower. But unfortunately the Army has not been very eloquest in getting its point of view across in the Pentagon or Congress. It has been outtalked, outbragged and outmaneuvered by its rival, the Air Force.

To the Air Force the ICBM means not merely a better weapon; it means survival. When United States launched missiles are capable of dropping H-bombs on Moscow, there will be no need for the huge and expensive Strategic Air Command. If anti-aircraft rockets take over the chore of the Air Defense Command, there will be small need for a separate air arm of the United States Military Establishment. The flying generals are in desperate need of something to ward off the dreadful fate of being reabsorbed by the Army. So Air Force press agentry has been working overtime to sell Congress and the public on the idea that the Air Force should control rocket development and employment.

The Air Force has been helped enthusiastically in this effort by the military aircraft industry—which has been living off Air Force contracts and gets panicky at the thought of losing them. Major aircraft companies lately have been going all out in rocket experimentation, and their public relations mimeograph machines have been working overtime to turn out glowing reports of progress. The ABMA's contractor on the Jupiter missile, on the other hand, is the Chrysler Corp., which is in the auto business primarily and isn't much concerned over who controls the ICBM or why.

All this might be just another object lesson on what can be achieved by publicity if Air Force plans were working out well for the Nation as well as for the Air Force and its satellite industries. But they aren't. The Air Force's prize missile, the Atlas, has yet to make a successful full-power flight, despite all the overblown claims made for it.

Two weeks ago, the first such flight was attempted, after many delays, and the missile blew up in midair.

It appears to be about time for Congressmen and the public to take a more informed look at this situation. It is very expensive for this country to finance the kindergarten education of southern California aircraft engineers so they can learn the same lessons Van Braun and his teammates learned in Germany 15 years ago. It also can be risky, since we cannot assume the Russians, too, are dumb enough to shelve their existing experts while they develop new sets of experts. Our present policy is all right if our goal is to save the Air Force and its industrial supporters. But most of us have thought the real goal was to save the United States of America.

Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter from Mr. HARRY MCGREGOR, senior member of the House Public Works Committee, on which I have the pleasant assignment of serving. This is indeed a thoughtful act on the part of Mr. MCGREGOR, and I am gratified at his words of commendation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1958.

The Honorable EMMET F. BYRNE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE AND FRIEND EMMET: Congress will soon be in adjournment, and as senior member of the House Public Works Committee, I want to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for the cooperation you have given me.

Your activities and your knowledge of legislation clearly indicates that you have put in many, many hours arriving at decisions which you believe are fair and equitable, not only to your people but the Nation as a whole. I have greatly appreciated having your excellent legal counsel, which is of material assistance in drafting legislation that will be most beneficial to the taxpayers. You have assisted in saving many millions of dollars by helping to hold the line.

You have done an excellent job, and I sincerely hope that the people of your district will acquaint themselves with your record and so insure your reelection. We need you in the Congress.

Best wishes and always with kindest regards.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

As we are near adjournment, my thoughts naturally turn to my district and what I can with pride report to the people of the Third District as to the accomplishments of the 85th Congress, the Republican administration in particular, and, more specifically, my own record. I have sent my constituents regular monthly newsletters; I have circulated two questionnaires during the 85th Congress; and I have sent other special reports. The purpose of this has been to keep the Third District voters apprised of my activities and views and to ascertain their thoughts on many of the important issues before Congress. I have done everything possible to inform them of every type of service I could give them as their Congressman. This is not just a responsibility any elected official assumes, but it is a privilege to serve one's constituents. The Third District people have been responsive to my efforts, and this is rewarding.

Upon my arrival in Congress, I adopted a policy—in fact, it was a promise to myself—that I would reflect the will of the majority of the people in all matters on which I must vote, but in the event there were any differences of opinion as to the appropriate course of action, I would act in the best interest of the Nation, my State, and my district. It would be incumbent upon me to report to the people on the differences.

President Eisenhower, the Republican administration, and Congress has kept us out of war. Human life is a valued possession in America. Few Americans have escaped having a close look at the cost of war and the irreparable losses incurred. We remember vividly World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and, yes, even the stages of cold war. We want no more. Keeping the peace requires constant vigilance, and it is not achieved without cost in some shape or form. Running the best government in the world, our Republic of America, is a mammoth task with responsibilities growing and changing as the world is almost daily changing face. We must be alert to every new development, whether in the field of outer space, nuclear and other types of warfare and arms, finance, and economics. Nuclear weapons are inconceivably expensive, as well as necessary, for us to remain a first-class power. However, holding our position means that we must be grounded, in fact, rooted, on a firm economic base at home. It is not a pleasant task to have to say no to a child who wants a 10-cent candy bar instead of a nickel bar, but if they only have a nickel, it is the wise parent who insists they keep within their spending limit instead of borrowing from next week's allowance.

PUBLIC WORKS HIGHLIGHTS

Our President is alert to the dangers of public-works programs which are really crash programs or doles, and so am I. No program will have my support unless it meets certain conditions: First, the proposal must have the green light from the necessary Federal agencies involved and my committee as a result of a thorough study and analysis; second, the program must be in the national interest as far as security, defense, and well-being of the taxpayer.

Our country has not reached the pinnacle of a free and sound economy with an abundance of private enterprise under a policy of crash or dole programs. We must not let a few months of a lull and a lag pull us into a floodstream of reckless and wasteful spending. Not only you and I will pay the price, but more important we will be handing a heavily mortgaged legacy to the generations to come, our children.

Twenty-two percent of the budget request for fiscal 1959 is for civil benefits which include public works for Federal and civil programs. Some Federal programs authorize the Government to pay the entire amount, while others require participation by individual States or combined States as well as the Federal Government. Often this type of program is done on a matching, 50–50 basis. Frequently, a State's share is determined by area or population. The estimated $16.4 billion to be spent in the area of civil benefits—including public works—programs in fiscal 1959 is $600 million less than the comparable amount for fiscal 1958. To bring you a clearer picture, I would like to point out that in June the Bureau of the Budget estimates for fiscal 1959 showed that 8.8 cents of every dollar spent will go for public works.

I introduced public works legislation which will continue bridge work on the Cal-Sag project; reimburse the State of Illinois for highway construction; test the effects of diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; and carry out construction, repair and preservation of important navigation projects throughout the United States and our Territories. These public works proposals I introduced are important to Chicago and the Third District because:

First. Modifications and alteration of bridges on the Cal-Sag project is necessary to fully utilize the St. Lawrence seaway facilities when it is ready for operation in Chicago in the not too distant future.

Second. Legislation providing for testing the effects of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway would help protect property owners on Lake Michigan from damages and flood conditions.

Third. I introduced a clean version of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill—the original bill was twice vetoed by the President because of 18 pork barrel projects in it. My bill was devoid of any of the crash type and pork barrel projects so unnecessary and so costly to the taxpayers. Fortunately, on July 3, the President signed into public law a good bill containing countless rivers and harbors and flood control projects which were given the green light in both Houses of Congress, the Army Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies involved. This was a difficult fight because of the efforts of some who favored crash programs. The President had repeatedly warned Congress that he would not approve any programs not having a clean bill of health. In matters of public works, it is necessary to scrutinize carefully all projects since often they are beaten down in committee, but they come back in a package deal and will sneak through. Fortunately, the Cal-Sag bridge work is included in th omnibus bill, which is now law. Based on 1957 figures, the total cost of the Cal-Sag projects will be $141 million. Illinois' total share amounts to $54 million, making a total overall cost of $195 million.

Fourth. Under my proposal, Illinois would receive a depreciated total of $273 million for toll road reimbursements. Governor Stratton favors my proposal of authorizing additional miles of interstate roads to substitute for equivalent

miles of toll highways which connect with interstate roads. I believe this to be one of the first considerations of the 86th Congress when it convenes in January.

I desire the people of my district to understand our present road and highway systems. The Interstate Highway System was enacted in 1944, authorizing an Interstate System of 40,000 miles. In reality, there was a delay of 12 years between the authorizations by Congress and the enactment of the necessary financing legislation in 1956. The Federal Highway Act of 1956 contained a policy statement of intent on the part of Congress to determine whether the Federal Government should equitably reimburse the 48 States for toll or free highways constructed between August 2, 1947 and June 30, 1957. Three major questions are involved: First. Is a policy of reimbursement economically sound and feasible. Second. What is a fair formula of apportionment. Third. The time and method of reimbursement. An example of how this reimbursement formula would work in Illinois, if enacted, is this. Our great State, which ranks second among the States who had the foresight to go ahead and remedy our traffic problems of safety hazards and congestion between August 1947 and June 1957. Illinois has spent $550 million in interstate roads. I am glad to say that our State has done this without waiting for the Federal Government to step in with the funds for our highways.

I wish to mention the St. Lawrence seaway. No one can dispute the value of this fourth seacoast to the United States and to Chicago. Our share of the cost involved in creating this eighth sea is $281 million. This represents completing the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels to a controlled depth of 27 feet. It is the realization of a joint American-Canadian dream. The benefits to Chicagoans will be multiple, increasing trade, new employment opportunities, new business and industry and expansion in other fields. Chicago will be a world port. In September the first passenger ships, steamship *North American* and steamship *South American* will use the completed facilities of the seaway, arriving at Massena, N. Y., on September 6.

I wish to comment on a bill to provide the Tennessee Valley Authority with the power to issue bonds to finance the construction of new generating capacity. I opposed the bill because I believed it paved the way for TVA to expand into areas beyond its jurisdiction, and this would enable TVA to compete with private enterprise.

Know Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of August 5, 1958:

KNOW YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Periodically, some one notes that a great many voters don't know who their Congressmen are. The situation is serious enough to warrant concern on the part of anyone interested in the democratic process, and ridiculous enough to prompt rather extravagant proposals for solving the problem.

One of our favorites, among such proposals, comes from a reader—doubtless maddened by the spectacle of ignorant, indifferent voters—with a taste for irony. Maybe, he thinks, Congress ought to pass a bill, requiring that the names of lawmakers be posted in post offices. Then a second bill could be passed requiring people to go to their post offices and read the notices telling them who their Congressmen are.

If this is too inconvenient, says the reader, things could be made easier by building new post offices in every block and along every mile of country road. That would give every voter a chance to know who his Congressman is without making the task of discovery too difficult.

This positively won't be necessary in Luzerne County, where the Representative of the 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania is no mysterious figure to the electorate. In fact, we'd say he is a fairly well known citizen of these parts. If there is a voter who does not know who he is, we have a feeling his education will be brought up to date before November.

Military Reserves Feel Resentment at Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of a recent letter to the editor of the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, written by my friend, Charles L. Bullock, of Springfield, Mass.

Mr. Bullock presents an excellent treatise on the equalization of benefits bill, H. R. 608, which is sponsored by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., of Alabama.

The material follows:

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of June 11, 1958]

MILITARY RESERVES FEEL RESENTMENT AT NEGLECT

EDITOR, SAFETY VALVE:

This message concerns the quality of treatment between Regulars and Reserves in the military.

It represents one of the most constant and most frustrating tasks which confronts every Congress, and one which is once more before this present Congress in many forms. It is axiomatic with most Members of the Congress that justice as well as the best interests of the national defense require that a soldier, sailor, or airman, of whatever rank, be treated the same for his war service, both while on active duty and after retirement, irrespective of the unit or component in which he served, whether Regular, Reserve, or National Guard. Yet the application of this obviously sound principle is beset at all times by the attacks, overt or covert, of the administrators of our defense machinery, virtually all of whom are of the Regular persuasion—i. e., adherents of the "Old School Tie." In a score of different pieces of pending legislation at this time, notably in the current military pay bill, this 85th Congress, like its predecessors, struggles to make its will in this area effective, and to counter the almost numberless subterfuges by which administrative edicts seek to thwart the congressional intent.

One of the most notable of these administrative evasions has to do with the area of retirement pay, which Congress has repeatedly said shall be equalized between Regular and Reserve component personnel with substantially the same service. For example, in title 10, United States Code, approved in 1956, the Congress expressly said that:

"Laws applying to both Regulars and Reserves shall be administered without discrimination (1) among Regulars; (2) among Reserves; and (3) between Regulars and Reserves."

Yet the plain provisions of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, which in that respect were reenacted in 1949, and are still the law, have been consistently flouted by administrative perversion, backed by judicial distortion, some of it positively painful in its absurdity. The law plainly provides 75 percent of base pay as retirement pay for "any officer of any of the services * * * who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law."

By administrative fiat, with later judicial sanction, this has been in effect amended, without benefit of Congress, to read "any Regular officer," etc., despite the fact that the authors of the original law, and of its reenactment in 1949, have clearly and repeatedly stated that they intended no such interpretation.

There are pending in Congress at this time two bills to correct this particular perversion of the congressional intent. They are S. 1085, sponsored by Senators JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, and the companion bill in the House, H. R. 689, sponsored by Congressman GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., of Alabama. Mr. HUDDLESTON has been joined in this effort of late by several other Congressmen who have introduced duplicate bills, and these stanch supporters include Congressmen JAMES G. FULTON of Pennsylvania; STUYVESANT WAINRIGHT of New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON of Washington; and Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON of Minnesota. It is the aim of all these to state once more the intent of Congress, and this time so plainly as to make unlikely, or at any rate unsuccessful, any further attempts at administrative amendment.

When the basic law, the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, was originally enacted by the Congress, it was a part of a vast military recruitment effort then made necessary by World War II, into which this country had just entered as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor. At that time (June 1942), there were on duty in all about 13,000 regular officers of all the services. At the same time, there were over 120,000 Reserves and National Guard officers on active duty. It would seem, under these circumstances, that any assertion that the expression "any officer of any of the services" was intended by Congress to be restricted to the 13,000 regulars, and to ignore the 120,000 Reserve component officers, should have been so ludicrous as to be laughed out of court at once. It is one of the astonishing vagaries of our administrative and judicial system that such manifest absurdities occasionally creep into our legal system, and in such instances it is the manifest duty of Con-

gress to correct them. Such is the intent of S. 1085 and H. R. 689.

Meantime, it is heartening to all those concerned with such correction to have the sound and energetic backing of so many service and veteran organizations.

By resolution of its national convention of 1957, the American Legion went unequivocally on record for this legislation. So also did the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard Association, the Naval Reserve Association, the Regular Veterans Association, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Veterans of World War I, and Retired Officers Associations in Indiana, Missouri, Texas and elsewhere. Such support is deserved encouragement and inspiration to the sponsors and supporters of this legislation in the Congress, who are battling to remove now, and discourage in future, this form of discrimination against our citizen soldiery, whose performance on the battlefields of every war in which this Nation has been engaged proves that their worth and patriotism deserves every consideration to which any of their fellow service men and women are entitled.

It is hoped and believed that this corrective legislation will receive congressional approval during the present session of the Congress.

CHARLES L. BULLOCK.

SPRINGFIELD.

One Hundred and Eleventh Anniversary of Liberian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, Liberia celebrated her independence day for the 111th time. All too few of us here in the United States have any concept of the struggle it has been for her to protect her independence, pressed as she was on one frontier by England, on another by France. But the passion of her people for freedom has carried her through storm and sunshine to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith the remarks broadcasted on WUST by her Ambassador, George Padmore, on July 27:

Yesterday the people of my country celebrated for the 111th time the most important anniversary a country can have—the anniversary of its attainment of independence. It is an occasion which awakens in the hearts of all Liberians unusual feelings of gratitude and pride—gratitude for the protection afforded to us, by Divine Providence, over more than a century of hard-won and often imperiled freedom, and pride in the sacrifices which our forefathers made to maintain that freedom, and extend it from our first small beachhead on the Gulf of Guinea until it is now shared by a prospering and peaceful republic of 2½ million people. Our survival has been something of a miracle, for we were for many decades an island of liberty in a sea of colonial states. We believe that part of the explanation of that miracle (if miracles can be explained) lies in this sentence, which is taken from our Declaration of Independence: "Liberia is not the offspring of grasping ambition, nor the tool of avaricious speculation." From the moment of our birth as a sovereign nation we have been scrupulous in respecting the rights of others and conciliatory in asserting our own. So far as it has lain within our power we have sought to bridge and not to widen the chasms of misunderstanding which unhappily still divide mankind.

Freedom is not cheaply bought nor easily defended. For part of our history we were a poor nation because we did not choose to be deceived by those who came bearing gifts but in the end might have taken away much more than they gave. In the past 30 years, however, and especially under the leadership of our much revered President Tubman, we have felt strong enough to open the door to friendly foreign investment, most of it from the United States, the country in which all our Founding Fathers were born.

The result is that today the march of progress in Liberia is rapid. Every anniversary we celebrate sees our country stronger and happier than before. We look back with pride on a past which was not always bright and forward with confidence to a future on which, with God's help, we know the sun of prosperity will continue to shine.

The Simon Bolivar Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the noted radio commentator, Ray Henle, made a statement about the Simon Bolivar champion of liberty postage stamps issued that day by the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Henle's statement in the RECORD:

The Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield, held an especially felicitous ceremony today to inaugurate two new United States postage stamps.

These are a 4-cent stamp and an 8-cent stamp in the so-called champions of liberty series, intended to honor men who have championed the cause of liberty in foreign lands.

Both stamps issued today honor the Venezuelan patriot, Simon Bolivar, who not only liberated Venezuela, but several other South American countries as well. The stamps carry Bolivar's portrait.

All Latin American Ambassadors or their representatives attended. Present also was Vice President NIXON. Also, Assistant Secretary of State Andrew Burding, who represented Secretary Dulles, and the Venezuelan Chargé d'Affairs.

The speeches made by Messrs. Summerfield, Nixon, Burding, and the Venezuelan representative were keyed to the theme that freedom is a state of living precious to all. Mr. Summerfield said that millions of Americans, and people wherever United States mail goes, will see the likeness of the great South American patriot, and know that the United States honors such men, regardless of their origin.

We spend many billions of dollars round the world to gain friends. It seems to us that with 2 postage stamps and 1 carefully run ceremony, the Postmaster General may have done vastly more than all the planners to win friends for us in one vital area of the world.

The Lures and Baits Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, without any further comment I am quoting the above entitled piece "The Lures and Baits Bill," a syndicated newspaper column by Raymond Moley, released by the Associated Newspapers.

He describes the Federal aid to education bills before Congress as a hodgepodge of unnecessary items.

The Federal aid bills change so rapidly with the tides that it is difficult for the United States Office of Education to find suitable titles. The name used this year to describe all manner and sundry of aids contained in the bill, is the National Defense Education Act.

THE LURES-AND-BAITS BILL—FEDERAL EDUCATION-AID BILLS BEFORE CONGRESS ARE HODGEPODGE OF UNNECESSARY ITEMS

(By Raymond Moley)

In making his exit from the Washington scene, Marion B. Folsom, erstwhile Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, urged the passage of the aid-to-education plan which he sponsored, saying that it is devised as a system of lures and baits in the form of matching-fund grants to induce States to spend more. This, then, is the philosophy behind the bill, based upon the ridiculous theory that when you give someone something he will thereupon go out and buy the same. I wonder whether, as Folsom resumes his old job at Eastman Kodak, he will propose giving away cameras in order to get people to buy cameras. If so, I imagine that the board of directors would wonder whether 6 years in Washington had not impaired the judgment of their one-time treasurer.

The hot breath of the coming election should not prompt aid-to-education legislation to be rushed through in these dog days at the end of the session.

The bills before both Senate and House (which differ little except in amount) are a hodgepodge of assorted items gathered together by the Folsom Department to do something about education because of the sputnik scare. Congressional semantics designates such legislation with the term "omnibus." This would be a base indictment of a useful and practical mode of transportation. A far more descriptive term in this instance would be "moving van," which brings to mind a conglomerate assortment of bedsprings, mattresses, chairs, bureaus, kitchen stoves, and washboards inside, and tricycles, scooters, cribs, and skis stacked on behind. Indeed, the figure of speech is not inappropriate, for these, too, are "aid" to keep youngsters from worrying about the serious business of schooling.

The House bill, for example, provides for scholarship loans, laboratory trappings, audio-visual materials, foreign language institutes, institutes to discuss scientific testing of students and statistical processes. All these under the guise of a wholly phony title, "National Defense Education Act." Presumably, this is to make the conglomeration a matter of great urgency.

But most of this has no possible bearing on the cold war. The scholarships and loans are available to all, the needy and unneedy alike. They are for any sort of study, not limited to science.

It ought to be noted that title VII of the bill, to give $84 million for testing, is added despite the fact that the United States Office of Education as well as many sound educators have testified that there is still great confusion as to what aptitude test is a valid means of measurement. Until someone has worked out a valid testing method, it would seem somewhat absurd to subsidize on a large scale the doubtful tests already in existence. All we know is that the commonsense of a good teacher and old Dr. Trial-and-Error are the most valid means we have. They ought to do until the States and local communities and foundations have gotten the bugs out of current efforts toward scientific testing.

Finally, there is good evidence, including the opinion of the Association of American Colleges, that our colleges already have adequate means for scholarships and loans. The sudden plunge of the great sums proposed to be provided by the Federal Government would tend to discourage private givers.

Moreover, on the general subject of Federal aid, there is the irrefutable consideration that aid means ultimate control. This sort of bill would put the Federal bureaucracy deeply into the business of education.

Liberian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to me to insert in my remarks a poem read at the celebration of the 111th anniversary of Liberia's Independence, Liberian Embassy, July 26, 1958.

The land whose birth we mark today
Was founded, by the grace of heaven,
An ocean's frowning width away,
Far back in 1847.

By exiles from this western shore
Who sought to recreate elsewhere
A freedom which they loved the more
Because its joys they could not share.

No hate of potentate or pope
Impelled them, but this simple theme:
To fan to flame the guttering hope
And build again the broken dream.

And on a distant, alien coast,
Across the sundering leagues of foam,
All they had learned to cherish most,
All that reminded them of home.

They planted in responsive soil
And, tending it from hour to hour,
In breathless peril, grinding toil,
Brought this frail seed to wholesome flower.

Ghosts of our gallant pioneers,
Long gone but never out of mind,
We greet you, through the mist of years,
Here in the land you left behind.

See how secure the bonds have grown
That your wide-wandering voyage spun
Twixt both the homes you called your own,
The home you lost, the home you won.

So that, in 1958
With friendship tried and proven true,
We meet today to celebrate
The old republic and the new.

Nearer to that united goal
When, matched in wisdom and in worth,
Mankind will seek, with heart and soul,
Freedom and peace o'er all the earth.

Minnesota Judge Pleads for Continuation of National Guard at Full Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine letters I have received on the need and value of the National Guard in our country comes from a judge in the probate and juvenile courts of Jackson County, Minn. The correspondent, Judge William G. Kreger, is also a colonel, Infantry, Minnesota, Army Reserve National Guard. Under unanimous consent, I include his excellent statement on behalf of retaining the National Guard at full and necessary strength:

PROBATE AND JUVENILE COURTS,
Jackson, Minn., August 5, 1958.

Hon. COYA KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KNUTSON: Many of us citizen soldiers have watched, not only with interest but with sincere concern, the development of Department of Defense plans affecting the reorganization of the Army National Guard. These plans affect the structural strength of the footings upon which the foundation of this Nation is poured.

Time precludes a detailed development of the historical background of the National Guard of the United States. Suffice it to say, however, that we had first a Militia, then an Army, and then a Nation. It is a child of the Constitution of the United States. Its paternity is acknowledged in article I, section 8, of the Constitution. Therein its "care, custody, and control," so to speak, is given to the Congress. This for the purpose of upholding the basic principles enunciated in the preamble to our Constitution, viz, "insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, and secure (hold and protect) the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

For some years past various procedures and means have been proposed which would adversely affect this bulwark of our national defense. Some to the point of almost being a process of emasculation.

The troop basis allotment for the Minnesota Army National Guard, as proposed by the Department of Defense, is neither fair nor proper.

There are 66 communities in Minnesota which have armories. Some of these armories the multiple-unit armories. We currently have 107 units in the State. The reorganization proposed would give us a total of 80 units. The new strength would be about 7,000, a cut of almost 2,000 men.

The troop allotment proposed for our infantry division is short two battle groups. In lieu of the two battle groups we are given a separate signal battalion which would not be feasible for us to maintain because of the high percentage of technical personnel necessary for it. This is the type of emasculation I speak of. Destroying the unit integrity of a fighting division by pulling out two battle groups and replacing them with an infeasible unit to maintain.

You can readily appreciate how very near impossible it would be for Minnesota, or any other State, to meet such requirements. Instead of the reorganization requirements and troop basis allotments being practical and simple they are just the opposite. This apparently has not been invited to your attention by the Department of Defense.

The following is respectfully submitted for your consideration in obtaining fair and workable troop basis allotments for your National Guard:

1. Maintain 400,000 strength, as prorated by the National Guard Bureau of the States, Territories, District of Columbia, and Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on June 30, 1958.

2. Retain State headquarters and headquarters detachments at present strengths.

3. Retain 27 fully organized pentomic-type divisions at approximately 65 percent of tables of organization and equipment.

4. Maintain antiaircraft onsite units at 54 percent of tables of organization and equipment.

5. Maintain and concert existing nondivisional units and obtain additional nondivisional units to absorb the remaining strength. These units to be of the type required by the Army and to be maintained by 65 percent of tables of organization and equipment.

6. All of the foregoing to be accomplished with the approval of the Governor of each State concerned.

I should like to add that it is my privilege and honor to command the 135th Infantry Regiment, of Minnesota's 47th (Viking) Division. I first enlisted in this regiment in 1924, rising through the ranks and serving 9 years during World War II and Korea.

Many of the members of the Minnesota National Guard are sons and grandsons of former members. In Stillwater, Minn., one of our company commanders is the fourth generation of one family to serve as commanding officer. We must not subject the will of the citizen-soldier to serve to the type of dissolution proposed.

Minnesota has the unique distinction of having twice tendered volunteer Militia or National Guard regiments for service in war. Both times, Civil and Spanish-American Wars, they were the first volunteer regiments of the United States Army. It is the regiment I command.

I have faith in the American militia man. He costs less to maintain and produces more, because of his inherent qualities of citizenship, than his professional counterparts. In addition he is locally available within the State for any type of service.

Respectfully,

WM. G. KREGER,
Colonel, Infantry, Minnesota, Army Reserve National Guard.

The Veterans Hospital Radio Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, Members of Congress, and heads of veterans' organizations have on numerous occasions congratulated the Veterans Hospital Radio Guild on its work over the past 10 years among hospitalized servicemen. This national nonprofit organization sends its representatives—actors, writers, producers, musicians and technicians—into veterans' hospitals all over the United States as a voluntary service. The hospitalized veterans are trained by the VHRG professionals to produce and per-

form in their own radio programs which are broadcast over their hospital bedside networks. Group participation in VHRG activities has helped many veterans to want to get well, and thus to be started along the road to recovery and normal living.

The latest such tribute to the valiant work of this volunteer arm of the entertainment industry comes from Richard L. Roudebush, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose national headquarters are in Kansas City, Mo. I am happy to join the VFW in their commendation of the splendid work the Veterans Hospital Radio Guild is doing, and to include below the letter of commendation which Mr. Roudebush has written to Alex Kramer, president of the Veterans Hospital Radio Guild, on behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 15, 1958.

Mr. ALEX KRAMER,
President, Veterans Hospital Radio Guild, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KRAMER: There have been many remarkable rehabilitation programs instituted throughout the Veterans' Administration since the end of World War II, but I can think of none that can exhibit a greater record of achievement than the program of the Veterans Hospital Radio Guild. On this, your 10th anniversary, it gives me great pleasure to extend the heartfelt thanks and congratulations of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for a job well-done.

Unlike so many rehabilitation programs which were started during and immediately following World War II, you have not fallen along the wayside. It has distressed me in recent years to note that, more and more, the volunteer VA programs are slowly slipping out of existence. For that reason, I am especially gratified to note your continued interest and continued enthusiasm for those men who are still paying the price of war.

I honestly believe that your 10th anniversary publication will gain you increased support so that your activities can be extended to all VA facilities. I feel confident that the Veterans Hospital Radio Guild will have the full cooperation of V. F. W. Posts wherever they might be. The V. H. R. G. is performing a real service, please keep up your good work.

My best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,
RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH,
Commander in Chief.

Republic of Liberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, these are days of tensions across the world—days when misunderstanding and suspicion becloud the sun of friendship. It used to be that one took friendliness for granted. Alas, that these days are over. So it is a particularly happy experience to find that our effort to answer the call of a small country in the Near East in her moment of need has been understood and welcomed by another small country in Africa. At a time when the United States is none too well fortified with support from other nations in defending its policy in this greatly disturbed area, the rather courageous intervention of the President of Liberia, Dr. Tubman, deserves more attention than has been accorded it in the press.

This support is doubly significant coming as it does from a small nation in a position to appreciate both Lebanese fears and American motives.

On July 26, in addressing the Liberian people during their independence day celebration, President Tubman said:

The Liberian Government regrets the conditions and circumstances in the Middle East which made it necessary for the United States Government, in the interest of peace and stability, to have landed United States troops in Lebanon upon the request of Lebanon and in support of the sovereignty of that country. But we sympathize with this action since it seeks to assure the protection of smaller nations, and we note with a great degree of gratification that no acts of violence or depredation have been perpetrated by these troops. While there may be great risks involved, yet the greater dangers which may have developed appear in our opinion to justify the risks.

All nations should firmly resolve to lend their strongest efforts toward finding a solution to the complicated and tense world condition and not pursue a course of conduct for purposes of expediency for national or self-aggrandizement, thereby resulting in greater and additional complications. We, the nations of Africa, should strive to adhere to this principle.

The Liberian Government feels that the United Nations should as soon possible replace both American and British troops in Lebanon and Jordan, the reason being that the Liberian Government maintains that it is the duty and obligation of the United Nations to protect the sovereignty and integrity of all nations against direct or indirect aggression and subversive intrigues that tend to create coups d'etat.

It is good to know that there is this strong bond of understanding between Liberia and the United States.

Medical Rehabilitation—A New Specialty of Medicine for Helping Injured People To Become Self-Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, medical rehabilitation is a new and significant specialty of medicine. There is a widespread lack of knowledge about the availability and effectiveness of this important branch of medical treatment. Therefore, I offer an explanation of its great possibilities which was given to me by Dr. Frederick Ziman, of New York City.

Dr. Ziman is a distinguished medical practitioner who specializes in rehabilitation medicine.

Dr. Ziman's communication follows:

AUGUST 1, 1958.

The Honorable LUDWIG TELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The purposes of this communication are to explain to you what is meant by medical rehabilitation, what can be done with this new specialty of medicine, and to point out the necessity for a centralized organization for medical rehabilitation for those of New York City's employees who become injured or disabled. I select New York City solely for purposes of illustration, for our city under Mayor Wagner's leadership, has evidenced substantial awareness of the need for medical rehabilitation. New York City employs over 250,000 people. This includes not only the members of the uniformed forces—the fire, police, and sanitation departments, but the schoolteachers, transit workers, hospital workers, and all the other civil-service employees, administrative as well as clerical. New York City is a self-insured employer under the workmen's compensation laws. This is administered by the workmen's compensation department of the corporation counsel's office. Our city spends a great deal of time and money choosing and training its employees. The complete rehabilitation of the injured and otherwise handicapped members of this work force, therefore, is an important consideration for all of us, as citizens. The example set by some of the big insurance companies in their work with medical rehabilitation should be studied and followed by the city of New York.

Because of the tremendous strides made in modern medicine and surgery the lives of many people with severe injuries have been saved, but many have been left with permanent physical disabilities. It is not enough to preserve these lives. Having saved lives, it becomes necessary for the medical profession, with the help of the rest of society, to give these individuals the opportunity to become self-sufficient again, to become independent, to assume their responsibilities so that they may be able to discharge their duties in a capable manner. It is also obvious that for the disabled wage earner of a family, if a complete medical program, which includes rehabilitation, is not utilized, and if the various services and agencies designed for such tasks are not called upon, the effect of this neglect becomes far-reaching. It goes beyond the individual and beyond his family. The taxpayer pays a tremendous cost, for these disabled and their families inevitably become public welfare cases.

Mr. Congressman, it is not enough to talk of rehabilitation in terms of saving money, of time, and of increased efficiency, although getting skilled, capable people back to their jobs, for which they have been trained, is a practical aim. There is something much more important than all this—savings in terms of human misery, of frustration, of destitution. It is impossible, unless one has been in that position himself to fully realize the frustrations and to know what the handicapped person goes through, who wants to become self-sufficient, but cannot get work. The costs in human misery are greater than all the cost to the taxpayer in terms of dollars and cents. There is a cost to society—the miserable, broken-up homes.

Thus, the physical disability is compounded right down through the family and the rest of our social structure. It has been proven that many of the disabled can be helped by medical rehabilitation. Training with special aids and devices, helping them solve the problems of housing and job-finding, all these help them assume their place in the world and become self-sufficient human being, again able to take care of themselves and their families. It is the tragedy of our civilization that having saved

lives we deny livelihoods. It seems easier to leave the crippled as beggars than to get them up from the depths of despair, helplessness, and uselessness. Medical rehabilitation could prevent a lot of these far-reaching effects. The specialist in medical rehabilitation is trained to know that he is not through with the care of his patient until that patient is gainfully employed, within the limits of his disability.

Our mayor, Robert F. Wagner, in an executive order on March 6, 1958, to all city agencies, said, "Such employees who have been handicapped through illness or injury and have received adequate rehabilitation care and training, and have been declared employable and who are competent to perform the duties of their positions should be restored to their regular duties or other duties appropriate to the titles they hold. Within limits fixed by existing law and civil service rules where an employee cannot perform the duties of his title he should be given every opportunity for transfer to a position with duties which he is able to perform. Such policy is in line with the most progressive thinking in industry and government as evidenced by the expression of public policy in section 25B of the Civil Service Board, which encourages the hiring of physically-handicapped applicants to civil service positions where they are competent to perform their required duties.

"The policy has proved beneficial to the employee whose usefulness is continued thereby, to the agency which will have experienced persons assigned to duties which they are physically able to perform, and to the public generally."

This is an example not only for other municipalities and State governments but for all other employers to follow. The excuse offered by employers for not hiring handicapped workers is that there is increased liability. Statistics and the carriers themselves belie this.

There are thousands upon thousands of cases of successfully rehabilitated handicapped and numerous sets of statistics that prove that amazing results can be achieved with complete medical rehabilitation. To quote some of the authorities, quoting from Sommers and Sommers from the Council Clearing House in Rehabilitation and Workmen's Compensation, Chicago, 1954, pages 78, 79: "Both local and Federal Governments received a profit on rehabilitation moneys expended, in the form of reduced welfare payment and new tax revenues." While all authorities on the workmen's compensation are agreed that an important goal in the rehabilitation of the injured worker is to return him to productivity, Dr. Alexander P. Aitken, chairman of the subcommittee of industrial relations of the American College of Surgeons, in the Bureau of Labor Standards Bulletin No. 167, pages 205, 206, said: "True rehabilitation of the injured worker * * * is virtually nonexistent under our present workmen's compensation system."

There are several important reasons for the lack of medical rehabilitation for the injured employee. In our own city and State some of the fault lies with my own profession; doctors that handle industrial cases either are not fully aware of the possibilities, or they do not have the facilities available for rehabilitation. To quote Dr. Alexander P. Aitken again: "Most cases of prolonged disabilities are due either to errors in diagnosis or to inadequate and insufficient treatment, or to both. True rehabilitation can begin only when such errors and diagnosis and treatment have been corrected."

Dr. Willis M. Weeden, medical director of the New York Workmen's Compensation Board, says, "Because of its newness and lack of knowledge of possible results, rehabilitation is still not being used in as fully effective a manner as it should be. Just as 40 years ago when modern surgery first started its first strides, many physicians continued to treat cases of appendicitis by medical means rather than calling in a surgeon, today many physicians are treating severe disabilities with outmoded methods and not calling in the specialist in rehabilitation." This was from the National Conference on Workmen's Compensation and Rehabilitation Proceedings, 1950, United States Bureau on Labor Standards, Bulletin No. 122, page 52. "Rehabilitation of the disabled is assuming more important aspects as time goes on. In Dr. Howard A. Rusk's words, "If we do not do something about providing more opportunity for the disabled to be trained and to take their place in our economy, and the same for the chronically ill, by 1980 for every able-bodied worker in the labor force there will be one in this category on each laborer's back."

There are several insurance carriers that have done very important work in rehabilitation. The New York State Insurance Fund is one of the most important. In its Statistical Summary of Rehabilitation Activities for 1957, there are several very illuminating and very heartening facts. A special department has ben set up devoted to rehabilitation. With careful followup of cases and educational programs for its claims examiners, long drawn out cases are brought up early and frequently for review. The result is that where this is indicated there are earlier referrals for physical medicine and rehabilitation. This introduces another fact that has become increasingly important—unless rehabilitation is started early the possibility of getting full rehabilitation is poor.

Quoting from this same report: "Our experience clearly demonstrates that carrier savings are not achieved at the claimant's expense; carriers and claimants are not opposing camps. A successful rehabilitation program primarily benefits the claimant and his dependents. The secondary savings that accure to the employer and carrier ultimately also go to the claimant's benefit. The employer's savings are passed along to the consumer through a reduction in cost. This when compiled with the claimant's earlier return to useful productivity and his increased buying power contribute to the social and economic betterment of his community." For the actual dollars and cents savings I should like to quote from their table on incurred cost estimates: Before rehabilitation $875,185; after rehabilitation $606,395; the net reduction in incurred cost estimates was $268,790. In other words, the fund's reserves were reduced by this tremendous amount and this meant a large saving that was passed on right down the line.

In the Moreland Commission's Report of January 28, 1957, to Gov. Averell Harriman, Commissioner Joseph M. Callahan states: "A more positive approach to the field (medical rehabilitation) which is the means not only of lowering compensation costs but also of converting injured workers from welfare recipients to productive, wage earning, taxpaying individuals, will, therefore, be beneficial to employers, employees, and the community.

"Statistics comparing costs with results dramatically demonstrate that rehabilitation affords the greatest single opportunity to improve the workmen's compensation system. Thus, the State insurance fund was able to cut its compensation costs by more than $170,000, following the rehabilitation of 40 handicapped persons" (the U. S. Department of Labor Bulletin, No. 180, 1954, p. 40), and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, in its 1952 report, states it was able to rehabilitate 1,017 persons at a cost of $197,000, to an extent sufficient to increase their total income from $433,000 to $2,336,000. Of the 66,273 persons undergoing rehabilitation in fiscal 1955, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 13,000 of them had been receiving welfare assistance totaling $11,100,000. Their estimated total wages increased from $17 million to $119 million, while the total and nonrecurring cost of rehabilitation was only $9,200,000. Nor is the process limited to a small number of individuals or a few types of cases. Dr. Howard Rusk, director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center, indicates that 90 percent of the back cases, caught early enough for effective work, were back on the job in 6 weeks * * * and that 90 percent of all handicapped persons can be trained to do some useful work."

Again quoting from the same report: "Rehabilitation cannot be considered as a last resort measure. All competent authorities agree that the first 60 days after injury are the most important. During this period the handicapped must be appraised and the medical and psychological phases of therapy begun. If not, neuroses and regressive, hostile, and depressive attitudes may develop, and these can make belated treatment useless. Further, mere ameliorative treatment without a definitive rehabilitation result in mind can become overtreatment and can also lead the patient to think that he is unfit for further work. On the other hand, early referral gives the worker the reassurance concerning his economic future and is more likely to produce the necessary attitude of cooperation on his part."

Mr. Congressman, our city's workers, as do all persons, need a rehabilitation program. This should operate under the corporation counsel. A well administered rehabilitation program will result in a profit in dollars and cents to the city and its taxpayers, and a profit in terms of increased human satisfaction and happiness to the injured and disabled. Whatever we do in this great city of ours is watched eagerly by the rest of the country and the rest of the world. The results we get, and I am sure we will get good results, will encourage others to follow our pattern. Our efforts to benefit mankind will be magnified many times.

Very respectfully,

FREDERICK ZIMAN, M. D.

Address Delivered by Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, the Adjutant General of Pennsylvania, Before the Tatra Club, at Kingston, Pa., July 24, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to place in the RECORD of Congress a great speech made by a great American diplomat and soldier, the distinguished Adjutant General of Pennsylvania, Maj. Gen. H. J. (Tony) Drexel Biddle, delivered at the annual dinner of the Tatra Club of Luzerne County, Pa., John Cresko, president, an organization of leading citizens of Slavonic, Lithuanian, and Magyar ancestry at which time I had the high honor and great privilege of presenting my dear friend Lenard Biddle to the gathering:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MAJ. GEN. A. J. DREXEL BIDDLE, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE TATRA CLUB, AT KINGSTON, PA., JULY 24, 1958

Mr. John Cresko, president of Tatra Club, I deeply appreciate the warm welcome so graciously accorded me by Congressman FLOOD. I greet his heartening message with a sense of humble satisfaction—and doubly so since it comes from a distinguished American, for whom I have an abiding admiration, affection, and esteem. Indeed, I have the greatest respect for his understanding and his sustained interest in the importance of realistically relating our Nation's military capabilities to our commitments, as well as to our own political, economic, psychological as well as military objectives—this, in addition to his devout and fruitful efforts to advance the interests of the community.

It's not surprising that free world attention has centered upon Soviet Premier Khrushchev's announced willingness to attend a meeting, under certain conditions, within the framework of the U. N. Security Council.

The pace of events leading up to this development has been so swift that it might be useful to remind ourselves that on July 18, only 3 days after our landing of troops in Lebanon, in response to the Lebanon Government's call for assistance, the Soviet delegation, sitting in the U. N. Security Council, vetoed 2 resolutions: 1 offered by the United States to replace our forces in Lebanon by a U. N. security force; another proposeed by Japan calling for a strengthened U. N. observation team. We may further recall that the following day, July 19, Khrushchev urged a heads-of-government meeting in Geneva, but so timed as to preclude the careful preparation necessary for some measure of assurance of accord. It was clear that, by attempting to exploit the current wave of free world anxiety over Middle East developments, Khrushchev hoped to accomplish, in short order, what he had been doggedly striving to attain during the past 8 months of diplomatic maneuvering; namely, an unprepared summit conference.

In response, President Eisenhower proposed that the conference take place within the framework of the U. N. Security Council. And it was on the 23d that Khrushchev dispatched his acceptance, under certain conditions. These are that the U. N. accept Arab and Indian representation, and that the meeting take place on July 28, only 5 days distant—hardly time for proper preparation. Moreover, the fact that Khrushchev left open the question as to what would be discussed, strongly suggests that he seeks opportunity not to work out any constructive solution, but to charge the United States with aggression in Lebanon, Britain with aggression in Jordan, and perhaps to harangue western policy all along the line. For, he's already been loud in erroneous arraignment of our two countries on this score. Yet, when his U. N. delegation had opportunity to support resolutions which would have made way for the withdrawal of our troops, it vetoed them. If it were a peaceful solution of the Middle East problems that Khrushchev were seeking, his delegation would have supported either the United States resolution for a U. N. security force to replace our troops, or the Japanese resolution to augment the U. N. observation team. So, it's a strange spectacle of the old hands at the boring-from-within technique with its current practice of employing assassins in civilian clothes, as well as the threat of the use of soldiers in uniform—posing as advocates of noninterference. It's obviously because our action serves as a roadblock across Nasser's path of undercover aggression that Moscow and Cairo are trying to paint it as interference in Lebanon's internal affairs.

Certainly, if any solution is to be found for Middle East troubles, the scope of the discussions would have to include not just part but the whole area, and—very importantly—the underlying causes; for example, for Lebanon's and Jordan's respective calls for assistance against underground aggression. And, what this would boil down to would be an unmasking of Soviet-supported Nasser imperialism as the menace to the independence of the several states in the general area.

Maybe there's some significance in Khrushchev's having omitted the inclusion of Israeli representation when he cited his conditions for attending the contemplated meeting—maybe not. But one thing is clear: any conference dealing with the shape of things in the general area of the Middle East would be meaningless without the participation of Israel.

At any rate, it would be for the Security Council, not Khrushchev, to determine the timing, the composition, and the rules of procedure governing the conference.

And, I am confident that within the next 24 hours President Eisenhower will have placed the whole matter in its proper perspective.

Should the meeting take place, it would be our prayerful hope that it might lead at least to a lessening of tensions in the Middle East. And, we may be sure, there would be no lack of readiness on our part for an honorable accommodation of differences.

Before giving way to these fond hopes, however, let us consider a few stark facts.

As I read the developments, Khrushchev had become dissatisfied with the pace at which Nasser, his man on the other end of the telephone, was advancing Khrushchev's program for gaining control of the Middle East. So he called upon Nasser to accelerate his pace from a walk to a gallop.

This, then, brought on the trouble in Lebanon and Iraq. Under Nasser's orders, a group of outsiders dressed up as insiders and, claiming to be Lebanese rebels, strove to effect the removal of the pro-Western chief of state from office.

While our attention was focused upon this shameful spectacle, the scene was being prepared for the assassination of King Faisal of Iraq and a number of pro-Western leaders.

Now, what's behind all this? A plan of vast bearing—and it's this: to swiftly gain control over the Arab States—thereupon to effect the nationalization of their respective sources of oil, and the pipelines that pass through their lands; this with a view to their conditioning continued oil supply to Western Europe upon the latter's withdrawal from NATO, and its denying the United States further use of its presently leased overseas bases. This would be accompanied by a closing of the Suez Canal.

The plan envisages gaining a throttle hold over Western Europe whose economy has, since World War II, become largely dependent upon Mideast oil. A longer range objective is thus to isolate the United States from its allies and important sources of raw materials.

So—had the United States stood by with hands in pocket, and not lent assistance to Lebanon, and had the British not aided Jordan, it would have been but a matter of time before these two countries would have fallen victims of the machinations of the combined Red and Nasser imperialism.

President Eisenhower's decision to land our Marines was both intelligent and courageous—and it was consonant with the authority invested in him by the Congress, as well as with the principles contained in the U. N. Charter.

These things, Khrushchev obviously knows. Yet, what he seeks is a hastily convened summit conference which might provide him with a sounding board for further denunciations, mainly of the United States.

Any such spectacle could hardly lead to more than a facemaking, name-calling contest—what with Khrushchev falsely accusing us, and with our exposing—but with justification—the Soviet record of subversion and coercion, broken promises, and abrogated accords.

But Khrushchev would be apt to lose his enthusiasm and to back away from his declared sense of urgency for the meeting once he were to find that instead of the swiftly summoned, hence unprepared, top-level gathering he had been envisaging as an opportunity to further arraign us for action in Lebanon, full opportunity would be granted all concerned in an orderly and adequately prepared conference within the Security Council.

Yes, this is a possibility for which it would be well to allow.

Then, too, there's another possibility that should not be excluded: some diversionary activity while our attention is focused on the Middle East—perhaps in the form of some Soviet-perpetrated trouble in Indonesia, Indochina, or Korea. But I also have in mind that just as the eventual liquidation of Israel, with Soviet blessings, is held out as bait to the Arab States by Moscow, so the capture of Formosa, with Soviet blessings, is held out as bait to Communist China.

You see, it's been a long time now that Khrushchev has been maneuvering to have himself included as a major consultant concerning Mideast problems. Should he come to feel that it was his fomentation of real trouble that enabled him to muscle his way, and that of his designees, into the high councils concerned with the problems of the Middle East, he might conceivably resort to similar methods in the Pacific area, in the hope of attaining the long-sought inclusion of Red China's representation in the councils dealing with Pacific problems. It is my belief that, in dealing with the leaders of despotism, it is wise to prepare for the worst, in order not to be caught off balance.

Now, to return to the issue of a summit conference. From the outset, President Eisenhower has made it clear that we are open to any carefully prepared, hence measurably promising, top-level conference. Meanwhile, however, events have borne out his wisdom in having rejected Khrushchev's previous attempts over the past 8 months to rush us headlong into an unprepared meeting.

At the same time, there are those who continue to encourage the thought that the Kremlin is seeking a fresh approach to disarmament and coexistence. I wonder whether they might not have forgotten some things and overlooked others. Part of their argument is that the Kremlin would welcome, just as would we, relief from the heavy burden of military costs. Well, maybe so, at some presently unforeseeable time, but not until the Soviets might have achieved world preeminence through the threat of their excessive armed strength, or through its use in battle. Besides, the effect of military expenditures upon the economy and psychology of the people of Soviet Russia is not the same as in our country. The question of bettering the standard of living of the individual in our free country is not a matter of similar importance in the Soviet police state, where the individual is merely another number. And, whereas our dollar economy is tied to gold, the Soviet economy, as in the case of that of the former Nazi regime, is an economy of totalitarian despotism, which is, in effect, tied on to the back of labor, which, with a gun in its kidneys, steps up its production, or else.

I'm sure some of us will recall the no doubt well meaning, yet unrealistic estimate from western sources in the years leading up to World War II, to the effect that Hitler's economy, and, among other things, his comparatively low steel production would

not permit him to make war. Yet, he was able so to exploit what steel production he had at his disposal, and so to harness labor's back to his military requirement, as to cause the world a pack of trouble. These are just some of the things that seem to have been forgotten.

And still another angle: again, as in the years leading up to, and including 1939, an expansion-hungry totalitarian government rules in a powerful military country. Instead of Hitler—this time it's the unscrupulous Khrushchev, who seems to have taken many a leaf from Mein Kampf, and, what is even worse, Kreminized their content. Hitler used to talk as Khrushchev does now. He would proclaim his desires for peace and his wishes to avoid war. It was not until 1937 that Hitler's despotic actions prompted Britain and France to conclude that they could not hope to endure in a Europe dominated by Hitler. Meanwhile, however, all actions in the nature of appeasement, including the statement published following the Godesburg Conference between Prime Minister Chamberlain and Fuehrer Adolf Hitler, were proclaimed as "peace in our time."

In the mid and late thirties, Hitler had flaunted his tanks and his bombers in the faces of visiting foreigners. The purpose of the show was, of course, to intimidate other countries into believing resistance would be useless. Consequently, safeguarded by the fear generated by his vast armed strength, Hitler pocketed one country after another—while others helplessly looked on, each with the prayerful hope that it might not, in turn, become the victim of Hitler's expansionist intentions.

It was at about that juncture that from ingenuous, timid, credulous and defeatist sources in Britain and France, and even in the United States, voices were heard to proclaim that "You can do business with Hitler." Just as today, there is an audible refrain that "You can negotiate with Khrushchev."

Sure—maybe we can. But it would be only prudent, I think, that those of this school of thought not overlook the importance of realistically evaluating the Communist doctrine and the mentality of those who direct the thoughts and actions of militant communism. The answer is that experience has shown, and documentary evidence has borne out that the Communist doctrine is one of irreconcilable, total, permanent conflict between classes, and between the capitalist and Marxist concepts.

For the Communists, war is a continuation of policy and vice versa. The Soviets have but one combined command over political, economic, psychological, and military strategy. The product is a centralized, coordinated front. The war this combined command is directing is a war to the hilt. As a means to this end, "cold" war is only a part of the game.

And I wonder how frequently we pause to realize that for some years now, this sometimes hot—sometimes cold war has been waged on free world territory—and what is more—that it continues to be waged on the territory of the free world.

Contrary to the illusions so many of us have harbored since the close of World War II, what we have been living through, can hardly, I think, be called peace. I'll go along with the idea that it's in a state of very "shaky" peace that we've for some years lived with the Soviets. But, we've seemed unduly ready to overlook such local wars as that of Korea and other uprisings in distant places.

It was probably only natural, in our abhorrence of war, and desire for peace, that we grasped for the phrase "cold" war, when it was first suggested as a characterization of the troubles, through which we and the rest of the world were passing.

But, we may be sure that our Communist opponents do not share this view—for in their minds, the so-called cold war is merely a part of their deliberate total war to the bitter end.

Even since the Communist tyranny went on the march, its operations have been marked by grim determination to gain power—and this, through proficiency in the study and exploitation of weakness of the potential victims of the Soviet's expansionist program. And it's equally important not to overlook the mentality of those who direct the thoughts and actions of militant communism.

Today sees the world in a continued struggle between believers, regardless of faith, and those who would deny the soul and its relation to God. It is to overrun and subdue mankind that the imperialist-minded oligarchy in the Kremlin is exploiting this Godless faith.

The conflict between atheist communism and religion may be summed up as a battle between hate and love, between egoism and social justice, between tyranny and freedom.

Moscow's most recent blast against religion is a charge that belief in God is a basis for superstition—that only the gullible believe in God. This indeed is further evidence that in the struggle for men's minds, communism, as a totalitarian and materialistic philosophy, just cannot tolerate competition with spiritual force.

Now it's my conviction that, tied in very closely with the belief in God, is the honoring of solemn undertakings between men of good will. It follows, then, that we could hardly look to the Godless to fulfill their engagements—unless, of course, there were established the necessary systems of inspection and control, and unless we possessed the will and the military capability to back up these systems.

Then, too, ours was a hard experience in dealing with Stalin. How, therefore, should we expect to fare any better with his survivors, whose chief claim to significance, at the time they took over, was, in effect, to turn "state's evidence" against their former partners in misdeeds against God and humanity.

The realistic answer is that moral suasion has no impact upon the unscrupulous—that the only deterrent is strength, which entails armed force, and the will as well as the capability to use it, if need be.

This, indeed, is essential in order to keep the confidence of our Allies, as well as to command the respect of our potential enemies. It is no less essential in order to back up our diplomats in their ofttimes delicate negotiations.

In measuring the effectiveness of our diplomacy, in forwarding our foreign policy, we have only to evaluate the response of the free and noncommitted nations, to our established policies, under trying circumstances. We may be sure that their reactions to our policies, insofar as these concern their interests, mirrow a shrewd appraisal of our capabilities, and mood to back up these policies in a showdown. Any wavering, on their part, would reflect their lack of confidence.

I saw a clear example of this in the years leading up to the outbreak of World War II. Anytime a country in Eastern or Central Europe failed to respond to Britain's and France's "Stop Hitler" policy, it meant that, in the realistic appraisal of that country, the major nations of Western Europe were not yet of the mood, or of the state of military preparedness to support their policy with the requisite effective punch. It furthermore indicated that that country doubted whether, if it came to grips with Hitler, the West would consider it the cause for which Democracy should march. In short, all I had to do, to measure the state of Western Europe's preparedness, was to watch the reaction of the states in Eastern and Central Europe to Nazi pressure.

And, this brings me to our own position. We have, as you know, military alliances with some 48 nations.

It's impossible to foresee when these ominous sight bills might be handed us for payment. And, it's equally impossible to forecast the form or scope of performance these commitments might demand of us.

One thing is certain: The growing tensions in several widely separated cirtical areas of the world point up the importance of realistically relating our capabilities to our commitments, as well as to our own political, economic, psychological, and military objectives.

If, then, in the course of weighing this question, the conclusion was reached that saturation in nuclear potential, on both sides, might lead to a greater likelihood of limited war, consideration would necessarily be given the capability of coping with more than one limited engagement at the same time—probably in widely separated and relatively inaccessible places. For the potential enemy would be apt to try to stretch our capabilities to the maximum.

Yet, even in event that such a conclusion were reached, our capability of fighting total war with every weapon, would, nevertheless, have to be in the wings.

And—what's more—it's essential that we make it clear to all that we wouldn't hesitate to resort to our big weapons, if need be. For, as you know, the Soviets have a preponderance over the free world in conventional weapons. And, I have long attached great significance to the fact that, at the same time the Soviets have been hurrying to improve their nuclear potential—they have also been modernizing and further strengthening their conventional forces. Moreover, we may count upon it that they are not undertaking this double burden just to gaze into the free world's blue eyes.

No doubt, their actions reflect some fairly subtle speculation. Already we've seen evidences of their efforts to rally world opinion behind a move to abolish nuclear weapons. This would, of course, remove an effective factor from the West's war deterrent, and unblock the Soviet's conventional forces presently checkmated by the nuclear stalemate. It is these considerations that point up the importance of our military authorities being afforded a broad selection of military means to deal effectively with the flexibility of the Soviet military potential.

It is well to bear in mind, moreover, that in pursuing its ends, Soviet strategy counts upon the free world peoples' so wearying under the constant threat of war, that they will resort even to the false bargaining of appeasement. So, it is, that while constantly keeping alive the threat of war, Moscow announces from time to time its terms for the removal of the threat.

In all likelihood, the men in the Kremlin might hope to achieve their diabolic purposes through something tantamount to surrender. At the same time, we must remain on guard lest a fanatic, such as Khrushchev, might, if ever allowed to think he could do so, without risking his country's suicide, resort to the force of arms.

In waging the cause of freedom for the capture of men's minds, we must be prepared to defend ourselves in the new forms of so-called cold-war techniques, whether they be propaganda, psychological, or subversive attack. But these unconventional weapons will not be successful without the backing of armed power. Armed power is at the core of a nation's protective shield. It may never be used, but we must have it up our sleeves.

In our tried and proven democracy, the role of armed power is not an end in itself—but rather, a recognizedly necessary means to several constructive ends; namely, to keep the peace—shaky as it is—and eventually to achieve an enduring peace, consonant with our indestructible faith in freedom under the guidance of God.

Meanwhile, we should never overlook the fact, in our preoccupation with the troubles of the moment, that our Nation has the resources, the technical skills, the scientific knowledge, the creative imagination, to get the essential job done—and that our people have proven themselves equal to every demand which has ever been placed upon them.

Indeed, there are no challenges the future may hold in store for us, which we cannot master, provided, so long as the threat of militant communism remains, we will oppose it with energy, wisdom, and determination. I am confident our people will so decide.

Unpaid Balance of Philippine War Damage Awards, Debt or Gift?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an article entitled "Unpaid Balance of Philippine War Damage Awards, Debt or Gift?" which I believe is most enlightening in view of our desire to help the Philippines in their day of need and since a bill on the subject of Philippine war damage payments is now pending before us. The authors are two well-known lawyers, John A. O'Donnell, formerly Commissioner of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and Ernest Schein, who was chief examiner of claims of this Commission. They have both been widely recognized for their familiarity and friendship with the Philippines and their words are entitled to high respect.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UNPAID BALANCE OF PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE AWARDS, DEBT OR GIFT?

(By John A. O'Donnell and Ernest Schein)

Widespread attention drawn to efforts of the Republic of the Philippines to tap sources of additional United States economic aid has obscured what actually amounts to an asset of the Philippines long frozen due to failure of Congress to provide funds necessary to liquidation. The credit consists of the unpaid balance of awards made by the United States Philippine War Damage Commission nearly a decade ago of more than $100 million which if released would have a substantial stabilizing effect on the Philippine economy.

It is true that the President of the Philippines during his recent state visit emphasized his purpose to obtain help which would not require immediate congressional action. According to the communique made public after official talks in Washington, "The Export-Import Bank informed the Philippine Government that it will establish a new line of credit of $75 million for financing private and public development projects," and the Development Loan Fund "would examine specific projects submitted to it to determine whether they would merit * * * financing in an amount not to exceed $50 million." Upon analysis it becomes clear that the Export-Import Bank only added to resources in existence which had not yet been completely exhausted for the purpose of importing materials from the United States to maintain Philippine industrial projects on schedule. The amount which the Development Loan Fund financing, if approved, would require depends upon congressional action in the form of additional appropriations for this fund.

President Garcia in a speech before the National Press Club of Washington on June 19, 1958 mentioned claims among the avenues of potential financial assistance which he would explore, stating "we hope that at a propitious time a careful and definitive review shall be undertaken of a number of outstanding financial claims which the Philippine Government has pressed in the past. The sums involved in these subsisting claims are rather substantial and if considered and granted in a spirit of mutual understanding and equal justice, would go a long way in strengthening our financial and economic position. Among these are our veterans' claims and it is our confident hope that they can be met in a manner that is not piecemeal, but that a policy can be laid down that will decide once and for all this problem, the satisfactory solution of which is so vital to Philippine-American relations."

Presumably an undetermined volume of claims of almost infinite variety still unrecognized and undischarged by the Government and courts of the United States will require either legislation, judicial determination, or the settlement of new policy by our executive agencies. These claims include not only those of veterans and their families but for procurement of money and supplies from Filipinos by the guerrilla forces, for compensation for property destroyed and reimbursement for requisition and confiscation. Whatever the amount and whatever the category unpredictable complications lie in the path of disposition of these items.

On the other hand, payment of the balance still owing upon the war damage awards made by the Philippine War Damage Commission involves none of the intricacies implicit in the presentation and procesing of other types of claims. The Commission, a legally constituted body, has already examined and finally approved claims for war loss and damage. Allowances up to $500 have been paid. Moreover, approximately $250 million appropriated by Congress for the purpose has been paid upon the excess over $500 of larger claims. Remaining now are relatively simple procedures once Congress appropriates the funds necessary to discharge the unpaid balances.

This article is intended to throw light upon the whole Philippine war damage picture which may be fading in the memories of our citizens and public officials. Bringing the subject into clearer focus may assist us in reaching an answer to the all-important question of whether the payment of the balance of Philippine war damage awards constitutes an immediate obligation or is simply an act of grace dependent for execution upon discretion and political determination.

I. EARLY PROPOSALS FOR COMPENSATION OF WORLD WAR II DAMAGES

Congress became concerned very soon after the commencement of the war with the problem of compensating its victims. On March 27, 1942, Public Law 506 of the 77th Congress was enacted, authorizing and directing the War Damage Corporation, then in existence, to provide premium insurance effective as of July 1, 1942, against certain losses. By September 30, 1944, the War Damage Corporation, under these provisions, was notified of prospective claims for losses alleged to have occurred in the Philippines aggregating more than $135 million. Coverage had not been extended to property in these far-off islands because of lack of control of the United States during the period of Japanese occupation. No payments, therefore, were made to Philippine claimants. An added consideration for withholding war-loss compensation in the Philippines was the general sentiment in Congress that this subject should be dealt with on a special basis when the occasion should arise.

II. PROVISION FOR WAR DAMAGE PAYMENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Early in 1945 it was proposed to amend section 5 (g) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act relating to the War Damage Corporation by (1) broadening the definition of war damage; (2) extending automatic free insurance on property in the Philippine Islands (with designated exceptions) beyond the date of July 1, 1942. In connection with this proposal, the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs read the following from a letter of Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

"To summarize, it seems to me that Congress should enact legislation with respect to the overall Philippine situation and should provide for the payment of appropriate compensation for property damage due to combat operations in the islands throughout the period of enemy attack, enemy occupation, and our reoccupation. Since such compensation will have close connection with general relief and rehabilitation in the Philippines, it may be that Congress would want the whole Philippine problem handled by a Filipino rehabilitation commission, the members to be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate." (See Report of proceedings, hearings before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs on S. 104; 79th Cong., 1st sess.; 1945.)

Hearings before the committee disclosed that the War Department proposed to pay out of customary appropriations any claims for private property taken for military uses in the Philippines according to common wartime practice. Such claims would not include those based upon property destroyed to prevent capture or seized or destroyed through enemy action. Naturally, therefore, the settlement of losses as a military measure fell short of what was proposed to be done in the direction of compensation for the vast war damage suffered in the Philippine Islands. Moreover, the payment of claims for such losses on the basis of insurance adjustments appeared to be woefully inadequate.

The Senate committee soon recognized that it could not act along traditional lines and at the same time provide fully for war damage compensation and the restoration of property under circumstances prevailing during the battle in the Philippines. It was decided to defer action on S. 104, the bill contemplated for this purpose, pending examination in detail of all of the requirements of the Philippines in connection with its war losses in the effort to develop a program constituting a constructive solution of the whole complicated problem.

Early in 1946 a bill, S. 1610, was introduced in the Senate for the purpose of implementing the proposals emanating from many sources not only to compensate war victims for specific losses but in general to restore the economy and rehabilitate the physical structure of the Philippine Islands. From this bill there emerged the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 128).

The Philippine War Damage Commission consisting of 3 members, 2 from the United States and 1 from the Philippines, was created to administer the provisions of the law, which in effect had the following threefold purpose: (a) to restore in full the property of the very humble consisting usually of a nipa hut, carabao, and the simplest equipment; (b) to adjust more substantial war

losses in a manner analogous to the payment of insurance benefits; and (c) to make available funds for the purpose of furthering the program of physical rehabilitation adopted by the Republic of the Philippines, which came into existence on July 4, 1946.

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The War Damage Commission, under the terms of the law, was charged with the function of receiving, investigating, approving or disapproving war damage claims covering property lost, destroyed or damaged during and as a consequence of World War II in the Philippines, and make payment, replacement or restitution for such losses in accordance with the provisions of the act. The time limit on the activities of the Commission was set at 2 years after the expiration of the period allowed for the filing of claims, in no event later than 5 years after April 30, 1946, the date of enactment.

Losses to be considered by the Commission must have resulted from: (1) Enemy attack; (2) action by or at the request of the forces of the United States to prevent property from coming into the possession of the enemy; (3) action by civilian or military representatives of enemy or governments cooperating with it; (4) action of the Armed Forces of the United States in opposing, resisting or expelling the enemy; (5) looting, pillage or other lawlessness or disorder accompanying the collapse of civilian authority determined by the Commission to have resulted from any of the other perils or from control by enemy forces.

Qualified claimants were: (1) Those who had an insurable interest in the property alleged to be lost, as owner, mortgagee, pledgee or lien holder; (2) any heir, devisee, legatee or distributee of a deceased person's interest; (3) executors or administrators of the estate of a deceased person for the benefit of such heir, devisee, legatee, or distributee.

Furthermore, the claimants had to come under one of the following categories: (1) Citizens of the Philippines or the United States on December 7, 1941 and continuously to the date of the filing of the claim; (2) citizens of a nation not an enemy of the United States in World War II, if he had been a resident of the Philippines at least 5 years prior to December 7, 1941, provided that the country of which he was a citizen granted reciprocal war damage payments to the United States citizens resident therein; (3) persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States or Commonwealth of the Philippines or the merchant marine; (4) churches or religious organizations; (5) unincorporated associations, trusts or corporations (or their successors if already dissolved) organized puruant to the law of the several States of the United States or territories or possessions including those organized pursuant to the law in effect in the Philippines but excluding corporations wholly owned by the Philippines.

Specifically disqualified from receiving war damage compensation were: (1) Enemy aliens; (2) convicted collaborators and disloyal persons; (3) any unincorporated association, trust, corporation or sociedad anonima owned by any such persons.

Payment was barred: (1) If loss or damage to the property was insured except for the excess of the value over the face value of the insurance; (2) if the loss or damage was one for which the War Department or Navy Department was authorized to make payment; (3) if the loss or damage was payable or had been paid or authorized to be paid by the Government of the United States or the Government of the Philippines unless such payment was declined; (4) if the claimant did not file a claim in reasonable conformity with the law within 12 months after the opening date set by the Commission for filing.

The law provided for compensation of all property lost and damaged with the following general exceptions:

1. Accounts, bills, records, films, plans, drawing, formulas, currency, deeds, evidences of indebtedness, securities, money, bullion, furs, jewelry, stamps, precious and semiprecious stones, works of art, antiques, stamp and coin collections, manuscripts, books and publications more than 50 years old, models, curiosities, objects of historical or scientific interest and pleasure aircraft unless such were included in the inventories, supplies or equipment of a regularly conducted business in the Philippines.

2. Vessels and watercraft, their cargoes and equipment with certain designated exceptions.

3. Intangible property.

4. Property diverted to the Philippines by the authority of the United States Government or otherwise as a result of war conditions.

5. Property in transit which was insured against war perils or with respect to which insurance was available.

The amount which was payable in compensation was based either on actual cash value at the time of loss, destruction or damage, or the actual cost of repairing, rebuilding or replacing with other property of like quality, whichever was less. In lieu of cash payments the Commission could at its option make payment in whole or in part of the amount payable by actually replacing lost, damaged or destroyed property with any other property of like or similar kind; and the Commission was authorized to acquire such property, to have the necessary work done, to make contracts and to take such other action as might be necessary for the purpose; and surplus property of the United States was to be transferred to the Commission at a fair valuation for this purpose.

Before payment was made to claimants, the Commission might require that lost, destroyed, or damaged property be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired, provided that in the event that the Commission determined that it was impracticable to do this, payment might be made subject to such further requirements as the Commission might impose to insure the application of the awards to the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines.

Claims up to $500 each, which would cover the cases of the great mass of war victims, were to be paid in full immediately upon allowance. On larger claims the amount above $500 was arbitrarily reduced under the act by 25 percent. A pro rata, not exceeding 80 percent applicable to all claims was authorized to be paid immediately upon allowance. Whatever funds remained available to the War Damage Commission were to be distributed pro rata among allowed claims. Upon notification of the approval or disapproval of claims and the amount of the allowance, the claimants were given the opportunity to appeal decisions and to have a hearing, but the decisions of the Commission after the claims were finally resolved were final and not reviewable by any court.

Penalties were provided for fraud and a 5-percent limit was placed upon fees for services in conenction with the presentation and collection of claims.

Congress authorized the appropriation of the sum of $400 million for the payment of claims based upon property lost or damaged of which $12 million was earmarked for administrative expenses. As a matter of fact, all of the administrative expenses of the Commission were defrayed for a much less amount and ultimately $2,500,000 was returned to the Treasury of the United States.

The act further provided for the payment into the Treasury of money or bullion received by the United States from Japan for reimbursement of the sums appropriated for the payment of claims first to satisfy unpaid balances, then to make up the deficiency of 25 percent by which the claims were arbitrarily reduced. Recovery from Japan never took place.

There were provisions in the act concerning the disposal of surplus property, the restoration and improvement of public property and essential public services and the designation of appropriate agencies to assist within their respective jurisdictions in reaching the goal of complete physical rehabilitation of the Philippines. All of these items of the law as well as amendments subsequently adopted in furtherance of its objectives based on subsequent practical experience will be omitted from the present discussion which is limited to the disposition of claims for loss and damage of private property and the full payment of the awards made by the Philippine War Damage Commission.

IV. DISPOSITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY CLAIMS UNDER THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The War Damage Commission immediately after organization adopted rules and procedures for the filing and processing of private claims. The period from March 1, 1947, to February 29, 1948, was set for the presentation of all claims. A staff of personnel recruited in the United States was installed in Manila early in 1947 and a working force of several hundred Filipinos and some Americans residing in the Philippines was added to the organization in order to handle the vast workload which was in prospect.

A claim not exceeding $2,500 received a thorough office examination and settlement was based on standard values of property lost which recurred frequently in this class of claims. When data in support of a claim was insufficient to justify determination or there was any indication of fraud or other irregularity, the claim was referred to a branch office in the locality of residence of the claimant for investigation. Moreover, about 10 percent of claims of this size received a field investigation or spot check in order to furnish an occasional reading as to overall validity.

Claims between the amounts of $2,500 and $25,000 were investigated by branch offices; and all claims in excess of $25,000 were checked by qualified personnel actually in the field. Obviously, in postwar Philippines the difficulties involved in considering and settling claims were many and complex. No records were expected from the vast number of claimants for small amounts. Industries with larger claims had lost their books during the fighting and occupation. The best that could be expected was an estimate of damage based on replacement charges which were not compensable in full under the law. Efforts to make a fair appraisal faced such obstacles as the destruction of many buildings and the age of others which had been built during the Spanish occupation. Items of personal property embraced an assortment much of which was foreign to the experience of the appraisers and absent from any known tables of valuation such as abaca, copra, and yautai, an indigenous vegetable.

In a project of the magnitude of war-damage compensation there was bound to be an incidence of ignorance, mistake, and even fraud which accounted for substantial disallowances. Many claimants who felt that they were entitled to recovery were actually ineligible according to the wording of the law; some property forming the basis of claims was acquired after December 7, 1941, and, therefore, not compensable. In many instances, property was overvalued on the basis of standards adopted by the Commission. As of June 30, 1950, the disallowance rate averaged about 56 percent and this proportion did not decrease substantially during the remainder of the operations of the

Commission. Total disallowances of about 91,000 claims were principally on the basis of the ineligibility of the claimants by reason of nationality. It was observed with some satisfaction that the cases of outright fraud were negligible in proportion to the total volume and dollar amount of claims.

V. PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE PAYMENTS

By December 31, 1950, the War Damage Commission had substantially completed its program. The following figures as of that date with respect to private claims were included in the report published by the Commission in March 1951:

Amount group	Number of claims	Amount approved	Amount paid	Unpaid balance
$500 or less	997,924	$132,091,620.40	$132,091,620.40	
$500 to $25,000	247,586	172,172,987.22	130,021,286.83	$42,151,700.39
$25,000 to $50,000	1,676	23,859,876.01	12,850,989.08	11,008,886.93
$50,000 to $250,000	1,374	55,481,604.90	29,344,266.63	26,137,338.27
Over $250,000	338	158,610,481.85	83,181,411.66	75,429,070.19
Total	1,248,901	542,216,570.38	387,489,574.60	154,726,995.78

The final computations of the Commission made in March 1951, do not vary appreciably from the foregoing. The Commission received in all 1,248,901 private claims valued at approximately $1,250 million. Total payments aggregated $388,150,000.

Complying with the provisions of the law and in accordance with a preconceived plan, the Commission, commencing in September 1947, paid up to $500 on all claims allowed. On the basis of an analysis of its resources and a projection of prospective claims requirements, the Commission began in May 1948, to pay 30 percent of the amounts of claims in excess of $500 each. In order to maintain a margin of safety, the Commission continued this conservative policy until August 1950 when it determined that the $400 million authorization of funds for the disposition of private claims would permit a second and final payment amounting to an additional 22.5 percent of each claim in excess of $500. The claimants, therefore, received payment in full up to $500 on each claim and 52.5 percent of each award in excess of that amount.

It will be recalled that the act provided that "in case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to anyone * * * exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of claims approved in favor of such claimant shall be reduced by 25 percent of the excess of $500." In other words, each claimant was expected to receive 75 percent of the amount of his award above $500. The proportion of 52.5 percent paid by the Commission, therefore, still left unpaid an amount equal to 22½ percent.

Even taking into account the considerable disbursement and unpaid balance, the total does not measurably represent fair compensation for the war ravages suffered by the people, agriculture, business, physical structure and industrial plant of the Philippines. Such damage has been variously estimated as from $800 million to $1,250 million and by some experts at $2 billion.

A voluntary report by 1,328 of the larger claimants of the use of their war damage payments as compared with overall expenditures for rehabilitation and reconstruction indicates that although the Commission had paid them about $137 million, they had actually expended $513 million for necessary repairs and reconstruction.

Much of the responsibility for the financial dislocation represented by the war damage awards as compared with actual losses lies in the provision of the law to the effect that "no claim shall be approved in an aggregate amount which exceeds whichever of the following amounts, as determined by the Commission, is less: (a) The actual cash value, at the time of loss, of property lost or destroyed and the amount of the actual damage to other property of the claimant which was damaged as a direct result of the causes enumerated in this section; (b) the cost of repairing or rebuilding such lost or damaged property, or replacing the same with other property of like or similar quality."

Obviously, the cash value at the time of loss was always less than the cost of replacement at postwar prices in the Philippines. The Commission contributed to the further construction of war damage payments by deciding that the value of a piece of property at the time of loss had to be measured in terms of age and depreciation according to tables adopted by the appraisal experts of the agency.

A fair analysis of the awards made by the Commission including both payments and the unpaid balances reveals that the total compensation did not represent much more than half and possibly no more than one-third of the destruction wrought by the war in the Philippines.

VI. STATUS OF UNPAID BALANCES OF WAR DAMAGE AWARDS

The complexity of the subject of war losses and war claims necessarily evokes careful scrutiny by interested governments of the method and amount of compensation. There is no definable rule under recognized principles of international law requiring a government to indemnify even its own nationals for the deprivations incident to armed conflict. Irrespective of any rigid requirements of foreign or domestic law, international agreements, treaties or conventions, the United States in a characteristic attitude of fair dealing has always studiously observed its obligations, moral if not legal, to make whole in some measure the victims of war loss and damage. In connection with the devastation of the Philippines during World War II, Congress extended its solicitude beyond legal and historical grounds for indemnification because of the peculiar circumstances surrounding our relations with the distant archipelago which not only had been for many years our political responsibility but during the war formed a glorious battlefield in the conflict with a common enemy.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as we have observed, was a speedy and expedient answer to the pressures of our sense of legal obligation as well as a manifestation of our irrepressible emotions. The legislative history of the act shows unmistakably that the Congress contemplated further action permitting greater deliberation to fulfill the undertakings upon which we embarked through the provisions of the initial legislative step. The report (No. 1921) of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives states: "While the committee feels it is urgently necessary to provide through this legislation (S. 1610) for the rebuilding and restoration of the physical plant of the Philippines, it is generally realized that additional legislation will probably be necessary in the future to augment and supplement the benefits which will be accomplished through S. 1610 * * *. It is expected that proposals for additional legislation will be made from time to time by the agencies of the United States Government, by the Government of the Philippines, and the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission to meet needs for legislation as they arise."

Since the purpose was clearly expressed to augment and supplement the benefits to be accomplished through the act, it may fairly be assumed that Congress intended that first of all, the benefits actually provided by the act should be completely dispensed.

Continuously since 1946 the subject of war claims has occupied the time of our lawmakers. A notable report was made to the President of the United States under the requirements of section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948 broadly covering claims arising out of World War II. Additional laws have from time to time been enacted making provision for prisoners of war, internees in the Philippines as well as religious institutions not adequately compensated under the provisions of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. While activities in the field of war claims have been sustained without abatement in interest, the operation one of the earliest of the war damage compensation acts has been left half suspended.

In each Congress since 1953 bills have been introduced seeking to provide for the appropriation of sufficient funds to discharge the unpaid balance of 22½ percent of the awards in excess of $500 each made by the Philippine War Damage Commission. In the 1st session of the current 85th Congress, H. R. 8791 was submitted by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, providing in effect that the sum of $100 million be authorized to be appropriated for the payment of private claims shown by the records to have been approved by the Philippine War Damage Commission to complete the payment of a maximum of 75 percent of the full awards of these claims. No action has been taken upon any of the proposals.

VII. CONCLUSION

Whether or not there was any legal obligation for the reimbursement of World War II victims in the Philippines and whatever the motivation behind the adoption of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, it is still true that certain forces were set in motion upon its enactment which may not at this late date be stemmed. War damage claimants were invited to file statements of their losses; administrative machinery was set up for the examination and investigation of their claims; funds to the extent of $400 million were authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of satisfying the claims based upon the loss of private property. More than an implication resulted that the awards made by the War Damage Commission under the act would be paid in full.

It would be idle for our purposes to explore through legal reasoning just what rights arose from the awards of the War Damage Commission. It may be asserted on one hand that the whole compensation program being in the nature of an act of grace, whatever was paid in fact under this program constituted the fulfillment of our undertaking. On the other hand, it may be argued that an award granted a right on the part of the claimant which was measured by not less than 75 percent of the total amount allowed under the law upon the claim by the Commission so that the payment of 52½ percent of the claim above the initial allowance of $500 comprised satisfaction only in part. From this viewpoint, a claimant stands in the position of a judgment creditor against the United States whose judgment has been only partially satisfied.

Considering the intensity of the Philippine war damage effort at its inception and early implementation and the nature of the individuals and corporate organizations receiving the awards, it is reasonable to conclude that the second attitude prevails among them, that is to say, the holder of

an award which has not been paid in full feels that he possesses a valuable piece of property in the form of a judgment against the United States upon which a substantial portion of the face value remains owing and unexcuted. Under such an interpretation, Congress may well wish to make immediate provision for the full payment of Philippine war damage awards just as it never fails to appropriate funds for the satisfaction of judgments entered by the courts against the United States.

At least three cogent considerations weigh in favor of the enactment by Congress of legislation necessary to provide for the payment of the balance of the awards made by the Philippine War Damage Commission between the years 1948 and 1951:

1. The desire of the United States to extend aid on a reasonable and justifiable basis to the Republic of the Philippines to bolster its faltering economy.

2. The purpose of the United States expressed in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and in the legislative record behind its enactment, to compensate losses and damages incident to World War II in the Philippines at least to the full extent of the awards made under that act.

3. The necessity for maintaining the credit of the United States, even if moral rather than legal in concept, by paying in full awards of a Government agency which in the hands of the holders assume the character of judgments against the United States of America.

It has been observed that other claims of great volume and variety arising from the war in the Philippines still remain unsatisfied. These, however, are either controversial in nature, questionable as to validity against the United States, unliquidated in amount and often inestimable because of faulty records and other supporting evidence. At best, they require further legislation by Congress or the adoption of new administrative procedures for adjudication and settlement. On the other hand, the war damage claims contemplated and provided for in the act of 1946 have been presented, screened, pared down and determined as to authenticity and amount. Substantial payments on account had been made. All that remains to be done is the appropriation by Congress of further funds required to liquidate the awards to the extent provided by law. Only in this way can we balance an account which according to a respectable body of opinion entertained not only in the Philippines but in our own country constitutes a valid obligation of the United States Government.

Miners' Medical Plan: Model for the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the city of New Kensington, which was the subject of an article appearing in the Washington Post, Sunday, August 3, is in my congressional district, I want to put into the RECORD this very interesting observation.

This Congress this week passed legislation dealing with welfare and pension funds and the subject matter of this article is in direct interest with this legislation. This is another example of the many ramifications and facets which pertain to welfare and pension plans and attempts to legislate on a national basis.

I have watched this controversy in the Allegheny-Kiski Valley since its beginning and, like every other citizen, either in public or private life, I am vitally interested in the eventual outcome.

With this in mind, and knowing the interest of Congress in this explosive subject, I am taking the liberty of placing in the RECORD, the excellent feature story of Nate Haseltine:

MINERS' MEDICAL PLAN: MODEL FOR THE FUTURE?

(By Nate Haseltine)

PITTSBURGH, PA.—In this city, scene of past bloody strikes, labor is again locked in head-on conflict—this time with another giant: Organized medicine.

At stake is an emerging form of medical care, one which may be what the people rather than the doctors are ordering. It is the United Mine Workers' Welfare Fund operations, scornfully called third-party medicine by physicians opposing it.

Such opponents regard third-party medicine as the opening door to nationalized, or socialized medicince. Its proponents see it more as a compromise, or at least a buffer to forestall medical care by Federal fiat.

Forgetting ideals and destinies for the moment, both sides of the controversial movement admit that more people are getting more and better medical care today than before the start of the labor organization's ambitious move to protect miners and their beneficiaries medically.

Those who oppose fund operations the most see it as an unhappy model for other powerful labor unions. They envision the medical profession of the future honeycombed with stables of doctors, price cutting themselves and others for funded dollars, undermining the standards of medical care.

The model, the 10-year-old UMW welfare fund, pays hospital charges and attending medical and surgical bills for coal miners and their families, numbering nearly a million individuals. In its last full year of operation, the fund spent some $60 million for such full-scale medical protection.

What has infuriated the medical profession is that the fund specifies which doctors and which hospitals are available to its beneficiaries. These doctors must bill the fund, not the patients. And the fund-approved list of physicians and hospitals is growing smaller and smaller with each issue, they protest.

The center of the controversy is in Pittsburgh. Here the problems between the doctors and hospitals and the fund administrators are shouldered by a careerist in medical care programing. He is Dr. Leslie A. Falk, area medical administrator, whose territory takes in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, the northern panhandle section of Kentucky, and other scattered regions.

The Pittsburgh area is a powderkeg in fund operations. It is in the mining communities—as close as a long ambulance run away—that fund checkers have amassed perhaps most of their "ammunition" against the professional cry that the fund violates free choice of physicians.

In the Nation's Capital, Dr. Warren Draper, chief medical officer of the program, holds the inventory of that ammunition. Dr. Draper says that he is ready to give the details of fund investigations to "properly constituted authorities." It would be improper for him, he said, to make them public.

But both he and Dr. Falk have publicly generalized on the subject.

The investigations showed, they have reported, that when the fund accepted any doctor who wanted to service UMW beneficiaries, an undisclosed number of such doctors performed needless surgery, prescribed unnecessary hospitalization and gave inferior services at luxury-rate prices for miners and their dependents.

Vague as the fund disclosures have been, there are some hints to the nature of the findings. Like the miner's wife for whom the fund was charged for removal of her appendix—five different times. Or the miner's family whose "sickly" children were hospitalized because the mother and father were going away for a time and had no babysitter.

Then, too, there's the oft-told story of the physician who hospitalized almost all his UMW patients, because it was more convenient to have them in one location than make house calls to so many widely scattered homes. The fund does not pay for physician services not associated with hospitalization.

What rankles the outside doctors most is that not all the doctors who were removed from the fund-approved list are guilty of such doings. But the implication is there, and the fund administrators, they say, are taking advantage of the situation to the discredit of the whole medical profession.

The opposing doctors also talk darkly about fund administrators operating in such a manner as to encourage participating doctors to work for lower fees, or salaries, in order to retain their status as program participants.

The UMW welfare fund medical care program started operations 10 years ago with an open door policy. It provided its beneficiaries with unlimited free choice of physician, payment to the physicians on a fee-for-service basis only, and a promise that it would not develop new hospitals or clinics unless the need was indicated.

In the Pittsburgh regional area, about half of the 4,000 available physicians signed up as being willing to participate. Today, the list is down to about 700, and none can say how many withdrew voluntarily or were peremptorily cut off by administration order.

Some noncooperating hospitals, too, were cut off, and clinic groups sprang up in some mining communities. The new groups operated from their start with blessings of the fund. Opponents charged that the clinic doctors were imported for the purpose.

One such clinic, the Russellton Medical Group, began operation in northeast Allegheny County. Another was formed as the Centerville Medical Group, in southeast Washington County (also a captive mine area), and a third, the Bellaire Medical Group, was set up in Ohio, across the river from Wheeling, W. Va.

All have run into opposition from their medical colleagues who shun the medical program.

The Russellton Medical Group has been under the greatest fire from the Allegheny Medical Society, a constituent member of the American Medical Association.

Dr. David Katz, immediate past president of the society, accused the UMW welfare planners with setting up in a secret way the Russellton Medical Group, and blacklisting, by omission, doctors who wouldn't compete with their lowered prices.

While all this was going on, he said, the UMW "began to channel the bulk of the area work to the Russellton group." The UMW, he said, then wrote the area doctors that their fees were not in accord with other doctors of the area, even though the prevailing fees were the same as those billed Blue Shield and Blue Cross subscribers.

"This move," he declared, "could be interpreted only as a bid for cheaper fees. The

doctors began to realize they were dealing with a type of medical service that sooner or later would be controlled by a small group."

Dr. Katz has charged that the UMW has conducted "a tremendous public relations campaign, telling their members and the public that the doctors are cheating, doing unnecessary surgery, and prescribing needless hospitalization." Fund officials, he said, have never shown that the doctors who remain on the UMW program "have not done what those who were dropped were charged with doing."

The controversy between the county medical society reached its greatest public volume when the 230-bed, voluntary nonprofit hospital in nearby New Kensington, Pa., refused to give staff privileges to the Russellton Medical Group doctors.

Then Dr. Falk wrote his famous, or infamous (whose side are you on?) letter notifying the hospital—Citizens General Hospital—to admit the group's eight qualified physicians for staff privileges, or the fund would drop it from its approved list after October 1, 1956.

Citizens General didn't; the fund did.

Subsequently, each April 1—Miners' Day, commemorating the 8-hour work day—miners around New Kensington have staged protest parades.

The embittered UMW beneficiaries say that the hospital is part theirs, in that it is a community hospital supported by Community Chest funds. And the miners, up to now at least, have been contributing 2 days' pay each year as their part of the Community Chest drives.

The effect on the Russellton Medical Group members is that they must send nonemergency UMW beneficiaries to Pittsburgh hospitals. They also suffer in prestige in their communities, and among some complaining UMW beneficiaries.

A few other hospitals are bucking the fund's medical care program elsewhere. But the New Kensington deadlock stands out.

By contrast, the UMW welfare fund built, equipped, and staffed its own hospital chain in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, and relations with the doctors there are relatively serene. The chain consists of 3 major hospitals, and 7 satellites which lean on the 3 big ones for supply and specialty services.

In New Kensington, the community hospital keeps the Russellton Medical Group doctors out with the simple proviso that all applicants must obtain the written endorsement of three members of its attending staff. And not one attending staff member will sign endorsements for these particular applicants.

Similarly, in Allegheny Valley Hospital, Tarentum, also about 6 miles from Russellton, the UMW physicians cannot obtain hospital privileges on the ground of "the controversy" between the Allegheny County Medical Society and the UMW medical plan.

The program is also having trouble in Belmont, Ohio, where the Bellaire Medical Group was set up.

No physician on the UMW-approved list has been expelled from medical society membership.

Some threats toward such action have been voiced, but the rumblings have quieted down. Legal opinion is that such expulsion, with its economic impact on the expelled physicians, might provide grounds for a conspiracy suit, with punitive damage awards.

On the effects of the various resistance to fund operations, Dr. Falk said:

"Naturally, there are some miners and their beneficiaries who are unhappy over the fact that the fund won't pay just any doctor or just any hospital they'd like. But the overwhelming majority are sympathetic (to the fund's problems with organized medicine)."

Dr. Campbell Moses, director of the Addison H. Gibson Laboratory (medical research) at the University of Pittsburgh, is more liberal minded than his colleagues in the Allegheny County Medical Society. He sees faults on both sides.

"Freedom of choice of doctors," he said, "is already a myth."

"Compensation case patients," he added, "are directed to specific physicians. The patient doesn't question the practice or even ask if he can go to his own doctor."

Dr. Moses maintained that a high percentage of patients either have no doctor of their own or have one they became associated with more by accident than choice.

Dr. Moses said that medical societies should develop effective means to police their members on the quality of medical care. But he saw little hope that they will. Hospitals, however, he said, can do this effectively through tissue committees (which determine the persistent question: Was this operation necessary?).

The Pittsburgh medical researcher, who is not engaged in private practice now, said the necessary medical policing could be done by a special panel of long-qualified and respected physicians, of at least 65 years of age, who are no longer in medical competition.

The American Medical Association stand on the matter is that "every physician, duly licensed by the State, is assumed to be competent in his field unless considered otherwise by his peers and not by any third party."

In all his talks with operators of the program, this writer has found no indication that the fund would want such an inclusive physicians' roster. There was every indication that Dr. Draper and his regional administrators are satisfied they have more than enough participating physicians to fill UMW needs, and that the rosters will be further reduced more readily than increased.

Third-party medicine, as practiced by the UMW welfare fund may be a shadow of, or beacon to medical practice of the future.

Czechoslovak Independence and the Death of Jan Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, geography has placed Czechoslovakia in the heart of Europe, and the Czechoslovaks have thus been in the center of everything European. They have enjoyed the benefits and blessings of European civilization, to which they have contributed their full quota; and they have also shared Europe's misfortunes. Their modern history is inextricably woven into the long series of European wars, and more often than not the Czechoslovaks have found themselves at the mercy of their more powerful and ruthless neighbors.

For centuries their country was dominated by foreign powers, and they were subject to oppressive foreign regimes, but the sturdy Czechs and Slovaks never seemed to have wavered in their determination to fight for liberty and independence. Inured to hardships and reared in the school of adversity, their independent spirit served them well under almost unbearable conditions. They have never entertained any doubts about the righteousness of their national cause, and they have ceaselessly struggled for its attainment. At the end of World War I they attained that goal and the freedom-loving world was overjoyed to see the rise of the Czechoslovak Republic as the handiwork of the great Thomas Masaryk. Unfortunately, that Republic became a casualty of the last war, and now the fate of Czechoslovakia is subject to the whims and dictates of Moscow. Yet, even under the most oppressive tyranny the Czechoslovak spirit of liberty, of freedom, and of independence still remains alive. They are not permitted to celebrate the 40th anniversary of their independence, but we in the free world do so with due solemnity, and pray that soon those freedom-seeking Czechoslovaks will do the same in their homeland.

In commemorating the 10th anniversary of the death of Jan Masaryk we honor the memory of a great public servant of Czechoslovakia, one who was also a great servant of Europe's fight for freedom and democracy. For almost two decades this great son of a greater father held most of the important Government posts in Czechoslovakia and in all of them he served with distinction. By his affability and amiability, by optimism and profound faith in the eventual victory of good against evil, he has become and was known as one of the most convival and pleasant of European statesmen for more than a decade. But against the overwhelming steamroller of the forces of evil, those of Communist totalitarianism, even his tough and robust nature had to give way. Though tragic, his was a noble and glorious death, a living protest in behalf of freedom and democracy. It is just and proper that the 10th anniversary of his death be observed on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence Day, for to the end of his life he was the true embodiment of Czechoslovak freedom. Honor and glory to his blessed memory.

House of Representatives Praised for Doing a Good Year's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for years, the United States Senate was known as the conservative body of the Congress. The House of Representatives was looked upon as being more liberal and having less regard for sound, fundamental principles and fiscal sanity. For the past few years, however, the opposite has been true. Particularly has this been so with the present Congress.

There appeared a most interesting article in the Monday, August 4, 1958, Richmond News Leader by Mr. Holmes

Alexander. I desire to include the article, which is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PRAISED FOR DOING A GOOD YEAR'S WORK

(By Holmes Alexander)

The worm will turn. Even the patronizingly called lower House will rise up in its wrath and strike back.

This was the session of Congress at which the House of Representatives outdid the Senate in using its cerebral powers and earning its salary. On quite a few bills—I expressly have in mind Defense Department reorganization, reciprocal trade agreemeents, and Supreme Court curbing—the House cogitated while the Senate merely orated.

Anybody who wants to take a pile of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS to the hammock will soon find this out for himself. Most of the work that was thoughtful, penetrative, remedial, stimulative, and activating was done on the House side—and this is unusual enough for special notice.

Even the House hearings were more informative (the space scientists) and more sensational (Sherman Adams and Bernard Goldfine). I am not one who believes that Congress has done its duty when it fills the caucus chambers with spectators or passes a large number of laws. As a matter of protest, I stayed away from the Adams-Goldfine hearings, which seemed absurdly unimportant with the world half afire. And it is my Jeffersonian opinion that the fewer laws the better.

But if anybody is looking for the best single bill passed on Capitol Hill, it would be a House measure—one called H. R. 3 by HOWARD W. (Judge) SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia. Its off-the-floor manager was EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican, of California. Its legislative rewrite man was DE WITT HYDE, Republican, of Maryland. The bill is short and important enough to quote in full:

"No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is direct and positive conflict between such act and the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

The Smith bill is aimed at a doctrine which the Supreme Court attempted to lay down in the Steve Nelson case, Nelson is a notorious Communist who was prosecuted and convicted under the Pennsylvania antisedition law. The Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Government preempted the antisedition field, so the State law was not constitutional.

Judge SMITH is also author of the Federal law against sedition, the well-known Smith Act. A stalwart States rights man, Mr. SMITH was indignant that a bill of his could be construed to invalidate a State right.

There was a 3-day debate, July 15, 16, and 17, on H. R. 3, which any American would profit himself by reading. But before that there was a real parliamentary battle off the floor to bring this bill out of committee. Both the committee chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and the ranking Republican, KENNETH KEATING, of New York, opposed the bill. It took some dedicated scuffling to round up enough committee members to override these leaders. On the floor the bill won with the votes of 138 Republicans and 103 Democrats. All this was done while the Senate was mumbling and stumbling over a similar bill, by Senators JENNER and BUTLER, which thus far remains in committee.

H. R. 3, if I have read the signs right, is even more important for what it promises than what it actually delivers. It promises, as I am told by its sponsors, that we may be in for a restoration of the famous old conservative coalition between the southern Democrats and right-wing Republicans. It is shattering to contemplate what would have happened to the country if this combination of fundamentalists had not stood and fought all these years against the spendthrifts and try-anything extremists of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and now modern republicanism.

About this time last year, however, the grand alliance was split on the administration's civil-rights bill. Southern Democrats have taken to looking the other way when old-guard Republicans need votes to hold down Federal spending. On H. R. 3, the sponsors moved, as somebody once wrote, "as if the floor was sanded with gunpowder." Every care was taken to avoid even the suspicion that this was either a southern or a Republican bill. One Virginian, DICK POFF, of Radford, agreed to forego a long speech, although he entered it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The GOP leader, former Speaker JOE MARTIN, purposely kept away from the microphone in the well of the House Chamber, although his influence in the cloak room was paramount.

But the bipartisan passage of H. R. 3 performed invisible healing upon the wounds of the coalition—perhaps just in time to make a big difference here at the end of the session. There are a number of money-mad measures coming over from the Senate. The reunified coalition may be able to kill or modify the worst of them.

President Nasser's Opinion of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nasser is continuing his anti-America propaganda. The following article which appeared in the summer 1958 issue of Prevent World War III magazine, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

THE UNITED STATES IS THE CHIEF EXPLOITER OF ARAB PEOPLES

On April 12, 1958, the New York Times correspondent in Cairo reported that President Gamal Abdel Nasser had put a stop to propaganda attacks against the United States and the Eisenhower administration. This news was printed in other papers and was subsequently hailed as a significant turning point in United States-Egyptian relations. Editorials praised President Nasser and confidently asserted that the Egyptian strongman had begun to see the value of friendly relations with the West.

One can understand the enthusiasm of the editorial writers and many other people who greeted the news from Cairo. It appeared to them as a welcome relief from the constant barrage of insults and abuse against the United States. Particularly after Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal did these attacks grow with unprecedented ferocity in the government-controlled press. The United States was cast in the invidious role of the chief exploiter of the Arab peoples.

One can hardly exaggerate the magnitude of Nasser's propaganda assault against the United States and its impact among the Arabs. A sampling of Cairo's propaganda shows the length to which Nasser went in order to distort the policies of the United States in the eyes of the masses in the Middle East who are kept ignorant of the true state of affairs.

On January 20, 1958, the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram accused the United States of resorting to wholesale bribery and corruption in the Middle East at the expense of the Arab peoples: "America has now become the enemy of peace, the enemy of security and the enemy of the peoples who are fighting for world peace and for the peace of America itself."

On February 27, 1958, Nasser himself delivered a speech in which he harped on the theme that the Arab peoples were being sold down the river by a clique of "Arab collaborators of imperialism." These collaborators were betraying their country so as to please their "imperialist masters and the dollars."

On March 13, 1958, Al-Ahram accused the United States of threatening other countries with nuclear bombs in an obvious attempt to whip up new fears and hatreds against the United States. This paper reminded its readers of the sufferings experienced by the Japanese in Hiroshima.

On the same day the Egyptian newspaper Ash-Shab wrote: "It appears that America will never keep still. Imperialism is still seeking to tamper with the structure and independence of small countries. America either tries to dominate their economies and markets after having been expelled from the markets of countries which freed themselves from imperialist domination and exploitation, or it attempts to snatch air and naval bases from these countries in order to be able to shift the battlefield from its own territory to the small countries and use the people of these countries—to spill their blood and that of their children instead of the blood of people of the imperialist countries. Often America seeks to tie these countries to imperialist military alliances and control their military and economic resources so that in the event of a third war, the people of these countries would be forced into the holocaust. Events which attest to these facts take place every day."

On March 22, 1958, Ash-Shab turned its attack on the Arab "collaborators" of "Western imperialism." These people, the paper declared, "March behind Britain and America. Their interests are the same and they have a mutual aim, that is, to subjugate the Arab people, exploit them, and drain their resources."

On March 25, 1958, Ash-Shab lashed out against the United States on the Algerian question. It accused the United States of being the ring leader of the conspiracy to subjugate the Algerian people and to bring them under the yoke of Western colonialism: "We see imperialist forces grouping under the leadership of America and mobilizing reactionary elements, traitors, conspirators, and collaborators in North Africa to end the liberation struggle in Algeria in order to maintain North Africa and the African continent under imperialist domination."

When the New York Times reported that this hate inciting propaganda was at an end, as noted above, many well intentioned people expressed the opinion that Nasser, at last, had been converted. But can a regime which has been responsible for the propaganda of such diabolical lies and distortions as quoted above, be trusted?

Only a few days after reports of Nasser's change of heart had been widely publicized, a huge rally took place in Damascus, the second capital in Nasser's United Arab Republic. Once again, the United States and her leaders were targets of vilification and abuse. One of the speakers, Nasir as-Said, denounced "agents of American imperialism." He boasted that Syria had fought and won against all kinds of imperialism, especially "the criminal American imperialism."

The United States, he charged, was responsible for practically all of the ills in the Arab world. He heaped scorn upon American technical aid programs, the point 4 program, and "the imperialist Marshall plan." His fulminations against the United States did not stop there. He called the President of the United States "the criminal accursed devil Eisenhower." It should be pointed out that he was not the only speaker to rail against the United States in this vein. Moreover, it is significant that the rally took place in the presence of Nasser's leading henchmen, including the commander of the first army of the United Arab Republic.

Those who would like to believe the best in Nasser may regard this incident as a lapse. Unfortunately, this is not the case at all. Let us cite some examples: On May 6, 1958, the American aid policy was blasted by Damascus: "The aim of United States aid is to obstruct progress in various fields in other countries and to keep them always dependent on aid, and consequently subject to American influence."

On May 11, 1958, Damascus described American imperialism as the chief culprit in the troubled Middle East and, for that matter, in the world: "Through its present policy, the United States is trying to extend its political, economic, and military influence throughout the world, and in order to realize this aim, it sets up military alliances and implements programs known as United States economic aid."

On May 13, 1958, a commentary from Damascus warned against the machinations of the stooges of imperialism: "The gang, and we do not mean the nationalist gang alone, but also all the agents, traitors, and hired persons—from the nationalists and others, to Nuri as-Said, ar-Rifai, the British and American spies, and the agents of the information offices—this gang will not succeed in silencing the voice of our people."

On May 14, 1958, the Cairo paper Ash-Shab charged that the United States was intervening in the Lebanon crisis. "There is talk about the American 6th Fleet being ready to move to protect United States interests. * * * The United States is yearning to apply the Eisenhower plan."

In another article from the same paper the President of Lebanon is denounced for conspiring with his imperialist masters: "It also is not strange that he has informed the three western imperialist states—the United States, Britain, and France—that he is in an exposed position."

Despite these vicious slanders against the United States optimism still remained the keynote among certain United States officials and newspaper correspondents. On May 20, 1958, the New York Times reported that even though Cairo newspapers were portraying the leaders of Lebanon as traitors, "there has been no direct attack against the United States. This was considered of major significance among diplomats who are trying to assess the present complicated situation in the Levant." Ironically, on the very same day of the Times dispatch from Cairo, the Damascus propaganda machine told its listeners: "The United States wishes to dominate various parts of the world. It considers as enemies those nations which refuse to pursue policies identical to American policy and carry out its orders. The United States favors division of the world into two groups, continuation of crises arising from the cold war, and perpetuation of the threat of atomic war."

How much longer could the mounting evidence be ignored? Four days after the Times had announced that all was well, it was obliged to report: "The Cairo propaganda machine has started once again with even greater fury its attacks against the United States."

Thus, it appears that things are back where they were prior to the April 12 announcement that Nasser had seen the light. As a matter of fact, the society had never been impressed by this highly publicized report. Our skepticism was not based on an inflexible prejudice but only on the nature of the regime which now rules the peoples of Egypt and Syria. It is a totalitarian dictatorship and like every dictatorship, it controls all channels of information and propaganda. It is not responsive to the basic needs of the people but must act always along lines which will strengthen its grip over the people. Furthermore, policy and propaganda are interrelated. Since Nasser's power is, to a large extent, predicated in his antiwesternism, it follows that he must develop the necessary supporting propaganda or else he is lost.

At the present time Nasser is in deep trouble economically. The guns and other military aid which he has received from the Soviet bloc, are no substitutes for the bread which his hungry people needs so desperately. Thus, the Nasser regime is compelled to turn to the West for economic help. However, such overtures as he makes to the West, must be examined with circumspection. It would be foolhardy, to say the least, if the United States based its own policies on Nasser's smiles, behind which he tries to hide his deepseated hatred for us.

The People's Right To Know—Tribute to California State Assemblyman Ralph M. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in the State of California, the people's "right to know" is no longer a crusade toward better government. The crusade has been replaced by a citizenry intensely interested, accutely aware, and accurately knowledgeable of the activities and the procedures of its public bodies.

California is unique in the fact that it has recognized that good and just local government is very often and in large part a mere by-product of an alert and informed population.

The opportunity for the people to observe and the press to report on the transactions of the public's business with the public's funds is conducive to Californian's direct participation in matters of government, locally as well as on the State level.

The practice of "star chamber" and "secret sessions" is virtually eliminated by California's antisecrecy bill authored by State Assemblyman Ralph M. Brown of Stanislaus County. Assemblyman Brown's bill, giving the press and the public access to the activities of publicly elected officials and groups, is the subject of a recent award of merit presented him by the California Newspapers Publishers Association, Inc.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the text of the CNPA's resolution and its tribute to Mr. Brown:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the people's right to know is an essential part of their democratic freedom, and

Whereas the Nation's press is an agent of the people in this right to know: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the California Newspaper Publishers Association, Inc., assembled in annual convention this 8th day of February 1958, at Coronado, Calif.:

1. That the legislature, particularly Assemblyman Ralph Brown, and the Governor of the State of California be commended for their action in enlarging this right to know by the passage and approval of necessary legislation to keep open the workings of State and local governments; and

2. That the national administration and the Congress be urged to extend this right to know to all segments of government save where the national security precludes the revelation of military information, and we commend Congressman JOHN MOSS of California, for his determined efforts on behalf of freedom of information; and

3. That the free exchange of newsmen be encouraged by the National Administration between this Nation and all nations of the world except where a state of war exists between the United States of America and any nation, so that the people have full access to the information necessary for sound decisions; and

4. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Governor of the State of California, the president of the senate of the State of California, the speaker of the assembly, the California congressional delegation, and to Congressman JOHN MOSS and Assemblyman Ralph Brown.

Fair-Trade Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, since there is every likelihood that advocates of a Federal fair trade law will be in full cry shortly, and certainly by the time a new Congress convenes, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues some very pertinent remarks on the subject by Robert A. Bicks of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

The Department's official views, of course, will be contained in the hearings published by both House and Senate committees. However, Mr. Bicks' statement is so cogent, goes so straightly to the heart of the matter that I especially want to commend it to your attention. Excerpts from his statement follow:

Thus, fair trade—urged by some as a benefit to the small independent retailers—in fact facilitates the very discount-house competition of which some small independent retailers now complain. On the other hand, apart from discount-house operations, large mass retailers—for example Sears Roebuck and Macy's—may perhaps use fair trade as an umbrella to preserve from competition their own private brands which smaller retailers cannot afford. Thus, even apart from the discount houses, in the mass retailing field, fair trade, again, may thwart rather than aid small independent retailers' ability to compete * * * fair-trade prices

may afford such wide profit margins as to invite the discount operation's slash.

* * * * *

More difficult to gage is the impact of fair trade on small retailers' ability to compete with mass department store vendors, like Macy's and Gimble's, and large mail-order sellers, like Sears Roebuck and Montgomery Ward. The discount house, as we have seen, prospers by selling nationally branded items with only more or less careful observation of fair-trade restrictions. The large department store or mail-order house, in contrast, avoids fair-trade prices largely through resort to private brands.

We have insufficient data available to sketch the precise significance of this private brand phenomenon. We attempted to get such information by request from some of the companies above. Unfortunately, we have not proven successful. Accordingly, I can present little significant new data for your consideration here.

I can, however, suggest a possibly profitable path for this subcommittee's inquiry. Thus, large department stores or mail-order houses may well encourage manufacturers to fair-trade national brand items—the only items which the small retailers can secure. At the same time, such mass sellers may market their own private brands—substantially identical to nationally branded goods—at prices lower than fair-trade markups for the nationally branded counterparts. The result could be to enable large retailers, by hampering their smaller competitors' ability to cut prices, to hold an umbrella over the market for their own private branded items. In closing, I take the liberty of suggesting that this question might well be an area ripe for this subcommittee's inquiry.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in adding my voice in support of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, I do so with full knowledge of the importance of this legislation.

The purpose of this bill, H. R. 13247, is to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school. It is designed to accomplish these objectives by, first, establishing a limited program of Federal scholarships; second, establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education; third, providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools; fourth, establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of languages; fifth, assisting in the expansion of graduate education; sixth, assisting in the improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs; seventh, providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes; and, eighth, improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

The bill contains all of the corresponding proposals recommended in 1958 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, plus two others, the loan program and the provision for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes.

America is confronted with a serious and continuing challenge in many fields. The challenge—in science, industry, government, military strength, international relations—stems from the forces of totalitarianism. This challenge, as well as our own goal of enlargement of life for each individual, requires the fullest possible development of the talents of our young people. American education, therefore, bears a grave responsibility in our times.

It is no exaggeration to say that America's progress in many fields of endeavor in the years ahead—in fact, the very survival of our free country—may depend in large part upon the education we provide for our young people now.

The primary responsibility for education, in the future as in the past, should remain with the States and local communities and higher educational institutions. The Nation looks primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, to school boards and city councils and State legislatures, to teachers and school administrators, and to the trustees and faculties of our colleges and universities to develop the support and the educational effectiveness needed to bring our educational system more abreast of today's needs.

In an effort which is so critical to the national interest and to national security, however, the Federal Government can and should play a constructive role. This role should be one of encouragement and assistance to the States and communities and higher educational institutions as they strive to meet certain critical national needs.

There is ample precedent for such action. For example, as early as 1862, the Federal Government acted to meet a national need in education by providing aid to land-grant colleges. During World War I, Congress recognized a great national need for more agricultural and mechanical training by enacting the vocational education program. With Federal support and encouragement, the States and communities greatly strengthend their own educational activities in these fields. This program over the years has contributed greatly to individual opportunity and to national strength.

In much the same way, H. R. 13247 is designed to help our educational system meet the grave challenge of our time. Although the bill embraces a variety of approaches, its central purpose is to encourage improvement in the quality of education particularly with respect to those aspects which are most important now to national defense.

A number of provisions in the bill are aimed specifically at reducing the waste of needed talent which results when students with great potential ability drop out of school or college too soon. Several other provisions are designed to encourage an improvement and expansion in the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Another provision recognizes the need for more college teachers to prepare future scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields.

It is exceedingly important to maintain a balanced program of instruction in all fields. The committee does not desire that one field of training be developed at the expense of another. It is evident, however, that many of our elementary and secondary schools today are not providing instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages of sufficient quality or quantity to meet today's increasing needs in these fields. Serious shortages of equipment in all three fields exist. H. R. 13247 provides financial assistance to State for use by local school systems in improving equipment and materials in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, both in quality and in quantity. Grants also are provided to assist State departments of education in expanding their professional services to local schools in these subjects. In addition to grants to the States, the legislation authorizes the establishment of institutes for teachers to improve the quality of instruction of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools, the secondary schools, and the colleges and universities. Language institutes and area study centers would also be established to provide training in the so-called "rare" languages, many of which are not now taught in the United States, but which are spoken by many millions of people and are essential to the conduct of our economic, cultural, and political relations with other peoples. Grants for basic research in improved instruction and newer methods and materials in the teaching of modern foreign languages are also provided.

In the development of this legislation we have sought to preserve the fundamental principle that education in our country is a State and local responsibility. States and institutions of higher education retain basic responsibility for planning and administering the programs authorized in the bill.

The estimated cost of the bill is approximately $840 million for the basic 4-year period, and an additional $230 million during the next 3 years as the program is phased out on an unusually reduced level.

We believe this is a modest amount when measured against the need and the benefits we can derive from the enactment of this legislation.

In conclusion, I want to pay my respects to Congressman ELLIOTT for his untiring efforts in behalf of this legislation.

His work, in and out of committee, has been a contributing and determining factor in bringing this bill to the floor.

He was ably assisted by others too numerous to mention; however, their work was needed to finish the project headed

by Mr. ELLIOTT, the chairman of the subcommittee.

This is a start, not everything we hoped for, but a start on the road of educational opportunity for our children with the ability but lacking the funds to pursue their education without help.

Let us get it started and then add as we go.

Statement by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement by the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York, former Postmaster General of the United States:

An American election is something more than a political contest. From the earliest days of this Republic, the American people have elevated important campaigns into national ceremonies, which are occasionally great theater, and seldom lacking in high entertainment value. The torchlight parade, the bunting, the posters, the village bandstand and long-winded orators are part of our historic folklore. But this is the dynamic age of raido, television, and daily five-edition newspapers. However much we may have loved the old standbys, and none loved them more than I, we must take notice of a changing world. Television has eliminated the professional spontaneous demonstrations from conventions, just as modern communications have made ridiculous the spurious draft to public office. Much as all of us liked and enjoyed these delightful old customs, they are gone. But tens of millions of past generations enjoyed the hoary, hackneyed plot; the rehearsed enthusiasm for the shy candidate, his initial withdrawal, the ardent pursuit, the coy consent to listen to the passionate plea of the desperate professional partisans, the troubled candidate's withdrawal to the mountaintop to wrestle with himself, the anguished wait, the breathless suspense, the candidate's final mock-reluctant acceptance, the wild exaltation of the carefully assembled claque that the country is saved, must ever remain one of the most cherished folk-operas of times past. In the days when this was in vogue it was a surefire cliffhanger, a real-life soap opera. But, unfortunately, history repeats itself only as a farce.

It would be a pity to drag out this time-honored though time-worn comic opera and tag it on a fine young mayor like Robert Wagner. As one who has witnessed various presentations of this show, it is my considered opinion that it has its hallowed and nostalgic place along with Weber and Fields

But this is the sixth decade of the 20th century and the solution is in facing facts, not in a search of a theatrical warehouse. Mayor Wagner is enough of a star in his own right to deserve better props and better material. Further, if I may speak as one with some professional experience in these matters, it seems to me downright amateurish to take a very able young mayor and cast him as the juvenile lead in the most transparently absurd production since Charlie's Aunt. Nor can I easily imagine as seasoned and distinguished a leader as Carmine De Sapio accepting a buffoonish role.

Since Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's classic refusal, over 90 years ago, anyone in politics knows full well that no draft is possible unless the recipient has given his previous approval. I doubt very much whether Mayor Wagner has ever seen this preposterous script, much less accepted the part. I am certain that he will disdain any clumsy device whereby a few well-intentioned zealots will importune him to break a solemn promise extended by him and accepted by the people of New York City in the last campaign.

I have just returned from several up-State New York tours, where I was afforded a good old Democratic reception by good old Democratic friends. They tell me that if there is an open convention I will be nominated With their usual good humor and good sense they urged me not to be asleep at the switch. One gave me a hearty laugh by suggesting that I might be side tracked via the Union Pacific but I told him that that would be both unfair and unwise, and our Governor is neither.

With the Buffalo convention only 3 short weeks away, it is not improbable that my opponents will prevail upon some prominent and innocent citizen, as yet in the wings, to come forth as their pinch-hitter. I am not naive enough to believe where will not be a last desperate effort to prevent my nomination, a nomination which I know is the wish of the thousands and thousands of New York Democratic men and women who feel I am entitled to it.

Accordingly, it looks to me as if one of those healthy old-fashioned intra-Democratic Party battles is developing, the kind which caused Will Rogers to jovially remark that a Democrat always reserves his best shillelagh for another Democrat. My position, of course, is clear; I most certainly want to be the second Senator from New York and I, even more certainly, am not going to be the first American Irishman who ran away from a fight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a most illuminating report on resale price maintenance was made several years ago by the Canadian Committee To Study Combines Legislation. In its report to the Honorable Stuart G. Garcon, P. C., Q. C., Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, dated March 8, 1952, the committee expressed opposition to the establishment by law or private agreement of minimum resale price maintenance because such agreements place a real and undesirable restriction on competition and have a general tendency to discourage economic efficiency.

That is why—

The committee stated—

the prescription and the enforcement of minimum resale price maintenance must be viewed as manifestations of a restrictive or monopolistic practice which does not promote general welfare.

In view of the bill, H. R. 10527, now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to establish fair trade on a national basis, I should like to bring this report of the Committee To Study Combines Legislation to the attention of Members of Congress. The general conclusions and recommendations of this committee are reproduced below:

GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee has studied resale price maintenance in the light of the two standards of judgment originally set up, namely, the desirability of a free economy and the need for economic efficiency. This study has led the committee to the general conclusion that resale price maintenance, on the growing scale now practiced, is not justified by either of these standards. It represents a real and undesirable restriction on competition by private agreement or "law" and its general tendency is to discourage economic efficiency. That is why, in our opinion, the prescription and the enforcement of minimum resale prices must be viewed as manifestations of a restrictive or monopolistic practice which does not promote general welfare.

The committee, therefore, recommends that it should be made an offense for a manufacturer or other supplier:

1. To recommend or prescribe minimum resale prices for his products;

2. To refuse to sell, to withdraw a franchise or to take any other form of action as a means of enforcing minimum resale prices.

It is to be noted that the committee does not recommend that it be made an offense to prescribe and enforce resale prices which are not minimum. It follows that suppliers would be free to suggest and enforce maximum resale prices. It should not be overlooked that the fixing of a specific resale price unavoidably involves the fixing of a minimum price. It is useful to compare these recommendations with the British proposal which reads as follows:

"The Government proposes to provide in the legislation to be introduced that manufacturers shall be entitled to indicate, recommend, or prescribe only maximum prices for the resale of their goods and it will be unlawful to give any indication of resale price unless it is clearly stated that the price indicated is a maximum."[1]

As can be readily seen, the committee's recommendations do not go as far as the British proposal. While in the legislation which is contemplated in the United Kingdom the manufacturer will not be entitled to mention any price, unless it is clearly indicated that it is a maximum, it would still be possible, in the framework of our proposals, to indicate a maximum or other price and to issue price lists, provided that it is made clear that the price mentioned is not recommended or prescribed by the manufacturer as a minimum.

The committee is not prepared to recommend action so drastic that it would interfere with established practices of issuing list prices. It is of the opinion that it will be sufficient to prohibit the recommendation, prescription, or enforcement of minimum resale prices. If all list prices were to be made enforced maximum prices, we think it not improbable that the result would be merely higher list prices.

As to the "loss-leader" device, the committee believes that it is a monopolistic practice which does not promote general welfare and therefore considers that it is not compatible with the public interest. However, we do not believe that it presents any immediate danger: extreme forms of price cutting are not very likely in this period of inflation and relative scarcity. Moreover, we are convinced that there can be found other effective and more desirable methods of controlling the "loss-leader" than minimum

[1] Board of Trade, A Statement on Resale Price Maintenance, June 1951, p. 11.

resale price maintenance. Present circumstances afford time to make a careful study of such methods and the committee, therefore, does not think it imperative to make an immediate and hasty recommendation regarding that practice.

The Civil Rights Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, last month I submitted a statement to the House Judiciary Committee pointing up the urgent need for a civil rights bill to protect the constitutional rights of all persons. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include my statement in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAIR ENGLE, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1958, JULY 11, 1958

Last year I was privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives when it passed the first meaningful civil rights bill in 82 years. Those of us who stood our ground for a vigorous civil rights measure were proud of the bill that left our Chamber. But in the legislative process that followed we were disheartened to see a vital section torn from the bill, leaving a gaping hole in the measure as it went to the White House.

Nevertheless, we felt a distinct sense of accomplishment. After many years of flagrant violation of the 15th amendment to the Constitution we now had on our statutes books concrete recognition that the Federal Government has a direct responsibility in protecting the voting rights of every citizen whatever his creed, his race, or his color. Supporters of the original bill were therefore not discouraged. They proceeded to pick up the pieces and to set their sights on a restoration of the discarded section of the bill to enforce the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws.

The enactment of the 1957 civil rights law recalled another more dramatic event that took place in 1954. It was in that year that the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its explosive decision declaring that under our Constitution all schoolchildren, regardless of origin, color, or religion, are unequivocally guaranteed equal protection under the law. After 80 long years it was an historic moment.

The 1954 decision broke the logjam. The fight for civil rights took on new momentum—and in 1957 the first civil rights law of any consequence in more than 82 years became a reality.

We have had 4 years to take stock since the Supreme Court's decision, and 1 year to judge the adequacy of the 1957 civil rights law. The findings are a discredit to us as a nation and as a world power.

We find that there has been a shameful flouting of the mandate of the Supreme Court.

We find that some States are making subtle and not so subtle efforts to pass ordinances to render ineffective the law of the land.

We find that in many areas aggrieved individuals who attempt to assert their constitutional rights are blocked by a solid wall of intimidation and repression. We find that many ways are being found to silence the friends and supporters of desegregation. Teachers and other public servants who speak up for equal rights for Negroes suddenly find themselves without jobs. Organization, such as the NAACP, who challenge proclaimed State policy are facing an almost impossible task as their limited resources attempt to buck massive-resistance tactics.

And so we find that 4 years after the Court's decision there remain more than 2,100 segregated school districts in 17 Southern and border States. In those 17 States more than 10 million American schoolchildren, 7½ million whites and 2½ million Negroes, plus the uncounted children in de facto segregated situations in the North and Southwest, are today denied the equal protection of the laws by being denied the opportunity to attend desegregated public schools. Here we have 10 million schoolchildren being taught according to the ways of segregation and discrimination in a land where segregation and discrimination are unlawful.

The moral victory won in 1954 has taken on a hollow ring that can be heard in the far reaches of Asia and Africa.

We have failed in the Halls of Congress and in the corridors of the executive branch. Congress failed in 1957 when it blocked out of the civil-rights bill the section that would have unmistakably committed the Federal Government to enforce the constitutional rights of all persons to equal protection of the laws. The President and the executive failed miserably in showing no leadership, in equivocating when a firm stand was called for at the first flaunting of the Federal mandate.

I am not overlooking the positive side of the picture. I am aware of the fact that desegregation has begun for over 2 million white children and 400,000 Negro children who in 1952 attended segregated schools. But I cannot overlook the deplorable fact that the overall program of desegregation in our public schools has failed to move forward as rapidly as it should.

The 14th amendment to our Constitution states that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." In too many areas of this country neither the letter nor the spirit of that decree has been observed. The Supreme Court in 1954 made a valiant attempt to underscore and reinforce that mandate to protect the rights of the schoolchildren of the Nation. Regrettably this was not enough. That is why it is imperative that we have a law that puts the full weight, the full force and power of the legislative and the executive branches of the Federal Government behind that judicial decision.

I believe wholeheartedly that the Celler-Douglas bill entitled "The Civil Rights Act of 1958" answers that purpose. This bill in no uncertain terms commits the Federal Government to the moral and legal responsibility for implementing and enforcing the constitutional guaranty of equal protection of the laws. The most important objective of the measure is to make clear that the Federal Government accepts the leadership and the responsibility in the area of school desegregation. But the bill is not limited to school desegregation. It contains the legal power and remedy to bring suits to guarantee the equal protection of the laws to every American denied his rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Celler-Douglas bill is a masterly piece of work in combining the ideals of civil rights with a practical plan for bridging the gap between prejudice and enlightenment. It improves on the discarded part III of last year's bill by laying out a working program to guide school districts in the desegregation process. It draws heavily on the know-how and resources of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by authorizing that Department to work hand in hand with the school districts in providing services of specialists, in appointing advisory councils, in giving the kind of technical assistance not available to the communities. In addition, it authorizes the Department to make grants for school facilities, for additional teachers and specialists, and for training courses. In short, the major emphasis in the bill is on assistance and cooperation.

But the proposed legislation has by no means overlooked the need for legal power and enforcement authority where the helping hand of the Federal Government fails, and it clearly and plainly empowers the Department of Justice to step in and enforce the law when a school district refuses to yield.

Moreover, the bill goes beyond this basic legal power and authority. It embodies additional provisions that reflect the wisdom and experience of realistic men. While the measure strongly reaffirms the principle that all men are created equal, it does not fail to recognize the hard cold facts of life. It recognizes that persons deprived of their civil rights are usually in no position either economically or socially to institute and pursue court actions to enforce those rights. The bill recognizes that high sounding legal rights are not worth a tinker's dam if left entirely in the hands of impoverished, intimidated, unsophisticated persons. And so the legislation does not settle for a restatement of man's inalienable rights or for general enforcement powers of the Justice Department. It gives the Attorney General the authority to step in and start civil court actions for aggrieved persons who are unable themselves to seek legal protection. We would all like to believe that the principle "equal justice under law" is not an empty platitude. But even the most naive of us know that in the absence of a sharp instrument to defend the rights of the underprivileged it is a meaningless phrase. No one penetrated the irony of those words better than Anatole France when he said: "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

The Celler-Douglas bill will bring order to the disarray in our legal house. It will return to our Negro schoolchildren their right to human dignity. It will bring peace of mind to their parents. And it will, moreover, stop the growing false sense of superiority which segregated public schools nurture in our white schoolchildren.

There is, I'm afraid, some danger that the domestic issue of civil rights may pale against the more dramatic backdrop of events abroad. I hope that the Members of Congress will keep in mind that this is not entirely a domestic issue, and that it may soon be too late to reaffirm in a civil rights law at home the principles that we project in our foreign relations. Now is the time to shorten the gap between our pretensions and our performances in the field of civil rights if we are to maintain the confidence of the peoples of the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa. We will be guilty of grave dereliction if we default this year on a bill urgently needed to buttress our legal stand on school segregation. Without a strong unequivocal measure we will find ourselves buried in a landslide of Little Rocks. And, more important, we will find that we have lost the precious ground gained in the painfully slow march toward the ultimate in equality and justice for all.

Social Security Amendments of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important unfinished business before this Congress is final action on the social security amendments approved by the House. Although the bill did not go as far as I had hoped it would in increasing the amount of benefits, and in other respects, I voted for it because I realize that it was a compromise measure and it seems of the utmost urgency to me that some change be made in this regard before the Congress adjourns.

Briefly, the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee and passed by the House without amendment under a closed rule, would:

First. Increase benefit amounts across the board by 7 percent to bring them in line with increases in the cost of living which have occurred since the last increase in 1954.

Second. Raise the wage base, which serves as a basis for benefit amounts and for taxes from $4,200 to $4,800 to bring it more nearly in line with the increase in wages which has occurred in the past 10 years.

Third. Strengthen the program of benefits for permanently and totally disabled men and women, which was established in the 1956 amendments, by (a) making benefits available not only to the disabled worker aged 50 or over but to his dependents as well, in the same ways that the dependents of a retired worker are not eligible for benefits; (b) removing the eligibility requirement that now denies these benefits to a worker who could not work in covered employment during the last year or two before his impairment became total, so that people with a progressive illness can qualify, and (c) eliminating the provision which now cancels or reduces the amount of the disability benefit by the amount of benefits received under other Federal programs or State workmen's compensation programs.

Fourth. Liberalize the retirement test, which cancels benefits on the basis of earnings, so that retired workers can earn $100 or less—now $80 or less—in a month without loss of benefits.

The bill further recognizes the special health problems which face retired men and women by requesting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to conduct a study including the study of a proposal by a number of Members of Congress that the cost of hospital and nursing home care, up to 180 days a year for people otherwise eligible, be covered by social security. The committee expressed its concern over the fact that the costs of needed hospital and nursing home services is out of the reach of many older people and asked that this proposal, as well as a number of other alternatives, receive careful review so that Congress would be in a better position to decide what legislative measure, if any, should be taken to meet this problem.

I am very much concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the situation of our older men and women on social security because I know very well that each upward step in the cost of living during the past 2 years has, in effect, taken nickels and dimes out of their pockets. We must, also, I believe, be especially aware of the fact that social security checks are a major source of income for the majority of our older people—checks which now average just $65 per month for a retired worker. This fact is attested by a survey last December, conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which showed that 60 percent of the married couples on the rolls had only $1,200 or less of outside income in addition to their social security.

I am looking forward to final action by the Congress, on this measure, now pending in the Senate, at an early date. The security and well-being of some 12 million Americans today—and of most of us tomorrow—depends upon congressional action to keep our social security system in line with our economic system.

The Civil-Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Monroe Sweetland and published in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review:

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review of July 31, 1958]

"MYSELF, I'M NOT PREJUDICED, BUT MY CUSTOMERS—"

Last week several hundred Masons from the Western States, Alaska, and Hawaii, gathered in Portland for the annual convention of Prince Hall Rite of the Masonic order. They met all week at the Masonic Temple, stayed at all the downtown hotels, spent their good money at the downtown cafes and shopped the stores. They delighted in tours to our scenic spots, admired Oregon's beautiful homes, and sang the praises of the hospitality of the City of Roses.

In short, they were received as we like to think we receive all visitors, and they expressed the appreciation we all like to hear.

Why do we even bother to comment on this, when it happens almost every week with some big convention or other?

Well, we mention it because the Prince Hall Masons are Negroes.

Just 20 year ago the Portland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of which Milwaukie's gentlewoman, the late Annie Ross Roberts, was a principal patron, was organizing the fight for equal accommodations in Oregon's public places. A convention like this would have been impossible in 1938. Portland hotels and restaurants frequently refused service to nonwhites, and usually rejected Negroes for service.

When the civil-rights bill was defeated in the 1939 legislature at Salem, the refrain of the innkeepers was always "Myself, I'm not prejudiced, but my customers won't stand for it." The same pious buckpassing was heard from most restauranteurs, motel operators and even hospitals.

Many factors have been at work, notably in the churches, the schools, and labor organizations. By the time civil rights and fair employment practices laws were passed following World War II, the battle for equal rights was won. Only isolated cases have arisen under the acts. Housing remains the principal vestige of bigotry and discrimination, and even there the restrictions of only a generation ago against the foreign born, persons of Oriental or Indian descent, or even against some religious minorities, have gone. Only Negroes still face major housing problems, but that battle is rapidly being won, too.

Nearly a thousand Negroes convened in Portland last week without a ripple of trouble. They were a more orderly, sobrietous group, to be sure, than many veteran and fraternal pow-wows have been. But the big fact is that the dire forebodings of the alarmists of 20 years ago were completely refuted by this and many day-to-day experiences as we work, live, and play together in Oregon.

News Article States That Steel Price Boost Keeps Inflation Rolling Along

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a special article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for August 2, 1958, by William H. Stringer, chief of the Washton news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor:

STEEL PRICE BOOST KEEPS INFLATION SPIRAL ROLLING ALONG

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—The steel companies have increased their prices after all—not as much as in some years—but enough to boost the price of steel in the average automobile by something like $10.

Although a $10 price additive is going to deter few persons from buying a $2,500 automobile, still a bill for an extra million dollars for steel is not going to help a company like Chrysler, already facing a deficit in 1958. Nor will the steel boost fail to show itself, gradually and inevitably, in the cost-of-living index, as steel users, ranging from appliance manufacturers to bobbypin makers, pass along the higher price.

In short, the long-range problem, that annual, persistent wage-price inflation, is still with us, unresolved.

Congressional concern, pleas from the White House for industrial statesmanship, and a brighter public spotlight on the wage-price spiral—all helped to hold the steel increase to $4.50 a ton.

The price decision took account of many factors: On July 1 steel wages went up 13 to 20 cents an hour, due to the steelworkers' 3-year contract. Steel corporation profits have been falling, in some instances, due to reduced capacity. With the recession tapering off, prospects for new orders are hopeful.

price boost or no price boost. With Congress adjourning soon, punitive legislation is unlikely this yeaf. And with the White House having its hands full of Lebanon and summit preparations, it is unlikely that anybody is going to be summoned to Washington and be asked to retract the price increases.

There is also the disinclination of the steel companies to meddle with their union wage contract, at a time when the steelworkers are having their own presidential crisis, with David J. McDonald, steel union president, apparently on the way out.

These reasons are all interesting; some are impressive. Steel officials are not totally oblivious to the problem. One steel official recently said: "I am concerned, but I don't know of any practical remedy."

In tackling the problem the United States now does have some accumulated data.

We know, for instance, that in a moderately serious recession like that of 1957–58, prices do not drop. It takes a riproaring depression to force powerfully based corporations—steel, automobiles, oil, for instance—to capitulate on the price front, or to persuade labor unions to forgo their anual round of wage increases.

We know, also, that Western Europe recently has been reducing steel prices, to gain larger volume. And while it is strange to have the economics minister of a formerly cartelized nation lecturing the United States, still it is significant that West Germany's Ludwig Erhard, after a tour here recently, observed: "The one alarming symptom I have observed in the American economy is the decline in production coinciding with a rise in prices. * * * It is against the spirit of free enterprise to raise prices in an attempt to maintain profits at a certain standard, regardless of production and sales."

We know also that the Henry Ford philosophy—expand your market and create new job opportunities by constantly reducing the price of the product—has been heavily modified, in steel, autos, oil, and now perhaps in aluminum.

And we know that a novel definition of "competition" has developed—when all the big producers boost prices by precisely identical amounts in precisely the same week. The explanation of Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, that "a price that matches another price is a competitive price" sounds fine when prices are falling, but not when they are rising. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, comments that it is as though Macy's in New York proclaimed: "Our prices are always exactly as high as Gimbels."

What should be done? Senator KEFAUVER wants to explore the antitrust angle. Others question whether some companies (notably in the auto field) have not become big beyond any requirements of efficiency. Industrial statesmanship—price restraint, wage restraint—can help a lot. More explanation of all the ramifications—a larger public understanding of all the pros and cons—is in order.

The fundamental fact is that this recession didn't cure the wage-price spiral. It's ready to roll again.

Albert Graichen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, a truly great American died Thursday, July 31, 1958, in a small, friendly cooperative hospital situated at Wild Rose, Wis. He died of old age—87—they say. Yes, when the body refuses to perform its natural functions, the soul, beckoned by the Angel of Death, like a frightened bird, takes wing. In this instance, we who knew him say he earned his heavenly fare. "By their works shall ye know them, by their deeds shall ye judge them."

Every one loved Albert, especially the waifs at the American Boys Camp at Coloma, Wis., sponsored by the Legionnaires of Illinois and their friends. He came from a distinguished family of artisans in the Coloma area.

He was born on December 1, 1871, in Chicago's downtown loop, of humble parentage; and, at the age of 1, his family moved to Marshfield, Wis., to live on a farm. His father was more woodsman than farmer and, after several changes to other farms, settled in the Coloma area. Farming lands in these sections had been worked out due to the impoverishment of the soil. This resulted from the constant year after year planting of the potato crops, without enriching the soil by fertilizing it—or rotating other plantings—to restore its productivity.

And so during this recession period, Albert and his dad went to the lumber camps for work. Thus, at an early age—7—Albert went out into the world of logging, with his dad, as a water boy. The sharp ax edge taught him to respect rough men. The vibrant singing, methodical unison of solid blows told the story of power and teamwork. The silence of the forest influenced his watchfulness and alertness to sudden danger.

In a melting sun, water was important to the workmen and always in demand. Albert was always ready and anxious to please. And so he spilled very little; the hike to the stream was nigh on to a mile, he kept it fresh. So the men never cursed at him. He did this simple and important chore well, and his dad was proud of his ever-happy and smiling son. The boss, as well as the men, liked him and gave him coins. He learned what it meant to please others, no matter what type of men they were.

It was not long before he became a "kitchen slave" and did odd jobs for the cook as well as for the crew.

And so from camp to camp Albert put in his apprenticeship, working and learning with the tools of his trade. He became a lumberjack.

His dad was a versatile man and taught him many things, too. Strangely, all sorts of knowledge had to be learned and applied in far away places, far from cities and farms. Dad studied books on medical subjects, and administered to the men in case of illness, even performing operative surgery in critical cases, such as amputations, professional men being inaccessible and hundreds of miles away. Albert acted as his surgical nurse and worked with him, becoming very proficient in the use of medicine and performing minor surgery.

At a time when most young men were seeking pleasures, caresses and love, Albert was facing the cold realities of life's experience in the world of pioneers, back in the wildernesses of northern Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and southern Minnesota.

And so he wandered about, wherever men were needed—even as far west as Spokane, Wash., where he worked on a gigantic building project. He soon became carpenter-foreman, and became an apt student in reading blueprints, structural engineering plans, and concrete specifications and studies related to the building trades. It can be truly said that even without a technical education he was, at 35, thoroughly schooled in experience to handle the entire job involving all the trades, as a general foreman.

In his middle thirties, getting work was difficult—1907 panic—and returning to the central western Wisconsin area, there was little work to be had, outside of several building jobs as foreman, in Milwaukee and Wisconsin Rapids.

Upon returning to Coloma, Wis., he married a genteel and gifted lady, a schoolteacher, Miss Elizabeth, who bore him 1 son and 3 daughters, all wonderful children. They were a closely endeared and loyal family.

His building activities in this area are well known. His great knowledge of lumber and building materials made him a valuable consultant. His freehand drawn plans, platted and squared on rough, meat-wrapping paper, measured to scale, were perfection itself. The State of Wisconsin approved these architectural plans, as they were drawn, without question. His ability carried respect. He had been recognized for his honest and efficient work by the State officials. The law, under the "grandfather clause," Albert, having registered plans before the State Assembly had passed the Architectural Supervisory Act, or the University of Wisconsin had established a School of Architecture, was listed under this classification.

Derrill Follette, the banker, an old pioneer from England, who settled in the Coloma area in the early 19th midcentury, recognized his great ability and talent, and with great confidence in his loyalty and honesty, placed him in charge of the Coloma Lumber Co., formerly owned by other interests, where he remained for over 30 years.

Albert trained many men on the job in the trades of carpentry, concrete and steel work, to say naught of the short cuts and secrets known only to the clever artisan. All the Graichens are master craftsmen, and Albert was their mentor.

Mr. Frank Calugi, a Chicago political worker and court bailiff, an old friend, who not only arranged for the camp purchase, but has been very charitable in many ways, both financially and by donating building materials to the camp, introduced me to Albert and his brother Gust on a matter of business in the latter part of 1937, relating to having purchased from the United States Government a 180-acre tract, with a private lake and farm buildings, 2½ miles from the city of Coloma, Wis., to be used as a boys' and girls' camp for indigent children.

My intimate association with this great man has extended for a period of 22 years.

The building of the camp started in 1937. Albert selected the highest knoll, overlooking the little lake, and broke ground. The excavation was started with an old drag shovel, purchased by him for $5, which he repaired to render it serviceable. Two horses drew it across the land marked for the foundation of the big lodge, 50 by 80 feet, and about 50 feet at its peak—English-type basement, windows at ground level; 2 stories and a first floor with 2 rooms in front for the director, and 2 rooms in back for examination and first-aid rooms; also, a large hall for sessions and lectures. The second floor has a beautiful balcony effect, with room for 50 double-deckers for sleeping quarters. The foundations and stone fronts were built of hewn stones of different colors a beautiful sight, with its high peaked roof reaching to the heavens. Later, he added 2 gigantic fireplaces—15 feet long, one in the basement and the other in the first-floor hall.

The first load of lumber—5,000 feet—arrived at the camp on New Year's Eve. We had started—it was tough—with no money, but we had credit; people believed in the plan and went along. It was nip and tuck all the way. He kept the payroll and ran the show. I hustled the money, and the Lord helped me time and again—something always happened just at the crisis of things. That was a rough winter, snow and ice—the stone men, Muskie, Albert, Strunke, Gust, and Krueger, worked with leather gloves, and Albert ordered fires around the stone piles so that the men could handle them, in splitting them for the front facade.

One hundred thousand feet of lumber went into that building, not including the Indian-skinned trees, 2 feet in diameter, that rise majestically from the basement to the roof, with beautiful hand work of the supporting joists—smaller logs—spliced into their positions into the six horizontals, equally spaced, 3 to either side. Only a master with the axe could have so artistically fashioned them. He could control the cut of the axe to the inch. His men, Leach, Red Howard, August Krueger, John Deukis, Kenneth Woodworth, Emil Britske, August Conrad, Forrest Schmudloch, and his dad, followed his instructions with growing admiration with the years.

So building after building after building took its place in a beautiful setting—a hundred acres of pine and oak wood. He supervised the planting of 75,000 pines over the years, and replaced each one that was lost—so that, today, timber is growing, adding to the beauty and value of the camp. Perhaps in a lean year, it can be thinned out and sold to realize needed money for the camp's maintenance.

Albert used a witchhazel crook and located the water veins in the bowels of the earth. At the knoll I sat with him as he counted the bowings of the pointer below the crook, holding an end of the forked branch in each hand. It stopped at 73 feet—73 separate attractions downward. When the well was drilled, I paid for a 73 foot well. He also located the powerful veins in the same way, and we drilled and hit an over-abundance of water, both at the location we selected for the water plant and at the pool.

Whether with money or not, he said, "Even if you haven't full pay—show up—let the men see you. They are just as interested in the project for poor kids as you are." And so it went on, until today it is by far the finest and most modern camp in the United States.

It was Albert who made it possible—the men and the merchants needed the money that we owed—he prevented any trouble over it by giving all sorts of excuses, until at last each one received his long overdue portion. Albert's old saying. "No one ever was cheated and everyone always got paid," kept us going.

Today, after 11 years of the big camp program, over 6,000 youngsters, poor but proud, have been recipients of true happiness and fun because Albert Graichen persisted in building and completing the greatest monument dedicated to his memory—the work of a master and a great man with a blessed soul.

Under his plans, together with his brother Gust, there were constructed at the campsite, 10 cabins, 5 large huts with long ramps for the wheel chairs of crippled children, 2 large overnight huts for visitors, a large mess hall—seating capacity 500, twin chapels, 1 enormous steel warehouse, a miniature railroad 1 mile long—for the crippled and blind children, a bath and latrine steel building, a complete olympic regulation pool with a 3-story building, including shower rooms, dressing rooms, pump room, observation room and rest rooms, to accommodate the swimmers and waterfront supervisors.

And this simple God-fearing and kind-hearted man, who believed in humanity and loved children, spent 22 years of his life with us in the building program. The Legionnaires and women of the auxiliary of the State of Illinois knew him and loved him. He had an inventive mind and made iron parts—fantastic pulley and bar arrangements for lifting heavy objects—special locks and all sorts of mechanical contrivances. The building of the railroad necessitated the erection of stone bridges and level grading elevation approaches, and so forth, the twisting of rails and levels were perfect. The erection of the pumping station and the laying of extended pipeline feeds and mains to all the large buildings called for the knowledge of a master civil engineer. All in all, under his supervision, 30 buildings were completed. Only through his efforts was the work among the destitute and orphaned children successful. Only a man with natural creative genius could have accomplished so much in his chosen field of endeavor. He gave his superlative talents to the great cause which he loved to serve. He refused many offers of higher salary by men interested in erecting commercial buildings, saying, "I can't let the kiddies down." It is no wonder that the men and women of the Legion bowed their heads in prayer and humble reverence at his passing.

He was buried at Coloma, Saturday afternoon, August 2, in a little graveyard on a hill, where his antecedents rest. Elizabeth is there, too—they are together now, and their work is done. There, on this wind-swept hill, sleeps a great American, who in his deep humility learned the lessons of life the hard way. He did not complain, but carried on. In his simplicity he lived well—he thanked God for the chance to learn and master the things he liked to do. His importance might not be written by a distinguished panegyrist, or listed in the volumes with great men's names. But there is one tome on whose sacred pages every man seeks to be included. That is the Book of Judgment, and there on the paged index of service rendered to the helpless and abandoned children of his time will be written the name of Albert Graichen, sprinkled with the tears of Christ, not in sorrow but in the joy of a true servant of charity, the greatest of the virtues in man.

The kids, I know, will keep his memory alive and, with flowers on his grave, pay their humble respects each year. And the men who knew him best, his many pals who worked with him from the beginning—some from Chicago, volunters without pay, Frank Ralph and Bob DeLetto, Buck Tortoriello, Frank Mallerdino, Tony Girolomi, Tony Venezia, Ralph Madia, Telephone Farrell, and many others; as well as those from the camp area—Sheriff Frozene, Mr. Joe Macham, Flyte, Mr. Primo, and the Constable worked at odd times in emergencies, who, with the others braved the hard winters, and were imbued with his spirit of confidence that doing real charity was the job's reward.

George, Otto and Leonard at Fish Lake, will miss him—and Starshak, Pat Petrone, Dutch Von Bremer, Van Dyk, Clausen, Youngblood, Clamage, Brautigam, Bottigliero, Joe Sweeney, Viggiani, Ringley, Cusack, Monico, and myself, know, as do the others, that Joe Brown, Joe Madia and Joe Cronin—men who have gone before, are building another camp with the old skipper in the Promised Land.

Blessed is the man that is found without blemish, that hath not gone after gold, nor put his trust in money nor in treasures. Who is he, and we will praise him? For he hath done wonderful things in his life. Who hath been tried thereby, and made perfect, he shall have glory everlasting. Ecclesiasticus 31: 8–11.

The end at last, the end at last;
Your start may be fine, old friend,
But the world will finally judge you
By what you are at the end.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

President Eisenhower Calls on the Congress To Complete Action This Session on Legislation To Establish a National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives will report S. 3335, a bill providing for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed with funds raised by voluntary contributions, in time for the House to vote on it before this session ends. It is important that this bill be reported in the form in which it passed the Senate unanimously on June 20, 1958, for it would be disastrous if it were loaded down with crippling amendments.

The President has now given tremendous impetus to this drive for cultural facilities, and I include the text of his letter urging the Congress to complete action on this legislation during this session.

Included also are two editorials from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, and statements presented for the American Institute of Architects, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, and the Federal City Council by distinguished representatives of those respected and powerful organizations.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 1, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you with reference to legislation now pending before your committee which would authorize the establishment of a National Cultural Center here in Washington on a site made available by the Federal Government with funds raised by voluntary contributions.

There has long been a need for more adequate facilities in the Nation's capital for the presentation of the performing arts. An auditorium and other facilities such as are provided for in pending legislation, established and supported by contributions from the public, would be a center of which the entire Nation could be proud. I hope that the Congress will complete action on this legislation during this session.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of August 6, 1958]

WELCOME THIS OPPORTUNITY

We suppose that if a group of citizens came to Congress with the money in hand for construction of a National Cultural Center and offered to build it, provided the Government supplied an appropriate site, there would be no question concerning the acceptance of such a gift.

The question which seems to worry some members of the House Subcommittee on Public Works, which conducted a hearing yesterday on the legislation, is whether, if the Government supplies the site, the money to construct the center will be forthcoming from private sources.

We do not see why that question should be of any immediate concern. If the Senate-passed bill is approved by the House and becomes law, availability of the site will either produce the construction funds from private sources, or fail to produce it. If the money is not forthcoming, the Government will have lost nothing. It will still retain the site, and the site will be available for some other need.

In other words, the Government gambles nothing. It stands to lose nothing. But if the pending center legislation is approved, it stands to gain another permanent improvement for this American Capital which in time could rank in importance with the National Gallery of Art. The legislation, in short, provides an opportunity which, if declined, may not soon knock again.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of August 4, 1958]

ALL WIN, NOBODY LOSES

In expressing his hopes that Congress will complete action on legislation making possible construction of a great cultural center in Washington, President Eisenhower has spoken for many citizens, here and throughout the country. There have been attempts in the past to supply such facilities for the Capital. But we have never been so close to success as now; there has never been such an opportunity for Congress to do so little, and accomplish so much, as offered by the pending legislation.

In brief, the legislation, approved in the Senate without dissent, authorizes purchase from locally derived revenues of less than 2 acres of land. Added to Government-owned land already available, a site—now generally approved—would be provided for construction of an appropriate edifice for the performing arts. Money for such construction is anticipated from private sources. There are indications that it would be forthcoming. If not, the Government would have lost not a penny—for the land would be there for other uses.

Hundreds of thousands of American citizens this summer, in a record year of travel abroad, have been visting the capitals and other cities in foreign lands, almost all of which are supplied with splendid buildings for the performance of opera, orchestra concerts, ballet, and other artistic enterprises reflecting cultural attainment. The singular lack of such facilities in this Capital of the richest Nation on earth is a reproach, an indictment which should be wiped from the record.

We commend Representative JONES of Alabama, chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, for his willingness to hold hearings tomorrow and his own sympathy toward the project. We believe there will be evidence aplenty at the hearing in its support. The authorization sought represents so small an obligation by the Federal Government, leaving the success of the undertaking in the hands of private contributors, that there is everything to be gained and nothing to be lost.

House approval of this legislation would mean something for people everywhere, not merely those who live in Washington. It would represent a great forward step in completing the development of this Federal City, the city of all Americans.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of August 8, 1958]

CULTURAL CENTER PROGRESS

Seldom do Washingtonians and the many agencies which govern them in their local affairs find themselves in such happy and unanimous agreement on a project as that which appears to prevail on the proposed cultural center in Foggy Bottom. The Senate has approved legislation to designate a mostly federally owned tract for the projected theaters and to advance funds, to be repaid by the District, for the purchase of a small added area to round out the site. The plan is to obtain private subscription of money for construction; the enterprises themselves are to be self-supporting. Experience with similar ventures in other cities makes these plans considerably more solid than mere hope or aspiration.

Much will depend, of course, upon the caliber of the proposed Presidentially appointed Commission which would be in charge of fund raising and other aspects of the venture. There is a widespread feeling in the community that the members must be chosen with great care and drawn from the top ranks of philanthropists and art patrons here and elsewhere. The success of the National Gallery of Art, established under similar procedures and auspices, has been due of course to the outstanding sponsorship which it had from its inception.

Chairman ROBERT E. JONES, of the House Public Buildings Subcommittee, has performed a real national service in holding hearings on the measure despite the nearness of adjournment and in proposing to bring the bill up under suspension of rules in the House. This will mean a two-thirds vote will be needed for passage, but surely the House will not turn aside an enterprise so promising and one that places squarely and solely upon interested private citizens the responsibility for its success.

STATEMENT BY JOHN NOBLE RICHARDS, FAIA, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, ON THE FULBRIGHT-THOMPSON BILL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER BEFORE THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 5, 1958

My name is John Noble Richards. I am a practicing architect with offices at 1600

Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio. I am president of the American Institute of Architects and appear here today as its representative to urge prompt and favorable action on the Fulbright-Thompson bill to establish a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital.

The American Institute of Architects is the national organization of the architectural profession in the United States. Its 128 chapters and 11 State organizations are located in every State. With a membership of nearly 13,000 registered architects, the Institute represents the majority of practicing architects in the Nation.

We have followed closely the devoted efforts of Members of Congress and leading citizens who have worked unceasingly to make possible this much-needed facility for the proper presentation of opera, music and other performing arts in Washington. In May, 1957, Mrs. Eugene Meyer appeared at our Centennial Convention in Washington to outline the proposal for the cultural center then being advanced by the special commission of which she was chairman.

Great interest and support was expressed and the convention passed a resolution urging that a national competition be held to select the architect for this very important project. As a public service, The American Institute of Architects would gladly name a special architectural advisory committee to assist in the setting up of procedures for such a competition.

As the organization representing the Nation's architects we have long felt a deep responsibility for the Nation's Capital and have demonstrated this concern over the century of our existence. During the Centennial Convention a resolution was passed unanimously, reaffirming our members' deep conviction that the capital city is the heritage, not only of those who dwell in or about the District of Columbia, but the heritage of all the people of this country as well. We therefore fully support all proposals that will in any way enhance the city of Washington.

There is no question bu that the proposed Cultural Center would greatly benefit the capital city. More importantly it would serve as a symbol to all Americans, as well as to peoples overseas, of our Nation's interest in and support of cultural activities.

My distinguished predecessor, Leon Chatelain, Jr., of Washington, appeared before a congressional committee in February, 1957 to express the Institute's support at that time. He urged that the proposed Cultural Center be located in the Foggy Bottom area. We are gratified that an adequate site there can be made available provided Congress takes the appropriate action.

To take full advantage of the broad public enthusiasm that exists and the substantial financial support that has been pledged, we earnestly request your subcommittee to take favorable action at once in order that final approval of the Cultural Center may be given prior to adjournment.

STATEMENT ON A NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BY MISS CHLOE GIFFORD, PRESIDENT, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 5, 1958

I am Sally Butler, legislation consultant for the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has been interested in the cultural aspect of life in the United States ever since our organization was chartered by Congress in 1901.

In Article II of the constitution of the General Federation it states, "The object of the General Federation shall be to unite the women's clubs and like organizations throughout the world for the purpose of mutual benefit, and for the promotion of their common interest in education, philanthropy, public welfare, moral values, civics, and fine arts."

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has a department of fine arts with chairmen in every State. This interest in fine arts prompted the clubwomen of Michigan to raise funds to build the Fine Arts Building of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich., in 1948. To mention a few other States that have done outstanding work promoting fine arts—Illinois Federation has a summer art school, Kansas auditions and gives cash awards for outstanding performance in this field. Virginia actively participated in promoting the Art Mobile, of Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; General Federation of Women's Clubs sponsored a fine arts festival in Estes Park, Colo. The president of General Federation of Women's Clubs attends and participates in Chicagoland's music festival every autumn.

General Federation of Women's Clubs was recognized for its work in this field in 1955, when under the provisions of H. R. 1825, General Federation of Women's Clubs was named as one among the national organizations to be represented on the Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium.

In 1956 the General Federation of Women's Clubs passed the following resolution:

"FINE ARTS—CIVIC AUDITORIUM-INAUGURAL HALL OF PRESIDENTS, MUSIC, FINE ARTS, MASS COMMUNICATIONS CENTER (CONVENTION, 1956)

"Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs since its inception has been consistently interested in and worked for the development of the cultural life of the United States; has promoted the fine arts in all aspects; and has given encouragement and assistance to many artists; and

"Whereas a District of Columbia Auditorium Commission has been established to prepare plans to erect a civic auditorium including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a Music, Fine Arts, and Mass Communications Center: Therefore,

"Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs shall use its influence in the promotion of the plans for establishment of a civic auditorium in the District of Columbia, which would include an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a Music, Fine Arts, and Mass Communications Center in the national capital."

The General Federation of Women's Clubs certainly commends Congress for passing a bill which created this Commission and the people who have worked long and hard to bring about a cultural center in our National Capital which will portray the cultural aspect of American life.

We know the criticisms of those nations that belittle United States culture—we are sure your Members of Congress know all the arguments for and against the construction of a cultural center in Washington, D. C. We are sure you do appreciate, as we do, the generosity of those individuals who have and will help to raise the necessary funds.

We can assure you that the members of our organization will renew their efforts to help make this national cultural center a reality. The many States that have continued their efforts on a local basis will surely do everything possible to promote plans laid out by Congress to achieve this goal.

We, the women of General Federation of Women's Clubs, with clubs in every State, urge immediate action, so that the Cultural Center in our National Capital will become a reality. It will take time, but let us get started now.

STATEMENT OF MRS. T. DAVID GATES, PRESIDENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, WASHINGTON, D. C., TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1958

Mr. Chairman, this is a distinct privilege and pleasure to come before the committee to reaffirm the stand taken by the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs in regards to the Thompson-Fulbright bill for the Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital.

The Cultural Center is a means of guarding the heritage of this land of ours. To meet the demands of these crucial times how can we overlook or bypass a single opportunity to make us stronger to meet the onslaught of communism from within as well as from without.

Never before has the need been so strongly felt; never before has the very heart of American culture been challenged; never before has Congress had the opportunity to do so little and accomplish so much; never before has the need for exchange of culture of all nations been so evident; never again must we take our own American way of life, nor that of other nations for granted.

No nation is stronger than its local community, no home than each individual member, so we plead with you for the sake of the youth of our land, the future citizens of our country, to place within their reach the proper facilities of all the performing arts.

It is a mutual feeling, I am sure, and the sincere conviction of everyone under the sound of my voice and every Representative of all the States that through this medium of the fine arts one may speak to the infinite being.

True democracy cannot be maintained without a spiritual foundation; therefore, it is necessary that we search ourselves and not be found wanting.

The 11 million members of the National and International Federation of Women's Clubs is a force not to be taken lightly. There are 15,000 clubs in the United States—and over 3,000 members in the District of Columbia federation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as we pledge our support may we expect the same in return. Delay is dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving of your time to call this hearing.

STATEMENT BY FRANCIS G. ADDISON, JR., CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL, AT HEARINGS OF HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, AUGUST 1, 1958

Mr. Chairman and committee members, my name is Francis G. Addison, Jr. I am president and board chairman of Security Bank, and chairman of the Federal City Council. The council is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization of civic leaders dedicated to promoting the economic, social, and cultural growth of our Capital City. I am submitting a membership list for the use of this committee.

I am here this morning to urge that members of your committee assign a top priority to favorably reporting out S. 3335, in order that this bill can be enacted by Congress before adjournment of the current session.

This legislation, already approved by the Senate, would authorize creation of a National Cultural Center in Foggy Bottom, on a site bounded by New Hampshire Avenue, 26th Street, Rock Creek, and Potomac Parkway and approaches to the new Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge.

We believe that passage of this bill is an absolute must, in order that Washington City may finally acquire the cultural facilities commensurate with its position as Capital City of the free world.

S. 3335 represents the culmination of years of effort toward this goal. It has the unqualified support of every major civic or-

ganization in this city. Congress faces a high responsibility to assure its speedy enactment and thereby remove one of the major obstacles remaining to realization of this city's cultural heritage.

To delay the legislation at this point would be a severe blow to the entire cultural-center effort. It would mean that the legislation would have to be started all over again in the Senate next session. This, in turn, would cause the drive for a performing arts center to lose a great deal of its momentum.

I cannot believe that Congress would be so insensitive to the importance of our Capital City and its cultural needs as to allow this to happen.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that your committee will act immediately to report this bill out favorably, with the recommendation that it be approved by the full House at the earliest possible date.

Thank you.

Savings, the Secret of American Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Savings, the Secret of American Growth," delivered by Mr. Norman Strunk, executive vice president of the United States Savings & Loan League, before the Stanford business conference on July 21, 1958.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make approximately 3⅔ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $297. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVINGS, THE SECRET OF AMERICAN GROWTH

(An address by Norman Strunk, executive vice president of the United States Savings & Loan League, before the Stanford Business Conference, July 21, 1958)

All of you, I am sure, are familiar with the proverb, "Necessity is the mother of invention." I would like to refute the claim, at least so far as America is concerned, and attempt to demonstrate to you that abundance, rather than necessity, has been the mother of invention.

I do not pretend to be any more of a historian than any of you, but one does not need to have graduated as a history major from Standford University to know that throughout world history those people who have had to struggle because of their physical or economic environment merely to get enough food to eat and keep a roof over their heads have advanced slowly, if at all, in material and cultural things. It is only those people who have what economists term an "economic surplus" that have developed a culture, art, education, and a constantly rising standard of living.

As you know, most of the original advances of early civilizations took place in the lush river valleys of the ancient world. Egypt, for example, had a fruitful influence on the progress of the early civilizations and for thousands of years its agriculture and stock breeding enjoyed unmatched prosperity. The government of the Pharaohs maintained the fertility of the country by intelligent control of the Nile at its period of floods. Because of the abundance of their economy, they were able to save or conserve part of their energy and build dams, dikes and canals to control the river, to make use of its advantages and to justify the classification of Egypt as "the gift of the Nile."

Incidentally, ancient Egypt used the residential mortgage in a form not too different from what we know in our country today.

Other nations whose people had to scratch constantly for a living and who never knew where their next meal was coming from, never progressed beyond most primitive stages of culture. The Eskimos and nomadic tribes of the East (until the discovery of oil in the Middle East) are illustrations.

Bringing our story to more modern times, to the period after the industrial revolution, we find that the most highly developed nations had an economic surplus early in their history: Examples are Sweden, England and Germany. Here again, abundance and saving were the prime causes of their stature in the world history and the relatively high standard of living enjoyed by their people.

SAVINGS AND AMERICA

The cause and effect relationship between savings and a high standard of living is especially vivid in America. There are three things that make this country great: (1) Natural resources, (2) an abundant and efficient labor supply, and (3) savings. These have enabled our Nation to increase production and, through successive business cycles, to raise its standard of living. Had it not been for savings, our resources and our labor might never have really been put to work.

In modern times there are countries where labor is abundantly available (such as India and China), but where the standard of living cannot even be compared to ours. Likewise, there are countries with ample natural resources but with a very low standard of living. An example of this is Russia until very recently and Brazil to this day.

In comparing our Nation with others which have ample labor and resources but whose people have not saved, we find that savings are the moving force. If savings are not the "mother of invention," they are certainly the key to economic progress and the development of our culture.

Improvement in productive facilities, a fine transportation network, efficiently functioning government and social capital such as schools, parks, hospitals, and the like is not possible unless the people can and actually do produce more than they consume—that is, unless they save, as Americans always have saved.

Ours has always been a thrifty Nation. Its pioneers may not have had cash savings such as we see on the balance sheets of our financial institutions today, but they worked longer hours than necessary to get the next meal and used their surplus labor to improve their land, build fences, produce a surplus crop to buy farm equipment, etc. The fact that Americans have worked hard and have had funds left over after providing for their basic, essential needs and that these savings could be invested in such things as education, housing, research, and improved industrial technology is the factor that has made America great and produced further abundance. Truly, savings are the secret of American growth.

OVER-SAVING THESIS

No doubt about now those of you gentlemen employed in a business which sells things to the American people and who have found this recession actually to be a depression so far as you are concerned are probably thinking: "That's all right in theory, but what we need today is a little less savings and more spending."

You maintain, and with considerable justification, that one of the reasons for this recession was the fact that the American consumer stopped buying new automobiles, appliances, and other durables and has been saving his money. The fact is that the increase in savings in our savings and loan associations in the first half of this year is 20 percent greater than in the first 6 months of 1957. You might well say, no wonder we have a recession.

Your case has strength although I cannot give you credit for originating the idea because the same sentiments were advanced under the heading "the over-saving thesis" during the 1930's by economists you wouldn't then or now want to identify yourselves with.

Let us look a little more closely at this concept. One point we can agree on is this: American consumers, by exercising their free choice, can and do change the pattern of their spending, disturb what appears to be the established business structure, and cause a downturn in our economy. In the same breath I hasten to add that the American consumer ought to have this right. It is much like the right to vote.

If the consumer likes the highly stylized, multi-colored, roomy, chromey, "souped-up" and expensive automobile turned out by a certain Detroit manufacturer, then he can cast his dollar ballots for that care and make its manufacturer successful. By the same token, he has an equal right to vote against this "hot" model if he doesn't like it and to spend his dollars for some other product such as a Volkswagen or to save his dollars. This competition for the dollar-votes of consumers is part and parcel of the American way of doing business.

Savings in some ways are another commodity for which the consumer can cast his ballot. And, as the representative of a group of aggressive savings institutions, I wish to warn you that savings can be sold and merchandised and that the savings and loan associations will continue to compete with you for those dollar-votes being cast continuously by Americans in our economic election.

The fact that Americans have been favorably disposed toward savings at financial institutions recently speaks well for the competitive abilities of savings institutions in the market place. If Americans decide that future needs, such as the education of their children or a new home (fully paid for) are desirable goals, then they have the right to save to purchase such things.

If businessmen have temporarily oversold their market and cannot induce the consumers to part with their funds, perhaps they ought to look back to two fundamentals: The nature of the products they are trying to sell, and the price at which they are trying to sell them. In a money and credit economy such as ours, producing durable goods in large volume, we must accept the risks of cumulative tendencies toward inflation and deflation. The more style we put into our products (and there is no end in sight), the more likely it is that we shall have peaks and valleys. Such fluctuations could not be removed without seriously impairing some things I don't think we want impaired: Individual initiative, freedom of action, and economic growth in the American way.

HISTORY OF SAVINGS IN AMERICA

If I have now convinced you of the importance of savings to our life and times, then you might agree that it should be worth your while to know a little more about the history and current nature of savings—why people save, where they save, how the savings of the American people are made available to American industry and govern-

ment to finance new factories, new roads, schools and houses. You might also want to know how to encourage people to withdraw their savings from their savings accounts and buy more of your products.

There have been some very significant developments in the last few decades in the savings habits of the American people and the way in which these savings are made available to American industry and other users of capital.

We have had what we might call a democratization of savings. That term expresses the fact that millions of individuals are now able to save money and actually are saving and thus providing capital for our continued economic progress. Much of the savings of the American family today is made available to the users of capital through financial institutions, or financial intermediaries, as the economists refer to organizations like savings and loan associations, life insurance companies, pension funds and mutual investment trusts.

In its early years, the United States met its capital requirements or obtained savings funds from two principal sources (1) the wealthy individuals, and (2) foreign investors. Factual data is hard to come by, but we do know that European capital, principally English, built the first American railroads. In 1914 private foreign investments in the United States totaled $7 billion—quite a bit of money in those days and a big part of the total investment in American business and commerce. Of that $7 billion, over half was invested in railroads.

We don't need any data to convince us that the foreign investor has ceased to be a factor in American economic life. Can you imagine any new important American industry, such as the electronics industry, being dependent upon foreign money for its capital needs as were the American railroads during the years of Leland Stanford, Mark Hopkins, Collins Huntington and Charles Crocker, and even later in the days of Harriman and Hill.

America today does not rely so heavily on a relatively few wealthy individuals for its capital requirements as it did a generation ago. In the first place, with the impact of income taxes, there are relatively few people with millions to invest. Second, with American industry today having over $15,000 per worker invested in plant and equipment, compared to $3,900 in 1920, we required a lot more capital than could ever be furnished just by rich people, even if we had never had Federal income taxes. Finally, and most important, the average American family now has income well above the subsistence level. It can afford both a standard of living that permits some luxuries and also afford to save a part of what the breadwinner earns. Last year, for example, individuals—that is, people like you and me—saved about $38 billion out of their current income.[1] This is a tremendous addition to America's savings capital.

GROWTH OF MIDDLE CLASS AMERICA

The great change that has occurred in America in the last generation has been the rise of the middle-class family. The middle-class family now dominates America politically, culturally, and economically. If we define the middle-class family as one with an annual income of from $4,000 to $8,000 we find that today 43 percent of the families are in this bracket as compared with only 15 percent in 1935, speaking in terms of constant 1957 dollars. Today 63 percent of our families earn more than $4,000 a year.

We have plenty of evidence that families making a lot less than $8,000 a year save money—quite a bit of it—but if you have a hard time living within your income (which would be normal for an up and coming business executive), you might be hard to convince that anyone making less than $8,000 a year would be much of a factor in providing capital for America's economic progress. Even so, the democratization of savings which I referred to earlier is well illustrated by the fact that while in 1935 only 3 percent of the people made more than $8,000 today 20 percent of American families earn in excess of $8,000 annually.

Thus the rise of the American middle-class family has broadened the number of investors in American industry and provided much greater capital for the production of better houses, roads, schools, and factories—just as the rise of the American middle-class family has doubled and tripled the market for the products of American industry.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SAVERS

In taking a look at the American saver today, we find that he is very much the same person who buys most of the products of American business.

The United States Savings and Loan League had a survey made in 1955 and these statistics give a picture of savers and their habits in the fall of that year. At that time 35 percent of all savers in banks and savings and loan associations had incomes of less than $4,000. Only 25 percent of all the savers in banks and savings and loan associations had incomes of more than $6,000. We checked those people who indicated that they had more than $5,000 in an account in a savings and loan association and 30 percent of them had incomes of less than $6,000.

There is not much difference between the saver in a bank and in a savings and loan association as to income, occupation, or age. Thus, of the people having accounts only in the savings and loan associations and not in banks, 75 percent had incomes of less than $6,000 and of the savers having accounts only in banks, 71 percent had incomes of less than $6,000.

Most of our savers are either executive, clerical or sales personnel. The same thing is true of bank savers.

Of all the savers in savings and loan associations in 1955, 56 percent had savings accounts of less than $2,000. Fifty-one percent of the bank savers had savings accounts of $2,000 or less. Forty percent of the people with accounts in savings and loan associations also have an account in a bank.

Our savers tend to be people with families, and we find a distinct correlation, of course, between a favorable attitude toward thrift and whether or not the family has any children. We find that women are more thrift-minded than men.

This, I believe, is enough to give you a picture of the people who save in America's leading thrift institutions, that is, the savings departments of banks and the savings and loan associations. You know, of course, that people with pension plans cover the entire range of employed Americans and that the same is true of the holders of life insurance policies.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SAVINGS

The rise of the American middle class family and the fact that most American families now can and do save some money have not only resulted in the provision of a great deal more capital for American industry, it has also resulted to a large degree in the institutionalization of savings and investment.

That is to say, more and more of the savings of American people are going to financial institutions—financial intermediaries—which in turn invest in the American economy in various ways.

Let me cite a few figures to help make my point. Take the 3 years 1926–29 (during the days of the great stock market boom prior to the great depression). Of the total savings, 47 percent went into securities. Only 10 percent went into currency, bank deposits, and savings accounts.

In the year 1955–56 these two figures were virtually reversed. Thirty percent went into currency, deposits, and savings accounts and only 11 percent into securities.

In the 1926–29 period 18 percent of the savings went into private and Government insurance and pension reserves. In the 1953–56 period 28 percent went into insurance and pension reserves. The big gainer here was, of course, Government insurance and pension reserves.

Institutional savings, that is, money placed by Americans into financial institutions rather than directly invested in securities, increased an average of $21 billion annually during the last 5 years. This compares to a direct investment in securities—bonds and stocks—of $5 billion over the same 5-year period. In other words, the people in this country are putting $4 net into savings institutions for every $1 of net investment in securities. Even in 1957 when the yields on bonds were so very attractive and when there was a bullish sentiment in the stock market through most of the year, only $6 billion was invested net in securities compared to a net increase in institutional savings of $22½ billion.

The fact is that today Americans are not bond or stock buyers and that, relatively, only a small portion of the savings of the American people, as individuals, is going directly into securities. Rather, they are putting their money into financial institutions, pension funds, and life-insurance companies, and these institutions then are making the security and mortgage investments for the American people.

You have seen one result of this shift in savings and investment patterns—the great increase in so-called direct placement of new corporate securities with insurance companies and to a lesser extent with pension funds and savings banks. You also see it in the decline in importance of the individual as an investor in real-estate mortgages. The institutional investor, such as the savings and loan association, has put him out of the home-mortgage business in all but the small rural communities. You see it in the tremendous influence currently of the pension funds and mutual-investment funds in the stock market, giving constant support to the market, and in the relatively strong market for the blue-chip stocks which the institutional buyers, for various reasons, prefer.

The principal savings institutions—these private intermediaries in the savings and investing process—today have resources totaling about $290 billion. Some pertinent statistics about them are given on the data sheet left at your seats.

We find that these financial intermediaries consist of 3 big segments or types and 1 small segment. The largest group consists of deposit-type institutions—the savings department of commercial banks, savings and loan associations, mutual-savings banks, the credit unions, and postal savings. At the end of 1957 they held $132 billion, or 54 percent of all institutional savings funds.

Another type of financial intermediary is the insurance company. These held a total in savings of approximately $83 billion.

Next are the pension funds. We refer to them as the noninsured pension funds—that is, funds not handled by life-insurance companies. Most of them are administered by the trust departments of banks, but some are union managed and some are managed by individual trustees. This is the newest form of financial intermediary, and at the end of last year had resources of approximately $19 billion.

Finally, we have a fourth type, the mutual-investment funds. These are open-end funds and have about $10 billion in assets.

[1] Savings by individuals as estimated by Securities and Exchange Commission. New debts incurred excluded.

I have included United States savings bonds in this table for completeness and comparison because they were such a popular form of savings until recent years. The United States Treasury is not what we would call a financial institution.

You will note that almost $48 billion of public savings are currently in savings bonds. Savings bonds reached a total of $50 billion during the middle 1950's. In the last few years redemptions have exceeded sales by a nominal margin each year, and the total outstanding is declining.

It is appropriate to note that total institutional savings have grown tenfold since 1920, while our gross national product has increased only four times. Total savings in financial institutions in 1920 were equal to little more than one-fourth of the gross national product that year; now they are equal to two-thirds of our much-expanded GNP.

The pension funds are the fastest-growing savings medium, having grown from $2½ billion in 1947 to almost $20 billion today. I hope that I will be forgiven if I point out that savings and loan associations now hold twice the proportion of the savings they held in 1920. This great relative increase in the importance of savings and loan savings all has come in the last 10 years.

These financial institutions are getting $4 of every $5 that American families save out of their incomes. These are the institutions that are doing most of the investing today—investing in obligations of Federal, State, and local governments, obligations of public-utility companies and railroads, obligations of manufacturing concerns, mortgage obligations on homes, farms, and commercial real estate—all of which we consider investment versus short-term commercial self-liquidating credit of the type made by banks.

SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS VITAL

I think it may safely be said that these financial institutions have grown up in answer to a definite economic need. To put this concept "democratization of savings" into the frame of reference commonly used by businessmen, we tapped the mass market for savings in much the same way that you developed a mass market for consumer durable goods such as automobiles, refrigerators, and television sets. You streamlined your plants, took advantage of the economies of scale and are able to offer the consumer more goods of better quality at lower prices. In the world of finance we have done somewhat the same thing. Your process has required tremendous amount of capital and I doubt if you would have gone very far without parallel developments in the field of finance.

The financial institution as an investment intermediary came along, I think, for a number of reasons. In the first place, the typical individual investor in American securities got pretty badly burned in 1929 and later. The government savings bond and the account in a financial institution insured up to $10,000 by a Federal agency looked pretty good to him, even though there was no promise of capital gains and the return was only 3 or 3½ percent. In fact, it was in many cases the only investment he would even consider. Prof. Jules Bogen of New York University points to the failure of the mutual investment funds to grow more than $1 billion in each of the past few years as evidence of the fact that people still have a yearning for safety of principal where their dollars are concerned.

With the typical American investor today being a man of considerably smaller average means than a typical investor a generation ago, a different type of investment medium is needed. Today's investor does not have capital sufficient to permit him to take excessive risks. He does not have the time or talent to analyze corporate financial statements and the vagaries of the financial and investment market. Basically he needs an investment that is risk free or virtually risk free or one which provides broad diversification. He needs above all convenience and the ability to set aside varying sums of money at varying times. Liquidity or the ability to cash in his investment without undue loss or paying large brokerage or commission fees is also important. He needs, as you can see, institutions such as our modern-day savings and loan associations. Our institutions provide all of these features to savers and fixed dollar investors. For equity investments something like the investment trust comes closest to meeting the needs of today's average investor.

Along with this development has come the tremendous growth in popularity of life insurance, medical insurance and retirement plans. Whereas in 1928 there were 28 million ordinary life insurance policies in force, or 1 for every 4 persons, today there are 83 million such policies outstanding, or 1 for every 2 persons, virtually no one had a pension or annuity in 1928. Social-security was unknown. Today, considering all types of life insurance policies and annuity contracts, there are 1.6 policies for every American or, on the average, five for every family. The tremendous resources of the life insurance companies and the noninsured pension funds that have resulted from this growth of life insurance and retirement plans have made these institutions tremendous forces in the investment market.

INSTITUTIONAL INVESTMENT PREFERENCES

Most life insurance company and pension fund investment decisions are made by people who know and prefer to invest in securities, either bonds or stocks and who do not really understand or like to invest in mortgages, even FHA insured mortgages.

I know that insurance companies are a big factor in the home mortgage market, but the mortgage is actually a second choice investment for most life insurance companies, to be made after the attractive investments in securities have been made and only if the yield on mortgages is attractive compared with the yield on other investments.

In the same way, commercial banks are essentially commercial lenders and prefer short-term loans and only invest in mortgages as a second choice. This is not true, I realize, with the Bank of America, but that great bank is quite unusual in this respect. Most commercial bankers do not like long-term home mortgages as an investment of the bank's funds, even its savings funds, and if given a choice will almost always prefer short-term loans, even nonsecured consumer loans that savings and loan people wouldn't think of acquiring.

Savings and loan associations, as you may know, invest almost wholly in first mortgage loans on singly family homes. We do this in part because the law points us in that direction, in part by tradition, and in part because our people know and understand and like home mortgages as an investment just as the managers of most pension funds prefer marketable securities.

MULTIPLICITY OF INSTITUTIONS

It is in part because of this fact that various types of investors by tradition and preference invest in different types of securities and obligations that I think it is fortunate that we have a multiplicity of financial institutions and that public policy has permitted, even encouraged, the development of a number of types of savings and investment institutions and competition between them.

Just as in the retail field there are department stores which serve virtually all of a buyer's various needs and specialty shops which handle only one type of merchandise, so is there a variety of financial institutions. The commercial bank is in a way the department store of finance, offering most types of financial services, and then we have the specialty shops such as savings and loan associations which offer only savings accounts and home loans; credit unions which provide a savings facility and make only consumer loans; small loan companies which get their money largely from banks and make consumer loans; mutual investment funds which provide a means for investment of relatively small sums in a broad list of securities, etc.

Savers are offered a broad range of institutions which appeal to them on a different basis. For example, if an individual desires absolute safety above everything else, there are available to him United States Government bonds and postal savings. There is no safer investment in the world, of course, than the fixed dollar, direct obligations of the United States Government. If a saver desires almost equivalent safety but a somewhat higher return and considerably greater convenience, he is offered a savings account in a savings and loan association or a commercial bank. If he wants to take some risks with his capital and invest in the stock market, the mutual investment funds are available to him.

For one who has to be forced to save and wants to combine savings with life insurance or an annuity, there is the life insurance company. As you know, many life insurance contracts are more a savings contract than insurance.

This broad group of financial institutions were developed essentially in the years after World War I, reached adolescence following the great depression and maturity after World War II. Prior to the 1920's, for example, savings and loan associations, known then as building and loan associations were small neighborhood cooperatives, not far advanced from the basic tenets set down in Philadelphia in 1831 when the first savings and loan association was started to provide a means for working people in that area to acquire a home. Even in the 1920's most savers in savings and loan associations were members of a small community group who bought serial shares in the building and loan association as a first step toward home ownership.

Although the term "building and loan" still persists to some degree, the character of our institutions has changed tremendously, physically from one-room, second-floor or club room locations to large and attractive financial offices; managerially from the part-time services of one or a few people to skilled business executives and an experienced staff; financially, from assets of $2½ billion in 1920, $10 billion in 1946, to $50 billion today.

The growth of several of the other types of financial intermediaries is almost as startling and spectacular.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE FAVORABLE

Public policy has permitted and even encouraged the development of several types of financial institutions. It certainly has refused to give any one type of institution a monopoly in this field.

It is no secret, of course, that the commercial banks have resented and resisted the development of the savings and loan business. This is somewhat natural because one business group never likes to see another come along and provide a competing service. We think it is inevitable that the growth of the credit unions in the next 10 years will also be resisted and decried by the commercial banks and, no doubt, by some of our people as well.

The mutual funds have sometimes employed sales practices that have been at least frustrating to our people, as we compete frequently for the same money. Credit unions have some advantages over us because of the existence of payroll savings arrangements for the credit union right in the factories or places of employment. It, therefore, gets the so-called first chance at the saver.

If the Federal Government had not encouraged the development of different institutions, we would today have a rather stifling monopoly in the handling of the savings and investments of the American people, and certainly not the great volume of savings available to meet the great and wide variety of the capital needs of the country through the mechanism of a free market.

We have now reviewed a bit the history of savings in this country, taken a look at where people save their money, noticed the tremendous increase in institutional type savings versus direct investment in industry by the American people and seen a little of what the American saver looks like.

We also want to explore, of course, the significance of all this in American corporate business financing, but before we do that and in order to have the entire picture, we ought to look just for a few minutes at the reasons why people save money.

WHY PEOPLE SAVE

What is it that motivates a person not to spend all that he earns? What makes a saver?

The United States Savings and Loan League twice has had conducted motivational surveys on this basic question and the results give real clues as to the reasons why people save and some of the differences between the saver and the nonsaver.

We find that people have many different reasons for saving. The most common and powerful seem to be saving for old age, for emergencies, and for children's education. People also save, but not so frequently or so much, for such things as a downpayment on a house, the purchase of durable goods, and vacations. This is true both as to savers in banks and savers in savings and loan associations.

These same reasons may not apply when savers come to get their money.

As to the use made of money withdrawn from banks and savings and loan associations, these are the most frequently cited reasons: To meet general living expenses, to pay medical bills, to make a downpayment on a home, to buy a car, for vacation and travel expenses.

Of these, the most important are to meet general living expenses and medical bills.

This is the case, of course, with so-called passbook-type savings. The other great forms of savings are insurance company and pension fund savings. These clearly are for old age and family emergencies.

We find that a good saver knows how to save and tends to be a rather consistent saver. He knows that he must save regularly and that he must resist, or at least postpone, the purchase of nonessential items. He believes that even an urgent need for things is a poor reason for not saving and he believes that everybody can save if he tries. He believes that the nonsaver has only himself to blame for not saving.

Once the saver has mastered the simple secret of savings—which is merely not to spend everything he has—he cannot blame others if he does not save, and when he does not save he has considerable guilt feelings. The knowledge that there is no real urgency about nonessential items, the realization that the purchase of such items can and often should be postponed is the driving force behind individual and family savings. Most good savers start to save as children or when they first start to work.

I don't know what good that information will be for you whose business it is to urge people to buy rather than to save. Maybe there is some reverse psychology that you could use.

It is fortunate for all of us that the savings habit is pretty well engrained into the typical American. It would be a great tragedy to our country if Americans lost their will to save as they might as the result of a great inflation.

SIGNIFICANCE TO BUSINESSMEN

The growth of these financial intermediaries means that more and more American business will look to financial institutions as a source of capital. When you need investment funds you will find the greatest supply at attractive prices in the financial institutions—the banks, insurance companies, pension funds and savings and loan associations. The financial executives of our corporations will have to know more about the functioning and the investment preferences of the various financial institutions. They will have to know, for example, that savings and loan associations deal almost exclusively in first mortgage loans on homes; that life insurance companies are the chief sources of mortgage loans on commercial and industrial property; and that pension funds have a considerably greater proportion of their resources invested in equities than do the life insurance companies. It will be as important that you become acquainted with the investment officers of quite a number of financial institutions as it was 50 years ago for corporate executives to know the personnel of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., N. W. Harris & Co., or the Walker Bros. of Salt Lake City.

It also means that your financial planning will have to be slanted toward the more conservative investor. Financial institutions dealing with other people's money in a trustee capacity are more conservative investors than the rich individual. Most financial institutions have as their prime objective returning to savers an equal number of dollars as were placed with them, plus earnings on them. Thus the prime objective of a savings and loan association is always to have the saver's dollar ready for him.

Of all the institutional investors, only one does not have a dollar-for-dollar obligation, and that is the mutual investment fund. The life-insurance companies, pension funds, banks, and savings-and-loan associations, all have fixed dollar obligations to their savers and policyholders. As a result, their investments will be largely in bonds and fixed dollar obligations.

You cannot expect that there will be any great move to authorize banks, insurance companies, and savings-and-loan associations to invest in common stocks, or, if they were so authorized, that a significant portion of their funds would be so invested.

Time does not permit any further elaboration here. The point simply is that more and more the users of capital, that is, businesses and governments, will have to reckon with financial institution executives in their search for money.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me remind you that the early financial development of the United States was not unlike that of many lesser developed nations. The fact that both special classes of Americans and foreign individuals provided their savings to American industry until the masses of the people had advanced beyond subsistence levels to the stage of abundance was indeed fortunate. Without this base, the age of abundance might not yet have been attained. Within recent decades, the accumulation of savings by large groups of individuals through institutions like your local savings-and-loan associations have broadened the savings base even further, and permitted more widespread gains in economic growth and increased our potentials.

The men in the savings-and-loan business, I know (and others in the savings business, I feel sure) are dedicated to doing their part to encourage the American people to provide the savings that you men today and the business leaders of tomorrow will require to keep America growing.

Some writers have termed America "the people's capitalism." If by this we refer to the fact that the average man is putting up the capital to support our further growth and progress through his personal thrift, it is an appropriate term.

Problems Faced in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Senator PROXMIRE before the Zionist Organization of America, in San Francisco, Calif., on February 13, 1958.

In discussing the problems faced in the Middle East, the Senator presented sound recommendations for bringing to that important area of the world an era of true peace, and a rising standard of living to its poverty stricken peoples.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR PROXMIRE BEFORE THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA IN SAN FRANCISCO ON FEBRUARY 13, 1958

One year after the enunciation of the Eisenhower doctrine, the Middle East stands as the greatest challenge to American statesmanship in the world today. The Middle East challenges our ingenuity, our determination, and our democratic faith. Our security as a nation—indeed our very existence as a nation—depends on whether—and how—we meet that challenge.

It is not through indifference that we find ourselves thus challenged. We know that the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East must be one of the major aims of United States foreign policy. We know the vital importance of the Middle East's oil to the economic and military strength of the free world; we understand the strategic significance of the trade routes which pass through the Middle East; we recognize the symbolic importance of the Middle East's religious and historic sites.

We have known, in short, that we ought to do something. But, somehow, despite the Eisenhower doctrine, despite the Baghdad Pact, despite our wooing of King Ibn Saud, despite our gifts of revolvers to Nasser, peace and stability today seem farther away than ever.

We have failed, I submit, to achieve our foreign policy objectives in the Middle East, because we have failed to understand the real nature of the problem we faced. The Middle East faces us today like a smoldering forest fire. At best our efforts to date have merely put on a sudden outburst of flame or halted momentarily a new outcropping of fire; at worst what we have done has actually fanned the embers. But never have we taken the steps necessary gradually to destroy permanently the sparks which some day could erupt in a world conflagration.

What are the realities of the Middle East today?

First, the Middle East is a region of vast poverty and, more important, of increasing

awareness by its impoverished population that there can be a better way of life. Israel, of course, stands as a shining exception to this melancholy picture of a downtrodden people, still enchained by the economic conditions and social patterns of a feudal past. The fantastic development of Israel by her people has been one of the major forces, I believe, in making clear to the people of the Arab lands that they too could live better. The fact that the great potential wealth of the Middle East has been tapped by a very few Arab billionaires serves to bring the urgent problem into sharper focus. In every Arab country—no matter who the leaders or what the form of government—this "revolution of rising expectations" is rapidly becoming the key political factor.

It is precisely because the rulers of many of these Arab nations have been unable, or unwilling, to meet this insistent popular demand for economic and social improvement that Arab nationalism has made such headway. Deliberately exploited in the age-old pattern of dictators, nationalism in the hands of men like Nasser offers an outlet for popular discontent.

The Soviet Union in turn has been waging an all-out campaign to win the allegiance of the Middle East Arab States, by appealing to the same emotions of discontent and nationalistic pride. It is not the likelihood of Soviet military invasion of the Middle East with which we must contend today. The Soviet technique is to win friends and influence people by providing the tools with which national ambitions for prestige, power, and economic development can be realized. Least among these techniques has been persistent Soviet propaganda exploitation of Arab enmity toward Israel.

A popular demand for a better way of life, a strident nationalism feeding in part on this popular demand, persistent Soviet penetration—as if these three conditions were not enough, there exists yet a fourth element of disruption: the million or so Palestinian refugees whose misery is a constantly festering open wound.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the United States is losing ground in the Middle East today. It seems to be little more than a matter of time before we are faced with an explosion which could place us on the brink of a tragic and pointless war. Can we reverse the trend?

I believe we can.

I propose that the following steps would greatly reduce the danger of further Soviet expansion and of a Middle East war between the Arab States and Israel which would soon engulf the entire world:

First, let me say categorically here that I believe that the United States can and must do all it can to support the legitimate needs of Israel. America has no better friends in the Middle East today than Israel. In part I suspect this is because Israel today in many ways resembles our own United States in its formative years. It is a new land and a refuge for the oppressed of many nations. It is firmly dedicated to the principles of democracy. It is a country of pioneers, carving out of a wilderness no less harsh—and often much harsher—than our own frontiers a productive economy of free peoples. It is a melting pot of men and women of many cultures and many backgrounds living together in unity and harmony. Perhaps most important, Israel is a nation which has vigorously attacked her many problems with positive and constructive plans for development.

In any efforts we make toward reducing the Middle Eastern tensions, we must make it unequivocally clear that we believe that Israel is here to stay, that her present boundaries are not subject to third party negotiations. We must guarantee and commit ourselves to defend Israel's right to existence. We must strive to get a commitment by the U. N. to take forceful action against any aggression on the State of Israel. We must recognize that she cannot be expected in some miraculous way to absorb hundreds of thousands of hostile Arabs in her already crowded and strained economy. The integrity of Israel cannot be a bargaining point.

Second. The present economic situation in the Middle East, with its explosive political implications, is a serious threat to the stability of the entire area. Starvation and poverty, against a backdrop of billion-dollar oil fields is the raw material for strife and bitterness. Without economic development to meet tide of rising and legitimate expectations, peace in the Middle East will remain as much out of the question as it is today. For this reason, we should move at once to create a Middle East Development Agency, similar to that suggested by Senator HUMPHREY. This agency must be adequately capitalized to do the regional development job so sorely needed. I am thinking of a multilateral agency in which the states of the Middle East would share equally with the more advanced nations of the West in the planning and execution of regional river development projects, regional malaria eradication projects and a host of other projects which would utilize the enormous untapped resources, both natural and human, of the area. Let me assert, however, that to expand the economy of a country, only to have the increased wealth go to fill the already bulging pockets of the rich will merely increase the explosiveness of the situation. The fruits of economic development must be broadly shared. An important corollary of this approach would be the greater use of America's surplus food and fiber to further economic and social progress.

Third. We must exert real leadership toward the solution of the outstanding differences between the Arab states and Israel. This is no easy assignment, but it seems to me absolutely essential that somebody move to break the stalemate. All the Middle Eastern states are spending abnormal resources on military defense. Think what even a little easing of the tension could mean in releasing energies and resources for constructive development.

Fourth, and equally important, I submit that we should do all we can to halt the arms race in the Middle East. In the poor lands of the Middle East, it is tragic to spend millions of dollars in sterile expenditures for armaments. Whether through direct negotiation with the Soviet Union or by use of the United Nations, we should stop the frantic building up of armed might. The Middle East today reminds us of the Balkans of 50 years ago—the same fierce passions of nationalism, the same increasing entanglement of the major powers, the same deadly growth of armaments. We think we are buying security with our arms, but actually we are laying the groundwork for conflict.

Fifth. To build security, we should invigorate the role of the United Nations in the Middle East. The Senate has already unanimously adopted a resolution urging the creation of a permanent Middle East United Nations Force to act as watchdog and firefighter. This U. N. force should be stationed on all of Israel's borders until such policing is no longer necessary. I would like to see President Eisenhower's "Open Skies" proposal given a try—thus providing a continuous inspection of sensitive areas and military preparations.

Sixth. We must take the lead in working for a permanent solution to the Arab refugee problem. The refugees live today in tragic surroundings and hopelessness largely on American bounty. Why can we not use that same bounty to move toward the resettlement of these thousands of homeless people in Arab lands? In a sense these men and women can provide replacements for the tens of thousands of Jews who have migrated to Israel from throughout the Arab world.

Would the proposals I have outlined stand any chance of acceptance by the Middle Eastern countries and by the Soviet Union? I believe they would.

For the nations of the Middle East there would be the opportunity for a real advance on the path of economic development. Without any sacrifice of national independence, there could be release from the crushing burden of mounting armaments. Given an opportunity such as the proposals I have put forward would present, I am convinced that a strong impetus would be given to the political growth of moderate constructive forces in the Arab nations. The new union of Egypt and Syria represents after all only the most extreme type of Arab leadership. Even they would be hardpressed, I believe, to reject a program such as I have suggested.

As for Russia, I would venture to suggest that an arms embargo to the Middle East might well meet acceptance. Indeed the Soviet Union has herself suggested such a course in the past. By such an embargo, the whole area would rapidly become demilitarized for all practical purposes. Today the growing possibility of an armed clash which could explode into world war III is ominous enough to give pause even to the men in the Kremlin. They could well have a genuine interest in making the Middle East a military no man's land in the cold war. Even they must turn over at night at the thought of a Nasser brandishing an atom bomb. Russia, too, could hardly afford to boycott a generously conceived and financed Middle East Development Fund. Undoubtedly she would seek to use it for her own ends, but that could hardly be easy and certainly it could hardly be worse than the present all-out aid program carried on by the Russians directly. Indeed, should Russia refuse to join with us in this effort this would be no loss. We then would appear, and rightly so, as the one great nation with a real interest in the progress and peace of the Middle East. Russia would be firmly identified as the power which is fostering poverty and disruption.

How about the United States? What would we gain?

I think the answer is obvious. Slowly we would end the nightmarish quality of our present policy where every crisis is superceded by yet another. We would be working towards harmony in the Middle East instead of keeping alive difference and tension. We would be looking forward to progress instead of backward to unresolved conflicts.

Pan American World Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me and the article referred to in the statement, from the American Aviation Daily of July 31.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are sometimes asked about the activities of our private industry good will ambassadors abroad. The Communists wail long and loudly that American business is

imperialistic, that it exploits the country wherein it has an international branch.

In answer to those wails, I invite your attention to a page from American Aviation Daily of July 31.

This newsletter reports on the excellence of the service rendered to the State Department recently by Pan American World Airways, on the occasion of the evacuation of Americans from strife-torn Iraq.

With 27 hours after our State Department had requested Pan Am's cooperation in the evacuation, 4 planes were on the job. That the job was well done is manifested by the Aviation Daily article, which tells of the State Department's gratification with the "wonderful cooperation" from Pan Am.

[From Aviation Daily of July 31, 1958]

STATE DEPARTMENT USES COMMERCIAL AIRLIFT FOR EVACUEES FROM IRAQ

The State Department reported this week that it has received excellent help from Pan American World Airways in evacuating United States businessmen and tourists from Iraq since the recent revolt in that country, and that TWA would also have helped in the lift except for previous commitments which prevented them from responding instantly.

Pan American, after receiving assurances that certain en route navigational aids were still functioning, responded with 4 aircraft—1 DC–7C and 3 DC–6B's. The first plane arrived exactly 24 hours after Pan American World Airways officials accepted the commitment; the second an hour later; and the other two within hours after that. Staging for the evacuation took place in Ankara, Turkey, where Pan American delivered the planes. To date six flights have been operated, the most recent of which took place yesterday. Current schedule calls for 2 a week, 1 each on Monday and Wednesday. TWA had previous commitments which prevented them from making instant response to the request.

Planes were chartered by State and will be paid for out of a special emergency fund set up for the purpose; Pan American World Airways, where possible, is collecting its normal fare from the non-Government passengers. Because of the unusual conditions, the carrier is accepting promissory notes and personal checks as payment. Proceeds are being applied against the State Department bill for the service. In this way, receipts from the non-Government passengers are not allowed to be diverted into the Treasury Department's miscellaneous funds account, draining State's already limited emergency fund.

REBEL REGIME ALLOWS PLANES IN ON LIMITED BASIS

Evacuees, for the most part, are being picked up in Baghdad and flown directly to Rome. Some, however, have boarded at Basra to be taken to the Italian capital, and the attempt is now being made to make a pickup at Kirkuk, in northern Iraq. The Iraqi rebel regime has allowed these United States planes in, along with those of other countries, on a limited basis, according to State Department officials. The United States evacuees, waiting their turns with nationals of other foreign communities there, are all flying commercial. In cases of civil disturbances such as this, State emphasized, commercial—not military—airlift is essential. Our Government and the Iraqi's join in opposition to any possible kind of military implication into the situation. Policy, therefore, is to exhaust all commercial facilities first. But it is entirely up to the civil carrier whether or not it wishes to offer its services. The State Department said that it had received wonderful cooperation from Pan American, however, and indicated it was gratified with the quick response the airline made to the request.

Meanwhile, it has been reported that Middle East Airlines is supplying comparable lift to remove British subjects from the area. Viscounts are being used for the thrice-weekly flights. British were allowed three because of the lesser capacity of the Viscounts.

This incident, it was learned, may also have provided some needed stimulus to a cooperative program talk about for some years now between airlines and the State Department.

The program would cover similar situations throughout the world, and agreements with airlines serving areas which might be subject to Iraq-type disturbances would allow for greater cooperation. Seaboard & Western Airlines looked as if it were ready to sign an agreement this week. State has also invited Pan Ameircan, TWA, Northwest, Braniff and Panagra and intends to ask others to sign up. Defense Department coordination is also included in the program.

Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND

As a longtime advocate of statehood for Alaska I am not only happy that that objective has been achieved, but I am highly pleased with the almost universally favorable nationwide response with which that achievement has been acclaimed.

In the course of the debate preceding the vote on Alaskan statehood I had occasion to quote from, comment upon, and insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, some of the pro-statehood editorials taken from our Florida newspapers. And it is particularly gratifying that since statehood for Alaska was accomplished public opinion in our southernmost States—as indeed elsewhere—so warmly welcomes the admission of the northernmost State.

Those two States, Florida and Alaska, have much in common. Historically, both Florida and Alaska were acquired from a foreign power. Geographically, both States are peninsulas thrust away from the mainland. Before the admission of Alaska, Florida had the longest coastline of any State of the Union. Both have been largely populated by Americans coming from other States of the Union. The people of both are imbued with the pioneer spirit. Both are growing rapidly in population and destined to continue to do so, and both offer certain unique attractions not found elsewhere in our Union.

The winning of statehood for Alaska has been a long and arduous battle. It has been with us actively for all the 12 years of my service as a Senator from Florida. Throughout that considerable period it has been my privilege to see the devoted action of a man whom I know to be in large measure responsible for this victory.

I refer to Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953, and "Tennessee Plan" United States Senator-elect from that territory, whom I have known well and favorably since our association at governor's conferences, while I was Governor of Florida and he was Governor of Alaska.

When I entered the Senate, he was midway through his long service in the governorship, during which he laid the foundation for statehood by getting the Territory financially prepared for it, and serving with great ability and dedication, as I learned from many Alaskans when I visited Alaska in the summer of 1953, several months after Ernest Gruening's retirement from the governorship. He was then engaged in writing a book, The State of Alaska, which, through its marshalling of facts, proved a powerful presentation in behalf of Alaskan statehood, and has helped me to a fuller understanding of Alaska's problems.

From the earliest days of my senatorship, Ernest Gruening sought to enlist my support. No one in the Senate has been unaware of his persistent and effective advocacy of statehood for Alaska. He battled for it in the antechambers of Congress. He carried his message back into the States. I know that he has appeared before representative audiences in Florida's centers of population, on the platform, over the air, and on television, and at the University of Florida at Gainesville, last winter, where he was honored by being asked to deliver the David Yulee Lectureship. The public opinion that he has helped mobilize in my State and throughout the Nation has been a powerful force in buttressing his personal appeals to Members of the Senate.

Many have contributed to bringing the 49th State into the Union, but, in my opinion, without Ernest Gruening's unremitting efforts through the years, statehood for Alaska would not now be a reality.

The People of the United States as I Know Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I received in the mail recently a short statement written by Dr. R. Dwarkadas, who had a fellowship to the United States in 1955 under our Government program.

I think this is an excellent statement, and is further evidence of the value of the exchange programs which our Government fosters. I do hope my colleagues will read the statement and agree with me that this program should be expanded.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AS I KNOW THEM

(By Dr. R. Dwarkadas)

I shall not say here anything about the United States Government or their foreign policy. I like to say a few things about the people in the States—the common men as

they live, their outlook of the world and things, of their neighbors, of their hospitality to foreigners like us, of their preoccupations, their likes and dislikes, and mostly the things that have impressed me during my short stay of 10 months over there.

Couple of decades back the people had been basically isolationists—the very people who said "No" to President Wilson on the eve of League of Nations. Now the people are, of course, conscious of their role in international affairs, though not completely for they are rather shocked why they should be taken to task if something went wrong in Goa or in Cyprus. They are sensitive about Korea or Indochina or Israel because these problems have affected them rather intimately. On Asian affairs they have not had much knowledge though they earnestly and carefully listen to all points of views, especially the anticolonial point of view with great deal of interest and sympathy. On European affairs they seem to have a good deal of knowledge, a lot more than we on this side, mostly because of their ancestral connections and also because of the sound perception—peace loving as they are—that good many big wars arose from that end. They are, of course, shocked at the rate of expansionism of the Soviet bloc and in their bewilderment sometimes criticize even their own beloved President Roosevelt for having been "soft" with Stalin.

While the Constitution gives them a secular state, the people are intensely religious. They are religious not in the sense of being very dogmatic. They are questioning and speculative. I was impressed by the fact that they were lot more openminded than philistine and wanted to know about other religions, especially Hinduism, Buddhism, etc. Even a mild dose of Upanishadic thinking was a very stimulating experience. The most thrilling experience in their debating sessions was the regular cross-fertilization of ideas. To my mind, the advanced technological triumphs, instead of making the people by and large grossly materialistic have turned them more and more toward spiritual speculations—a phenomenon of incalculable significance to the success of Democratic way of life.

Their socials and coffee hours developed in a foreigner a surprising measure of a sense of homeliness. It is so nice to know that middle-class families go round to one another's places, inviting foreign boys and girls, during the after debate coffee hours, to keep the ball of informed discussion further rolling. It is thrilling to notice that brilliant ideas crop up more spontaneously than in the regular debating sessions. No aspect of life is too technical nor too profuse for these coffee hours. Invitees freely discuss a range of topics that varies from segregation to the state of Nation or delinquency to dating habits of American females. I had far deeper insights into the American dilemmas in these coffee hours than in handling the truckloads of literature available on the burning problems of American life. In one of these socials I was told how a student from New York gave the initiative to his friend from Wisconsin, in the job of attacking McCarthyism at Wisconsin. The initiative of the local man worked miracles, for the group began to see the other side of the coin and became critical of their own Senator. Again, I learned how the problem of segregation was not an easy one, and how there were many Souths and how progress was being made step by step and how progressive-minded people are genuinely interested in attacking this problem—a problem by no means of less magnitude and of less complexity than our own problem of untouchability.

The most striking thing I noticed about the common man in the United States is his capacity to plan his living in terms of future. It is amazing how a private enterpreneurial system works out segments of planning at lower levels. The consumer in States has a sense of planned values. He knows what kind of house he has to build in what span of time, what family planning, how much to invest on luxuries, how much on necessities so on and so forth. He often succeeds in cutting the coat according to the cloth. He has visions of a future. He has practical plans for the present. He knows when to relax and how to relax. Sometimes I wonder the reason why the Government could talk less of planning is basically because the people in their homes, factories, etc., know how to plan their living.

In most of the cases I know of, on the whole, the family life of the common people has been clear and honest, decent and natural. The parents do not have the inevitable problem of finding out suitable matches for their boys and girls. The latter, however, know how to take care of themselves. Girls and boys, when they are in love, are truthful to each other. If they are not, they are again truthful enough to tell each other that that is the case.

To my mind the continuing prosperity of the United States is largely due to the continuing vitality and dynamism of the common people. They are creative, prone to constructive criticism rather than destructive criticism. They not only believe in spinning new ideas and innovations in their way of practical living but also believe in finding ways of executing them. The practical genius of the people makes their inventiveness to descend below the purely speculative levels to useful channels. On the whole they are a very agreeable and friendly lot.

Delaware Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there are many historic military units in the United States. None has a greater record than the regiment in Delaware during the Revolution which was known as the Delaware Volunteers.

A very fine statement relative to that organization was published in the last edition of the National Guardsman. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLUE HEN'S CHICKS

"No regiment in the Army surpasses them in soldiership." (Gen. "Light Horse Harry Lee.)

Delaware's Volunteers, answering the Continental Congress' summons in 1776, took with them into camp champion fighting cocks descended from a legendary blue hen. In their first battle against the British, at Long Island, the fighting spirit of the outnumbered Delaware militiamen was likened to that of "The Blue Hen's Chicks," a nickname which guardsmen of Delaware's 198 antiaircraft artillery group still wear.

Poorly clothed, seldom paid, once reduced by casualties to only a single company, the regiment fought in every major battle of the Revolutionary War but one. When Gen. George Washintgon accepted Lord Cornwallis' sword at Yorktown, men of the Delaware regiment stood proudly with their commander in chief—they had earned the right to be there.

Hastily organized in 1655 to defend New Sweden, as Delaware was called, against encroaching Dutch, the militia already was more than a century old by the time their gallant stand at Long Island inspired the whimsical nickname.

Today their war honors read like a United States military history: French and Indian Wars, the Revolution, War of 1812, Civil War, Spanish-American War, Mexican Border; World War I, in France as the 59th Pioneer Infantry Regiment, predecessors to our modern combat engineers; World War II, fighting as beachhead antiaircraft artillery in the South Pacific; and Korean war service.

Scientific Discoveries Made at Linfield Research Institute in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Senate soon will consider the Federal college scholarship bill, with its emphasis on achievement in courses in science, I think it is well to call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding strides which have been attained in this field at one of Oregon's fine private institutions of higher learning.

This is Linfield College, located in the city of McMinnville. At Linfield, research has promoted many significant and valuable scientific attainments. This has been particularly the product of the Linfield Research Institute, under the supervision of Dr. Walter P. Dyke, able director of the institute. In cooperation with Linfield's scholarly president, Dr. Harry L. Dillin, the Linfield Research Institute has developed many important inventions in such vital fields as electronics.

This program is thoroughly summarized in an article which appeared in the Oregonian of Portland of August 3, 1958, written by John L. Denny, business editor of the Oregonian. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Denny's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINFIELD RESEARCH BEHIND NEW X-RAY INDUSTRY

(By John L. Denny)

A compact but complicated system of "black boxes" that takes X-ray pictures so fast it can photograph the "insides" of an exploding bullet, will start coming off the production lines of a new McMinnville industrial plant this month.

This is the first Oregon industry to be incubated by the Linfield Research Institute, a basic research center which is growing almost unnoticed at Portland's doorstep into an institution of considerable stature in the scientific world.

MORE INDUSTRIES LOOM

The new enterprise, Field Emission Corp., may be only the beginning of industrial ap-

plications of the storehouse of basic research already accumulated at the institute.

There is more to come, for the institute itself will break ground this month for the first step of a planned million-dollar expansion program which will equip it to offer a complete research service for Pacific Northwest industry, buisness, and government.

Initial project in the expansion program is a 12,000-square-foot building, on which construction will start next week, in a recently acquired 36-acre tract adjoining the college campus on the south. The tract will be developed into a combination research-industrial park. Half of the area will be a research center, the rest sites for industry which manufactures products based on the results of research.

This concept of a research center becoming the nucleus for industry has proved notably successful at Stanford University, where the Stanford Industrial Park has become a major electronics center.

Start of the expansion program was made possible by a $150,000 loan to the institute by E. J. Linke, Carlton lumberman. Additional phases will be undertaken as the institute's workload increases and capital becomes available. Some of this may be provided by existing industrial firms, since industry rapidly is learning the value of having a handy source of research.

The expansion program is being handled by Research Development, Inc., a nonprofit holding company created to develop the property for the institute. Eugene Marsh, McMinnville attorney, is president.

ELECTRONIC WORK FEATURED

Since it was launched 12 years ago, first as a department of Linfield College and becoming a full-fledged research center in 1955, the institute has specialized in harnessing the principle of getting electrons out of a vacuum and putting them to use.

Conventional method of doing this is with a hot wire in a vacuum tube. At the institue, they have found how to do this by stirring up the electrons in a piece of metal with a high-voltage shot, then squirting them through a tiny field emitter needle, a tungsten sliver so fine it tapers to a single metallic crystal at the tip.

This has much the same effect as squirting water through a fire hose, compressing the electrons into a fine stream of extremely high density.

This concentrated stream from the field emitter has several advantages over conventional methods of generating electrons. "Machines" can be made much smaller, for one thing. And with the sharper definition of the fine, high-density stream, can do the job much faster and more efficiently. Then, too, getting rid of the heat necessary in the "hot wire" method does away with the need for space and other provisions for cooling.

MANY USES POSSIBLE

Possibilities of useful applications of these "cold" electron guns are many and varied, and some of them could lead to industrial developments of major magnitude in the area. Better TV picture tubes is one possibility. And little can be said about the possibilities in the field of high-frequency wave generation and radar, because of a Defense Department security cloak. Informed observers, however, have dropped a few hints that stagger even a space-age imagination.

Several outside firms have expressed an interest in manufacturing electronic devices developed at the institute. But these eastern companies wanted to send in their engineers to learn the techniques and processes, make the item elsewhere and leave Oregon holding the bag.

Aware of both the immediate and prospective possibilities that could create jobs and payrolls within the State, the institute folks decided to set up the Field Emission Corp. as a separate manufacturing arm to apply the research and develop products.

BIG ORDER ON HAND

The new company will start life with a sizable order for its first product. It has a Navy contract for the high-speed X-ray machine which takes X-ray pictures at two-tenths of a micro-second—a micro-second is one-millionth of a second.

The institute, meanwhile, is at work on a Government-financed research project which could result in the new company being swamped with orders. This study is to determine effect of the high-speed rays on living tissue, and whatever the outcome, the results will command considerable attention. If the super-fast X-rays are found to be less harmful than regular X-rays—and there has been a lot of recent national publicity on the danger of over-exposure—it would be reasonable to expect a bright medical future for the new X-ray tubes. If found to be more destructive of living tissue, cancer treatment possibilities would be opened up.

DR. DYKE PRESIDENT

President of Field Emission Corp. is Dr. Walter Dyke, director and guiding genius of Linfield Research Institute, who started the field emission studies in the college's physics department in 1946.

The institute has come a long way since Dr. Dyke started the first research work with a grant of $5,000. During the coming year it will have a budget of $800,000 and a staff of 70 people, including mathematicians, biologists, physicists, chemists, engineers and, for the first time, an economist.

Most of his growth has stemmed from Government-financed research projects, plus an occasional job for a private or State agency. Dr. Dyke is steering the institute toward a closer relationship with business and industry, in a firm belief—which is shared by many—that research will play an ever-increasing part in the economic development of Oregon and the Northwest.

The Federal Government Moving in on the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Moving in on the Schools," from the Washington Daily News of August 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

In both Houses of Congress, committee approval has been given liberal bills to solve our educational problems by plunging the deficit-ridden Federal Treasury deeper into this field. The House is expected to pass a bill tomorrow giving scholarships to bright students.

On top of the $1 billion or so the Government now feeds into public education via various routes, the bills before Congress propose to go directly into the production of scientists, scholars, and teachers.

Over the next several years, these bills propose to dole out up to $1.5 billion for scholarships, student loans, teacher training, etc.

Up to now, Congress has turned back the energetic effort to get the Government in the school-building business. But the scholarship bill is the opening. It heads the same way.

This all is based on the theories that too many gifted youngsters are not going to college simply because they lack the money, and that only the Government can remedy this—generalizations never substantiated.

There literally are thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. And the number of scholarships has been growing fast—the last survey indicated there were nearly 250,000. (The most liberal of the bills before Congress would provide an average of 23,000 a year.)

This is called a shot-in-the-arm program—a one-time deal designated merely to stimulate State, local, and private effort for better education. Such programs repress rather than stimulate because they tempt people to depend on others for things they can do better for themselves.

This simply is a part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits; more power here in Washington and less for the States and the people themselves.

Marshal Carlton G. Beall Nominated for Another 4-Year Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article under the headline "Our Own Marshal Beall Renamed for 4 Years More of Gun-Totin'," written by Morrey Dunie, staff reporter, and appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

United States Marshal Beall has done a good job and is deserving of the reappointment which he has just received from the President.

The news article by Reporter Dunie is well organized and is written in a humorous vein.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR OWN MARSHALL BEALL RENAMED FOR 4 YEARS MORE OF GUN TOTIN'

(By Morrey Dunie)

Yes, Johnny, there is a United States marshal for Washington.

He doesn't race a great white stallion down Pennsylvania Avenue in pursuit of cattle rustlers. And he rarely saves beautiful damsels in distress back at the ranch.

Our marshal, Carlton G. Beall, doesn't have a long-barrel six-shooter strapped low on his thigh, and it's pretty certain any one of your favorite marshals could outdraw him in a noontime showdown.

But, Marshal Beall does wear a .38 caliber revolver on his hip and has been known to arrest bad men around town. As a matter of fact our marshal and his 85 deputies made 10,724 arrests in fiscal 1957.

And just yesterday, President Eisenhower nominated Marshal Beall for another 4-year term. He became our marshal in 1954 after being a sheriff for 4 years out in the hinterland—Prince Georges County.

Of course, no one seems to be able to remember the last time our marshal or any of his deputies camped overnight on the Washington Monument grounds or on the Capitol lawn, sitting around a snapping campfire and eating beans from a bent tin plate.

But they certainly have camped on a lot of doorsteps, serving annually more than 400,000 separate civil documents on residents of Washington.

In some ways, it may be unfair to compare Marshal Beall to those TV marshals and their real-life predecessors of the Old West. Those men were marshals all right, but they were Territorial marshals where the only law was Federal law and they were the law-enforcement officers.

Marshal Beall's primary mission is to carry out the orders of the Federal courts. Basic law enforcement here is left to the Metropolitan Police. But, as Beall points out, Washington is still a Federal jurisdiction and so, in theory, at least, we have two police chiefs—Robert V. Murray of the Police Department and Marshal Beall.

Beall dresses in a neat business suit and bow tie, and works in a tastefully furnished air-conditioned office. One of the 94 Federal marshals in the United States and its Territories, Beall is 40 years old. Probably the most he really has in common with those TV fellows is that he's handsome enough to be one himself.

The Culture of a Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Northwest Arkansas Times, of Fayetteville, Ark., entitled "The Culture of a Community."

This editorial was written by a chaplain of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Fayetteville, and I think is an extremely fine statement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times of August 2, 1958]

THE CULTURE OF A COMMUNITY

(By Chaplain B. D. Willetts, Veterans' Administration Hospital)

Most generally we are unaware of the culture of a community, but each one of us is adding to it daily. Culture is a word used to denote the summary of all influences of all people living together. We think mainly of culture when the community encourages people to grow in abilities and to live on a friendly basis with one another.

One would need to evaluate the musical activities, the theater, the movies, the social life, working conditions, the homelife, the schools and colleges, business establishments and the organizations active in a community to get a picture of its culture. Altogether they produce an atmosphere in which men and women accept and contribute values and standards of living which make up the culture. Each one of us by our support and interest in one or all of these fields helps to make a desirable or undesirable neighborhood. No one can be careless with his choice of activities for it makes up a part of the culture in which we all have to live.

What can most surely contribute to a real land-of-opportunity culture for our community? It will be the ideals by which we live. Where do we get our ideals? Do we pick them up on the street? Such might not be the best for all of us, for some people are selfish and have a limited interest. I believe that if one wants ideals that are dynamic and that make his life a strong influence for the finest culture, he will find them expressed and suggested in our churches and the Great Book which they use as the textbook of great living. If anyone is not acquainted with this influence and these ideals, he probably is not doing his part for a finer community. Each time we neglect to attend their worship services and study groups we are subtracting from the strength of the ideals that would make us contented and many others happy.

Everyone should be serious about the culture of the community. One does not need to be rich to be cultured. He does need to have ideals and to enjoy the good things of life. The cultured person has more resources of living and makes more opportunities for cultured living as your neighbor.

Bombings in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the civil rights committee of the Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias of the State of New York supporting a resolution submitted in this body by me and in the other body by my colleague from New York, Representative KEATING, which seeks to deal with the very vexing problem of bombing schools, houses of worship, and other institutions, Negro or Jewish, in the South—and which, incidentally, could take place anywhere else. The resolutions have been submitted in an effort to provide the Federal Government with some area of jurisdiction, which is now in the twilight zone, so that the Federal Government may deal vigorously with these affronts to our national dignity, our national morality, as well as to the Constitution and the law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE OF THE GRAND LODGE, KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS

Whereas there have been recent and alarming occurrences of bombings of houses of worship, community buildings and homes in the South; and

Whereas a question has arisen as to Federal jurisdiction in such cases involving such bombing and violence; and

Whereas the terrorizing of minority groups is deplored by all decent people; and

Whereas bills have been introduced in Congress, sponsored by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and Representative KENNETH B. KEATING which would specifically authorize such Federal jurisdiction and permit Federal prosecution and investigation of racially inspired bombings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the grand lodge, Knights of Pythias of the State of New York, That—

We urge Congress to adopt legislation that would close the gap, if any, in our Federal laws, and permit the Federal Bureau of Investigation to intervene whenever interstate conspiracies are found to exist, working to break State felony laws, resulting in such incidents noted above; and

We further urge that our order actively support the bills submitted by Senator JAVITS and Representative KEATING, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congress to indicate our position in this matter.

Respectfully submitted by the civil rights committee.

MAX CAPLAN,
Chairman.

Approved under section 56 of grand statutes.

MURRY LEVENE,
Grand Chancellor.
DAVID MOSS,
Grand Priest.

Ed Wimmer Answers Attacks on Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Frederick C. Othman, in his syndicated column, was critical of the national fair trade legislation which I have coauthored with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. A fine reply was made by Mr. Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America Publishing Guild, Inc., and vice president and public relations director of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Othman's two articles on fair trade, and Mr. Wimmer's reply to him, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILDA PREFERS CUT-RATE PRACTICE

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON.—My bride, I must let the so-called fair traders know, takes a dim view of 'em.

Particularly would she be pleased if they'd kindly quit worrying about her. She says they're doubtless fine gentlemen, every one, but that she can take care of herself buying an electric iron or a washing machine in any discount store in America.

What brought up this ladylike outburst was arrival here of an assortment of fair traders to appear before the Senate small-business committee, headed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, JR., (Democrat, Minnesota) who used to run a fair-trade drug store, himself.

My Hilda wouldn't have done business with the Senator; she patronizes cut-rate druggists. Her theory is, why pay 44 cents for a large economy size when she can get the same thing down the street for 29 cents?

Senator HUMPHREY has up an assortment of bills which would tend to bring back prices at retail as fixed by the manufacturers

and I can only tell him that Mrs. O. wants no part of the deal.

What particularly roused her was the evidence of Joseph Fleishaker, who operates the six Will Sale Appliance stores in Louisville, Ky., and who is president of the National Appliance and Radio Dealers' Assn.

He said he wasn't attacking the discount house as such, because it was only a symptom of the ills besetting the appliance industry. The trouble, he said, was the manufacturers boosting their production capacity ahead of time to take care of the growing population. His members want Congress to pass a national fair-trade law allowing the manufacturers to franchise dealers and set retail prices.

"I'm not so much concerned about the dealers as I am about protecting the consumer," he continued. "Your wife has suffered. Everybody's wife has suffered."

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, couldn't understand exactly how his wife had been hurt.

"The service angle," said Fleishaker. "The discount houses have eliminated service. An electric iron can be sold by mail at a ridiculously low price, but if it goes bad, the customer must ship it back, say, to the factory at Dayton, Ohio, to have it repaired."

That's where Fleishaker stepped on the toes of my Hilda. She'd seen electric irons that shoot steam into the clothes advertised at $19.50. Down she went to her favorite man on 11th Street, who operates from a store that has nothing much on display except cardboard boxes full of merchandise. He sold her the identical iron for $11.38.

It came in a sealed carton containing the standard manufacturer's guaranty, which she promptly threw away. It's too much trouble mailing irons back to the factory when busted, she said.

Her iron, in any event, functioned perfectly and she said she was willing to gamble. She saved $8.12 by patronizing the man who didn't seem to care whether she bought anything and who refused to wrap her purchase. If the iron goes cold when it should be hot she calculated she could pay a repairman and still be ahead of the game. Senator PROXMIRE seemed to have the same idea.

"Why isn't it more logical to sell the article at the low price," he asked, "and then pay for the service as needed?"

"The other method is the historical way," replied Fleishaker. That's when my bride had a notion (happily suppressed) to take a swing at him with her reticule. She said she wasn't interested in history when buying an iron, particularly when it cost her $8 more.

WITNESS JOLTS THE FAIR TRADERS

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON.—American druggists, who are almost solidly behind a so-called fair trade bill making cut-rate prices illegal, got a horrid jolt today from Charles F. Fort, one of their own.

Pharmacist Fort told the Senate Commerce Committee that when the Louisiana fair trade law collapsed, he slashed prices 10 to 50 percent on everything in his Baton Rouge drugstore. Business boomed so that his eight clerks were run ragged.

Now he's got 52 clerks and 6 drugstores and he's doing a $2 million a year business. Very simple, said the youngish, plumpish Fort.

"There are millions of people in this country who wouldn't think of spending $26.95 for an electric mixer," he told the Senators. "But now there's many a man who'll drop into one of our stores (adv.) buy this same, identical mixer for $14.50 and take it home to his wife for a birthday present."

Fort said that his markup ranged from 5 to 30 percent and that he never sold an item below cost.

"We don't believe in giving our merchandise away," he continued, "but we do keep our costs low so we can give the people a fair price."

He bitterly denounced the bill which would allow manufacturers to set retail prices on trade-marked merchandise, as written by Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE (Democrat, Wisconsin) and ex-druggist HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota.)

"If this bill is passed, you mean the consumer will have to pay more?" inquired Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, who takes a dim view of the Federal Government passing laws taking controls away from the States.

"Yes, sir, unless he buys from us, because we'll go to court," replied Fort. He quickly apologized for that one; said he meant no contempt for Senators.

"What you're saying is you're against the bill," suggested Senator THURMOND, who didn't seem insulted.

"Yes, sir, I sure am," Fort said.

He looked around the tiny hearing room with the crystal chandelier and the cupids on the ceiling, then he said: "If the people knew what this bill meant, you wouldn't be able to hold these hearings in this little room."

The room was jampacked, incidentally, by fair-trade proponents; Fort was able to observe few mere customers. Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, was interested in his profits at cutrate prices.

"Since slashing prices on everything in the store," said Fort, "we've been making money. In fact, the only time we have to borrow is when we pay taxes—and that's no reflection on the Senate."

Druggist Fort, I hasten to add, had a receptive audience in the two members of the subcommittee and my guess is that the so-called fair trade bill, after extensive hearings, will smother to death in one of those senatorial pigeonholes.

(This letter is submitted for the record of the public hearings on fair trade, beginning, July 21, 1958, Washington, D. C., before Special Subcommittee on Fair Trade of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the Humphrey-Proxmire bill, S. 3850, to establish Federal fair trade, by Ed Wimmer, president, Forward America Publishing Guild, Inc., 450 Commercial Square, Cincinnati, Ohio; vice president, public relations director, public relations division, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.)

JULY 12, 1958.

Mr. FREDERICK C. OTHMAN,
Daily News Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OTHMAN: Several of our more than 100,000 members (many more of whom I am sure read your usually delightful commentaries) have complained bitterly over your most unfair attitude concernnig fair-trade legislation—designed to protect the very papers who are buying your commentaries.

In other words, Mr. Othman, you seem to go out of your way to ridicule and hold in contempt those who are testifying before Congress in behalf of fair trade principles while, on the other hand, you uphold, defend and eulogize the bait artist, chiseler, and discount-house operator who are little more than scavengers of the market place—preying upon the uninformed, among whom is your own little Hilda.

You say in your column that Hilda wishes the so-called fair traders would quit worrying about her, and would let her buy the things she wants at the discount house; that "Hilda would not have patronized Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY's fair trade drugstore"—because "Hilda believes in patronizing cutrate druggists." You referred to those testifying for fair trade as "an assortment of fair traders," which assortment included officials of such newspaper advertisers as Sunbeam Corp., Westinghouse, General Electric, Parke-Davis, Eli Lilly & Co., and many, many others, including representatives of the most respected organizations in the Nation.

In my own testimony during hearings on the Harris bill, before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I asked the committee if any young man would dare to open a retail store in any neighborhood in which the discount house or price-baiting chain was dominant, and if freedom of opportunity could long exist in any area of the economy if our American philosophy is to be based on survival of the fittest instead of survival of that which is fit to survive.

Another of my questions dealt with profits and taxes, my contention being that loss leaders were now running into the billions upon billions of dollars in sales, on which no income tax is paid. I asked the committee: "Why is it that price cutters always use the most advertised lines as baits, never offering a lesser known trademark of equal quality?"

The chiseler and bait artist you and Hilda patronize, and whom you so often defend, are living on the reputations of the advertisers who need profits to promote and build up those reputations through papers buying your column. These people have no reputation of their own—except price cutter, and were it not for the legitimate manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, and retailer—who establish trademarked merchandise—where would your "discount dealer on 11th Street" be today?

Your column ridicules the statement of Joseph Fleishaker, president of the National Appliance & Radio Dealers' Association, for his statement that "housewives are harmed by the ills besetting the appliance industry," and again I ask you: "What young man would start an appliance store today?" And boys are sons of housewives, you know, who want them to make good. Why is it that 50 or more appliance makers went broke, merged or were liquidated since your glorified discount house came into being, and do you think that is good for you and your Hilda?

You say your "Hilda couldn't understand how she would be helped by fair trade," but if fair trade assists in keeping the trade channels of this Nation open to the 750,000 graduating newcomers now entering the market place each year; if fair trade enables manufacturers and merchants to sell reputable goods at fair prices so that fair wages can be paid out of fair profits—isn't that better for Hilda?

The small appliance store owner in your neighborhood may be your Sunday School teacher; a member of the Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, or Optimist Club, and when he displays several refrigerators or television sets, and helps you decide which is best for your needs, and when he gives a service guaranty with what he sells: do you think you are being fair when you choose what you want through his efforts (or through advertising in the papers carrying your column), and then buy from the discounter?

Furthermore, Mr. Othman, the regular price and savings you mention are completely misleading in that discounters always quote the list price of the manufacturer, which, unless fair traded, never prevails. So, the savings you mention are entirely fictitious. I would also ask your Hilda (and all the other bargain-seeking Hildas)—Why not fight for

a further savings by asking manufacturers to sell their merchandise out of freight cars or trucks, since Hilda enjoys trading in a store where goods are piled up in boxes with no service, wrappings, or fixtures?

I am sure that automobile manufacturers could sell their cars direct from big warehouses, with no guaranties, service, or fancy showrooms, thus eliminating the thousands of dealers, employees, taxes, electric signs, rentals, advertising, etc., which the dealerships represent. After all, hasn't the discounting, price slashing, unethical list-price-shouting car dealer destroyed public trust in his business and the industry he serves? Hasn't the Congress viewed the bankruptcy of thousands of dealers and found evidence disastrous enough to warrant adopting a price-labeling act which is aimed at halting some of the lying advertising engendered by cutthroat competition? Do you think it is good for the economy when new car sales this year average a reported $46 loss per car?

No trade, my friend, is good trade if it isn't fair trade, and Senator HUMPHREY and an overwhelming number of the House and Senate Members have endorsed this philosophy in their previous votes establishing national fair-trade laws. So did the legislators of 45 States when they thought they were outlawing unfair trade, and how about the United States Supreme Court which ruled on several occasions that unfair trade practices—loss-leader selling—is detrimental to the national welfare?

Officials of Bissell Carpet Sweeper Co., for example, testified that Bissell laid off 20 percent of our employees, and our sales went down 35 percent due to cutthroat pricing practices.

Herman Van Meil, general counsel for Sunbeam, related that Sunbeam lost 74 percent of our dealers in Utah due to price wars, and he said that following price wars in St. Louis, his company ended up with 135 out of 1,200 dealers; that 4 percent of Sunbeam dealers in price-cutting areas control more than 80 percent of Sunbeam volume.

Consider the statement of General Electric that loss-leader selling ruins the manufacturer's reputation and decimates his distribution system. With this in mind, let me ask you why any salesman should bother to call on the Hildas of America, to interest them in buying new products when they know the Hildas will end up at a discount house? Isn't that what G. E. is saying when they charge decimation of distribution systems?

Dr. John Dargavel, National Association of Retail Druggists, has called upon the labor unions to face up to the fair-trade issue, reminding their leaders of the constant drive for bigger pay envelopes and more fringe benefits, and he has asked them where these increases and benefits are to come from if union workers continue to hunt for loss-leader sales, discount house bargains, catalog goods, trading stamps, and other free enterprise killing devices.

It has been said, and wisely, I believe, that the way a people spend their money determines the kind of society they create, and it has been most encouraging to me to note that more people are asking, "What kind of a life can I buy with my money"? And there is a growing hunger for knowledge which says that in the exchange of the gifts of earth, unless they be in kindly justice, many may someday go hungry.

Edwin Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, made the statement that if ethics are not restored to the market place, free enterprise is doomed. Pope Pius XI spoke of American capitalism becoming so cruel and hard, that it no longer serves the spiritual needs of the average man.

In a resolution adopted by the Churches of Christ, they declared:

"Economic institutions should serve the whole man, body and spirit, and it is the church's duty to influence the development of economic institutions, policies, and practices that are favorable to the right relations between all the people."

Do you honestly believe, Mr. Othman, that the assortment of so-called fair traders to whom you referred, are asking for anything more when they seek a system of economic traffic lights to help keep the road hogs from running American free enterprise over the precipices of predatory competition and monopoly power? Aren't you willing to see, that economic gangsterism is no different than gangsterism in any other form?

Advertising Age (another member of the assortment of so-called fair traders) has stated that Congress cannot wait any longer to halt the jungle-type competition that is over-running enormous areas of our marketing system. Paul Fisher, of the Fisher Pen Co., who also testified during the hearings on the Harris bill, has said that "fair profits widely circulated through our economy, are essential to continued prosperity. Every citizen has a basic and fundamental right to fair and equal treatment."

Such publications as Advertising Age, and men of such reputation as those whom I have quoted, are not an assortment of so-called fair traders, and I can assure you that organizations such as the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade are not headed up by selfish, greedy individuals who are seeking new ways and means of picking the pocketbooks of women like your Hilda.

We hear so much today about the young people who have lost their boldness and sense of adventure; their zest for exploration and risk taking; their capacity for dedication, and we are told that a generation such as this is headed for the history books. We read that 33 percent of the girls and 25 percent of the boys in one poll, favored Government control of all basic industries, while another poll showed 50 percent favoring Government censorship of the press, radio, and television.

These kids are not communists and neither are their teachers, but you ask any assembly of boys and girls in our schools and colleges, how many want to venture into a business of their own, and the results will amaze you. There was a time every For Rent sign on an empty store was a challenge to our youth, and, yes, to men over 60—but not now.

If we had a market place governed by rules of fair play—the same kind of rules that keep baseball, football, and other sports alive, we could keep fair competition alive, and that is all Peter Sletterdahl, editor of the NARD Journal (National Association of Retail Druggists), has sought in his bitter denunciation of those who constantly use trademarked products as loss leaders or discount house items, to destroy legitimate competition.

Senator Humphrey and, other legislators supporting fair trade, can make themselves more popular with more people by beating the drums of those who are turning American free enterprise into a gigantic bargain basement, but they believe with Jonathan Swift, who wrote in Gulliver's Travels:

"Honesty has no fence against superior cunning, and since it is necessary that there should be a perpetual intercourse of buying and selling, and dealing with honesty, there must be a law to protect the honest dealer—else the knave gets all the advantages."

Abraham Lincoln must have been thinking along these lines, when he said that the wolf could complain that his freedom was being restricted when he was kept from the flock, but the restrictions enabled the flock to live. Bishop Fulton J. Sheen put it another way when he warned, that "freedom to do as you please is decadent liberalism, while the freedom to do what you ought to do is the roots of civilization."

Even the Hildas of America, who are caught in the present craze of something for nothing, should know that predatory competition is the pathway to monopoly, and that monopoly always leads to high prices and national disaster. They should also know that if lustful men had been allowed to continue their predatory course, there wouldn't be a live buffalo in America. The deer and pheasant would be gone. Many lakes would be emptied of their fish. Our great Redwood trees would have been cut down. The wild game reserves we now so jealously protect would not exist.

Ignorance is not bliss, my friend. It is oblivion, and oblivion it will be if the typical American housewife loses sight of the fact that her duty to her children is to give scope to their latent abilities, by giving scope to the economy which is to control their future standards of living.

During the past year, there have been more small business failures than at any similar period in history, but the giant chains and discount houses, with their something for nothing ballyhoo, are in a stronger position than ever. As a result of cut-throat competition, thousands of substantial businesses have merged or liquidated, and the president of a sizable supermarket chain that merged with a bigger chain, said recently, that "competition is such that only the biggest can survive, and that is why we are selling out."

Yes, Senator HUMPHREY owns a drug store, the operation of which must show a profit. The Senator is convinced that papers handling your column must make a profit in order for your syndicate to make a profit, so they can pay you a profit on your talent and time.

The Senator is also aware (as you should be) that profitable sale of the merchandise offered by reputable advertisers is the only thing that makes continued advertising possible, and pardon me for saying so, but he knows, and you know, that no newspaper can make any money selling papers full of columns and news.

And what a drab society we would have if all merchandise was sold in drab surrounding, with a "don't care if you buy attitude," which you say your Hilda prefers. Think for a moment what Washington or any other city would look like if the business community was made up of stores without fancy fixtures, clerks, or services. Isn't that the way it is in Russia? And isn't it the Communists who condemn our profit system?

No-profit operations cut the number of newspapers some 50 percent in the past decade, which cut the number of prospects for your column accordingly. If all the Hildas of America would seek out ways and means of buying everything at the lowest possible price, with nothing in mind but price, their pocketbooks would become an economic H-bomb.

In other words, the women of America have the fate of their families, and perhaps that of the Nation, in the purchasing power they now control, and if that power is understood and used wisely, the women of America can open up the greatest era of human progress and prosperity in the history of the world.

Man, I am sure, was never produced to become a mere belly for the products of his hands and machines. He was born with a personality and a soul, but if the economic environment is to become a contest of who can cut who's throat the quickest and deepest, is to prevail, then man a product will become.

I want my boy to have his chance in a market place where the rules of fair play are the same as those on the baseball diamond or in the fight ring; not to be struck

out in a jungle-type warfare brought forth by unrestrained competition.

Very truly yours,

ED WIMMER,
Vice President, Public Relations Director, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., Public Relations Division, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Who Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Will McGrath, one of Cincinnati's leading citizens, has called my attention to the editorial in the August 1 issue of United States News & World Report, by David Lawrence, entitled "Welcome, Murderer."

This editorial says so well what the Committee on Un-American Activities has ben trying to convey to the Congress and the American people for many years; namely, that we hurt our cause with the people behind the Iron Curtain who are so violently opposed to their Communist masters, when we meet and deal with them at summit conferences.

WELCOME, MURDERER

(By David Lawrence)

Somehow, to carry on conferences at the United Nations with Sobolev or some other Ambassador from the Soviet Government seems tolerable to a degree as a formal mechanism of diplomacy, but to sit down and fraternize with the arch-conspirator—the man who ordered guns and tanks to shoot down and trample upon men, women, and children in Hungary just a few short months ago—that is something else again.

If summit meetings are to be held with rulers whose hands are soaked with the blood of thousands of human beings killed in eastern Europe, then indeed have we lost sight of fundamentals and succumbed to a passion for appeasement of the present-day Hitler.

Only 2 weeks ago, the United Nations, in a special report, was deploring the fact that the Soviet Union had disregarded the resolutions of the General Assembly which had demanded information about the trial and execution of the patriots in Hungary. Henry Cabot Lodge, Ambassador to the U. N., said on July 16:

"This new and revealing report shows that the United Nations has good reason to remain deeply concerned over the tragic situation in that country. The murders of Imre Nagy, General Maleter, and other Hungarian patriots will never be forgotten. The perpetrators of these acts have reverted from civilized behavior to the law of the jungle. These frightful acts are obviously not the acts of free Hungarians but of puppet rulers kept in power by Soviet military forces. In the name of simple humanity, these killings must stop."

And here is what the Government of the United States said about it in a special statement issued by the Department of State on July 17:

"The U. N. report makes it abundantly clear that the Hungarian regime, which was forcibly imposed by the Soviet Government in November 1956, and has since been supported by the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary, secretly tried and executed Imre Nagy and his associates in flagrant violation of assurances of safe conduct and of recognized conditions of immunity * * *.

"The Committee (of the U. N.) also calls attention to the fact that the Soviet and Hungarian Governments have continued to persist in their refusal to comply with resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and to cooperate in any way with the Committee. * * *

"The United States Government is convinced that the nations of the world, feeling a deep sense of shock and revulsion at the events in Hungary, will not assume an attitude of indifference permitting the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to escape the full weight of the opprobrium that they must justly bear because of their actions."

The Committee reported also that it has evidence that 33 patriots have been sentenced to death and that more may shortly share their fate.

Who gives the command for these murders to be committed? Naturally, it's the man who holds the top post in the Kremlin—none other than Nikita Khrushchev.

This is the man we are asked to "welcome" at a "summit" conference.

What a strange delusion has swept the world, and particularly so many misguided persons in the parliaments of the free peoples, as they enthusiastically urge "summit" conferences. Is it that somehow, by sitting down uder the glare of the kleig lights and television, with cameras clicking and thousands of newsmen looking on, some sort of "deal" can be arranged which supposedly will—as Munich falsely promised—give us "peace in our times"? What nonsense.

Have we lost our perspective? Are we to forgive and forget the murders of innocent persons in Siberia? Are we to deprive the enslaved peoples in eastern Europe and in the Middle East of their hopes for emancipation?

What of the traditional ideals of the liberty-loving peoples of Britain, France, and America? Do we believe in them still? Or do we rush with open arms to welcome the man who has blasphemed us, the man who stirred up rebellion in the Middle East and sent weapons to Nasser to help him threaten and then annex, 1 by 1, the defenseless states adjacent to Egypt?

What principle of humanity beckons us to do aught but deal sternly with the murderer who is today the foremost enemy of peace in the world?

What principle of "diplomatic courtesy" requires us to remain silent when the man who has threatened to "bury us" comes to our shores supposedly to "negotiate" some vague agreement that will never be honored by him—if, indeed, one is ever signed?

We should, of course, assure the personal safety of Khrushchev, but we should din in his ears daily the case against murder and tyranny.

Let the kinsmen of the patriots of the captive states parade flag-draped coffins down the streets of New York City day after day during Khrushchev's visit so he may be reminded that in America, at least, we do not glorify murderers. Let the placards read: " 'Welcome,' Murderer."

Three Recessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the August 4 issue of Time sheds light on some aspects of the recent recession which should be of significance to some current legislative proposals being considered by Congress and congressional committees. The facts which it reveals concerning the trend toward recovery should be a warning against passage of the many spending proposals which will be presented in the closing days of this session.

THREE RECESSIONS—SCORECARD SHOWS 1958'S WAS SHORTEST

How does the 1957–58 recession compare with the two other postwar business dips of 1948–49 and 1953–54? Last week the nonpolitical Committee for Economic Development brought out a remarkable set of graphs that for the first time put the recent downturn in clear focus—and incidentally laid to rest some cherished views about combating recessions. Starting at the first real dips, CED individually plotted such prime indicators as industrial production, gross national product, employment, inventory changes, plant expansion, month by month or quarter by quarter to show the relationship of each to the others. Conclusion: the current recession is the shortest and probably the mildest of the three. It is also the recession that proved it a fallacy to consider tax cuts and heavy Government public works pump priming, either together or separately, as the speediest and surest cure for any business lag.

Overall, the recession hit bottom in April 1958 in the jigtime of 9 months—2 months faster than the 1949 recession and a full 4 months sooner than in 1954. At times, particularly during February and March, the current slide was sharper than in the other two recessions. But so was the upturn. Gross national product has apparently turned around after dropping for two quarters, versus a year of backing and filling in 1949 and a year of decline in the 1954 business downturn. Industrial production recovered in 8 months, versus 11 months and 12 months before any steady rise took place in the other two postwar recessions; the percentage of workers unemployed turned down after 8 months, faster than before.

The CED charts seem to be more proof of the correctness of the administration's course in opposing loud congressional demands, and some by businessmen, for heavy tax cuts and a vast program of Government spending. According to CED's graphs, neither course would necessarily have accelerated the recovery. Despite 1954's tax cut, personal income took 14 months to regain and hold lost ground. This time personal income is almost back to prerecession levels in 10 months, without any reduction in taxes. At the start of the 1949 recession, Government spending was sharply increased, yet employment showed no improvement for 8 months. Without such help this time, the strong upturn came in 8 months. According to Keynesian theories of countercyclical government pump-priming, 1949's recovery should have come considerably faster than it did, while 1958's should be much slower.

Where does the United States economy go from here? On CED's charts a major booster out of the 1949 and 1954 recessions was the turnabout in inventories. In the 1949 recession businessmen continued to liquidate inventories for more than a year, in 1953–54 for 15 months, before any sizable upturn took place. This time the rate of inventory liquidation seems to be bottoming out after 2 quarters, though no one is willing to predict any heavy accumulation in the near future. Business outlays for new plant and equipment are a more worrisome problem. The 1958 slide in expansion expenditures has already gone on for 3 quarters and may continue for possibly

another year, thus holding the general economy down.

What might accelerate the recovery, regardless of what happens to inventories and plant expansions, is housing, which CED's chartists call the economy's ace in the hole. After dropping farther than in either of the two preceding recessions (13 percent versus 2½ percent in 1953, 3½ percent in 1948), the annual rate of new housing starts broke through prerecession levels in June, and the industry is expected to pump $1 billion into the market for men and materials this year.

Millions of Enslaved Europeans Watch With Anxiety Struggle Between Western Democracies and Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum released by the Ministry of Foreign affairs of the Polish Government in Exile, with headquarters in London:

POLISH GOVERNMENT (IN EXILE),
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
London, S. W. 1, July 28, 1958.

MEMORANDUM

About a hundred million human beings, enslaved by Russia in Europe alone, are with greater and greater anxiety noting every move of the western democracies in their struggle with international communism or rather, in plain language, with Soviet Russia. For the fate of these hundred million people and of their countries depends on the outcome of this struggle. Not only their future is ever more menaced; the democratic, great powers of the West are ultimately no less menaced. Realization of the undoubted community of interests within the whole civilized world, both the part in Russian bondage and that which is still free, impels the Polish Government now in exile to turn to the Western Powers with the appeal that the following considerations be seriously taken into account.

1. In these times of unparalleled speed in technological progress, Russia has undoubtedly very important achievements behind her. In some fields, her rate of progress outstrips that of the West chiefly due to successive dictatorships mercilessly exploiting the enormous reserves of enslaved populations forced to labor for the Soviet state to the limits of human endurance and in conditions of the direst poverty. It would be erroneous, however, to affirm that the spectacular attainments of Russia's technology in given fields provide a just measure of her power in general. The economic methods of communism, based on extreme exploitation of the population and marked by spasmodic, often impracticable planning, is the antithesis of all that goes to make up the power of a modern state, one based on universal freedom, with a steady growth in the general prosperity and happiness of the people. It will probably be no exaggeration to affirm that the present appraisal of Russian power by the West is largely the result of an assiduously self-inculcated belief in the existence of this power, a belief that is moreover enegretically propagated by the Western Powers themselves.

In reality, however, 20th-century Russia has never been able effectively to withstand any country without fundamental help from the West. Whether in tsarist or in Communist times, Russia invariably suffered defeat whenever this help was lacking, and gained victories only when in receipt of such aid. It will suffice to recall the Russo-Japanese War, the First World War, and the Polish-Russian War (of 1920) in which she was decisively defeated; even the Second World War was marked by striking German victories and an advance deep into Russia until the tide was turned by lavish help given her in the form of supplies, weapons, ammunition, military equipment of every kind, and even shipments of food.

Naturally, the above remarks are not meant to suggest the present war effort of Russia should be made light of; they are merely intended to point out that Russia's actual possibilities should not be over-estimated. Russia is unable to maintain an equal footing with the western democracies in critical times; the West should therefore adopt a more determined and categorical attitude towards Russia's expansion. Confirmation of the justice of this observation would seem to be provided by the decline in Russia's prestige after her relatively mild reaction at the outset of the Iraqi upheaval, when it appeared that the Western Powers would, after landing their troops in Lebanon and Jordan, continue a more determined line of political action.

2. Despite the vociferous propaganda of international communism regarding the alleged aggressive aims of the United States, the Polish Nation—and doubtlessly all the other captive peoples—has no illusions on the point of Russia's own intentions while harboring no doubts regarding the sincerity of the peaceful objectives of the United States and the other western democracies. The Poles, however, consider that these objectives can be attained only if based on a broader foundation than that afforded by acquiescence in lawlessness already committed, and by mere declaration that future lawless acts will be opposed. After all, the tactic of Soviet aggression is fully based on the conviction heretofore firmly held in Russia and in the rest of the world that she can be sure of impunity for all her more or less treacherous acts of aggression. Moreover, Russia's strategical policy is likewise based on this premise. Her latest achievement is the shifting of Iraq from the orbit of the Western Powers to that of the East, even if the new Iraqi regime for a time pretends neutrality. When this successive victory of Russia's is consolidated by her and accepted by a resigned West, she will again take the latter by surprise on some other sector, in the meantime playing for time by raising hopes of the most varied conferences calculated to maintain the illusion that durable peaceful relations between East and West can be arranged without Russia changing her present attitude and abandoning her final objectives.

The Polish Government returns to the suggestion made in several of its previous memoranda, viz, that the only effective means of interrupting the series of Russia's successes in the field of aggression is for the western powers, upon a broadly conceived international forum and in unequivocal determined and global fashion, to denounce all the Soviet acts of violence and lawlessness, beginning with the subjugation of the central-eastern European nations and ending with the Iraqui coup d'état, in which Russia has skillfully exploited Arab nationalism for her own political powers.

A. The passivity hithertofore maintained by the western powers with relation to Russia's violation of the freedom and independence of the captive nations is confirming the belief current in Russia and even in the free world that the western powers are convinced of the invincibility of her power, and that they fear it. It would seem indicated to make an effort to reverse this state of affairs, so that Russia should realize and actually believe the West is determined to restore order in world relations, to make good all the lawless acts committed by Russia, and to prevent the realization of any new ones planned by her. Only then will possibilities arise for the construction of lasting global peace and for the development of universal prosperity throughout the world. Only then would the danger of a new war, now ever closer, be removed.

4. Russia's declared intention of assuring her own security but by violently imposing so-called friendly governments in the weaker countries bordering with her is sheer hypocrisy and should no longer be tolerated. It is, after all, quite clear that these friendly governments are not national governments but the administrative organs of a Russian occupation. A Polish attack on Russia in 1939 was inconceivable. It was Russia that concluded an alliance with Germany in order to effect a new partition of Poland. With independence restored to Poland, any possibility of aggression on her part would be similarly unthinkable. It is quite clear that a foreign occupation evokes a psychological reaction that makes friendly feeling for the occupying power impossible. Russian statements that harmony and amity allegedly mark Polish-Soviet relations are nothing but cynical falsehoods unworthy of any credence.

Orthodox, and in time even amicable relations so necessary to assure the peace of the world between Russia on the one hand, and the nations now subjected by Russia on the other hand, can be attained only when the latter are liberated from foreign occupation with their full liberty and independence restored and assured against renewed aggression. This assurance can be provided primarily if the countries now subjected by Russia form a confederated and neutralized zone in central-eastern Europe, the integrity of which would be guaranteed by all the powers interested in maintaining peace in the world. Such a pacific setlement of European relations would facilitate a settlement likewise in other parts of the world if only as an outcome of the release of political tension in Europe.

5. The whole Polish nation, comprising Poles in the homeland and elsewhere, undoubtedly together with all the other nations subjugated by Russia, desires to cooperate with the western powers in this field insofar as this is possible at present.

What Union Members Have Been Writing Senator McClellan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, shortly to appear in the Reader's Digest, is a very sad and revealing one.

Mr. John Dos Passos, its author, is a sincere and honest writer who has been so impressed with the lack of freedom, fair play and Americanism prevailing in some labor unions that he has been compelled to write the truth as he found it.

The article seems to have the full endorsement of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, who permitted Mr. Dos Passos to go over the letters in the files of the Select Committee on Improper Activities

in Labor and Management Fields. The Senator writes as follows:

The letters that we have received have been not only a source of information for the committee, but a source of great encouragement and inspiration. As John Dos Passos points out, one cannot help but be impressed with the intelligence, stamina and fighting spirit of this cross section of America.

It is clear from this response that problems exist for union members that need attention and need it now. Not only are they denied the rights to which they are entitled, but in many cases their treatment has been utterly degrading. It is incumbent upon union officials, both local and international, to meet their responsibilities to their membership.

I trust that this article will help to reawaken the selfless idealism of trade unionism which has guided union officials for so many years in the past.

Mr. Speaker, We will now hear loud screams that this article is antilabor from the usual quarter. To this I can only reply, in the words of the two closing sentences:

They want action. They want legislation. They want protection. The want democracy. We pray to God that we will some day get some laws passed in this country that will help us working people rid ourselves of these dictators so that we can govern ourselves.

WHAT UNION MEMBERS HAVE BEEN WRITING SENATOR MCCLELLAN

(By John Dos Passos)

"I'm sorry I can't sign my name, as it may mean my life or my livelihood. We may as well admit we are living under a labor autocracy—graft, rackets, intimidation, goons, etc. For fear of being bumped off, ostracized, or deprived of making a living, I'm afraid to sign my name."

These sentences are from a letter by an American workingman, addressed to the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Fields, popularly known as the McClellan committee.

Congressional committees are accustomed to an enormous mail, but the correspondence reaching the McClellan committee ever since its hearings started bids fair to set a record. Last February it was estimated that 100,000 letters had been filed away in the committee's offices. Hundreds more pour in every week.

They come from every State of the Union, from men and women in every trade and occupation; hod carriers and seamstresses, operators of draglines and makers of delicate dental equipment; from steelworkers, ditchdiggers, salesmen, miners, musicians, and machinists. Letter after letter is written in fear, fear of violence and loss of job. This reporter read thousands of them. It was an awakening experience. This is no organized campaign. These letters come from the heart of the American people, spontaneously. It took great courage and bitter experience to write them. How many hundreds of thousands more disillusioned people are represented by these letters?

The member who protests against the way his union is being run does so at his own risk. "I'd never have another job on the waterfront if they knew I'd written this," a stevedore warns. A number of men typed a petition asking the committee to investigate strong-arm methods used by their local business agent. "Can't sign names," they scrawled at the bottom of the sheet. "We'd be blacklisted." Some of them put it jokingly. "I'd sign my name, but I don't like my undertaker."

Not all the writers have let themselves be terrorized; many are ready to fight. "You are our last hope," writes a union member. "I don't like to live in fear for the rest of my life, but if I am asked to testify I shall." Here's a courageous house painter: "The goons got nine-tenths of the rank and file scared. That's the reason they don't come to meetings. I'll face any of 'em for you, Senator. I've lived 63 years now, how much longer can I live? But for God's sake give these young men a chance to raise their families."

Many write in anger. "Is this the United States of America or where are we?—when a man has to see his family in want because he didn't approve of what the union officials were doing and had nerve enough to say so." A veteran writes: "Is this what I fought for in World War II?"

These are not cranks addressing the Senate committee. None of them is opposed to unions as such. Many have devoted their lives to the labor movement. But they want labor leaders to be subject to the law like everybody else. Again and again they draw the distinction between the leaders and the rank and file. They feel that proper legislation, before it's too late, can save the labor movement.

"All labor will profit by these investigations," one man writes. "Your investigation has been rought on unions but all unions will be the better for it." "Clean up this mess," another pleads. "Make it so a man has a right to work and not have to bow down to them damn Hitlers."

Why, if there is so much discontent within the unions, don't we hear more of rank-and-file action? Senator MCCLELLAN himself asked that question in a speech which drew comment from union members.

"You state, Senator, that members can do a lot to clean up their unions by standing up for their rights," wrote a railroad worker. "We did just that, and there are 50 men in this little mountain city walking the streets for a job."

This reporter traveled to the little mountain city to meet that worker. For his protection, let's call him Jones—though having lost his job, he has little more to lose.

It is a rainy Sunday afternoon. Jones and his friends have called a meeting of most of the 50 men in the assembly room of their social club. Locomotive engineers, conductors, brakemen, switchmen, railway clerks—all so eager to tell about the raw deal they got that they keep interrupting one another.

"Don't have no respect for the rank and file. * * * All they care about's your money. * * * They've been in there too long."

It comes as a shock to an outsider because the railroad unions are among the oldest in America. "If you don't like the leadership, why can't you put them out and elect somebody else?" this reporter asks. The whole room breaks into a loud horselaugh.

"Mister, you don't understand," Jones says. "The only way you can get your ballot counted is by voting the way the boys upstairs want you to. They had it their own way so long they think we're a bunch of suckers."

An elderly railroad employee tells this story: Many years ago a union management made some bad investments of union funds. In 1927 the union faced bankruptcy. The management appealed to the members to bail them out by buying loyalty certificates, which resembled bonds. When these didn't sell fast enough the members were given a choice between a $100 assessment and a $100 loyalty certificate. Six million dollars was raised in this way.

These loyalty certificates were supposed to pay 4-percent interest. But they had a lot of small print, to the effect that they would be payable "at the discretion of the trustees when funds became available." They never became available.

When a new industrial union for all operating railroad crafts was formed, these 50 workers decided to go along with it. They liked its constitution, which called for direct election of officers, limitation of salaries, the referendum and recall, local self-government, and public accounting of funds. But they had reckoned without the union-shop contracts approved by the Railway Labor Act. When they joined the new union they were cited by their old unions. The men put up a long fight with the National Railway Adjustment Board and in the courts, but in the end they were fired.

The fight has gone on year after year. The rank and file of their old locals petitioned to have these men reinstated, but the leadership said no. "We've been under pressure for 5 years," one of the ousted men wrote the McClellan committee. "You never knew which knock on the door would mean violence, or which phone call would be a threat. Don't sound like we lived in America, does it?"

A hundred thousand letters. A hundred thousand stories, each lighting up some dark corner of American labor life. The over-all story that emerges is that the leaders have taken over the labor movement. No place for the independents. No place for the idealist who organizes for the benefit of his fellow workers. The letters are desperately urgent. Send your investigators now—tomorrow will be too late.

The writers of these letters are terribly earnest men, as their reporter can testify from long talks with many of them. Here's the story of a man who has just lost a battle for honest unionism inside one of the best internationals in the country. Let's call him Murphy because he's an Irishman, a husky bull-necked young fellow who was a paratrooper in World War II.

Five years ago Murphy was working in a plant in an eastern city. Many foreign-born workers there spoke little English and were getting a raw deal. It was dirty, dangerous work. Safety regulations were often neglected. The foreman contemptuously spoke of the men as donkeys. The independent union in the plant seemed to be company-dominated. So young Murphy found himself trying to stiffen the men's spines. He set up a class in English for them after work. He got an organizer from a great CIO industrial union, and threw himself into organizing the plant. They lost one election, petitioned the NLRB for another and won it.

Murphy was elected shop steward and chairman of the safety committee. His local sent him as a delegate to union conventions. A career was opening up for him as a labor leader. Still he wasn't satisfied with the way safety regulations were enforced at the plant and felt that some men were being discriminated against in the wage scale. He began to quarrel with the president of his local, a man we will call Joe Cermak, whom he had helped elect.

Cermak's brother was the industrial union's field representative. These two had become labor professionals. Cermak did no more work in the plant though he was paid full time. He sat in his office smoking cigars and drinking whiskey. He was building himself a $30,000 home and playing the stock market. Murphy was still sticking up for the rank and file, but Cermak was backed by his powerful brother. They intimated to Murphy that if he went along with them he could have a fine career—president of the local maybe, money and soft living. Let the donkeys do the heavy work.

It was a hard decision to make. Murphy wanted a nice life for his two small daughters. Yet he chose to fight. His wife began getting anonymous phone calls hinting that he had better keep his nose clean. But the men in the plant believed in Murphy. He had enough votes lined up to take the presidency of the local away from the professionals at the next election.

The Cermaks decided to get rid of Murphy. They got help from management, which didn't like his harping on improved working conditions. When Murphy got into a dispute over safety regulations with his foreman, he was fired on charges of using abusive language. Murphy took the case to the State labor arbitration board. The union and management put their heads together to pick the arbitrator. Murphy lost his case and that was the end of one man's fight for the rights of his fellow workers. Fortunately he was able to take up a new career in a different type of work.

How can such a thing happen in a union whose leadership is reputed to be honest and intelligent? "Bigness," answers Murphy. The international president cannot keep an eye on the smaller locals. He must trust his field representatives. If a field representative keeps up his per capita on dues colected he's asked no questions and can build a little satrapy of his own. The men who lead unions for the money hate a troublemaker as much as management does.

"They just don't have time to pay attention to little guys like me," says Murphy. "We've got to have proper legislation because the United States is made up of little guys like me."

Not all the battles are lost, of course. Sometimes a courageous union member wins a round. Some of the committee's letters tel of men risking their lives right now for what they consider their rights as Americans.

Here's one who drives a taxi in a teeming industry city. Let's call him Bronski. When he came home from several years in the armed services he went to work for a new small cab company we'll call the Blue Cabs. But a larger company, the Red Cabs, had established a monopoly in the city and worked hand-in-glove with a powerful union. Both were entrenched at city hall. Their union moved in to organize the Blue Cab drivers.

Although he had always been a union man, Bronski didn't like the deal. He suspected that the professional labor leader who ran their local, whom we'll call Mr. Marino, was being paid by the Red Cabs to drive Blue Cabs off the street. So Bronski and some friends invited an organizer from another big out-of-town union to form a local for the Blue Cab drivers. They are only 200 men. They don't need to be protected from the management; the aggressive young fellow who owns the company gives his drivers a square deal. But they've got to protect themselves from Marino.

The fight is on. Marino calls a strike of Blue Cab drivers. A few Blue Cab drivers go out, but most of the men decide to cross the picket lines. The usual pattern of violence develops. Drivers are slugged, cabs are burned, passengers are intimidated; gasoline supplies are siphoned off, tires slashed. At the same time the Red Cab Co. is harassing the Blue Cab's management through the State public utilities commission and the State labor board.

Needless to say, there's no police protection for the Blue Cab drivers. When an out-of-town wholesaler sends in two tank trucks of gas for them in the middle of the night, a policeman is seen copying down the license numbers and turning them over to the Red Cab pickets. Meanwhile Marino lets it be known that the man who runs the Blue Cabs had better look out for lead poisoning.

At the height of the battle the Blue Cab drivers hold an election. They manage to keep Marino and his musclemen—all equipped with red armbands so that they won't slug each other—at bay at one gate of the compound while their men sneak out one by one through a back door to the voting machines. The vote is 10 to 1 in favor of the Blue Cab's own local.

Nevertheless, acts of violence kepe up after the election, until the Blue Cab drivers decide one night that they are tired of going about their business in fear of their lives. They would show that two can play the game of terror. A mysterious fire destroys a couple of taxis belonging to the Red Cab Co. Suddenly everything is quiet. No more bricks are thrown, no more drivers are beaten up. Marino is even heard to announce that the Blue Cab's manager needn't be afraid to walk out on the street.

This young man never did let them scare him: that's the moral of the tale. A stranger from another city, he bought into this company without knowing he was buying into a hornet's nest. Once in, he decided to stay. Now, saving the Blue Cab company has become a crusade with him and his drivers. He feels he's risking his life for American principles.

The doors leading to this man's office have stout locks. He never stirs without a gun. He knows he has a long fight ahead, but he knows what he's fighting for. His Blue Cabs are still on the street.

There are plenty of brave men in American business and honest men in the labor movement. But many of them are beginning to feel that the odds against them are too great. In view of the testimony of Senator McCLELLAN's mail pile it's no wonder they are discouraged.

Here's an elderly man in a Midwestern city, a member of a union in the entertainment industry, who's been collecting evidence for 30 years against the racketeers who control his trade. His best friend was shot dead for trying to get some of the crooks into court on that same evidence. Here's a team of machinery movers. Their business is going to pot because the union makes them hire stumblebums who can't do the work. Here are two brothers who have paid dues to the carpenter's union for 30 years. They can't work at their trade because they had a squabble with a business agent 5 years ago. Here's a skilled lathe operator who's working as a janitor because the union's got him blackballed. Here are a hundred thousand stories of grief and frustration.

But there is hope among them, too. These men believe in unionism and they believe in America. They aren't writing to the McClellan committee just to air their grievances. The great majority of them are offering constructive programs.

As you read their letteres, you can't help feeling pride in your fellow citizens. The letters are level-headed, reasonable; the suggestions offered are practical and carefully thought out. The committee's chief counsel, Robert F. Kennedy, who has had experience with the correspondence of other committees, estimates that at least 30 percent of the suggestions for legislation deserve consideration in the drafting of new labor laws. He rates this percentage unusally high. Ten percent of usable suggestions, he says, is about average.

What do the writers of these letters want?

The want unions, but not the checkoff or the union shop. They want union membership to be voluntary instead of compulsory. Some ask for right-to-work laws with teeth in them.

They want unions to be financially responsible under the law like banks and insurance companies.

They want the right to present grievances, without danger of reprisals, before the courts or the NLRB or the Department of Labor or some new Federal agency.

They want self-government in the unions, freedom of speech and the right for all union members to elect their officers by secret ballot.

They want action. The want legislation. They want protection. They want democracy.

"We pray to God that we will some day get some laws passed in this country that will help us working people rid ourselves of these dictators so that we can govern ourselves."

Fourteenth Anniversary of the Battle of Mortain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in reminding the Congress that August 7 marks the 14th anniversary of the battle of Mortain. This strategic engagement blunted the German counterattack in France designed to save its field armies in that country and prevent the surrender of France, loss of the channel coast missile bases and a disastrous withdrawal to Germany. Owing entirely to the unforgettable heroism of the 30th Infantry Division, the Germans were repelled at Mortain, thus assuring the liberation of France and materially enhancing the prospects of allied victory. In honor of this valiant division and this landmark in the history of American gallantry, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an article from the July issue of Army magazine on the Mortain engagement entitled "Heroism Is Never Out of Date."

I have, in recent weeks, been privileged to assist in successfully procuring from the Government of France the award of the Croix de Guerre with Palm to the 30th Infantry Division. The justification for such an award is apparent from the Army magazine article which states:

Taken by surprise and manning unfamiliar positions, the 30th Division stood its ground and fought as hard as any unit was to fight in the European theater.

I had long felt that the 30th Division merited more recognition than it received for its operations in World War II. The man to whom I turned for help in securing the French award of the Croix de Guerre with Palm was the French Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency, Herve Alphand. My trust was well placed for no one in the Government of France was more helpful than Ambassador Alphand.

In order to express congressional appreciation for the assistance of Ambassador Alphand, I arranged a luncheon in his honor. This luncheon was held last week in the Capitol and was attended by the congressional delegations of Tennessee, Georgia, North and South Carolina, from which States the 30th Infantry Division drew its members.

The Ambassador spoke eloquently of the courage of the men of the 30th Division and of his country's continuing appreciation for their efforts in liberating France. I have been asked to con-

vey to the veterans of the 30th Division and to the people of Tennessee the eternal gratitude of France and the French people for the heroic deeds of these fighting men.

In his remarks, the Ambassador alluded to the traditional and historic friendship between France and the United States. He told us further that under the leadership of General de Gaulle, France will once again become a stable force in world politics, world economy and international cooperation. America can expect that the de Gaulle program, carried out within the strict limits of democratic process, will restore to France her rightful position as a leader of the free world and a force for justice and liberty. France, by virtue of her rich natural endowments and the creative genius of her citizens will, under de Gaulle, become a full partner of the United States in combating communism and protecting the security of the free world.

In responce to Ambassador Alphand, I restated my long held conviction that the miseries that plagued France could be remedied only by the strong proscriptions of Premier de Gaulle. I told the Ambassador that we, in Tennessee, welcomed the return to office of our great comrade in arms of World War II. Furthermore, that we looked to General de Gaulle for leadership of the kind of France America so desperately needs as a partner.

In thanking Ambassador Alphand for his help in honoring the 30th Division, I told him that the interest of the American Army in General de Gaulle predates our World War II cooperation. With great pleasure I related the story recently told to me by General MacArthur. In the early thirities when General MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, was wrestling with the problems of mechanizing the Army, he traveled to France to study the mechanization program of the French Army.

In order to brief General MacArthur, the French high command chose a young, erect, 6-foot 4-inch lieutenant colonel. This young officer so impressed General MacArthur that the young colonel was asked by MacArthur to join him in a lengthy private discussion of these problems. That young lieutenant colonel, Charles de Gaulle, is today premier of France, a fact which might have been foretold by the impression he made upon our magnificent general, Douglas MacArthur.

This story was greatly appreciated by Ambassador Alphand and seemed to reassure him of the high respect in which his government is held. In conclusion, I assured the Ambassador of our gratitude for his diligent work and that the 30th Division and the people of Tennessee will not soon forget the strong bonds which were forged between our peoples in the common fight against oppression which we shared on the soil of France.

Heroism Is Never Out of Date—The Mortain Counterattack: Future Portent?

(By Capt. Martin Blumenson)

In this age of atomic weapons and missiles, World War II seems so remote as to belong to a distant epoch, and many soldiers appear to have relegated that experience to oblivion. What can we learn, they say, from outmoded forms of warfare?

The answer is simple. Heroism is never out of date.

In repelling at Mortain the first large-scale German counterattack launched after the Allied invasion of Normandy, two months to the day, brave men, though outnumbered, stood and outfought an enemy who had surrounded part of them, who threatened to isolate the rest of them, and who almost destroyed them all.

Confused fighting at close range, infiltration and counter-infiltration, action by small, dispersed groups operating in a battle area rather than along established front lines, the story is not unlike the combat envisioned for the future.

How the American commanders reacted is a story of courage, of the unabashed assumption of risks, and of confidence in the ability of the American fighting man—in short, an inspiring example of command.

And for those who are curious about "the other side of the hill," it may be of interest to learn of an attack that in its essentials was the prototype of the Ardennes counter-offensive launched by Hitler's forces 4 months later.

The German situation on 1 August 1944 was desperate. General Bradley had parlayed his American troops from a limited breakthrough operation into a wide-open, fast-moving end run that outflanked the German defensive lines in Normandy for a distance of 30 miles. From Avranches, Patton's Third Army swung south and west into Brittany while First Army (Lt. Gen. C. H. Hodges) pivoted eastward on the first stage of a projected advance toward the Seine.

Two days later the disintegration of the German left was so apparent that Brittany was dismissed as worth only a minimum of forces, and part of Patton's army joined Hodges in the swing toward the Seine. By sweeping to the Seine River, where all the bridges (except at Paris) had been destroyed by air bombardment, the Americans, British, and Canadians hoped to push the Germans back against the lower reaches of the river and destroy them.

As General Montgomery, the Allied ground force commander, judged the situation, the only hope the Germans had of saving their two field armies in Normandy was by making a staged withdrawal to the Seine. On this basis, he saw his mission as the need to transform their retreat into a rout. These were his orders. But while Patton's forces raced through lightly defended territory in the German rear, First Army and the British and Canadians fought enemy troops who had no intention of abandoning their defenses.

Part of the German determination came from an analysis of their alternatives that differed from Montgomery's.

Withdrawal from France

The American breakthrough meant that the Germans might have to withdraw from France. There were no prepared positions in France in the rear, and the Siegfried Line or Westwall on the western approaches to the Rhine River had been neglected for 4 years. With France no longer a buffer, the Germans would have to fight on their own soil.

Though Hitler ordered work begun on defensive lines and the Westwall rehabilitated, and though he quickened preparations for raising a reserve force within Germany—and thereby admitted the possible necessity of withdrawal from Normandy and France—he was reluctant to withdraw because it meant the inevitable loss of a great part of his combat-trained forces. Troops in withdrawal always abandoned equipment and straggled, and, what was worse, the Germans lacked not only the mobility of the Allied mechanized armies but also control of the air. To surrender France, to lose the missile bases along the channel coast, to withdraw to the homeland might signify the beginning of the end, defeat and disaster.

The alternative was to restore the conditions that had made possible the static warfare of June and much of July. If a continuous defensive line could be reestablished in Normany, the shortest conceivable line in western Europe, the Germans might yet hold. To attain this goal, the Germans had to close the breach on their left. They had to recapture Avranches. A counterattack was in order, a thrust toward Avranches through Mortain.

The German field commander, Field Marshal Kluge, began to assemble an armored force east of Mortain for this purpose. XLVII Panzer Corps, directing the 2d SS, 2d and 116th Panzer Divisions in an initial effort and the 1st SS Panzer Division in exploitation, was to attack to the west after dark on August 6 without artillery preparation and seize and secure Avranches.

Into the path of this scheduled effort and on the very day the attack was to start came the United States 30th Infantry Division (Maj. Gen. L. S. Hobbs).

A few days of rest

The 30th Division had been in the line for a month. It had fought in the hedgerows, made possible the capture of St. Lô, participated in the breakthrough operation, and fought a particularly hard battle at Tessy-sur-Vire. To give the division a few days rest, General Hodges moved it to a place he thought would be relatively quiet—Mortain.

Three days earlier, the 1st Infantry Division (Maj. Gen. C. R. Huebner) had taken Mortain, a village at the foot of a rocky hill just to the east, Hill 314 (or 317). From this height in a region of convulsed and broken wooded highland, an observer has a magnificent view of flat tableland to the south and west. Avranches, 20 miles to the west, is visible on a clear day. When the VII Corps commander (Maj. Gen. J. Lawton Collins) inspected the 1st Division positions around Mortain, he pointed to the high ground east of the town and said, "Ralph, be sure to get Hill 314." "Joe," General Huebner replied, "I already have it."

As the 30th Division came into Mortain on August 6, the 1st displaced to the south to prepare for the projected move eastward toward the Seine.

The 30th, having fought under XIX Corps at Tessy and scheduled to come under V Corps control, was, because of its abrupt shift to Mortain in the VII Corps zone, unable to complete proper reconnaissance. With little knowledge of the terrain and of neighboring unit locations and with practically no information of enemy dispositions, the 30th hastily took over the positions established by the 1st Division. Shallow foxholes and field artillery emplacements far forward in offensive formation were hardly suitable for an outfit soon to be fighting for its life in a defensive situation.

No maps, no communications

Maps were not available; for the most part, troops used the crumpled maps Big Redmen had pulled out of their pockets and off their map boards and passed along before departing. The telephone wire nets left in place were unfamiliar. The 30th had no time to tie its positions together before the Germans struck.

Nor was the division at full strength. Almost 800 replacements who had joined a few days earlier did not completely fill the thinned ranks; they were not yet fully assimilated into the depleted units. Two infantry battalions were absent, one attached to an armored division, another dispatched to Barenton, where it was soon to be isolated for a day.

Tired because of the preceding month of combat, fatigued by the road march from Tessy to Mortain that day, manning unfamiliar positions in unfamiliar terrain, the 30th Division troops were hardly in the best condition to meet the German counterattack.

General Hobbs assumed responsibility for the Mortain area at 2000 on August 6, four hours before the German attack began.

Though well conceived, the German attack was faulty. Kluge had misgivings, and as late as the day of attack he was tinkering with the plans. He tried in vain to find additional units for commitment. He wondered whether his attack front ought to be broadened. He talked of changing the axis of advance.

He had reason to be apprehensive, for American pressure on the German line north and northeast of Mortain and American mobile forces slashing deeply into his left flank and rear were coming close to nullifying the conditions necessary for the attack. American occupation of Mortain was a serious setback threatening assembly areas. American capture of Laval on August 6 endangered important supply bases near Alencon and Le Mans. And American advances toward high ground northeast of Mortain menaced lines of departure for the attack.

In order to regain operational initiative before additional developments further complicated the jump-off, Kluge had to launch his attack on schedule. But on that day, just a few hours before the attack, Hitler interfered.

Hitler made available to Kluge sixty Panther tanks still held in reserve east of Paris, and released eighty Mark IV tanks of a Panzer division moving toward Normandy from southern France. He also wanted Eberbach, commander of Fifth Panzer Army (in Normandy), to lead the attack instead of Funck, commander of XLVII Panzer Corps.

It became obvious that Hitler and Kluge were not thinking of the same kind of operation. While Kluge hoped only to regain Avranches and restore the defensive line, Hitler was thinking of a big offensive to be launched by several corps under Eberbach, a defensive blow that would sever the Allied front, throw the Allied armies into confusion, and eventually push them back into the sea.

To cater to Hitler's grandiose delusion meant postponing the attack and awaiting the arrival of the armored reinforcements. Uncertain that the German defenses on the left flank could hold much longer and fearing that the Allies would capture his assemblies or bomb them out of existence, Kluge persuaded Hitler to let the attack go as planned.

COMPOSITION OF THE ATTACK

There was a good possibility of success. The first wave of the attack was to be composed of 3 armored divisions in 6 columns, and a fourth armored division was to be ready to exploit initial success and capture Avranches. Between 120 and 190 German tanks were to operate in a zone where only the 30th Division and an armored division's combat command (the latter assembled between Mortain and Avranches) were located.

But German assembly had been made in great haste, at night, and with great difficulty due to almost constant pressure by American forces. In some instances German units had to fight their way to assembly points while in danger of being encircled. No distinct line of departure was possible. Many units had taken heavy losses before the attack started.

Two hours before midnight, when the attack was supposed to begin, Funck telephoned to request a 24-hour delay. He had two reasons:

First, the 1st SS Panzer Division (the exploiting force) was not going to be able to reach its assigned position in time; nor would it be able to detach an armored battalion to the 2d Panzer Division in time, because its relief from the 5th Panzer Army front had been slower than expected, traffic congestion and Allied air attacks had harassed the approach march, and an Allied fighter-bomber had crashed on the lead tank of the heavy-tank battalion while it was moving through a defile in close formation and had thereby blocked the entire column.

PANZER COMMANDER BALKS

Second, the 116th Panzer Division had not detached a tank battalion to the 2d Panzer Division as directed, through sheer perversity on the part of the division commander. This was not the first (nor would it be the last) time he had failed to comply with orders.

The only concession to Funck's request was postponement of the jumpoff until midnight.

Shortly thereafter, the 2d SS Panzer Division (on the left) attacked in two columns, encircled Mortain, overran and captured the village, and advanced toward high ground west of Mortain and to the southwest toward St. Hilaire. There was no significant American opposition, and by noon of August 7, German troops seemed on the way to St. Hilaire where they could threaten Avranches directly. One thing interfered: A battalion of 30th Division infantrymen, surrounded but still holding out on Hill 314, called such devastating artillery fire down on the panzer division that the Germans were unable to advance after daylight.

The 2d Panzer Division, making the main effort in the center, got off only one column. Without the tank battalion of the 116th, the troops moved off, achieved surprise, and rolled through the 30th Division line for 6 miles. The refusal of American troops to panic and the effect of American artillery fire on their flanks (particularly from the 4th Infantry Division under Maj. Gen. Raymond O. Barton) brought the Germans to a halt at dawn.

By this time, the other column, after having waited for the Panzer battalion of the 1st SS to join, jumped off and made a similar advance until similarly stopped.

In midmorning, Funck committed part of the 1st SS Panzer Division through the 2d Panzer Division. A restricted roadnet, limited maneuver room, and American resistance on the ground and in the air balked progress. With German tank losses skyrocketing, Funck halted the attack and ordered the troops to dig in. They had already done so.

As for the 116th Panzer Division, it did not attack at all. The division commander felt he had enough to do to prevent encirclement by troops of First Army, so he continued to fight a defensive battle. He was relieved during the afternoon of August 7. The division launched a half-hearted attack that evening and got nowhere.

Instead of a coordinated massed attack, only 3 of 6 assault columns had jumped off on time; 1 additional column and the exploiting force joined later. The Germans achieved surprise and made a sizable penetration through the American line. Yet it was obvious to Kluge and to other commanders that the attack had failed. Withdrawal seemed in order.

Hitler gave no choice. He commanded that the attack be prosecuted daringly and recklessly to the sea.

Under this mandate, Kluge pulled two armored divisions out of the Falaise sector and moved them toward Mortain for an additional effort toward Avranches. Until they assembled and were ready to attack (actually they never did), the committed elements at Mortain had to hold the positions reached by the forward elements. To assist them in an effort that had suddenly changed from offense to defense, Kluge on the evening of August 7 sent the remainder of the 1st Panzer Division into the line.

A HARD ROW FOR THE 30TH

The result pitted the 30th Division against 3 armored divisions (the 116th was not in the 30th's sector), 2 of them SS divisions. Five battalions of German infantry, 4 of artillery, and 2 or 3 of tanks were behind the lines occupied by the 30th on the previous day.

Not only was the 30th threatened with destruction, but the Germans were threatening to cut the narrow Avranches corridor through which flowed American troops, equipment, and supplies to nourish the drives westward into Brittany and eastward toward the Seine. German success would separate First and Third Armies and perhaps make the latter vulnerable to defeat in detail.

American commanders recovered quickly from the initial shock and reacted with an offensive intention rather than a defensive attitude. General Bradley made available only one infantry division, the 35th (Maj. Gen. Paul W. Baade), to reinforce the troops around Mortain, meanwhile continuing the drive toward the Seine. By the following day, August 8, he was convinced that the troops at Mortain would hold and at that time he proposed to General Montgomery a daring maneuver to trap the Germans who had put their heads into a noose, the maneuver that was to squeeze the Germans at Argentan and Falaise.

General Hodges kept the First Army exerting pressure on the Germans, while General Collins, localizing the counterattack within the confines of his VII Corps sector, set out to eradicate the German threat by an attack of his own. He sent the 35th Division into the breach southwest of Mortain, committed the 2d Armored Division (Maj. Gen. E. H. Brooks), less a combat command, at Barenton for a spear-like thrust deep into the German left flank (and incidentally to relieve the isolated troops at Barenton), attached the 39th Infantry of the 9th Infantry Division (Maj. Gen. Manton S. Eddy)—caught in the wake of the German attack—to the 4th Division, which had been in reserve and remained so, alert for commitment (which turned out to be unnecessary). He also attached to the 30th Division the combat command of the 3d Armored Division (Maj. Gen. Leroy H. Watson) assembled several miles west of Mortain and a regiment of the 4th Division, and instructed General Hobbs to clean up the German penetration. While all the units of VII Corps contributed to the eventual defeat of the Germans, the main job rested on the shoulders of the 30th.

Hobbs had three problems: eliminating the penetration northwest of Mortain, blocking the thrust southwest of Mortain, and recapturing Mortain itself to reestablish contact with the surrounded battalion on Hill 314.

FIERCE, CLOSE-RANGE FIGHTING

It took 5 days to do the job. During that period the action was small-unit combat, fierce close-range fighting by splinter groups maneuvering to outflank and in turn being outflanked, "a seesawing activity consisting of minor penetrations by both sides," operations characterized by ambush and surprise and fought on the level of the individual soldier.

"What does it look like down there?" the division G3 asked a regimental officer.

"Looks like hell," came the reply. "We are just mingled in one big mess, our CP is getting all kinds of fire, enemy tanks within 500 yards of us."

Disorganization and isolation of small units were the most serious factors. Communication throughout the division area was precarious; wires had been cut or shot out, and infiltrating Germans and raiding

parties menaced messengers and command posts. Several infantry battalion command posts and one regimental headquarters were surrounded. More than a few battalions were isolated. Several companies were overrun.

The reaction to this situation? The troops fought.

Threatened by German tanks 400 yards away, the regimental commander of the 117th Infantry decided that moving his headquarters might have an adverse effect on morale; he stayed put and directed the battle although virtually encircled.

A five-man patrol checking outpost defenses suddenly and unexpectedly confronted about fifty Germans. While T. Sgt. Harold V. Sterling engaged the enemy, his four companions maneuvered to positions of safety. Then all five conducted a fire fight for an hour until reinforcements arrived and dispersed the Germans.

PHONE OPERATOR "DOUBLES IN BRASS"

When two German tanks worked their way to within 250 yards of the regimental CP of the 120th Infantry, Pfc. Joe O. Shipley, telephone switchboard operator, slipped away from his duties long enough to knock out one tank with a bazooka and drive the other away.

The 823d Tank Destroyer Battalion, attached to the 30th, lost 11 three-inch guns and prime movers, had 13 wounded, 3 killed, and 91 missing in the first day of the counterattack; but it destroyed 14 enemy tanks, 2 trucks, 3 tracked vehicles, a half-track, 2 motorcycles, a staff car, and a machinegun crew.

A company roadblock eliminated very early in the attack by tanks moved back several hedgerows and set up another block even though its antitank guns had been lost. Bazookas proved effective.

A battalion overrun and pushed out of its defensive line established another line several hundred yards to the rear, and, though tanks were swarming over the area, defended along a sunken road, clerks, cooks, and messengers fighting alongside the riflemen.

Troops manning 81 millimeter mortars refused to move from their original positions and fired at ranges as close as 175 yards. An artillelry battalion started firing at a range of 5,000 yards and was soon firing at targets only a 1,000 yards away, but the crews remained and continued to put out the shells.

This was the pattern of the battle. A typical message: "Very fatigued, supply problems not solved, defensive sector penetrated, however key terrain feature still held."

While the infantryman stood his ground, American artillery operated on the premise that it was better to waste shells than miss a target. The weather was clear, and while observation planes pinpointed German formations for the artillery, fighter-bombers roamed the area and destroyed enemy materiel and morale. Much of the reason why artillery and air were so effective came from the fact that the soldier on the ground had immobilized the German striking force and turned them into sitting ducks.

Of the 70 enemy tanks estimated in the original penetration, only 30 were judged in operation at the close of the first day. By the morning of August 8, the estimate had dropped to 25.

As Americans around Mortain were proving their courage and stamina, other Americans in battalion strength on top of Hill 314 were demonstrating the meaning of heroism in one of the outstanding small-unit achievements of the European campaign.

The battalion command post had been in the village of Mortain, and when the German attack surged through the town, the command group set out on foot to try to join their troops marooned on the hill. The group was captured soon after daybreak.

GERMAN MOVEMENT PARALYZED

On the height east of the village, Capt. Reynold C. Erichson assumed command of the surrounded force: the 2d Battalion, 120th Infantry, reinforced by a rifle company and a few antitank guns, and two forward observers of the 230th Field Artillery Battalion (1st Lt. Charles A. Bartz and 2d Lt. Robert L. Weiss).

The battalion had split a rifle company three ways to establish roadblocks augmented by antitank guns. Two roadblocks were overrun at once. The third remained in place and in action and eventually accounted for the impressive score of more than 40 of the enemy's vehicles and tanks.

Occupying the most important piece of terrain in the Mortain area, the battalion held the crest of the hill for 5 days and denied the Germans possession of the ground that would have given them observation over the major part of the VII Corps sector. The Germans knew this, and the regiment-size 17th SS Panzer Grenadier Division, which had the mission of taking the hill, attacked almost constantly. American troops not only retained their positions but called down fire on all German units within observation. Like Erichson, the company commanders (Capt. Delmont K. Byrn and 1st Lts. Ralph A. Kerley, Joseph C. Reaser, and Ronal E. Woody, Jr.) refused to consider surrender.

Their isolation did not panic the troops. "Not worried about situation as long as [friendly] artillery fire continues," they reported. It was their stocks of supply that bothered them. And even this problem was partially solved. A light artillery plane tried to drop supplies by parachute, but German fire drove it away. Army Air Forces cargo planes did better and dropped food and ammunition.

The 230th Field Artillery Battalion also brightened the supply picture by firing smoke-shell cases, normally employed for propaganda leaflets, filled with bandages, adhesive tape, morphine, and other medical supplies. Eventually, the 743d Tank Battalion and the 113th Field Artillery Battalion joined in this supply shoot.

Nearly 700 men held out. By August 12, 300 had been killed or wounded, but more than 300 walked off the hill unharmed. During the battle of Mortain, they had been, the Germans later said, "a thorn in the flesh" that had paralyzed all German movement in the Mortain area.

Not until August 11 did Hitler acknowledge defeat at Mortain, and that evening the Germans began to withdraw their salient. They had never pushed beyond the positions they had reached on August 7 by virtue of the initial momentum achieved mainly by surprise.

During the 6-day battle, the 30th Division lost nearly 2,000 men. German losses were worse. One regiment of the 2d Panzer Division was annihilated, the 1st and 2d SS Panzer Divisions were seriously depleted. Nearly a hundred German tanks lay abandoned around Mortain at the close of the battle.

The main effect of the counterattack was that it temporarily halted the VII Corps advance. It had prompted some readjustment of forces in the Mortain-Avranches area, but of no more than local significance. What the counterattack might have accomplished seemed in retrospect to have been its only merit.

MEN FIGHT NO BETTER THAN LEADERS

"It was precarious for a while," General Hobbs reported to General Collins. "We are holding and are getting in better shape all the time."

Collins was not surprised. He had gone along on the assumption that no position is untenable when it is defended by men of courage and determination.

Taken by surprise and manning unfamiliar positions, the 30th Division stood its ground and fought as hard as any unit was to fight in the European theater. "It isn't very easy," a staff officer wrote, "to tell the men in the front lines that the battle is going well when he's still up against that old combination of machineguns, burp guns, mortars, 88's, artillery, tanks—and terrain. * * * But the battle is going well; and it's worth saying."

The battle had indeed gone well. By blunting Hitler's Avranches counterattack and holding a considerable force tied down at Mortain, American troops made it possible for the Allies in Normandy not only to fashion the Argentan-Falaise pocket, where two German field armies were soon to be destroyed, but also to drive to the Seine. But more, the German withdrawal from Mortain was the start of a retrograde movement that was to end a month later at the West-wall fortifications along the German border, more than 300 miles away.

Portent of the future? Small units, disorganized, separated, and isolated by surprise attack, can fight and can win against superior numbers despite precarious communications and supply and despite the absence of a well-defined frontline. The key factor is superior leadership, for men fight no better than their leaders. The determining factor in the final analysis—plain old-fashioned guts.

A Fine Job Performed by the Employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been so much impressed by the wonderful work done by the employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, as explained in Mr. Summerfield's news release of August 5, that I would like to place this in the RECORD. This is another illustration of the tremendous efforts which Federal employees as a whole often give in service to their country and for which they so seldom receive due credit. I am very happy to see that credit is given where credit is due in this instance.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing employees, most of whom worked a full month of uninterrupted 12-hour days on a strictly voluntary basis to complete the job, certainly deserve such a tribute.

The news release follows:

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield noted today the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department turned out the greatest stamp printing job in its history to help the Post Office Department make an efficient changeover to new postage rates at 12:01 a. m. last Friday (August 1, 1958).

Great credit is due the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department, Mr. Summerfield said. The Bureau has met the unprecedented demand for new stamps with record production schedules

since the new postal rate law was signed on May 27, 1958, Mr. Summerfield explained.

"This is such an excellent example of two units of Government cooperating in meeting a large single problem," Mr. Summerfield explained, "that I inquired of Bureau of Engraving and Printing Director Henry J. Holtzclaw about details of the job that was done by the Bureau to help the Post Office Department meet the need for new stamps in such a relatively short time.

"I am informed," Mr. Summerfield continued, "that, on May 27, 1958, when the increased postal rate bill became law the Bureau's high-speed rotary stamp presses of the Plate Printing Division were placed in production on three shifts to print 4-cent book, sheet, and coil stamps, as well as the new 7- and 5-cent airmail stamps for the August 1 start of new rates.

"As an example of how well this was done, figures show that since the law was signed to meet the changeover, the Bureau has turned out 6,237,004,794 stamps. This was far above normal production schedules."

The breakdown on production of stamps in the new denominations alone (not counting production of other stamps in other denominations) is as follows:

	Number	Total stamps
Sheet stamps:		
4-cent ordinary postage		2,334,250,000
5-cent airmail		19,150,000
7-cent airmail		257,850,800
Books of stamps:		
4-cent ordinary books	20,311,000	487,464,000
7-cent airmail books	8,181,500	98,178,000
Coils of stamps:		
4-cent coils of 100	2,630,200	263,020,000
4-cent coils of 500	2,423,393	1,211,696,500
4-cent coils of 3,000	29,837	89,511,000
7-cent coils (airmail) of 500	103,950	51,975,000
7-cent coils (airmail) of 3,000	1,344	4,032,000
Grand total		4,817,127,300

"All of the stamps printed were processed through the Bureau's examining, perforating, collating, coiling, stitching, quartering, wrapping, and cartoning operations necessary to manufacture finished coils, books, and sheets for delivery to post offices," Mr. Summerfield noted.

"In addition to 2 full shifts in the sheet section, book and coil sections of the Post age Stamp Division worked around the clock on two 12-hour shifts 7 days a week to process the largest quantity of stamps in the history of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing during any comparable period of time.

"In a 2-day typical period, the Bureau's packing and shipping section delivered 750,000 coils—an amount equivalent to a full month's delivery in the calendar year 1956. The majority of the group of more than 500 employees who participated in this record production effort worked through a full month of uninterrupted 12-hour days on a strictly voluntary basis."

TVA Should Be Financed by Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Glenn D. Owens, associate research analyst, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York State, speaking for the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey and the National Taxpayers Conference to the Public Works Committee, United States House of Representatives, July 29, 1958. Mr. Owens was testifying on S. 1869, which would permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue its own revenue bonds.

I think Mr. Owens correctly and succinctly sets out the position of most residents of New York State in regard to this proposed legislation.

STATEMENT OF GLENN D. OWENS, ASSOCIATE RESEARCH ANALYST, CITIZENS PUBLIC EXPENDITURE SURVEY, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE, SPEAKING FOR THE CITIZENS PUBLIC EXPENDITURE SURVEY AND THE NATIONAL TAXPAYERS CONFERENCE TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 29, 1958

In the interest of taxpaying citizens of New York State who are represented by the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, it is strongly urged that this committee reject S. 1869. This bill would further extend a Government enterprise (the TVA) at the expense of the taxpayer. And it would do so in direct violation of traditional congressional and executive fiscal controls.

The TVA was established 25 years ago to provide flood control and navigation for the Tennessee Valley. Generation of power was only to be incidental to its operation. In the intervening years, the production of cheap power has become the TVA's main function, apparently, as a high percentage of the power it produces a steam generated.

Now it is proposed that TVA be allowed to issue its own revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $750 million to assist in financing its own power program.

As a representative of taxpaying citizens, it is the judgment of the CPES that if a need for more power facilities exists in the Tennessee Valley, that need should be filled by taxpaying, private industry. Enlarging private industry's investment in the States affected would give the economy in those States a real shot in the arm.

The States affected by the TVA are among that group of States constantly cited as needy when new Federal grant-in-aid programs are proposed. They never seem to have enough taxpaying ability to help them pay their own way.

Here is legislation which openly proposes to keep taxpaying industry out of the Tennessee Valley—to perpetuate the inability of the States in that area to solve their own governmental problems. It is apparently a deliberate move to prevent the States affected from ever being able to support essential government services themselves. Such a move can have no other effect than to force have States like New York to pick up the tab through Federal taxes for governmental services for those States indefinitely.

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey is not in favor of taking anything away from anyone. But, proposals of this sort generally cost the taxpayers of the Nation (and in particular, New York State) plenty. And, our only interest in the bill is that of the taxpayer.

On the next point, I have been authorized to speak also for the National Taxpayers Conference by its chairman. The conference is an organization made up of the heads of taxpayer organizations in 37 States and Hawaii.

Besides being costly to the taxpayers, S. 1869 would establish a dangerous precedent by removing traditional congressional control over appropriation and expenditure of funds and executive control over the issuance of bonds by a Government corporation, as established by the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945. With Federal Government expenditures soaring to new record peacetime levels each year, prudence dictates a tightening, not lessening, of controls over spending by all Government agencies—including Government corporations. Furthermore, if one agency is exempted from such controls, what is to prevent all others from seeking and gaining like treatment?

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey and the National Taxpayers Conference support the position taken yesterday by the representative of the General Accounting Office in testimony before this committee when he stated:

"In our opinion, the financing of Government activities of this character should be by appropriations. If, to obtain needed funds, borrowing from the public is necessary, the Secretary of the Treasury should perform this function."

It is respectfully urged that S. 1869 be rejected by this committee.

Conditions for Mr. Eibel's Admission Into the United States for Permanent Residence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, General Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, has directed that Mr. Eibel be offered a seaman's conditional landing permit by the local immigration officers which will allow him to remain in the United States for a period not to exceed 29 days. This type of permit is issued under a provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act regularly applied in the case of any alien crewman who is able and willing to reship from the United States on a vessel other than the one on which he arrived. This procedure relieves Mr. Eibel from the necessity of sailing on the *Frederick Chopin* to Poland, but his status as a seaman is still preserved. It will be left to him to comply with the usual requirements of the law as to obtaining a visa for migration to the United States which are applicable to all other persons seeking entry for permanent residence here.

Mr. Eibel's ability to depart as a seaman is established by an offer of a representative of the Scandinavian Shipping Association to provide him a berth on one of their vessels within the 29-day period of the landing permit. That berth carries with it the assurance that the vessel on which he sails will land him in some non-Communist country. On his arrival abroad, Mr. Eibel will be in a position to apply to an American consul for one of the special nonquota visas authorized by Congress in the act of September 11, 1957. Under that law, as well as under the basic immigration law, procurement of an immigrant visa from a consul is the first step in gaining admission to the United States for permanent residence.

It remains for Mr. Eibel to indicate his willingness to accept this offer.

Foreign Aid and the Kruse Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a most interesting editorial from the Blair (Nebr.) Pilot-Tribune of August 4, 1958, written by Associate Editor Rufus Olson.

Mr. Olson tells an interesting story about an American serviceman who is stationed in Germany, and how the Kruse plan is creating friendship for America that foreign-aid money cannot buy. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to others in Government who are interested in this subject:

Private and Mrs. Bud Kruse, who are stationed in Germany, live off the Army post there and have become acquainted with a number of German families.

While a student at Dana College, Bud participated in athletics, and this summer has devoted considerable time to coaching the German youngsters near his home the fundamentals of baseball.

Recently the Kruses attended a public function in a stadium in Germany. Present were the parents of the youngsters Kruse had assisted in teaching the great American game of baseball.

The parents of these youngsters greeted the Kruses with a round of applause and a hearty handshake and expressed their deep appreciation for the time spent in the interest of their youngsters.

Yes; Kruse is also popular with those youngsters who have been learning to play baseball and attendance at practice is punctual—and the young lads have revealed a devoted interest in the game, a willingness to cooperate and a determination to play the game just as efficiently as American youngsters play the game of baseball.

We are not acquainted with the attitude of the German people relative to Kruses connection with the Armed Forces, but here is an American serviceman who has shown an interest in the youngsters of another nation—and who, undoubtedly, is building up better relations between the people of America and Germany by acts beyond the call of duty, than by performing his assigned duties.

It is doubtful if money could purchase the respect, the appreciation, and the devoted friendship which these young German lads and their parents have for an American serviceman who has taken the time to teach these lads the game of baseball.

Doesn't this prove that there are other methods besides the use of the American dollar to build friendship between this Nation and other nations?

Wouldn't Uncle Sam find it more beneficial and less costly if the—let's call it the Kruse plan—was adopted to replace the give-away-money plan that, in the opinion of many Americans, has not only been costly but has done little to bring about the friendly attitude toward America that is desired?

Undoubtedly a million dollars devoted to the Kruse plan would be far more beneficial than many millions of dollars spent trying to buy a friendly attitude toward this great Nation of ours.

We compliment young Kruse on his excellent work, his efforts beyond the call of duty and he is deserving of far greater recognition than he will receive by the writing of this article—but it is doubtful if he will receive the credit that he deserves.

Mrs. Kruse is the former Sandra Lamb, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Everett Lamb, of Blair.

All Sense Is Not Yet Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Chicago Tribune for their vote of thanks to House Members who voted against expansion of the communities facilities loan program under the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

ALL SENSE IS NOT YET LOST

Much to everyone's surprise, the House last Friday voted down a $2 billion Federal loan program to finance public works in municipalities. The surprise was occasioned not because there was any merit in the bill—there wasn't—but because Congress has shown no great disposition to avoid spending in the present session. The same bill, scaled down to $1 billion, had already passed the Senate.

This legislation was concocted by the Democratic leadership as part of its clamor to play up the recession, which appears now to be on the wane. The Democrats wanted to strike a pose before the voters suggesting that if the Eisenhower administration wasn't going to run around and scream and shout, they were. The bill was unneeded and was what the Republicans called it—an encouragement to boondoggling.

An equal number of Democrats and Republicans—151 in each party—were ranged for and against the bill. Oddly enough, Democrats supplied the margin to defeat it, for 36 of them put fiscal prudence above partisan considerations and voted against the legislation, while 22 Republicans defected to the spending side. These Democrats, notably Representative HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, deserve the gratitude of the taxpayers. SMITH put the matter well when he suggested that Congress adjourn without more spending and go home to let the taxpayers "catch up with what we've done to them already."

What Congress has done to them is plenty.

We congratulate the Illinois Republican delegation on resisting the additional waste represented by this bill. All Members, with one exception, whose position was not recorded, were against the bill.

The editorial is inserted as it appeared in the Tribune of Tuesday, August 5.

There was a record vote on this bill and the result as 187 nays to 173 yeas. I was not the one member of the Illinois Republican delegation who failed to register opinion one way or the other.

Yesterday I expressed myself at considerable length on my beliefs about public works spending. Needless spending in public works must be curtailed.

I commend my colleague from Illinois, Mr. ALLEN, for his pertinent remarks pertaining to the aspects of this bill which are not consonant with the Constitution of our great State of Illinois.

I recall recently debate in this chamber on another bill which dealt with the Federal laws superceding State laws. I declared myself on this legislation and voted for the bill—H. R. 3—beecause I believe we need to reassure the people at home that there are some of us who still believe in safeguarding the rights guaranteed us under our State Constitution since the Constitution of the United States made it clear that our State Rights would not be ignored.

Had the House passed S. 3497, it would have been another debt our children and grandchildren would have to pay in the years to come. Instead of adding to their burden we should be endeavoring to reduce it by economies wherever and whenever possible. The security of the young men and women not only in the Third District but throughout the entire United States is more important to me than any political consideration.

When I started out in my profession as a lawyer, the other responsibilies of family life came. At that time I did not have near the number of built-in-taxes that the young men of today must pay though they have had no voice in incurring them.

A View of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Mr. John Temple Graves which appeared in the Roanoke Times, of Roanoke, Va., on August 6, 1958:

"Do they sleep well of nights—the NEITOUS nine who held hands and jumped?"

Before Little Rock, Ark., was something of a border State as regards integration. The landslide for Faubus reflects more than anti-integration and more than the South, it seems to me. It is part of the national revolt against destruction of our form of government and our American ideal.

C. Herman Pritchett, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, justifies the increasingly questioned desegregation decision on grounds that the Court is not the only interpreter of the Constitution but "keeper of the American conscience." Can it really be that the nine who propose to take over America mean to take Heaven, too, not only to usurp legislative executive and State functions here below but to fudge on infinity?

Under what halo do Hugo Black and Earl Warren qualify as conscience-keepers? It is easier to contemplate the couple as sociological agent of Gunnar Myrdal than as moral agent of God Almighty.

One simple resolution, suggests the Birmingham Post-Herald, might solve the Constitution crisis, a resolution of Congress so affirmative and so acclaimed by the public that the Court would feel bound to subscribe or would be committed in spite of itself.

The resolution would be a simple assertion that the Court "does not exist to, and of right, should not—do good."

Little did I guess how meaningful some words of Hugo Black's were to be when I

asked him shortly after his appointment to the Court what he deemed his mission to be. We were resting between sets of a tennis game at High Park Club in Birmingham. His answer was unhesitating.

His mission, my fellow townsman said, was human advancement within the limits of constitutional interpretation. Or words to that effect.

It seemed a noble thing but millions know now it is an ignoble thing. It has meant straining, twisting, warping, and bleeding the Constitution and the American ideal, all to serve 1 man's (or 9 men's) contested notion of advance. And this may be without mandate from the people or the Constitution, egotistically and arrogantly committed by a handful elected to nothing, responsible to nobody, immune to time and tide.

It seems so uncivilized, medieval, that this situation, involving the very foundations of the Republic, should exist in a vacuum with the nine going their ways and saying nothing.

You would think they would take judicial notice of the American people.

You would think they would wish either to dispute or to justify this gathered picture of the court as imposing both a new form and a new ideology on America.

You would think they might be eager to explain what the need is—and why they are nominated when we have a Congress for such things, and political parties, and national elections.

There is no law against the court's explaining itself.

Congress might ask it politely please to make a statement as this crisis deepens.

American Legion Posts in Luzerne County (Pa.) Again Win First Prize in Americanism Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of August 6, 1958, which relates that district 12 of the American Legion again was awarded first prize in Americanism programs:

DISTRICT 12 AMERICAN LEGION AGAIN WINS FIRST PRIZE IN AMERICANISM

District 12 of the American Legion, comprising all of American Legion posts in Luzerne County, was awarded for the second straight year, first prize in Americanism. The presentation was made at the recent Department Convention held in Philadelphia.

Department Commander, John Collins, in making the presentation, cited the many programs conducted by Luzerne County group and stated it not only conducts such Americanism programs, but it talks and promotes such activities.

Accepting the award for the district was district Americanism chairman for the last 2 years, Nello S. Corozzoni, Jr., a member of Miners Mills American Legion Post 741 of Wilkes-Barre. In accepting the award, Corozzoni praised the Legion posts in the county for the many Americanism programs and activities during the last two administrations. He stated it was a pleasure and an honor to work with the different committees and posts under his chairmanship.

Louis J. Greco, District 12 commander and one of the leaders in Americanism in the department, commended his chairman and the 40 American Legion posts under his command, for the many Americanism programs and bringing honor to the district. "We will strive harder to promote and conduct stronger Americanism programs in the future in order that we may preserve the lights of freedom," he stated.

The district was further honored by having Richard Sterling, Kingston, receive an award for the best essay in the department. Sterling, a senior at Kingston High School, was applauded for his essay given at the convention. The essay contest, part of the Americanism program, was headed by John Gallagher, newly elected district commander and a member of Freeland American Legion Post.

Commissioner August W. Heckman, of Jersey City, Appointed Chief Counsel of New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT J. DELLAY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin Turpanjian, president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., has called my attention to the fact that City Commissioner August W. Heckman was appointed as chief counsel for the league and that on June 17, 1958, a meeting was held to celebrate the occasion. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating Commissioner Heckman on the honor bestowed upon him, and as Mr. Turpanjian suggested, am offering for insertion in the RECORD a clipping from the Hudson Gazette relating to the event:

A giant scrapbook containing more than 400 newspaper and magazine clippings in English, Armenian, French, German, Hungarian, Polish, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Hebrew, and Arabic languages was presented to August W. Heckman recently for his archives as token of deep appreciation and gratitude of the league members—newspapers serving in all the 567 communities of New Jersey as messengers of goodwill.

Chief Counsel Heckman is an authority on constitutional and international laws and is an outstanding citizen in New Jersey as doer of things. He is a towering figure in civic, fraternal, social, and governmental circles and is constantly in demand as an after-dinner speaker and orator.

Everywhere Chief Counsel Heckman's name, his fame, his high integrity, his intellectual assets of moral and political philosophy, have met the true apprisal and logical evaluation.

In the local press, in the foreign press, and in the national and international newspapers and magazines we can say without any sense of adulation that Chief Counsel Heckman is highly respected everywhere.

In this age of sham and camouflage, when we find the unhappy paradox of un-Christian Christians, unsocial Socialists, it is indeed refreshing to find a real exponent of truth and justice radiating from the personality of this modern exponent of fair play and Chief Counsel Heckman has translated his ideals not in a strident ballyhoo of empty promises but in the literal living reality of the deeds of his service to more than 500 weekly newspapers of the State of New Jersey. His philosophy has not been mechanical repetition of trite platitudes and copybook epigrams; it is embodied, inherently, in the rare consistency of his character.

The Heckman family is unique in the world, for all his five children were born on Sundays, and he has been proclaimed as the Father of the Year.

"How many think of all the thinking few,
And many never think who think they do;
Our Jersey thinkers are not quite so crass,
We're thinkers in August W. Heckman class."

Hon. William S. Hill

SPEECH
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that our distinguished colleague the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, who has so ably represented the Second Congressional District of Colorado for 18 years, has decided voluntarily to retire from the House of Representatives.

It was my great pleasure to become well acquainted with BILL HILL many years before he or I were elected to the House of Representatives. BILL HILL had rendered distinguished service to the State of Colorado prior to his election to Congress in 1940. He was a member of the General Assembly in the State of Colorado and was secretary to the late Governor, the Honorable Ralph Carr. It was while he was serving in this capacity that I learned to know him best during the time it was my pleasure to be the attorney general of Colorado. At that time and on many occasions BILL HILL assisted me in carrying out my duties.

The good people of the second congressional district recognized his capacity and understanding of governmental affairs and entrusted to him the responsibility of representing them in the House of Representatives in 1940.

Since this congressional district is principally devoted to Agriculture, BILL HILL was assigned to the Agriculture Committee and throughout his service has devoted himself to the interest of his constituents and particularly as it related to the agricultural problems. He has been instrumental in placing many statutes on the book during that time and credit should be given to BILL HILL for his activity in the extension of the Sugar and Wool Act.

BILL HILL is admired and respected for his hard and diligent work. He has been congenial and willing at all times to cooperate and has made himself available to his constituents and colleagues and we, of the Colorado delega-

tion, regret the decision of our amiable and friendly colleague to remove himself from active public service.

We will miss him and extend to Mr. and Mrs. Hill my best wishes and hope they will enjoy their retirement in the great State of Colorado.

Note of Thanks and Appreciation to 85th Congress From Osceola County Barracks No. 402, Veterans of World War I, for Action on Their Charter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Arthur H. Carr, publicity chairman for Osceola County Barracks No. 402, World War I Veterans, Evart, Mich., and the statement of appreciation from the members for favorable action by the Congress on H. R. 11077, the charter bill for Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc.:

REED CITY, MICH., *August 5, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Representative, Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: By way of introduction, I must let it be known that I am publicity chairman for Osceola County Barracks, No. 402, Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc., of Evart, Mich., and the legislative chairman of this barracks is buddy George E. Mills, of Evart, Mich.

The following words showing and expressing of our thanks, gratitude and appreciation for a piece of work well done by you and the greater part of your congressional body are truly those coming from the heart of every member of above-stated barracks and now to be made manifest by said barracks' publicity chairman and legislative chairman. We trust you will accept this document in the spirit given and will take full charge in seeing this gets entered in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARTHUR H. CARR,
Publicity Chairman, Osceola County Barracks, No. 402, Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc., of Evart, Mich.

NOTE OF THANKS AND APPRECIATION FOR OUR MEMBERS OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Osceola County Barracks No. 402, Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc. (chartered at Evart, Mich.) does on this date, August 5, 1958, send their many thanks, gratitude, and commendation to all our Members of Congress (House and Senate) for the generous services they rendered our organization, during the 85th sessions of Congress; with special emphasis being placed or brought to bear on the work of the members of the Committees on the Judiciary of both House and Senate in their services there and in reporting our Federal charter bill of incorporation No. 11077 out for action by both House and Senate, also, we do express special thanks to all Members of the House who so ably spoke in behalf of this bill at the hearing held on it as it was about to be voted on by the full House on June 25, 1958, and for the thoroughness in the way this bill was taken into consideration, and the way it was handled throughout this session of Congress.

Our deepest expression of thanks and gratitude also goes to all members of this 85th Congress, who, even a remote way lent a hand in making it a reality the having H. R. 11077 become Public Law 85-530. At this time we also extend special thanks to President Eisenhower for his placing his signature of approval to this legislation on July 18, 1958.

If any have been left out of being recognized as having taken a noble stand on this legislation, it is implied that this document must and does cover such.

It is the wishes of our Osceola County Barracks, No. 402, Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc., under charter at Evart, Mich. [that if it so be at the pleasure of the Members of this 85th Congress and our President] that this document be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the date received by one of this congressional body, this to be Congressman, Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, author of this bill, held as such reference to action taken by this barracks.

ARTHUR H. CARR,
Publicity Chairman for Osceola County Barracks No. 402 of Evart, Mich., acting in said capacity and on behalf of said barracks.

Attest:

ARTHUR H. CARR,
Publicity Chairman,
GEORGE E. MILLS,
Legislative Chairman.

It's a Long Lane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the summer of 1948, when the Republicans had it won and our Democrat colleagues were knee deep in gloom. And we also remember that November when the GOP literally snatched defeat from victory with President Truman in the White House for another 4 years and the Democrat Party in control in this House.

Looking back 10 years, it occurs to us that a similar situation might develop, with the result that the Republican ship which you recently described as already sunk might float along for a few more years.

And why this restrained optimism? Well, it appears that most of the issues that our Democrat friends have been counting on have more or less faded away.

Take sputniks, for instance. Having already launched four satellites, and having successfully fired an intercontinental ballistic missile, we seem to be holding our own in that field.

And then there was that depression that was to rival that of the thirties. Well it just has not panned out and it seems that we are headed back up toward a better day. And the farm revolt has simply petered out in the face of a 20-percent rise in agricultural income.

And take the Goldfine-Adams furore. Well, it has not turned out that Mr. Adams did anything illegal while there is evidence that Mr. Goldfine reserved some of his more lavish gifts for the Democrats.

And finally, there is this Middle East mess about which previous Democrat administrations did little to correct until it came to a head a few weeks ago. And the matter is not yet resolved although happily, as is our custom, politics has stopped at the water's edge and we are united as a people in our determination to work out a solution. But the important thing to remember is that there was no vacillation or quibbling when it became imperative to land marines in Lebanon. And our President displayed those qualities of leadership which were expected by our people and which cannot help but reflect favorably on Republican chances this fall.

All of this, of course, has been said so much better by Mr. Gould Lincoln in his column in yesterday's Evening Star which is included with these remarks:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

OUTLOOKS SHIFTS FOR BOTH PARTIES

HYANNIS, MASS.—Political leaders and strategists of both Democratic and Republican Parties are taking a new look at the situation and the issues. Election day, November 4, is still almost 3 months away and much can happen in that period—just as it has since the beginning of the year.

Earlier the Democrats were riding high, wide, and handsome. The big issues which they counted on to make big gains in both Houses of Congress and to elect Democratic governors of States have somewhat faded. First there was an uproar over the Russian sputniks. The Democrats claimed the Republican administration had permitted the United States to fall far behind the Soviet Government in the matter of scientific discovery and accomplishment; that this country was in imminent danger of becoming a second-rate power militarily.

But now we have successfully launched four earth satellites of our own. In addition, and most important from a national-defense point of view, we have just had remarkable success with an intercontinental missile, designed to hurl a tremendously destructive hydrogen warhead more than 5,000 miles.

RECESSION MEASURES

Second, according to Democratic prophets earlier, this country was on its way to a depression that would rival that of the early 1930's. All kinds of panaceas, costing billions of dollars, were proposed in Congress.

President Eisenhower and his advisers, however, refused to be stampeded into these huge spending programs. The administration went to work on a saner course. It declined to recommend a reduction in taxes which some of the Democratic economists demanded, too. The economy has taken a distinct turn for the better. And most unexpectedly from the Democratic standpoint, American farm income has gone up and up, until in the first half of this year the net income of agriculture has increased about $3 billion. The Democrats may have to make a new estimate of their party's pulling power in the agricultural States of the Midwest, the East, and South.

Also, earlier in the year, and, indeed, more recently, President Eisenhower's foreign policy was under heavy fire from the Democrats.

They charged that the President was exerting no leadership; that things were at sixes and sevens, and that we had lost both prestige and all our friends, if we had ever had any, abroad. The sudden further development of the Middle East crisis, however, brought prompt and immediate action by President Eisenhower, who ordered the marines into Lebanon. Even after he had taken this necessary step, he was harshly criticized for imprudence which might hurl the world into a third world war. But that, too, has now changed. The Communist nations have taken no steps toward armed conflict, although Khrushchev ordered military maneuvers on the borders of Iran and Turkey, in a further effort to frighten the nations of Europe and the United States. It did not work. The British sent their troops into Jordan.

U. N. SITUATION CHANGES

Now there is strong likelihood of a special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on the Middle East issue, possibly attended by heads of governments. Should such a meeting be attended by a measure of success in settling the Middle East problem, and the world can breathe easier, much of the credit will go to President Eisenhower. And another Democratic issue for the closing campaign will have faded into insignificance.

Since this country became immersed in the Middle East situation, the Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine incident, rated by the Democrats as a first-class issue against the Eisenhower administration and the GOP, has assumed more correct proportions. The House Investigating Committee has tried desperately to tar Mr. Adams, the President's first assistant at the White House. But it has failed to show any corrupt action, or attempted action by Mr. Adams.

Mr. Goldfine, the Boston industrialist and the giver of many presents to many men, Democrats as well as Republicans, is still under strong attack. However, Mr. Goldfine has testified that he contributed even more liberally to Democratic campaign funds than to Republican.

So far, the Democratic attempt to prove there is a mess in the Eisenhower administration has not progressed. Undoubtedly the House committee will keep at it. Up to date, what it has disclosed is a pale picture as compared to the mess in Washington during the last Democratic administration, when even the head man in the Internal Revenue Bureau was found to have transgressed.

The Republicans, who were down in the dumps—far down—a few months ago have plucked up courage. Democrats are wondering if everything is as rosy as they had believed. Early in 1948 and far into the summer the Democrats seemed in for a terrific defeat at the polls. Things changed in the last few weeks of that campaign. It could happen again.

Improved Mail Service Announcement Gratifies Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, recent announcements by Postmaster General Summerfield directed to improved mail service will be received with overwhelming gratification by the American public. Among these is a relaxing of the rule with respect to rural delivery. When the present administration took office, a Department regulation required four patrons to the mile, including retrace, for the extension of any rural route. Under Mr. Summerfield the rule was changed to 3 per mile. Now it is being further relaxed to 2 patrons per mile.

Rural patrons of mail service have long felt that with improved highways each family was entitled to delivery to its own mailbox. The new ruling will, in most cases, make this a reality. As the Postmaster General says, this change will benefit an estimated 300,000 families.

Rural boxholders will hail Mr. Summerfield's announcement as one of the outstanding achievements of this administration. I am sure they join me in expressing their gratitude and appreciation.

Address by G. G. Beard, President, United Engineering & Foundry Co., Before the Pittsburgh Society of Financial Analysts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. G. G. Beard, president, United Engineering & Foundry Co., before the Pittsburgh Society of Financial Analysts, March 19, 1958:

Gentlemen, it is an extreme pleasure to have this opportunity to present a brief story of United Engineering & Foundry Co., together with some observations on its foreign operations. Inasmuch as this is the first time the company has had this privilege, let me give you a very short résumé of its background. The part of its story which will be of greater interest to you, as it is to all of us at United, is what are its current activities?

The company was founded in 1901 under the leadership of Isaac W. Frank, a copartner in the Frank-Kneeland Machine Co., a Pittsburgh manufacturer of rolling mill machinery. As a consequence of what Mr. Frank envisioned to be the future of this industry, he negotiated a merger involving the Frank-Kneeland Machine Co., Lincoln Foundry Co. of Pittsburgh, McGill & Co., of Pittsburgh, and Lloyd-Booth Co., of Youngstown, who collectively but not necessarily individually were manufacturers of rolls, castings, and rolling mill machinery. With a charter which stated, "Said corporation is formed for the purpose of manufacture of iron or steel, or both, or of any other metal, or article of commerce from metal or wood or both." United Engineering & Foundry Co. was in business.

Between this time and 1916 the company acquired the Chilled Roll Foundry Co., Inc., Vandergrift, Pa.; Mahoning Foundry & Machine Co., Youngstown, Ohio; American Roll & Foundry Co., Canton, Ohio; William Tod Co., Youngstown, Ohio.

From these beginnings, the company grew and prospered. The name, "United," became synonymous with the dynamics of the growth of steel. The company early established itself as a world leader in the development, design and manufacture of machinery and rolls for the steel and nonferrous industries.

Prior to World War II, the company was exclusively identified with the industries to which I have just referred.

Also, United's experience prior to World War II pointed up the cyclical character of its business. Relative to many other industries, for example, the steel industry and other capital goods producers, its experience from a cyclical standpoint is no worse. As with business in general, the company is affected by the overall conditions of our national economy. United would anticipate that its business will fluctuate accordingly, but unfortunately its particular industry, because of its historical sensitivity to certain economic fluctuations, is occasionally referred to as a feast-or-famine industry. We think it is time to lay the ghost in this regard, so far as United is concerned.

The company has been geared to the activities of the steel industry. The steel industry is and will continue for the foreseeable future to be its largest single customer, but it is now serving other industries extensively and in ever increasing volume.

In 1944 United acquired the Adamson Machine Co., of Akron, Ohio, one of the largest and oldest makers of machinery for the rubber industry. In 1949 the company purchased the business and assets of the hundred-odd-year-old Stedman Foundry & Machine Co., of Aurora, Ind., having an iron foundry serving the diversified market of the Cincinnati area and manufacturing various types of crushing and pulverizing equipment. In this same year the company acquired part of the business and assets of the Lobdell Co., of Wilmington, Del., manufacturers of iron rolls and equipment for the paper industry, together with a specialized line of machine tools. United is diversified. Since the acquisition of these latter facilities, the volume of their outputs has been increased several times.

Many of the machines and processes which have revolutionized the heating, treating and shaping of metals in the past half century have been notable United firsts. To mention just a few, there are such well known landmarks as the Gary Rail Mill; the Lukens 206 Inch Plate Mill, built in 1918 but still the largest in the United States of America; the Nation's first electric powered reversing mill; the first halogen continuous electrolytic tinning line; and the first continuous aluminum heat treating line, a process in stage of further development which may well revolutionize the production of aluminum strip and plate.

Others have rightfully been credited with the development of the process of continuous rolling of flat metal products, but this process was made practically possible by United's development and introduction of the now famous four-high mill. No single development in the machinery field so far has contributed so much to the economical mass production of flat metal products. We appreciated your mention of this in your notice to your members of today's meeting.

The first continuous hot strip mill was built for the Columbia Steel Co., now the Butler, Pa., plant of Armco Steel. This mill was put in operation in 1926. Since that time 63 mills of this type, rolling steel over 42 inches wide, have been built, of which 35 have been installed in the United States of America and 28 in other free countries of the world. United has built 33 of these mills.

Currently, the company is developing new designs which will further advance this art, providing better and cheaper materials than heretofore and with an eye on the requirements to meet the challenge of modern science and all its implications.

United has always been noted for tackling the big jobs. The 35,000-ton die forging press recently built for the United States Air Force, while not absolutely the largest in the country, is the first to use automatic level control, television to enable the operator to determine the position of the center of loading relative to the center of the press and automatic recording of stresses in the main components during operation.

Typifying the large machines the company builds is the 16-million-pound capacity stretcher for stretching aluminum plate 6 inches thick by 138 inches wide. Four of the castings in this machine weigh 230,000 pounds each and are the product of our own steel foundry.

By far the largest number of slabbing and blooming mills installed in the United States recently are United Mills. This is the mill that gets the first crack at rolling steel after the steel has been cast in ingot form. This was the result of intensive development and the introduction of radical innovations. The methods applied with so much success to this particular product are now being applied to the company's other lines of manufacture.

Other recent installations and machinery now in process of manufacture are of interest. Three Rendleman rod mills, 2 are being installed in the United States and 1 in Europe, employ new principles in rolling steel rods for higher quality and greater precision product. Other existing mills have been revamped to embody these new ideas.

The world's fastest tinplate mill, 7,000 feet per minute, at Weirton Steel Co., division of National Steel Corp., is a United product. It is understood the company has competition in this claim, the proof of which is in the actual speed at which quality tinplate is successfully rolled, and we believe United has it.

Currently, the company is manufacturing a 120-inch wide continuous hot aluminum strip mill. To date, this is the largest aluminum strip mill in the world and the 170-inch-wide roughing mill which will feed the strip mill will be the largest mill of this kind in existence.

Time does not permit a full description of all the company's products. Briefly, the parent company builds mills for rolling all kinds of metal from huge steel ingots to paper thin aluminum foil, from heavy structural beams to wire rod. It makes iron and steel rolls for every application in rolling of metals, rubber, plastics, and paper; cars for transporting metals, shears for cutting metals, reels to wind metals in coil form, steam-hydraulic and hydraulic forging presses, gears, gear drives, and specialized power transmission units, processing equipment such as picklers, tinning and heat treating lines, material handling equipment, lubricating systems, roll lathes, heavy weldments, iron, nodular iron and steel castings.

The Adamson United Co., which is operated as a wholly owned subsidiary, has pioneered such basic rubber manufacturing machines as tubers, strainers, mills, mixers, and calenders. Those huge tires you see on earth-moving equipment, tractors and large trucks could have been molded in an Adamson tire mold. Your plastic shower and window curtains, your plastic raincoat, and the film in your camera could have been processed on Adamson calendering equipment. Most plastic film produced on these calenders up to 72 inches wide is generally three to four thousandths thick and sometimes less with a permissible tolerance of plus or minus 5 percent. This imposes difficult standards which have been met by Adamson design and workmanship.

Adamson has been highly successful in the development and sale of tire, brake and wheel testing equipment which simulates the performance of similar equipment on automobiles and aircraft under operating conditions. With the trend to higher speeds in all forms of transportation, the contribution of this type of equipment to our safety can be appreciated.

Special machinery for the production of building materials, hydraulic presses, multiplaten presses for plywood and belt curing presses are among Adamson's other products.

The Stedman Foundry & Machine Co., located at Aurora, Ind., is also a wholly owned subsidiary and manufactures crushing, grinding, pulverizing, mixing, and screening equipment. These products are used in the meatpacking, rendering, fertilizer, chemical, sand and gravel, crushed stone, and other industries. The company specializes in engineering and building complete fertilizer plant machinery for the production of chemical fertilizer. A foundry division produces grey iron and semisteel castings for the local machine tool, valve, canning, printing, and other manufacturing industries.

RESEARCH

Together with its subsidiaries, United places emphasis on research and development as an important means of assuring future growth. Total expenditures for research and development expressed as a percentage of sales is difficult to assess inasmuch as a high percentage of the company's machinery is tailor made. Consequently, much of its development costs are absorbed in job costs. In its Pittsburgh office there is a product research and development staff and an office for the correlation of research activities in our foundry metallurgical laboratories. The company believes that the efficiency of its metallurgical research in the development of certain specialized rolls for rolling metals has been responsible for its increasing share in the markets for these products. Recognizing the coming demand for superaccurate, thin and flat, high temperature alloy steels and other metals for jet aircraft, rockets, and guided missiles, United is concentrating research in this field and has already produced results. In research, the company looks beyond the industries it traditionally serves and currently has under development new machinery for the manufacture of new products.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

As a result of a vigorous foreign-sales policy, United is widely recognized. Its rolling mills, forging presses, and machinery, including the products of its subsidiaries, can be found all over the world. The greatest foreign activity has occurred in recent years, much of which was due to the great reconstruction required abroad as a result of war devastation and stagnation. Now we are entering a new era of foreign trade, one which presents an even greater challenge to American exporters. Most of the war-torn countries of the world are now back on their feet—at least by their standards, and in certain countries by ours, too. Many of the countries abroad, however, no longer have sufficient dollars with which to purchase our goods, but they are in a position to trade with one another if not with us. Recognizing this eventuality and preparing to continue to share in foreign markets to the fullest extent possible, United has entered into and continued technical know-how contracts with a number of manufacturers in England, France, Germany, Australia, Belgium, and Japan whereunder the company licenses these manufacturers to use its know-how for the manufacture of its products. While as a result the company is in direct competition with these foreign manufacturers, it nevertheless continues to enjoy very substantial foreign business in certain specialized lines where it is recognized as a world leader and in countries where their manufacturing capacity is inadequate and also where dollar exchange is available.

FINANCIAL

United's reported financial statements are on a consolidated basis. As of December 31, 1957, current assets amounted to $36,181,874 and current liabilities to $15,683,515, leaving net working capital amounting to $20,498,359. The ratio of current assets to current liabilities was 2.3 to 1. Inventories and receivables are at high levels, reflecting in our business an increased volume of production at all of the company's plants. Except for the item of store supplies, amounting to approximately 8.5 percent of its total inventories, the company's inventories apply to contracted work in process of manufacture, and are not, therefore, subject to the possibility of serious loss in the event of a reduction in market prices.

The highest sales volume in the history of the company was reached in 1957, aggregating $100,456,237, approximately double its sales 10 years ago.

United's gross income before taxes established a new high, but because of a higher effective tax take in 1957, its net earnings are just short of the per share earnings record for the period of 1948 to 1950. Net earnings from 1957 operations were $5,069,960, equal to $2.02 per common share after preferred dividends. During 1957 the company paid total dividends of 90 cents on each share of common stock. United's unbroken dividend payment record has continued through its 57 years of operation, and though varying in amount from time to time has been consistent with available earnings and with due regard to the company's economic growth and changing needs for fixed and working capital.

Other highlights of its financial position are available to you in the company's annual report, so I will not burden you with additional figures at this time.

United maintains a continuous program of plant repair and maintenance and studies of replacement opportunities are conducted to maintain its physical plant in proper operating condition. Expenditures in this regard are generally within the company's normal depreciation allowances.

The consolidated backlog of business carried forward in 1958 amounted to approximately $88,592,000 as compared to $114,200,000 a year ago. As it stands, the current backlog, while lower than that of a year ago, is still substantial and 1958 should produce a good year for the company.

Key to Beating Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial from a recent issue of the Poughkeepsie New Yorker entitled "Key to Beating Inflation":

One of the great questions of this century is whether the free economies of the world can grow and prosper without continuing inflation.

On the record, it has not been generally managed so far. Ever since World War II ended, the great expansion in America and Europe has been matched almost step by step by strong inflationary pressures.

The matter is one that governments deal delicately with. They want to control infla-

tion, and will in nearly every instance make some moves toward that goal. But they also fear deflation and depression, and hence hesitate to clamp the anti-inflation screws too tight.

It seems to be agreed that expansion of the economy takes money. If funds are pumped into the country's bloodstream by government borrowing and unbalanced budgets, the results will be inflationary. If the money comes from wage boosts that far outrun gains in productivity and from prices higher than reasonable costs dictate, the outcome is the same.

Is there any way to escape the spiral and still give the economy powerful propulsion?

Wage gains which simply match advances in efficiency do not seem to have a big enough impact, for in many fields there is no room for such advances on a significant scale. What can a locomotive engineer do to improve his output?

In a London dispatch, John Allan May, of the Christian Science Monitor, suggests, however, that expansion and stability might yet work out as traveling companions.

He points out that for most of the period since 1951 West Germany has managed expansion while avoiding the inflation pitfalls.

The explanation seems to involve complex relationships. Investment in new plants, must, of course, be high. But the German experience indicates this investment capital must be drawn heavily from accumulated individual savings if the currency and hence the economy are to be kept stable.

The Germans have had no special magic. When they have not held savings and investment in balance, or have let wages far outstrip efficiency gains, inflation has hit them, too. But their good results when the balance is kept suggest the problem may have an answer.

The key to it, as May intimates, is perhaps the individual. If we assume he really wants stability, he must know how he may get it.

He must understand that a large share of savings must go into investment for expansion. This means denying himself their use for other purposes. But if this reservoir can not be drawn upon, there will either be no great expansion or it will be brought off by strongly inflationary measures.

Hon. William S. Hill

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, when my good friend and colleague BILL HILL retires this year, the farmers of America will be losing a man who has been their friend in Congress for 18 years, one who has worked constantly in their behalf.

Born on a farm in Kansas, educated in some of the finest agricultural colleges in the country, BILL HILL came to Congress in 1940 to champion the cause of the men who form the backbone of our Nation—the American farmer. He brought to the House of Representatives for 9 consecutive terms not only the desire to better farm life but a vast store of knowledge and experience on how to accomplish his goal. BILL has been a personal counselor to me on farm problems, and we will sorely miss his leadership and sage advice on the problems that face so important a segment of our population.

To me, however, BILL HILL has not been just a fellow legislator, but a warm personal friend with whom I have been privileged to share many wonderful hours ever since we first started our political careers in Washington back in 1940. Our families have enjoyed the hospitality of each others homes many times, and I will always be extremely proud to number BILL among my closest friends. He and his lovely and gracious wife, Rachel, will be missed by all in Washington, but I hope that they will come back to visit with us often. I want to wish them the very best of everything possible as they begin a much deserved rest and a long and happy retirement with their fine children and grandchildren. Rachel and BILL, our prayers and best wishes are with you always.

How To Go Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, sounded a doleful warning the other day when he reminded us that an ever-increasing national debt is the pathway to national insolvency and the primrose path to national suicide.

And it seems quite proper to emphasize today, as we consider adding another billion to the impending deficit by passing a Federal-aid-to-education bill, that this erosion of our financial structure is something that we, the Members of Congress, and we alone, are responsible for.

Admitting that national defense takes 50 pereent of all of our tax income, the fact remains that we are at war—a cold one at the moment, but, nonetheless, destructive financially—and the injunction to tighten our belts, to postpone a lot of these spending schemes, is here. We are fighting a ruthless enemy, and thank God we are fighting him overseas. But that is all the more reason why we should tighten our belts and forego the butter in favor of the guns and missiles our arsenal so sorely needs.

Only the blind will fail to see that we can stop Khrushchev on all fronts and lose to him here at home by destroying our financial and economic structure through profligate spending. Let us not go the way of Athens and Carthage and Rome with our financial excesses. Instead, let us start living within our means and from here on barricade the Federal Treasury against this unnecessary and wasteful spending. The gentleman from Arkansas has sounded the tocsin. His words deserve attention.

Yesterday's Evening Star carried a fine editorial on this subject, which I am pleased to include with these remarks:

How To Go Broke

In voting to increase the statutory limit of the national debt to $288 billion—a jump of $13 billion—the House has acted in keeping with necessity. But it has done so in an unusually somber spirit generated by ever-multiplying signs that our country is heading fast into a period of immense inflationary danger.

This danger, as Chairman MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee, has warned, is inherent in the prospect of huge Federal deficits for years to come. The situation is attributable not merely to essential military and foreign outlays, but also to heavy domestic spending that is not truly essential—spending of a kind that could be markedly reduced, if only the executive branch, Congress, and the American people as a whole would make up their minds to put an end to the profligacy and substitute reasonable frugality for a budgetary policy that seems to be based largely on partisan politicking and a what's-in-it-for-me philosophy.

Mr. MILLS, however, does not expect any such reform in our national fiscal thinking. And so, quite gloomily, he has predicted that Federal spending over the next 5 years will amount to about $80 billion annually, with virtually no chance that enough revenues will be raised to pay for the outlays. Thus, as he sees the future, we are in for a long period of deficit financing that can hardly fail to militate against the idea of tax relief for either corporations or the general public. More than that, in Mr. MILLS' words, "it will loose inflationary pressures here that in turn will be emulated by industry and labor. The result may well be, in the next several years, that we will see rises in prices such as we have not seen before in peacetime."

Warnings of the same sort have been voiced repeatedly in the past, notably by Senator BYRD, and they need to be heeded now more than ever. For the new debt limit approved by the House is symptomatic of a continuing inflationary trend that could cause another great shrinkage in the dollar's acutely shrunken purchasing power. Beyond that, unless it is checked and reversed, the trend could ultimately shatter public confidence in Federal securities and wreck the Nation's credit at home and abroad. These are not imaginary perils. On the contrary, as emphasized by Mr. MILLS and other close students of the subject, they are real perils, and they can readily materialize if nothing is done to head them off.

This matter, with all its astronomical figures, may seem to be dull to most of us Americans. But it is important for us to keep in mind that our present national debt is about seven times greater than it was in 1940, and the interest we must pay on it each year is roughly as much an an entire Federal budget in the early 1930's. Clearly, if we keep on spending as we are, without balancing income and outgo, we will be in danger of waking up one day to find our country quite disastrously broke.

Puerto Rico, Uncommon Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Puerto Rico.

This article furnishes further evidence of the great progress made in that state under the enlightened and forceful leadership of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín. All Americans can be proud of the achievements of our associate in the Caribbean.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCOMMON COMMONWEALTH

(By Wyatt Jones)

People keep asking, "Who owns Puerto Rico?" The answer, of course, is "the Puerto Ricans." The island is a free, associated state of United States citizens, not a territory or a possession. As an autonomous state, it adopted its own constitution, elects its officials, appoints its courts, and has complete local self-government. It is independent in everything except economics, defense, and foreign relations. Puerto Ricans have no voting representatives in Congress and cannot vote for the President and Vice President—they therefore pay no Federal taxes. However, with a few specific exceptions, all Federal laws, including the draft, apply to the island.

Even before the Spanish-American War there was a strong independence movement in Puerto Rico. Under Luis Muñoz Rivera, father of the present Governor, the island had been granted provincial autonomy by Spain. When the United States took over, in 1898, a military government was established, which was superseded, in 1900, by a colonial-type administration dominated by mainlanders. In 1917, the islanders were made citizens of the United States and given an all-Puerto Rican legislature over which the United States Congress retained its veto power. In 1941, Rexford Guy Tugwell was appointed Governor and the Popular Democratic party took over the legislature under the dynamic leadership of Senator Luis Muñoz-Marín, the present Governor. In 1946, President Truman appointed the island's first native governor, who served until a popular election in 1948 was won overwhelmingly by Muñoz-Marín.

COMMONWEALTH STATUS

By this time, the Governor was convinced that Puerto Rico could not live economically outside the United States political system. Turning from a strong supporter of independence, he became the architect and advocate of the unique commonwealth status. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico came into being on July 25, 1952, by an act of Congress granting full autonomy under a commonwealth constitution, ratified by the people of Puerto Rico in a popular referendum.

Governor Muñoz-Marín has twice been reelected, the last time in 1956 with 62.5 percent of the vote. Political experts consider the Governor, his cabinet, and other Puerto Rican officials among the ablest, sincerest, and most dedicated men ever to rise in public life. This able and honest government, with widespread popular support, has been able to perform miracles in the island's economic and political life. The Puerto Ricans are working hard and constructively at the task of solving their problems and achieving their own economic salvation. The name "Operation Bootstrap" has been applied to this self-help development program. In a world beset with problems of colonialism and dependent people, the Puerto Ricans can take justifiable pride in the remarkable success they have achieved. The United States, on the other hand, can be equally proud of its role in providing the conditions that have made possible this unique experiment in self-government.

The tremendous progress Puerto Rico has made since 1950 in living standards, industrial production, employment, public health, housing, overseas trade, public utilities services, and efficient farming has caught the attention of the entire free world. Over 5,000 trained observers have come to Puerto Rico in the past few years to study, at first hand, the Commonwealth's phenomenal economic and social advances. These visitors have come from more than a hundred countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, from 20 Latin American Republics, and even included a delegation of American Indians.

SHOWCASE OF DEMOCRACY

At a recent point 4 conference in San Juan, Governor Muñoz suggested that Puerto Rico become a yardstick for United States policy toward less-developed areas: "What our friends who come from so many different countries and cultures discover in our island is a spirit of self-confidence, a creative energy dedicated to a challenging and worthwhile task, a sense of urgency in the face of difficult obstacles, and the conviction that only in an atmosphere of freedom can the main goal finally be achieved. And they see that the goal is being reached with the encouragement and support of the United States, without any conditions save those born of mutual respect and trust. Here can be seen the true attitude of the United States toward colonialism and economic imperialism and toward the enormous problem of how to deal with peoples of different cultures who are struggling to free themselves from inadequate agrarian economies. Thus, Puerto Rico is a showcase of the intentions of the United States. The success or failure of our experiment is a measure of the success or failure of United States policy toward the countless millions who dwell in less-developed areas."

PROGRESS REPORT

The indicators of economic and social development in Puerto Rico are a revelation. Between 1940 and 1958, the population increased by almost 50 percent, to a record 2.3 million—672 persons per square mile, as compared with 51 for the United States. This makes the island one of the most densely populated areas in the world. In 18 years, the death rate dropped from 18.4 per thousand population to 6.9—2 points below that in the United States. In the same period, the birth rate dropped from 38.5 per thousand to 32.6, and the life expectancy increased from 46 to 68 years. School enrollment tripled, whil the percentage of literacy advanced from 68 to 83. Net income from manufactures increased tenfold, while the gross national product and personal consumption expenditures increased almost fivefold. During the last 18 years, annual per capita income has risen from $121 to $443—a figure exceeded in Latin America only by oil- and ore-rich Venezuela.

Such phenomenal progress can be credited only to hard work, skillful management, imaginative planning, and resolute application of limited resources to a well-conceived goal. For, in truth, the wealth of the Commonwealth is embarrassing—in a special sense. In natural resources, raw materials, and sources of power, Puerto Rico is embarrassingly poor. In manpower potential, geographical location, and climate, however, the island is embarrassingly rich. The idea back of Puerto Rico's Economic Development Administration—better known as fomento, the Spanish word for development—was to use these very real assets to overcome the equally real and pressing liabilities. Fomento's wizard administrator, Teodoro Moscoso, Jr., realized that rapid industrialization under private enterprise was the only possible method. To this end, fomento offered tax exemption, high profits, and expert services to mainland industries willing to open plants in Puerto Rico. During the past 8 years, more than 600 plants, employing more than a half million workers, have been started with EDA assistance. The new goal, set this year, is 13 plants per month. Before 1950, the saying went, "If it isn't sugar or pineapple, it's imported." Today the textiles, electrical appliances, clothing, paper, rugs, rubber goods, drugs, or what-have-you sold in New York or San Juan is just as likely to have been made in Puerto Rico.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The second leg of Puerto Rico's economic stool was private investment. Last year, the annual rate of investment in capital goods rose to $250 million, an increase of almost $50 million over that of the previous year. About half of this came from Puerto Rican sources, the remainder mostly from the United States. To achieve this rate of investment, Puerto Rico promises—and delivers—up to 60 percent return on high-risk capital. Among the many opportunities for safe investment of United States capital are the well-secured, tax-exempt bonds of Puerto Rico and its various revenue authorities, offered by the Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.

Noteworthy examples of American capital at work in Puerto Rico are the projects of the International Basic Economy Corporation, an investment financing company founded by Nelson Rockefeller. With a view to providing the most basic necessities for all the people, IBEC has concentrated on low-cost housing, building attractive complexes of modern, one-family units to replace the festering slums of the cities. These new neighborhoods take into account the Puerto Ricans' desire to "conmingle"—what might be thought of overcrowding in a Westchester suburb is just company in Isla Verde. With an eye to lowering food costs and improving the food distribution patterns, IBEC has also sponsored a series of modern supermarkets, among the first in Puerto Rico's history. In both of these operations, utility has been enhanced by beauty, and function has been informed by Puerto Rican culture and traditions.

The serious shortage of hydroelectric power and fuels makes Puerto Rico a natural for the exploitation of atomic energy. A bill now before the United States Congress would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to build a pilot reactor at the University of Puerto Rico—largely for teaching and demonstration purposes for Latin American scientists. The future power needs of the island are such that this is only a good beginning, and public or private financing should be forthcoming for commercial production of electricity from atomic power.

American tourists, businessmen, and investors are very much in the position of the Three Princes of Serendip in the Arabian Nights story, who, searching the world over for their fortunes, discovered them by chance along the way. For such unsought for and unexpected advantages. Hugh Walpole coined the rather outlandish word, serendipity. Puerto Rico has proved to be the place for such serendipity, not only for investors and businessmen, but also, and especially, for American tourists.

The island's geographical position places it literally at America's doorstep. Pan American clippers make the flight from New York to San Juan, nonstop, in 5½ hours. The record-breaking Puerto Rican air traffic is such that Pan American offers three classes of service—first, tourist, and thrift—on frequent daily schedules. Round-trip passengers may elect to come or go by way of Miami, less than 4 hours' flying time from San Juan. Eastern Airlines and Trans Caribbean offer similar schedules, Delta Airlines flies from southern cities, and several foreign carriers include Puerto Rico in their Caribbean services. Caribair flies regularly among the islands.

The superlative climate of Puerto Rico is possibly its greatest attraction for tourists. Travelers who have suffered disappointment

in the weather at other resorts are certain to be pleased with nature's performance here. There is no extreme of heat or cold—the year-round temperature ranges from a low of 70° to a high of 85°, with an average of 78°. There is no rainy season—only flash tropical showers that seem to come from clear skies, leaving the land green and sparkling—and San Juan boasts of 355 sunny days a year.

This semitropical island offers a wealth of scenic beauty. Luquillo Beach, stretching for miles along the northeast coast, is one of the world's finest expanses of palm-fringed sand. The nearby tropical rain forest, El Yunque, is a spectacular jungle of orchid-festooned bamboo, palms, and ferns—all to be viewed from a paved highway—not an hour's drive from San Juan. Coconuts and bananas grow everywhere, coffee plantations dot the central highlands, sugarcane fields share the northwest landscape with pineapple and citrus groves.

This year, a quarter of a million American tourists will enjoy Puerto Rico's hospitality. The building boom in hotels is such that a monthly magazine can hardly keep up with hotel openings. Among the new luxury-class establishments are the Caribe Hilton, bellwether of this now-famous chain; the San Juan Intercontinental, another jewel in the Pan American World Airlines group (a second Intercontinental for Puerto Rico will open in Ponce, on the southern coast, early next year); the Condado Beach Hotel, recently enlarged and renovated, with its country cousin in the mountains at Barranquitas; and the small but exquisite La Rada, on the Condado Lagoon, in San Juan. The choice among these fine hotels is largely one of convenience and location: the Caribe Hilton is on the island of old San Juan, built partly on the foundations of El Moro, a historic Caribbean fort; the Condado hotels are in Santurce, the modern section of San Juan, on the mainland. Besides air-conditioned rooms and suites overlooking the swimming pool and lagoon, the La Rada offers studio penthouses with kitchens. This in spite of the fact that the hotel's restaurant is under the management of New York's Copain and serves superlative food. The taste and elegance of the furnishings attest to the fact that the owner, José E. Alegría, is also Puerto Rico's best known interior designer.

Among the new hotels to be opened later this year are the ultramodern La Concha—luxury on the halfshell—just down the beach from the Condado; an exclusive club in the El Escambron section of San Juan, to be created by Maxim's of Paris, with 50 guest suites and 2 restaurants; and the Dorado Beach Hotel, another of the Rockefeller projects, about 20 miles west of San Juan.

The latter, on a 1,200-acre oceanfront site just beyond the town of Dorado, on the north central coast, will be one of the most elaborate resort centers in the world. The first unit, an 18-hole championship golf course laid out by Robert Trent Jones, was opened last May. A Spanish-style plantation mansion has been converted into a luxurious clubhouse, and already the club's membership list reads like a Who's Who of business and sport. Later this year, the second unit will be opened—a hotel with lounge and dining rooms overlooking the sea and a total of 136 guest rooms in separate beach houses and cabanas, each with an ocean-front terrace and direct access to the beach. Facilities for beach and swimming, tennis, sailing, and fishing are already available. Designed as a major contribution to the island's expanding tourist program, this project is being developed personally by Laurence S. Rockefeller in conjunction with Puerto Rico's Economic Development Administration.

As the third stage in this project areas of tropical forests and citrus groves have been set aside for future residential development. The building sites have views north to the Atlantic Ocean and south across the coastal plain and sugarcane fields to the mountains. Driving time from the city to the resort area is about 40 minutes; flying time from the San Juan International Airport to the Dorado Beach private airfield is 10 minutes. Flying golfers now are as commonplace in San Juan as they are in Washington.

If this sounds like all business and commerce, it's because the writer is a norteamericano. No puertorriquen would ever describe his pais in these terms. Governor Muñoz-Marin is a practicing poet and lay philosopher. He is horrified at the thought that Puerto Rico's material success and prosperity may come at the cost of his country's spiritual and artistic values. To allay these fears, the Governor has counterpoised Operation Bootstrap with Operation Serenity, "an attempt to give to economic efforts objectives that commend themselves to the spirit."

Under this charter, a burgeoning institute of culture presents exhibitions of art treasures, workshops in poetry, and lectures in philosophy. Under government sponsorship, historic houses, churches, and monuments are restored; a rare book museum has been installed in a colonial house on Calle del Christo; folklore is collected and old music is recorded. The Ballet San Juan features Puerto Rican choreographers and composers. In one 2-week period last June, three 1-act plays in English were presented by the Little Theatre, including a concert reading of Sartre's No Exit, and a company augmented by Metropolitan Opera stars sang 8 grand operas in as many nights.

Perhaps the high point of Puerto Rico's cultural season is the annual Festival Casals has held each year, in May. Here, cellist Pablo Casals (now a Puerto Rican resident), the Budapest String Quartet, and a dozen distinguished guest artists have presented a series of 12 concerts.

The Department of Tourism gets into the act by sponsoring such projects as local and international sports events: golf and tennis tournaments, the annual International Invitational Game Fish Tournament in September, and a variety of cultural programs both in San Juan and out on the island. This summer, for another example of the cultural influence, the floor show at the chic Club Flamboyan was an authentic Spanish ballet featuring the young dancer Roberto Iglesias. There is a lively ferment of the arts, especially painting, all over the country. The lobbies of all the major hotels have been turned into art galleries—the pictures are priced and sold off the walls. A new supper club near the airport is exactly what its name implies—the Little Gallery.

Throughout both of these "Operations," Puerto Rico has sought to maintain and foster the best of its cultural traditions—Latin and American, Spanish and English, Old World and New. Governor Muñoz doesn't like to think of Puerto Rico as a bridge between North and South America—bridges are to be passed over too quickly—but rather as a meeting place, where the two worlds can mingle and even live happily together.

Mr. Dulles Defines Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as so often happens of late I have had to depend on my favorite columnist, David Lawrence, to underscore a forthright statement by Secretary of State Dulles, which I think deserves emphasis. Quoting from Mr. Lawrence in yesterday's Evening Star we have these words which the Secretary delivered the other day in Brazil:

"The international situation is critical. Atheistic, materialistic, and aggressive forces that would dominate all the world, talk boldly; they suggest that efforts to halt them will mean nuclear war.

"We do not in fact believe they want war or would invoke war. No sane people want war. War would be for all an inexpressible disaster.

"The question is whether their threats will cause us to weaken and give in and thus sacrifice the genuine independence of nation after nation. That is not the path to peace. It is the road to war."

In the same able article and supplementing this ringing statement of Mr. Dulles', Mr. Lawrence goes on to point out:

America's record is untarnished. Though engaged victoriously in two World Wars to defend its interests, it has not annexed a single foot of territory. When it has landed Marines anywhere, the reason always has been to protect the lives and property of its own citizens. The United States sent military forces to the Middle East last month to accomplish two purposes—to protect American lives there and to help preserve the political independence of a small nation, thus demonstrating to the Communists and their allies that the people and Government of this country are not pacifistic but ready to fight in the future as in the past for a just cause.

The full-length article by Mr. Lawrence entitled "Appeasement Leads To Defeat" is included with these remarks and commended to your perusal:

APPEASEMENT LEADS TO DEFEAT—DULLES' WARNING AGAINST LETTING SOVIET THREATS WEAKEN US CITED

(By David Lawrence)

Sometimes in a few sentences in a public utterance there is epitomized the whole background of a crisis in the world. Secretary of State Dulles, speaking in Brazil this week, said:

"The international situation is critical. Atheistic, materialistic, and aggressive forces that would dominate all the world, talk boldly; they suggest that efforts to halt them will mean nuclear war.

"We do not in fact believe they want war or would invoke war. No sane people want war. War would be for all an inexpressible disaster.

"The question is whether their threats will cause us to weaken and give in and thus sacrifice the genuine independence of nation after nation. That is not the path to peace. It is the road to war."

The foregoing is an eloquent answer to those critics here and abroad who frivolously exclaim that "America has no foreign policy."

It is a courageous answer to those who keep on giving the impression that the American people are terrorized and that there is only one thing to do—to make concession after concession to the Soviets and the Red Chinese as well as to their stooges in the Middle East.

Many a so-called plan has been proposed by panicky-minded persons who seem to feel that the alternative to war is just plain surrender. They cloak their proposals in fancy phrases; indeed, they bring out the old clichés about neutralization of certain regions and talk glibly about bold and imagi-

native ideas for revising American policy. But paths of appeasement lead only to the same goal—defeatism.

For there are only two ways to try to maintain peace in the world. One of them involves military force, and this not always, but sometimes, means war. The other involves moral force, and this—when backed by a unified country and a willingness to use military force if every other effort fails—could succeed in keeping peace.

Some of the critics have derisively called this brinkmanship. They use the term because Secretary of Dulles once endeavored to express the need for courage in foreign policy and said that sometimes it is necessary to go to the "brink of war" in order to avoid war. He did not mean that he would merely resort to bluff. What he did mean is that, while it is imperative to exhaust every means of making a settlement, no nation which believes in the justness of its cause can avoid going to the very brink of war, itself, if that is necessary to impress its adversary that it is deeply in earnest.

There is a great advantage in applying moral force to the limit. If, for instance, war does come, it is then recognized by the people as the only choice left. Moral force means public discussion, good propaganda, debate in the forum of the United Nations General Assembly or in the press of the world or over the air waves. The theory is that people will control the hand of a government that threatens war. This is logical up to the point where censorship and suppression of ideas by a totalitarian government build an insurmountable barrier to communication between peoples.

Just now America has the most convincing case a nation ever had in the international arena. The United States stands for maintenance of the territorial integrity and political independence of all nations and is willing to supply military might, if necessary, to uphold that principle. For this is the key to peace in the Middle East and in every other area. To condone aggression, direct or indirect, is eventually to invite a world war.

America's record is untarnished. Though engaged victoriously in two world wars to defend its interests, it has not annexed a single foot of territory. When it has landed marines anywhere, the reason always has been to protect the lives and property of its own citizens. The United States sent military forces to the Middle East last month to accomplish two purposes—to protect American lives there and to help preserve the political independence of a small nation, thus demonstrating to the Communists and their allies that the people and Government of this country are not pacifistic but ready to fight in the future as in the past for a just cause.

The fact that America, itself, may be in military danger unless such a determined stand is taken now is not perhaps generally appreciated. It wasn't widely understood either during the 1930's when it was being said that in the battle between the democracies and fascism the "frontiers" in the defense of America may be in the Middle East.

The United States has drawn a line in the Far East beyond which it has said the Communist forces must not advance. In an analogous fashion—through the Truman and Eisenhower doctrines—notification has been given that communistic infiltration of free countries in Europe and the Middle East can reach a point where, if necessary, it will be challenged by arms. The hope is that peoples everywhere will perceive the real issue and restrain any dictatorship governments from taking chances in a delicate situation that could break down the peace of the world.

Selected Recent Plant Closings, July 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting compilation by the Area Employment Expansion Committee in New York on the recent plant closings, for July 1958, as submitted to me by John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This rather terrifying list of recent plant closings—with numbers of employees who will lose jobs—should be of interest in connection with the imminent debate on S. 3683, area redevelopment bill.

We make no claim that this is a complete list—these are merely cases that have come to our attention during 1958. Obviously, however, there is under way a sharp and dangerous contraction in the number of industrial establishments, with a consequent loss of employment, in almost all sections of the country. You will note that almost all types of manufacture are included in the obituary notice.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative.

Selected recent plant closings, July 1958

COMPANY, LOCATION, AND EMPLOYMENT	
Maine:	
Massachusetts Mohair Plush Co., Dana Warp Mills Division, Westbrook	500
Wilton Woolen Co., Wilton	200
Verdun Mfg. Co., Somersworth	35
New Hampshire:	
American Machine & Foundry Co., Laconia	150
Massachusetts:	
Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., Adams (remainder of mill)	800
Hoosac Mills Corp., New Bedford	800
Lawrence Duck Division of Mt. Vernon Mills, Inc., Lawrence	90
Merrimack Mfg. Co., Lowell	1,100
Mohasco Industries, Inc., (Alexander Smith plant), Brockton	100
Shoe Lace Co., Inc., Lawrence	150
Ellis (A. D.) Mills, plant No. 1, Monson	-----
Miron Mills, Clinton	300
Oxford Looms, Oxford	-----
Ford Motor Co., Somerville	1,500
Velveray Corp., Fall River	100
U. S. Bobbin & Shuttle Co., Lawrence	200
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Morgan Plant, Worcester	294
Florence Stove Co., Gardner	650
Reed-Prentice Corp., Worcester	190
U. S. Steel Corp., American Steel & Wire Division, Worcester	2,335
Standard Coil Products, Inc., North Dighton	1,000
Briggs, Bates & Bacon Co., Attleboro	25
Windsor Mfg. Corp., Fall River	111
Resorter's Inc., Lynn	8

Selected recent plant closings, July 1958—Continued

Massachusetts—Continued	
Acme Shoe Co., Salem	20
Universal Tanning Co., Peabody	130
Thomas O'Keefe Leather Co., Salem	40
John McCarthy & Son., Inc., Peabody	20
Associated Tanners, Inc., Peabody	85
Stein Sulkis Shoe Co., Haverhill	250
Knipe Bros., Inc., Haverhill	200
Kamfel Shoes, Inc., Haverhill	20
Laird Schober & Co., Haverhill	175
Holtz Shoe Co., Methuen	120
American Maid Footwear, Inc., Easthampton	180
Hathaway Bakeries, Inc., Springfield	330
Hi-Craft Handbag Co., Springfield	10
Doeskin Products, Inc., Northampton	130
W. F. Whitney Co., Ashburnham	90
Harvard Brewing Co., Lowell	175
Aero Gear & Electronics Corp., Burlington	40
Lowell Insulated Wire Co., Lowell	150
Jay Shoe Manufacturing Co., Cambridge	600
Ward Baking Co., Cambridge	200
Tailby-Nason Co., Cambridge	60
Ellis F. Nelson Co., Melrose	50
Moore & Cram Webbing Co., West Concord	20
Beggs and Cobb, Inc., Winchester	450
Browning Laboratories, Inc., Winchester	40
Gregg & Son, Inc., Framingham	100
Richard Sherman Shoe Corp., Marlboro	8
Bow Moccasin Shoe Co., Avon	40
Brockton Manufacturing Co., Brockton	15
Acme Heel Co., Brockton	30
Smith Holmberg Co., Inc., Brockton	15
Kierstead-Anderson Co., Inc., Brockton	10
John Foote Shoe Co., Brockton	100
Tudor Press, Inc., Boston	150
Pratt & Whitney, Boston	250
A. S. Campbell Co., East Boston	500
Boston Beer Co., Boston	125
Hubrite Informal Frocks, Boston	100
Ro-Ann Sportswear Co., Boston	150
American Machine & Foundry Co., Boston	650
Griffin Wheel Co., Chelsea	70
American Can Co., South Boston	210
Nuclear Magnetics Corp., Boston	15
Puritan Manufacturing Co., Boston	12
Wilson Manufacturing Co., Boston	25
Wright Batchelder Corp., Boston	15
J. C. Morris, Chelsea	25
Gaychrome Co., Worcester	100
Arter Grinding Machine Co., Worcester	200
Universal Braiding Mills, Inc., Worcester	30
L. B. Ramsdell Co., Gardner	30
C. S. Allen Co., Webster	50
Doeskin Products, Inc.:	
Hardwick	100
Mt. Tom	72
Worcester Bickford Corp., Spencer	25
Connecticut:	
Ahern Textile Print, Inc., Norwich	100
Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., velvet and yarn divisions, Thompsonville	800
Gera Corp., USF-Aspinook Division, Norwich	600
Bridgeport Casting Co., Bridgeport	85
Solar Steel Corp., Precision Steel Rolling Mills, Inc., Bridgeport	55
Rhode Island:	
Collins & Aikman Corp., Bristol Worsted Plant, Bristol	250
Apponaug Co., Apponaug	550

Selected recent plant closings, July 1958—Continued

Rhode Island—Continued	
Sayles Finishing Plants, Inc., Phillipsdale	600
Indian Head Mills, Inc., Franklin Process Division, Providence	200
Saco-Lowell Shops, Pawtucket Spinning Ring Co., Pawtucket	
King Union Co. & King Union Brass Co., Hillsgrove	50
Nicholson File Co., Providence	975
New York:	
D'Oro Novelty Corp., New York	25
National Automotive Fibres, Inc., Cohes	250
Continental Can Co., (1 of 3 plants), Syracuse	495
Julian & Kokenge Co., Auburn	-----
Sinclair Refining Co., Wellsville	240
Ford Motor Co., Buffalo Stamping Plant, Buffalo	1,500
Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., Massey-Ferguson, Inc., Batavia	800
Somco-Logan Corp., New Tonawanda	50
Sterling Precision Corp., Smith Palmer Corp., Buffalo	41
New Jersey:	
Forstmann Woolen Co., Inc., Garfield	1,700
Foster Yarn, Inc., Trenton	100
Haledon Textile Processors, Inc., Paterson	60
Ideal Textile Printing, Inc., Paterson	60
Maupai (F. P.) Dyeing Co., West New York	125
Morton Hosiery Mills, Inc., Runnemede	-----
Progressive Silk Finishing Co., Hoboken	100
Jersey Match Co., Elizabeth	62
Puritan Piece Dye Works, Paterson	200
Litton Industries, Inc., Monroe Calculating Machine Co., Morris Plains	200
Mather Spring Co., Linden	225
Worthington Corp., Ampere	100
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Edgewater	130
Celotex Corp., Metuchen	83
Pennsylvania:	
Atwood Mills, Philadelphia	90
Gross Knitting Mills, Kutztown	-----
Lees (Jas.) & Sons Co., Bridgeport	275
Newton (H. B.) Co., Philadelphia	30
Reading Dyeing Co., Inc., Reading	100
Chesebrough Pond's, Inc., McKees Rock	106
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., American Wire Fabrics Corp., Mount Wolf	-----
Rheem Manufacturing Co., Richmond Radiator Division, Uniontown	375
Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meadville	500
Earle Hardware Manufacturing Co., Reading	300
McGraw-Edison Co., Griswold division, Erie	270
National Metal Products Co., Cannonsburg	30
Stubnitz Green Corp., Flannery Manufacturing Co., Bridgeville	237
United States Steel Corp., American steel and wire division, Donora	3,450
Michigan Limestone division, Kaylor Mine, East Brady	213
Enterprise Wallpaper Manufacturing Co., Penndel	87
Maryland:	
Linen Thread Co., Baltimore	430
Armour & Co., Baltimore	240
Landerking Metal Products Co., Baltimore	10

Selected recent plant closings, July 1958—Continued

District of Columbia:	
Shen-Valley Meat Packers, Inc., Washington	75
Kentucky:	
Clayton & Lambert Manufacturing Co., Louisville	100
Tracerlab, Inc., Keleket X-Ray Corp., Covington	295
Virginia:	
Schwarzenbach Huber Co., Stehli plant, Harrisonburg	-----
North Carolina:	
Burlington Industries, Inc., Pacific Mills, Carrboro	380
South Carolina:	
Abney Mills, Gosset finishing plant, Anderson	100
Kent Manufacturing Co., Edenfield Mills, Leesville	50
Victoria Mills, Rock Hill	250
Georgia:	
Dan River Mills, Inc., Anchor Rome plant, Rome	1,000
Lafayette Cotton Mills, Lafayette	250
Linway Manufacturing Co., Palmetto division, Palmetto	-----
Dayton Rubber Co., Atlanta	40
Florida:	
United Aircraft Corp., Hamilton Standard division, St. Petersburg	211
New York Rubber Co., Sarasota	90
Tennessee:	
Ford Motor Co., Ford division, Memphis	1,250
Continental Baking Co., Nashville	-----
United States Rubber Co., Milan	250
Reelfoot Packing Co., Memphis	60
Cramet, Inc., Chattanooga	694
Continental Can Co., Inc., Memphis	204
Alabama:	
Florence Cotton Mills, Florence	150
Texas:	
Three Rivers Refinery, Three Rivers	28
Warwick Wax Co., Inc., Kilgore	12
Rheem Mfg. Co., Houston	600
Oklahoma:	
Flour Mills of America, Inc., Alva	
Muskin Mfg. Co., Muskogee	25
Ohio:	
American Brake Shoe Co., Toledo	60
Chain Belt Co., Newton Falls	18
Chain Belt Co., Niles	35
Chrysler Corp., Youngstown	230
True Temper Corp., Ashtabula	400
True Temper Corp., Conneaut	125
National Car Repair Shops, Inc., Findlay	21
Thresher Paint & Varnish Co., Dayton	40
Woodall Industries, Inc., Cleveland	30
Murray Ohio Mfg. Co., Cleveland	1,200
Electric Auto-Lite Co., Toledo	
Indiana:	
Meyer Mfg. Co., Lynn	50
Riverdale Products Co., Hammond	25
Hoosier Cardinal Corp., Evansville	500
International Harvester Co., Richmond	475
Schult Corp., Elkhart	225
United States Rubber Co., Fort Wayne	700
Illinois:	
Linen Thread Co., Chicago	
Jiffy Steak Co., Chicago	12
American Can Co., Chicago	500
Bucyrus-Erie Co., Chicago	150
Owen Mfg. Co., Litchfield	30
Republic Steel Corp., Sylvan Works, Moline	132
U. S. Foil Co., Reynolds Metals Co., La Grange	110
Chain Belt Co., Rock Island	
Michigan:	
Borg-Warner Corp., Detroit Gear Div., Detroit	400

Selected recent plant closings, July 1958—Continued

Michigan—Continued	
Chrysler Corp.:	
Meldrum Plant, Detroit	2,700
Russell Plant, Detroit	150
McGraw Plant, Detroit	600
Ford Motor Co.:	
Manchester	325
Waterford	175
General Motors Corp., Fisher Body Div., Detroit	650
Hayes Mfg. Co., Grand Rapids	550
Michigan Steel Tube Co., Detroit	225
Welbilt Corp., Detroit	325
Allied Paper Co., Monarch Div., Kalamazoo	299
General Conveyor Corp., Pleasant Ridge	16
Picklands, Mather & Co., Youngstown Mines Corp., Anvil Palms Mine, Ramsey	289
Northwestern Leather Co., Sault Ste. Marie	500
Motor Wheel Corp., Plant No. 4, Lansing	----
Wisconsin:	
Cherry-Burrell Corp., Milwaukee	80
Harris-Intertype Corp., Cottrell Co., Milwaukee	110
National Presto Industries, Inc., Lakeside Aluminum Co., Eau Claire	170
Parker Pen Co., Menomonee	52
Minnesota:	
Pickands, Mather & Co., Sagamore Ore Mining Co., Sagamore Mine, Riverton	70
Ford Motor Co., Glass Plant, St. Paul	100
Iowa:	
Cudahy Packing Co., Bedford	45
Farm-Rite Implement Co., Steel Tank Mfg. Co. Div., Clarinda	112
Missouri:	
Allen Industries, Inc., St. Louis	----
McQuay-Norris Mfg. Co., Navy Div., St. Louis	500
North Dakota:	
Armour & Co., Grand Forks	150
Kansas:	
Sinclair Refining Co., tank car shop, Kansas City	28
Nebraska:	
Elgin National Watch Co., Lincoln	520
Utah:	
Pitkin, Lucius, Inc., Western Uranium Project, Monticello	301
Washington:	
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Tacoma	550
Oregon:	
American Brake Shoe Corp., Portland	44
California:	
Studebaker-Packard Corp., Pacific Div., Los Angeles	425
Sanymetal Products Co., Inc., Los Angeles	20
Gantner & Mattern Co., San Francisco	----
Electric Auto-Lite Co., Los Angeles	----

Hon. John A. Burns of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding service of Delegate JOHN A. BURNS of Hawaii in the 85th Congress.

JOHN BURNS has brought to the Congress a remarkable talent for explaining clearly and concisely the case for Hawaiian statehood and has skillfully advanced this noble cause in which he believes so devoutly. Working tirelessly with supporters of statehood in Congress, JOHN BURNS has broken the persistent bottleneck which, for many years, prevented statehood legislation from clearing Congress.

The approval of Alaskan statehood this year has paved the way for the admission of Hawaii to the Union, almost certainly in the 86th Congress. The people of Hawaii are to be congratulated for their judgment in sending JOHN BURNS to Washington to represent them. In the 20 months since his arrival on the congressional scene he has done more to advance Hawaiian statehood than decades of service by his predecessors.

Despite his prodigious efforts for statehood, he has always found the time and energy to attend to the day-to-day needs of his constituency. As Hawaii's spokesman on the Agriculture, Armed Services, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, and on the floor of the House, JOHN BURNS has been diligent in serving the best interests of the people of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, it is an honor to pay tribute to the Delegate from Hawaii. JOHN A. BURNS is a dedicated man of unquestioned honor, sincerity, integrity, and ability who is admired and respected by his congressional colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Free Press: A Reflection of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and leader of the Liberal Party in Canada. Mr. Pearson spoke at the annual May 15 Prelude to Independence ceremonies in Williamsburg. His remarks cover the timely topics of East-West relations and Canadian-American affairs in addition to the question of responsibility of the press:

THE FREE PRESS: A REFLECTION OF DEMOCRACY

(An address by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson on the occasion of the celebration of the Prelude to Independence, May 15, 1958, Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Va.)

(Preface)

CELEBRATION OF THE PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE, WILLIAMSBURG, MAY 15, 1958

Each year in order to remind men of our basic American concepts of liberty and individual rights, Colonial Williamsburg commemorates the Prelude to Independence Period—May 15 through July 4, 1776. This year May 15, celebrated as Prelude to Independence Day, was devoted to the commemoration of the concept of a free press as expressed in the Virginia Declaration of Rights. This declaration, adopted by the Virginia Convention of Delegates on June 12, 1776, was the precursor to the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution.

The Honorable Lester B. Pearson, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, and leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, delivered the key address in a program that included the opening of the printing office, reconstructed on the original foundations of the shop of William Parks, who in 1736 founded the first newspaper in the Virginia Colony—the Virginia Gazette. The printing office, which also served as postal headquarters in colonial days, was officially opened by the Postmaster General of the United States, Arthur E. Summerfield, who paid tribute to the allied traditions of a free press and an uncensored postal system. In honor of the occasion Mr. Robert Carroll, television and film star, read the Virginia Declaration of Rights, and the Colonial Williamsburg Militia Company and the Lancraft Fife and Drum Corps of New Haven, Conn., mustered and marched in the 18th-century manner.

Special guests included representatives of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, the American Newspaper Guild, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, the American Institute of Graphic Arts, the National Editorial Association, the Virginia Press Association, the Virginia State Printers Association, the Virginia Gazette, and the mayor and the postmaster of Williamsburg.

The purpose of Colonial Williamsburg, and hence the reason for this celebration, is "to re-create accurately the environment of the men and women of 18th century Williamsburg and to bring about such an understanding of their lives and times that present and future generations may more vividly appreciate the contribution of these early Americans to the ideals and culture of our country."

(Address)

THE FREE PRESS: A REFLECTION OF DEMOCRACY

It is an honor as well as a pleasure for me to address the 1958 celebration of the Prelude to Independence in this city so steeped in American history and which has played such a vital role in that history, especially in those stirring and memorable events which led up to independence.

I realize that I am following some very distinguished predecessors in this series whose words—and I have read them—did greater justice to the occasion than mine will be able to do.

You may indeed think it a shade surprising that a Canadian, proud to be a subject of a lovely and gracious descendant of George III, has been asked, and is happy to have been asked, to speak on this occasion, when we praise those men who fought for freedom from the British Crown, and recall with gratitude the nobility of their ideals and the greatness of their deeds.

I feel, myself, no trace of embarrassment in this role; though uneasy about my ability to do justice to it.

Those who fought for independence here did so because there were those in the Great Britain of that time who refused to recognize that a British subject carried his freedom with him across the ocean. The colonists were determined to secure in America the same rights and freedoms of British subjects in the homeland. They asked for nothing more and they were resolved to have nothing less. The effect of their success extended far beyond the borders of their new State, and the triumph of the ideals that inspired the great Virginians and other patriots of that time helped to advance social and political democracy in the motherland of those same men.

In Canada we, too, have secured our independence; but in a different and more peaceful way. We are very glad that we have been able to work out our own national destiny from dependent colony to sovereign state while fighting, not against, but side by side with our mother country.

That we were able to do this by peaceful evolution rather than by angry revolution was due in large part to the success of the American colonists in their War of Independence. Your victory was, in a very real sense, a victory for democratic progress in Great Britain itself. So when, many years later, the Canadian colonies reached a point where they wished to form a self-governing federation, that was encouraged, not opposed, by a Britain which had learned a great lesson in imperial policy. Later when our Canadian federation desired to become a full-fledged international unit the change was made without drama or drum beating but with the hearty approval of the mother country. So the fathers of our country are not generals with drawn swords, but gentlemen in frock coats. Conferences, not campaigns, are the signposts to our independence. Though not as spectacular, our method has been quite as effective as yours.

So today not only Canada but other former colonies of the British Empire—in all continents and climes and of all races and creeds—have become independent states, with freedom as complete as is possible in this interdependent age. They direct every aspect of their own policy—domestic and foreign. It is in this sense that the defeat of the British imperial system of the 18th century—a defeat begun perhaps here in Williamsburg—made possible the British Commonwealth of free nations of the 20th.

There are many in Canada, however, who worry today lest we should have ceased to be a colony of the United Kingdom only to become an economic dependency of the United States. With some historical justification it is felt that this would be a prelude to political and cultural absorption. That worry is increased rather than decreased by the realization of the inevitability, as well as the strength of the friendly ties, economic, social, cultural, and political, that bring us together. These ties have converted neighborhood, which is a state of location, into neighborliness, which is a state of heart and mind.

Their strength is the greater because of the dangers to our free existence which we face together and which we can only overcome together. We have learned—or should have learned—in the last 25 years that independence is not enough, for security or prosperity; that it must at times make concessions to the requirements of interdependence. A smaller state in a coalition is apt to have that lesson driven in on it more forcefully than a great power; through pressures not only from its potential foes but also from its powerful friends.

The relations between our two countries are a good illustration of what I mean. We have good reason to appreciate the fact that without the power and leadership of the United States in our collective security arrangements under NATO we would be isolated and insecure in the face of great and menacing forces that we have cause to fear and which are centered in Moscow. It is true that it is not easy to be powerful and to be loved. Indeed, the big and the powerful must expect rocks to be occasionally thrown at them by the malicious and the excitable. But, as the British learned in their days of imperial power, perhaps it is more important to be respected than to be loved. Even the Yankees in the American League are envied and disliked by some merely because they win so many pennants.

In Canada, however, we do appreciate the value and importance of American power. But we are uneasy—and this is natural—in the consciousness that powerful decisions can be taken in Washington with inescapable and far-reaching consequences for us which we might have little to say about.

We know also that our trade with the United States is essential to our prosperity, indeed to our economic stability; that the pace and pattern of our amazing development in recent years has been made possible by United States investments, which, incidentally, have been very profitable to the investors also. But we become understandably annoyed when your Congress raises or threatens to raise barriers against our exports to you which are now annually more than a billion dollars less than the value of the goods we buy from you. And we become worried when your investments—which serve to save us from the effect of this deficit—seem to dominate some segments of our industrial life.

These irritations are increased when we are told, and rightly, that strategically, for defense purposes, the continent must be considered as a unit; while for trade and production purposes the old rules of national interest and trade protection must apply.

Whether it is a cause or a result of the tendencies I have mentioned, the fact is that we are combining at the present time in Canada an acceptance of the requirements of interdependence through loyal and, I hope, effective participation in international activity, with a vigorous and vibrant national feeling of national pride and a sense of national destiny.

We are determined to do what we can to preserve and strengthen to the maximum possible extent our distinct national identity: Politically, economically, and culturally. We do not wish to—and we will not—be overwhelmed even by the most friendly neighborly pressures. This is a fact of which our friends in Washington, especially in Congress, should be aware. Its complete acceptance is the only sound foundation for good neighborhood and friendly cooperation between our two countries.

That cooperation, not only between our two countries, but between all free countries, is more important today than ever before. One principal purpose of this cooperation is to become so united and so strong and so confident in ourselves that we will be able to bring about an easing of tension generally, through a solution of some of the international problems that divide the world. This will make possible, we hope, cooperation with those with whom we now merely coexist in fear and suspicion.

There is not much evidence, I admit, to suggest that this fear and suspicion is lessening. There is evidence, however, that we are becoming more aware of the consequences of allowing it to degenerate or slide into armed conflict. Nuclear missiles of intercontinental range and satellites in outer space have made it clear that war means common and complete destruction. Deterrence based on a balance of terror which comes from the possession of hideous power on both sides is at the moment the best foundation—and it is sad to have to say this—that we have for security against this tragedy. But we must find something better or the result will eventually be catastrophe.

For that purpose the work of negotiation, patiently and persistently, must go on—without sacrifice on our side of unity or strength or principle. In the pursuit of that work it is hard these days to see much constructive purpose or progress in some of the maneuverings and propaganda manipulations that now pass for diplomacy in accordance with the rules which Moscow has managed to get established.

Instead of the quiet and confidential operation of the diplomatic machinery of the bad old days, we have sensational weekly—or even daily—installments in press, radio, and television, of such things as the Pilgrim's Progress to the summit, with a good deal of doubt in recent weeks as to who is leading whom through or around mines and roadblocks.

In this diplomatic maneuvering, we of the West work under certain handicaps, and I am not now thinking of the moral restraints and obligations which we attribute to ourselves. We work as a group, as a coalition of free countries, each government of which is sensitive, in foreign as in domestic policies, to a public opinion at which is aimed daily a bewildering barrage of information, misinformation, and opinion. This comes from all the mediums of comunication which have made it possible now to know at once everything that is going on everywhere, but make it more difficult at times to plan quietly and dispassionately what we should do about anything.

The fact that we work as a group of countries, each sensitive to public and legislative opinion and influence, inevitably imposes delays on diplomatic action and often necessitates compromise and adjustment of viewpoints.

This is one reason why Moscow, operating within a single and central control of policy and opinion, has so often been able to take the diplomatic initiative. Fortunately, this has been less evident in recent weeks. We are, I think, beginning to adjust ourselves to the new rules of this diplomatic game. We are also acquiring more steadiness in the face of Soviet moves, a refusal to be pushed off balance by every new letter from Mr. Khrushchev. This, if we can maintain it, will serve us in good stead in the future. Steadiness, imagination, and initiative should be the watchwords of our policy.

It seems to me, however, that our reactions to many Soviet developments, largely because of the difficulties I have mentioned, have often been too slow and uncertain. They have also on occasion been too transparently negative. It is surely not wise to shout "wrong number" every time the Kremlin calls up, even before Mr. Khrushchev begins to speak, and even if we know what he is going to say, and have already given him our reply. This has a bad effect on those countries with their hundreds of millions of people who are not as suspicious about Russia and communism as we are and who from their own experience—and perhaps this is the only way you can learn—have not yet learned the necessity of reading the small print, and even between the lines of small print, in Moscow's words.

It would surely be sensible for us to say, whenever we possibly can, in replying to Russion proposals, "Yes, providing" rather than "No, unless." There is a distinction.

While, however, we can improve our tactics and our reactions, it would be even better if we could ourselves act more—so we will have to react less. In other words, if we would take more diplomatic initiatives ourselves, always providing they are genuine and honest ones, with proposals in which we believe.

For this purpose, we will have to centralize the making of coalition policy far more than has previously been the case; and in a body with power and authority to concert and agree on what should be done. The obvious place for this is the NATO Council. Then, having come to decisions in that body which are acceptable to the group, we should not be afraid to choose one member—and in most cases it would have to be the United States—to act as our spokesman with the other side when that seems advisable. This, among other things, would do away with such unseemly wrangling as whether Mr. Gromyko will see western ambassadors singly or together when they have the same thing to tell him.

All of this kind of diplomatic pirouetting seems very childish when we are confronted with a situation that involves the possibility of nothing less than human extermination.

I know how difficult it will be to make effective progress toward centralized formulation of coalition policy on the one hand and the delegation of its execution on the other. However, I am afraid that if we cannot do something along these lines we will find it increasingly difficult not to be pushed and kept on the defensive; or, indeed, to keep the coalition together at all.

Public opinion, especially in Europe, is becoming more and more restive at what seems to be—even when it isn't—the negative and trench warfare character of our diplomacy. That is one reason why there is such a demand for a summit conference, even though, in the terms in which Moscow conceives and has pushed it, such a conference can accomplish little that will be beneficial and might do much that would be harmful by arousing expectations that cannot be fulfilled, with the inevitable hardening of attitudes and cynical disillusionment that would follow.

The best kind of summit meeting that I can visualize in present circumstances—and it would be no formal conference at all—would be a meeting of the heads of the American and Russian Governments for a couple of days, without agenda, files, or crowds of experts, to exchange views informally and frankly; to try to get to understand each other and in the process perhaps to remove some misconceptions and even some fears. Then, the work of negotiation and diplomacy on a wider basis and dealing with concrete problems—the long, hard pull—could follow in perhaps a better atmosphere.

The worst kind of summit conference I can imagine is a meeting of the heads of a dozen or more governments, more or less evenly divided between Communists, anti-Communists, and uncommitted, each with a staff of a hundred or so, and all surrounded by 4,000 journalists, photographers, radio and television commentators, crouching on any ledge they can find, however uncomfortable, providing it is on or near the summit. In this melange, there will be only one man who knows exactly what he wants to do—Mr. Khrushchev. He will submit ten or a dozen propositions at once to the conference, full of such words as peace, coexistence, disarmament, abolition, and ask that they be agreed to at once as being entirely consistent with the Sermon on the Mount and the United Nations Charter. He will have a wonderful time and the Asians, Africans, and Arabs—and some others—will blame everything on Mr. Dulles.

In my somewhat random observations I have already mentioned the press and other mediums of communication which have enlightened but also complicated our free society, and which are so important to its proper functioning.

It is obvious that the free press is a vital factor in the effort we are making—based, as it must be, on public opinion—to secure peace, preserve freedom, and further international cooperation.

In the American struggle for independence, the press of that day, so different in form, organization, control, and even spirit, from the huge business enterprises of today, played a defiant and an important part. In doing so, it indulged in a vigor of language and a picturesque violence of expression that makes the editorial of today seem a very tame thing indeed.

Today we are especially conscious of the part played by the revolutionary press through the fact that we are opening the

reconstructed printing office of one of the most influential of the papers of colonial America, the Virginia Gazette.

The press had its responsibilities then. It has them today. Indeed, no agency has a greater responsibility in democratic society; and how it is discharged will largely determine whether our form of democracy—a relatively new growth in man's history—will survive.

A Canadian who has thought much on these matters wrote the other day that democracy as presently conceived and dedicated cannot long endure. He came to this gloomy conclusion because he felt that the mass of the people on whom democratic government now rested did not have enough sense of responsibility to make it work.

It is true that the greatest threat to democracy and freedom comes from within itself. That applies also to the free press as a reflection of democracy.

Too often today in democratic government the courage to lead, to decide, to discharge a responsibility in an effective way has been replaced by a desire merely to reflect, to adapt, and to follow. Perhaps the same charge can be leveled at the press; that instead of informing, enlightening, and leading, it seems at times more concerned with the competitive requirements of attracting, enticing, and exciting; of "gettin' there fustest even with the leastest."

This danger may be exaggerated but it exists. And only the press itself can remove it; unless freedom goes and newspapers become, as in the Soviet Union, merely an instrument of government.

There is indeed a threat from those who would destroy the freedom of the press by direct action. But there is also this other threat, which comes from irresponsibility appears and grows in the press itself. Indeed, such irresponsibility in any one newspaper eventually weakens belief in the integrity, fairness, and reliability of all newspapers. The resulting loss of public confidence and support inevitably makes it much harder for the press to stand up to those other forces which would destroy its freedom.

These two things—freedom and responsibility—are, as we are so often reminded, inseparable. If one goes, they both go, in government as well as in journalism.

The fathers of your nation, the men who gathered here in Williamsburg in an age which seems a 175 centuries ago, so vastly has our world changed since then, those men knew how important it was to reconcile in action and not only in thought or word, those two things—freedom and responsibility. Perhaps no group of men in history was ever more successful in that endeavor.

I trust that we today—in 1958—beset by problems of a terrifying and baffling complexity, may show some of their wisdom and their greatness. The stakes are far higher than they were then; and if we fail the penalty will be far greater.

Comments Concerning Needed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include another series of comments concerning needed labor legislation. These comments were received in reply to my questionnaire. These statements by rank and file union men clearly show the need for stronger control of our Nation's unions:

Concerning labor legislation:

I am familiar only with the workings of the UAW, but think Reuther is a power-crazed dictator. The most fearful aspect of the union is the things you never hear about because people don't dare speak up against union bully tactics.

Anyone at a union meeting who says "no" when he is supposed to say "yes" has to be afraid for his very life. Reuther's goons are active in every local. I think if the Senate investigators would promise protection for witnesses, they would discover facts that would make Russia's KMVD look like a bunch of Boy Scouts. Reuther takes care of dissenters like Russia "took care of" Hungary and why not. It was in Moscow where he learned the methods.

What I have said is pure truth but it will be hard to prove because everyone is afraid to admit it. I certainly would never say this in public. I will not even sign my name to this.

Question 7 (D), right to work laws:

I do not agree to ban union shops as the union is the workers' protection in a number of ways, but again the union is getting too big, too greedy, and all for itself (for the white collar representatives, I mean). The working individual hasn't got much to say anymore. I'd like to see the union's funds checked into to see where all our union dues are going and for what purpose. I'm a machine operator myself.

In plain words, the union representatives do not do as they should to each common laborer. They're looking out for themselves more or less.

In regards to No. 7 (A): Now the statement as to public inspection to me is somewhat confusing. I am for legal inspection by law of any and all institutions that handle money under the system now used by unions, churches, etc., because there is no way to protect the purpose that this money is being given for. It was necessary to have a depression in order to establish such a protective law in the banking system. I affirm that this is true. Banks had in those times absolute control of the money. The banks were in a position to rob the Nation. The banks in infancy had not that power. The unions today do not have that power. The religious institutions today do not have that power but they are fast growing to the day that they may have it because of the money growth. Laws to safeguard money are needed today. I am for such a law over the unions. I am a union man; a good union is an upbuilding to any industry. A dirty union is like a dirty cop. A dirty cop is like a traitor in the military service. Unions that are dirty today are that way because there has been no enforcement of law over them to the extent that such conditions could have been checked or brought to light in the infant stage.

As for labor legislation, we are long overdue on laws which should bring unions in line with others. I for one do not want anybody spending my dues for political purposes as I think I should have the right to make up my personal mind.

I think a man's right to work is and should always be his American privilege as granted in the Constitution. (Farming and shopworker.)

Our unions have done a lot of good for our country and they should by no means be straitjacketed. Yet they should be responsible organizations. Sure there is some corruption, but there is also corruption in business, government, or practically anything one can mention. So don't kill the cow to kill the lice. (Factory worker and farmer.)

Concerning labor unions: I belong to the UAW and I don't like it. I have a choice of belonging or losing my job. I don't feel this is very free or democratic. As for present UAW demands, I feel they serve neither the interest of the rank and file nor are they very concerned with the inflationary effect they may have on the economy. (Toolmaker.)

I believe unions should be required to show financial statements the same as corporations or companies in order that we may know what is done with our money. (Machine operator.)

No. 7: As a dues-paying member of the CIO, it is a shame the way the workingman is being misled today. I've seen its rise to power and in turn become a big racket. (General Motors Corp. employee.)

In regard to No. 7 (D), I believe that those that want union representation should have it and those that don't want it, be not forced to join them because there are good employers without unions, especially in the small shops and small jobbing shops. But in the larger shops or employments of 100 people and more, I believe unions are needed but have gone too far in some instances. (Machinist.)

The Adams Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., relating to the Sherman Adams case:

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 18, 1958]

NICE WAY TO TREAT A FRIEND

Sherman Adams, testifying before a House committee about his gifts from Industrialist Bernard Goldfine, said that the material in the vicuna coat cost the mill only about $69. Newspaper reports earlier placed the value of the coat at $700 to $800. Could it have been one of the coats that somehow got the wrong label sewed into the collar and started all this mess?

A NAME TO BE REMEMBERED

The White House yesterday admitted that Industrialist Bernard Goldfine once gave President Eisenhower a supply of expensive vicuna cloth. The President gave it to a friend and now does not remember the name of the friend, Press Secretary Jim Hagerty reported. But it will be a long time before the President will forget the name Goldfine.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 19, 1958]

MORE THAN A LACK OF PRUDENCE

There is an old saying that "give a man enough rope and he'll hang himself." But few expected that to be the case in the incidents involving Sherman Adams, Presi-

dential assistant and outspoken critic of past administrations where gifts were reported to have brought preferential treatment from governmental agencies. Mr. Adams appears to have furnished most of the rope himself.

Mr. Adams' longtime friend, Bernard Goldfine, gave the Presidential assistant a vicuna coat, paid some $2,500 in hotel bills for him, lent him a $2,500 oriental rug, according to the "assistant President's" statement before a House investigating committee. Mr. Adams gave Mr. Goldfine a gold watch, a silver dish and a painting by his wife. The items were not reduced to dollars and cents. He also contacted Federal agencies on behalf of Mr. Goldfine. On some occasions, where "contacts" were made in behalf of his old friend, Mr. Goldfine definitely was not in the good graces of the agencies.

Mr. Adams posed two questions in connection with his intervention with Federal agencies in behalf of his friend:

"Did Bernard Goldfine benefit in any way in his relations with any branch of the Federal Government because he was the friend of Sherman Adams?

"Did Sherman Adams seek to secure any favors or benefits for Bernard Goldfine because of this friendship?

"My answer to both questions is: 'No.'"

But "No" is not the answer that comes readily to mind when these same questions are propounded to others. We believe most persons will agree that Bernard Goldfine did benefit because of his relations with Sherman Adams. So far as we have been able to learn from the testimony and news reports, Mr. Goldfine apparently succeeded in accomplishing what he set out to accomplish in each appearance. There is no record that he ever lost a decision when he went before a Federal agency. If Sherman Adams didn't want these Federal agencies to feel the weight of his name and position, then why did he intercede personally in these matters? He knew perfectly well that his voice on the telephone was supercharged with influence, and we doubt that anyone on the other end of the line ever said: "Thanks for calling; we'll pass this along to the proper officials," and then sent Mr. Adams form letter No. 4 in reply to his inquiry. Mr. Adams himself admitted that his contacts lacked prudence, which is putting it mildly.

Furthermore, Robert Lishman, subcommittee counsel, said he is convinced the inquiries Mr. Adams made, or had others make at FTC and SEC, resulted in Mr. Goldfine getting information in violation of laws and regulations covering confidentiality. Mr. Adams also told the committee that implications and inferences could be drawn with some justification that his actions were open to question.

In his appearance before the committee, Mr. Adams adopted the Nixon technique: he spoke in hurt tones as did the Vice President—the misunderstood victim of friends who gave him $18,000 to supplement his salary after he had been elected to the United States Senate as he sobbed out his story to Mr. Eisenhower in that famous "Go west, young man" episode of the 1952 presidential campaign. But did Mr. Adams tell all? Surely there could have been letters or memos sent to departments of government relating to the matters in question, or even letters sent to Mr. Goldfine, that would have been of interest in clearing up some phases of the inquiry.

Mr. Adams made a great to-do about the fact that every Senator and Representative receives calls from constituents to pave the way for them to see Federal agencies or high governmental officials. But do these constituents—and many of them are old, old friends of the Senators—generally pass out $2,500 hotel bills, $700 vicuna coats, or lend them $2,500 oriental rugs before or after packing their suitcases for Washington?

If Mr. Goldfine had been asking for help for the entire woolen industry, for some amalgamated union of workers, for something that would have been beneficial to his section of the country, there could have been no complaint because Mr. Adams arranged meetings or made contacts. But in every instance it was a question of getting Mr. Goldfine personally "off the hook," to use an expression that most seekers after governmental favors understand.

President Eisenhower has not raised his standing by insisting that Mr. Adams remain in government. Mr. Adams is guilty in the eyes of the Nation of the very things he previously condemned so bitterly in others. He should tender his resignation to the President, and Mr. Eisenhower should accept it.

Summit Meeting Should Not Require American Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial below. It is very good advice:

SUMMIT MEETING SHOULD NOT REQUIRE AMERICAN SACRIFICES

The trouble with too many high-level conferences to which we have been a party in the past, including the last summit conference held in Geneva, is that somehow the United States always seems to wind up in the unenviable position of feeling that it has to give something away—must make concessions, even though unilateral ones sometimes, in the interest of "lessening the tensions" of the world brought on by the Communist cold war now being waged against the western allies—and we may usually be considered fairly lucky if we don't lose our shirt into the bargain. This has been going on with monotonous regularity since the days of Potsdam, Teheran, and Yalta.

It's time we put an end to this one-way street of traffic for Americans. What kind of nonsense demands that the people of the United States must give away their substance and security without proper quid pro quo? What sort of insane counsel have some of our leaders listened to in the past when we have been advised to make concession after concession in order to prove to the world our sincerity and good intentions—while at the same time these whisperers of the foolish word had little or nothing constructive to suggest what the Red Bolshevik leaders housed in the Kremlin might do simultaneously to prove their much more to be desired demonstrations of good intentions toward us?

Certainly, we want universal peace—but the proper way to obtain it is not on the self-serving terms of the hateful Bolshevik leaders. They have only provided the peace of the grave to their opponents whom they caught napping in the past. That we stand next on their list is no longer to be doubted. Old Nikita Khrushchev has already said so, stating that he will "push us to our graves."

When he said it he was angry and it was an ample threat—although the Soviet propaganda machine tries to downplay this item today. It seems to have let the cat out of the bag.

Now what steps should we take to shore up our defenses against a cruel type of leadership which is amoral, murderous to its own people and has selected us as its No. 1 enemy which it has repeatedly said it plans to liquidate?

Are we to keep on repeating the senseless and entirely unrealistic formula which comes from the superliberal left that it is up to America alone to allay "the suspicions of the world" and particularly those of the dread Bolshevik cotillion of Marxist warlords housed in Moscow?

Let's be frank and at the same time completely sane and reasonable about this matter. Anyone who thinks that America is a threat to world peace, viz-a-viz the Bolshevik conspiracy to forcibly set up an international world government which will dominate us and other freedom-loving nations of the earth, should quietly examine both his senses and his conscience. Such a concept is not only unrealistic, but it is also dishonest. And all normal persons who do not yield to cunning Red propaganda are already well enough aware of this fact

Therefore, it is time to stop being weak and allowing ourselves to be continuously placed on the moral defensive—or any other kind—before the bar of world opinion. We have conquered no oppressed people as the Reds have done in modern Central Europe and China. We have murdered no 50 million of our own citizens over the past 40 years as the Bolshevik leadership may have accomplished in its own homeland. We have not fomented upheaval and strife in every corner of the planet we live upon for our own selfish aggrandizement and political gain. Can as much be said about the paranoiac leaders of the Soviet Union today?

The correct answer to the last question, of course, is a resounding "No." And thereby hangs a tale. In spite of its incredible history over the past 4 decades against the moral health of the world, in which it has never exploited very much of anything except evil and wickedness, there are still some soft Americans and other members of the Western Alliance who plead with us constantly to "trust the Soviet Union" again and again and again—and continue to indicate to us, even quite fiercely at times, that it is really up to us to convince the rest of the world of our honesty and good intentions.

To this sort of tommy-rot one may say "Nuts," just like Maj. Gen. Anthony McAuliffe of the 102d Airborne Division told the Nazis who had his men encircled at Bastogne some 14 years ago. It's time for us to choose our stands on the proper moral ground henceforth and then refuse to budge from what we know to be right thereafter. Let's trust in God and keep our powder dry.

Gen. George Catlett Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker—

I have seen a great many soldiers in my lifetime, and you, sir, are the finest soldier I have ever known.

Thus spoke Secretary of War Henry Stimson in acknowledging the Nation's debt to Gen. George Catlett Marshall at the end of World War II.

But General Marshall was more than a soldier. History will record, along with his military achievements, his greater accomplishments as a statesman. In a fine NBC radio network program on Thursday, July 3, 1958, David Brinkley narrated a sound portrait of this great military and political leader—one of the truly great men of the past quarter century.

By unanimous consent of my colleagues in the House, I present herewith this interesting NBC program:

BIOGRAPHIES IN SOUND: GEN. GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL

Mr. O'KEEFE. This is Nightline, your tieline to the world, and I am Walter O'Keefe.

During the next 55 minutes, Nightline will bring you a sound portrait of one of the great military and political leaders of the past quarter century. This is another in NBC's award-winning series, Biographies in Sound. Your narrator, David Brinkley.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Now we have had 25 years of the age of the common man, but we still find there is never a day when we don't need uncommon men of special and uncommon ability. Sometimes we get them; sometimes we do not.

We are to hear now about a time when we needed a man like this and got him. In spite of a stubborn and reactionary system that might easily have lost him.

Gen. CHARLES LANHAM. Remember in these dark days in the late twenties, the early thirties, until the Hitler stage began to build up, that the Army numbered about 120,000 people. It was nothing. We were scattered about this country, walled up in little isolated, forgotten Indian posts, battalion posts. When you turned out a company for training, if you got 10 or 12 men you were lucky. There was no future that anyone could see.

Mr. BRINKLEY. There were no promotions until somebody retired, resigned, or died, and then promotions were by seniority. In the twenties and thirties the Army had an officer named George Catlett Marshall whom it knew was brilliant and who eventually had to be Chief of Staff, but if this preposterous seniority system did not work faster, he would be out of the Army and retired as a colonel—a casualty of the system.

BROMLEY SMITH. The thesis may be valid. It is a little frightening to think we are going to have to play our luck this hard, but there is no question in my mind that General Marshall served a specific function at a particular time in American history that could not have been served by anyone else.

Dr. FORREST C. POGUE. It was perhaps the emergency which knocked aside seniority and brought him into a position which a great number of people felt he was fitted for 10 years before, you see. So I think it is in that way that the emergency brought the man forward. It was not that it suddenly turned him into this great leader. He had the potentiality all along. It was the emergency that gave the opportunity for those people who had been talking to members of the Cabinet, had been talking to the President about this man, that gave him a chance to push him forward.

Pershing had mentioned Marshall's name more than once as a potential Chief of Staff.

Mr. BRINKLEY. It is frightening then to think we have to play our luck this hard and though it is thought to be accidental, that these people just happened, the fact is that they have all been men who spent their lives preparing for missions that sooner or later would come.

It might also be added that when these missions do come, they call for uncommon men who are prepared in the three necessary ways, prepared first to see and understand the problem; second, to know or to find a solution; and third to have the power to put the solution in effect.

Well, many men have one of these abilities, some have two of them, and very few have all three. Our history and our lives today are filled with examples of missions that came and found we had men so prepared and other missions that failed because we did not.

Well, here from the beginning is how it happened that when this mission, the Second World War, when this mission came, Gen. George Marshall was prepared in the three necessary ways. His biographer, William Frye.

Mr. FRYE. I get again the picture of a boy who is always sure of himself and of what he wanted, always courteous, full of fun, but reserved, even as a boy. He liked to hunt; he liked to fish; he was not a very good scholar, that is, he didn't make good grades in school, but he never had any difficulty learning what he wanted to know.

And he never had any difficulty making good use of it. And he had a widely curious mind. His playmates liked him. Older people liked him. He could always get other people to do things, but he was always willing to do things himself, too. The Marshall family had been going to VMI since Uncle Tom had moved to Vicksburg, Miss., before the Civil War and sent his boy to VMI, and all the Marshalls had gone to VMI after that. And really it was while Marshall was at VMI, according to his own story, that he decided to become a soldier. When just after the Spanish War, while he was still a cadet at VMI, he stood on Main Street in Uniontown and watched the 10th Pennsylvania Regiment, back from the Spanish War, parade down Main Street, the pavement of which had been painted red, white and blue for the occasion, and while he watched the regiment parade and heard all the cheering and listened to the band, he decided that at last he was going to be a soldier.

Marshall went to VMI and was a member of the class of 1901 at VMI.

Mr. BANKS HUDSON. In 1897 when George Marshall and I both matriculated at VMI in Lexington—of course you realize that VMI in 1897 was quite different from any college or university now. We had no holidays, no overnight holidays, we had no spring vacation. Christmas Day we were absent from the school from 8 o'clock in the morning until 5 that afternoon, and that is all the holidays we had during the school year. He was right around 6 feet—maybe a little over—broad shouldered, heavy features, a splendid figure and an amazingly great voice. That was one of the characteristics that you had to have to get these military honors at VMI. You had to have the figure, you had to look like a soldier, and your voice had to be so that you could give commands in a manner that could be heard all over the parade ground.

He was always cordial to us, called us by our last names, usually.

Mr. BRINKLEY. That was Banks Hudson. He entered VMI at the same time Marshall did and recalls that military schools were run then as they are not run now.

With a VMI diploma, and a new pair of gold plated second lieutenant's bars, Marshall entered the Army in 1902 and they sent him to the Philippines. Here for the first time you could see the kind of soldier he was going to be. These words from Captain—and later General—William T. Sexton.

General SEXTON. In 1939 a book that I had written on the Philippine insurrection was published. It was entitled "Soldiers in the Sun," and General Marshall, as it turned out, was very much interested in history, and particularly in the history of the Philippine insurrection. He had served there twice on two tours, one in 1902 and one in 1913, and on both of these tours he had become very much interested in operations and had made quite a study of the Philippine insurrection himself. He read my book and liked it very much and wrote me a very nice letter about it.

"DEAR CAPTAIN SEXTON: At Randolph Field Colonel Brooks presented me with a copy of Soldiers in the Sun. I occupied a great deal of my spare time during the 3 years in going completely through War Department records covering the military events in the field and in the Government between the arrival of the first expeditionary force in 1898 and the campaign in Mindanao in 1904. During this period I arranged to visit as many of the scenes of action as possible and tried to take with me officers who had been actual participants in the events. I would like to congratulate you on a remarkable piece of research and writing.

"Faithfully yours,

"G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff."

Mr. BRINKLEY. There is our first glimpse of how Marshall felt a man should prepare himself. On being assigned to the Philippines he read everything in the Army's records about the islands' military history, he talked to people who had done the fighting, he visited the scenes of battle and studied them, he learned all he could and had another insurrection begun then, he would have been prepared to lead an army to put it down. His military career had begun.

In this tiny and hidebound Army 16 years later when we entered World War I, Marshall was still a 1st lieutenant. Three months after the war started he made captain. We will hear his story from that war told by Mark Watson, later a foreign correspondent for the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. WATSON. My first encounter with General Marshall was when he was a junior officer, and I was a very junior officer and not a professional soldier at all. This was at Chaumont, in France, which was General Pershing's general headquarters. He had a small office and only one man could get into the doorway at a time.

He had the door arranged so that it didn't open very wide, and nobody could squeeze past his desk. He had there all the information that he wanted and he was going to keep it there.

Marshall's largest feat there was in the preparation for the great battle of St. Mihiel, which was the first large-scale operation under strictly American command. His preparation for it involved bringing divisions of troops from away up in the north where they had been under British command, from the middle of the line and from the eastern line and from reserve sections where troops were still in training, to bring nearly 600,000 men and all the supplies that he needed over the roads and highways of France, which at that time were in pitiful shape, was a most extraordinary feat. It was because he had done this and was at the same time working on the larger movement for the Meuse-Argonne Battle which followed almost immediately that he became widely known to the professionals at Chaumont and throughout the Army and indeed throughout the Allied armies, because this was an extraordinary job that he had performed.

He didn't, I would say, come to any public attention at all. In fact, he shunned it, although he was very warmly spoken of for the job which he had done.

I don't think many of them saw him, but those who talked with Pershing about the organization—Foch, for example—did go out of their way to say that that logistics feat of Marshall's at St. Mihiel, and repeated on a grander scale at Meuse-Argonne, was a very great job.

Pershing himself was outspoken in his admiration for Marshall. I remember his mentioning him at a hearing in Congress as

the best young officer in the United States Army.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The best young officer in the United States Army, in Gen. Black Jack Pershing's judgment, but Marshall's fame then was confined almost entirely to the professional military and to the public he was unknown, as staff officers usually are.

The headlines go to the commanders in the field who gain ground and win battles, not to the men who pored over the maps and made the plans that led to the victories. The headlines went to the field commanders, and so did the promotions. Dr. Forest Pogue saw how this happened.

Dr. POGUE. Now he tried throughout World War I to get a field command because a fellow colonel, for example, who got a regiment, ended up in a short time as a major general, while Marshall stayed a colonel. Actually in the closing days of the war he was promised a command and was put in for promotion to brigadier. The war ended before that was acted on back here and all promotions were suspended.

Now, friends of his, and men of the same age, who had their one star, either kept them or at least didn't go back as far as he did, whereas he had to go back to his permanent rank, which was that of captain. However, he was brought on shortly afterward.

You've got to remember that the peacetime Army, though, was very strict on the matter of seniority.

Mr. BRINKLEY. It was so strict it took him another 15 years to reach the permanent rank of colonel. Well, while he waited he was rotated around in the usual Army routine. There was another stop for Marshall as he, in a somewhat machinelike way, went about preparing himself for command of the United States Army, even though by now—this was in 1927—he was still a lieutenant colonel.

Gen. LAWTON COLLINS. General Marshall was the assistant commandant of the Infantry School from about 1928 to 1931, during which period I was an instructor there, in the Tactical Department.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Gen. Lawton Collins.

Gen. LAWTON COLLINS. Incidentally, he had at that time assembled at Benning a remarkably able group of people. For example, General Bradley was in the Tactical Department. General Hodges, who commanded the First Army in Europe. Many of them were relatively young men, like Gen. Charles Bolté and myself. And the thing that we all admired very greatly about General Marshall was that he was constantly seeking new ways of doing things. He never accepted something that had been done in the past at its face value.

The new infantry drill was devised. I had something to do with that. When tested out by the Army, the bulk of the people in the Army were in favor of it. The people who were against it were the old codgers who just simply couldn't see anything new, and it was only after General Marshall became Chief of Staff that that drill system was put into effect.

That was the sort of thing that went on constantly at Benning.

Mr. BRINKLEY. With this kind of preparation and this kind of record as a junior officer, even those bound up in the archaic promotion system began to see if Marshall didn't get promoted faster he would be lost to the Army because he would reach retirement age still a colonel. But it happened otherwise because it had to, because an emergency was developing in Europe and, while President Roosevelt talked peace and neutrality, he knew there was going to be a war.

So here is what happened as recalled by Gen. Charles D. Herron.

General HERRON. When, due to the seniority and the fortunes of war, I came to Chicago as commanding general out there, Marshall was then a colonel under my command. I, with other people, urged it on the War Department that he must be promoted before he reached that critical birth age.

It so happened that Mr. Dern came out there, the then Secretary of War, and I gave him a luncheon and got Marshall there early, and Dern there early and introduced him to Marshall and told him that this was the Colonel Marshall that he had undoubtedly heard a good deal of. And it wasn't but a few days after Dern got back to Washington that Marshall was promoted.

Dr. FORREST C. POGUE. It was perhaps the emergency which knocked aside seniority and brought him into a position which a great number of people felt he was fitted for, you see. Pershing had brought up Marshall's name more than once as an excellent Chief of Staff or a very outstanding person. But as long as you had a number of people of greater seniority and as long as the tendency was to pick the oldest man in point of service who had still 4 years to serve for Chief of Staff, it was difficult for even Pershing or men of that type to persuade the President to set them aside. For General Marshall became Chief of Staff the very day Hitler invaded Poland.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Marshall became Chief of Staff at the time when it was clear to all Americans who were willing to believe the ugly facts that a war was on the way, but not all were willing. A comment on this troubled time from the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, of course, there were a lot of people who never were for selective service. They didn't think there was any danger in the world, they said, that nobody was going to fight us, and they asked who was going to fight us in the world. And that was the argument made up and down on the floor of the House for hours—a day or two—and then we finally came to the vote. I tried to convince everybody that the world was in turmoil and that there was a world war going on, and I have always, since World War I, believed that when there is a big disturbance in any quarter of the world, that that disturbance might spread to the remainder of the world, and I thought that we should not be at that time taking down our Army, which would have been done, if we had not renewed the Selective Service Act, and we finally convinced enough people that we passed the extension by a vote of 203 to 202, which I think is a most fortunate thing because it was only a few months before we were hit at Pearl Harbor and that answered the people who said nobody is going to fight, nobody is going to fight us, we have done nothing to anybody.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The new head of the Army had to get along with the Army, with Congress, the Secretary of War, and with the President.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recalls how he got along with the President.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. My husband had the greatest respect for General Marshall. Of course his contact with him was in a military position, as head of the Armed Forces, and I don't think—he not only respected his military ability, but he respected his judgment and his integrity in all questions that came up. And I remember very well having my husband sometimes after a meeting say how extraordinarily patient General Marshall was in gathering his information and in following what was happening and how very wise he felt his judgments usually were.

Gen. W. T. SEXTON. He had a great feeling of parental responsibility toward his soldiers and when the expansion program was going on he insisted at all of these camps that there be ample chapels built and he organized this USO for morale, and his theory was that these soldiers should not only have all the opportunities to go to religious devotions but that they should have ample, proven, wholesome entertainment, preferably on the camp. The idea was to keep them off the streets in these towns that fringe the average Army post.

And he was also very interested in letters that he would get from parents and he was very insistent that they be answered and be investigated, particularly when a complaint of any nature came in. I recall this letter that came in from a mother who apparently heard from her son that the Army food was no good, that he was starving to death. He called me in and gave me the letter and said "I want you to run this down. You get in touch with that camp and you find out what the unit is and we are going to get that"—if this is true—"we are going to get that straightened out.

Well, I did that and what we found out was that this soldier who had written the letter to his mother had been in the Army about 3 months and he had gained 25 pounds.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Another new thing Marshall had to learn was the difficulty of dealing with Russia.

Here is Gen. John E. Hull.

General HULL. General Marshall felt that there was only one leader in Russia who had to make the decisions and that was Stalin.

During the negotiations, General Marshall, and the other of our Chiefs of Staff were negotiating with a view to trying to reach agreement with the Russians which would be satisfactory from our standpoint and acceptable to them, realizing that in anything of this nature there has to be some give and take, but we found the Russians a little bit difficult to get to agree to some of our proposals.

For instance, we wanted air bases in Eastern Siberia from which we could fly our bombers against Japan. Although agreeing that it would be a good thing, we never were able to get the Russians to come to a satisfactory agreement on that problem which would permit us to base our bombers there.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Also there were problems of a different kind in dealing with allies. Britain's Lord Allen Brook.

Lord ALLEN BROOK. There came occasions when a lot of the matters were settled quite easily, matters on the agenda, but occasionally amongst the more difficult ones, we argued up to a certain point where it became very clear that we were going to have difficulties in arriving at an agreement. And by being able to take our hair down, then, and really thresh out the matter, and we knew we had to arrive at an agreement, it was no good going up and meeting the President and the Prime Minister and telling them that we failed to agree. We had to arrive at an agreement. Well, by a process then of a rather more intimate discussion, and that is the time which I think General Marshall always shone. He was always perfectly ready to discuss, to put all his cards on the table, we put our cards on the table and we shuffled them around until we got some pattern out of it. I though always in those discussions there, how fortunate we were to have a man of Marshall's temperament, integrity, and outlook generally, to arrive at these decisions and how difficult it might have been had we had somebody else in the chair. We were bound to have differences and we had many differences during the war, but we were always able, even after the most heated discussions in conference, to walk out arm and arm and go to lunch together still exactly the same friends.

Mr. BRINKLEY. As Chief of Staff, Marshall's behavior was not merely correct but punctilious. So much so many people thought he was cold, but there were exceptions to this among those who knew him best. His military secretary, Brig. Gen. Frank McCarthy.

General MCCARTHY. Certainly he was a great admirer of General Eisenhower, of General Bradley, and General Patton. By no

means to the exclusion of all others. However, he found in General Eisenhower the one man whom I think he felt from the beginning could unite the points of view which were not always initially in agreement, of the allied leaders and allied powers.

General Bradley, I think he admired for his very firm command in high positions. And General Patton he considered a very fine close-in battlefield commander. He always felt the Germans considered General Patton perhaps their greatest threat as a single individual.

For some reason General Marshall singled General Patton out for a special accolade that I never knew him to give any other senior officer of the Army and only a few junior officers. General MacArthur was always called MacArthur. The President was always called Mr. President. General Eisenhower was always called General Eisenhower. General Bradley was Bradley, but for some reason which I never fathomed, General Patton was always "Georgie."

Mr. BRINKLEY. Not "Patton," not even "George," but "Georgie."

A few years after SAM RAYBURN and the other leaders of Congress put up on faith about $2 million for the secret project, he got a report on what happened to the money. RAYBURN recalls that day.

Speaker RAYBURN. We got the $800 million for him and then about 15 months after that they came back and said "Now this is a success. It is 99½ percent complete, and we'd like for you to go down to Oak Ridge and see it."

I said, "No; I wouldn't know anything about it. I would see a lot of buildings and pots and pans and jars that nobody could explain to me, but if you say you got it, it is all right."

Mr. BRINKLEY. It worked, and it ended the war, and that ended Marshall's service as Chief of Staff. It was time for him to retire from the Army, his job done.

The President who gave him the job had not lived to see it finished, and the new President was Harry Truman.

The new President was Harry Truman. His opinion was that Marshall was the greatest living American. Truman called others in high office "Jack," and "Tom," and "Bill." Marshall he called General. As RAYBURN said it, "I would no more call General Marshall 'George,' than I would call Gen. Robert E. Lee 'Bob.' "

That is how they felt about him, as Truman said.

Mr. TRUMAN. In a way unparalleled in magnitude and horror, millions of Americans gave their country outstanding service. General of the Army George C. Marshall gave it victory. Statesman and soldier, he had courage, fortitude, and vision, and best of all, a rare self-effacement. He has been a tower of strength under two Commanders in Chief. His standards of character, conduct and efficiency inspire the entire Army, the Nation, and the world. To him, as much as to any individual, the United States owes its future. He takes his place at the head of the great commanders of history.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Biographer William Frye in retrospect recalls another of what he regards as Marshall's great works.

Mr. FRYE. I think a lot of people have forgotten the directive he issued and too little attention has been paid to it incidentally, to the postwar planning group of the Army Special Staff, in 1944, which told them that the postwar Army of the United States should be composed of the smallest possible professional army augmented by adequate citizen reserves, because "the largest professional standing Army has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state."

I think that is one of the finest things that any American soldier or any other soldier has ever said.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Marshall had earned his retirement, but he was a long time getting it. Gen. Marshall Carter——

General CARTER. General Marshall had served with tremendous capacity as Chief of Staff of the United States Army and had earned his retirement in 1945. Certainly he had nothing else in his mind at that time than to enjoy the rest of his life with Mrs. Marshall.

It was not long after, however, that President Truman telephoned him and asked him to go to China as his special representative.

It never occurred to General Marshall to say "No," or "Why," or "What's in it for me." It never occurred to General Marshall to question the assignment.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Here, for a man whose whole life was success, here was failure. Drab, ugly failure. His job was to arrange some kind of agreement between Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists. Maybe success was impossible for anyone, but in any case not even Marshall's best friend, with the kindest intentions and the softest language, could call it anything but a failure. Col. J. Hart Coy.

Colonel COY. I do think that I could say I detected a decided enthusiasm with which he was intent on approaching his new and tremendous task. He was anxious to undertake it and I believe he had a great deal of confidence that he was going to be able to bring some sort of order out of the chaotic conditions. General Marshall always felt, and I think most westerners do, too—or did, too, that there was a great deal of corruption in the Chinese Government. At least we westerners referred to it as corruption, but in a certain sense this was sort of a way of life in the Chinese system.

But this was of such a character as to cause disloyalties within the general Chinese governmental command channels. His reaction to the failure was one of deep disappointment and one in which he felt a great agony, I suppose, for the Chinese people.

Mr. BRINKLEY. During his China mission, working for Marshall at the other end of the transpacific cable was Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State.

Mr. ACHESON. He came back from China for the second time in January of 1947 and at that time it was announced that Secretary Byrnes had resigned, to retire to private life, and General Marshall was going to take his place. I remember very well the day on which he took the oath of office.

I had been sitting at my desk for a few moments when the door opened a short way and General Marshall's head appeared around the corner. He asked me if he could interrupt me and came in. He said "Will you stay on?"

I said, "Yes, sir; I shall do whatever I can to be of service to you and if you wish me to stay on, I will stay on. Not indefinitely, but we can work that out later."

I then said, "What do you expect from me here?"

And he said, "Two things. I expect you to run this place."

I said, "General, it will be the first time that anyone has run the State Department for 175 years."

"Well," he said, "we will take care of that."

And indeed he did. I said, "Is that all?"

He said, "No; not all. I expect from you the most unvarnished truth at all times, particularly about myself."

I said, "General, do you really mean that? Sometimes that is rather difficult."

And he said, "Don't worry about my feelings. I have none, except those which I reserve exclusively for Mrs. Marshall."

Mr. BRINKLEY. If, as Acheson said, no one had run the Department of State in 175 years, Marshall gave it a good try, and the people in the Department knew they had a Secretary, as the Army had known it had an officer.

Here is how he worked, recalled by Bromley Smith.

Mr. SMITH. An Assistant Secretary of State received an important message from a capital abroad and went into Secretary Marshall's office, handed him the telegram, gave him time to read it, and then said, "Mr. Secretary, what should we do?"

General Marshall looked him straight in the eye and he said, "Never ask me such a question. You tell me what I am supposed to do. That is what you are paid for. I am paid to decide whether I will do what you tell me to do, or find someone else to tell me otherwise."

From that moment on, Assistant Secretaries and others learned that their task was to use their best judgment and make recommendations to the Secretary, rather than to run with a message to the Secretary, wring their hands and say, "What do we do now?"

On the peg I think the entire structure of the Department of State was changed and it made it much easier for some in the Department who wanted to make it a more orderly place to do business, it made it easier for them to establish what is now accepted routinely as staff work.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Marshall as Secretary of State did one thing that will be remembered, and remembered by his name as long as American history is written. Paul Hoffman tells how this came about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You may recall that in the spring of 1947 there was a meeting of foreign ministers in Moscow. The General had attended meeting after meeting after meeting with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Molotov and other foreign ministers. He finally concluded and came to me and told me something of a flash, that if the reconstruction of Europe was to proceed, it could not proceed on such a meeting, it would have to come from the offering of some rather dramatic program for the reconstruction of Europe. So in a sense it was the Kremlin, you see, or at least the meeting in the Kremlin which gave him this inspiration.

I think our memories are short and we may have forgotten the very desperate strait Europe was in in the spring of 1947. Industry was practically at a standstill. Transportation was only sporadic and most important of all there was great defeatism all through Europe. There was a feeling of "what can we do about it?"

This was a feeling, by the way, that the Kremlin helped promote because they could see in chaos and in defeatism their opportunity to take over and dominate Western Europe, which was very much, of course, a part of their program.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Many statements and speeches are called historic. Here is one that was. Marshall's speech at Harvard University offering a plan to revive Europe from its own wreckage.

General MARSHALL. The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements in the next 3 or 4 years for farm food and other essential products principally from America, are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social and political deterioration of a very grave character. The remedy seems to lie in breaking the vicious circle and restoring the confidence of the people of Europe in the economic future of their own countries, and of Europe as a whole. Such assistance I am convinced must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a palliative. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for our Government to undertake to draw unilaterally a program designed to put Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans.

The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so.

The program should be a joint one agreed to by a number if not all European nations.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The Marshall plan. Perhaps the only time in the history of the world that a nation and a people taxed and strapped themselves for years to perform a simple, uncomplicated act of generosity. To help other countries unable to help themselves, and to ask in return for this, no territory, no concessions, no special treatment, no favors, nothing.

This was the United States at its best, and the idea was George Marshall's.

Even after that he was not allowed to retire to his apple trees. President Truman asked him to take on still another job. Gen. Lawton Collins——

General COLLINS. After having served as Secretary of State, when the President asked him to come over and serve as the Secretary of Defense, I am sure General Marshall would probably have preferred to have retired for a second or third time and taken things easy, but here, great guy that he was, he was willing again to assume terrific responsibilities in an area of very great difficulties.

Mr. BRINKLEY. He agreed to serve as Secretary of Defense. His prestige at this point was enormous, comparable to Wellington's after Waterloo. But when he appeared before a Senate committee at an open hearing on his appointment, this prestige did not save him from rough questioning. Here are the questions and here are his answers:

"Question. General Marshall, the next question I have before me reads as follows: Why did you join in the suppression of the Wedemeyer report on China?

"General MARSHALL. I did not join in the suppression of the report. I personally suppressed it. This was a report of a man I had sent to find out something for me and not for a public speech. It seemed unwise but it became, I guess frankly, a political issue, almost, at the time.

"Question. Will you assure the American people unequivocably that as Secretary of Defense you will not be dominated by, or carry out the policies of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson—who will not turn his back on Alger Hiss?

"General MARSHALL. I will not answer that question."

Mr. BRINKLEY. And he didn't. Not only did his prestige not save him from rough questions, it did not prevent his failure in China from rising again to haunt him.

Ray Scherer of NBC News was there the day it happened.

Mr. SCHERER. By September 1950, President Harry Truman had come to the end of the line with Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. The Korean war was nearing its worst stage. Mr. Truman wanted a Secretary of Defense who could command public confidence. George Marshall at the time was living quietly as president of the Red Cross. The same day Louis Johnson got word from Mr. Truman that he wanted him to resign, the President called Leesburg, Va., got Mr. Marshall on the phone and asked him if he would take the Pentagon job.

General Marshall accepted immediately, but existing law had to be waived to permit General Marshall, a military man, to become the civilian Secretary of Defense. This caused a brief flareup on Capitol Hill. During this debate in the Senate, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, rose from his seat, got the floor and launched into a 1-hour speech. It was one of the most astounding speeches ever made in the Senate. Amid stony silence, JENNER went back to Pearl Harbor, reviewed the whole war, mentioned every major decision General Marshall was involved in, called Marshall "the living symbol of the swindle in which we are caught." Said "the appointment of General Marshall at this particular juncture in our destiny is a last desperate attempt of this administration to swallow up the treachery of the past in a new treachery they are planning for the future."

JENNER said, "General Marshall is not only willing, he is eager to play the role of a frontman for traitors." Then JENNER thundered off the charge which shocked the Senate. He said, "the truth is, this is no new role for him, for Gen. George Marshall is a living lie."

As soon as JENNER had finished, Scott Lucas, Senator from Illinois, Democratic leader—his face white with anger—said he considered it "the most venomous, the most diabolical, the most reprehensible, the most unfortunate and irresponsible speech I have ever heard made on the floor of the Senate or of the House of Representatives."

Moments later the Senate voted on whether to waive the law. The vote was 47 to 21 for General Marshall.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The first reporter to call Marshall after this got him on the phone at home and said "General, I am sorry to tell you this, but Senator JENNER of Indiana, in a speech in the Senate, has called you a frontman for traitors."

Marshall said, "What did you say that name was?"

The reporter said, "Senator JENNER, of Indiana."

Marshall answered, "I don't believe I know him."

That is all he said then, or ever said. Later Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, joined in this attack. By now President Eisenhower was in office and at a news conference he was asked what he thought of the attack and he answered:

President EISENHOWER. I happen to be one of those Army officers that did not meet General Marshall except in the most cautious way until the war started. But I would like to say, and I have been saying this ever since I first knew him well, that he, to me, has typified all that we look for in what we call an American patriot. I saw many things he did that proved to me at least his selflessness. I am certain he did not want to sit in Washington and be Chief of Staff. I am sure he wanted a field command. But he wouldn't even let his Chief know what he wanted because he said "I am here to serve and not to satisfy personal ambitions."

I think it is a sorry reward, at the end of that long term, to say that he is not a loyal, fine American, and that he served only in order to advance his own personal ambitions. I can't imagine anyone that I have known in my career of whom this is less so than it is in his case.

Mr. BRINKLEY. While Marshall was Secretary of Defense, Dean Acheson was Secretary of State.

Mr. ACHESON. As a colleague, the general could not have been more perfect. He gave the most complete cooperation to the Department of State. He had his punctilious regard for rank which led him to insist always that as the senior Cabinet officer, I should precede him at all times, I should speak first on any matter, and I should be treated by him as though our actual positions were quite reverse, as though my prestige were as great as his.

In these years, the relations between the two branches of the Government dealing with foreign affairs, the military branch and the diplomatic branch, were as they should be.

Mr. Lovett, General Marshall, and I were so close to one another that all barriers between the departments were broken down, and our more junior colleagues, both in the State Department and in the Defense Department, worked together in complete cooperation.

It would have been impossible to have carried on the development of NATO, the conduct of the Korean war, the rearmament of the United States, as it was done, without this very close arrangement.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Another recollection from the Defense Department with Marshall as Secretary, from Anna Rosenberg.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I saw him as a strict military man, with men in the service. And then I saw him—oh, take for instance with myself, who came into the Defense Department pretty green. I was very much on the spot because, as you recall, no woman had ever served in that capacity before.

I went through a very difficult time when I was being confirmed—charges against me—and the general felt it very strongly because he told me when I came to the Defense Department that the people who are against him are going to take it out on me.

The day the Senate was voting, we were all rather tense, though we knew which way it would go. He kept on coming in and out of my office—"Have you heard yet? Have you heard yet?"

I told him I hadn't. He said, "The second you hear, come in. I am going to have a meeting of the Joint Chiefs, and we have to go over to the White House; but I do want to hear the moment you hear; and, if you don't hear it before, call me at the White House."

So they telephoned me the very good news and I flew into the general's office, and all the Joint Chiefs were standing there with white gloves on, ready to leave for the White House and the President, and General Marshall, all in hat and coat, and I flew in and I said "General," and I told him what it was.

And he came over and put his arms around me and kissed me and said, "Anna, that's fine," and he was quite choked up, and the others sort of embarrassed, came over to congratulate me.

And I think he felt it was a little too sentimental, though he started it, and suddenly he looked at me and said, "Now get out of here and get a facial; you look like hell."

Mr. BRINKLEY. Less than a year after he gave these instructions to Anna Rosenberg, Marshall and the Truman administration retired together, he to Leesburg, Va., named, incidentally, for another general whom Marshall believes to have been among the greatest we have had.

He has remained there quietly, obscurely, and peacefully in a retirement he earned a long time before he got it.

Again, how and why did we get a man like this at a time when we needed him so much, at a time when the mission came and called for a man prepared in the three necessary ways to carry it out? We have heard how we got him. No one can tell us why.

A final word from the man who was his superior during the war, Secretary of War Henry Stimson. One day he told Marshall what he thought of him. That scene, recalled by Robert I. Lovett.

Mr. LOVETT. One of the most moving occasions that I recall involved both of these fine men, General Marshall and Secretary Stimson. It took place after V–J Day, after the war was over, when the wonderful old Secretary of War, then well over 70, in his very large room in the Pentagon, sent for all of the leaders of the military services then available in Washington.

Before this distinguished group which had gathered in a semicircle facing the Secretary's desk, Colonel Stimson stood up, asked General Marshall to join him, and facing this crowded semicircle, he said to his audience these words, which were immediately

set down by one of his young assistants afterward:

"I want to acknowledge my great personal debt to you, sir, in common with the whole country. No one who is thinking of himself can rise to true heights. You have never thought of yourself. Seldom can a man put aside such a thing as being the commanding general of the greatest field army in our history. This decision was made by you for wholly unselfish reasons. But you have made your position as Chief of Staff a greater one. I have never seen a task of such magnitude performed by a man. It is rarely in life you make new friends. At my age it is a slow process. But there is no one for whom I have such deep respect, and I think greater affection.

"I have seen a great many soldiers in my lifetime, and you, sir, are the finest soldier I have ever known."

The ANNOUNCER. General George C. Marshall, Architect of Victory. Another in the NBC award-winning series, Biographies in Sound. Your narrator was David Brinkley.

Pittsburgh's Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of Pittsburgh's 200th anniversary celebration:

IT'S EVERYBODY'S BICENTENNIAL—HERE'S HOW YOU CAN HELP TO MAKE PITTSBURGH'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION WORTHY OF THE REGION THAT IS AMERICA'S GATEWAY TO THE FUTURE

YES, IT'S EVERYBODY'S BICENTENNIAL

You are a part of it. So is every other man, woman, and child who lives, works, or does business in the Pittsburgh region. As a celebration it will trace the growth of a world-famed and historically significant area during 200 eventful years with emphasis on the phenomenal progress of the past 12 years.

It is not planned as a sentimental journey into the past. Rather, its program will express our civic pride and confidence in the community's future through events of interest and entertainment to those who live here and for many thousands of visitors.

Officially the bicentennial year starting Thanksgiving Day, November 27, 1958, celebrates the beginning of the city of Pittsburgh. This was the date on which Gen. John Forbes, who had taken a smoldering Fort Duquesne from the French 2 days before, wrote his famous letter to William Pitt announcing that he had renamed the strategic location Fort Pitt.

FROM FORBES TO FISSION

From the events which established control by the English-speaking peoples to the events of the bicentennial year which will be lighted by atomic power, the history of the world has been pivoted again and again on the destinies of Pittsburgh, its political fortunes and its productive capacity. In these happenings, their causes and effects, together with the names of the men and women who brought them about, we commemorate the rugged integrity and pioneering spirit of our area. Today, this same determination which civilized a frontier has become world-renowned as the Pittsburgh attitude.

POINT PROMENADE

In this brochure you will find a schedule of the highlights of the year's celebration which will take place at many locations throughout Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and with some regional events beyond the county limits.

Focal point of the bicentennial will be in Point State Park at the tip of the Golden Triangle in Pittsburgh. Opening May 16th with the Armed Forces Day Parade, a 4-month festival will welcome visitors amid colorful gardens, lights, music, flags of our early history, displays, and events on the rivers and the land. This Gateway to the West of our early history will become the scene of the proposed Gateway Festival as imaginatively envisioned by artist Nat Youngblood on our back cover.

Once again, from May 16 through September 15, 1959, the people of the Pittsburgh region will make history through united action and with boundless hospitality.

HIGHLIGHTS OF BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, 1958–59

November 27, 1958, 9 a. m.: Ringing of church bells will begin the year-long celebration; Thanksgiving Day religious services; 10 a. m., 200th anniversary ceremonies at Block House of Fort Pitt; Highland Pipers; 1:30 p. m., Pitt-Penn State Bicentennial Football Game, Pitt Stadium; bicentennial film premiere.

November 29: Carnegie Museum special exhibits, Civic Center.

December 5: Opening of Bicentennial International Art Exhibition (through February 1959).

December 6: Bicentennial ball, Penn-Sheraton Hotel, with expected attendance of the President of the United States, Ambassadors of Canada, Great Britain, and France, and National and State Officials.

December 7–14: Pageant "Christmas Around the World," Carnegie Music Hall.

December 11–12: Steel Bowl basketball, Pitt Field House.

December 13: Pittsburgh Steelers bicentennial football game, Pitt Stadium.

January 1, 1959: International Bicentennial Art Exhibition (through January).

January 24: Robert Burns bicentennial dinner, Penn-Sheraton Hotel.

National Open Squash Tournament, Pittsburgh Golf Club (date to be announced).

February 1, 1959: International Bicentennial Art Exhibition (through February 8, 1959); Western Pennsylvania Scholastic Art Exhibit (through March).

January 15: Tri-State Golden Gloves, Pitt Field House (tentative date).

January 22: Mass naturalization ceremonies, Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial Hall or Syria Mosque.

March 1, 1959: Western Pennsylvania Scholastic Art Exhibit (through March), Kaufmann's Auditorium.

March 7–8: Eastern collegiate gymnastic championships, Pitt Field House.

March 11–13: Regional meeting of the American Bar Association.

March 14: Pennsylvania Catholic High School basketball championships.

March 22: Phipps Conservatory begins "City of Flowers" bicentennial observance.

March 26: State basketball championships.

World Affairs Forum for Youth, University of Pittsburgh (date to be announced).

April 12, 1959: Tamburitzans of Duquesne University, festival, Syria Mosque.

April 13: School Science Fair (through May 8, 1959), Buhl Planetarium.

April 18: Scots Ceilidh.

One-day science meeting, What Science Holds for the Future, Penn-Sheraton Hotel (date to be announced).

Western Pennsylvania branch of Pennsylvania Federation of Junior Historians (date to be announced).

May 1, 1959: School Science Fair (through May 8), Buhl Planetarium.

May 2: Institute on Better Family Living Through Home Economics Education.

May 2 or 9: Festival of bands, Pitt Stadium.

May 8: Junior high schools' decathlon.

May 10 or 17: Schools choral festival, Pitt Stadium.

May 12: Joint convocation, all Pittsburgh colleges and universities.

May 14: Major Tactical Air Force maneuver.

May 16: Armed Forces Day parade in Golden Triangle; Physical Fitness for Youth, Allegheny County Fairgrounds in South Park; Gateway Festival opens in Point State Park.

May 18: Duquesne University's Folk Festival, Syria Mosque.

Ford Industrial Arts Fair—Kaufmann's Auditorium (date to be announced).

School Safety Patrol Picnic—Kennywood Park (date to be announced).

June 5, 1959: Daughters of the American Revolution awards; Stephen Foster memorial.

June 6: Inter-Club Golf Day (tentative date).

June 7, 14, 21, 28: Sunday vespers in Point Amphitheater (June through August).

June 14: Bicentennial Parade in Golden Triangle; Sons of the American Revolution awards, Block House and Point Park.

June 20: National Women's Open Golf Championships, Churchill Valley (tentative date).

Bicentennial exhibits at Greater Pittsburgh Airport (date to be announced).

National Student Council Meeting—Schenley High School (date to be announced).

July 1, 1959: Bicentennial musical drama at amphitheater in Point State Park (through August).

July 4: Water events on rivers of Pittsburgh.

July 5, 12, 19, 26: Sunday vespers in Point Amphitheater (through August).

July 7: All-star baseball, Forbes Field (tentative date).

July 25: Western Open Golf Championship, Pittsburgh Field Club (tentative date).

Military displays (date to be announced).

August 1, 1959: Bicentennial drama (continues) at amphitheater in Point State Park (through August).

August 2, 9, 16, 23, 30: Sunday vespers in Point Amphitheater.

August 14–15: Prep World Series, West Field, Munhall.

August 22: National Public Park Tennis, Frick Park.

Military displays (date to be announced).

September 11–12, 1959: Tri-State Pipe Band.

First or second week: School Safety Patrol captain's training.

Camp, Pittsburgh YMCA in Zelienople; bicentennial events.

September 3–7: Bicentennial county fair at South Park.

October 1959: Pennsylvania State Industrial Arts Convention (date to be announced).

Safety Patrol Sponsors' Workshop, Penn-Sheraton Hotel (date to be announced).

November 7, 1959: WPIAL high school football championships, Pitt Stadium.

November 27: St. Andrew's Day Tartan Ball.

December 6–13, 1959: Pageant, "Christmas Around the World," Carnegie Music Hall.

Opening bicentennial hockey game (date to be announced).

Christmas basketball tournament (date to be announced).

OTHER EVENTS IN 1959

Aviation: History of aviation.

Education: Conferences, conventions, and publications.

LAW: Regional meeting, American Bar Association; symposium re newspapers, radio, trials; symposium re administration of criminal justice; Judicial Conference of Third Federal Judicial Circuit.

History: Meeting of American Association of Museums (spring); highlights of Pittsburgh's history to renaissance; museum exhibits; exhibit of history.

Religion: Interfaith conference (interracial problems), TV and radio; special listings of churches and synagogues more than 100 years old; essay contests for students; Symbolic Light at High Point.

Music: Jazz festival (winter); Stephen Foster Song Festival (summer); memorial recording; composition contest for bicentennial march; concert artists, South American tour (summer); Mendelssohn Choir, exchange performances with foreign choirs.

Science: Meetings of national scientific societies; educational TV programs.

GUIDE TO YOUR BICENTENNIAL PARTICIPATION

For information telephone, visit, or write Pittsburgh Bicentennial Association, 776 Building No. 1, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., EXpress 1-3230 or 1-3231. Please note list of chairmen of bicentennial events at left. You may wish to address the chairman of a special phase of the celebration in which you are interested.

Special events: To get help in planning or to report the details of a proposed activity for the bicentennial, write as above, addressing Special Events.

Displays: in Gateway Festival. For full information contact bicentennial office.

Decorations: Approved designs and recommended decorators through bicentennial office.

Parade entries: Made through bicentennial office. Floats must meet adopted standards for participation in bicentennial parade.

Merchandise: The bicentennial seal is protected by copyright and trademark registration. For use on souvenirs, products, or packaging contact the bicentennial office. In all noncommercial areas the use of the seal is welcomed to help spread the Pittsburgh story in the bicentennial year.

Address by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, at the 12th Annual Convention of the 30th Infantry Division Association, Washington, D. C., July 11, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a recent speech delivered by the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker. This address was made before the 12th annual convention of the 30th Infantry Division held in Washington, D. C., for the first time since the conclusion of World War II. Secretary Brucker pays fitting tribute to this magnificent division which, more than any other American unit, was responsible for the liberation of France. I was pleased to see that the Army remains justly proud of the "Old Hickory" Division, whose successor of today, the 30th Armored Division, is the State Guard of Tennessee. The Army's continuing appreciation of the work of this great division was beautifully expressed in the presence and words of the Secretary of the Army.

I am constrained to insert this entire statement in the RECORD because it is more than a tribute to an historical fact, but is rather a very forthright and encouraging statement on the preparedness and capability of the modern American Army.

Secretary Brucker has demonstrated an uncanny insight into the problems and needs of a nuclear Army and has been one of the truly great champions of the Army's welfare and a guardian of its traditions and historic roles.

I wish to commend Secretary Brucker for his dedicated service to the Army dating from the days when he was a decorated infantry officer with the Rainbow Division in World War I, to his present position. He is a man possessed not only of foresight, but of genuine heartfelt devotion to a strong and effective Army.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, 12TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, 30TH INFANTRY DIVISION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 11, 1958.

It is an inspiration to be with you as you assemble for the reunion of the famous 30th "Old Hickory" Division. As a former infantryman with the 42d "Rainbow" Division throughout the First World War, I fully appreciate the value of the comradeship which stems from sharing the dangers and hardships of ground combat. There are no human experiences that create the same bond beween men.

You have every right to be proud of the distinguished fighting record of the "Old Hickory" Division in two great world wars. The Nation will never forget the notable achievements of the 30th Division in World War I, when it played a strong part in cracking the vaunted Hindenburg line. Then in World War II, the 30th earned enduring honor in a long series of hard-fought battles on the soil of France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany. From the Vire et Taute Canal and St. Lo, where it spearheaded the historic breakthrough, to the Mortain Counterattack (a splendid account of which appears in the July issue of Army Magazine), and the reduction of Magdeburg, in the closing hours of the war, it once again splendidly epitomized the superb valor and relentless combat drive which have ever been the glory of the United States Army.

I know that all of you share with me an abiding interest in the welfare of our country. You all know that the Communist conspiracy has by no means slackened its attack upon the Free World, nor abandoned its ambition to conquer all mankind. Take the most recent Communist atrocity in Hungary, for example, the shocking execution, the brutal murder, of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian patriot leaders involved in the ill-starred revolution of October 1956, again underscores in blood the elemental barbarism of the Soviet Communist character, and brings into new and sharper focus our clear and present danger.

At this point let me say that the United States Army is indeed proud of the exemplary standard of conduct maintained by the 9 members of this service presently being held in East Germany. It is obvious to all of us that each of these men is quite familiar with the Armed Forces code of conduct. They have and continue to exert that admirable degree of courage and self-discipline which befits a member of the American Armed Forces. I am sure their families share our pride in these young Americans.

It would appear from the results of the July 2 press conference, held at Dresden, in East Germany, that these 9 men—2 crew members and 7 passengers of the United States Army helicopter which inadvertently crossed the border in the Soviet Zone of Germany on June 7—are regarded as political hostages. This line of reasoning is incompatible with existing international agreements applicable to the area.

For well over a month the Soviet authorities have refused to recognize the responsibilities they assumed under the Huebner-Malinin agreement of April 5, 1947. This agreement insured the Soviet and United States military missions the right to protect the interests of their respective nationals in the zones of Germany. The East German authorities have also blocked all attempts to arrange for the release of these nine Americans on the grounds that the East German Communist regime constitutes a sovereign government and is not party to the Huebner-Malinin agreement.

The direct participation by Soviet authorities was revealed by Maj. George E. Kemper in response to questions by the American press. The attempt by East Germany to assume jurisdiction over the American nationals was made quite clear during the press conference by the men being held. The record of this conference makes it quite apparent that the ultimate responsibility for the release of these Americans rests in Soviet hands. The American people can rest assured that the United States Government is continuing its efforts and hopes to have the men free soon.

We have every reason to know what we can expect if we let down our guard for even a moment. For this reason it behooves all of us, and especially the members of organizations like this, to keep America aware of the continuing need to be strong.

Your experience in ground combat gives you a unique understanding of the indispensable and timeless role of the ground soldier. You have met the enemy face to face. You have seen it borne out time and time again when the chips were down in actual combat that man is the only ultimate weapon. You who have fought in the front lines have good reason to know that no final decision can be obtained by remote control. Ultimate victory is dependent upon the courage, devotion, and capability of the trained soldier who achieves superiority on the ground.

As the ranks of those who have learned this lesson through bitter experience thin out, the theory that machines can be substituted for men is apt to be accepted by those who lack your background. That tendency can be observed today, and would be dangerous to our national security if it were not for the clear thinking of seasoned veterans like yourself. More than ever before, it is the obligation of those who know the truth to make the truth known.

Because of the growth of atomic stockpiles, general nuclear war, fought to its inevitable conclusion; could, I believe, result in nothing short of disaster for all participants. In the present situation, with an abundance of mighty retaliatory weapons on both sides of the line, it is illogical to believe that the Soviet Communists would irrationally abandon all hope of profit, and invite the almost certain destruction of their own country, by intentionally launching a suicidal nuclear conflict. Therefore, we must regard limited aggression, with a succession of limited, attainable objectives, as the more likely form in which the Soviets might some day employ their military power to carry forward their ruthless program of conquest.

Local wars, fomented civil strife, military intimidation, and similar forms of limited

operations, coupled with vigorous efforts along every line to divide, confuse, and weaken the free world, are all down in the Soviet book as very practical methods by which they might achieve their ultimate purpose without ever challenging our nuclear retaliatory power. The Soviets have been employing this strategy for well over a decade, during which they and their allies engaged in eight local wars and military actions for Communist aggrandizement. These ranged in size and scope from the Korean war to guerrilla conflicts such as that waged in Greece.

It is imperative that we be prepared for every eventuality—for a "big" war or a local war, for an atomic war, or one in which atomic weapons are not used, for a war fought by Soviet troops against the main bastions of freedom, or a war fought by puppet "volunteers" in an effort to nibble away the fringes of the free world. It does us little good in the long run to be able to deter an enemy from one kind of aggressive action, if we leave him free to pursue with comparative impunity another course by which he might attain the same result. We must not forget that if we were unprepared for limited war, we would be helpless to deal with any attempt at piecemeal conquest except by precipitating the suicidal nuclear holocaust we are striving by every means to prevent.

It is the combined strength and versatility of our Armed Forces, our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, integrated in a great defense team forming the keystone of a worldwide system of collective defense linking the United States and 45 other nations, which deters the Soviets from unleashing their military might in an effort to achieve their goal of world domination.

Soviet leaders have attempted to use the threat of nuclear violence against many nations allied with us in collective defense in a determined effort to precipitate a flight into frightened neutralism which would very seriously impair the collective ability of the free world to resist Communist aggression. They are attempting in particular to "soften up" and destroy the North Atlantic Treaty Organization because they know that they cannot seize and profitably exploit the rich prize of Western Europe—stepping stone to the conquest of America—as long as the nations of the Atlantic Community maintain their interlocking military strength and their moral cohesion.

Nearly half of the United States Army is deployed overseas at this moment, standing shoulder to shoulder with the troops of our partners in the defense of freedom. The presence of our soldiers stimulates the morale and stiffens the resistance of our allies. It constantly reminds them—not in mere words but in the solid substance of American men and American armaments right there with them—that we are in this crusade for peace together, and that we intend to see it through together. It also has a very discouraging effect upon any plans the Communists might have to extend by force the bounds of their "empire of fear." It is noteworthy that they have so far attempted armed encroachment only where resistance was feeble or nonexistent. Defensive strength, coupled with determination, has effectively dampened Soviet enthusiasm for military excursions. No Soviet aggression has yet been launched within range of American guns.

Advanced weapons systems, strategic missiles, and bombers—although absolutely essential to the effectiveness of our combined forces, and thus to the deterrence of aggression—will never be able to win any war alone. No final decision can be obtained by remote control. The control of the land, which is the ultimate objective of every military operation, can finally be achieved only on the ground. Ever since the first crude machines of war were contrived to extend the capabilities of men, all down through the years to the age of nuclear weapons and guided missiles, there have always been those who have needed to be shown again and again that it is the fighting man on the ground who is the fundamental element of warfare—the only "ultimate weapon." In this nuclear era, strong and effective Army forces, able to cope with any aggressor, any time, any place, and on any terms, as part of a unified land, sea, and air command, are more essential than ever before to our national security and the preservation of the peace of the world.

The United States Army of today is characterized by balance and versatility. It is built to fit the pattern of the space-atomic age. It is prepared to meet the requirements of the entire spectrum of war from an all-out nuclear conflict throughout the whole wide range of lesser enemy operations, which are possible, and which would pose a grave and direct threat, not only to the security of the United States but to the very existence of civilization as we know it today. Our Army has a one-two punch—the ability to fight effectively with either atomic or nonatomic weapons—which is the key factor of our national power to apply military pressure with precise discrimination in order to deter aggression on the spot, anywhere in the world. Moreover, in any kind of war which might be thrust upon us—large or small—that one-two punch would be indispensable to ultimate victory.

The ability to make prompt and decisive response to any situation is essential to the prevention of war or the winning of a victory in this modern age in the event that war was ever thrust upon the United States. The United States Army's Strategic Army Corps—consisting of 2 airborne and 2 infantry divisions, armed with atomic weapons as may be appropriate to any situation which might arise—is ready to move by intercontinental airlift at a moment's notice. "STRAC" it is called—S-T-R-A-C—and its slogan is based on those letters: "Skilled, Tough, Ready Around the Clock." The capability of STRAC as a ready force was dramatically demonstrated a few weeks ago when 2 companies of the 101st Airborne Division stationed at Fort Campbell, Ky., one of its component organizations, with no prior warning were alerted for transoceanic air movement at 3:55 one afternoon. At 8:35 a. m. the following morning—only 16 hours and 40 minutes later—the 2 companies, comprising about 500 men, together with all their necessary vehicles, weapons, ammunition, and rations, had been set down—"ready to go"—1,740 miles distant from Fort Campbell. That is our modern Army in action.

The Army has kept fully abreast of all the tremendous advances of science and technology, and is putting them to practical use in every field to enhance its power and flexibility. Its years of experience in rocketry are paying handsome dividends in the development of guided missiles and rockets for military purposes, and in helping America to push back the frontiers of space. Including its mighty weapons for our air defense, the Army's arsenal contains more than 10 types of missiles and rockets precisely adapted to the accomplishment of its varied tasks. Tactical surface-to-surface missiles range in size from the mighty Redstone, which can deliver a nuclear warhead more than 200 miles to the relatively tiny Dart, which is capable of destroying the heaviest tank.

An outstanding example of the achievement of the Army's excellent military-civilian team of missile scientists, engineers, and technologists is the great 1,500-mile intermediate range ballistic missile, Jupiter—which is now in production and will soon take its place in the line of America's defense. It was an Army Jupiter-C missile—so-called because similar vehicles were used to test components of the Jupiter during the course of its development at the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala.—which lifted the United States into the space age on January 31 of this year when it hurled Explorer I, America's first earth satellite, into orbit. Less than 2 months later, the Army orbited another satellite—Explorer III—which provided immensely valuable information on flight conditions from 1,740 miles in space, down to the outer reaches of the earth's atmosphere. Explorer III was uniquely important as an instrument for the advancement of our scientific knowledge, and contributed immeasurably to our Nation's participation in the International Geophysical Year.

On May 22 of this year, a letter addressed to me by the director of the Missile Firing Laboratory at Cape Canaveral, Fla., was delivered to me in the Pentagon. It was a very unusual and significant letter because it had been carried in the tactical warhead of an Army Jupiter missile over 1,000 miles through space, and dramatically demonstrated the Army's completely successful solution of the problem of protecting a missile nose cone and its contents against the intense heat generated when it reenters the earth's atmosphere at supersonic speed. The solution of that problem was basic to the development of a successful Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile. That letter is evidence of a first for America which we have every reason to believe has not yet been matched by any other nation.

All-in-all—counting our experience with the Jupiter-A, the modified Redstone which preceded Jupiter-C as a test vehicle; the Jupiter-C, and the Jupiter itself—the Army has attempted 39 launchings of the big missiles in its Jupiter program. Thirty were successful—completely successful—shots. They accomplished everything planned. Seven were partially successful—they all had successful launchings, but then, for various reasons, did not entirely meet the scientific requirements which had been set up. Only two—both early test vehicles—did not score at all. Americans have every right to be tremendously proud of this splendid record. It is a solid and convincing answer to vicious propaganda by which the Communists have sought to prove that America is no match for the Soviet Union in scientific achievement, and that therefore Soviet ascendancy is inevitable. It has demonstrated to any doubters there may be that our great Nation is not a land of boasting, but, rather, a country which has the know-how to get things done, and the will to carry them through.

We realize that our security is not to be found in armaments alone, but rather in the willingness of all of our people to sacrifice to a common cause—in the toughness of our moral fiber and the steel-hardness of our spirit—in the quality of our self-discipline—in our readiness to shoulder responsibility manfully, and to put our hands to the plow with no thought of turning back.

If we are to defend our freedom successfully we must continue to pay whatever price in sacrifice and service is necessary to maintain military forces which compel the respect of any would-be aggressor. It has been well said that if a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and if it is comfort or money which it values more, it will lose that, too.

We must remember, however, that military strength is not an end in itself. The most powerful armaments will not produce the substance of true peace—all they can ever do is to provide us with the priceless opportunity to work for peace. Our Armed Forces constitute the stout shield behind which we must put forth every effort to bring about world conditions enabling men and nations to work out their human destiny without resort to strife and violence. Unless we are

able to accomplish this great purpose, we will face the tragic prospect of living from hour to hour under the shadow of war until our world, divided against itself, collapses in chaos.

The truth is America's mightiest weapon for peace. The Soviet Union maintains its tyranny over the minds and bodies of millions of Russians and satellite peoples only because it has the power to withhold from them the truth—the truth about America in particular—and to obscure the principles and values which are the foundations of the American way of life and the hope of mankind.

For more than 12 long years, the Soviets have maintained the Iron Curtain, a barrier as real and solid as if it were made of bricks and mortar. Why do the leaders of the Communist conspiracy compel their people to depend upon a servile and controlled press filled with vicious and ugly distortions of fact? Why do they jam the radio broadcasts of "The Voice of America" and other free world transmitters?

They are taking no chances that the rank and file of their people might come into contact with the truth, because they know full well that the truth will make men free and rob the Communist conspiracy of all hope for world domination. Before there can be any real peace in the world, the Iron Curtain must go. The Iron Curtain must be breached by radio, by the printed word, by expanded cultural exchange, by every method free men can devise to let the Russian people know the facts their leaders have so long and carefully kept from them. Only the light of truth can dispel the fears which make abject slaves of so many millions in the world today.

If even a tiny ray of the light of truth were allowed to penertate behind the Iron Curtain, the Soviet perpetrated myth that Americans are "aggressive, war-mongering imperialists" who advocate preventive war for their own gain would be shown up for the self-serving propaganda it is. If all the Russian people were allowed to read the record as it stands, how great a difference it might make.

They would recognize that our constitutional form of government, with its built-in guaranties against the sudden initiation of war, our long history of moral idealism, and the ingrained habits of thought which underlie the American character furnish compelling evidence that we could never resort to aggression—that we stand resolutely for peace and the peaceful triumph of the highest principles of our enlightened civilization. They would know that when the United States possessed an absolute monopoly in the field of atomic weapons we did not attempt to use them to advance any national ambition—that, on the contrary, we proclaimed our willingness to forego our monopoly in the interests of world peace and stability.

It is not enough for us to affirm our belief in liberty, justice, decency, and the dignity of man, we must leave nothing undone to make sure that the true image of America is clearly visible to all the peoples of the world. Consider the manner in which we have put our principles into practice in our international relationships:

At the conclusion of World War I and World War II, both of which were thrust upon us, we strove to rehabilitate our conquered adversaries as rapidly as possible, and to help them reassert their sovereignty without any strings attached. Witness our efforts in Germany, Japan, and Italy.

The United States has constantly and zealously striven to bring about worldwide renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy.

The United States has vigorously and continuously advocated an effective system of international military inspection which would prevent surprise attack by any aggressor, and a comprehensive program for the limitation and control of armaments.

The United States initiated the concept of atoms for peace, and was the prime mover in the establishment of an international atomic energy organization which now embraces 66 member nations.

The United States has taken the lead working toward the dedication of outer space to peaceful purposes.

The United States has likewise been the leader in advocating international action to assure the development of the great new continent of Antarctica exclusively along peaceful lines, and the reservation of the Arctic regions to the service of peace and not of war.

The United States has not coerced, dominated, or sought to control any peaceful, independent nation, but has scrupulously respected the integrity of all, and sought to uphold it.

The United States has never refused to sit down and talk over any world problem with any nation, and explore in all sincerity every pathway to peace.

If these facts were made clear to the people behind the Iron Curtain, how could any malicious Communist sophistry twist them to picture Americans as an imperialistic people who seek to plunge the world into war?

The Communist conspiracy has sought to enhance its influence among the uncommitted peoples of the world, by the brazen falsehood that the Communists are on the side of the underdog, while the United States seeks only to advance the interests of the rich and prosperous.

But the record is clear for all to read.

What nation has ever worked with more zeal and sincerity than the United States to raise to unprecedented heights the living standards of all its people? What nation has had greater success in achieving that purpose?

Has there ever been a calamity or time of affliction since the founding of this Republic which did not call forth from the heart of America unselfish help for those in distress? Famine in China, an earthquake in Japan, destitution in the Near East, starvation in Belgium, to such human crises as these America has always responded without counting the cost.

Has there ever been a nation which has welcomed so many unhappy people seeking sanctuary from want or tyranny? An example very much to the point is the manner in which America recently threw open her gates to many thousands of Hungarians fleeing the terror imposed by the very nation which seeks to deride our character.

What nation has ever done more to help struggling, underdeveloped countries build up their economies in an effort to minimize privation and suffering? Under our mutual security programs, American technicians have been working for years shoulder to shoulder with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Near East to develop new skills, and introduce new agricultural and industrial techniques which will create the conditions of a better life, not for the rich and prosperous, but for the poor and underprivileged.

What nation has ever shown more heartfelt consideration for all people in need? For example, wherever the United States Army is on duty, our soldiers ardently support movements which contribute to the health, education, and welfare of children. Left in the wake of war are a host of tragic war orphans. They live in a large measure without purpose or hope, sometimes dying of exposure, malnutrition, or outright starvation. Countless soldiers have freely shared their own food and money to help some child to live. In South Korea, which was ravaged by 3 years of brutal war, American soldiers contributed more than $2½ million from their own pockets to aid the orphans, the needy, and the homeless. The Armed Forces assistance to Korea program contributed over $20 million for materials and technical assistance in the construction of orphanages, hospitals, and churches, and the volunteer work of our soldiers more than tripled this amount in actual benefits to the Korean people. Of the 200,000 orphans in Korea, the majority have been settled in Army-sponsored orphanages. In Europe, tens of thousands of orphans and refugee children yearly receive tons of good clothing, athletic equipment, and toys freely donated by American troops and Army organizations.

This is the truth about America, the truth which no Soviet propaganda can ever disarm.

As we look out upon the world today we recognize that we must be strong. Organized and armed iniquity can be held in check only by organized and armed morality. Throughout the span of the ages, nations which have lacked the protection of a righteous sword have been compelled to accept a conqueror's peace at the price of honor and integrity and the debasement of the human soul. However, in the final analysis, it is the sword of truth which will cut down those who seek to conquer through tyranny and aggression. The truth is mighty and will prevail. Despite all our military armaments, Communist ideology, and Communist propaganda, like vicious weeds, will choke out the good growth unless we are zealous in helping to cultivate in every way the best that is in mankind. We must make sure that in all our dealings we bear true witness to the principles and ideals upon which this Nation was founded. We must take full advantage of every opportunity to create behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and in every corner of the earth, an understanding of America, and the concepts to which we adhere. Only by so doing can we ever achieve our goal of lasting peace with honor and justice.

Expression of Sympathy to the People of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the department of Michigan of the American Legion recently passed two resolutions which I feel to be of considerable interest to Members of Congress and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For this reason, and because of the importance of the subject matter, I am inserting them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the shocking news of the murder of Premier Nagy and three of his colleagues by the Soviet Communists has recently been announced; and

Whereas the United States Senate by a unanimous vote of 91 to nothing demanded that our President protest officially to the Soviet Union for the murders perpetrated; and

Whereas the actions of the Soviet Union in the death of these four Hungarian patriots contravene the universal declaration of human rights as set forth by the United Nations; and

Whereas the secret trial and execution of Premier Nagy and his three colleagues is an affront to all members of the United Nations and to the conscience of the world; and

Whereas the conscience of decent mankind has been shocked by the brutal political reprisals upon the Hungarian leaders for their part in defense of the native country: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in convention assembled in Detroit, Mich., this 27th day of July 1958, Express its deep sense of indignation for the murders committed and express the Legion's sympathy for the oppressed people of Hungary during their ordeal of political oppression and terror; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Representatives from Michigan and to United States Senators POTTER and MCNAMARA.

RESOLUTION

Whereas section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist; and

Whereas selective service is based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every young man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and their reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existence of that induction authority; and

Whereas the existence of full induction authority enables the Selective Service System (1) to insure that the required strength of the active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by inductions and indirectly by stimulating enlistments, (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve Forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, and (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields; and

Whereas the Selective Service System maintains through registration an inventory of all men of military age including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces who in an emergency might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve; and

Whereas Selective Service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of local citizens has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people; and

Whereas the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to an agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties; and

Whereas some 40,000 of the 46,000 full and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and receive no compensation; and

Whereas the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in annual convention assembled in Detroit, Mich., this 27th day of July 1958, That section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625) as amended, be further amended so that all the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963, and that copies of this resolution be mailed to the Governor and to all Members of Congress from the State of Michigan, and that the American Legion use all of its efforts and influence to this end.

Nick of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, adequate fuel resources are a basic essential for American defense and prosperity. Our dependency upon fuel in this 20th century industrial economy is self-evident. We must have supplies in readiness in quantities that will fill our own needs as well as supply deficiencies to our allies in the event their sources from the Middle East are curtailed at any time.

In this connection, I recently called upon the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization to advise me of what progress it is making toward the development of an emergency fuel program, with special emphasis on coal, our basic fuel resource. I have been informed by Defense Mobilization Administrator Leo A. Hoegh that such an emergency program is being devised but that the details of it are largely classified.

More recently I have called upon the Eisenhower administration to lend every possible encouragement to a program looking to the development of oil from coal and shale. Every indication points to the possibility of vast untapped oil reserves from those two sources.

In connection with the possibilities of tapping the Nation's shale resources for oil, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House a timely and informative article from the Nicholas Republican, Nicholas County, W. Va., entitled "Nick of Time." I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the Nicholas Republican of Richwood, W. Va.]

NICK OF TIME

Nothing is more irresistible, it has been said, than an idea whose time has come. And today, with the world crisis centered in the oil-rich Near East—with American Marines and British paratroopers established in Lebanon and Jordan and reinforcements building up in nearby staging areas—comes the technological break-through that could free the West from dependence on the Arab world's petroleum.

For more than half a century geologists and engineers have dreamed and studied and worked to find an economical way of releasing oil from our vast reserves of shale. And only now, at the precise moment in the world's history when oil—or the lack of it—could determine the free world's destiny, comes word that liquid fuel can now be recovered from oil shale at costs that make it competitive with domestic petroleum.

The announcement comes from Shirley A. Johnson, Jr., director of the Denver Research Institute of the University of Denver, and Dr. Charles H. Prien, head of the Institute's chemistry and chemical engineering division and a recognized authority on oil shales. For the past 2 years Dr. Prien has been conducting research and development work at the Institute on this earth-shaking new process for The Oil Shale Corp. of Carson City, Nev., owners of process and patents. For some 9 months, the institute has been operating a 24-ton-a-day pilot plant.

Under this new process, Mr. Johnson reports, shale oil extracted in Colorado can be delivered on the Pacific coast at a cost of $1.42 to $1.92 a barrel (exclusive of profit), whereas California crude oil is presently quoted at around $3.00 to $3.25 a barrel.

Mr. Johnson forsees a shale oil industry in the order of a million barrels a day by 1970. And while he points out this would not of itself take care of domestic fuel requirements, there would seem to be no reason why shale reduction plants could not be expanded as rapidly as demand might require.

The full significance of this long-sought development is only apparent when we realize the extent of our shale resources. Deposits in northwestern Colorado, alone, from which shale was mined for the Institute studies, have been estimated by the United States Geological Survey to contain some 1.5 trillion barrels of oil. This is about 50 times as much as the Nation's proven crude reserves, and more than 7 times as much oil as is known to exist in the entire world. And, if this should not be enough, there are other large shale deposits in Wyoming and Utah with lesser amounts in a couple of dozen other States, including Alaska.

Oil is one major defense item, it would appear, that we can strike off the worry-list if needs be. The Mediterranean trade route, east and west, however, must be kept open. That is a military necessity and has been for ages.

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as I stated here a couple of weeks ago, the hour is desperate for the continuing life of small business in the dynamic economy that has developed in this country through the past decade.

The small businesses in this Nation are in grave danger of disintegration and disappearance because, at this moment, they have no way of obtaining equity capital and long-term credit which they vitally need for any hope of survival. Although many words of sympathetic encouragement have been spoken here in the Congresses of recent history, legislative response and recognition of small business has been too long delayed.

It is and has been obvious, for a long time, from committee hearings, independent reports, and the persevering pleas of small business throughout the country, that their fundamental requirements cannot be extended by commercial banks or the Small Business Administration, as presently constituted.

I am not going to repeat the provisions of the bill, which have already been explained at length. It is in substance a good bill and an earnest attempt to grant material help in an emergency situation, although it does not go as far as a great many of us would like.

I earnestly believe it is practically the unanimous intention of the Congress to preserve the traditions of small business in the economic life and history of this country; this is an opportunity to do so.

The financial problems of small businesses all over the United States are very, very serious and this legislation is essential for their cure. I urge you to adopt this conference report so that life-preserving help may be granted to a basic segment of our economy at the earliest possible minute.

M. L. Benedum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania as well as West Virginia are proud of our distinguished citizens, among the top of whom I rate my good friend and civic worker, M. L. Benedum, known to his friends as Mike Benedum. Gilbert Love wrote an excellent article for the Pittsburgh Press of Friday, May 23, 1958, which should be preserved for posterity to know what a fine and devoted citizen Mike Benedum really is:

HARKING BACK
(By Gilbert Love)

What does a person think about toward the end of a long and active career?

If he's like M. L. Benedum, the great wildcatter of the oil industry, he harks back to his early years.

"I am now standing on the most sacred spot on earth to me," Mr. Benedum said at the dedication of the Benedum Civic Center in Bridgeport, W. Va., the small town that he left at the end of his teens to win fame and fortune.

"It was on this spot that I first saw the light of day," he added. "It was here that my angel parents taught me the simple virtues I have tried to follow. It was here that I filled the treasure chest of memory, from which I draw strength and courage in my sunset years."

"This is home. It is where the foundation was laid for all that I am or ever hope to be. Here is the anchor to which I have been moored for 87 years. No matter how far away I have gone, I have always been securely fastened to that anchor by the chains of faith and sentiment."

Mr. Benedum's feeling about his boyhood home is no recent thing. Back in 1939 he undertook a big improvement project at the historic Bridgeport Cemetery. A bronze plaque there says:

"Presented to the Bridgeport Cemetery by Michael Late Benedum in loving memory of his father, mother, brothers, sisters, and boyhood friends, and in thanksgiving for the precious years he lived among them in the beautiful hills of West Virginia."

Although Mr. Benedum's home and headquarters have been in Pittsburgh for a great many years, he has placed some of his dearest possessions in Bridgeport. Portraits of himself and his wife, painted by world-famous Douglas Chandor, face each other across the beautifully furnished parlor of the Bridgeport Methodist Church.

In the junior chapel of the church is a large oil painting of the couple's only son, Claude, who died while in service in World War I.

Most of the Benedum gifts to Bridgeport are for the benefit of boys and girls who are growing up where he spent his boyhood. Remembering how he used to swim in Simpson Creek, he built the new generation a fine swimming pool. He wandered across meadows where the Benedum Airport now serves a large part of central West Virginia, but he has replaced that recreational facility with a summer and winter skating rink, a library, and meeting rooms.

More than 62,000 persons were counted in the various parts of the Benedum Civic Center last year. That included repeaters, because Bridgeport has less than 4,000 residents, but it's significant.

After Girl Scouts started to meet in their well-equipped lodge at the center, their membership rose from 35 to 200. After the library opened, sales of paperback books in a nearby store fell to almost nothing.

"I have noticed a difference in the youngsters in the year this place has been open," said Mayor Richard L. Cutlip, nodding toward the busy civic center. "They're more poised," he added. "They have discovered that they can do things that they weren't sure of before. They will be better and stronger adults because of the interest that Mr. Benedum has taken in this town."

The Best Allies of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Latin American dictatorships, far from being effective allies against international communism, are in reality doing more to promote communism in the Western Hemisphere than any other single force. For readers who wish to know more about this, I refer them to Robert J. Alexander's recent book, Communism in Latin America. For others I commend their attention to the following editorial from Americas Daily for August 5, 1958, which is included here under a previous consent to extend my remarks:

LATIN AMERICAN DICTATORSHIPS AND COMMUNISM

Russia is highly interested in exercising political influence in the Latin American countries. Constantly, statesmen of the Kremlin are on the alert regarding every political movement in the Western Hemisphere, with the purpose of taking advantage of it, whether it is for direct benefit in favor of communism, or for indirect benefit, channeling it against the United States of America.

The hierarchs of Moscow know that they cannot impose within the zone of influence of the United States a completely Communist government, with origin in the type of revolutions that Russia has promoted in central Europe, in the Middle East, and in the Far East. Before this reality, that is to say, before the inability to impose satellite governments in America, Russia is engaged in discrediting Latin American democracy, because from that discredit a climate propitious for the malignant growth of communism always results.

The democratic governments existing in the Americas are, without doubt, harmful to Russian designs, because the people who are governed by them get used to respect and to love the authentic values of republicanism, and are always ready to defend, with all possible energy, the institutions which guarantee their individual rights, social well-being and political freedom. On the other hand, peoples who are subjugated, those who see the government making a constant mockery, in the most irritating manner, of democracy, are in great danger of becoming skeptical, of losing their faith in democracy almost completely, and perhaps avoiding any effort to defend it, because they do not enjoy it.

The four dictatorial regimes which still remain in America are, for these and other reasons, direct or indirect contributors, but always effective contributors, with their antidemocratic attitudes, to the political distrust which is planted in public opinion, and they play the game of Communist imperialism, and put out deeper roots where democracy is practiced the least, where the people are less disposed to defend it because they do not know what it means, or, if they do know, are not able to enjoy it. In democratic governments Russia has enemies. In the dictatorships she has allies.

The Need for Farm Legislation Prior to Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in today's Washington Post. It makes sense. I insert it in the RECORD for review by my colleagues:

NOSE CUTTING

Why should the House leaders give up on the farm bill because they failed to muster a two-thirds vote to pass it under a suspension of the rules? The vote of 210 to 186 for suspension of the rules indicates that a substantial majority favors the bill even in its present form, and a still larger majority could be expected if some of the defects could be eliminated by amendment. In these circumstances it would be very shortsighted to let pique over Secretary Benson's opposition to the bill prevent the enactment of any farm legislation.

The defeat of the move to suspend the rules closed only one door. Chairman COOLEY of the Agriculture Committee is now entirely free to seek a rule under which the bill could be debated and passed by only a majority vote. Indeed, this is the normal course. Speaker RAYBURN and Mr. COOLEY have said that they will not ask for such a rule. But they spoke in anger. Their irritation can be understood, but to leave cotton and rice

farmers with overly rigid quotas next year would hurt the farmers rather than the Secretary of Agriculture.

The constructive and forward-looking course for Messrs. RAYBURN and COOLEY is to move ahead on the course that is still wide open. Let them ask for a rule; let the bill be debated and amended in accord with the will of the House. It would certainly pass in some form and could then be reconciled with the Senate version in conference. The House leaders will stand on very spongy ground if they insist on shelving the farm bill, with the votes to pass it already in sight, because the House would not permit it to be railroaded through with inadequate debate and without amendment.

Mansfield Sprague Leaves a Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, the President accepted the resignation of Mansfield D. Sprague, who has served with the Department of Defense for 3 years, first as General Counsel and later as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

With permission of the Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD Mr. Sprague's letter of resignation and the President's reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 10, 1958.*

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is no pleasure for me in writing this letter to submit my resignation as Assistant Secretary of Defense, effective at a mutually convenient time. When I was appointed General Counsel of the Department of Defense I undertook a 2-year commitment which has stretched to almost 3 years. The sole reason for this action is purely personal, involving family and financial considerations. I earnestly hope I may again someday return to Government service.

Mr. President, words are totally inadequate to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity you have afforded me to serve in your administration. In submitting my resignation, I would like to make one comment relating to the mutual-security program, the military-assistance portion of which has been administered in the Defense Department by the Office of International Security Affairs, for which I have been the Assistant Secretary for the last year and one-half.

Echoing what you have so often and so effectively stated—I want to express my personal conviction that no program is more vital to the immediate and long-range security of the United States and the free world. To argue whether military or economic assistance is more important is immaterial since they are both complementary and indispensable. The central question is whether the United States should make a substantially greater total mutual-security effort in the years ahead. I firmly believe the answer is in the affirmative. I pray that the American people have the determination, the willingness to sacrifice, and the imagination to stay the course upon which we are embarked. Only thus can the free world remain free and peace which is the major objective of the United States be achieved.

I close with best wishes for your continued good health and with the most profound admiration for your magnificent leadership in these troubled days.

Respectfully,

MANSFIELD D. SPRAGUE,
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 6, 1958.

The Honorable MANSFIELD D. SPRAGUE,
Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPRAGUE: It is with real regret that I accept your resignation as Assistant Secretary of Defense, to be effective on a date mutually agreeable between you and the Secretary of Defense.

I greatly appreciate your many contributions to the defense effort in your nearly 3 years of service in the Department of Defense. Your problems, both as General Counsel and as Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, were not easy ones, and you have my warm thanks for a job well done. Through the military-assistance programs under your supervision, the strength of allied nations has continued to increase, augmenting substantially the security of our own and other nations. I trust you will long derive particular satisfaction from the knowledge of your contribution to this part of our mutual-security program. Most properly do you characterize that program as vital to peace and freedom in the world.

I wish you continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

This, fellow Members, is a fitting tribute to a man who, in my opinion, has done outstanding service for his country in two of the most difficult assignments in the Federal Government.

Born and raised in Connecticut, a resident of New Canaan, he saw active duty with the United States Navy in World War II, practiced law in Bridgeport, Conn., served as speaker of the State assembly, and later as deputy attorney general of his home State.

Through all this, we in Connecticut knew him to be a man of exceptional ability and integrity. We were proud when he was nominated for his important assignments here in Washington, and this pride has been justified, for, in my experience, his service to the United States has been consistently of the highest order and deserves the thanks and praise of his State and country.

Commonsense and Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, world peace through world law is not just an idle idealistic dream. It is hard commonsense which we must soon adopt if we are to survive.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter, which is full of commonsense, written by the president of the United World Federalists, Donald Harrington, to President Eisenhower, July 30, 1958:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., July 30, 1958.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: Once again we stand on the edge of the abyss. The Middle East crisis highlights once again the tragic consequences of the lack of law and order in the modern world. It must now be plain that there should be no further delay in implementing your basic principle, enunciated at the time of the Suez crisis, that "there can be no peace without law."

It is time, and passed time, to give the United Nations institutions to enforce law on recalcitrant nations and individuals who threaten the peace, to give it the power to enforce universal disarmament, to give the United Nations effective U. N. police and courts capable of protecting large and small nations alike.

Until these things are done, similar crises, of increasing gravity, must be expected. This, then, is the objective. Present policies should be guided by this aim, measures taken now should be steps toward this end.

We hope that a summit meeting will be held promptly under the direction of the Security Council; we approve the proposal made by Lester Pearson that the Security Council set up a special subcommittee composed of Great Britain, France, the United States, the U. S. S. R., and, by special invitation, Prime Minister Nehru of India, with the U. N. Secretary General presiding.

Any agreements reached should be submitted to the Security Council and the U. N. General Assembly for approval.

Should it be impossible to hold a summit meeting, the United States should press its proposal for an emergency session of the U. N. General Assembly.

In whatever U. N. body the negotiations are carried on, we believe the United States should support the following policies:

1. Increasing the numbers and the authority of the U. N. Observer Corps, to protect the borders of both Lebanon and Jordan, and make possible the immediate withdrawal of the United States and British forces now in those countries.

2. Creation of a permanent U. N. force, to be continuously available to the U. N. for dealing with future threats to the peace, wherever they may occur. So that this force may be at the direct and immediate disposal of the U. N., and be suitable to any situation in any area, it should be compose of individuals recruited by the U. N. from the smaller nations.

3. Agreement by the major powers and by the nations in the area to a U. N.-inspected and policed arms embargo in the Middle East, coupled with U. N. protection against armed attack or infiltration across any of the national borders in the area.

4. Creation of a U. N. Good Offices Commission to facilitate peaceful and just settlement of the outstanding disputes in the area.

5. Creation of a U. N. Development Corporation for the area, with pledges from the major powers of adequate funds for economic development on a long-term basis.

6. The United States should not oppose the legitimate national aims of any country, and should accept nationalism which does not threaten the political, economic, or social life of any other State. It should recognize the legitimacy, and even the value, of political neutrality on the part of any nation wishing to take such a position.

We applaud the United States insistence that efforts to deal with the problems be carried out under the auspices of the United Nations, which alone is capable of finding equitable solutions and securing their acceptance from all concerned.

The United States should not fear, but should welcome, the opportunity to negotiate with the Soviet Union and other nations on the basis of such a positive, immediate program, directed toward the essential objective of world peace through world law.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD HARRINGTON,
President.

National Insolvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, wading over the shall shelf with its thrill of engaging deeper waters has taken the life of many venturesome but unsuspecting individuals when suddenly engulfed in dangerous depths beyond the shelf of safety.

Recent actions of the 85th Congress, tempting the people of the Nation by Federal handouts, leading them unconsciously toward the deep levels of economic insolvency, will stand out in future history as the last big splash that will make return to responsible Government impossible.

The following editorial "How To Go Broke," from the August 7 edition of the Evening Star, is timely:

HOW TO GO BROKE

In voting to increase the statutory limit of the national debt to $288 billion—a jump of $13 billion—the House has acted in keeping with necessity. But it has done so in an unusually somber spirit generated by ever-multiplying signs that our country is heading fast into a period of immense inflationary danger.

This danger, as Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee has warned, is inherent in the prospect of huge Federal deficits for years to come. The situation is attributable not merely to essential military and foreign outlays, but also to heavy domestic spending that is not truly essential—spending of a kind that could be markedly reduced if only the executive branch, Congress and the American people as a whole would make up their minds to put an end to the profligacy and substitute reasonable frugality for a budgetary policy that seems to be based largely on partisan politicking and a what's-in-it-for-me philosophy.

Mr. MILLS, however, does not expect any such reform in our national fiscal thinking. And so, quite gloomily, he has predicted that Federal spending over the next 5 years will amount to about $80 billion annually, with virtually no chance that enough revenues will be raised to pay for the outlays. Thus, as he sees the future, we are in for a long period of deficit financing that can hardly fail to militate against the idea of tax relief for either corporations or the general public. More than that, in Mr. MILLS' words, "it will loose inflationary pressures here that in turn will be emulated by industry and labor. The result may well be, in the next several years, that we will see rises in prices such as we have not seen before in peacetime."

Warnings of the same sort have been voiced repeatedly in the past, notably by Senator BYRD, and they need to be heeded now more than ever. For the new debt limit approved by the House is symptomatic of a continuing inflationary trend that could cause another great shrinkage in the dollar's acutely shrunken purchasing power. Beyond that, unless it is checked and reversed, the trend could ultimately shatter public confidence in Federal securities and wreck the Nation's credit at home and abroad. These are not imaginary perils. On the contrary, as emphasized by Mr. MILLS and other close students of the subject, they are real perils, and they can readily materialize if nothing is done to head them off.'

This matter, with all its astronomical figures, may seem to be dull to most of us Americans. But it is important for us to keep in mind that our present national debt is about seven times greater than it was in 1940, and the interest we must pay on it each year is roughly as much as an entire Federal budget in the early 1930's. Clearly, if we keep on spending as we are, without balancing income and outgo, we will be in danger of waking up one day to find our country quite disastrously broke.

Boosts Candidacy of Former Postmaster General James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to the editor of the New York Times and an editorial from the New York Mirror concerning the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States:

[From the New York Times of July 25, 1958]

FARLEY FOR SENATE PROPOSED—HE IS DECLARED BEST QUALIFIED FOR DEMOCRATIC POST

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As a former Massachusetts citizen, now a citizen of New York State, I should like to discuss the candidacy of James A. Farley for the United States Senate.

In 1928 I sponsored the raising of funds to carry Massachusetts for Alfred E. Smith. In 1930, as Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, I qualified as one of the leaders of the Democratic Party in that State. In 1932 I was the first so-called Democratic leader from any State to break the logjam and declared for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During these years I learned to know James A Farley intimately. Without exception I never knew a more loyal Democrat and hard worker for the party than Mr. Farley. Today James A. Farley is an outstanding citizen of the world, Nation, and New York State. He has experience and knowledge unequaled by any other person.

If Governor Harriman wishes to obtain the Democratic nomination for President in 1960, James A. Farley as the New York Democratic Senator can lay the groundwork for Governor Harriman in Washington for the next 2 years. Why Governor Harriman does not recognize this potential aid and declare for Farley for Senator in a loud voice, is beyond my comprehension.

Secretary of State De Sapio with his keen political foresight knows the importance of a Democratic State victory this year and a national victory in 1960. Why De Sapio even gives a second thought to any lesser known candidate for the Senate is puzzling to me.

James A. Farley will be supported by hundreds of thousands of Republican and Independent voters and everybody concedes will receive the greatest vote ever given to any candidate in New York State. James A. Farley should be nominated by acclamation at the Democratic State convention.

James A. Farley has earned this honor by past services to the Democratic Party. He is best qualified. He is in excellent health and can outwork any man 20 years younger. He will represent New York State in the United States Senate with great credit.

STRABO V. CLAGGETT.

NEW YORK, *July 18, 1958.*

[From the New York Mirror of August 7, 1958]

WAGNER BOWS OUT

New Yorkers will be happy that Mayor Robert Wagner is not a candidate for the United States Senate. Not that we begrudge the mayor a membership in the "Greatest Gentleman's Club in the World," which the Senate used to be called. It is understandable that the mayor would like to follow in his father's footsteps and wear the senatorial toga.

But we New Yorkers like Bob and prefer that he stay right here. On the whole, he has given the city a pretty good administration and he has represented the city with dignity.

Left in the Democratic field are three candidates for the senatorial nomination:

James A. Farley, who has widespread support, particularly upstate and who is putting on an old-fashioned, fully in the open campaign;

Frank Hogan, New York County's veteran and outstanding district attorney; and

Thomas K. Finletter, noted lawyer and former Secretary of the Air Force.

The one who seems best qualified as of the present moment is James A. Farley, but politics is a queer game and nobody can tell what deals are being made. Thus far, the only objection to Farley is the contention that the Liberal Party will not accept him. This is not substantiated by inquiries. The Liberal Party leaders apparently are still open-minded. On the other hand, the Farley supporters say that the ex-Postmaster General could get enough Republican votes to make up for any Liberal Party defections.

It seems to be a hot campaign in both parties, both for the governorship and the Senate. But we say, the hotter, the better for the citizens. When the politicians have to work hard for public office, they usually let the people in on the wrongs that have been done.

Fifty-Dollar Fare to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1958, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am privileged to be a member, held hearings on my bill, H. R. 13174, and other similar bills introduced by our distinguished majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Congressman JOHN H. RAY, of New York, and others. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to contract for the construction of two transatlantic superliner passenger vessels, of approximately 90,000 deadweight tons, capable of carrying

approximately 6,000 passengers, with a sustained speed of 34 knots. It would also authorize the appropriation of such sums of money as would be necessary to construct, outfit, and equip such superliners. Concurrently, the Federal Maritime Board would be authorized to contract for the sale of said vessels, upon their completion, to the Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines, Inc., for the fixed price of $70 million per vessel.

If this legislation is enacted into law it will permit an individual to travel to Europe for $50. It seems to me that would be a wonderful opportunity for young people to have this chance to go to Europe at such a reasonable rate in a truly people-to-people program. There is nothing like personal contact between our citizens and that of foreign countries to aid in mutual understanding. Likewise, the construction of these new ships would unquestionably improve our national defense. In order that my colleagues may have a more complete picture of this important proposal I, under unanimous consent, insert a statement made by Harry E. O'Reilly, executive secretary-treasurer of the maritime trades department of the AFL–CIO before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on July 1, 1958:

My name is Harry E. O'Reilly. I am executive secretary treasurer of the maritime trades department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The president of the department is Paul Hall, who is also the president of the Seafarers' International Union of North America, and secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic and Gulf district of that union.

Attached to this statement is a list of the affiliates of the maritime trades department. Briefly, the affiliates comprise organized workers in the maritime industry, including the licensed and unlicensed personnel who sail the ships, the longshoremen who load and unload them, the warehousemen who receive and store cargoes, shoreside workers whose employment contributes to martime operations, ship builders, and other employees performing duties essential to the maritime industry.

More specifically, I speak here today for the Seafarers' International Union, the Masters, Mates, and Pilots, the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, and the Shipbuilders.

The legislation I am endorsing would also benefit other union members, such as the skilled mechanics of the International Association of Machinists.

All of these unions and their members earnestly recommend that your committee report favorably the bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, H. R. 10692, or the bill H. R. 10638, introduced by Representative RAY of New York, which are identical, and which would authorize the construction of two low-fare trans-Atlantic passenger superliners.

We believe it is impossible to overstate the importance of building up and preserving the American merchant marine. Its existence is not only vital to maritime employees, but indispensible to the prosperity and safety of this country. Experts from the Department of Defense have repeatedly stated that the safety of this country depends upon the existence of an efficient merchant marine operating under the American flag, capable of carrying a minimum of 50 percent of our foreign commerce. Unfortunately, today American-flag ships are carrying only about 25 percent of our exports and imports. This figure, which is about one-half of what the experts estimate as the safe minimum, is the measure of our national danger. If total war came upon us, we would be unable to deliver, in any foreign area, either the men or the material which would be necessary to wage that war. We know that this committee is aware of these alarming facts and is doing what it can to overcome this frightening deficiency. Unfortunately, it appears that neither the Congress nor the administration is aware of, or in any event has taken steps to correct, our maritime deficiency and to place our merchant fleet in a position of readiness.

Of all segments of our maritime industry, probably the one which is least adequate is our passenger fleet. In the post-Korean era, only one new American passenger company has come into existence, the American Banner Line, which at present is operating only one passenger ship on Trade Route 8. As I speak, that ship is sailing on her second voyage. But, as I say, notwithstanding the great increase in passenger traffic between this country and Europe, notwithstanding the fact that brandnew highly efficient, and thoroughly modern foreign ships are swarming in our harbors, grabbing an ever-increasing share of our foreign commerce, and by substandard wages and working conditions driving the American Merchant Marine from the seas, the American Banner Line is the only new American shipping company to commence operations in the last decade.

The pending legislation, in our opinion, embodies a tremendous idea, which, if encouraged and sustained, would enable American initiative to capture its fair and adequate share of our foreign commerce. In spite of all the progress of recent years, it remains true that an ocean voyage to Europe is a luxury enjoyed only by the rich. This is a stupid and dangerous situation. American ideas, principles, inventions, and cultural creations are now germinating throughout the world. But the degree to which American culture could be carried to the nations of the Old World would be vastly increased if we made it possible for the average American worker, American businessman, and American student to visit foreign countries. This would produce an intellectual and economic cross-fertilization which would accelerate the development of a peaceful society bountiful beyond our wildest dreams.

And it is an economic paradox that only the rich can afford ocean travel. By train, bus, plane, and boat, we have woven tightly together the farflung empire which is the United States. In our economy, travel has become a daily necessity, instead of a rare luxury. I strongly believe that the travel tradition of Americans, the resolution of our people to see our country for themselves, to become acquainted with how other Americans think and live, has been our strongest economic stimulant. It is within our financial and industrial power to make a sea voyage to foreign lands an inexpensive commonplace. Indeed, it is surprising that with the material and facilities available in this country, no one has yet undertaken it. That is why the affiliates of this department salute the imagination and energy of Mr. H. B. Cantor, the creator of the idea embodied in the pending legislation.

Mr. Cantor has planned two superliners, each of which would carry 6,000 passengers and 1,300 crewmen. His plans would bring the round-trip fare to Europe within the reach of almost every American. While preserving the highest standards of comfort and sanitation, he would open the vast Atlantic seaway to the worker and the student, to the poor and humble, to the middle class, to the rank and file. And by the creation of mass ocean carriage, he would make it possible for the common people in our allied nations to visit this country. Ocean travel, like land travel in this country, would become a daily necessity instead of a rare and costly luxury.

If Mr. Cantor's idea is allowed to materialize, we will have the beginning of a great and growing passenger fleet which will be capable not only of carrying peaceful voyagers, but in time of national emergency could transport fighting men and materiel to every region of the earth.

We think this is a superb idea. We think it is in the tradition of American industrial genius. We think it is worthy of the support of Congress, the administration, and the people at large. As workers in the long neglected maritime industry, we endorse this legislation and recommend that it be passed speedily.

In behalf of the affiliates of the maritime trades department, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you in the interests of the maritime industry.

ATTACHMENT No. 1

International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers.

American Federation of Technical Engineers.

International Union of Operating Engineers.

National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association.

International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers.

American Federation of Grain Millers.

International Brotherhood of Longshoremen.

International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots.

Seafarers' International Union of North America.

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

The Commercial Telegraphers' Union (radio officers).

Office Employees International Union.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Jobs-After-40 Program of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most socially enlightened and useful organizations in the country is the Fraternal Order of Eagles. This is the organization which campaigned so persistently for the great Social Security and Old-Age Survivors Act, which the Senate may amend this week to provide expanded annuity benefits.

Today, in this present era, the Eagles are crusading for jobs after 40, in order to protect the economic security of older workers who have many skills, but who are the victims of unfair discrimination.

I have introduced proposed legislation to protect the jobs of older workers in defense industries and in other avenues of Government supply. This bill is S. 3188, and a somewhat similar measure has been offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. We have a wide group of able cosponsors of both major political parties who share our opposition to discrimination because of age.

At the 60th international convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, held in Chicago from August 6 to 9, it was my privilege to be one of the speakers. Other participants included such citizens as our illustrious ex-President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell; the columnist and author, Drew Pearson; and William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO.

My topic on the program which concluded the convention, on August 9 at Hotel Sherman in Chicago, was Jobs After 40, and I emphasized to my fellow members of the Eagles that our cold-war rivalry with the Soviet Union will not allow us to waste the skills, talents, and energies of older workers in our great democratic Nation.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we cannot waste either our human resources or our natural resources. The Soviet Union is using both to the utmost. For example, I understand Russia is training four times as many new doctors annually as we do, and one reason may be not only Russia's less-thorough training, but also its widespread encouragement of women to enter the medical profession. This fits in with my firm belief that we shall be sacrificing the welfare of the United States if we let indifference and cruel discrimination drive skilled and experienced older workers out of our national labor force.

That is why I believe so strongly in the jobs-after-40 crusade of the Eagles, and that is why I traveled to Chicago over the last weekend to advance it. I spoke under the auspices of Judge Robert W. Hansen, of Milwaukee, national chairman of the jobs-after-40 project.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of my August 9 address at the 60th international convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, where, I am happy to report, an outstanding delegation of Eagles from my home State of Oregon was in attendance.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NEUBERGER PLEADS WITH EAGLES TO SAFEGUARD JOBS AND SKILLS OF OLDER WORKERS

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER told the Fraternal Order of Eagles national convention tonight that the fierce competition of the space age should warn the United States against wasting either its human or natural resources. NEUBERGER spoke in favor of legislation which he has introduced in the Senate to safeguard the jobs of older workers.

The legislation is endorsed by the Eagles as part of their jobs-after-40 campaign.

"Older workers in our Nation possess priceless skills and talents," NEUBERGER said. "It makes no sense to lose this reservoir of national strength because of cruel or anachronistic employment policies. We should start at once by forbidding discrimination because of age in all plants or factories which supply the Government. In this era of $40 billion defense budgets, that would be most of the great manufacturing establishments in America."

NEUBERGER lauded work of the Eagles in focusing nationwide attention on employment practices which discriminate against older workers. He recalled that officials of the fraternal organization presented Members of Congress on March 11 with petitions signed by 671,328 persons on behalf of legislation to ban discrimination because of age in hiring of persons by Government contractors.

Under the pressures of so-called competitive coexistence with the Soviet Union, he added, America cannot afford tragic wastage of manpower in the American economy. The Oregon Senator said that a key factor in outcome of the free world's struggle against communism is "whether we have the foresight and wisdom to establish policies which fully utilize all our human and natural resources effectively."

NEUBERGER said that the Soviet Union was constructing 44 waterways projects, and that 4 of these will be greater in hydroelectric production than Grand Coulee on the Columbia River, until this time the largest ever built. "By contrast," the 45-year-old Oregon Democrat added, "the present national administration has not recommended one new start on a dam in the Columbia River Basin, where over 40 percent of our own country's water-power potential is concentrated."

In documenting his thesis, NEUBERGER listed Grand Coulee's maximum output as 1,900,000 kilowatts while these will be the capacities of the 4 principal dams being erected within the borders of the Soviet Union: Stalingrad and Kuibishev on the Volga River, 2,350,000 and 2,100,000 kilowatts, respectively; Bratsk on the Angara, 3,200,000 kilowatts; Krasnoyarsk on the Yenisei, 4,004,000 kilowatts.

"Surely this means that today is an unwise time in which to abandon river-development programs in America which were begun some 25 years ago," said NEUBERGER. "Energy may be a key factor in the world production race which Khrushchev has foreseen. No energy is more reliable than hydroelectric energy, because it is eternal. It uses up no oil, natural gas, coal, uranium, or any other exhaustible fuel which may be in short or limited supply."

"Few sterner tasks confront us than that of continuing our national strength and prosperity without, at the same time, exhausting the resources which have made these possible. The emergence of Soviet technology backed by vast natural resources adds emphasis to our own need for public officials dedicated to preserving wildlife, land, water, and forest resources."

Faced with threats of greatly increased economic competition by Soviet Russia, United States policies for use of natural resources "may decide the rivalry of the future between free and slave worlds in the realm of industrial production," NEUBERGER added.

"Throughout this cold war decade, we have been conscious of the great military might of Soviet Russia. But until very recently, Americans did not regard Russia as a serious competitor in economic and other peacetime fields of endeavor. Any remaining illusions of Russia as a country of backward serfs being driven reluctantly onward by terror and despotism has now been rudely shattered by sputniks. We shall be better off for no longer underestimating the competition we face."

The Passage Under the Polar Ice Cap of the "Nautilus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in connection with the epic voyage of the *Nautilus* crossing the North Pole, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on Friday, August 8, 1958, and an editorial from the New York Times on Sunday, August 10, 1958.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 8, 1958 STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE MILITARY APPLICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, ON THE OCCASION OF THE SUCCESSFUL SUBARCTIC VOYAGE OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINE, THE "NAUTILUS"

I commend the Navy and Captain Anderson and his crew. And, particularly, I feel we must not forget Admiral Rickover, the father of nuclear seapower. The Navy and the Nation owe Admiral Rickover a great debt of gratitude.

The Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am chairman, long has advocated the subarctic voyage now completed so successfully. Both the military and peaceful implications of this voyage are enormous.

The military implications require little elaboration. The nuclear submarine is proven a true underwater satellite. It is virtually impossible to detect a nuclear submarine deep beneath the sea—the difficulty is compounded when it is both deep beneath the sea and ice.

This voyage removes any doubt as to the ability of nuclear-powered submarines to get anywhere in the world under the most adverse conditions. It opens up for the first time a whole new ocean which will become a theater of great naval importance, vital to the security of our Nation, in future years. It opens up waters adjacent to all of the land mass of Asia, Europe, and North America.

In terms of peaceful application, this voyage heralds the unlocking of the great mysteries of Arctic waters that have intrigued scientists for years—such as the depth of the ice cap, the depth of the oceans beneath it, the large discrepancies of temperature in the Arctic which result in great open areas amidst the ice.

The entire science of oceanography will be advanced, and it is my hope that it will not be too long before we have a nuclear submarine equipped with an underwater oceanography laboratory. In addition, there is untold wealth under the seas. But all we know of it today is surmise and speculation. Underwater exploration in nuclear submarines will translate our guesses and hopes into knowledge and use for mankind. Still further, this voyage blazes a new path for underwater commerce and transportation.

[From the New York Times of August 10, 1958]

UNDER THE POLAR ICE

For months to come scientists, strategists, and men of politics will be studying and debating the implications of the passage under the polar ice cap of the atom-powered submarine *Nautilus*. Manifestly, another step forward in the conquest of our physical world has been made. Much good can come from it so long as the knowledge that we have gained can be put to the best use in both military defense and the development of new international trade routes.

In this case there is something so eerie, so other-worldly, about the idea of crossing the North Pole under the ice that it is hard to bring the mind back from the world of fantasy into that of reality. In a few weeks or months, perhaps, the evaluation of the exploit—and its probable repetition—may make it seem commonplace. There will be other crossings. At the moment it is hard to get even a primary focus on the significance of what has been done.

One thing, however, we know. This transit of the Arctic was not the product of accident. It did not take place in a dream world. It came about through days and nights, weeks and months, and years in the laboratory, on the testing ground, in the training camps. If it was the product of vision, it was also the product of hard work. The combination of the two, as Leonardo once said, adds up to genius.

It is for that reason that Americans pay tribute, now, both to the gallant commander and crew of the *Nautilus*, and to the man whose vision and indefatigable energy made its exploits possible, Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover. Commander Anderson's graceful gesture in making an immediate call upon him evokes a warm response all over the country. His vision was the driving force in making this exploit possible.

Another thing we know. The horizons of achievement continue to widen. No frontiers for accomplishment can be fixed. The cruise of the *Nautilus* should teach us, once more, that we live in an age of immense, even explosive, expansion. We cannot go back. We will not stand still. New worlds, in the Arctic and elsewhere, are still to be conquered and there will be the conquerors.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Armed Services During the 85th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a letter from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, making a report on the accomplishments of his committee during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, a splendid record, a constructive record of accomplishments.

This Congress is a historic one. In the accomplishments of this historic Congress the House Committee on Armed Services has played a most important part.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1958.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In response to your letter of August 4, I am pleased to take this opportunity to give you a résumé of the activities of the House Committee on Armed Services during the 85th Congress.

Inasmuch as the report on the committee's activities was filed for the first session, the following résumé will include the activities of the second session, followed by a consolidated summary of both sessions.

The activities of the committee during the 2d session of the 85th Congress were perhaps the most unusual of any session since the committee's formation in January of 1947. This was due to the number, complexity, and importance of a variety of problems and legislative matters before the committee.

As early as December 4, 1957, it was concluded that the committee should conduct an inquiry into the status of our military missile program, in order to determine our degree of progress, or lack thereof, and the legislative actions which the committee might take to support and improve the program.

The committee's executive hearings on the subject of missiles began on January 13 and were concluded on February 25. On February 18, Subcommittee No. 2 began hearings on the bill to revise and improve the military pay system, which hearings extended through March 7. During the same period, February 4 through March 3, Subcommittee No. 1 conducted hearings relating to the proposed reduction in the strength of the Army National Guard, the United States Army Reserves, and the active duty establishment. Also, during this same period of time preparatory work was being accomplished for the conduct of the hearings on the legislation to reorganize the Department of Defense, which hearings began on April 22 and extended through May 21. On the next day, May 22, the full committee began hearings on the fiscal 1959 military construction bill, which hearings were not concluded until June 24.

From the foregoing, the importance and complexity of the committee's work is obvious. This becomes even more obvious when it is realized that there were more full committee meetings (84) during the 2d session than the combined total of subcommittee hearings (65). This is the first time in the 12-year existence of the committee that this has occurred.

To summarize the activities during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the full committee held 84 meetings, and the subcommittees held 65 meetings, exclusive of the meetings held by the 6 special subcommittees investigating various aspects of national defense, for a total of 149 meetings on legislative matters. The committee and its subcommittees considered in excess of 75 bills, of which 46 were reported to the House.

The committee completed an investigation of our military missile program; revised and improved our military pay system through the passage of appropriate legislation; reported resolutions and supported legislative actions to maintain the Army National Guard at a strength of 400,000, the United States Army Reserve at a strength of 300,000, and the active duty Army Establishment at a strength of 900,000, all for fiscal 1959; approved legislation reorganizing the Department of Defense; approved a military construction bill in the approximate amount of $1.7 billion for fiscal 1959; and acted on a variety of other legislative matters.

The Real Estate and Construction Subcommittee has considered and approved the following projects: 151 real-estate projects, 1 of which covered 37 installations; 32 Capehart housing projects, involving 10,207 units; 56 housing projects involving 1,643 units to be constructed by appropriated funds; 10 Wherry acquisition projects, including 15,330 units; 6 surplus commodity housing projects including 1,784 units.

The Subcommittee for Special Investigations has conducted 8 public hearings and 10 executive hearings, and has processed 70 inquiries from congressional offices.

In summary, from January 15, 1957, until this date there have been 140 meetings of the full committee, 151 meetings of the subcommittees, and 74 meetings of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, for a total of 365 meetings on legislative and investigative activities of the committee. More than 175 bills and resolutions were considered during this Congress. The committee reported 109 bills and resolutions, and 106 of these have passed the House. Thus far, legislation emanating from this committee has resulted in 58 public laws and 7 private laws. These totals will be substantially increased as the result of completed legislative action now pending the President's signature and a number of other bills which will undoubtedly pass the Senate in the immediate future.

In addition to these legislative and investigative actions of the committee, the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction has considered and approved the following military transactions:

Real estate; 273 projects.

Capehart housing: 60 projects, 21,827 units.

Appropriated fund housing: 61 projects, 1,897 units.

Wherry acquisition: 50 projects, 25,844 units.

Surplus commodity housing: 9 projects, 5,784 units.

There have been 96 printed committee hearings, containing in excess of 8,200 pages of testimony.

I am sure you will agree that the work of the committee during the 85th Congress has been most constructive in the field of national defense. I assure you that this record is most rewarding to those of us who have had the responsibility and the honor to participate in these accomplishments.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

Gen. George Catlett Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with the passage of 100 years since the War Between the States, the names of at least 2 men have survived for their true greatness: Lee and Lincoln. Even now, there is one from World War II who is certain to be remembered centuries later as truly great: Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of August 9, 1958, entitled "The Mark of a Man."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARK OF A MAN

A small news item of recent date stated that Gen. George Catlett Marshall had been tendered a round million dollars for his memoirs, and had instantly rejected the offer.

"The Government of the United States has already paid me for all of my services," said the magnificent soldier who directed America's military efforts in World War II.

To those who know General Marshall, this action came as no surprise. In fact, it was very characteristic of the old Virginian. He has turned down equally flattering offers several times before. He was equally blunt in 1948 when he was told he could have the presidential nomination on a political platter. With a few quiet, but unmistakable words, he took himself out of all consideration, then or in the future, for the highest office in America.

So far as we know nobody ever broached that subject to General Marshall again.

In these days when congressional investigations swirl around men in high places suspected of having been influenced by paltry jimcracks, it is heartening to reflect on the fact that we do produce men as big as General Marshall. Maybe there are only a few that big, but at least a few.

While we would not presume to guess what goes on in General Marshall's mind, it is not unlikely that he recalled Gen. R. E. Lee's reply when a somewhat similar windfall was offered to the Confederate chief.

The Civil War was over. The Gray leader was making a skimpy living as president of a small, run-down Washington College at Lexington, Va. His salary was $1,500 per year.

Lee had lost everything he owned in the war, every acre of ground, his fine home called Arlington, his cattle and sheep had been slaughtered to feed the Union soldiers and his horses and mules commandeered to pull Union guns.

One day in 1867 a group of men from New York came to Lee's house on the college campus and tendered the Gray warrior more money than he could possibly make for the remainder of his life. Their wish was straight and simply stated; the use of the name R. E. Lee for an insurance company they were forming.

General Lee heard the New Yorker's proposition in polite silence. When they had finished outlining what they must have though was an irresistible offer, the old soldier said: "Sirs, my name is not for sale."

Though Lee lived out the few years left to him in ill health and near poverty, there is not the slightest evidence that he ever regretted turning down the bonanza in return for his good name.

It has been said many times that General Marshall adopted Robert E. Lee's code of personal honor and ethics when Marshall was still a cadet at Virginia Military Institute. He has lived by that almost-spartan code all his active military life. Now that he is old and in retirement it would be completely unlike George Catlett Marshall to even consider breaking that high-minded code in the twilight of his years.

Obviously, we do not imply, in comparing General Marshall to General Lee, that Marshall is living in near poverty. The Government of the United States will pay General Marshall his full salary as a 5-star general officer as long as he lives. That is little enough for the man who directed, from beginning to end, the greatest war we have ever fought, generally conceded the ablest Chief of Staff we have ever had, and who, later served as Secretary of State and the first Secretary of Defense.

Ex-President Harry S. Truman once said, "General Marshall is the greatest living American." Many people, perhaps most people, agreed with the Missourian. Those who did not failed to come forward with any contenders for that title.

We pray that he will be with us, as an inspiration to lesser men, for many more years.

Why the National Debt Is Giving Treasury Secretary Lots of Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an article from U. S. News & World Report of August 8, 1958, titled, "Why the National Debt Is Giving Treasury Secretary Lots Of Worry":

WHY THE NATIONAL DEBT IS GIVING TREASURY SECRETARY LOTS OF WORRY

Troubles in the management of this Nation's huge debt are harassing Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson.

Treasury bonds have been losing favor with investors. Result: a plunge in market prices of these bonds, despite strenuous efforts of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System to prop up prices by massive purchases of Treasury securities.

At the close of market trading on July 30, the 2⅝ percent bonds maturing in 1965 were down almost to 97—a $970 price for a bond with face value of $1,000. These bonds have been issued in June at par. The 3¼ percent bonds of 1985, issued in June at 100½, were at 96. The 3½ percent bonds of 1990 were at 99, down from nearly 107 in April.

Seldom in modern times have Treasury bonds taken such a beating.

SWITCH IN MONEY POLICY

Only a few months earlier, these securities had enjoyed a record rise in price as the Reserve System switched to a policy of cheap and easy money.

Now, signs of a business upturn and threats of war have generated a new inflation psychology in this country. Investors expect that, before very long, a shift back to tighter credit will mean rising interest rates. So investors are not willing to pay recent prices for bonds, which offer fixed interest rates.

Mr. Anderson's problems are further complicated by a recent unsuccessful financing. To pay off $16.3 billion in maturing I O U's, Mr. Anderson had offered a 1-year certificate.

Here's what happened: Some $9.1 billion worth of the maturing I O U's were held by the public, the remaining $7.2 billion by Reserve banks. The Reserve System, besides exchanging its I O U's, purchased $1.1 billion of the new certificates for delivery when issued. This, in effect, left only $8 billion of the maturing securities to be exchanged by the public. Yet holders of $2.8 billion dollars' worth spurned the offer and demanded cash.

This meant a 35 percent failure in the offer. Bond dealers described the financing as a real lemon.

AHEAD: MORE BORROWING

Mr. Anderson's troubles are far from ended. With much of the $276 billion debt in short-term I O U's that come due frequently, he must refinance an average of $4.6 billion worth of debt each month in the year that began July 1.

Even that is not all. The Budget Bureau has just predicted that the Government's deficit in the year which started July 1 will be $12 billion. So, in addition to his refinancing, Mr. Anderson must borrow heavily to fill the gap between current income and outgo.

In this task, the Secretary faces formidable problems. These are related to the size and frequency of his borrowings. A single borrowing may amount to more than all the bonds issued by all the corporations and all the States and localities in the country in a year. In setting the interest rate and maturity on a security issue, Mr. Anderson can, if he slips, thus demoralize the money market on which all borrowers depend.

Suppose the Secretary sets too high an interest rate on an issue. Then other Treasury securities, and corporation bonds as well, look unattractive by comparison. That can drive down the prices of all bonds. Yet too low a rate of interest means failure of an offer.

If speculators are permitted to take large amounts of an offering, then dump them on the market if a price drop occurs, as they did in the recent offering, then Mr. Anderson's issue is unsuccessful.

Mr. Anderson's job will require rare judgment in months ahead. Whatever he does, the frequency of his trips to the money market may keep that market in a continual state of uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, I have often said in the past that as an individual I would know when I was approaching the limit of the money I could borrow, but that there would be no similar indication when the United States was fast approaching the limit of its credit.

The dilemma set forth above is one which I had predicted and is just another good reason why I have consistently opposed the spending bills. Opposition to the free-wheeling spending spree of the Congress has brought me more brickbats than bouquets. The easy course, and the one which is most popular in Congress at the moment, is to vote for all of the spending programs and a half-hour later tell the people that you are working night and day for a tax cut.

When this Congress adjourns, the Nation is going to suffer a terrible hangover for a good long time. Already there are signs among the people indicating they are beginning to wonder if the spree is worth the hangover.

The Mallory Quagmire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the bills to come before the Senate is the so-called Mallory bill. In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald appeared an editorial entitled "The Mallory Quagmire." I think this particular editorial makes a very fine suggestion. Among other things, it suggests that the bill go back to the committee, and gives the reasons for that suggestion.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MALLORY QUAGMIRE

The congressional effort to upset the Supreme Court's ruling in the Mallory case has turned almost a full circle. Legislators in the House decided to intervene because, they said, the Supreme Court had confused the meaning of rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. But the Senate Judiciary Committee concluded that the House, in its efforts to override the Court, would weaken the basic safeguard to personal liberty that Congress had erected in rule 5 (a). So the committee modified the House version by the insertion of a new word "reasonable," and now it is a question of whether anyone knows the meaning of this measure to end the confusion from the Mallory ruling.

Rule 5 (a) says that "an officer making an arrest * * * shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner * * *." The Supreme Court interpreted this to mean that a confession obtained by the police as a result of extensive questioning of the accused before arraignment was invalid. In the so-called corrective bills neither House attempts to change rule 5 (a). The House said in effect that no delay in arraignment should invalidate an otherwise valid confession, and the Senate committee says that no reasonable delay should have that effect. Apparently this would take away the implied license of the House bill to hold an arrested person indefinitely without arraignment. But what is reasonable delay? How does the reasonable delay that would be permitted by the committee differ from the unnecessary delay forbidden by rule 5 (a)?

It can be argued with a good deal of force that no delay in arraigning an arrested person and informing him of his rights is reasonable. But "reason" is an elastic word that could easily lead the courts, the police, and prosecutors into a deeper semantic quagmire. The only proper solution in our opinion is to discard the bill entirely and to call for a new study of rule 5 (a) and the problems to which it has given rise by a Supreme Court advisory committee similar to that which prepared the present rules.

CBS News Broadcasts Inform the Public on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, under our democratic system, a government must have the full support and understanding of its citizens in order to function effectively. This support and understanding can only be won by making facts and issues available freely to the public. In times of crisis, speed as well as thoroughness becomes of paramount importance in this flow of information. In the present Middle East situation, the cause of democracy has been well served by America's radio and television networks. Reaching instantaneously into virtually every home, these electronic pathways have carried a clear picture of the fast-moving events, and of the issues involved, to Americans everywhere.

In this connection, I should like to mention the valuable services performed by such programs as Meet the Press, Face the Nation, Youth Wants To Know, College Press Conference, The Leading Question, and many others. Recently the Columbia Broadcasting System has been broadcasting a series of special programs dealing with the basic issues behind the crisis. These programs have been presented in the evening, in place of scheduled commercial programs, in order that they might reach the widest possible audience. Taken together, these CBS news radio and television broadcasts have contributed toward public understanding of America's stake in the conflict.

One of these programs, The Ruble War, has already been noted on the floor of the House, and its text printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Following up, CBS news presented two other unique broadcasts—again on both radio and television. One was Kuwait: Middle East Oil Price, which focuses attention on the most valuable stake in the contest. The other was Prologue to the Summit: The Arab Tide, which exposed the impact of Arab nationalism on the current dilemma.

Mr. President, while the insertion of these two broadcasts is estimated to make approximately 2¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $182.25, I ask unanimous consent because of the importance of these broadcasts to the present world situation that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the scripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KUWAIT: MIDDLE EAST OIL PRIZE

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Wednesday, July 23, 1958. Introduction by Howard K. Smith, CBS News Washington correspondent. Narration by Winston Burdett, CBS News Rome correspondent and a reporter of the Mediterranean and Middle East countries, who recently visited Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt. Produced by CBS News, New York.)

Announcer. The CBS Television Network presents Kuwait: Middle East Oil Prize. Here is Howard K. Smith.

Mr. Smith. Good evening. It is the standing policy of CBS News to bring you today's news today, but tonight we are going to do something different. We want to bring you tomorrow's news today.

Iraq has gone over to the Arab nationalists. Soon or late, in one way or another, the world's richest single piece of real estate, the little desert sheikdom of Kuwait, is bound to be drawn into the rushing mainstream of Middle Eastern events.

Kuwait is a patch of desert floating on the most prodigious sea of oil known to man. Its reserves of that precious fuel are called almost limitless by geologists. Texas is almost a secondary source by comparison.

Kuwait is wedged in between Iraq, lately turned nationalist, and Saudi Arabia, the least advanced nation in the Arab world.

It is situated at the head of the Persian Gulf, that small perimeter that supplies most of the free world's industries from Britain across Europe and South Asia to Japan with the fuel those industries must have to operate.

The dominant force in Kuwait right now is Great Britain. But Kuwait's most recent mention in the news came when a few days ago Kuwait's ruler Sheikh Abdulla conferred with Nasser in Damascus.

The topic of the conference between the ruler of the West's most important oil sources and the Arab world's leading nationalist is not known. But since then Kuwait has halted the issue of visas to western reporters and has denied cable permission to those already there.

CBS News correspondent Winston Burdett was in Kuwait before that shutdown. Here now is Burdett's report.

Mr. BURDETT. This is Kuwait, at the head of the Persian Gulf, 900 miles east of Suez: just a few years ago a fishing and trading village, but today the surging capital of a desert sheikhdom that has become the biggest oil producer in the Middle East. Population of the country, about 210,000. Area, about the size of New Jersey. Annual income from oil: more than $300 million. No place in this part of the world has seen such an extraordinary boom and such a turmoil of change in recent years. Along the Kuwait waterfront, you can still find the trade and traffic of the ancient Arab town. The shipbuilders are still making their famous dhows, the fast, high-pooped ships that Arab traders have been using for the past 3,000 years. The dhows still traffic up and down the gulf coast; they still carry their dates to Bombay and Zanzibar, and bring home African timber and Indian spices

and teak. They still smuggle gold from here to India, and at night, from across the gulf, they smuggle in illegal immigrant laborers from Iran.

The streets of the bazaar are still crammed with life; and you can still lose your way in the jostling markets under their tattered tin roofs, in the populous maze of shops and coffee houses in dusty alleys that twist between mud walls.

But all of this will be gone 10 years from now. The town has already burst its old mud walls; the walls themselves have been knocked down by an army of bulldozers; and much of Kuwait today looks like a bombed-out city, with houses and mosques alike slashed in two by new thoroughfares. And every day, more houses and more walls cave in and crumble in the bulldozers' path, to make way for new roads and new boulevards and new fleets of Cadillacs. In 10 years, the old town will probably have vanished completely.

This is the new city. The ruler of Kuwait, His Higness Sheikh Sir Abdullah Al Salim Al Sabah, has spent millions from his oil revenues on the building of highways, hospitals, and schools. Ten years ago, no public schools existed in the sheikhdom. Today, there are 70 schools like this one; they are certainly the most lavishly equipped schools in the world, with movie halls and restaurants, living quarters for the teachers, courtyards and gymnasiums and playing fields, and huge swimming pools in blue or pink or chartreuse. Teaching techniques are progressive, and there is a wealth of visual aids for the children. Even the kids in kindergarten have their own theater and their ballet classes; learning Hawaiian dancing or European ballet, and putting on a year-end pageant for their parents.

There's a severe shortage of Kuwaiti teachers, so most of the teachers are either Palestinians or Egyptians who are provided directly by the Egyptian Government. The Egyptians obey instructions from Cairo and they are the guiding force in the educational systems.. The students eat at school; they get their food free, as well as their clothes; and from this central kitchen, which the Kuwaitis say is the world's biggest, 30 thousand school meals are distributed in thermal vans each day. There is also a special technical college for engineers, but there has been trouble finding enough students for it, and it is still partially empty. Kuwait's greatest architectural monument is a high school, on a splendid campus by the sea. There is a vast central building, a magnificent library, a handsome mosque, a stadium, fine dormitories for the 800 students, and a seaside club with a swimming pool 150 feet long. Some day the Kuwaitis hope to make this an international university for the Arab world.

The Kuwait Oil Co., which has the sole concession for the almost limitless oil beneath the sands of this little country, is a 50-50 Anglo-American partnership, half owned by the British and half by American interests. The foreman at this rig is an American; the men who are working under him come from all parts of the Arab world and beyond: there are Bedouin nomads from the nearby desert, Syrians and Sudanese, Arabs from Muscat and Oman and Aden, workers from Iran, India, and Goa—a cross-section of the great influx of peoples that oil has brought to Kuwait. Today this country is the Middle East's leading oil producer, outstripping even Saudi Arabia; and right now her 3 fields are producing at a record rate of 6 million tons a month, more than 70 millions tons a year.

They represent the West's greatest single stake in the world's richest oil area.

The name of this particular field is Burgan. It is rated the world's biggest on the basis of current production, now more than a million barrels a day. There are 260 wells like this one, scattered around the desert, and their productivity makes even the most prolific well in Texas seem puny by comparison: in the United States, the daily average yield per well is 100 barrels; here, the average is 6,000. When a new well is ready to produce, tractors haul the rigs away and all that you see is this: a clean and polished wellhead, made of superhardened steel that can withstand tremendous pressures of up to 2,000 pounds per square inch. From the wellheads, the oil flows under natural pressure to the gathering centers, where oil and gas are separated in giant cylinders or separation chambers. Then it is pumped onto a huge tank farm, on a ridge overlooking the sea, 34 tanks with a storage capacity of 5 million barrels; and from the farm, it descends, by gravity, to the sea, across the coastal plain, and out along the mile-long pier, and then, still by gravity, into the holds of the waiting tankers.

An average of 8 tankers load up here each day; and the oil that leaves this pier goes to France, Holland, Italy, Australia, Japan, and Texas; but the greatest portion of it goes to Britain, where it supplies more than 50 percent of Britain's oil needs. This pier can handle 86,000-ton supertankers; but already, a couple of miles up the coast, they are building a new and greater pier that will take tankers of 100,000 tons. Indeed, the company is expanding all along the line.

Recently they have more than doubled their refining capacity, with two new refineries to produce gasoline, diesel oil, and tanker fuel. Expansion goes on also in the field; and up north, in another corner of the Kuwait desert, they are busy prospecting and drilling a new field that will probably go into production sometime next spring.

The one thing that you don't see in this whole operation is oil. But you do see plenty of signs and warnings to remind you that it's there. The port, the refineries, the gathering centers, every installation has its own fire-fighting equipment, and its entire personnel is trained to use it; each installation is inside a fenced compound, guarded by company watchmen and Kuwaiti police who relieve you of your matches, your lighters when you go in. Fire is the ever-present danger, and fire is never very far away. Day and night, the desert is ablaze with the flames from the burning of the excess gas. This gas is not being wasted; there is simply much more of it than can now be used. It supplies all the power needs both of the company and the Kuwait Government; and what is left, is burned. Scientists are now working on a way to make this gas commercial for export, that is, to pack it and transport it in bulk; and some day no doubt a way will be found.

They have a special training school here for Bedouin boys, a school run by the company. None of the boys can read or write. Their first class is in arithmetic. They go on from there to become electricians and welders, fitters and auto mechanics.

A boy who a few years ago was destined to spend his life tending goats in the desert is now learning how to use machine tools and how to bore a cylinder. It's a revolution in Bedouin life, for traditionally the men in the Bedouin camps shun manual labor. The men merely look after the camels and brew the coffee; and the women do all the rest. Now their sons—who come from a dozen desert tribes—are learning how to use an acetylene torch, and how to strip a diesel engine down to nuts and bolts and put it together again, and how to take a wrecked truck off the road and repair it and give it another 40,000 miles of life, all this before they can sign their own names. Even the life of their fathers is changing slowly. The tribes are now veering away from their traditional migration routes; and every afternoon, toward sunset, in slow caravan across the desert, they come in with their herds of camels to use one of the new water wells drilled for them by the oil company. They cannot write a single letter of the Arab alphabet, but they know the wavelength of radio Cairo, and they follow what Naasser says about Arab aspirations and the politics of the outside world.

You see a far greater change in the new oil town of 15,000 persons that has sprung up here, Ahmadi, the headquarters town of the oil company. This is a very cosmopolitan place, where Moslems, Christians, Hindus, and Buddhists live, work, and worship side by side. Of the company's 8,000 employees, more than a thousand are from India and Goa, another thousand from Pakistan; there are more than 2,000 Arab immigrants from half a dozen countries and, on top of this, about 900 Britishers and 73 Americans. Most of the Americans are drillers, geologists, and engineers. The neat brick and stucco houses in which they live have electricity and air-conditioning, gas-stove kitchens, bath and plumbing, and ample space for gardens. Only one rule is strictly enforced; the Kuwaiti employees, so as not to disturb their neighbors, are allowed to keep only 2 goats, 2 sheep, and 6 chickens. Because of that, many of the Kuwaitis have turned down the offer of modern, comfortable housing, and prefer to go on living, instead, in their own tent encampments outside the town.

Under the terms of the oil concession, exactly half of the oil profits here go into the private coffer of the ruler of Kuwait. This year, his revenues may reach a record-breaking sum of $375 million. Such wealth over the past few years has made the city of Kuwait the metropolis of the Persian Gulf.

Before oil was found here, Kuwait's only natural resource was brackish water that was unfit to drink. Water came by dhow from Iraq, was sold in goatskin bags and delivered on the backs of donkeys and camels.

Now the Sheik has built the largest water distillation plant in the world, drawing salt water from the sea and producing 4 million gallons of fresh water daily.

Right next to the water factory, an American firm is busy dredging a modern harbor, a $23 million job. Then years ago, there were fewer than 10 automobiles in the entire sheikdom: Today, there are about 25,000; the number is growing, and the traffic jams are getting worse every day. When the cars are run down, they are just driven off the road or into the desert, and abandoned. Five years ago, movies were still forbidden, and movie houses unknown. Today, a million-dollar movie palace looms at the edge of the city and there are 2 theaters inside, 1 for American and European films, the other for the latest films from Egypt, in Arabic.

Many new mosques have sprung up about the city; and at night their pointing minarets are garlanded with electric lights, and glitter like jewels as the worshipers arrive in limousines. And elsewhere, an entirely new market center is being built, and eventually the old congested bazaar of Kuwait will be wholly transplanted into clean, fresh, airy quarters like these. The bazaar of the goldsmiths and coppersmiths will be the first to move.

With more money than it knows how to spend, Kuwait has become the world's most spectacular welfare state. Everyone, Kuwait citizen or foreigner, is treated free of charge in the wards and clinics and operating theaters of the sheikdom's modern hospitals. He is cared for by European doctors and by trained nurses from Egypt, Syria, and India. Every Kuwait citizen is assured a job by his Government. He is assured a home in one of the new housing developments, where his rent may be as little as $4 a month, and even that goes toward eventual payment for the house. He gets a transportation allowance, and if he needs a loan

to buy a car, he can get that, too, with the Government paying the interest. New housing has not kept pace with the demolitions, but if a man's house is condemned and demolished, he gets fantastic compensation for it, as much as thirty to forty thousand dollars for a mud hut in the middle of town; and with the money, he can buy a refrigerator, an air conditioner, and a car. This method of compensation has been one of the more spectacular ways that the sheikdom has found to share the wealth and put cash in the pockets of the population.

Technically, Kuwait is an independent sheikdom. Its government is the personal instrument of His Highness Sheik Abdullah, and his family. The Government's income is his income; its revenues go into his private purse, and he himself keeps the strings of it. Euch Government department is headed by a sheik of the ruling family. Thus, a brother of His Highness is Minister of Health and Public Works; another brother is chief of the town police; a cousin is Minister of Education; and an uncle, Sheik Abdullah Mubarak, is both deputy ruler and commander in chief of the army and armed forces. Each of the ruling sheiks lives in a sheikly manner, with a retinue of servants and bodyguards, an armada of shiny limousines, and a palace or palaces where he holds court.

The tables at a Sheikly banquet are laden with mountains of rice and chicken and a score of whole sheep. You will meet at the sheik's receptions the American and British oil executives who run the country's oil industry; the American consul, who, aside from the British, is the only foreign diplomat here; and a British diplomat who is known as the political agent. This Britisher is a very important person. He is, in effect, the foreign minister of the country. For nearly 60 years, by special treaty terms, Kuwait has been under the protection of the British crown. The British political agent handles the sheikdom's foreign affairs, and Britain is responsible for the defense of the country.

They say that the oil reserves here are around 60 billion barrels. But in fact the reserves of Kuwait are so great that they are beyond calculation. On the oil of the Persian Gulf, the entire free world in this hemisphere, from Britain to Japan, depends for its industrial future.

For how long will it all last? Certainly, no end to the great boom here is in sight. There is money for everybody, and there is every prospect that Kuwait's huge oil revenues will go on getting huger. And yet even here, there is the rustle of political discontent. You can feel it in the bazaar, where blaring radios bring the message of Arab nationalism from Cairo; where streamers and posters proclaim the slogans of the Arab cause; and where Gama Abdel Nasser is the hero of the coffeeshops. Nasser's picture is everywhere, on the rugs that you buy in the market place, even on lighters and rings and keyrings, on handkerchiefs and coffee cups.

There is a small but vocal nationalist movement that follows the Nasser line. There is a new generation that is learning to read and write and to think politically; and which looks to Egypt as the progressive force and vanguard of the Arab world. There has been an unprecedented influx of foreigners, of Arabs from other countries, including Egyptian and Palestinian technicians and experts who are hired to help administer this sheikhdom. They are the carriers of ferment and change.

It so happens that the oil sheikhdoms along this gulf are the last area in the Middle East where the British still hold paramount power. It happens also that Arab control of Arab oil is one of the major objectives of Arab nationalism.

Finally, there is an archaic government to which the tremendous western stake in this little land is tied, a government made up of tribal sheikhs who rule autocratically, who are already quarreling among themselves about the succession, who spend their money as they will, who make their own law and their own rough justice. And so, even here in rich Kuwait, there is a rising cry for reform, for some representative government, for press freedom, and for rule by law. Even here is the prospect, sooner or later, of radical political change. The great challenge to the West in this vital spot is how to go to meet that change before it is too late, before the riptide of Arab nationalism crashes on this distant shore of the Persian Gulf.

Mr. SMITH. Since his trip to Kuwait, Winston Burdett has returned on a brief visit to New York, and is here in the studio with us now to help answer some of the questions that are in everyone's mind. Winston, would you dare a prediction about Kuwait's future?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, Howard, in the 6 weeks since I visited Kuwait, the tide of nationalism that I spoke of has swept right up to its borders, and I can't see how Kuwait can resist for very long. This is a completely artificial and archaic state. An accident of history has made Kuwait a British protectorate; an accident of geology made it the site of the biggest known concentration of oil reserves in the world. Geography placed it on the borders of Iraq, and the Iraqis regard Kuwait as their natural outlet on the Persian Gulf. Even before the Iraqi revolution, the Iraqi Government invited the ruler of Kuwait to Baghdad and urged him to merge his little state with the new defunct Iraqi-Jordanian Union; ironically, only 3 weeks ago, the British also were publicly urging him to do this, largely in order to save Kuwait from the subversive appeal and enormous power of attraction of Nasser's Arab Union.

Obviously, Kuwait has no future as an Arab nation, because it is not a nation. Its ruling family cannot be the focus of political loyalty—not in an era of dynamic nationalism. Its newly educated class can find no place in its medieval political structure.

You cannot teach people to read and write and think, and still expect them to accept the fact that they can be arrested and flogged in public because they have the impudence to overtake and pass on the road the limousine of one of the ruling sheikhs. The hundreds who are pouring out of the schools of Kuwait will soon be thousands; and in a country where the press and the right of assembly are practically abolished, this new literate generation will demand a daily newspaper to read. That will be a revolutionary demand, because of course they will want to write in the newspaper and express their political opinions. The ideas they express will be Nasserist ideas, for Nasser, beyond the borders of Egypt, through his missionaries, his teachers, his technicians, and his propaganda, has succeeded in identifying himself with modernism, progress, and social reform. Even in the desert of the Arabian peninsula, Nasser is the great name and great myth, the symbol of Arab revolt, of independent nationalism, and of the utilization of Arab resources by the Arabs themselves. It's a very explosive mixture of ideas.

Mr. SMITH. Well, Winston, what's the outlook for the oil in Kuwait?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, Howard, as in Kuwait, so in the entire Arab world today because of oil and because of nationalism you get a sense now of great and unpredictable changes ahead. On the one hand, there are the have-countries, the oil-countries, like Iraq and Saudi Arabia; on the other, there are the have-nots, the countries without oil, like Jordan or with very little oil like Egypt.

At one extreme, you have the pleasure-loving Cadillac and palace set; and at the other extreme, you have nearly a million destitute Palestinian refugees and the impoverished peasants of the Nile Valley. In Arab eyes, this does not make sense, and neither does Kuwait make sense, a tiny city-state staggering under the impact of sudden wealth, with more money than it can spend on even the most expensive social improvements. The ruler of Kuwait spends about a third of his money on these improvements and roughly another third goes to current expenses and the upkeep of the sheikhly establishment; and the last third is either banked or invested in gilt-edged securities in London. None of it is invested in the needy Arab lands around Kuwait. So the Arabs say that Kuwait's revenues, or anyway a good portion of them, should be redistributed for the benefit of other Arab countries, the poorhouse of Jordan or the even vaster poorhouse of Egypt. This is the irresistible argument of pan-Arab nationalism.

Sooner or later, I think, the march of events around Kuwait will be irresistible also. British troops could land there—they have a treaty right to do so—but it is hard to see how even they could reverse the tide for very long.

A merger or federation of Kuwait with a larger Arab union would mean first a redistribution of oil revenues among the Arab States; later, inevitably, it would mean increasing Arab pressure for a greater share of the revenues; and finally, it would mean increasing nationalist demands for an Arab share in the ownership and management of oil operations from the time that the crude oil is produced in the field to its final delivery and sale as gasoline at a gas station in Tokyo or London. Nasser's immediate objective is a share of the oil revenues, and if the Arabian Peninsula is the prize of his Arab union, then Kuwait is the greatest Middle East oil prize of all.

PROLOGUE TO THE SUMMIT: THE ARAB TIDE

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network Wednesday, July 30, 1958. With Howard K. Smith, CBS News Washington correspondent; Winston Burdett, CBS News Rome correspondent and reporter on the Mediterranean and Middle East countries; and Daniel Schorr, CBS News Moscow correspondent 1955–57, assigned to Washington, D. C. Produced by CBS News, New York)

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. I am Howard K. Smith. Under one set of auspices or another, the chief executives of the most important nations in the world will probably meet soon, possibly in this city, New York. The force pushing them together, in some cases against their wills, constitutes one of the most interesting revivals in history.

In the Middle Ages, when our ancestors were rising from barbarism, the Arabs were far the mightiest force on earth. Now, after a thousand years of stagnation, Arab nationalism makes a new imprint on history, asserting itself in angry demonstrations against the West, in rebellion that has sent government troops into action in the streets of Beirut, in adulation of the hero who has welded Arab nationalism into a potent force.

The CBS Television Network presents Prologue to the Summit: The Arab Tide.

Mr. BURDETT. My name is Winston Burdett. I have just returned from the Middle East.

In his own country, Egypt, the power of Gamal Abdel Nasser rests, above all, on his control of the army, and is maintained by his police and his propaganda. But outside his own country, in the rest of the Arab world, Nasser's power is based on something more solid than personal dictatorship; it rests on a basic political condition, the rise of the Arab nationalist movement. Nationalism is the ruling force in the Arab world today, stronger than kings and governments, stronger than princes and politicians. No Arab government can ignore it and survive.

It is not a Communist or even a pro-Communist force; and the Arab nationalist states are not satellite states. It is an independent movement. Nasser, by his deeds, by his daring, and his propaganda, has identified himself with this force, and has become its leader.

We think of the Arab States as forever quarreling among themselves, but the ideal of a greater Arab union has tremendous power and political appeal: a power that is often stronger than the old traditional quarrels, and it is very easy to see why. These borders that divide the Syrian desert into several Arab States were not drawn by the Arabs; they were drawn by Western statesmen sitting in London and Paris. A country like Jordan is not even an independent nation by any of the standards which the West applies: it has neither the natural borders, nor the internal unity, nor the resources of an independent nation. And here is a country, Syria—which is the real home and center of Arab national feeling—where the ideal of pan-Arab union is so strong that the Syrians have surrendered their national identity and taken second place to the Egyptians in order to become part of a greater union, the United Arab Republic, whose president is Nasser.

If Nasser is the leader, then Cario is the capital of the nationalist movement: And in this role it has no rival. To this city of nearly 3 million, come students and travelers from all parts of the Middle East, from all the feudal desert lands east of Suez. They have been coming here for more than 10 centuries, to Al Azhar University, which is the seat of Moslem culture. Cairo has behind it the prestige of history, and Al Azhar University is the 500-year-old symbol of that tradition. Today, Cairo has the added glamour of a political Mecca; and the students come here to discover the excitements of big city life and learn the gospel of modern nationalism. They see its monuments all around them, especially on days of national victory, triumphal arches celebrating the departure of the last British soldier from the Suez Canal Zone, and giant cartoons of Egyptain commandos, 5 stories high, bestriding the traffic of the capital. Cairo is a unique metropolis with its new buildings reared in the mudbanks of the Nile, its wide boulevards replacing the old slums with (indistinct) and its smart apartment houses and its movie palaces built or owned by Saudi Arabian princes. For this is where the shieks of Arabia invest much of their oil wealth, and this is where the talent is, where Cairo produces the movies, writes the songs and publishes the magazines of the Arab Middle East. This is the source of new ideas and new lines of propaganda attacks, which are sent out daily from swank, expensive newspaper offices, and broadcast to the entire Arab world, from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, over radio Cairo's powerful transmitters.

To Western ears, the propaganda of Cairo has a shrill and vengeful tone. Its message has a high emotional content, keyed to the four great themes of Arab nationalism. There is the underlying impulse toward Arab union; there is the hatred of kings and of feudal power; there is the drive toward radical reform, the yearning for modernization; and finally, there is the anti-Western element, born of the revolt against the colonial powers. Arab nationalism is anti-Western, both in spirit and immediate aims. Politically, it is a fight for total independence. Emotionally, it is a quest for national dignity, something the Arabs lost under Western rule.

A decisive event for Arab nationalism was a humiliating defeat, and it was this same event that propelled Nasser to power: The defeat of five Arab States by the forces of Israel in 1948. The rout of King Farouk's Egyptian army disclosed a scandal of corruption and incompetence, and fired the military revolt that ended the monarchy and sent Farouk into exile. It was a revolt to reassert national pride.

Where other Arab leaders merely talked, Nasser also acted; and each time that he humiliated the West, his stature grew in Arab eyes. Unable to get Western arms to rebuild his army against Israel, he turned to Moscow, got his arms, and became a hero. Armies are the final measure of prestige and status in the Arab world, and it was a day of triumph for Nasser when he was able to show off, on parade, before the astonished princes and officers and diplomats of all the Arab nations, his new army of tanks and guns from the Soviet bloc. Nasser is also the man who proved that by guerrilla warfare he could make life unbearable for foreign troops on Arab soil. He set in motion forces which compelled British garrisons to withdraw from the Suez Canal Zone, and he himself raised the flag of Egypt at Port Said. His greatest defiance of the West was still to come: The nationalization of the Suez Canal, which then remained blocked to world shipping for 5 months after the Anglo-French invasion. By that act of nationalization, Nasser became the champion of a new idea, the idea of Arab ownership of Arab resources; and he gave to Arab nationalism a new weapon which it has not yet fully exploited, the weapon of economic reprisal.

In that same year, 1956, Egypt's army was beaten again by the Israelis in a brief campaign that left a trail of ravaged roads and ruined equipment in the Sinai Desert. Israel is the Arabs' greatest antiwestern grievance, and, to the humiliation of defeat, you must add the bitterness of the dispossessed, of the 950,000 Palestinian refugees, who have lost their lands and their homes, and are still caught between Israel's refusal to take them back, and the Arabs' refusal to resettle them on Arab soil for fear of losing this political and moral issue. For the Arabs, Israel is a western creation, a reintrusion of western imperialism in a new guise, and the Arab refugees in their camps are fully aware that the Israelis, in their first 10 years as a nation, have received $500 million in Government aid from the United States, nearly 3 times as much as all the Arab States combined.

But misery extends far beyond the camps of the refugees, and the Nationalists everywhere aspire to rebuild their backward societies in the modern image of the industrial West. Their nationalism is a radical social movement. Once again, in their eyes, Egypt stands in the vanguard as the country that has a 5-year industrialization plan to make herself a modern nation; and Nasser, the dictator, stands for modernism, for social services, health and education, radical land and tax reform, technology, progress. Nasser has sent his missionaries everywhere. Egyptian teachers, technicians, army officers, civil servants, to Yemen, Saudi Arabia. There is hardly a corner of the Arab world that does not feel the contagion of Egyptian ideas. There are nearly 2,000 Egyptian schoolteachers in Saudi Arabia, where there were no schools at all 10 years ago; and this kindergarten class, with its Egyptian teacher picked by the Egyptian Government, is a thousand miles from Cairo, in the sheikdom of Kuwait, an outpost of Arab feudalism on the Persian Gulf. Arab nationalism is a republican movement—the enemy of kings—and the Egyptian teachers and army instructors are its agents. They are the subverters of the old royal order, with its Bedouin tribal sheiks from the desert paying homage to feudal lords like Jordan's King Hussein. The Arabs remember how the British used and abused the institution of monarchy; how one king from the Arabian Peninsula was given the kingdom of Iraq as a consolation prize after he had been driven out of his own country; and how Hussein's own kingdom, Jordan, was invented and carved out of the desert to accommodate British interests and to console a second prince of the same exiled royal family. In the royal armies equipped by the West and trained in a western pattern, the Arabs see the vestiges of colonial rule. The United States inherited Britain's royal allies, and our stake in the Middle East became tied to them; but it was already too late to review their prestige in Nationalist eyes. The kings of Arabia are hateful to the Nationalists because they also identify with western interests the dead King of Iraq through the Baghdad Pact, the King of Saudi Arabia through his oil ties and his American airbase, the King of Jordan through the British and then the American subsidies without which his state could not survive.

Today, even the absolute monarch of Saudi Arabia, King Saud, the Sheik of Sheiks and Protector of the Holy Places, has lost his moral position. Even in his own country, there is now open and contemptuous criticism of the wastefulness of kings, growing resentment of royal squandering and financial mismanagement, and of the whole expensive royal establishment, with its air-conditioned palaces and Rolls-Royces, its swimming pools and bodyguards, its vast retinue of servants, its lavish hospitality, its round of banquets. In Saudi Arabia which I visited recently the greatest and most costly modern monument is a palace that has the biggest central air-conditioning plant in the world, outside the Pentagon. This is the feudal way of life in modern dress, the modern look supported and magnified by a modern source of income: oil. The money that oil has brought in has changed the life of the Arab countries in this decade. It has created a new industrial working class, and a commercial middle class on the fringes of the new industrial society. It has sharpened the contrasts of the Arab world, the extremes of wealth and poverty. It's on a tide of oil that western commerce, western goods and western social ideals have reached the most backward Arab lands and swept away old customs. The combination of oil wealth and Egyptian radicalism has been overwhelming. The Arab educated in Texas, California, or Cairo as a geologist or oil engineer returns to his country and looks on its backwardness with contempt.

It is no wonder that Nasser is the sworn enemy of the oil monarchs. Nasser is the leader of a have-not country whose population is increasing at the rate of half a million a year. In the field of oil politics, he stands for two things. He is the apostle of the idea that oil is the source of Arab strength. He stands for Arab possession of Arab resources. Secondly, he wants a redistribution of oil revenues so that Egypt gets a share of them. This is the meaning of his war on kings. Now that Iraq has turned nationalist, Nasser has a first wedge in a great oil-producing country; and oil has become the issue on which, sooner, or later, he must try his strength.

For Nasser, the real test of the Iraqi nationalists, the test of any union or federation that he may be able to sell to them will be how much, if any, of Iraq's oil revenues he will be able to get from them.

But Nasser has other targets. For example, the oil of Saudi Arabia, the country where the United States has the greatest direct stake. Republican Nasserism is a popular force even there—in the professional classes, in the civil service and, most crucial of all, in the Saudi Army; and the forces of public opinion generated by Cairo have already shaken the throne of King Saud. The Saudi dynasty is in the crisis and we simply do not know whether the

forces that triumphed in Iraq 2 weeks ago will triumph in Saudi Arabia tomorrow.

The Arabs are a hard people to get along with. They are volatile, proud, suspicious, emotional. They suffer from bitter sense of inferiority.

They are quite willing to sacrifice practical self-interest in order to prove a point. In their eyes, if you are not entirely with them, you're against them. These traits alone make Arab nationalism difficult to work with. What makes it all the harder is that this movement, which has just shocked the West into a new recognition of its power, has become a factor in the struggle of the cold war. And the Arab tide is still rising.

Mr. SCHORR. I am Daniel Schorr, until recently CBS News correspondent in Moscow.

Arab nationalism, as Winston Burdett said, is not pro-Communist. And communism is not pro-nationalist either. But communism today is rising—and prodding—this force because, at this stage, they are traveling in the same direction. Their parallel aim—to drive the West out of the Middle East.

Not all of their aims are parallel. The Kremlin would like to deny Arab oil, which it does not need itself, to Western Europe for the specific purpose of creating economic distress in the West, tightening the cordon of isolation around the United States, the final and greatest prize in the drive for world domination.

Nor will the Soviets, as Nasser knows, be content to accept a strong, independent, non-Communist Arab federation. Its further objectives will be disclosed later. But, for now, the Kremlin soft-pedals Communist ideology. It aids Nasser though he has banned the Communist Party. It concentrates on building tension between Arabs and the West through war scares. It provides military and economic aid, with no visible strings attached, to encourage the Arabs to defy the west and it fans the fires of fanaticism against Israel.

The Soviets seek the role of protector and defender of Arab nationalism; flattering Arab leaders, bringing them to Moscow and promising them disinterested support as they did recently with Nasser.

Said Khrushchev: "Nasser is fighting for independence and our sympathies are on his side." But, elsewhere Khrushchev said, that this is a good time for Marxists, and he said nationalism is the first stey. The first step toward what, he did not say.

But the tactics of the first step are clear—eliminating Western influence in the Arab world, establishing Russia as a major power in that region, opening the way for an unhampered onrush of Nasser nationalism, claiming credit for having accomplished this, making the Arab nationalists dependent on the Soviet Union.

That is act 1, now reaching its climax and if it follows the Soviet script, then Arab nationalism will emerge as a force oriented to Russia, if not to communism. Then will come act 2.

Mr. SMITH. What is American policy toward Arab nationalism? It is one of the ironies of the times that Russia accuses the United States of having imperalist designs on the Arab nations. In fact, American critics of official policy say we have no design at all, and that is what is wrong with us.

America did as much to create Arab nationalism as any great power did.

Our businessmen and engineers went in to dig up oil, helping create much of the wealth that makes the Arab world important.

We were the chief sponsors of the creation of Israel which beat the combined Arab armies, stung Arab national pride and thus started the nationalist revolutions by humiliated officers like Nasser.

But having inadvertently helped launch Arab nationalism, we have failed to deal with it effectively. In fact, until the latest revolution of humiliated officers, that in Iraq 2 weeks ago we do not seem to have recognized it as a new force. Critics say that it is characteristic of our policy—or lack of policy—that we have never made up our official mind how to deal with the leader of Arab nationalism, Nasser. We could never decide whether to be hostile or to be friendly, so we have been each alternately.

We made an offer to help him build his main project, the Nile Dam at Aswan. Then, in a manner the Arabs considered an insult, we publicly withdrew the offer. When in reaction to that he seized the Suez Canal and Britain and France joined an attack on him; we intervened and it was mainly American action that saved Nasser. But having saved him we blocked his dollar accounts and refused to let him buy medicine and food that Egypt needed in the United States.

Arab nationalism is hard to make friendly to a Western nation. It may be impossible to contain or overthrow it, but the point is, critics say, we have not consistently tried either policy.

If our aim has been to win Nasser's friendship, we have failed as he has become increasingly hostile to us. If our aim has been to weaken him, we have failed in that too, for he has moved from strength to strength. And now we are approaching the summit with no visible new idea.

From what has been said up until now the West's three chief interests in the Arab world seem to be first oil, second the future of the Arab quarrel with Israel, to whose continued existence we are morally committed, and third the Arabs' increasingly close relations with Russia in the cold war. What about those features? First, what is the future of western oil interests in the Middle East?

Mr. BURDETT. The future is, that very soon the Arab nationalists are going to demand a radical revision of their oil relations with the West which means their relations with the international oil companies. For example we can expect that the new regime in Iraq will seek to end a situation in which a single foreign company has the sole oil concession for the entire country. The Iraqi nationalists will almost certainly demand that this monopoly be broken up. Next they may ask: Why should they tolerate absentee ownership at all? Why should a board of directors, made up of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans, and sitting in London, have the power to make policy decisions on which Iraq's future depends? And then, the question why? Why should their oil cease to belong to them the moment it is loaded into a tanker and shipped away? Ultimately the Arabs will demand an entirely new pattern of ownership and control that will make them partners in the world's distribution system and give them power in the world's markets. Indeed, some prominently placed Arabs are already demanding this. Of course, oil is of no use to the Arabs unless they can get it to market and today only the international companies, with their marketing system, can do this for them. The men I have talked to in the oil business about this say that the Arabs ought to be reasonable; that they will not want to risk an oil shutdown; and that what they really want, after all, is a larger cut of the oil revenues. After visiting the oil countries, it seems to me that this is only half the story. Of course, the Arabs want more money; but what they mainly want, it seems clear, is not a bigger cut but the pride and prestige of possession, and the political power which they believe that this will give them in the markets and political forums of the world. This is the grand objective of Arab nationalism—the goal which the West must prepare to meet, if we are to achieve our essential aim, with respect to oil, which is simply to keep it flowing to the free world.

Mr. SMITH. And now, Israel. What is the future of the Arab-Israeli dispute? Is any settlement possible to visualize?

Mr. BURDETT. Yes, it's possible to visualize a settlement. It appears now that in the present situation there's one possible source of hope and one great danger. The hope is that if the Arabs are able to unite, and if they are able to form over the years some kind of stable union, then they may gain the strength and confidence that would allow them to negotiate with Israel for a settlement. As much as anything, it has been fear and disunity among the Arabs that has made a settlement politically impossible up to now. The danger is an immediate one. It is that Israel's neighbor, Jordan, may go over to the nationalists in a sudden violent coup. If that should happen, Iraqi troops would probably then march into Jordan, then, Israeli troops would march in from the other side in self-defense, and go as far as the Jordan River, the historic border of Palestine. There would be thousands of new Arab refugees, and chaos in Jordan, and probably a new Arab-Israeli war.

Mr. SMITH. Now, the Arab role in the cold war. An increasing number of spokesmen from all over the world have suggested trying to neutralize the Arab nations, declare them off limits, or out of bounds to both Western and Russian shipments of arms. That, in fact, is the one concrete proposal that has been put forth as the substance of a summit meeting—if the summit meeting happens. There has been a hint that the United States may be willing to consider some limited form of a neutralization to stop arms shipments to some Middle Eastern countries. Is that possible?

Mr. SCORR. It's important to remember that the first proposal for neutralization originally came from Moscow a year-and-half ago, after Suez. Then it was a proposal for a big four conference to agree on banning arms shipments into the Middle East and liquidating all foreign bases, which means Western bases. Today it is a summit conference but the proposal is basically the same. Russian strategy remains the same for a summit conference because from the Soviet's viewpoint, it would crown their campaign to drive the West out of the Middle East. And still neutralization might be worth considering if it also served our aim of reducing tension in that region, and if some way could be found of making it acceptable to Israel. But, while we might be able to pull out of the Arab countries, we cannot—by treaty if for no other reason—withdraw from Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. And it's very dubious that Russia will accept such exemptions. Also in the Middle East, as elsewhere, the attempt to quarantine one arena in the cold war gets embroiled in the issues of the cold war itself. It is hard for us to disengage militarily from an area where the Russians are busy engaging themselves. Until general disarmament or some other wider agreement establishes confidence between East and West, the prospect for Middle Eastern neutralization looks unpromising * * * even if it were desirable.

Mr. SMITH. The summit meeting is still—as an Assistant Secretary of State is quoted today as saying—"all fuzzed up." We do not know for sure whether it's going to take place at all. Or, if it does, where it will take place and exactly what will be talked about, if it does take place.

But unquestionably the main factors that a summit meeting would have to take into consideration are radical Arab nationalism and the Soviet attempt to take it over. A chief significance of the revolution in Iraq 2 weeks ago is it shattered a kind of balance in the Arab world between pro-Western Arab governments and pro-Nasser Arab governments. Nasser and his form of nationalism is now clearly in the ascendancy and

may soon win new converts. Today's news has the item that the feudal ruler of Kuwait, the richest of Arab oil lands, has asked Nasser for more Egyptian school teachers for his schools. Among semiliterate peoples, teachers are the main purveyors of influence. The tide therefore appears rising, faster than before.

A policy for the West to treat with this force is for statesmen to design. But reporters who have watched this question grow for years on the scene in the Middle East and in the great capitals of the world may be allowed to conclude that a consistent policy is now a matter of urgency.

Good evening.

Getting Ready for the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chicagoans are becoming increasingly seaway conscious and this is good. I do not think that the majority of the residents of Chicago really begin to know just what the St. Lawrence seaway operation is going to bring to Chicago.

If our beautiful city continues to be guided by the vision of those men in the Chicago Regional Port District and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and takes the steps to be prepared, I have no doubt that Chicago will catch up with New York.

As a Member of Congress and a member of the House Public Works Committee, I intend to avail myself of every opportunity to get the seaway story across to the people in my district. The development of the seaway reads like an adventure story and in reality, it is another instance of man's using his God-given mind to harness the resources of nature for the greater development of United States, Canada, and the rest of the world.

I am proud to be a product of Chicago and I have yet to find another city with the vibrancy felt in Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune expressed itself in a fine way on this subject last week:

GETTING READY FOR THE SEAWAY

Our Canadian correspondent, Eugene Griffin, has visited Toronto and Buffalo in order to find out what those ports are doing to get ready for the St. Lawrence seaway.

He found them well aware of what the seaway will mean to them in the way of increased shipping, and more active than most other lake ports; but their biggest plans are still in the dream-and-talk stage. Toronto, which is Canada's biggest lake port and handles about 5 million tons of cargo a year, has built two million-dollar terminals, is building a third, and plans a fourth. Still in the talking stage is a $60 million project for converting the west end of Lake Ontario into a vast harbor over a 30-year period. Toronto, being nearer midwestern markets than Montreal, hopes to make quite a dent in the latter's overseas shipping business.

Toronto has done more than Buffalo, though Buffalo handles five times as much shipping. Buffalo set up a port authority 2 years ago, established it on a 3-mile stretch of lakefront, and endowed it with the income from city parking meters and from part of the Peace Bridge tolls. But work has only reached the dredging stage.

The significant thing about both cities, especially Toronto, is an awareness that the expansion of harbor facilities cannot wait until the ships come in sight, or even until the increased business is assured. If they don't have their facilities ready in advance, they reason, the business will go to some other lake port.

Fortunately, Chicago has been guided by this reasoning for some time. The Chicago Regional Port District was established 4 years ago and has spent $24 million on grain elevators, warehouses, docks, and rail spurs. It is already operating at a profit, and is out to borrow another $25 million for more docks and other facilities.

The port district has jurisdiction only between the Indiana line and 87th Street. Farther north, the city has committed $4 million for the improvement of berthing facilities in the Navy pier area.

Arrangements in the Chicago area are not perfect. For one thing, jurisdiction is split three ways geographically, between the city, the port district, which is under the joint control of the Governor and mayor, and the Indiana communities.

But Chicago's lead in planning and construction will pay off when the ships come in. The whole area already handles about 75 million tons of cargo in a good business year, and is the world's second largest port. Whether we catch up with New York, as some people predict, remains to be seen. In any case we'll be ready for whatever business we can lure our way in the next few years and for this we can be grateful to those who foresaw years ago what the seaway will mean to us.

The Jews In Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to insert in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Philip Slomovitz, editor and publisher of the Jewish News, which is located in my district.

THE JEWS IN ALASKA

(By Philip Slomovitz)

A new field for Jewish social research has opened with the admission of the Territory of Alaska as the 49th State in our Nation.

While it is known that Jews have lived in Alaska for more than a hundred years, very little is known about their continuous functions as a community, or about their organizational life as a religious entity.

It has definitely been established in several earlier studies that individual Jews have explored Alaska; that they have participated in the numerous gold rushes; that there were Jewish traders there. But until very recently there were no Jewish roots in Alaska.

Alaska was discovered by the two Russians, Bering and Chirikov, in 1741, and was then declared a Russian possession. The Russian-American Fur Co., formed in 1799, encouraged trade between the newly discovered territory and the United States. Alaska was sold to the United States for $7,200,000—2 cents an acre—in 1867. A dispute over the Alaskan-Canadian borders was adjusted in 1903.

These dates may be very vital to Jewish historians and demographers in their search for data about Jewish experiences in Alaska. In the 125 years of Russian control of the territory, there had begun fur trading and fishing. Jews are believed to have shared in both activities. While government restrictions and discriminations may have curtailed their participation in fishing, fur trading certainly is believed to have attracted Jewish skill.

It is not to be inferred from this, however, that the Jews who were active in trading in Russian-held Alaska were Russian Jews. In all probability, they were mainly from neighboring Canada, with a sprinkling of American Jews.

When the United States acquired Alaska, Jewish interest in the Territory increased, and adventurous Jews came there by way of the States of Washington and California. The major links for several decades were with California, many Jews from the Golden State having established businesses in the chief Alaskan centers—Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Ketchikan. But there was an equal interest among Jews in the State of Washington, sailings by boat from this country to Alaska having been arranged for many years, during the latter part of the last century; and the early part of the present, by way of Seattle.

Thus, with Seattle as the final point of embarkation from this country to Alaska in the eighties and nineties, the Klondike and Yukon gold rushes were attractions for Jews as they were for non-Jews. In a sense, this new attraction to the Northeast also was responsible for Jewish migration movements to the State of Washington.

A typical example of the settlers in Alaska, in the late nineties was a former Detroiter, Herbert Robinson Greenberg, who died last year at the age of 99. Greenberg left Detroit for California in 1896. From there he went by boat to Seattle, and from Seattle he went to Alaska on a summer boat. It took him 9 months to make the trip to Alaska. Today, by air, traveling time to Alaska from San Francisco is 5 hours.

Greenberg joined the Klondike gold rush and staked three successful gold-producing mines. He was in the habit, on his visits to his great-grand-nephews in Detroit, to present them with gold nuggets, and he was called Uncle Nugget. One of his mines became known as Bessie Mine and was the subject of a feature article in Time magazine 20 years ago.

Herbert Greenberg lived in Alaska from 1897 to 1954. He built the first Alaskan radio station and it was later taken over by the United States Army. His children now live in California—a typical result of Jewish wanderings away from small communities where there is danger of intermarriage because of the limited number of Jewish residents and the limitations in Jewish religious and cultural activities.

The three major Jewish personalities whose names are associated with Alaska are Ernest Gruening, the former Governor of Alaska and now its Senator-elect; and the two California pioneers, Lewis Gerstle and Louis Sloss.

Gerstle, who was born in Bavaria, December 17, 1824, worked his way on a boat to the United States in 1847, became a peddler in Louisville, Ky., was attracted to California during the gold rush days of 1848, and traveled by way of New Orleans through Panama to the Golden State. He opened a fruit stand, labored in the gold mines, later went into the wholesale grocery business in Sacramento, then moved to San Francisco and became a mining stockbroker.

When Alaska was purchased by the United States in 1867, he joined two other firms in acquiring the Russian-American Alaska Co., and acquired seal fishing rights. He also established a steamship line between San Francisco and Alaska. Gerstle was active in California Jewish affairs—congregational and philanthropic—and served as treasurer of the

University of California. He died November 19, 1902.

Louis Sloss, who also was born in Bavaria, was several months older than Gerstle, having been born July 13, 1824. Upon his arrival in the United States in 1845, he, too, became a peddler, in Mocksville, Ky., and later also went to California where he met Gerstle and both became partners, their business association lasting for 50 years. He was active in philanthropies and was treasurer of the University of California for 17 years. He died June 4, 1903.

Gerstle and Sloss were married to two sisters, Hannah and Sarah Greenbaum.

The career of Gruening is now a matter of record. It was due mainly to his valiant and untiring efforts that the campaign for Alaskan statehood materialized. Ernest Gruening, like his father, Dr. Emil Gruening, earned a medical degree from Harvard College. But, upon receiving his doctor of medicine degree in 1912, he turned instead to journalism and held numerous important editorial posts in Boston, Mass., and Portland, Maine. He served as editor of the New York Tribune and the Nation. Then he was given major Federal appointments.

As Governor of Alaska, Gruening formed the first Alaska National Guard in 1940, and during the last war was the organizer and commander of the Alaskan Territorial Guard. He was a member of the commission that supervised the construction of the great highway connecting Alaska to the United States.

A great interest was taken in Alaskan possibilities as an immigration center for Jewish refugees by Miss Ruth Gruber (now Mrs. Philip Michaels, of New York), the well-known writer, traveler, and lecturer.

Miss Gruber, as a member of the staff of the late Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes, in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, did most of the research for her Department in Alaska. She prepared voluminous reports on the Territory and she envisioned Alaska as a place of settlement for many thousands of Jews who were compelled to escape from naziism. But her idea never materialized.

Only about 35 years ago, a Jewish merchant was one of the leading citizens of the Alaskan city of Juneau. Isadore Goldstein was a popular merchant there and was highly honored for his honesty and integrity. He was elected mayor of Juneau six times.

His parents, Robert and Anna Goldstein, came from California and established a mercantile business in Juneau. Their son, Isadore, acquired that business. Isadore was married to Miss Carol Kahn, of San Francisco. He enlisted in the United States Army in World War II and temporarily left "Uncle Sam's Attic" to serve overseas. But his family still continues the Juneau mercantile business and may be known for a long time among the great pioneering families in Alaska.

Among the early American Jews who came to Alaska was the fur-trading merchant, Jack Goldstone, who was believed to have inspired the purchase of Alaska by the United States.

There are no known figures of the number of Jews in Alaska. It is believed that there are less than a thousand Jews there. There is no organized Jewish community, but with the formation of servicemen's groups there, the Jewish Welfare Board established its services and organized congregations for the men in uniform as well as for the residents in the major cities.

The Jewish Welfare Board chaplain who is in charge of the Alaska Jewish servicemen is Rabbi Joshua B. Wachtfogel, who is attached to the Alaskan Air Command in Seattle, Wash.

The Jewish Welfare Board service committee chairmen for the Alaskan Territory are: Burton H. Goldberg, Anchorage; Robert Sachs, Fairbanks; Charles Goldstein, Juneau.

The Governor of Alaska, Mike Stepovich, upon his visit in New York after Alaska was admitted to the Union, spoke of the 49th State as the new frontier of the United States. As such it is beginning to attract the adventurous and men of vision. We can well look to the near future, when organized Jewish communities will be among the major pioneering groups in the advancement of the new United States State.

A Letter From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a young friend who is currently traveling in Europe. He has an intelligent and perceptive approach to a number of problems which have compelled public attention. I am sure that his unofficial view of London, the Brussels Fair, and Germany will be of interest.

LONDON, *July 1958.*

I arrived in London just in time for the Middle East crisis amidst a chorus of "I told you so; we were right all the time; you should have supported us in Egypt or, at least, waited another week before you stopped us." Nevertheless, a great deal of criticisms could be discerned among thoughtful persons, particularly since the United States justification for the Lebanon intervention was accompanied by a particular weak set of reasons, at least, as reprinted in the English press. I had lunch with Cristopher Audland, who, after 4 years in Washington as the British Embassy's congressional outpost, is handling Somaliland and Ethiopia in the Foreign Office's African desk. This actually makes some sense, as the American desk is one of the least important desks, as there are so many United States-British contacts on all levels in the Government that United States-British policy is often made outside of the Foreign Office. Cristopher sits with five other "country" men in a large, austere, Victorian, bare room in Whitehall, directly across the street from 10 Downing Street. He has a little balcony, from which I saw Prime Minister Macmillan greeting at the door what seemed to be a group of Saudi Arabian sheiks. His hours are from 10 to 6:30, 5 days a week, which is standard in all Government offices. No one seemed to mind the cheerless looks of the office surroundings and during my 20 minutes in the office the telephone rang only once. The younger people, like Cristopher, were critical of the armed-intervention policy—a policy that placed just enough troops to let Khrushchev made hay with the neutrals and not enough to materially affect the balance of power between the Communists and the West.

London is jammed with people, many tourists from Commonwealth countries. The traffic system is impossible, and some one-way streets and parking restrictions are beginning, with more stringent measures lacking, to be introduced. Also, parking meters are being set up, although a taxpayer has filed suit claiming this is an infringement of civil liberties and the Magna Carta. Typically British, with their superregulated life, they have three violation zones on the meters; the final zone (a violation of more than 3 hours) calls for automatic arrest warrant issued, whereas the others call for fines.

Inflation is rampant in London. Over the last 2 years the price level has gone up another 15 percent. Wages have not kept pace, and there is much grumbling. The lack of a capital-gains tax has created a new class of millionaires, mostly real-estate operators and other less-dignified gamblers.

There is some movement in the direction of modernization, particularly in their administrative techniques. Progress is also being made in local government but rigid limitations remain on the ability of localities to borrow money, and finance long-term projects.

Among the upper classes a great deal of anti-Americanism remains but among the lower classes one discerns little. The word Dulles has become a symbol of all that is wrong in America. Less talk is heard about Little Rock, since there is an increasing amount of prejudice color bar in Britain. Dance halls are discriminating and so are most employers. At London University only 5 percent of the colored students were able to secure part-time employment whereas for white almost all that applied got some.

The National Health Service is working better although most doctors are still very bitter. One difficulty is, mostly in London, that many doctors that can make their living in treating patients for cash fees have not joined and in the West End this means almost every better doctor has not joined. And as I found out when I wanted to get a boil lanced, all foreigners are expected to pay, even though they have the legal right to be treated free. When this right is mentioned, you will get an appointment, but only in 3 months time.

The climate in London in the summer is cool and the countryside is lovely. A great country, even if they do drive on the wrong side of the street.

THE BRUSSELS WORLD'S FAIR

The Belgians have done a wonderful organizational and planning job in presenting a remarkable fair to the world. As one who can still remember the 1939 World's Fair (but not the 1936 Chicago one, as I have been accused) I must admit that the Belgian Fair, located in beautiful natural surroundings, tops it. Only the nighttime commercialized carnival atmosphere with its myriad of rides, hot dog and ice cream stands leaves something to be desired. (At night the pavilions are closed and everything is concentrated in the "Coney Island" section.) I spent a great deal of time in the United States, Russian, British, German, and other pavilions. There is no question that the American pavilion is more popular than the Russian. The general idea of the United States pavilion, namely to show the way the United States lives is a much more effective presentation than the ponderous Soviet machinery and other industrial development. The United States pavilion is an architectural marvel and is distinctly superior to the large and more costly Soviet building. On the other hand the United States pavilion could, at little cost, be much improved. Its worst drawbacks are due to unimaginative management.

The United States pavilion is weakest in its public relations aspects. It has almost no literature to offer, is the only pavilion that does not sell souvenirs or native products and has one of the worst restaurants. The concession was given the New York Brass Rail restaurant chain which offers poor service, greasy food, at very high prices. A ham sandwich is a dollar, a hamburger 45 cents, an ice cream soda is 50 cents. These are typical prices on which the Brass Rail Co. must do very well. The Soviets offer a great deal of free literature (even if

rather poorly done, see enclosed); we offer a 20-cent pamphlet. It would be relatively easy to give away, as the United Arab Republic does very effectively, cheap picture postcards of major American sights. And why not let Stuckeys or some other souvenir chain open a stand there?

We have an excellent thing in having 200 cheerful, dedicated college girls on duty. But why dress them in the worst looking sack dress uniforms possible with most of them, since it is cold, wearing ill-fitting yellow raincoats. They should have either good uniforms or wear their own clothes with an armband.

On the day I was there, the exhibit, Unfinished Business, was roped off without explanation, which made a poor impression. (This is on Negro problems.) It was explained to me afterwards that a guide would only take groups through so that wrong ideas could be explained, and on that day the guide was sick.

Finally there is insufficient material concerning democracy. The Swiss on the other hand have a very effective exhibit concerning their form of government. There is no reason why a copy of the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, etc. could not be posted.

To sum up there is nothing wrong with the United States exhibit that better and more imaginative management could not cure. The famous caption on the 1840 chair that "it is typical of most chairs used in United States schools today" still had not been changed. When I went to the office to suggest a change in this, a Belgian, who was the top man on duty at the time, told me smugly that I should write my Senator as they thought they had a pretty good exhibit and only a Senator could make them consider changes. It is this attitude that keeps the United States pavilion from being as outstanding inside as it is from the outside.

Of the Communist bloc pavilions, the Czechoslovaks presented the most effective show. In general smaller countries did a more effective job as they have less of a problem in selection—but the larger countries had theaters where in the evening they could present cultural events. It is here that the United States was particularly effective and United States shows were always sold out. The Germans had a fine building architecturally but very pedantic and hard to understand exhibits. The British had poor architecture but interesting exhibits using a lot of movies. The French had a huge, very cluttered up exhibit hall, but their restaurant was excellent.

On the whole, the fair, expensive, is well worth a visit. The Belgians publicly say they are losing money on it, having expected 50 million and getting only 35 million visitors, but the Brussels hotels and stores sure are doing well.

FIRST GERMAN IMPRESSIONS

The great phenomenon of present-day Germany is the apathy of the average German citizen and his nonparticipation in political life. This is, of course, exacerbated by the CDU which, like the Republicans in the United States of American, places the popularity of its leading figure coupled with 1 or 2 simple issues, usually in foreign policy, into election campaigns. It has made little attempt to imbue into the public any systematic theory of politics. The tragic feature of SPD is that it has played along in this game of the primacy of foreign policy. In fact the last election was little more than a referendum on the question whether or not the West German Army should use atomic bombs. Adenauer skillfully characterized the SPD as pro-Russian and skillfully won the election, even though most Germans look upon atom bombs with some degree of fear and uneasiness. But they are much more afraid of the Soviet Union. Almost every German is anti-Russian having experienced personally communism in one fashion or another and a more sophisticated political approach particularly to domestic politics is lacking. One result of the political apathy has been the gradual destruction of the small parties as the West German increasingly votes for 1 of the 2 major parties.

Furthermore the institution of federalism, despite universal grumbling has contributed a larger number of dedicated public servants and has given the SPD the opportunity to govern, and govern responsibly, on the land level. It is a great pity that the SPD cannot realize that it must get out of the 30 percent category into the 51 percent. Thirty percent would have been wonderful in the Weimar Republic, but today control rests with those who have the power in the head of state (hence majority of legislature) which requires in the Bonn Republic a 51 percent majority. Indeed, as the title of a recent book says, Bonn is not Weimar. In addition the judiciary has effectively asserted its independence—just recently it declared a pet CDU law exempting contributions to political parties from all taxes as unconstitutional. Democracy is making progress in Germany partly as a result of the increasing prosperity, partly of the intercourse with other democratic countries, and most importantly because of the gradual changes in the social structure brought on by common developments in Western Europe. Many of the problems here, social inequality, bureaucratization, urban-rural problems, are common to all Western countries. What is still a peculiarly German problem is the inadequate understanding of its own history and an honest appraisal of the forces that led to the rise of fascism and communism, together with a greatly underdeveloped sense of social responsibility on the personal, group, and particularly community level. The standard of living here is still lower than in Great Britain or France, but like in the United States, a great deal goes into automobiles, travel, and entertainment. This is a hasty first letter and I hope to write something better in a week or two. Best wishes to all.

CHARLES R. FOSTER.

Uncle Dan From Doolie on Inflation and Saturday Work for Congressmen

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, those of us who accept as true the proverb that "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine," are certainly indebted to Thomas M. McKnight, publisher of the Mooresville, (N. C.) Tribune for the articles he writes under the pen name "Uncle Dan From Doolie."

I feel certain that Members of the Senate and House can lighten their heavy burdens a little if they will read "Uncle Dan's" comments on inflation and Saturday work for Congressmen, which were published in the Mooresville Tribune on July 31, and Augus 7, 1958.

In order that those comments may be made available to them, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mooresville (N. C.) Tribune of July 31, 1958]

UNCLE DAN FROM DOOLIE SAYS

DEAR MR. EDITOR: There's rumors going around about some Congressmen working on Saturday's so's they could hurry and git through. Of course, I'm using the term "working" in its lighter sense here.

Now, Mr. Editor, I don't git alarmed as a rule over things that happens more'n a few miles from my house, because by the time a man keeps his own place from gittin into the hands of the banker or the Sheriff and figgers out enough answers to his old lady's questions and gits used to having his taxes reduced by the politicians in ever campaign and raised after ever election, he ain't got much time left to git alarmed about things taking place very far from home.

But I think this thing of Congressmen working on Saturday is heading us fer complete ruin. It has took me years and years to convince my old lady that working on Saturdays is unthinkable and un-American. When we was first married and I wanted to go to town on Saturday I had to claim I was going to the courthouse to git some farm papers signed, or the cultivator needed a new point. I recall that onct I even forged a jury summons to git to town on Saturday. But a couple wars come along and us men folks got bolder and finally got it down to where if we want to go to town on Saturday we just put on our other shirt and tell the old lady we'll be back in time fer church Sunday morning.

Now, if Congress, a outfit I figgered we could depend on to stand back of things, a sort of last refuge agin change and un-American ideas, is going to start working on Saturdays, then things is gitting in bad shape back here at home.

We got three kinds of Congressmen in Washington, the good ones, the bad ones, and those that is too lazy to show a marked trend in either direction. Up to now the good ones and the bad ones has been wrassling it out to a tie. If them lazy ones pitch in and start working on Saturdays, things is going to the dogs fer certain. A heap of folks might say that it ain't going to hurt nothing if them Congressmen do a little work onct in a while on Saturday. If you give some fellers a inch they'll take a foot, but you give a Congressman a inch and he'll take the shirt off'n your back and pass a law putting you in jail fer going naked.

I would appreciate it no end, Mr. Editor, if you'd write our Congressman and nip this Saturday business in the bud.

Yours truly,

UNCLE DAN.

[From the Mooresville (N. C.) Tribune of August 7, 1958]

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I doubt if you city folks has noticed it, but you don't see many scarecrows in the fields this year. The price of clothes is so high that a farmer can't afford to dress up a scarecrow anymore. If he's got clothes good enough to scare a crow away, he's probably wearing 'em to church on Sunday. When you git right down to brass tacks they ain't much difference between depression and inflation. Back during the big depression money was so tight that there wasn't none to speak of, and now it's so cheap that a farmer can't afford to dress up a scarecrow. Ed Doolittle says it's cheaper fer him to move his son-in-law and his rocking chair from the porch to the cherry tree than to rig up a scarecrow to keep the birds away.

One thing inflation has done to the country, inflation plus all these taxes that causes a feller to figger his take-home pay. It's taught folks to figger that couldnt' count up to 50 afore it started. One feller up at the country store said he used to set and dream what he'd do if he had a million dollars. Now he says he dreams what he'd do if he had $2,000,000.21. The extra million, he says, is for taxes and the 21 cents is fer them parking meters they got in town.

One thing I don't understand about this inflation. They say the banks is so full of money the clerks has to watch where they're walking and that they won't stoop over to pick up nothing unless it's a five spot or better. But when I go in to borrow $200 I sneak up to the window and git permission to go into the sweat box with the cashier. And I set there a hour twisting my hat into a wad and gitting all nervous while they take my pulse, my mortgage, and my shirt. And even then I ain't shore I'll git the money until they check the title and investigate around the country to see if I ever had any horse thieves in the family or has been black-balled in the Masons.

Well, I see by the papers where they got a factory in Georgia that is making wimmen's girdles out of peanuts. They say the protein that gives a peanut food value makes fine girdles. It makes a feller sorter sad to think about what science is doing to this world. It used to be a feller could pull up a handful of peanuts and set on a stump and enjoy hisself without worrying. Now evertime he eats a peanut he'll be wondering if he ain't depriving some pore working girl out of a two-way stretch.

Yours truly,

UNCLE DAN.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 9, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 9, 1958.

Adjournment of Congress like a mirage, recedes as it is approached. No telling now when it will be, although most important legislation has been considered. Many ruefully agree that the sooner Congress adjourns the better for the Nation's good.

The debt limit increase resolution to increase the permanent debt limit from $275 million to $285 million and a temporary increase to $288 million passed handily 286–108 (ALGER for). First, it was obvious to most that after the goods are bought they must be paid for. Even those who opposed many of the spending programs, as have I, are bound by the majority vote that promises later Federal payment. The only way to cut spending is to vote against specific programs. There is no other way. Second, debt limit is a misnomer. It is debt management we are talking about, that is, what form, for how long, etc. that Federal indebtedness will take, and the Treasury Secretary must be given latitude to arrange the best terms for Government securities or it will cost taxpayers even more in taxes. The pity is, there is no limit on Government spending or borrowing, until and unless we have a forced balanced budget. The yearly forced balanced budget has been and shall continue to be a continuing legislative interest of mine. Only in this way will the people be safe from inflation from Government overspending and be assured of sound fiscal Government. Thus far, neither the pressure groups, the Congress, nor the administration has exercised the necessary self-discipline in spending. The contingent liabilities of the Federal Government not covered by the debt limit now total approximately $283 billion.

The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act provides for registration, reporting, and disclosure of all such plans. Eighty to eighty-five million people rely on a million or more pension and welfare plans involving $30 billion now invested. The idea of this bill was to provide regular accounting of the financial operations and assets of these plans through the Federal Government, mainly a result of many labor union misappropriations and mismanagements of such funds. The great debate took place over the requirement of all business firms reporting their plans in detail. Proponents claimed that all business firms, just like unions, should give detailed accounting. The opponents pointed out (1) that the detailed and burdensome paperwork would be prohibitively expensive (over 5 million documents immediately required by Government); (2) that employees can be adequately protected by a full accounting without the Federal forms; (3) that such Government regulation will cause many pension and welfare plans to be stopped; (4) that labor unions should obtain their demands through collective bargaining, not through legislation. The Bosch amendment to exempt those businesses with level-of-benefits plans (fixed benefits to employees, but variable cost to employers) was defeated and the bill passed. How ironic that a bill to prevent misuse of members' money by some labor bosses should be used to hamstring business pension and welfare plans, to the detriment of employees. That's how big labor controls congressional legislation.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, this year's Federal aid to education passed much to my sorrow although watered down by amendments. The bill provides $1,070,000,000 over 7 years for (1) scholarships, (2) loans, (3) grants to States, (4) language teaching, (5) graduate education, (6) counseling programs, (7) research, (8) statistical. Like the dew it covers everything. The debate produced astounding statements. That Congress would even debate such a bill I found hard to believe. But I saw it and heard it. My objection included: (1) The language barrier, using generalities—"defense," "temporary," "emergency," "national interest," to justify Federal aid, without factual justification. (Has Federal Government a greater interest in students' education than parents?) (2) Fear of Russia is motivating us, not appreciation of American strength in free institutions of education. We must not emulate Russia, to beat them. Russia has Government control of education. (3) Federal control will follow Federal aid, with local control losing out every step of the way. (4) Responsible students and parents are not developed, but destroyed, by Federal handouts. (5) Thousands of private scholarships will dry up. My contribution included: "We are in a deficit position $12 to $15 billion or more this year. We will meet this deficit by a large tax increase or by inflation with printing press money, cheapening our currency. We have a debt of $250 billion and contingent liabilities of $283 billion. By what right do we offer grants and loans under this heavy Federal debt? Is it fair for the heavy laden taxpayer to pay taxes, these to be distributed as scholarships? Maybe the taxpayer prefers shoes for a son or daughter. Maybe he would prefer the student to hustle and earn his way, even as he, the taxpayer, is working to provide the needs for his family. Should he or the Government do the providing? If the taxpayers' money is taken in taxes he will need Federal aid to support and educate his family. So what is the best way to do it—by leaving the fruits of labor, the earnings in the earners' hands or by Government taking it in taxes to redistribute, to return enough to support him and his family? It is a simple choice—simply explained—with a frighteningly simple conclusion if our choice is wrong. We will all be wards of the Government, not just the students, or those destitute taxpayers who are bankrupted first."

Hold That Camel!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Zanesville Times Recorder, one of the fine daily papers serving central Ohio.

In the space of a few well-written paragraphs, this editorial points out in no uncertain terms the dangers embodied in S. 1869, the so-called bond revenue TVA finance bill which now rests in the House Rules Committee.

If this legislation is allowed to pass, a Government agency will for the first time in the history of this country be able to completely bypass the Congress, and the taxpayers—who have been literally forced to pour billions of dollars into the TVA empire—will be left holding a very shaky second mortgage.

I am pleased to note that many, many thinking people throughout the country are becoming increasing aware of how bad this particular legislation really is, and are beginning to speak out strongly against it. I hope that their words are not lost to us in these closing days of the session, and I commend this editorial to every Member of Congress, regardless of his political affiliation:

HOLD THAT CAMEL

TVA, the socialistic camel that got its nose in the free enterprise tent awhile back, is doing some more shoving. Senate bill 1869, passed by that body last year, and recently approved by the House Public Works Committee, proposes to expand the service area of this tax-built, tax-consuming (but not tax producing) power octopus by 25,000 square miles—so that it might logically be called the "Mississippi Valley Authority." Further, and perhaps more devastatingly, it propdses for the first time in the sad history of Government-operated businesses to sell bonds ($750 million worth) to the investing public and incidentally bypass congressional control.

With the passage of this bill, Uncle Sam would be giving the taxpayers the back of his hand, since it would wipe out the present requirement that TVA repay to the Treasury in 40 years the $1.2 billion of tax money now owed. Repayment would only be made after the bondholders claims are paid, and

TVA could use its power revenues (which should go to the Treasury) to build still more producing capacity without congressional approval.

It does not take much imagination to see this camel (which we might as well start calling the Mississippi Power Authority) kicking the whole private tax-paying electric power industry out of the tent. With the continuance of such unbridled expansion there can be no other outcome. And yet, that is but the beginning of the end. With electric power generation completely in Federal hands, the "nationalization" (a nice word for seizure) of all industry and all business would logically follow. The planners doubtless have the details worked out now—a progression of control so gradual we would never be quite sure at what point, or on what day, we finally became slaves.

Congress, to save its own waning prestige and to check the erosion of its powers by the williwaws from the White House and the snows from the Supreme Court, should arise in whatever might it still possesses and reject legislation degrading to that body. But the Senate has already passed this bill. And unless there are cries of outrage from home, the House, stricken with adjournment fever, will pass it—and quickly.

But Americans who cherish any hopes for capitalism, to say nothing of ever getting the Government out of business, must not let this happen.

Soviet Tests Raise Fallout More Than United States Blasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a recent Associated Press dispatch from Moscow, dated August 1, reporting that Soviet nuclear tests have caused larger temporary increases in radioactive fallout to Japan than United States tests. These were the conclusions of Japanese scientists who reported on the results of a study to a conference of the International Geophysical Year in Moscow.

In view of the misleading and vicious propaganda leveled at the United States in recent months by the Soviet Union regarding United States weapons tests in the Pacific, I think it is important for us to keep the record straight. In the words of Dr. Y. Kawabata, chief of the observation division of the Japanese Weather Bureau, the latest increase, "seems to be due to frequent tests in Siberia or the Arctic." I think the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times of August 2, 1958]

JAPANESE SCIENTIST REPORTS SOVIET TESTS RAISE FALLOUT MORE THAN UNITED STATES BLASTS

Moscow, August 1.—A Soviet nuclear test brought larger temporary increases in radioactive fallout to Japan than a United States experiment, a Japanese scientist reported today.

The reason is that a radioactive cloud has less distance to travel to Japan from Soviet test sites and so is hotter on arrival, the International Geophysical Year Conference in Moscow was told.

Dr. Y. Kawabata, chief of the observation division of the Japanese Weather Bureau, said that the level of fallout intensity had been steadily increasing since the study started in April 1955. He said that the latest increase "seems to be due to frequent tests in Siberia or the Arctic."

The Soviet Union said March 31 that it was suspending tests.

Measurement of nuclear fallout over large parts of the world is one activity of I. G. Y., a study of the earth and its environment. Dr. Kawabata is a member of the I. G. Y. discussion group on fallout here.

TIMETABLE GIVEN

Dr. Kawabata gave this timetable for the arrival of fallout in Japan:

From Bikini or Eniwetok, 1 to 2 weeks, from the Nevada area, 2 to 4 weeks; from Siberia and the Arctic area, 3 days to 1 week.

Dusts produced in Siberia or in the Arctic reached Japan more directly than those from Eniwetok, which move with the tropical winds, then turn near the Philippines toward Japan, Dr. Kawabata said. Dr. Kawabata explained that fallout was measured with every rainfall since April 1955. Measurements show peaks corresponding to nuclear explosion tests.

The scientist said that the intensity of fallout radiation seemed to be rising and this "suggests a dirtiness of atmosphere which is gradually increasing in respect to artificial radioactivity."

"The level of dust radioactivity is steadily increasing and the latest value is at least 10 times what it has been," he added. "This seems due to frequent tests in Siberia or in the Arctic."

Hon. William S. Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, as friend and colleague, I add my heartfelt tribute to the many that are being paid the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado.

One of the finest dividends that life in Washington has paid me and Mrs. Harvey is the privilege of knowing Bill and Rachel Hill. Finer friends we will never know.

Congressman BILL HILL will be leaving us at the end of this session, but memories of him will surely remain vivid in many hearts for years to come. BILL HILL to me is that enviable type of high character and arresting personality—easy to know, like and admire, and hard to forget for the very human touch that is his in all his endeavors.

I stand with those, too, who say this man has left his mark. Some of BILL HILL's commonsense has rubbed off on more than one piece of legislation that came his way, and in consequence that legislation is wearing well in its service to farmers, to small-business men, to the whole American citizenry.

On this occasion words are inadequate. It can but be hoped that BILL HILL and his wife realize in some small way the void they leave behind for many of us as they go back to their beloved Colorado. With them go our prayers for the happiness they deserve.

Fifth Anniversary of the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD information concerning the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, which union will soon observe its fifth anniversary.

A Congressman made a suggestion to a friend back in 1953 that has resulted in doing much good and providing financial help for many Capitol Hill persons. As a result of that suggestion, assistance has been made available to House employees suddenly stricken by misfortune, disaster, tragedy, and by many other acute and often desperate situations requiring quick financial aid. His suggestion resulted in the organizing of the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union.

This credit union, which will soon observe its fifth anniversary, has proven both helpful and profitable to the employees of our offices and others employed by the House of Representatives. For instance, many an employee faced with the sudden need to return to his member's district on urgent business, and being short of funds, has found quick assistance at the credit union office. This is but 1 of the 50 or more uses to which the more than 2,100 loans, made by our credit union, amounting to over $450,000, have been put.

Our credit union began its operations in August of 1953 with about $150 on deposit put there by the charter members. It now has assets of over $130,000. Deposits owned by 819 persons employed on the Hill, on July 1, amounted to $128,064.39. It has current 416 loans amounting to $96,952.05. It has, including July increases, $37,295.26 in outside Government-approved investments. Our credit union has consistently paid 4 percent dividends since its first year, when it paid only 3 percent. Our credit union has exceeded the reserve bad loans requirements of the Government and in addition started 1958 with undivided profits of $1,461.26. Each passing month has seen an increaes in its growth, deposits having increased from $6,625.29 on January 1, 1954, to more than $130,000 as of July 21, 1958; its members from 158 to 819 during the same period. During 1953 it loaned during its part-year of operation $4,328.82. During 1957 it loaned $183,882.85 to the employees of the House. Its average deposit increased

from $41.33 in 1954 to $156.36 in July 1958 and for 1958 its growth is running well ahead of 1957.

Our credit union, as one of its benefits to its members, pays for insurance on its members, based on each member's age and deposit. For instance, a credit union member not over 55 years old who has $1,000 on deposit, automatically has an equal amount of insurance payable in event of death or total and permanent disability. It he has only 1 share or $5 on deposit, he has $5 insurance paid by the credit union. Our credit union loans are also insured by the credit union and any borower who dies or becomes totally and permanently disabled, has his loan balance paid by the insurance company.

The operating personnel of our credit union is: president, Miss Arista Huber—Congressman Jenkins of Ohio; vice president, L. K. Alderman, Jr.—Congresman Barden of North Carolina; secretary, Miss Pauline Graves—House Agriculture Committee; treasurer and former president, Ralph A. Patterson—Congressman Wainwright of New York. The 7 directors, in addition to the 4 officers are: John T. Calkins—Congressman Robison of New York; William H. Hackett—Congressman Cederberg of Michigan; and W. H. Palmer—House Property Custodian's Office. Robert B. Vail is the assistant treasurer and manager. Among others who are contributing valuable assistance in the operation of the credit union are Henry C. Oglesby, Helen Goldsmith, Frank Crowley, Virginia Morris, Barbara Burke, Mary Bowman, Clara Herman, Marie Ridgeway, Joan LeFevre, Lud Andolsek, Eugene Krizek, William F. Vail, and others.

I am sure the development of our Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, which Members of Congress are eligible and cordially invited to join, will be of interest to us all.

A copy of its July financial and statistical report may be had by phoning the credit union in the House Folding Room, extension 2215.

Pentagon in Contractual Whirl Over Space Weapon Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article, Pentagon in Contractual Whirl Over Space Weapon Management, which appeared in the August issue of Aeronautical Procurement magazine.

The author, Allen M. Smythe, a financial writer, has written a number of business articles pertaining to national defense in financial, trade, and military journals:

PENTAGON IN CONTRACTUAL WHIRL OVER SPACE WEAPON MANAGEMENT

(By Allen M. Smythe)

With our weapons systems increasing in complexity, size, and lethality as we enter the space age, the Pentagon realizes that management and contractual policies for producing these new weapons will have to be adjusted. Relationships of the prime contractor and his major component subcontractors are being reexamined.

Airframe manufacturers, disturbed by official warnings that prime contracts for guided missiles and spaceships may be shifted to electronic and rocket propulsion firms, have been urging the armed services to adopt some form of team contractors. The Navy already has established a group management for the Polaris program. The Air Force is introducing a plan with the initial awarding of the first phase of development contracts to two teams of contractors.

The Atlas system concept is one whose workability can be debated. Convair, listed as the prime contractor, will build the airframe and be responsible for testing. Associate contractors will produce the propulsion engines, guidance system, nose cone, and other large and complex components. Ramo-Wooldridge has been awarded the inspection and technical supervision. In actual practice, management responsibility rests with the Ballistic Missile Division of the Materiel Command. Such management duties for the Air Force officers were not contemplated.

While the Ballistic Missile Division is set up as a permanent agency, the Special Projects Office of the Navy is a temporary unit to expedite the building of the entire Polaris program—nuclear-powered submarines, shore facilities, and testing vessels, as well as the Polaris IRBM.

The Special Projects Office has a team concept for the management of this program, including various agencies of the Navy and main contractors alike. For instance, the steering committee has representatives from the Bureau of Ships, Bureau of Ordnance, Naval Ordnance Laboratories, Lockheed, Sperry, Aerojet, Westinghouse, and M. I. T. It is an efficient and workable group for the management and timing of the program.

The Special Projects Office has complete and positive control over all management activities. In effect, the Bureaus and contractors act as subcontractors for the overall program. Letters of intent, cost-plus contracts, and price-redetermination contracts are made by negotiation with the individual firms according to Navy procedure.

The initial Air Force Dyna-Soar project awards go to two teams of contractors. One group consists of Boeing, General Electric, Aerojet, North American, Ramo-Wooldridge, and Chance Vought. The second group consists of Martin, Bell, and Minneapolis-Honeywell. The funding of this initial development work is not expected to run over $5 million.

The Dyna-Soar, incidentally, is a vehicle which can be propelled through the upper atmosphere or orbit around the earth. It can be brought back to earth, and can be used both for bombing or reconnaissance. Its complexity will require scientific skills that are not available in any one company.

Detailed contractual arrangements have yet to be made with these contractors. Contract extensions, amendments, and terminations are to be expected as technical progress and scientific breakthroughs are made. The whole theory of team contractors is on a trial-and-error basis in this instance.

Earlier this year, the Air Force asked for cooperation from airframe firms and their trade groups to help solve the financial, management, and legal problems inherent in the weapons systems of outer space. They asked that industry devise a plan that would fit in with present Defense Department policies, such as aid to small business. They emphasized that management proposals were the outstanding needs of the present procurement policies.

Combined proposals of two or more contractors would be considered by the United States Air Force Selection Board in making awards. These combined efforts would be considered either permanent or for a single specific weapon.

Most of the airframe companies are enthusiastic over this suggestion. It offers them greater financial security and profits and maintains their standing as important military contractors.

Electronic firms and rocket propulsion builders are not so enthusiastic. Electronic trade groups have been urging the Pentagon to give their members more prime contracts for guided missiles. They have a compelling reason: Most of the scientific skill and cost go to electronic firms, regardless of type of contract.

Rocket propulsion companies whose technical experts have been responsible for many of the scientific breakthroughs for spaceships are also anxious for the prestige and responsibility as prime contractors on these new weapons systems.

While different trade associations may reflect various viewpoints, they agree on one point—the concept of team contractors may run afoul of antitrust laws. Many prefer that the Pentagon request special legislation to clear this up in advance, recalling the difficulty of retroactive and clarifying amendments to the renegotiation, profit-limiting, and other restrictive laws.

The team approach to the management problems for producing the weapons of the future hinges on the single point of responsibility for a weapon system manager. Should this manager be a national defense agency, an engineering management firm, a unit of a scientific organization, a major contractor, or a technical laboratory? There are some positive views, if not unanimity, on the subject.

One thing is certain. While present management systems are O. K. in theory, they are ponderous in operation. The weakness is the lack of emphasis on efficient management, plus the inability to reorganize when difficulties arise at the top level of administration. Industry observers, as well as Pentagon officials, now agree that management control is the key to effective weapons, fast delivery, and reasonable costs. Time will tell whether the team approach is the answer.

Raymond Albert Young Is Louisiana Champion Competing in Teen-Age Road-e-o

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the seventh Annual Jaycee National Safe Driving Teen-Age Road-e-o is under way in Washington this week and I take much pride in the fact that the Louisiana champion in this event is from my con-

gressional district. He is Raymond Albert Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Young of Centerville, La., who won State honors in the Louisiana finals held at Lafayette. He is accompanied to Washington by Ted L. McIntyre, son of Mr. and Mrs. F. P. McIntyre, of Franklin, La., a member of the board of directors of the Franklin Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Fifty-one top teen-age automobile drivers from the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii are participating in the national finals of the Road-e-o which opened today and will continue through Thursday. They are indicative of the interest and enthusiasm of over 300,000 teen-agers in more than 2,500 Junior Chamber of Commerce communities who believe that good driving is just as much their responsibility as it is of other age groups.

The purpose of this very deserving project is to give young drivers the opportunity to prove their ability to drive safely, improve their driving habits and attitudes, and to stimulate community interest in high school driver education programs.

Each State participant receives an all-expense paid 4-day trip to Washington to compete for the 3 top awards—$2,000, $1,500 and $1,000 educational scholarships to be presented at a banquet Thursday night. The contestants undergo a thorough examination of their driving ability, knowledge of the rules of the road, and a personal evaluation of their attitudes and aptitudes will be weighed before the winners are announced. The various events are being staged at the Willard Hotel, road-e-o headquarters, and at the National Guard Armory.

I am happy to join with all other Louisianians in wishing our State champion the best of luck in the road-e-o finals, and in the hope that he will become the national champion.

Communists in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent international events have clearly pointed out that the United States and the free world must face, for years to come, a continuing struggle.

The principles of our life and Government are under constant challenge. Every moment of disinterest and relaxation will be capitalized upon as the time for a forward encroachment by international Communists and their followers.

The United States has just adopted the largest military budget in our peacetime history. We are all agreed we must be militarily strong to withstand any aggressive action.

Yet the most distressing gains against the free world in recent years have not been made by direct military attacks. The gains have been achieved by indirect means.

We in this country must marshal the forces and efforts of the free world to effectively combat the Communist nonmilitary and indirect methods.

It has been my belief the first place to consolidate and strengthen our mutual efforts is close to home—Latin America. A strong and effective Western Hemisuhere will provide leadersihp and strong moral support for the rest of the free world.

Furthermore, as individual Americans we must use our enthusiasm and zeal to nurture and broaden the base of acceptance of our principles of life and government.

Our citizens have asked many times what can we do? There are many ways by which the individual can help foster and improve better international relations for his country.

In Florida we have been very conscious of this, particularly in my district.

I take this opportunity to set forth for my colleagues' attention these following two articles—which have appeared in the Miami Herald and the Miami News—of a series on Communist activity in Latin America:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of August 5, 1958]

MOSCOW IS BOSS, ARGENTINE EDITOR BRAGS OF POLICY

(By Al Neuharth, Herald assistant managing editor)

(This is another in a series of articles about Communist activity in South America.)

BUENOS AIRES.—When we walked into the offices of La Hora, the daily Communist newspaper here, the headlines of its latest edition screamed:

"England and the United States Prepare To Increase Their Aggression."

Beneath it in smaller type:

"Russia Denounces It."

This was the Moscow mouthpiece in South America, feeding its readers the Pravda and party line.

We asked Ernesto Giudici, La Hora's chief editor, where he got the news dispatches for his newspaper.

"Some from Tass (Russia's official news agency) and many we write ourselves," the Red editor explained.

He wasn't kidding.

Out in the newsroom, reporters sat around rewriting wire service stories. The purpose: To take out the objective and factual aspects, and substitute the Communist Party line.

This is the type news Ernesto and his comrades have been publishing here for 3 months. They claim 80,000 copies of La Hora (The Time) are being bought daily by readers in Buenos Aires.

Whatever the number, they're getting a strict Red Party line, straight from Moscow.

Ernesto and his buddies made no pretense of being just a national Communist Party, as some Reds claim elsewhere in South America. These boys are proud of being a part of Moscow's international communism.

They talk as they write. Listen to some of the exchanges and you'll get the thinking of these Red neighbors.

We asked Ernesto, tongue in cheek, if he approved of our landing marines in Lebanon.

"The best thing you can do is get the hell out of Lebanon just as fast as possible."

On that subject, we noted that Buenos Aires Reds stormed the American Embassy here 2 weeks ago in protest against the Lebanon situation. A crowd of 1,000 threw rocks and ink bottles.

We figured those respectable Red newspapermen wouldn't admit to any part in that riot. But we sprung the question anyway.

"The whole bunch of us were right in the middle of that," he proclaimed proudly.

No hedging. No double-talk. These boys give it to you straight. They have been commissioned by Moscow to spread communism through this part of the world, and they aim to do their job.

Ernesto and his comrades take themselves seriously. But that outlook isn't shared by the Argentine government of President Frondizi.

The Communist Party has legal staus in this country. The government considers it no threat.

We asked Dr. Mariano Wainfeld, assistant to President Frondizi, about La Hora's claim of strength.

Wainfeld, the Sherman Adams of Argentina, shrugged it off. He insists La Hora has very little circulation and the Communist Party has no influence.

Ernesto just smiled and called Wainfeld's remark stupid.

The Red editor quickly pointed out that his party publicly supported Frondizi in last February's presidential election. He admitted that Frondizi had not sought the Red support.

As a parting shot, we asked Ernesto if the United States can live peacefully in this world with the Communists.

"If Ike starts a war, New York will be destroyed in 5 minutes," Ernesto promised.

He's just our next-door neighbor, but he sounded like Nikita Khrushchev talking.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of August 5, 1958]

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 2—RIO WOULD DEAL FOR RUSSIAN OIL

(By Herbert Zschech)

RIO DE JANEIRO, August 5.—The Soviet Union's trade offensive has been under way in Brazil several months.

It has been more intense here than in many other Latin nations, and last month obtained its first success when Brazilians said "Yes" in principle to a barter-trade offer.

However, the deal depends on conditions spelled out by Brazil. There has been no indication the Soviets will agree.

Russia offered to supply Brazil with 200,000 tons of crude oil—worth about $9 million—in exchange for coffee, cocoa, and cotton.

NO GATE FOR INFILTRATION

According to reports which have not been denied, Brazil accepted the offer with these two provisions:

1. It should be strictly trade, not involving currency.

2. It should not be a pretext for Russian trade missions, technical missions, or similar groups to be sent to Brazil.

Alexander Volkov, a member of Russia's Supreme Soviet, said in Rio yesterday that the time was ripe for Brazil and Russia to renew diplomatic relations, which were severed in 1947.

The Soviet delegate said Russia was in a position to supply Brazil with large quantities of machinery, including oil-drilling equipment and nuclear plants with technical assistants.

The recent Russian offer was made through the Soviet Trade Bureau in Montevideo, which is the hub of Soviet South American

activities, to the Brazilian Government's oil monopoly, Petrobras. Brazil now imports about $400 million worth of oil annually, mainly from United States firms.

Russian trade specialists earlier submitted a proposal to supply ships in exchange for Brazilian coffee. Brazil rejected the offer, but then accepted a similar deal with Communist Poland for 12 merchant ships.

ALSO WANTS MANGANESE

The Soviets also have expressed interest in buying Brazilian manganese.

Red attempts to extend trade relations lately have been meeting with increasingly favorable reception by Brazilian nationalist groups, including some quarters close to President Juscelino Kubitschek.

The Brazilian foreign ministry has been the principal center of defense against these tendencies. It remains to be seen whether the recent resignation of Foreign Minister Macedo Soares will change this attitude.

Opposition deputies in the Brazilian Congress have frequently accused the government of attempting to blackmail the United States with the Russian trade offers in order to gain financial and commercial advantages in Washington.

KEY WEAPON IN RED DRIVE: NEWSPAPERS

The Communist press in Latin America is a key weapon in the Soviet Union's economic offensive. At least 15 daily Communist newspapers, all boosting the official Kremlin line, are being published now. In Brazil alone there are six Community Party daily newspapers.

Congressman Roland Libonati: A Job That Is Being Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is far too seldom that a Congressman receives recognition and praise for his accomplishments in print. However, on Saturday August 9, Mr. Drew Pearson engaged in some well deserved praise for our colleague from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]. Rather than in my own words, I am happy to include Mr. Pearson's fine testimony to Mr. LIBONATI's accomplishments in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

In fact, his record of attendance on the House floor is phenomenal. LIBONATI has not missed one minute of the daily meetings of Congress since he took office.

He has a 100 percent voting record on all roll and quorum calls and, because he is always there, has been called upon by Speaker SAM RAYBURN and other leaders no less than 20 times to make the motion for daily adjournments.

In addition he has not missed a single meeting of the House Judiciary Committee, of which he is a member.

LIBONATI has introduced a total of 40 bills, dealing with slum redevelopment, juvenile delinquency, veterans' benefits, Alaska statehood, and employment rehabilitation of jobless and old people.

The bill he is proudest of is called the Youth Camp Recreation Act of 1958 to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a summer camp program for indigent children all over the Nation.

Before coming to Congress, LIBONATI was cited by the American Legion for the founding of the American Boys' Camp at Coloma, Wis., which has been in existence since 1937 and which provides accommodations for 800 children of veterans and servicemen each year.

Brief for the Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, and year, the severest kind of criticism has been leveled at the American public school system. All too often that system has illogically and unfairly been blamed for many of our ills.

It was good, therefore, to note the recent statement by the Oregon Education Policies Commission in defense of our educational system, placing in proper perspective the role of the school in the totality of community action and environment.

Attempting to shift responsibility is a normal human frailty. However, when the move is on to place responsibility for our present crisis solely on the American schools the attempt should be strongly resisted lest it dull our perception of the proper course of action.

The statement by the Oregon Education Policies Commission has been entitled "The Public Schools and Our Times." It could as well have been described as a bill of particulars as to society's failure to face up to its responsibilties. The Portland Oregonian has described the statement as a brief for the defense in an editorial in which the highlights from that statement are reviewed. I ask unanimous consent that such editorial be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BRIEF FOR THE DEFENSE

A few days ago we noted that the Portland public-school administration was, in effect, biting back at school critics in its resolve to reduce extracurricular demands on school time. This week the Oregon Education Policies Commission, membership of which is drawn almost entirely from among professional educators, bit back more directly and with more sting.

In a 20-page statement entitled "The Public Schools and Our Times," the commission says: "Our present crisis is a total one, not just a school crisis. This crisis belongs to everyone. And everyone is thereby responsible."

The burden of the commission's forthright statement is a recitation of the failures of everyone in meeting the responsibility:

On national leadership: "Indeed, although conditions may dictate the necessity, the fact remains that we have even found ourselves in the contradictory position of supporting feudalistic governments so as to insure our oil supply."

On parents: "In a busy world of bells ringing in appointments, of mothers working, and fathers serving the god of success, children are being overindulged to assuage the guilt feelings of adults. They are overfed, overdoctored, and overallowanced. * * * It should also be noted that many adults are demanding that the schools get tougher while they ask shorter hours for themselves."

On the public: "The public sometimes manifests more interest in the business, athletic, and social aspects (of educational institutions) than in the academic."

On advertising: "While a school child may be learning about Franklin's frugality, out of school he is to buy and be happy."

On the press: "Stories about the significant issues of our time often get pushed to obscure positions in daily papers by more sensational topics of passing interests. Or they are diminished by traditional news formulas which equate them in space and form with less important stories."

On Congress: "The Congress piously places the words 'under God' in our flag pledge, and then many Congressmen advocate a Federal scholarship bill limited to science and mathematics students. Yet every true scientist knows that we must preserve those disciplines which transcend fact in the search for truth."

There is substance in the educators' saucy rebuttal; although we can't see any chance of improvement by putting the schoolmasters in the place of the news editors—or vice versa. There would have been greater substance had the commission acted fully on its own admonition: "To understand the nature of this crisis we need to look far beyond the schools, yet keep them within our vision." There is no critical scrutiny of the schools here beyond the admission that they have not reached their goals.

Perhaps this is explained in the foreword: "This statement is not intended to offer solutions to school problems. Later statements will deal with specific problems and recommendations for possible action."

These later statements should reveal whether the commission intends to take a positive and critical role in the direction of Oregon education policies or purposes merely to supplement its able brief for the defense of the schools.

The Political Doctors of the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle of June 30, 1958, discussing the social philosophy of the AMA.

It was most interesting to me to see the daily press recognize that the people of this country have not yet been able to drag the American Medical Association kicking and struggling into the 20th century.

The article is as follows:

THE POLITICAL DOCTORS OF THE AMA

As we say goodby to the doctors who have been visitors in San Francisco during the American Medical Association's convention, our thoughts and feelings are mixed.

Last week's reports of splendid advances in medical research made exciting reading; they captured our lay imagination and inspired our gratitude. The operation on Tommy Hunter's heart made all who watched it the debtors of the wonderfully skillful people who performed it.

Yet while we were edified by the scientific achievements of the medical profession, its sociopolitical proceedings left us limp and pale and gasping for breath. Any layman

reconciled to the 20th century could hardly help wondering if the heart that beats beneath the white coat does not beat with longing for the return of the 19th.

The social viewpoint revealed by the AMA's house of delegates was old-fashioned and stuffy and foundered under clichés. In their resolutions on public affairs, the doctors fell miles behind the other scientific professions. The explanation for this, we suppose, is that the intending medico's training is never really broadening after he leaves high school. Specialization atrophies his opportunity to acquire a social understanding. Thus, when the rubber gloves are removed and the plenary session is in order, a group of rather ignorant and discontented lobbyists for the status quo ante McKinley responds to the knock of the gavel. The clarity of mind that defeated polio is left at home in the laboratory and the spokesmen for medicine address themselves to issues that bring them income-tax problems.

When the delegates shouted their opposition to the idea of extending medical care to the aging beneficiaries of social security, when they raised their hands to deny people the right to chose closed-panel medical programs, when they declined to permit their own members to elect old-age coverage under social security, an image was created. Somehow it was not in character with the image of the selfless, white-bearded, ministering physician that public relations counsels have taught us to venerate.

Gen. Alvin C. Welling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with pleasure that the President has nominated and the Senate confirmed the appointment of Col. Alvin C. Welling to the rank of brigadier general. Having had the opportunity of observing General Welling's fine performance of duty in several roles in the CBI in World War II, as district engineer in Baltimore, and more recently as Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, it is gratifying that his outstanding ability is recognized by the Department of the Army. His friends and associates will look forward with confidence to his continued success in the present and future assignments.

Under leave granted, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 2, 1958. It reads:

COLONEL WELLING: SPARKPLUG

This is a birthday of sorts for Colonel Alvin C. Welling, who stepped into the ticklish job of District Engineer Commissioner just a year ago.

On his first anniversary as a city official, we wish to congratulate our town on its good fortune.

Urbane, witty, polished, but as sharp as a tack, he has proved to be just the sort of sparkplug this hamstrung city government needs.

Some men can not stand to see a job undone. It bothers them. So they go out and do it.

Colonel Welling is like that. We may not always agree with him, or expect to, but it is a pleasure to have him around, because you know where he is, and what he is doing, and he is always doing.

Now President Eisenhower has nominated him for brigadier general, the rank held by his immediate predecessors and one he richly deserves. We are confident that he will get his star with all the dispatch to which, in matters relating to Welling, we have become accustomed.

Weekly Broadcast of Congressman Emanuel Celler Over Radio Station WINS, New York City, Sunday, August 10, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the transcript of my weekly broadcast over Station WINS, New York City, Sunday, August 10, 1958:

THE UNATTAINABLE SUMMIT

Khrushchev has once again changed course. He now wants no summit conference. The switch this time should unify the West against him. Also, he has relieved President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles of the burden of a summit conference. In truth, the latter only paid lipservice to a summit conference they did not want.

Khrushchev is now in retreat. He is no longer master of the "Red House," that is, the Communist world. He went to China to meet with his old friend, Mao Tse-tung, Premier of China. The latter must have told him off, and Khrushchev was forced to refuse the summit conference under the Security Council's auspices because this would bring to the Council table Chiang Kai-shek of Nationalist China and not Mao Tse-tung. Khrushchev countered by suggesting a U. N. Assembly meeting and very properly, President Eisenhower accepted. This is what we wanted in the first place.

It may be feasible now, in the General Assembly, gradually to enlarge the U. N. inspection forces in the Middle East. They could police the areas against direct and indirect aggression. This would be a great step forward in maintaining peace in that troubled area.

In his latest note, Khrushchev again delivered one of his abrasive, infuriating lectures and asked why American and British troops are not withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan. We might well ask why Soviet troops are not withdrawn from Hungary. In the Assembly meeting there will undoubtedly be the airing of these charges and countercharges. In any event, any promise that Russia would make below the summit or at the summit, would be like pie crust—easily broken.

If you turn the pages of history, you will see that Russia has only on the rarest occasions recognized its treaty obligations. Between 1917, when the Communists came into power in Russia, and 1957, a period of 40 years, the rulers of the Red domain made 26 highly important international agreements with the non-Red world and violated every 1 of them. Let me cite a few of these damaged and violated treaties.

In 1928, the Soviet Government joined us in the Kellogg-Briand Disarmament Pact to outlaw war. Five times in 1939 and 1940, Russia breached her obligation and invaded Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and Romania.

In 1932, Russia signed a nonaggression past with Finland. Seven years later, in 1939, she invaded the territory of Finland.

In 1934, Poland signed a nonaggression pact with Russia, which pact Russia violated in 1939, when the Red Army invaded Poland. It was then that Moscow split Poland with Nazi Germany.

In 1945, at Yalta, Stalin agreed with Roosevelt and Churchill that, subsequent to Hitler's defeat, the liberated nations would solve their economic and political problems by democratic means. Instead, Moscow breached the agreement in Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania.

In 1945, Russia and Yugoslavia entered into a 20-year treaty of friendship and mutual aid, which 4 years later was denounced by Russia when Stalin expelled Tito from the Cominform.

Again in 1945, Truman, Stalin, and Churchill at Potsdam, agreed that defeated Germany, occupied by the United States, Russia, Britain, and France, should receive equal treatment in all occupation zones. Now only the Bonn Republic, occupied by the Western powers, is a sovereign state. East Germany, dominated by Communists, is a vassal of Russia.

At the summit conference in Geneva in 1955, the Russians agreed to embrace a new Geneva spirit of international friendship. Subsequently, Russia sent arms, infiltrators, and volunteers to Egypt and abetted the ambition of Nasser in his efforts for control of the Arab world. Russia, by these insidious means, joined Syria and Yemen to Egypt.

Thus what can we expect from any U. N. Assembly meeting as far as Khrushchev and Red Russia are concerned—naught but deception and sheer wickedness. Nonetheless we must within the framework of U. N. seek to find solutions for world peace, Russia or no Russia.

FRANCE AND THE NEW CONSTITUTION

Now, turning to France and De Gaulle, it would appear that De Gaulle, the new head of the French Government, has submitted a new constitution for the Fifth Republic of France. This new constitution is strong medicine for the politically ailing France. But it is really what the doctor ordered.

The Fourth Republic of France, like its predecessors, suffered from a diffusion of powers. The legislative branch was too strong, the executive branch too weak. There were repeated falls in the Government. Premier succeeded premier in rapid succession and the premiers were blamed for the many debacles that beset France. They were not to blame; the old system was to blame. It was like shooting the pianist because the piano is out of tune.

Now General De Gaulle seeks to remedy these political weaknesses and would set up a strong centralized executive and a weakened legislative branch.

The parliamentary form of government of France has been handicapped, on the one hand, by a large Communist bloc dedicated to opposition and obstruction, and on the other hand by a proliferation of weakened democratic parties, unable to agree. All this produced a form of legislative paralysis.

Here are some of De Gaulle's proposals:

1. The President will be elected for a term of 7 years, but not alone by the Parliament as at present, but by an electoral college of thousands of members, including city councils throughout the French union.

2. The President, not Parliament, will choose the Premier, who will, however, be responsible to Parliament. A vote of censure by Parliament can force the Cabinet out, but also the President can dissolve Parliament after it has served a year and force a new election.

3. To end the legislative impasse, any government bill will become law within 3 days unless blocked by a motion of censure, signed by one-tenth of the Deputies and approved by an absolute majority of the Assembly.

4. Parliament will vote only on specified major subjects such as budget and public welfare but all other subjects will be determined by decree of the government.

5. The President will have the power to negotiate treaties. During grave emergencies he has the right to govern dictatorially.

6. A 9-member Constitutional Council of 10-year terms will perform some of the functions of the United States Supreme Court to judge the constitutionality of all laws before they are promulgated. There will also be a high court of justice composed of equal but unspecified numbers of Senators and Deputies, elected for 6-year terms.

Whatever flaws may lie in De Gaulle's plan, in general it seems to me that it is a good plan. De Gaulle's program would be quite unsuitable for democratic United States but considering the nature and character of Frenchmen and the mores and history of France, his plan ought to succeed. Already, the stature of France has been heightened under De Gaulle's determined leadership and the country is playing a genuine role in the negotiations of the so-called big five.

In a word, De Gaulle's constitution will establish a strong executive, a reform long past due in France. It is hoped that the French people in the fall constitutional referendum, scheduled for late September or early October, will approve De Gaulle's program.

UNITED STATES JUDGE PUTS OFF INTEGRATION 7 YEARS

A Federal district judge, Sterling Hutcheson, at Richmond, Va., authorized a 7-year delay this past week in the integration of schools in Prince Edward County, Va. This county is where one of the pioneer cases decided by the Supreme Court originated.

Judge Hutcheson said he feared violence and he referred to the turmoil concerning integration troubles at Nashville and Clinton, Tenn., and Little Rock, Ark. This decision, involving a 7-year delay in the integration process, comes as a rude shock, especially after the recent decision of Judge Lemley, ordering a coolingoff period of 2½ years at Little Rock before integration in the Little Rock schools can be effectuated.

The Little Rock decision is now on appeal and arguments were heard before the Eighth Court of Appeals at St. Louis, the other day. The Judge Hutcheson decision must be appealed forthwith and I believe the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has filed notice of appeal.

It is most tragic that these Federal judges have failed to follow the rule of the Supreme Court, that integration in the schools must be with all deliberate speed. Now we are confronted with delay after delay. There would seem to be a deliberate effort on the part of these judges to spike the decision of the Supreme Court. Meanwhile, President Eisenhower offers no real leadership on this troublesome question. We have no word whatsoever from the White House, except that we should be patient and wait. Our patience is about exhausted. At his last press conference the President reiterated his conclusion that respect for the integration decision can only come from within the individual. These are cold words of comfort to those who feel the sting of segregation.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY

The House of Representatives recently voted an increase in social security benefits. The vote in the House was overwhelming with 375 in favor and only 2 votes against.

The bill that was passed embodies an average 7-percent increase in benefits for all individuals now on the benefit rolls with a minimum increase of $3 a month for retirement after the age of 65.

The average increase for workers now retired would be around $4.75 a month, effective the third month following enactment of the legislation. To finance these increases and to put the social security system on a more substantial actuarial basis, the bill would raise from $4,200 to $4,800 the annual wage base to be taxed under the pay-as-you-go insurance system. It also provides a minimum increase in the payroll tax from 2¼ to 2½ percent each on workers and their employers.

While the increases are not very large and the age at which one could start receiving benefits was not decreased, in toto, the amounts involved will be substantial. The increases are consonant somewhat with the rise in cost of living. It is a step in the right direction, although I admit it does not go far enough.

CLARIFYING LAW ON UNITED STATES FLAG

On August 5, the House passed a bill which I introduced to clarify the law relating to the design and dimensions of the United States flag.

There is no Federal statute which fixes the proportionate dimensions of the flag, including the size and arrangement of the stars in the Union of the flag. These matters have been regulated by custom. However, a study of past actions on the design of the flag each time a new State was admitted to the Union, discloses no established procedure. For example, in 1912, when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted, a joint Board of Army and Navy officers recommended a plan of the Union of the flag and thereafter President Taft, by Executive order, approved its action. However, when Oklahoma was admitted in 1907, the arrangement of the stars in the flag was decided without Presidential Executive order. The Navy simply wrote the War Department, suggesting that officers meet to recommend a design. When these Departments approved a design, other agencies adopted it.

Prior to these two changes in the flag, the military services arranged the stars without Executive order or legislation, but followed, generally, the basic law of 1818 which required the addition of a star on the 4th of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

In 1947, the 1818 law was repealed. This 1947 act, however, contains a possible ambiguity because one section limits the number of stars to 48 and another section provides for additional stars on the admission of new States.

While I think these sections can be reconciled, I nonetheless feel that the law should be clarified. Certainly it will be necessary to amend the law after Alaska is admitted into the Union, in order that the provision providing for 48 States can be changed to 49 States.

Furthermore, there should be a Federal statute setting forth standards to guide those who are given the responsibility for rearranging the component parts of the flag. Today there is no set precedent for them to follow. My bill would place this important duty under the direction of the President of the United States.

There is an act authorizing the Army to design flags and other insignia for the military departments only and to advise other agencies on matters of heraldry. However, this act gives no express authority for the Army to design or rearrange the flag of the United States.

My bill contains flexible provisions and is so drawn that it will require no change if and when additional States are admitted to the Union. At the same time, it establishes clear standards for the guidance of those who will be charged with the responsibility of providing additional stars as new States are admitted.

Federal Timber Sales Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, practically no private timber, outside of that owned by big companies for their own purposes, is available for mills in Oregon today. This means that Federal timber sales policies and programs are of vital concern to forest products industries.

Today I conferred in my office for 3½ hours with lumber operators from the Pacific Northwest, Western Forest Industries Association executives, and officials of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. Don Barker, who owns lumber mills in Grants Pass and Eugene, was spokesman for the lumber mills in Josephine County.

Mr. Barker presented me with the petition set forth below, which is endorsed by the Illinois Valley Chamber of Commerce in a separate petition following it. The Josephine County petition was signed by 22 lumber mills, the Grants Pass-Josephine Chamber of Commerce, and the Illinois Valley Chamber of Commerce.

The petition complains that the Forest Service has not put up timber on the schedule promised. It asks for timber to be put on the market so mills will not have to close. I have referred it to the Forest Service and have arranged for the top regional officials to confer with Josephine County operators in Grants Pass at an early date.

Under leave previously granted I include the two petitions:

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

The failure of the United States Forest Service to allot sufficient funds from its appropriations and to assign sufficient technical manpower to the Siskiyou National Forest is forcing Josephine County, Oreg., into a dire economic crisis. This area has suffered abnormally heavy unemployment for almost 3 years.

Timber-using industries constitute the foundation of its economy. Unless an immediate flow of logs can be achieved, these industries must either sharply curtail their operations or close completely.

The bulk of the available log supply is on the Josephine and Rogue River working circles of the Siskiyou National Forest. For lack of funds and manpower, the forest has never sold logs from these working circles

in any volume even approaching their allowable cuts.

The forest's hopes for men and money is reflected in its annual sales plans. But the volume of logs actually offered on the market simply fails to approach the announced plans on which operators and the dependent community generally ought to be able to rely.

The record speaks for itself:

Josephine working circle

[Annual allowable cut: 34 MM]

Calendar year	Sale plan	Actually offered for sale	Deficiency from sale plan	
			MM	Percent
1955	35.15	15.6	19.55	56.0
1956	37.7	27.56	10.14	26.8
1957	47.0	19.17	27.83	59.0
1958 (1st 6 months)	43.7	14.4	29.3	67.0

Rogue River working circle

[Annual allowable cut: 54.0 MM]

Calendar year	Sale plan	Actually offered for sale	Deficiency from sale plan	
			MM	Percent
1955	44.0	33.6	10.3	23
1956	37.0	3.3	33.7	91
1957	33.5	12.8	20.7	67
1958 (1st 6 months)	50.9	24.9	26.0	51

As this record discloses, these working circles are far below their allowable cuts.

This raises another aspect of the problem. Under Forest Service rules the Rogue River working circle, for example, should sell during the 5-year budget period 1955–59 a total of 5 times its allowable cut plus 1 year's allowable cut out of the far greater deficiency accumulated during past years. Hence, for the period 1955–59, this working circle ought to market 324 MM board-feet. But through the first 3 years of this period it has sold only 49.7 MM feet. The plan for the fourth year (1958) calls for the sale of 61 MM feet. If the Forest Service can fulfill its sale plan for 1958, and it has never yet been financed or manned to the necessary level, then in order to achieve the full allowable for this 5-year period it would have to sell during 1959 a total of 213.3 MM feet. Obviously, the deficiency on this forest is going to be incredible unless the Forest Service is willing to take sharp action.

And, according to the statements made by the Forest Service last winter to Senator GORE's subcommittee, unless the allowable cut is harvested on a reasonable schedule, it is lost forever. Applying the Forest Service's rules in this respect, it is permissible to carry 54 MM feet of the current deficiency to the next budget period, 1960–64. Hence, if loss is to be avoided, of the 213.3 MM feet of deficiency that will accrue on January 1, 1959, 54 MM may be carried for sale into future years. This leaves an absolute minimum of 159.3 MM that ought to be sold in 1959 if the community and the Nation are to avoid substantial loss.

To this community, logs mean jobs. Logs mean payroll. Logs mean customers for the merchants and taxpayers for the community. We cannot survive under this type of forest management. Some of us must have logs on the market now for harvest during the coming winter. Otherwise our mills must close. We cannot operate them without logs. This will mean still another winter of deep unemployment in this community.

The Forest Service has every cent of appropriation it sought for timber sales and administration. The allowable cut figures are compiled by the Forest Service, itself. Splendid access into much of the untapped areas near our town has been supplied by a magnificent, new, all-weather road constructed by the Department of the Interior. This road is available to the Forest Service. The Forest Service does not use this road. And our community starves for logs.

The timber is here. The access is here. The mills are here. The labor force is here. We lack only men and money for our forest. The Forest Service has the men and it has the money. If the Forest Service continues unwilling to use its men and its money in our area, our community will rapidly wither.

We ask the Congress, and its individual Members to investigate this critical situation and to induce or compel the Forest Service to put on the market a full supply of logs within the limits of sustained yield. If this is not done at once, Josephine County cannot escape another dreadful winter of unemployment, loss, and suffering.

PETITION OF THE ILLINOIS VALLEY, OREG., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

To Members of the Congress of the United States:

The Illinois Valley Chamber of Commerce heartily endorses the petition of the lumbermen for an increase in the timber cut in the Siskiyou National Forest and the south Josephine section of the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The past record shows that cutting in this area is far below the allowable cut.

The failure of the Government agencies concerned to get timber on the market has resulted in a depressed economic condition here, and unemployment.

We believe that the Congress should adopt policies requiring more timber sales, and provide the necessary funds to the National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to carry out the mandate.

This chamber of commerce is the overall civic body of the Illinois Valley, made up of businessmen, professional men, merchants, etc., and generally represents a cross-section of public opinion.

This endorsement has been voted by its board of directors,

Sincerely,

ALLAN MARKLEY,
Secretary.

Two Slovak Cardinals of a Century Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, three leading American Slovak fraternal organizations will hold their national conventions in the following few weeks. The first Catholic Slovak Union of United States of America and Canada will convene for its 33d convention this month in Detroit, Mich., where also will be the 23d convention of the National Slovak Society during the week of September 15. The Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, with national headquarters in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., will meet for its 31st national convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., during the week of September 22, 1958.

These national conventions are important to our social and civic life. Their combined membership is over 200,000.

During these national conventions their progress and past history are reviewed. Last month, during the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol national convention in Cleveland, Ohio, their youth performed gymnastics and calesthenics, winning the praised of the city, States, and Government officials. In tribute to the Slovak history and culture, I wish to publish an article entitled "Two Slovak Cardinals of a Century Ago," by Mr. John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N. J., which appeared in the Bethlehem (Pa.) Bulletin and other Peerless publications to show the important part the Slovakian leaders played in the past. Mr. Sciranka is an editor of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom. The article follows:

TWO SLOVAK CARDINALS A CENTURY AGO

(By John C. Sciranka)

With His Eminence Cardinal Stepinac of Yugoslavia often in the press on account of his imprisonment by Marshal Tito, no doubt, it will interest our readers that a century ago a Slovak by birth, Juraj (George) Cardinal Haulik, received his red hat from the Holy Father as first archbishop of Zagreb, the capital of Croatia.

Cardinal Haulik was born in 1788 in the historical city of Trnava better known as "Rome of Slovakia" on account of its many churches. In 1837 he was consecrated bishop and in 1853 he became first archbishop of Zagreb. Three years later he received his cardinal's hat from Pope Pius IX.

Cardinal Haulik was so popular that he was chosen "ban" or a governor of Croatia, where he fought for the independence of Croats. And in spite of his uncompromised leadership he was never imprisoned like his 20th century successor, Cardinal Stepinac.

Cardinal Haulik is remembered by the Croatians as a true champion of their liberty. His reign of leadership in 1861 marks the golden era in the history of Croatian nation.

He is remembered as a great humanitarian. The city of Zagreb and his archdiocese will never forget the many institutions he founded and the generous scholarships given especially to the poor students. Many a Croatian family owes its cultural and intellectual rise to the generosity of this Slovak Cardinal by birth and a true leader of Croatia by adoption.

During the years of 1850–53 he published his scholarly three volumes, entitled "Selections Encyclicae Literae et Dictiones Sacrea," which was printed in Vienna. The volumes are eagerly studied by the theologians even in this age.

Cardinal Haulik died in 1869 and the entire Croatian as well as all Slavonic nations mourned his death. His full name was Juraj (George) Cardinal Haulik de Varallya but he is registered everywhere as Slovak, who loved dearly his nation.

Indeed, the Americans of Slovak origin and descent are proud that a century ago a Slovak cardinal occupied the throne of the Archbishop of Zagreb now vacant by the persecuted Cardinal Stepinac, whose red hat and robes are still awaiting him in Vatican. Let us hope and pray that with the turn of events in Europe, Cardinal Stepinac and all imprisoned church dignitaries, as well as civic and political leaders, will soon be free.

ALEXANDER CARDINAL RUDNAY

The other Slovak cardinal is His Eminence Alexander Rudnay who was elevated to the princehood of church before Cardinal Haulik.

Cardinal Rudnay was born 16 years (1760) before the Declaration of our American Independence (1776) in the town of Sv. Kriz (Holy Cross), the historical county of Nitra, Slovakia, from a family of noblemen. At the time of his birth, Slovaks had quite a few lords, known as "zemani." The future prince of the church received the best education. His family expected him to choose a diplomatic career. He preferred

priesthood and was ordained in 1783. A year later he received his doctorate of theology. For a short duration he was a chaplain on the estate of Count Berenyi. Later he was a curate at various places.

His magnetic personality and wide knowledge of sciences aided his rapid rise. In 1808 he was consecrated titular bishop and also became adviser on church matters to the Government in Budapest. In 1816 he became ordinary of the see of Sibinia and in 1819 archbishop of Estergrom, also known as Ostrihom.

It was a period after the Turks plundered his see. His predecessors were forced to leave the city, which was left in ruins, including the historical cathedral and the archbishop's palace.

The new cardinal went into a planned building action and left an immortal reputation as a builder of a new cathedral and other religious institutions. He also built a new seminary, which later, to our sorrow, expelled many Slovakian seminarians for their nationalistic adherence to the rights of their persecuted nation. Quite many of them were forced to come to America and after finishing their schooling here they became leaders in American Slovakian life. One of the expelled Slovak seminarians, Peter V. Rovnianek, came to the Cleveland, Ohio, seminary at the invitation of Rev. Stephen Furdek and before ordination he chose to become a lay leader. Rovnianek is known as father of the first American Slovak fraternal organization, the National Slovak Society, which he organized on February 16, 1890. He was also publisher of the American Slovak Gazette (founded October 21, 1886), as well as the first Slovak daily in America.

All these American Slovak leaders were great lovers and admirers of Cardinal Rudnay, who proclaimed on more than one occasion, although a primate of Hungary, with power to crown the King and Emperor, these historical words: "I am a Slovak; and though I should sit in the chair of Peter, I shall remain a Slovak."

Cardinal Rudnay built many beautiful churches in his archdiocese which still stand to the glory of God.

He was a great humanitarian, which he proved on many occasions and especially during the famine in Transylvania (where Capt. John Smith, builder of Jamestown, Va., fought the Turks in 1601–02, for which he was decorated by Duke Zigmund Bathory). He received his red hat in 1828 from Holy Father Pope Pius VIII, and died in 1831. A year after his death, Canon Palkovic published his sermons in his birthplace, the seat of the literary society of St. Vojtech (Adalbert), largest Slovak cultural institution in the world, of which many American Slovaks are members.

The Slovaks, indeed, are proud that at the time the father of our country, George Washington, was fighting for our freedom that a young Slovak, Alexander Rudnay, was preparing for priesthood and became prince of church, promulgating the same ideals of freedom as our Founding Fathers in the first American colonies.

The American Slovak youth should look with pride to its heritage that over a century ago Slovaks had two cardinals of Slovak birth, who always gave evidence of their love for the country of their forefathers, Slovakia, which today is fighting for its freedom, for which it is ripe due to its historical and cultural background of great leaders like Cardinal Rudnay and Haulik. May their memory live always in our hearts and minds, and may it inspire the present and the future generations to preserve these great ideals of four freedoms.

Interesting Opinions on Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, every now and then an interesting, different and thought-provoking article appears in one or more of our newspapers that should be given wider circulation than is always possible in a given area.

With this in mind, I want to submit for insertion in the RECORD the following featured article from the New Kingsington Dispatch, New Kensington, Pa. It covers the opinions of two well-known labor leaders, Mr. Charles Winnie Keller, president of local 302 of the United States Steel Workers and John Haser, president of Northern Westmoreland Labor Council. Both of these men are qualified to speak on this important subject.

[From the New Kensington (Pa.) Dispatch of August 4, 1958]

DO-NOTHING GOVERNMENT HIT—RECESSION CALLED CONSPIRACY TO BREAK UNIONS—UNION-BUSTING PLOT ENVISIONED

(By Philip M. Haskell)

One of New Kensington's top labor leaders has indicted manufacturers throughout the country for causing the recession and the Federal administration for its continuance.

Charles "Winnie" Keller, president of local 302 of the United Steelworkers, charged that the recession was result of a long-range program on the part of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce to break labor unions.

Another union official predicted harder times in fall.

Keller also raped the Federal Government for doing nothing to stimulate the economy.

He accused industry of building up large inventories and flooding the market with cheaply made foreign goods.

He cited the glass industry as a prime example of an international cartel dumping goods on the United States market.

"The responsibility for stimulating business rests with the Federal Government," he declared. So far, he charged, they have done little or nothing.

Keller also hit automation and the tendency of companies to combine classifications and eliminate jobs.

During one period at the Alcoa plant production increased 64 percent while workers' earnings decreased 34 percent, he stated.

For an improvement of the local economic situation Keller proposed:

A reduced workweek to combat automation.

Government spending on public works.

The plowing back of more shareholder profits into the expansion of industry.

That companies produce more products in the local plants rather than having them manufactured elsewhere.

That diversified industry be attracted to this area.

A prediction that times will be tougher in the fall than they were last year was made by John Haser, president of the Northern Westmoreland Labor Council.

"The recession is far from over, he charged and the Federal administration has done nothing to combat it."

As a cure Haser outlined organized labor's 10-point program.

Lower taxes for small incomes, increased unemployment compensation, and an expanded public works program were the principal points of the program.

"To have mass production you have to have mass consumption," he said.

To accomplish this you have "to get the young people back to work," he continued.

Union leaders pointed out that 20 years seniority was necessary in several area plants to hold a job.

Haser also endorsed Keller's stand for shorter workweek to combat automation.

In the wake of an article of this kind the following news item in the same paper shows clearly why men in various walks of life are giving more and more time to thinking about our economic situation.

JOBLESS TOTAL REMAINS HIGH

Despite a slight drop in unemployment-compensation claims the jobless in the New Kensington area total almost 7,500 according to the Pennsylvania State Employment Service.

This figure is approximately three times the number unemployed during the same period last year.

Normal unemployment payments extend for 30 weeks. For those who exhausted their benefits after June 30, 1957, the Federal Government extended payments 15 weeks.

Unemployment benefits range from $10 to $35—the average is $28.

During the first 6 months of the year benefits in the area rose to $4,500,000 from $2,378,000 during the same time last year.

Fifteen temporary workers have been hired to handle the increased load.

Why 108 House Members Oppose Increasing the Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the July 31, 1958, issue of the Bremerton Sun explains in simple terms and at least in part why 108 House Members including myself voted against raising the debt limit:

MORE SHRINKAGE IN YOUR DOLLAR

President Eisenhower's new request for a $10 billion increase in the permanent national debt limit means the dollar bill or sawbuck in the bank or in your pocket is going to shrink some more.

The weight and dimensions of your dimes and folding money will not shrink, of course. But their purchasing power will—in terms of beans or biscuits or butter, or in terms of anything you may buy.

In terms of what this shrinkage does to the individual and collective funds of the people of the United States, this is larceny on a scale greater than grand. All the footpads and burglars of all times surely could not have made away with as much of the citizens' money as the process of currency inflation has accomplished in a single year—the year 1942, for example.

That was a big year in the cycle of currency inflation. The Finance Committee of the United States Senate calculates that the dollar shrank in purchasing power in 1942 by 9.1 cents. The year 1947 showed a 9-cent shrinkage.

Only 4.4 cents were melted away from the value of the United States dollar in 1948 and only half a cent in each of the following years, according to the committee's calculations. In very recent years the inflation trend has been substantially checked but not stopped.

During the first 4 months of this year the depreciation of the dollar averaged only 0.2 cents per month. The big, bad fact, however, is that the Senate committee figures show that from an arbitrary valuation of 100 cents in the year 1939, the dollar had shrunk in purchasing power by the end of April 1958 to 48.1 cents.

In just under 20 years, therefore, the value of the proud product of the United States Bureau of Engraving and Printing has gone off by nearly 52 cents, a bit more than half. A $10 bill now in circulation is worth slightly less than $5 in terms of 1939.

Where all of this will end, none can say—not even those in the top echelons in Washington who borrow and spend the money which puts the Government in more debt and requires raising the debt limit in bites of $10 billion a whack.

Tribute to the Christian Science Monitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a 50th birthday is an important occasion any time. The 50th anniversary of the Christian Science Monitor is particularly significant because it marks a half century of important contributions to the American scene. It marks the golden anniversary of a newspaper which has done as much as any single publication in this country to raise the standards of journalism.

The breadth and depth of the Christian Science Monitor are properly legendary. I never cease to be amazed at the speedy and accurate manner in which the Monitor's outstanding staff interprets rather than reports, analyzes rather than repeats, the major news events of the day. I look forward with pleasure to the thought-pieces on little publicized, but important topics, and the penetrating essays on subjects far removed from the ordinary spotlight of news events. I applaud the Monitor's adherence to a pithy style and its stress on that which is really important and not what is merely sensational.

All of these attributes add up to the international daily newspaper. Its worldwide reputation merits that title.

To the firm hand and leadership of Erwin D. Canham, the present editor, must go much of the credit for this outstanding performance. He has consistently championed the highest ideals of journalism and the purposes for which the Monitor was founded.

It is a pleasure to salute the Monitor on its golden anniversary and to express the wish that it will continue for many more years its unique mission of analyzing, searching, and dissecting the byways, as well as the highways, of the world in which we live.

Comparatively Low Earnings of Employees in Gasoline Service Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last year Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, held hearings in Washington, D. C.; Denver, Colo.; Los Angeles, Calif.; and Chicago, Ill; regarding distribution practices in the petroleum industry. During the course of these hearings testimony was heard which showed a rather dreary financial picture of the average gasoline dealer's earnings.

In the report issued by the subcommittee—House Report No. 1157, 85th Congress, 1st session—it was noted that very many dealers experienced difficulty in obtaining financing, were dependent upon their oil company suppliers, suffered from price discrimination and coercion, and had other grievances, with the result that there was a large turnover of these distributors. In confirmation, in part, of the small financial returns received by the average retail gasoline service station operator, are the hours of work and the earnings of employees in such occupation as compared with those in other businesses.

The United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted a comprehensive study of earnings of nonsupervisory employees in retail trade for the month of October 1956. It is Bulletin No. 1220-4 and contains the latest published figures relating to gasoline service stations. I shall try to summarize some of the findings.

Widely dispersed throughout the country, in the smallest towns and the largest cities, individual gasoline service stations are comparatively small in terms of employment, rarely employing as many as eight workers. Composed almost exclusively of men, the work force is largely paid on a time-rate basis—although some larger companies provide commission payments on the sale of tires, batteries, and accessories.

Nationwide, gasoline service stations employed approximately 390,000 nonsupervisory employees in October 1956. As a group, these employees averaged $1.21 an hour, which included commissions and bonuses. It was found that 54 percent worked 48 or more hours per week.

It appears to be of special interest that although the South accounted for only about one-third of the total nonsupervisory employment in gasoline service stations, it accounted for almost two-thirds of the employees earning less than $1 and 83 percent earning less than 75 cents an hour.

For comparison purposes, I consulted the Statistical Abstracts of the United States. This indispensable compendium reflected that employees in wholesale trade worked an average of only 40.4 hours and earned an average of $2.01 an hour. Nonsupervisory employees in furniture and appliance stores worked an average of 42 hours weekly, earning an average of $1.65 an hour, and those in lumber and hardware supply stores, for an average of 42.5 hours, made an average weekly salary of $72.68 or at the rate of $1.73 an hour.

Thus, statistics appear to confirm the complaints of small and independent gasoline retailers as well as the findings of the subcommittee in respect to some of the financial problems encountered by the retail segment of the petroleum industry. From this study, one can readily conclude that such retail gasoline dealers seem financially unable to pay their employees salaries equal to that received by workers in other merchandising fields.

The Rose, Our National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7 of this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 465, designating the rose as the national flower of the United States and authorizing the President to so proclaim it. Interest in this matter has been widespread and, in fact, nationwide. As an indication of this interest, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, meeting in Detroit, Mich. for their 67th annual convention, adopted a resolution on June 6, 1958, urging the Congress to enact legislation to designate the rose as our national flower. This resolution was submitted at the national convention by the chairman of the Gardens Division, Mrs. Chester E. Martin of Atlanta, Ga. Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution herewith:

THE ROSE, OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Whereas the United States of America has no national flower; and

Whereas the rose grows in profusion in all States and blooms in all seasons of the year and lends itself to multiple use; and

Whereas the rose by its beauty has won a place in the hearts of the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, June 1958, urges the Congress of the United

States to designate the flower commonly known as the rose as the national flower of the United States.

Submitted by Mrs. Chester E. Martin, chairman, gardens division. Approved by policy committee. Adopted June 6, 1958.

The United States Wise Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very sensible article on one for whom we in Massachusetts are justly proud for her brilliant and outstanding public service to the United States both here and abroad.

[From the Boston Globe of August 10, 1958]

THE UNITED STATES WISE WOMAN

(By Marjorie W. Sherman)

They all think she's wonderful, from the King of Belgium to the push-push boys who run the pedalchairs round the fair. She is affectionately called the United States wise woman in Spanish, and the Germans and French and Belgians come to her with many of their problems of diplomacy. "Ask Madame Howard" is one of the best answers in Brussels, and this slight, sweet-faced Bostonian can usually help.

"Where can I get American apple pie and ice cream," the hungry, homesick New England businessman wants to know. (And the answer to that one is right at the Brass Rail.)

Speaking of apples, green ones, that is, you wouldn't believe how many Americans ask what the trees are outside the United States pavilion. (There are apples—green ones—growing right on them.)

Some questions are harder, at least to find the right answer for—can somebody's 6-year-old please wade in the exhibit hall pool ("it's the only thing he wants to do at the fair")?

Can you find my daughter, she wants to stay here and work so she has run away, she doesn't speak any English?

What is the name of the red flowers in the gardens you can see from the road train (there are some 2 million plants used in the 500 acres of the exposition grounds)?

They want to get married at the fair, some of them are suddenly afraid they're going to die at the fair.

Deputy Commissioner General Katherine Howard is on demand many, many hours out of the 24. And she loves it. She has her family with her, including her pretty niece, so her lovely Brussels house (which she had to decide on sight unseen and which is just as delightfully like her as her Beacon Street home here) is full of young people most of the time.

Her decorative red-carpeted offices at the United States pavilion make you think of the United Nations any day in the week, and kings and prime ministers come in to refresh their minds as well as rest their feet. She has personally entertained more than a thousand of the fair's visitors, and officially greeted thousands more, and in addition she has given luncheons and dinners in the name of the United States to scores of VIP's in her attractive pavilion dining room.

She and Mr. Howard still find time to enjoy Belgium (which they feel has a lot of the conservative, pleasant living pattern of Boston), and their many Belgian at-home invitations, a real tribute to the gracious intelligence that characterizes Katherine Howard.

Her praise goes to so many others at the pavilion—the more than 200 girls who are the United States friendly, efficient guides and who ought, frankly to get a credit rating toward a career in the diplomatic service by October and fair's end.

They are a most attractive crew, in their chemstrand-nylon gray pleated skirts and flower-fresh yellow blouses, their decorative shoes and matching gray berets.

All of them speak French, a number of them Spanish and German as well, and they've yet to put a foot wrong, even though the arrogant demands of some of the fair's thousands of daily visitors must tempt them sometimes. They've been on duty from April, living five to a small, neat room, and nearly half of them plan to stay on in Europe to study this winter, even though less than a third of them had ever been in Europe before this year.

About 60 of the guides are college boys, and girls or boys, they are wholly a credit to their country, and they got the unofficial but fervent best at the fair from the Rotary Club (and nearly a third of the world's 450,000 Rotarians are estimated to have visited Brussels so far).

Their own top vote for the United States pavilion's best, in fact, it is most of the exposition staff's No. 1 "don't miss" of the entire fair, is the Circarama, the 360-degree Disney color movie that takes 19 minutes, is seen standing in a small circular building where 11 synchronized-projectors produce an uninterrupted panorama.

It's new to the world, deftly and beautifully done, makes you homesick quicker than the Stars and Stripes, and Katherine Howard thinks she must have seen it at least 27 times. I left her getting ready to take Mollie and Ernest Henderson and Bessie and Sam Pappas in just as soon as they arrived.

Congresswoman Florence P. Dwyer Among America's Outstanding Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced by the Office of the United States Commissioner General of the Brussels Exhibition of 1958 that during the year that Office will present American women who have distinguished themselves in various fields of endeavor.

I have been pleased to learn that among America's outstanding women who have been given a cordial invitation to be featured in a special program to be arranged in their honor is our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER.

Regretfully, it appears, Mrs. DWYER has decided she will be unable to accept the invitation due to the demands of her congressional assignment. This, however, is readily understandable to the thousands who have followed the legislative work of this remarkable woman in the State Legislature of New Jersey and more recently in the Congress of the United States. She is an indefatigable representative, specializing in so many humanitarian fields in which women are preeminent, and her works in committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives, have attracted wide attention and acclaim.

Citizen Patterson Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at the venerable age of 82, George E. Patterson of 926 Appleton Street, Long Beach, Calif., looks on the passing political scene with a long lifetime of knowledge and experience. A former attorney and newspaper publisher, Mr. Patterson sent me the following analysis under the title "Let's Win" which seems to be of general interest:

LET'S WIN

The Republican (or Lincoln) Party is on trial. The party organization and leadership has been greatly blessed by Eisenhower.

We have had 12 Republican presidents and 4 Democrat presidents since Lincoln. The writer has personally been interested in this party since Grant. We have noticed the only time the party has been defeated has been when there was a split in the Republican Party. For example, the Taft-Theodore Roosevelt split.

The present Democratic Congress, elected because there is a split in the Republican party, is making it difficult for our President in his efforts to serve our country. He needs cooperation. It is not cooperating with our President in trying to formulate policies in the public forum. Tell the President. As leader of his own party and this country he must adopt and enforce the policies of our country under the Constitution. All parties must unite back of the President in foreign affairs.

Foreign countries must not be permitted to interfere in our Foreign Policy. They have in many ways in times past. In fact, foreign countries have involved us in wars by interfering in our foreign policy. In the past three wars, during Democratic administrations, foreign powers have interfered and have created conditions which lead us to war.

The three wars during Democratic administrations, World War I, World War II, and the Korean (or Truman) war, cost the United States $350 billion and 1,450,000 causalties. We must not forget that Eisenhower stopped the Korean war thus saving millions of dollars and thousands of human lives. Likewise, we must not forget we practically fought that war alone and paid most of the cost alone. Other countries pushed us into that war and then scattered. Eisenhower had the courage to stand against the pushing tactics of other countries.

We all know how England, France, and Israel tried to involve us in Egypt. We have Eisenhower to thank for stopping that war. Wars cause inflation followed by deflation. Another fact to remember is that the national debt was $16 billion under the Coolidge (Republican) administration. Then that debt went to $283 billion, under Roosevelt and Truman. This was besides the untold amount of Democratic commitments and vast increases in taxes, direct and indirect. Many of these were passed over to Eisen-

hower although he had nothing to do with creating them. That increased the cost of living tremendously. Eisenhower inherited the result of 20 years of Democratic rule.

There is talk of cutting the defense budget in these perilous times—playing politics. The Democrats throw up a smoke screen to cover their extravagance. The United States Government was in existence 156 years before the Truman administration. The Guarantee Trust Company of New York said: "Truman, in his 7 years of office, and the Democratic Congress, taxed the American people $50 billion more than all the other 31 Presidents combined including Franklin D. Roosevelt." The Truman administration spent more than all the other presidential administrations combined.

This is colossal stupidity, as most taxes are paid by poor people, directly or indirectly. Truman's Attorney General, Howard McGrath, had this in mind when he said while Truman was President: "I know enough about the White House to blow it so high the force of gravity would never bring it back to earth."

The recent conviction of fraud in the Federal court of St. Louis of Mathew J. Connelly, who was secretary to President Truman, and T. Lamar Caudle, who was Assistant Attorney General under Truman, in charge of Tax Division, is typical of Democratic laxity.

The Democratic Party gave diplomatic representation to Russia. This was followed by Russia sending thousands of their representatives here to preach communism. The Democratic Party gave Manchuria to Russia. This is the most productive section in China and resulted in Russia being in control of China. The Democratic Party loaned over $11 billion to Russia, gave materials to Russia, loaned ships to Russia (which Russia refused to return), and gave part of Germany, including Berlin, to Russia, and many other concessions. All of which made Russia strong. Now Russia turns against us.

The Democratic Party has been under the control of big city bosses and labor leaders. They forced the nomination of Harry Truman as Vice President on President Roosevelt. Senator Barkley, recently deceased, said during the Truman administration, when Barkley was a candidate for Democratic nomination for President, the city bosses and labor leaders forced him to retire as they were promised greater control of the Democratic Party. The Democrats, through their control of committees, played politics with our defense in last session of Congress.

The Republican Party first advocated social security under President Hoover. The Republican Party first advocated under President Hayes, the doctrine where local and private enterprise were inadequate the Government should undertake the job. The Republican Party put the Government in the parcel-post business under President Taft. The Republican Party first enacted the Sherman Antitrust Act under President Harrison. The Republican Party first championed reciprocity with Canada under President McKinley. The Republican Party, under President Theodore Roosevelt was the force back of the progressive movement to regulate big business and not wreck it. The Republican Party, under Coolidge, passed the first law giving organized labor the right to bargain collectively. We might go on enumerating hundreds of other acts the Republican Party favored, helpful to small business and people generally.

However, there are two elements in the Republican Party, the standpat and the progressive. When the Democrats were successful in Washington the ideas of the progressive Republicans were confiscated by the Democrats and adopted as their own, and so publicized.

The farm problem, which is a result of war, is very vital and the consumer problem is also vital. When Eisenhower took office, there was a $9 billion farm surplus, which was costing $1 million a day storage. The two largest farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau and National Grange were against rigid price support. Eisenhower has accomplished much, and if given proper support by the Democratic controlled Congress, will solve the farm problem.

There are many things which add to the farm problem. Labor cost has gone up about 200 percent since 1940. Now nearly 70 percent of cost of a product is labor. We all labor and sympathize with the laborer. But for the plutocratic labor boss to try and make the farmer believe he will be benefited by raising the labor cost, is silly.

Eisenhower has been fighting for the American system of free enterprise, as opposed to Government controls and regulations, individual liberty as opposed to individual enslavement.

England tried nationalization of railroads, coal mines, etc., resulting in great deficits and losses. Germany did away with Marx's ideas, substituted private for state regulation and management, and today it is the most prosperous country in Europe.

President Eisenhower is trying to maintain the peace and prosperity and keep expenses down to the minimum, all things considered, and serve all the people regardless of race, creed, pressure groups or politics. That is a gigantic undertaking. Let us help him?

Coping With the Problem of the Drunken Driver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most effective and informative article from the New Christian Advocate of August 1958, by Mr. William N. Plymat. Mr. Plymat, a leading church layman in our Nation, is president of the Preferred Risk Mutual Insurance Co., which caters only to motor-vehicle operators who do not drink intoxicating liquor. He is also an able attorney at law. In this article from the New Christian Advocate, Mr. Plymat pleads for a realistic approach to the urgent task of coping with the intoxicated and drunken driver who imperils not only his own life, but that of his passengers and others using the highways and public streets.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. William N. Plymat, entitled "We Need an Intermediate Offensive on the Drinking Driver," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED AN INTERMEDIATE OFFENSIVE ON THE DRINKING DRIVER

(By William N. Plymat)

From the day the motor car first arrived on the scene, Americans have been plagued by traffic accidents involving drinking. For many years we have tried to cope with this problem by sporadic campaigns attacking "drunk drivers." We have set up heavy penalties for this offense. We have developed chemical tests for proof of "drunk driving." We have sometimes sent men to prison for repeated offenses, and in some States we have taken away driver privileges.

But today we are still plagued with the problem, and it does not seem to be getting any better. At least 15,000 lives are being lost and at least 200,000 persons are being injured yearly in traffic accidents involving drinking. It is apparent that something more is needed—and I have a suggestion.

An intermediate offense would be an effective tool in the reduction of drinking-driving accidents, and the offense should be defined simply in terms of blood-alcohol.

In general, we have been proceeding in reverse on this problem. It is said, in substance, that it is illegal to operate a motor vehicle while intoxicated. And then the attempt is made to define "intoxication" in terms of blood-alcohol. Actually, what we should be striving to stop is drinking-driving, and the offense, I say again, should simply be defined in terms of blood-alcohol. It should be illegal to drive with more than a certain amount of alcohol, and drivers should not be allowed to go past the threshold of impairment without violating a law.

In some States laws have been passed defining this offense of driving while intoxicated in terms of presumptions. Under 0.05 percent is a presumption of innocence, over 0.15 percent is a presumption of guilt, and the twilight zone in between evidence to be taken into account with other evidence. As a practical matter, what has happened? In many places we simply do not attempt to convict anyone unless they have a blood-alcohol content of over 0.15 percent.

I have known a judge to dismiss a charge of drunk driving against a driver when the test showed a little over 0:15 percent. The Iowa highway patrol has said they now file driving-while-intoxicated charges against all drivers found to have 0.15 percent alcohol in blood tests, but they did not say what is done beneath that level. They referred to the zone 0.05 percent to 0.15 percent as borderline cases.

We should seek to find the point at which impairment begins and make it illegal to drive with more than that much alcohol. Where is the point at which impairment in driving ability begins?

A pioneer study in Evanston, Ill., was reported by Richard L. Holcomb back in 1938. A random sampling was made of drivers throughout a week, with balloon tests determining the percentage of drivers who had alcohol and the amount in each case. A total of 1,750 subjects were tested and only 24 refused to take the test. At about the same time over a period of 3 years, 270 drivers in accidents requiring hospitalization were tested.

It was found that only 12 percent of the drivers in the normal population had alcohol, but 46 percent of the accident drivers had alcohol. And less than one-half of 1 percent of the normal population had more than 0.15 percent alcohol.

Both laboratory and road tests were made in a Swedish study undertaken in 1950 to determine the effects of small amounts of alcohol on driving ability. Two groups of expert automobile drivers, 37 persons in all, drove on a special test track designed to measure driving ability. One group, chosen at random, served as controls; the other drank beer or distilled spirits. All the subjects performed the test drive twice, the alcohol group before and after drinking.

Among the findings was this: "The threshold of impairment of driving ability in expert drivers is an alcohol concentration of 0.35 to 0.40 per mil in the blood."

Some of these drivers performed laboratory tests. One was a flicker test—this determined the ability of the eye to distinguish a flickering light. A blink test was

used and determined the stimulus necessary to elicit a blink reflex. The final summary of this study carried two interesting statements:

"The threshold of impairment corresponded to an alcohol concentration in the blood of 0.2 or 0.3 per mil on the flicker test and 0.4 to 0.5 per mil on the blink test. The results indicate agreement between practical road tests and laboratory experiments as a means of testing driving ability."

Some very interesting data has come from three States recently indicating alcohol involvement in fatal accidents and the ranges of alcohol. In Delaware, in 1955, 138 drivers were involved in 97 fatal accidents and of these 20 drivers (14.5 percent) had 0.15 percent alcohol while 13 drivers (9.4 percent) had 0.05 to 0.14 percent, and 3 (2.2 percent) had less than 0.05 percent of alcohol in their blood. But 20 drivers (14.5 percent) who were not tested had been drinking, in the opinion of the investigation officer.

In New Hampshire in 1955, there were 107 tests in fatal accident cases, with 55 being negative. Of the positives, 14 were in the zone 0.01 to 0.04 percent inclusive, 13 in the zone 0.05 to 0.14 percent, and 25 in the zone 0.15 percent or above.

In Montana between March of 1955 and November of 1956, there were 347 fatal accidents killing 438 persons. Blood samples were obtained from 202 of those killed. Of the 202 analyses made, 14 (or 7 percent) were contaminated by embalming fluid when the sample was drawn.

The blood-alcohol levels of the remaining 188 cases followed this distribution: 44 (or 23 percent) had less than 0.05 percent; 58 (or 31 percent) ranged between 0.05 and 0.15 percent; 86 (or 46 percent) ranged over 0.15 percent.

In Maryland, in 1953, examinations were made in 173 cases for incidence of alcohol in motor vehicle fatalities and, of these, 64 were found to be negative with 7 in the zone 0.01 to 0.04 percent, 34 in the zone 0.05 to 0.14 percent, and 70 over 0.15 percent.

The really significant information in these fatal accidents is the fact that there is such a sizable number of persons with 0.05 percent or higher of alcohol in fatal accidents. While the Evanston study was a long time ago, and we might wish there were more like it to corroborate it, the fact remains that a very small percentage of all drivers on the road appear to have alcohol, yet among fatals it runs high in percentage in all categories. And there is sizable significance in the area of 0.05 percent and higher.

What I have tried to show is that the point at which it should be illegal to operate a car so far as blood alcohol is concerned is 0.05 percent. There are already laws in two nations to that effect, and support is developing in the United States for one.

In 1926 Norway enacted such a law.

In August of 1957, G. Nelker, the principal executive officer of Ansvar, a prominent Swedish insurance company and former secretary of a Swedish governmental committee that investigated the alcohol problem, made this statement to me in a letter:

"According to (our) new law the lower limit is decreased to 0.5 per mil. Every driver with more than 0.5 per mil (the same as 0.05 per cent by American measurements) in his blood should be convicted for drunken driving. In case he has more than 1.5 per mil alcohol in the blood he should be convicted to prison even if the doctors have found him not drunken."

Dr. Horace E. Campbell, chairman of the Automotive Safety Committee of the Colorado State Medical Society, presented to his society a resolution asking that it be made illegal to drive with a blood-alcohol level of 0.05 percent. The resolution was passed in September 1957. Opinion in favor of the 0.05 percent limit is growing steadily.

We could leave all existing laws regarding "drunk driving" stand as they are and pass an intermediate offense law. Such a law would simply declare that it was illegal to operate a motor vehicle with more than 0.05 percent alcohol in the blood, and the fine could be a smaller one, by a considerable margin, than for drunk driving. A lesser offense such as this with a smaller penalty would help deter such conduct.

It would not be as difficult to convict, since the jury would not be considering whether the driver was drunk but only whether the driver had more than 0.05 percent alcohol. This would be a determinable fact, and the chemical test would answer the question clearly and precisely. While there might be those who would believe they could drive safely with blood-alcohol concentrations of 0.05 percent to say 0.15 percent, they would be discouraged from trying since with a lower fine, and a simple blood-alcohol test, conviction and fine would be more certain.

It it were possible to get such an intermediate offense law passed, we would then have the job of publishing widely the fact that if a man has two 14-ounce bottles of 3.2 percent beer, or 2 ounces of 100 proof whisky and weighs 150 pounds and is an average moderate drinker, he is in the zone of impairment; and if he has 3 bottles of such beer or 3 ounces of whisky he will be above 0.05 percent and in violation of this law. It would be as simple as that.

Nuclear Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD entitled "Nuclear Submarines Doom Large Surface Ships," from the May 1958 issue of Western World.

The ideas set forth in this article can provoke further serious thought and study on the role of surface and undersea ships in the Navy of the future.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR SUBMARINES DOOM LARGE SURFACE WARSHIPS

(By CHET HOLIFIELD)

(In urging the West to increase production of atomic submarines with nuclear missiles United States Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Atomic Legislation, states that today's weapons will be obsolescent when the weapons now on the drawing board have been manufactured.)

The aircraft carrier, since World War II the pride of naval enthusiasts everywhere, may well be obsolescent—or within 5 years, obsolete. I propose to present a line of reasoning which is growing rapidly in both Houses of Congress of the United States and in the free world.

Within the free world's navies we find a growing realization that the day of the great surface ship is ending.

Testimony before United States congressional committees, in behalf of the large nuclear aircraft carrier whose keel was unobtrusively laid on February 4, 1958, seemed weak and even apologetic. The principal argument was that aircraft carriers would still be needed for limited war purposes. There was no real, strong testimony seeking to justify the aircraft carrier on the basis of a competitive weapon system for use in an all-out nuclear third world war. The United States Congress reluctantly approved one large nuclear aircraft carrier, but it may yet be canceled.

In my opinion, its two sister carriers, requested by the admirals, will never be built. Techniques of faster and less vulnerable weapon systems are increasing so fast that as Deputy Defense Secretary Donald Quarles said, "If it works, it's obsolescent."

We are in the middle of a weapon development revolution. Yesterday's arms are inadequate to meet the weapon of today. Today's weapon systems will be obsolescent when weapon systems now on the drawing boards become a production reality. If this premise is sound, western governments should reevaluate all weapon systems constantly and cancel, without regard to present money investment, any grand design based on nostalgia or tradition. The real issue is whether the 4 years required for launching another large carrier and the billion dollars for the aircraft carrier and its complement of planes shall be used in a sacrifice to naval tradition or should the time and money be used to produce modern hunter-killer and missile-launching submarines to meet the No. 1 naval threat of the Soviet Union.

Tradition dies hard and military traditions die hardest of all. There are still military oldtimers who long for the pomp and ceremony of a cavalry company in dress array, and there are still admirals and incipient admirals who long for the thrill of being piped aboard a great ship and the prestige and feeling of grandeur which can only be realized from the centuries-old pinnacle of naval achievement—the admiral's bridge.

Today the admirals are clinging desperately to large surface ship tradition. They now ask for great ships that must have many planes and attendant ships which they hope will protect them from new terrors in the form of surface-to-surface guided missiles, air-to-surface missiles launched from a plane more than 100 miles away, and from torpedoes and missiles launched from underwater craft of an advanced power and speed never known before.

SURFACE TARGETS ARE VULNERABLE

All of these weapons can carry nuclear warheads so powerful that direct hits are unnecesary. Any of these weapons systems can achieve destruction of a billion dollar surface craft with one hit or near hit. Defense of the giant carrier now requires total defense. This is something new. A carrier will not absorb the nuclear punch and limp into drydock for repairs, so it can fight another day. Any nuclear missile from the sky or the depths will do the job. Total defense can never be attained. All targets are vulnerable in the atomic hydrogen age, therefore all targets must be expendable. This means that military hardware, whether it be naval or air, must be capable of maximum dispersal and mobility. It must be possessed of great capacity for evasion. It must be either fast or able to hide. If its position is fixed, predetermined missiles can be permanently keyed in for push button annihilation. If it is on the surface of the land or water it can be found and fought by supersonic plane or missile. If it moves slowly by land or water it cannot escape the techniques of faster pursuit and total nuclear destruction.

The argument advanced by Admiral Burke before the House Appropriations Committee

on January 13, 1958, as justification for the new nuclear carrier is based principally on two points:

1. A carrier with its planes is necessary for brush fire or limited war purposes.

The answer to this is that the United States already has 100 aircraft carriers. If limited war requires all of these carriers and more, then I submit that the war is neither limited nor brush fire.

2. Admiral Burke stressed the increased value of mobile bases (aircraft carriers) because of the oncoming missile capability to zero in on a fixed military base.

This argument is sound in principle, but actually weak, as can be shown in detail later. Its two weaknesses are relative slowness and easy detectability, because of surface visibility.

The carrier proponents point out the vulnerability of Strategic Airforce Command bases, crowded with B–52's and B–47's, to missiles zeroed in on them from foreign enemy launching sites. General LeMay admitted this vulnerability before a United States congressional committee—and asked for more SAC bases to facilitate dispersal of present massed bombers. Such facilities should be furnished as soon as possible. But the carrier proponents do not prove their case by pointing at the fixed bases of SAC. Carriers and their attendant fleets of small ships are not fixed as rigidly as SAC bases but their mobility is limited and slow when compared to that of supersonic planes with long range air-to-surface nuclear missiles. Their detectability is very great. They cannot hide on the surface of the ocean.

The new fast nuclear submarines possess pursuit capability never possessed before by conventional submarines. In addition to their almost unlimited cruising range, their great speed and long submergence qualities make them a formidable foe of any type of surface ship. They are a very evasive weapon, hiding as they can in the depths of the oceans from reconnaissance plane or surface craft.

RUSSIA'S UNDERWATER NAVY

Frankly, I want the United States Navy to meet the Russian Navy—if it must—with better weapons than it now has. I want it to be able to fight on the level which the Soviets have chosen for their naval operations.

What is that level?

The Russians have deliberately built submarines as their principal naval weapon. They are not building large surface ships such as carriers. Their surface ships are fast and relatively small; they are for minelaying, subchasing, and missile launching. But their Sunday punch (navywise) is their huge submarine fleet.

The publication, Jane's Fighting Ships, for 1956–57 and 1957–58, should be authoritative enough. It states that Russia has a fleet of over 475 submarines compared to America's 204.

We should not waste time debating the point of whether the Soviets yet have nuclear-powered submersibles or not. This merely confuses the issue. If they do not have them today, they undoubtedly will have them tomorrow.

Let us consider the scope of risk in possible Soviet submersible warcraft.

First, Hitler started the World War II attack on his opponents' shipping with an operating fleet in the Atlantic of 57 submarines. As the war continued he lost some and built some. During World War II, 24,246,489 tons of allied shipping were sunk by submarines, aircraft, surface craft, mines, collisions, and other enemy action. Of this total more than half (14,547,463 tons) were sunk by submarines. There was a time when the Atlantic sea coast was dotted with burning oil takers, supply ships, and troopships. Our convoys were under constant attack as they crossed the Atlantic. The convoy protection of World War II was inadequate—although it was helpful. Convoy protection today is impossible because of the wide target of nuclear destruction from a single megaton missile or torpedo. Ships cannot be massed close enough for convoy protection as the attack weapon now could extend its destruction from a single ship to other ships nearby. If you separate the convoy ships outside of the circle of nuclear destruction from one weapon, you forfeit the advantage of the convoy.

Today, according to Jane's Fighting Ships, the United States starts with a Soviet complement of more than 474 submersibles instead of Hitler's 57. Jane's states that a large percentage are long-range boats of new construction. Jane's adds that some 100 submarines are now under construction in Soviet dockyards, as a part of a submarine building program involving 75 to 85 new modern submarines each in 1958 and in 1959.

OUTMODED SUBMARINES ARE NO ANSWER

America ended the war with 232 submarines built mostly under wartime pressure. We are supposed to have about 204 now. Some are in mothballs, some are of pre-World War II vintage, many are old submarines converted to snorkel, some are post-World War II snorkel type. A conservative estimate would me that only about 100 of the 204 are effective even on a conventional-type basis. Five are nuclear propelled, the *Nautilus, Sea Wolf, Skate, Swordfish* and *Sargo*. Fourteen more modern nuclear submarines are under construction or on order, and Congress has just appropriated money for 3 Polaris-launching nuclear submarines.

My argument for the superiority of the submarine over aircraft carrier does not hinge on outmoded submarines. It hinges on the superior capabilities of the new nuclear-propelled submarine compared with the new nuclear-propelled carrier whose keel was laid February 4. I am arguing for the future, not to sustain the techniques or traditions of the past.

My principal argument is that new naval problems have been posed because of new techniques in submarine effectiveness as a result of the use of nuclear energy. These new techniques and capabilities are far more revolutionary when associated with submersibles than with nuclear powered aircraft carriers. Nuclear energy has given to both unlimited cruising range without refueling—but nuclear energy has increased submarine underwater speed several hundred percent. On the other hand the speed of the carrier's movement is governed by the average speed of the flotilla. Nuclear energy has also given the submarine almost unlimited submergence instead of the 48-hour battery time of conventional diesel craft. It has also given the submarine a new quality of relative silence in place of the vibration of a diesel reciprocating engine. All of these new and revolutionary qualities contribute to evasiveness and concealment from detection. The underwater speed of the new *Albacore* type may well exceeded the surface speed of the nuclear carrier. It is because of these advantages that I do not hesitate to predict the end of the large aircraft carrier, be it equipped with nuclear or conventional propulsion power.

Many strategists in the Navy already see the handwriting on the wall; even those who still remain true to large surface ship tradition reveal in their testimony before congressional appropriation committees from time to time their deep concern at changing factors of offense and defense.

Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates testified before Congress this year that we should "accelerate the Polaris missile-submarine weapons system. We are convinced that this is the most important contribution that can be made to the national deterrent power. It requires no launching sites in the continental United States or foreign land bases."

Adm. Arleigh Burke said the Polaris "should present to the enemy an unquestioned and continuing United States military capability which he cannot fail to understand and appreciate. At the same time, it should remain unobtrusive and politically least offensive in the public-opinion forums of the world."

I submit that no other weapon system, including the carrier system, can meet these stern requirements so ably outlined by Admiral Burke.

My contention is simply that the United States has, according to Jane's Fighting Ships, over 100 carriers now. True, many of them are of World War II vintage and are smaller and slower than the *Forrestal*, the *Saratoga*, and the planned nuclear carrier. But when we consider that they are already justified for use in a limited or brushfire type of war, it seems obvious that we should rely on the existing aircraft carriers for their present and foreseeable mission. No NATO countries should expend further billions of precious defense dollars for obsolete or obsolescent weapon systems.

We desperately need a crash program now for the more effective naval weapon system which we know can be built. This system, of course, should not be geared to the large missile-launching submarine (Polaris) alone. The smaller, faster hunter-killer attack type is just as important. If we are to seek out and kill the Soviet submarines, we must not rely alone on surface subchasers. We must add to our defensive capability, submarines designed especially to seek out and destroy enemy submarines. Fortunately, at this time, most of the Russian submarine fleet are of the diesel-propelled type and therefore are slower and more detectable than the fast new nuclear type we can build.

I believe that the era of the aircraft carrier is drawing to an end. It is vulnerable to supersonic missiles guided into its bowels from supersonic aircraft. We have the supersonic attack bombers today. We have the air-to-suface Falcon, Genie, and Rascal missiles. They are the forerunners of air-to-surface nuclear missiles of greatly increased range and destructive power. These missiles and their deadly successors will be ready long before great carriers can be built. They will help to make any type of expensive surface carrier obsolete before it is launched.

The free world must not, I emphasize, continue to be a slave to the traditional concepts of the last war. We all must recognize the new and revolutionary techniques which so clearly point to the new blitzkrieg techniques of world war III. It is only through a constant checkmating of enemy capability that we may be able to buy time to establish world peace. If our power of deterrence wanes by default, or by perpetuation of Maginot-line concepts of defense and offense, we shall be responsible for the suicide of civilization.

Why Not Go Into Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a well written and most interesting article written by Thomas Winship, that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on August 10, 1958, that should be read by representatives of business and labor.

WHY NOT GO INTO POLITICS?

(By Thomas Winship)

As another political season approaches, it is natural, and indeed encouraging, that we are being treated to such a rash of suggestions on what politically sensitive segments of our society should or should not do in the arena of elective politics.

This year's most popular subject seems to be the American businessman. It goes like this: Wake up, Mr. Businessman, and get into politics. It's to your own selfish interest to do so. Labor has stolen the march on you.

Lemuel R. Boulware, General Electric Co.'s tough, brainy idea man and vice president, recently preached this theme to several hundred businessmen in Phoenix, Ariz.

"In the 60-odd years since the Sherman Anti-Trust Act first warned business it was in real and deserved political trouble," said Boulware, "we businessmen have continued to concentrate on what used to be our whole job, but which, while still vastly important, is now only part of our job."

TAKE LESSON FROM FOE

"We have needlessly neglected to pay enough attention to politics and politicians," Boulware continued.

From where the General Electric executive sits, the business community's traditional skittishness of day-to-day politics left the field wide open to the labor movement to develop what he considers too much political muscle for the country's own welfare. Opinion obviously differs on labor's real political strength.

Boulware is too much of a realist to think labor's involvement in politics has been unwise or unethical.

In fact, he urged businessmen to take a few lessons from the CIO's political action committees and its other political organizations.

"We cannot quarrel," said Boulware, "with the right of any citizen—in fact we earnestly support his right—to seek through political action political solutions to what he considers his problems."

HOW TO DO IT

The General Electric spokesman went on to spell out a program for political action that would serve as a fine blueprint for CIO–AFL headquarters.

The same advice to businessmen—i. e., learn to be as at home in city hall as at the country club or in front of a stock ticker—comes from another quarter.

Prof. Norton E. Long, a New Dealer and political science lecturer last year at Littauer School of Public Administration, gives the businessman another mouthful in the current issue of the Harvard Business Review.

Too often, Professor Long decries, "the business community still is engaged in ritual do-gooding, waiting for George to do it, blaming the politicians, and, on occasion, calling for a business superman in a form of a Richard K. Mellon (in Pittsburgh)."

Full development of the potentials of the metropolitan economy must to a large extent come from the ranks of business, not from the politicians, says Long. "The politicos as a class are closely tied to the jurisdictions of the past," the professor holds, "and for the most part, their attitudes are reactionary."

That is a New Deal professor, a sometimes ghost writer for Michigan Gov. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, talking—calling on businessmen to take over from the elected politicians in the governmental field of local economic development because most politicians are too reactionary.

DROP POLITICS

From still another corner comes some quite different advice for the labor movement. In Harper's this month, a former AFL–CIO union staff worker tells labor to get out of party politics this year and possibly in 1960, too.

"As a former union staff man and a continuing supporter of organized labor," Dick Bruner writes, "I think the AFL–CIO should pull out of party politics right now.

"Their candidates will do as well or better without them, will be just as grateful or ungrateful if they win, and will respect their influence more deeply the next time."

Bruner concedes that unions should continue thir practice of exposing the voting records of politicians and of urging their members to vote. But for the next few years labor should tidy up its own house, somewhat disheveled by McClellan Rackets Committee hearings the past 2 years, and undertake an honest appraisal of its real function, Bruner concludes.

Who's right? Should organized business plunge deeper into political life? Should labor rein in its leadership in an election year? Several points seem clear.

DO IT YOURSELF

There is ample resiliency and there are ample checks and balances in our system of government for tough, aggressive wooing and pressuring of political candidates or officeholders. Citizen revulsion eventually takes care of excesses by a special interest lobbyist or an officeholder.

The more businessmen and labor leaders take an active part in politics the better will be the country's economic, political, and spiritual health.

Also, leaders of business and labor should throw themselves into the spotlight of public opinion and political activity more aggressively than ever for a common and very selfish reason:

It is, that both business and labor suffer today from below-par public relations.

Labor's public image has been marred by indefensible power and financial greediness on the part of a tiny handful of leaders. Their housecleaning has begun.

Business' public relations is in poor shape today essentially because too many businessmen devoted too much time to their own shops in the post-World War II boom years, and not enough time and energy to unselfish public service on the town, city, and national level. Too many have sat back in their offices and blamed the day's public affairs shortcomings on "those corrupt politicians."

Let's hope both business and labor are on the political firing line this fall, on election day and every other day in the year like never before.

CARE: Helping Others Help Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, upward of 35 million refugees have been driven from their homes by wars and political upheavals. Through the nonprofit organization known as CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances Everywhere, Inc.—Americans are helping these unrooted peoples and others in benighted areas of the world to get back on their feet.

The help provided by CARE takes many forms. It basically revolves around the sound principle that the best way to aid these people is to help them help themselves. Thus, CARE's self-help program provides farm tools, woodworking outfits, textbooks, fishing equipment, sewing machines, and other occupational materials which permit the recipients once again to earn their own living and become productive, self-supporting members of society.

CARE distributions in more than 50 countries have totaled nearly 23 million food, textile, and self-help tool packages and special shipments. This includes more than 260,000 tons of American farm surpluses given to CARE by the Government.

I am proud to report that residents of my home city of Rochester, N. Y., have contributed over $200,000 for CARE's work since the founding of the organization. This figure is a tribute not only to the many volunteer workers in the city who have given so willingly of their time and effort, but also to the thousands of city residents who have cheerfully and generously contributed to this worthy cause. Rochester's response proves once again that it is a city with a heart ever open to help those in need.

New York State, as a whole, has played a prominent role in the success of CARE. It leads all States in terms of total contributions with a sum of over $23 million. Contributions from the entire Nation have reached a total of $135 million.

In the short span of 12 years CARE has become one of the most effective tools in America's program to win friends overseas and to build effective and stable allies in all corners of the globe. Particular emphasis today is being placed on the self-help program, which is designed to put into the hands of needy people in underdeveloped areas the tools and supplies they need to raise their own standards of living and thus become self-sustaining members of their communities.

CARE is currently conducting its annual self-help campaign throughout the country. These self-help packages vary in type and price. An elementary school kit may be sent to a child in Korea, Hong Kong, or Vietnam for a dollar. Agricultural hand tools range from $8 to $13. A plow can be sent to east Pakistan for $8, to Greece and Malta for $11, and to Mexico for $17.50.

Kits to train apprentice workmen in the needle trades, to be auto mechanics, electricians, plumbers, or masons, range from $10 to $35. A refugee fisherman, who has fled from Communist China to Hong Kong can be given a new start in life with a CARE liner and neter fisherman's kit for $15. CARE also has an extensive book program, which includes technical and medical books for universities and hospitals, children's books in English, Spanish, and Chinese, and a portable library containing 99 paperback books in the fields of history, biography, art, science, and fiction.

Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard a good deal of talk about the need for bringing our foreign policy more in line with the needs and realities of the world situation today. We have read and heard a great deal about extending and expanding wise and generous trade and aid policies. Most of these suggestions have envisioned governmental programs of help and encouragement.

CARE represents a simple, inexpensive means by which each individual American citizen can express his concern with his brothers around the globe and his determination to help improve their lot. It is a concrete means for showing the people of the world that we really do care.

By providing a conduit for Americans to express this heartfelt concern for their less fortunate fellow men, CARE is contributing immensely to the building of a stable and peaceful world. The people of CARE deserve the commendation of all.

I want to take this opportunity to salute all of them for the splendid job they are doing. Although I am most familiar with those in Rochester, N. Y., I am sure their fine example is being followed in countless cities all across our Nation.

I hope thousands of our citizens will continue to contribute to this program to promote the renewal of human dignity in the free world. They may do so by means of donations through local CARE offices or any office of Railway Express, which accepts CARE contributions as a public service. Such contributions help solidify the already strong bonds made possible by this heart-to-heart, man-to-man program of living, human dynamic, personal diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD a graphic description of CARE's work which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of March 12, 1958:

CARE EXPANDS AID

(By Emilie Tavel)

A freshly baked bun, a glass of milk, a child's smile—for a dozen years Americans have CARED for the world this way.

Since May 1946, when Cooperatives for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc., began, Americans' generosity and the open-handedness of the United States Government have probably made CARE the most universally understood word in the English language.

What does it mean? Food for hungry people.

America's collective pocket today bulges with personally signed thank-you's for the 20 million packages of food sent to people in 50 countries of Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Orient.

Beyond that, CARE has distributed abroad nearly half a billion pounds of farm surplus foods in bulk. And every day this year CARE is feeding 11 million persons.

Hungry people can understand statistics like that.

And anyone can understand a statistic like this, fantastic though it sounds: A $1 gift sends 22 pounds of such surplus farm goods sailing off to a needy family on the other side of the world.

CARE is a man-to-man operation free from government strings. It reduces the staggering needs of today's world to proportions, which any person can grasp, any heart can respond to, almost any pocketbook can afford. It is a nonprofit, nonsectarian, private relief agency.

WHAT IS CARE, U. S. A.?

In 12 years, what has happened to the famous box marked "CARE, U. S. A."? It is gradually changing size, shape, and content. It is steadily shifting from help to self-help, from a handout to stave off hunger to a leg-up onto the road to recovery.

The significant fact is that 1957 was the year self-help as the new focus for CARE caught on with the public. Contributions for tools, books, and implements rose from 7 to 15 percent of last year's total donor gift of $7 million. Total contributions rose 66 percent over fiscal 1956.

This means that today a dollar bill can run these exciitng errands for the contributor:

It can hand a Hong Kong fisherman a new nylon net—to him a marvel—to replace the gear he lost in his flight from Communist China.

It can give a beautiful, colorful book to ac hild who has never even seen a book before.

It can place a kit of tools in the hands of a young man who has trained himself in a trade but is useless to his country because he has no tools with which to practice his skill.

It can thrust into the soil of a primitive farm the steel blade of a shiny new plow.

In the United States, September smells like new school shoes, like pencils and pads and unopened books. But elsewhere for too many children to count it means no such thing. They don't go to school either because there is no school or because they just don't have the equipment.

This is where the CARE school kit comes in. It is nowhere more dramatically appreciated than in Hong Kong, where thousands of refugees from China sleep on rooftops and in streets, and figure they are fortunate if they can rent space under a bed.

Last September CARE delivered thousands of school kits to unsmiling Chinese children. Little hands tugged eagerly at the boxes, each containing writing pads and copy books, pencils, and eraser, a ruler, crayons, and a pencil sharpener.

Describing the result, Frank Robertson, the Christian Science Monitor's correspondent there, reported that "what followed can only be described as communal rapture." Such a school kit costs the donor $1.

Besides food parcels, school kits, and fishing gear, CARE is supplying playground equipment for children of the streets, and has set up a revolving loan fund for fishermen to repair their junks.

CARE officials realize that once elemental hunger has been halted, the next and greater need is to put hands to work. "This is the challenge that shapes the CARE of today and tomorrow—self-help," says Richard W. Reuter, executive director of CARE. "It has been called the biggest overseas job of our generation."

JOINT PROGRAM DYNAMIC

"Self-help and food together, moreover," he says, "make a total program far more dynamic than just the sum of the two parts. Thus school feeding and school kit distribution together build minds and bodies for a more productive new generation. Food allotted to a trade school gives the greater strength needed for energetic new activities made possible by CARE vocational equipment."

Darcy Wilson, New England director of CARE, says: "We think that in X number of years the really outstanding thing CARE will have done is to educate Americans to the importance of a self-help program and to act as the agency for sending that help overseas."

CARE has four separate programs—the original CARE package to designated individuals, the $1 Food Crusade 22-pound surplus food package, and the self-help tools program which supplements technical assistance to village projects with such wonders as sewing machines.

The fourth is one you hear little about because you are never asked to contribute to it. Called the country feeding program, it provides thousands of children in needy countries with school lunches—often the only meal they have all day.

The United States Government gives the food out of its surplus stocks and pays the ocean freight to deliver it. The host country pays for internal transportation and all costs of the CARE teams which administer the program and account for every last pound.

Before British and French bombs pounded Suez and Israelis raced across the Sinai Desert in September 1956, CARE's country feeding program in Egypt was the largest voluntary agency feeding program ever undertaken. Its suspension by the United States Government at that time caused some hard feelings among Egyptians.

It can now be reported that CARE feels the time is close when the United States Government will permit it to move back into Egypt with a program of school feeding of an even greater tonnage than before. This time corn and wheat are expected to be added to milk and cheese. CARE's job is to be where the need is greatest. Often the areas of greatest need are areas of greatest tension.

At this moment globe-trotting Mr. Reuter is in the process of signing contracts with Turkey, Iran, and Ethiopia, countries never reached before by regular CARE remittances.

Eager to build up their industry and agriculture, these nations have asked for the farm tools and vocational equipment CARE is prepared to supply—with your help.

It has always been CARE's intention to phase out whenever a country could meet its own needs. Nevertheless, CARE itself has been delighted to discover, when quitting a country, that it has left behind valuable organizational machinery that country never had before.

Iran particularly wants CARE to set up a school feeding distribution program, which can be continued after CARE leaves.

In Ceylon, CARE teams personally oversaw the baking of bread for the school-lunch program. Today native Ceylonese do the baking; the Ceylonese Government is supplying some of the food and is taking over some of the costs.

The Foreign Policy of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent research and analysis of one of the administrative staff of my Washington office, Mr. Sheldon Parker, of Williams College and Pittsburgh, Pa., on the recent status of the fine relations that exist between Germany and the United States:

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

With the ratification of the Paris Treaties on May 5, 1955, came national sovereignty for the Federal Republic of Germany. Accompanying the restoration of her independence was a great sense of duty for improving the world situation, complete freedom of action in every field, and, more directly, a membership in the defense community of the Western World. The presence of troops of the Western powers on German soil in accordance with a joint alliance of defense provides the basis of the close relationship between the foreign policy of Germany and the joint defense policy of the Western powers.

On May 28, 1957, in speaking before the United States Senate, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer outlined the general direction of the foreign policy of the Bonn Government. He called freedom the first principle of the Government's policy and effectively showed why the German people feel so strongly about its attainment. In the past they have experienced a totalitarian regime imposed on the country during the National Socialist regime. At present the German people are vividly aware of the reality of communism which has taken the form of a Communist dictatorship in the Soviet zone. Besides rejecting the totalitarian form of government, the Federal Republic has shown that it wants freedom by its firm alliance with the West. Its policy of integration is a decided manifestation of this desire. West Germany has participated in all the European organizations set up in recent years. On January 1 of this year, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, and Germany started to join their separate national markets into one common market system by gradually doing away with custom duties and quantitative trade restrictions. On this date the six nations also jointly started to make plans for developing atomic energy for industrial use, to set up a common market for all fissionable raw materials, and to finance jointly research and experimentation.

The Coal and Steel Community of the 6 nations has in the 5 years of its existence provided a common market for coal and steel which is free from custom duties or import quotas. The Economic Community of the six countries is an important gain for American foreign policy; these countries are at present more valuable and freer allies. While the European Economic Community deals specifically with the economic character of the unification of Europe, it is also a very important political event. By transferring decisions on the economy to a group of supranational agencies, each nation has rejected part of its national sovereignty and has advanced the progress toward a federal union.

To Dr. Adenauer, European unity is second in importance only to German reunification. The German Republic cannot be complete until it includes the East German sector under Communist domination. The Chancellor has repeatedly made it clear that Germany's freedom must be won only in connection with the West. Although he realizes that millions of people are forced to live under a regime of lawlessness, arbitrary rule and slavery, he refuses to back Russia's demands for Germany's withdrawal from all European security pacts as a condition for German reunification. To heed Russian proposals would be to betray Europe and to postrate Germany before Russian imperialism in the East. There is no room for neutrality in Adenauer's program whether it be of the political or ideological type. For Germany to back neutralization would be to open the rest of Europe to Soviet influence. What is more, the Federal Republic would be surrendering to a reunited Germany of Russia's liking. The liberty of 53 million Germans would be sacrificed for the return of 18 million Germans in the East sector. Adenauer could never consent to such drastic sacrifices in order to attain reunification.

Dr. Adenauer regards Germany's relations with France as of the utmost importance in guaranteeing the peace of Europe. Back in 1850, Alexis de Tocqueville, the French political thinker refuted the arguments of a French neutralism which was against the close collaboration of Germany and France. De Tocqueville pointed to the greater danger of Russia in trying to allay French fears of Germany. Both Adenauer and De Tocqueville were thinking along exactly the same lines in advocating a strong bond between Germany and France to combat the Russian threat. De Toqueville made the following statement to counter the arguments of those against the union of Germany and France: "What exactly is the danger from Russia, which threatens European independence? It is my conviction that sooner or later our Western World will be in danger of falling under the despotism, or at least the direct and irresistible influence of the czarist regime. That is why I feel that our first aim must be to further the unity of all German tribes, in order through them to oppose the influence of the Russians. The world is in a new and changed situation; we must adjust our old principles, and we must shed the fear that our neighbors will become too strong, so that one day they will be able, together with us, to push back the common enemy."[1] The ratification of the Paris Treaties, the acceptance of the Federal Republic in the West European Union and in NATO have made Germany allies with France. The settlement of the Saar issue in the spirit of friendship eliminated the last issue which divided France and Germany until war between these two nations has become unthinkable.

West Germany's admittance to full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1954 marked a vast departure from the decision of 1945 in which the Western powers were determined that Germany would never again have arms. The Communist attack in South Korea in 1950 served to remind the United States of the situation in Germany and was largely responsible for the change of mind. In Korea there had been a well-trained army to the north attacking an undefended country in the south. In Germany there were Russian forces poised on the borders of a Federal Republic which had no forces of its own with which to defend itself. The decision to rearm Germany could have been avoided by one of two ways: either the occupying powers could have undertaken the defense of the country, or they could have left Germany undefended. Neither of these plans was or is feasible. Frenchmen and Englishmen would not risk their lives on German soil while at the same time preventing the Germans from defending their homeland. To lose Germany's 53 million people, along with industrial and natural resources, would adversely alter the balance of power and could not be permitted by default.

Originally, German rearmament was to be brought about within the European Defense Community. Under this plan, Germany would have no army of its own; there would be only a European army with French and German soldiers wearing the same uniform. Memories of the war prevented France from accepting such an arrangement, and Germany had to be rearmed without the concept of a European army. Germany later was brought into NATO as a full member and as an active participant in the defense structure of the West. According to present plans, Germany will be contributing 350,000 men to NATO defense by 1961 in addition to a tactical air force and a limited navy whose principal task is coastal defense. The Federal Republic is genuinely committed to carry out the requirements made by NATO even though they might not always be popular with the German citizens. In a recent parliamentary debate, Chancellor Adenauer told the Bundestag that his Government would not oppose nuclear arms for West German's army should the North Atlantic Community require it. He gave excellent reasons for this policy decision. For Germany to turn down offers of arms would be tantamount to removing itself from the organization, and because of her geographical location and industrial power Germany cannot isolate herself from the rest of Europe. He further stated that Germany would be drawn into the conflict whether it was armed or unarmed. The West German Government fully supports disarmament, but it is anxious to see Russian actions replace its vast number of words.

Before the decision on German armament could be enacted, it was necessary to convince ourselves, to convince the Germans, and to convince the French that there was no other way of countering the Soviet challenge. This process partially took the form of a meeting with the Russians in 1954 to see whether or not the unfavorable situation had changed. The Soviets refused to agree to the West's plan for a European security system under which the Soviet Union would be protected again the possibility of a German attack. In return the United States requested that free elections be held in all four zones so that the country might be united and given the chance to determine its own foreign policy and it own alliances. The Soviets again rejected the plans in meeting at Geneva in July and October of 1955. The Soviet Union has shown in quelling uprisings in Eastern Europe and Hungary that it will not hesitate to use force or threat of force to back up its ultimate objectives. This position held by the Russians makes it imperative that the military might of the North Atlantic Alliance be maintained. This alliance also demands flexibility in adapting to changing conditions in the world.

To further alleviate fears of German rearmament, its leaders have created a constitutional basis for the armed forces which makes it impossible for reenactment of the era of German history when the military determined the policies of the country. They wisely created a state within a state and drafted laws which reflect the democratic mood of Germany today. In addition a committee of prominent citizens representing different political philosophies was set up to screen all Germans nominated for the rank of colonel or above in the new army. This action appears to have satisfied any fears about the taint of nazism in the officer corps. The corps will be dedicated to the defense of Germany as a democratic member of NATO.

Chancellor Adenauer, more than any one man, has been responsible for the strong ties of Germany's foreign policy with the United States. The constitution and state laws reflect the very best of the Western-oriented system of law. Under his strong administration Germany's moral and political life has assumed a new direction and order. Dr. James Conant, former United States High Commissioner to Germany and Ambassador in 1955, paid tribute to Chancellor Adenauer recently when he stated that "I believe that history will record that his greatest service to his country and to humanity lies in the fact that he and his associates have restored the moral worth of Germany in the eyes of the free world."[2]

The octogenarian Chancellor rightly contends that alinement with the West is natural in view of Germany's spiritual, cultural, economic, and political outlook on life, which refers her in that direction. Dr. Adenauer's overwhelming victory at the polls on September 15 of last year also marked a great victory for the West and what it stands for. The Christian Democratic Union with its Bavarian affiliate, the Christian Social Union gained the majority of the seats in the Bundestag for the first time since the Federal Republic was founded in 1949. In a remarkably high turnout the party of the Federal Chancellor gained over half the votes, as compared to just over 45 percent in 1953. This victory should assure the continuance of at least 5 more years of effective

[1] Edgar Alexander, Adenauer and the New Germany, p. 147.

[2] New York Times, January 8, 1958, 2:6.

cooperation with the United States for the mutual benefit of both countries.

The Federal Republic of Germany occupies a very strong position in Europe today. A stable currency, its strategic location, its manpower potential, and its strong economic condition contribute greatly to this strong position. The important role that West Germany plays in European affairs is further accentuated by various problems besetting some of the other European countries. The relations between the Federal Republic and the United States can best be summed up in the word "partnership"; in the past there has been a give and take between the two countries which has worked for their benefit and for the benefit of the free world. Every indication points to the successful continuance of this partnership in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Alexander, Edgar, Adenauer and the New Germany, New York, 1957.

Arntz, Helmut, Facts About Germany, Germany, 1957.

Bathurst, M. E., and Simpson, J. L., Germany and the North Atlantic Community, New York, 1956.

Periodicals

Adenauer, Konrad, Address to the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Department of State Bulletin, XXXVI (1957), 957–960.

Adenauer, Konrad, The Soviet Letter Campaign, Vital Speeches of the Day, XXXVI (1958), 260–262.

Baldwin, H. W., Communique on the New German Army, New York Times Magazine, CVII (1957), 24–25.

Brandt, Karl, Europe, the Emerging Third Power, Vital Speeches of the Day, XXIV (1958).

Gordon, Lincoln, NATO and European Integration, World Politics, X (1958).

Holborn, Louise W., Adenauer's Victory: An Advance for Democracy? Foreign Policy Bulletin, XXXVII (1957), 1–3.

Hermens, Ferdinand A., Bonn's Foreign Policy, Current History, XXX (1956), 193–200.

Holmes, J. C., United States Foreign Policy and the Situation in Europe, the Department of State Bulletin, XXXVI (1957), 344–347.

Kohn, Hans, Germany in the New Europe, Current History, XXXI (1956), 257–260.

Kohnstamm, Max, Europe and Atoms for Power, Vital Speeches of the Day, XXIV (1957), 112–115.

Krekeler, Heinz L., The German Defense Contribution, the Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, CCCXII (1957).

The German to Watch, Newsweek, LI (1958), 50–56.

Report on the World Today, Atlantic, CCI (1958), 6–7.

Newspapers

New York Times, March 21, 1952, 2, 3.
New York Times, January 8, 1958, 2, 6.
New York Times, January 9, 1958, 3, 6.
New York Times, January 14, 1958, 2, 3.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed 123 measures on calendar call, cleared reciprocal trade extension for White House, and worked on excise tax technical changes.

House adjourned out of respect to Representative McVey.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15390–15404

Bills Introduced: 6 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4260–4265; and S. Res. 375.

Pages 15391, 15559

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Pursuant to authorization granted on August 8 the following 33 bills were reported during adjournment on August 9:

H. R. 6448, private bill (S. Rept. 2279);

H. R. 12217, to amend the Bankruptcy Act relative to reorganization of railroads (S. Rept. 2280);

H. R. 12894, to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense, with amendments (S. Rept. 2281);

H. J. Res. 652, H. R. 9160, 9851, H. J. Res. 659, 653, 661, S. 3028, 3814, H. R. 1329, 1339, 2062, 6589, 7738, 7746, 8732, 8905, 9180, 9197, 9765, 9993, 10515, 12942, 13151, 8134, 5351, 2592, 12256, 7866, private bills (S. Rept. 2282–2309);

S. 4031, to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act relative to change of educational or training program by an eligible veteran, with amendment (S. Rept. 2310); and

H. R. 13559, to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to provide special training for handicapped orphans, with amendments (S. Rept. 2311).

The following bills were reported today, August 11:

H. R. 9673, to amend the U. S. Code to specify the conditions under which retired pay may be paid in the case of retired officers dropped from the rolls, with amendments (S. Rept. 2312);

H. R. 12967, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act relative to review of minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands (S. Rept. 2313);

H. R. 1168, relating to preservation of basic compensation in downgrading of Federal employees (S. Rept. 2314);

H. R. 10495, extending limits for establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, with amendment (S. Rept. 2315);

S. 4191, to maintain existing minimum postage rates on certain publications mailed in the county of publication, with amendments (S. Rept. 2316);

H. R. 13404, to grant longevity credit for service performed in the Panama Canal Zone postal service (S. Rept. 2317);

S. 1801, 3950, 1258, 4061, H. R. 9783, 2338, 6773, 8407, 11236, 12204, 12364, 12624, private bills (S. Repts. 2318–2329);

S. 4249, to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose (S. Rept. 2330);

S. 4213, to afford vocational rehabilitation to veterans in need thereof to overcome a service-connected disability handicap of 30 percent or more, with amendments (S. 2331);

H. R. 7450, increasing retirement benefits to former D. C. policemen and firemen and to their widows, widowers, and children, with amendments (S. Rept. 2332);

S. 4091, regulation of fares for transportation of D. C. schoolchildren (S. Rept. 2333);

Individual views on S. 337, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws (pt. 2 of S. Rept. 2230); and

Veto message on S. 2266, to provide a method for regulating wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard, with recommendation of Committee on Armed Services that bill pass over President's veto.

Pages 15389, 15391

Bills Referred: Three House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees.

Page 15429

Bill Placed on Calendar: H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958, was ordered to be placed on calendar.

Page 15429

Bills Re-referred: Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of S. 4046 and H. R. 13265, bills authorizing appropriations for Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.

S. 3710, to extend unemployment compensation benefits to peacetime veterans, was by unanimous con-

Appendix

Foreign Policy and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Foreign Policy and the Future," which was published in the Wall Street Journal of August 12, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE FUTURE

A drastic, sweeping revision of our foreign policy is demanded by Senator FULBRIGHT, and we may be sure this will not be the only such call in the months ahead.

Certainly the Mideast situation shows the need for a hard scrutiny of the fundamentals of American policy everywhere. But whether drastic changes are required everywhere is another matter. It could be a mistake to conclude that the considerable failures of our Mideast policy prove that our policy as a whole has failed.

Indeed, it can be said that we failed in the Middle East just because we departed from standards which have stood us in good stead in other places. It is almost as though American policymakers had for 10 years or more carefully misread Mideast history and psychology, and thereupon set off toward several mutually contradictory goals.

Here, it seems to us, are some of the ways the United States went wrong in the Middle East.

First, refusal or inability, throughout the postwar years, to sit down and figure out an American policy for the Middle East based on American interest. What is the American interest? It is not direct in the sense that we need Mideast oil or even necessarily bases. It is indirect, though nonetheless important: To assure that the oil does not fall into Communist hands which could deny it to West Europe or use it as an economic squeeze. And, in a broader strategic sense, to assure that a sizable force in the world—the Arab-Islamic bloc—remains friendly to the United States or at least genuinely neutral between the West and the Communist empire.

United States policy in practice has worked against those ends. Consider the way the United States supported the creation of the State of Israel—a quite understandable position if we had any reason to suppose that the Arabs and Israelis could be persuaded to live in peace with each other. That, of course, was not the case. So our stand produced a jittery Israel and won for us the antagonism of the overwhelming majority of the people in the Middle East.

Second, we have not always recognized the implications of the revolutionary shape of the postwar world. It would have been abundantly clear, at least by the time of India's independence in 1947, that colonialism was in fact one of the great casualties of the war. True, the United States did support some independence movements, and at times seemed to support Arab aspirations, but in the Middle East it wobbled badly and consequently sowed confusion.

These remarks do not mean that all nationalism is good or—God forbid—to be equated with the American Revolution. Still, the United States did have a revolutionary origin, and in any case anticolonialism was a postwar fact that the United States would have to face sooner or later.

Third, we have often tended to regard Arab nationalism as identical with communism. There has been an imperfect realization of the fact that the Arabs hate Britain, France, and Israel far more than they fear Soviet Russia, which never attacked or colonized them; therefore the American efforts to keep Russia out, through the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine, were not popular and failed to prevent the rise of Communist influence. At the same time, in trying to oppose communism, the United States was drawn into backing unpopular Mideast regimes like the defunct monarchy in Iraq and the collapsing one in Jordan.

The frequent assumption that those who dealt with the Communists—notably Nasser—were automatically Communist stooges certainly suffers from deficient proof. But because of it the United States took it for granted that the turmoil in Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon was fomented by Nasserites acting in effect as Soviet agents, and on that basis the United States intervened in Lebanon.

The upshot of all this is that today the United States appears perhaps to most Arabs as anti-Arab, tightly tied to Britain and France, alined with the unpopular monarchy in Jordan, and committed to opposing Arab aspirations as they were reflected in the uprisings in Iraq and Lebanon.

That picture could hardly be better designed to propel the Arab world toward Moscow—a journey on which a vacillating and chaotic American policy has already helped start it.

How, in view of the foregoing, is it possible to assert that America's worldwide policy has not been a failure? We must remember that the overriding concern, once Washington awakened to the Communist menace, has been firm resistance to the expansion of the Communist empire (ironically this helped blind us in the Middle East) and so the prevention of another world war.

That basic policy, by and large, has so far been successful. Since the fall of China, the Communists have gained no significant additional territory. They have not dared, in view of America's overwhelming retaliatory military power, to launch a world war. This American achievement, surely, is more important than our past failures in the Middle East; surely no one seriously suggests that our resoluteness against Red encroachment be "drastically" revised.

And this policy has been successful because, unlike our Mideast confusions, it has shown America in its true posture of the friend of freedom against the age-old forces of political repression.

All the same, our Middle East experience indicates that resistance to Communist military attack will not by itself be enough for the future. The Communists evidently intend to employ everywhere they can, just as they have in the Middle East, the techniques of political subversion—arms deals, trade pacts and some aid, propaganda and civil strife. The United States must, within reason, be prepared to meet that, too, and the Middle East, again, suggests some possible approaches.

The answer lies not in indiscriminate American foreign aid and propaganda; indeed, these are self-defeating or worse, unless our policy impresses people as being in our own interest and faithful to the image the world has heretofore had of us. Nor does it lie in an indiscriminate show of force, as in Lebanon. Nor in reacting, as to Iraq, as though every revolutionary movement were automatically a Communist plot.

By most accounts there remains latent good will toward us in the Middle East. Certainly we can work toward an accommodation of the forces of Arab nationalism; a consistent policy of sympathy for Arab aspirations could revive that good will, particularly if the United States backed it up by dissociating itself from unpopular Arab regimes and by making it clear that its alliance with Britain and France in Europe does not require it to support Britain and France in the Middle East.

It is not necessary to cheer every fanatic and every nationalist crackpot. But it is necessary to avoid being maneuvered as we have been maneuvered in the Middle East, into seeming opposition to change when change is what is now stirring much of the world. A clear and comprehensible policy, supported by such actions as diplomatic wisdom may require, would have to be applied not only to the Middle East, but to north Africa and dark Africa. If it were, it could have highly favorable repercussions throughout the whole newly emerging, uncommitted world.

The present and the future, to be sure, can never be severed from the past, and the Eisenhower administration inherited a formidable array of foreign policy woes. The greatest threat to American security—Communist imperialism—need not have grown so great if the United States had chosen different courses in World War II and the wartime agreements. China need not have gone Communist except for United States misunderstanding—inexcusable ignorance—of communism. Korea need not have happened but for American ambiguity. The landings in Lebanon derive from at least a decade of Washington's mixed-up Middle East policies.

Yes, the mistakes of the past need not foredoom the future unless we permit it. We have successfully resisted communism's military march. It remains only to move forward from that. The most valuable counter to the growing threat of Communist subversion is the United States' own history, principles, and conduct. Too often in the postwar era, and especially in the Middle East, we have seemed to act contrary to our beliefs and so confused not only the Arabs but everybody else. We must once and for all bring our international deportment back into line with our own national traditions and national interest.

It is fantastic that the United States, of all countries, should appear in the light of an imperialistic power while the imperialist Communists get away with the pose of champions of liberty. It is even more incredible that on such a phony platform they

should be in a position to tempt much of the world.

And, if we will only adhere to our own heritage, it is wholly unnecessary.

Senate Group Says South Red's Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, entitled "Senate Group Says South Red's Target," published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, dealing with the tragic incident at Little Rock.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. V—SENATE GROUP SAYS SOUTH RED'S TARGET

WASHINGTON.—What lies ahead for race relations in the South and, indirectly, for the Nation? If the pattern of the last 3 years is followed in the future, the outlook is not favorable. Some may want to ignore the record, but they cannot hide it. Racial disturbances since the Supreme Court decision of 1954, culminating in the use of armed force at Little Rock, have made 2 areas of opinion where there were 3.

The middle ground on Southern civil rights issues, the ground on which progress had been steady if slow, is virtually deserted. Sides have been chosen, of necessity.

TWO EXTREMIST CAMPS

Without this conciliatory middle area, there are two extremist camps.

One is headed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Communist Party officially has planted its standard in this camp, its purpose to promote racial tension behind the NAACP program.

The other camp includes various white citizen organizations, established authorities of many Southern municipalities and States and, as time passes, more and more of the moderates.

The no man's land between these two camps is widened in an election year, like the present, and with the 1960 presidential campaign drawing closer. Neither major political party, nor, apparently, the Federal Government, wishes to intervene.

A HANDS-OFF ATTITUDE

The hands-off attitude in Washington was evident during Senate Judiciary Committee examination of incoming United States Attorney General William P. Rogers. The prospective head of the Federal agency that sent troops to Little Rock was not asked about his views on civil rights, not even by Southern Senators.

Absence of leadership from Washington has increased the importance of the role played by the NAACP. Its leaders apparently plan no change in policy.

Reviewing events through Little Rock, Dr. Channing Tobias, board chairman of the NAACP, declared,

"But this record of advance is only a beginning. Unjust practices are still commonplace in many parts of the Nation. The people have a continuing responsibility to take the lead, to assure the winning of equality in all communities, large and small, North and South.

GOOD OBJECTIVE

"The pattern is set; it's up to us to fill in the details of the picture. Only then will we have achieved our goal of a democratic America living up to its ideals."

These words from an influential Negro leader describe an objective which the majority of Americans would be happy to work toward.

But there is little reason to suppose that the good intentions of the NAACP will not capitulate, as they have before, to the driving, inflammatory race-tension strategy of the Communist Party.

After the 1954 court decision, the leadership of the NAACP promised moderation, a quiet talking over of issues among all segments.

EXACTLY AS FORECAST

Instead what transpired was a series of big, sharp struggles in civil disobedience and violence, exactly as forecast by Benjamin J. Davis, chairman of the Negro Commission of the Communist Party.

Today, Davis and his coworker, James E. Jackson, Communist chief for southern affairs, are using phraseology much like Dr. Tobias in predicting the future.

"The people must take the lead," says Davis. "Negro liberation is now the property of the whole American people."

Jackson's view: "The response to Little Rock has signalized that ours is the time ripe with opportunity to secure major victories in the cause of Negro freedom."

These words have a ring like Dr. Tobias,' but an utterly different intent.

AIMS NEFARIOUS

"You are aware, of course," FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover commented for the Standard-Times, "the Communists have no sincere interest in promoting racial harmony, but are ever alert to exploit any issue to further their nefarious aims."

This observation may be obvious to many Americans.

But is it obvious to Dr. Tobias, who has been associated with 40 Communist fronts, board chairman of NAACP, or to W. E. B. DuBois, honorary chairman of NAACP, who has been identified with 82 Communist fronts, more than any other American citizen?

Apparently it is not.

As recently as March 1958, the NAACP leadership brought a court action in Florida seeking to halt an investigation by the Florida Legislature of Communist activity in that State.

Besides the NAACP, leadership in the integrationist camp will come from the Reverend Martin Luther King, leader of the Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott. Mr. King also seems hazy in distinguishing between the Communist way and the American way.

A COMMUNIST EXPLANATION

At its 1957 national convention, the United States Communist Party selected a man identified by the Communist Daily Worker as Mr. King's secretary, Bayard Rustin, to be an official observer. Rustin praised the democratic proceedings of the convention in a report later denounced by FBI Director Hoover.

Mr. King was quoted as telling a Chicago assembly last year, "It (the Montgomery boycott, in which there was much violence) is a part of something that is happening all over the world. The oppressed people are rising up. They are revolting against colonialism and imperialism and all other systems of oppression."

This explanation is exactly that of the Communist Party, the depiction of the American Negro as a kicked around colonial, oppressed by imperialists.

Yet the same Rev. Martin Luther King was 1 of 4 Negro leaders who called upon President Eisenhower in June 1958, to try to set the pattern for racial progress.

A LOOK TO FUTURE

A former Negro Communist official, who later worked for the United States Department of Justice, sees the future in these words:

"In my opinion, the Negro leadership should realize that they have responsibility," a Louisiana legislative committee was told by Manning Johnson, "a responsibility to guide and spirit their people along the right paths, help to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, and to work together as a group for cooperation, mutual cooperation between races, to the end result that they can keep what they have, strengthen their economic and political position and move on to higher things.

"Men of King's type will not give that kind of leadership. The only thing they know is the threat and a sword.

"I know the NAACP can't do that. They have called the leaders of Southern life every conceivable type of name. They have labeled them everything they can, and there is no basis for them to negotiate with them because they have already built up a wall that cannot be gotten over, gotten under, or gone around."

Former Communist Johnson's judgment may be harsh. But the future will make him an accurate prophet unless there is wider understanding of the Communist background to immediate integration, to be accomplished by force if necessary.

In a little publicized report of last November, the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee declared: "There is a present-day pattern of Communist activity in the mid-South area. The Communist participants * * * make up the basic framework of a Communist operation that is directed against all generations of people in the South."

To that could be added, "and in the Nation."

Segregation in Arkansas Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the beginning of another school year approaches, it seems apparent that there will be significant developments not only in Arkansas but also in Virginia in the progress toward compliance with the constitutional requirements of equal protection of the laws. While 16 Members of the Senate from both parties have joined in proposing legislation to assist the transition to compliance with the Constitution, S. 3257, there are also obligations on the executive branch of the Government to deal with this important matter.

In the same spirit in which Mr. Ashmore has analyzed the problems in Little Rock, 2 editorials from the St. Louis Post Dispatch, 1 entitled "Mandate and Challenge" from the issue of August 1, 1958, and the other entitled "From Little Rock to Arlington," from the issue of August 6, 1958, highlight these executive responsibilities.

In the hope that high officials of the executive department will give some at-

tention to the constructive action that may be taken to avoid unfortunate occurrences in September, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 1, 1958]

MANDATE AND CHALLENGE

Gov. Orval Faubus says his renomination in Arkansas is a mandate to resist integration. If so, it is also a challenge to the Federal Government to assist compliance with court orders on integration.

Integration is, after all, the law of the land. The Federal Government—and this means the Eisenhower Administration—cannot permit a governor indefinitely to defy the United States Constitution.

Yet as matters stand the only agency attempting to enforce this aspect of constitutional law is a private agency, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. While this harassed group is appealing Federal District Judge Lemley's ruling for a delay of high school integration in Little Rock, the Federal Government sits idly by.

President Eisenhower has never said he favors integration. Attorney General Rogers has not ordered the Justice Department to intervene in the appeal. His civil rights chief, Assistant Attorney General White, has indicated plainly that the Department has no plan to cope with the Little Rock issue.

Next Monday, all seven judges of the Federal district court of appeals will convene in St. Louis to hear the appeal. One month later, Little Rock's Central High School will open its doors. If the appeals court should reverse the Lemley ruling, those doors must open to an integrated student body.

Hence the Government has only a month in which to prepare to support integration and enforce the law. What could the Government do?

It could, for one thing, be prepared to nationalize the Arkansas National Guard before Governor Faubus could use any part of it to defy the law, as he did last year.

It could order the Justice Department and the FBI to be on guard against law violations and to be ready to make arrests. Little Rock's school board has complained that Federal authorities in the past school term "placed on the district the full responsibility for compliance." This time the Government ought to be ready to use its law enforcement arm to enforce the law.

It could also ask its Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to offer expert advisers to assist the Little Rock board in maintaining discipline and high educational standards. Witnesses told the district court that normal disciplinary rules were not fully and impartially carried out last year.

Above all, if the appeals court rules that integration must proceed, the President of the United States and his Attorney General should make it plain that integration will proceed. Otherwise the Little Rock case may stand as a bastion against the Constitution, with Governor Faubus waving his flag of defiance from the ramparts.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 6, 1958]

FROM LITTLE ROCK TO ARLINGTON

The seven judges who comprise the United States court of appeals for the eighth circuit now are weighing the arguments for and against District Judge Lemley's suspension of racial integration at Central High School, Little Rock.

The court of appeals heard the case with commendable dispatch. Judge Lemley's order was issued some 6 weeks ago. In an effort to complete its step in the appeals process as promptly as possible, the court of appeals convened its full bench here in St. Louis much earlier than might have been expected. The prospect is that the court will have passed on the 2½-year suspension order before the opening of school.

Meantime a new Little Rock could be in process of development in Arlington, Va. For on September 4—in less than a month—5 Negro children, backed by a Federal court order, are scheduled to enroll in 4 previously all-white schools. Under Virginia State law these schools are supposed to close automatically to avoid any mixing of the races among schoolchildren. Let us hope that even though the Eisenhower administration did not enter the Little Rock appeal, it is planning a course of constructive, helpful action at Arlington, which after all, is just across the Potomac from the National Capital.

To Guarantee Security Is To Guarantee Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as one who has attempted to chart my course as a legislator by the guides planted by the Founding Fathers, I read with particular interest an editorial in the August issue of the Virginia Farm Bureau News entitled "A Generation That Knew Not Joseph."

I heartily commend this reminder of the dangers faced by a generation of Americans that knows not Jefferson, Washington, and Henry, and has forgotten their warning that to guarantee security is to guarantee slavery.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENERATION THAT KNEW NOT JOSEPH

When Joseph was sold into slavery and taken into Egypt, he suffered imprisonment and persecution. But through his ability to interpret dreams and warn the leadership of fomenting food shortages, he gained favor with Pharoah and rose in the government to become the world's first food administrator.

Through a series of events he sent for his family and eventually thousands of his brethren came into the new country. There they lived with the Egyptians for many years in harmony and prosperity. But, the Bible reports, there arose a generation that knew not Joseph. Long after Joseph's death a new generation forgot the events of the past and became fearful of the Jews living in Egypt. The Jews were enslaved and the long struggle for freedom and the return to the promised land began.

Today, in our country, there lives a generation that knows not Jefferson, Washington, and Henry, nor the history of the prosperity and progress which these and other leaders bred for us.

If we know the dreams of our ancestors, we do not heed their interpretative warnings. On the contrary, we're more inclined to believe in the pipedream interpreters whose gossamer songs lull us into the pursuit of life on the basis that it is more blessed to receive than give. We no longer wage the battle for opportunity, but for security.

We have become fearful of those who insist that it is just as important to have the freedom to go broke as it is to have the freedom to earn more. We would supplant guaranteed security for the freedom to go broke.

We do not heed the warning of our ancestors that to guarantee security is to guarantee slavery. To ignore this axiom and accept such friendly and harmless appearing ideas can enslave us. Any idea that chips at the four main foundation stones of the private competitive system can enslave us.

In order for our system to work there must be privately owned property, privately managed, operated for a profit in a competitive situation.

These are the yardsticks we must use to measure the soothsayings of our modern pipedreamers.

Carmen-Smith Project on McKenzie River in State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the history of water resource development in the West is checkered with events of controversy; but it is not often that these conflicts are finally settled on such amicable terms as has occurred recently over development of the upper McKenzie River in my State of Oregon.

In 1954 the Eugene Water and Electric Board, municipally owned public utility serving the city of Eugene, filed a license application with the Federal Power Commission to construct hydroelectric dam facilities at a site on the McKenzie River described as the Beaver Marsh location. Because of the unique scenic attractions of this area, the plans to desecrate this section of the river with a water impoundment and reservoir which would destroy the famous Koosah and Sahalie Falls were strongly resisted by local residents. They formed an organization called the Save the McKenzie River Association, which was supported in its efforts by leading sportsmen's and outdoor organizations. Despite this local opposition, the FPC licensed the project and cleared the way for construction of a dam which would do great harm to scenic, wildlife, and recreational values. I joined in objections to construction plans, and introduced a bill to revoke the FPC license. Hearings were held on my proposal, and the public opinion against Beaver Marsh continued to grow.

The Eugene utility had to go to the voters with the bond issue to finance construction costs. The bond issue was soundly defeated at the polls; thus the election served as a plebiscite for local opinion on the controversial project. After this rejection by Eugene voters, the board reconsidered its power requirements, and decided that equivalent

results could be obtained by locating the power facilities at another site. Thus, a compromise was worked out between those seeking power development and those who wished to retain the scenic grandeur of the McKenzie, untouched by commercial development. Perhaps not all individuals on either side are entirely satisfied with the compromise, but at least an agreement has been made which will permit both worthwhile power and genuine recreational development in this area of the McKenzie.

I am proud to have had a part in the fight to save the unique beauty of the McKenzie, and am pleased that an agreement has been reached between the various local interests. Here is one case where the checks and balances of the democratic process have served the long-run public interest. I ask consent to include in the Appendix an able editorial from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of August 6, 1958, entitled "New Plans for Upper McKenzie Are Sound."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PLANS FOR UPPER MCKENZIE ARE SOUND

Eugene Water & Electric Board's proposition to build the Carmen-Smith hydroelectric project on the upper McKenzie River has not, and probably will not, produce the bitterness the Beaver Marsh project did.

This lack of fighting mood does not indicate a lack of interest. On the contrary, the same groups which fought and licked the Beaver Marsh project are just as interested in this project.

The change of location for the project to an area considerably downstream from the Beaver Marsh project, which would have affected all of the McKenzie Falls as well as Clear Lake, has brought on an atmosphere of cooperation, with both sides willing to please the other.

This good will has been built up both by board policy and by Byron Price, the superintendent of Eugene Water & Electric Board who has been the salesman for the project. "Reasonable" is the word for Eugene Water & Electric Board in this project.

And, to be equally commended for their attitude in seeking a reasonable compromise on McKenzie development plans are those who formerly were bitter opponents of Beaver Marsh.

The fruits of such attitudes have already been seen, and two recent developments indicate that the Carmen-Smith project is viewed favorably by the public:

After long months of intensive study, the State water resources board approved the river section by hydroeletcric use, thereby saying, in effect, "go ahead" to the Eugene Water & Electric Board.

Both the State fish and game commissions have now approved the project, changing their previous position of protest to one of approval.

Both of these are victories for Price and the board, for these State agencies are, by legislation, powerful voices in the determination of how the State's streams are to be used.

And approval was gained by the ability of Eugene Water and Electric Board to meet protests and deal with them, frankly and honestly.

The agreement signed by L. W. Trommitz, president of Eugene Water and Electric Board; Phil Schneider, of the game commission; and R. W. Shoning, acting State fisheries director, to protect and encourage salmon reproduction in the Carmen-Smith area is of far-reaching significance, for it may well set the pattern for Oregon in dealing with the problems of fish and dams. An artificial channel will be built by Eugene Water and Electric Board on a plan similar to a successful venture in British Columbia, where man demonstrated he can actually improve on nature by providing even better reproduction facilities than are naturally present.

The next few weeks will see even more compromises on the part of Eugene Water and Electric Board. Objections to having no overnight camping facilities at the lakeshores of the three reservoirs in the project are being met, with Eugene Water and Electric Board presently drawing up plans for such areas as well as for some trailways around the project.

In this latter problem, Eugene Water and Electric Board sought out the objections voiced by experts in the field, asked them to sit around the conference table, then produced a plan to get what the objectors wanted. (Eugene Water and Electric Board was opposed, at first, to having any facilities except day-use picnic layouts similar to the popular one at Leaburg Dam.)

This newspaper has watched this project quite closely, for it was opposed to the Beaver Marsh project, but, like other opponents to the earlier projects, we are impressed with the reasonableness present in the current planning.

There are other hurdles yet, decisions by the Federal Power Commission, and, finally, by the people of Eugene who will be asked to approve the financing of the project, but these factors should win out:

Carmen-Smith is a sound approach to supply electricity which will be sorely needed by Eugene by 1962.

Not only is the public interest being protected, but it is the paramount factor in the thinking of Eugene Water and Electric Board as plans are drawn for the project.

Possible Diversion of Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read, in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor a most informative article, by its Portland, Oreg., correspondent, on the subject of United States-Canadian differences over the use of the waters of the mighty Columbia River and its tributaries.

I do not presume to be an expert on the water problems of the Pacific Northwest; but I do know the Golden Rule, of all religions, teaches us that if we would expect our neighbor to be good to us, we must be good to him. That applies, of course, to anyone, neighbor or not, but it applies especially to those who, like our Canadian friends, are so close to us, not only in geography, but also in ways of life, in common ideals, in common efforts, either in war or in peace, for a better world.

So, Mr. President, I have said to my friends who live in the Pacific Northwest:

Beware, lest some day you see the waters of the Columbia, which are so precious to you, diverted, because of an unneighborly action which our country might take by diverting Great Lakes water down the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

If we expect Canada to be a good neighbor to us, we must certainly be a good neighbor to her.

One of the ways by which we can be a good neighbor is by stepping up our research, so as to cope with the portion of sewage which remains as an untreated residue after present treatment methods. If we can find the answer to the problem caused by the final 10 percent of untreated residue, we may be able to solve Chicago's sanitary problem in such a way as to help her and help all other American municipalities, without doing the slightest damage to our good-neighbor relations. That, to me, is the statesmanlike approach.

Let us, therefore, join in research efforts which help everyone, and hurt no one, rather than in any action which would hurt a good neighbor and also would hurt the good name of the United States, in addition to hurting the Great Lakes States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article published in the Christian Science Monitor; and also a letter, with an enclosure, which I wrote to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I wrote the letter for the purpose of securing an authorization of research funds to be used in connection with the effort to cope with the problem caused by untreated sewage residue.

There being no objection, the article, letter, and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 11, 1958]

AGREEMENT SOUGHT FOR COLUMBIA RIVER PROGRAM—UNITED STATES AND CANADA TACKLE DIFFERENCES

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND OREG.—The one tributary of the Columbia River that flows from Canada into the United States and then back again into Canada is called by Canadians the Kootenay. South of the border it is spelled Kootenai.

The difference is symbolic. It reflects the lack of agreement between Canada and the United States on the development of the Columbia River system, which is shared by the two. As in Kootenay-Kootenai, these differences are not so fundamental as to be insurmountable.

This was the encouraging consensus among those officials who participated recently in a field exploration of the Columbia system, including both United States and Canadian members of the International Joint Commission, which has been seeking a bilateral agreement on the hydroelectric development of the upper Columbia and its tributaries.

"Our first consideration," said the United States cochairman of the Commission, Douglas McKay, former United States Secretary of the Interior, on arrival of the party in Portland after the journey down the river, "is to find out what is right for the river, what is the best use of the water resources, without regard to any international boundaries. Then we will consider the equities of both nations in determining our recommendations."

FACTS SOUGHT

The Canadian cochairman, Gen. Andrew G. L. McNaughton, nodded agreement. "We want to get the facts," General McNaughton said. "There may be disagreement as to the effect of those facts on each nation. There may be different points of view, but we must find a common denominator between the two nations."

These conciliatory words are not in the character of recent past developments within the International Joint Commission, which is deeply involved in one of the most controversial issues separating Canadians and their neighbors to the south, the exploitation of a great, international river system.

The United States got the jump on Canada more than 20 years ago when it began the systematic development of the Columbia to wring from the mighty river its last kilowatt. Only in the past few years has Canada, sensing the promise of economic prosperity in the harnessing of the white waters of its western rivers, insisted on having a major voice in the development of the river whose headwaters rise within its borders.

General McNaughton has led the vigorous offensive for Canada. His name has been identified with a plan to divert the waters of the Kootenay into the Columbia, in Canada, and from the Columbia to the Fraser to bring a powerful new hydroelectric-producing flow to the latter. He has been accused of proposing this billion-dollar Columbia diversion scheme as a wooden horse to improve Canada's bargaining position with respect to United States projects, such as the proposed Libby Dam in Montana, which would back the United States Kootenai into the Kootenay of Canada.

A joint board of engineers is making a study for the IJC of the diversion plan, of the Libby water impoundment problem, and of a compromise proposal including some aspects of both the diversion and the Libby projects.

But some informed and influential United States engineers already have some strong opinions on the revolutionary diversion project.

Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, who once supervised dam construction on the lower Columbia River as north Pacific division engineer in Portland and who is now Chief of Army Engineers, told a congressional committee this spring that the diversion of the Columbia to the Fraser, if carried out, would eventually cost the United States an annual 15,700 million kilowatt-hours of energy. This is roughly half the current production capacity of the Federal hydroelectric system in the Pacific Northwest.

General Itschner estimated that the value of the power that would be lost to the United States would be slightly more than $50 million annually.

These estimates did not include the effect of the additional diversion of the Kootenay into the Columbia, which would add several million more dollars to the United States loss.

Canada, which has already spent about $4 million on diversion engineering studies, would presumably reap a comparable gain by turning Columbia waters through Canadian rather than United States generators.

The magnitude of this problem is just one reason why both Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, have suggested that an entirely new international commission be formed to deal exclusively with the issues growing out of the development of the Columbia system. The IJC must concern itself with such issues all along the international border.

"The IJC has too many problems," Senator JACKSON observed recently. "This one alone, the problem of the Columbia River, could keep it busy morning, noon, and night."

A complication in the international dispute has been the attitude of Provincial officials in British Columbia, which harbors both the Columbia headwaters and the Fraser River. They have been cool to the McNaughton proposal because it would raise the vital question of the survival of salmon in the Fraser, one of the major fisheries of the world.

SALMON PROBLEM

The Fraser drains the bulk of the interior of British Columbia, crashing through the coastal range at Hells Gate. From its origins to the sea, the distance is 750 miles—miles of sharp fall and rushing current, features which well serve the requirements both of hydroelectric production and fish propagation.

The Fraser's potential salmon production is many times the present one, according to the testimony of biologists who took part in a recent seminar on fish and power problems at the University of British Columbia.

"The innumerable streams provide conditions for the adults and for the incubation of the eggs," said W. A. Clemens, director of the Institute of Oceanography, at the University of British Columbia. "The great array of lakes constitutes a vast rearing area for the young fish."

But the progress of salmon to the streams and the lakes and of fingerlings downstream would be hampered, at least to some extent, by the erection of hydroelectric dams in the Fraser, as they have been hampered in the United States reaches of the Columbia system.

Thus, if Canada is to benefit from the diversion, it must deal with a threat to the Fraser River salmon fishery.

From all the above it is not difficult to understand why, despite the optimism of the IJC cochairman during and after their tour of the Columbia, few informed people in the Pacific Northwest, on either side of the border, expect an early resolution of the United States and Canadian differences over the future of the Columbia River.

AUGUST 8, 1958.

The Honorable ROBERT S. KERR,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, 412 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In connection with the sewage aspects of Senator DOUGLAS' remarks to which you kindly gave me an opportunity to reply, I note that the Chicago proponents of the H. R. 2 make much of the Chicago Sanitary District's alleged inability to purify more than 90 percent of the city's sewage.

As I understand it, they maintain that, scientifically speaking, it is impossible to purify the last 10 percent by any known sewage purification methods.

It has come to my attention that scientists, inside the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in some universities, believe that they could conduct successful research upon this problem.

If Chicago's point is correct that no presently known method can purify the remaining 10 percent, the scientific breakthrough of developing a method to purify practically 100 percent of Chicago's sewage would solve that great city's problem and remove Chicago's need for diverting water from Lake Michigan.

As you will recall, Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission proposed such research by the Federal Government or the only thorough solution.

This would not only relieve all the other Great Lakes States from the loss they contemplate if H. R. 2 is enacted; but it would also help other great metropolises to cope with their own sewage problems more easily.

Of course, research is not always successful, so that there is no guaranty that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could find a solution.

However, I hope that while Chicago's sanitary problem is fresh in your mind and before your subcommittee, you will give serious consideration to authorizing and requesting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct scientific research into the more complete purification of sewage and industrial waste so that we can all support that authorization and the necessary appropriation to carry it out.

Enclosed is some data I obtained from Mr. Gordon McCallum of Health, Education, and Welfare.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

To develop new and presently unknown methods of purifying waste waters, basic as well as developmental research must be initiated along every conceivable line. This research would include chemical, physical, biological, and other approaches utilizing skills of teams of scientists in these fields. This team approach is now employed on a very small scale at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center of the Public Health Service at Cincinnati, Ohio.

The time has come to stop evaluating waste treatment in terms of efficiency and start considering it in terms of residues. Clearly, we need waste treatment processes with an efficiency of 100 percent to maintain the necessary quality in many of the Nation's waters.

Scientific talents can be brought to bear on this problem through intramural research within the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center and through contractual arrangements with universities and other research institutions. Some aspects of the water cleansing problem are more significant in some areas of the country than in others and could be approached most effectively by drawing upon the research talents of these areas. Thus, the universities and other research institutions could be utilized significantly in both basic research and in the subsequent field testing of promising methods.

Funds in the amount of $1 million for this specific research at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center of the Public Health Service and $1 million for contract research at universities for the initial year of an intensive 5–10 year effort are believed necessary as a minimum.

Integration in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the differing reports that have come out of Arkansas about the dispute on school desegregation there, a statement by a former Arkansas teacher addressed in a letter to the Washington Post on June 28 seems to me not to have had adequate attention. Prof. Daniel H. Pollitt, now associate professor of law at the University of North Carolina, pointed out in that letter that the first steps toward desegregation in Arkansas were taken 11 years ago, and that there is a substantial body of opinion which not only supported those steps, but will sup-

port law and order in the present situation.

If the political reasons for resistance to the court's order are now somewhat diminished, it would seem worthwhile once again to emphasize the underlying dedication to law and order that Professor Pollitt finds among the people of Arkansas.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his letter which was printed in the Washington Post on June 28, 1958.

There being no objections, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION IN ARKANSAS

Walter Lippmann's June 26 column on Little Rock Again spurs me, as a former faculty member of the University of Arkansas Law School, to come to the defense of that State.

Mr. Lippmann suggests that the Little Rock problem is caused by insistence on integration in a high school for adolescents which is coeducational, and supports the idea that integration in Arkansas should begin at the upper levels of education.

He thereby overlooks the fact that the University of Arkansas Law School voluntarily integrated in 1946–47, the medical school in Little Rock shortly thereafter, and for at least 10 years integration has been an accomplished fact at all levels of the State University. The coeducational high school in Fayetteville has been integrated for at least 8 years, and the student body voted almost unanimously to drop any scheduled football games if the opponents objected to playing against Negro members of the squad (none did).

The coeducational high school in the delta community of Hoxie has proceeded with its integration without mishap since outsiders were enjoined from interference over 2 years ago. Hearings 2 years ago on the proposed integration of the coeducational high school in Hot Springs drew only two spectators—both in favor of integration and there have been no problems there. Last fall the cities of Van Buren (home of Bob Burns) and Fort Smith integrated their coeducational high schools—again without mishap.

In short, the Little Rock problems cannot be blamed on the level at which integration occurred, but solely on the resistance of Governor Faubus to the court decree ending enforced segregration.

Mr. Lippmann says we are damned if we do and damned if we don't. Judge Lemley's decision establishes the precedent that mob nullification of the law is tolerable. Thus we are damned if the appeal is unsuccessful. On the other hand, continues Mr. Lippmann, we are damned if a successful appeal is taken, for a reversal condemns it (the Federal Government) to use troops to compel integration. I take exception to Mr. Lippmann's equating mob nullification with executive enforcement of the law. I would take the latter at any time and in any event.

Nor do I accept the dilemma in which Mr. Lippmann places us—no integration on the one hand, integration under armed guard on the other. I can visualize integration of the Little Rock school without armed guard as in other schools within the State. If, as has been widely reported, Governor Faubus' action was prompted by the desire to secure a third term of office, he will have no necessity to create a situation requiring the use of the Army after the gubernatorial primaries end this summer.

His end achieved, there is no reason to conclude he will continue to follow a policy condemned by every major religious body within his State, a policy condemned by his erstwhile stanch political allies including former Gov. Sid McMath, a policy condemned by his appointed board to entice northern industry into the State, a policy condemned by the President of the United States, a policy which has made his name known throughout the world as a bigoted racist.

Moreover, though the people of Arkansas did not like integration, even less do they like the role of die-hard obstructionists to law and order. I would hope that Judge Lemley's order is reversed and that the people of Arkansas are given opportunity to prove that the peaceful June graduation ceremonies at Little Rock's Central High School can be matched at next fall's matriculation.

DANIEL H. POLLITT.

WASHINGTON.

Integration at Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of July 21 through July 25, 1958, there appeared a series of articles dealing with the tragic incident at Little Rock, Ark., entitled "Little Rock—Here Are Its Origin and Its Aftermath." I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of the editors of the New Bedford Standard-Times and articles entitled "Forced Integration Fails To Promote Harmony," and "Communists' Basic Goal: To Incite Racial Strife."

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No domestic problem is more important to the people of this country than relations between white and Negro Americans.

An issue in which the extremist views are so widely separated is a natural for exploration by the Communist Party.

In this series of articles the Standard-Times documents and reviews the Communist campaign to promote racial unrest in the South and the influence of that campaign in the origin of, and the aftermath to, the impasse at Little Rock.

This series was written by Edward B. Simmons of the Standard-Times staff. Mr. Simmons received the award of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism fraternity, in 1957 for outstanding general reporting.

He gathered material for these articles in trips along the eastern seaboard, to the Midwest, in discussions with Members of Congress and from study of United States Senate and House committee files.

Based on experience in New Bedford, where diversity lives in the highest harmony, the editors believe that the material in these articles will make for better understanding of a most difficult and trying issue.

NO. 1—FORCED INTEGRATION FAILS TO PROMOTE HARMONY

WASHINGTON.—The luster is wearing thin at Little Rock, Ark., where bayonets were used last fall to enforce integration in a public school. Some of the trailblazers appear to have washed their hands of the cause of Negro rights. Others have been seen in roles considerably less flattering than those they played last fall.

Ernest Green's observation, "I'm glad that's all over," is perhaps not untypical. Ernest, 18, was 1 of the 9 Negro youths admitted to Little Rock's Central High School under the guns of federalized National Guard men and United States paratroopers.

Last month Ernest was graduated. One of the 9 was expelled; the other 7 may never return to Central.

If the experiment continues at Central, it will have to do so without the assistance of many persons who were instrumental in launching it.

Mayor Woodrow Wilson Mann of Little Rock, who made the daily telephone calls to the White House that led to Federal intervention, has left town.

He is now a resident of Denver, Colo., working in an investment banking firm.

Max Rabb, the presidential assistant who was at the White House end of the Mayor Mann calls and was a key man in the decision to send Federal troops, has left Washington.

He is now a partner in a big New York law firm.

Despite apparent success in its part in obtaining the Little Rock test, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has experiencd a sharp drop in membership.

Federal Judge Ronald Davies, whose ruling that integration must begin forthwith in Little Rock was the foundation for what followed, has long since left Little Rock.

He is now back in his court in North Dakota, where there are but 257 Negroes in the entire State. Arkansas has 462,000.

Harry Ashmore, the Little Rock editor whose editorials in behalf of integration stirred the controversy and brought him a Pulitzer prize, has conceded he will not employ a Negro on his newspaper.

Mrs. Grace Lorch, the Little Rock housewife who attracted national attention by befriending 1 of the 9 students, has since refused to declare whether she is a Communist.

Herbert Brownell, whose United States Justice Department gave the orders for dispatch of troops, is no longer Attorney General.

He has taken up the more lucrative private practice of law.

The Justice Department, itself, has had a change of heart. Under its new Chief, William P. Rogers, the word is "never again" on the use of Federal troops to enforce integration.

The Little Rock School Board, which had worked out a gradual integration program that Judge Davies' ruling nullified, has thrown in the sponge on any integration in the near future.

Central High School has claimed that the educational program for its 2,000 students was so badly dislocated by the 1-year experiment the school could not survive another year without complete disintegration of morale.

This was a major consideration in Federal Judge Harry J. Lemley's approval of a 2½-year stay of integration for the Little Rock high school, a decision that may have made the best of a very unfortunate situation.

MAJORITY NEEDS CONSIDERATION

Judge Lemley, while acknowledging the interest of Negroes in obtaining equal rights, said the public interest of the majority rated consideration, too. The burden placed on other Central High students and the racial tension and unrest created in Little Rock itself demanded a delay in integration, he said.

The ruling led to another example of apparent change in viewpoint among those who had been insistent on an immediate end of segregation.

When Judge Lemley's decision was taken to the United States Supreme Court, whose 1954 sociological and subsequent decrees had started the ferment in the South, that body declined to break up its summer vacation for a special sitting.

The court, in effect, passed the buck to a lower court with an admonition to act fast.

Little Rock, the morning after, appears to have been a venture that has not served racial harmony or promoted integration. As such, its origin, its leaders, and its original objectives invited inquiry.

No. II—COMMUNISTS' BASIC GOAL: TO INCITE RACIAL STRIFE

WASHINGTON.—To incite racial strife is one of the oldest objectives in the Communist program for getting world domination. "We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension," states a Communist Party handbook of 1912, well before a few hundred Bolsheviks seized control of Russia.

"By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party," the handbook continues.

"In America, we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. Thus will begin a process which will deliver America to our cause."

COINCIDENCE OR STRATEGY?

Is it coincidence or the result of strategy that, some 45 years later, racial unrest in an outstanding southern city, Little Rock, Ark., has increased so sharply that a Federal judge called for a 2½-year delay in any integration?

Again, is it coincidence or the result of Communist strategy that one of the most influential of all southern Negro leaders, the Rev. Martin Luther King, exhorts his followers with these words:

"It (the Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott) is a part of something that is happening all over the world. The oppressed people are rising up. They are revolting against colonialism and imperialism and all other systems of oppression."

When Mr. King draws a parallel between the situation of the American Negro and oppressed peoples rising against colonialism and imperialism, he is following exactly, to the word, the Communist line.

DIRECT APPROACH FAILED

At first, the Communist drive for creation of racial strife called for a direct approach to Negroes, using labor unions and Communist fronts like the American Negro Labor Congress and the League for Struggle for Negro Rights.

This approach was brazenly direct, and it failed. Former Communist Joseph Kornfeider, one of the party founders in the United States and its first director of southern operations, has described what happened:

"The South to the Communists was always one of the most vexing problems," Kornfeider told a joint legislative committee of the State of Louisiana in March 1957. "Moscow could never understand it. * * * According to Marx' theory, the South should be leading the United States in Communist development.

"It just didn't work out that way.

"It was just to the contrary. The South proved to be a hard nut and it didn't conform to the doctrine."

BLOCKED BY RELIGION

"They decided that the big block against penetration of the South is religion. The Negroes believed in religion; the hillbillies believed in religion; nearly everybody is religious. The South is more religious than the North.

"Therefore, they decided maybe they should get at them under the auspices of the Cross."

Kornfeider and two Negro former Communist leaders, Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson, told the Louisiana committee that the new tactics included, besides use of the church, penetration of reputable Negro organizations and the founding, but not obvious control, of others.

World War II, with its migrations and general dislocation of living habits, produced what Kornfeider described as a "sort of honeymoon situation" between the Communist organizers and Negro organizations.

FOUR AGENCIES INFILTRATED

"It seems the intellectuals during that time had shown a remarkable weakness," he testified. "They were bigger suckers for the Communist propaganda than many others were, apparently because they sort of led a life apart from the daily troubles and toil of the population.

"They were the ivory tower boys who picked up the theories of the Communists, not looking at what is behind the theories."

The results of this honeymoon were vital Communist infiltration of the most important agencies in the South dealing in Negro issues. The Communists infiltrated 4 of these organizations and actually helped found 3 of them.

They are the Southern Conference Educational Fund, the Southern Regional Council, the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

An almost incredible maze of interlocking officials, ideas, and publications linked the three first-named agencies with the Communist Party.

COUNCIL GOT FORD GRANT

The Regional Council and the Educational Fund were both offshoots of the old Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was dissolved in 1948 after twice being described by the Federal Government as "a Communist front serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party."

Former directors and officers of the Conference for Human Welfare became directors and officers of the Regional Council and the Educational Fund and of the Highlander School. The Communist Daily Worker openly boasted that James E. Jackson, chief of the Southern branch of the United States Communist Party, was a cofounder of the Regional Council.

Although the Regional Council is not widely known in the North, its influence in the South is attested by its receiving a $497,000 grant from the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic.

Likewise, the Highlander School plays an important role in southern civil rights developments, although it is scarcely known in the North. The school, according to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, was cofounded by a Communist and by a man who refused to testify on his beliefs.

NAACP INFILTRATED

During these organizing years by the Communist Party, the NAACP was extensively infiltrated, although not dominated by Communist sympathizers. Many of its leading officials were members of Communist fronts.

In fact, by 1954 and the crucial Supreme Court decision, the Communist Party was so confident it had set the stage for developments in its favor that the party's national convention in the winter of 1953 declared, "The next period ahead will witness momentous struggles of the Negroes * * * given the vanguard leadership of the Communist Party, we may be confident that the Negro liberation movement will ally itself more fully with the camp of peace and democracy."

The Communist Party was in a position to follow its long-proved doctrine:

To get a sociological or pro-Communist book on the reading list of influential persons, like a Supreme Court justice;

To persuade a Negro to violate a civil rights statute, in the cause of civil disobedience;

To inject a fellow-traveler in the forefront of a civil rights dispute;

To support the program of the NAACP.

These objectives were attained in the year to come.

New Federal-State Relationship in Developing California's Water Resources

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years water has become a nationwide concern, and in California particularly our rapidly growing population and expanding agriculture and industry have placed a severe drain on our developed water resources. We have enough water in the State to meet all our foreseeable needs but our problem is development and distribution of this water. It is more a legal and financial problem than it is an engineering problem. I believe that the present impasse on water in California stems primarily from trying to divide too little water among too many people and that we must develop additional supplies. One new approach to the problem of further development is joint Federal-State projects where the major purpose is municipal and industrial water supply. I proposed some time ago such a new Federal-State relationship and introduced legislation to implement it—H. R. 11544. I am including as part of these remarks excerpts from a talk I made recently in California on this new approach to water development:

NEW FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIP IN DEVELOPING CALIFORNIA'S WATER RESOURCES

(Excerpts of speech by Congressman CLAIR ENGLE before the annual convention of the California Municipal Utilities Association, Disneyland, Calif.)

You will recall that in 1951 I brought a subcommittee to California which sat jointly with the State water committee for the purpose of studying the water problems in the Central Valley project area. We came to the conclusion then that the developed water supplies in the Central Valley project area were overcommitted. We recommended immediate construction of the Trinity River project, and that project has since been authorized and is under construction. However, the water contribution of the Trinity is specifically dedicated to Central Valley project operation. It is contended, as you know, that the Feather River project will not produce sufficient water to permit water deliveries to southern California with adequate margins of safety for future water demands in the north. At the hearings in 1951, serious legal questions were raised as to whether or not the applications made on the Feather River were in conflict with the

applications already assigned to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation of the Central Valley project. I am informed there are interests in California that are prepared to litigate this matter—if water deliveries outside of the Central Valley project area are authorized by the State legislature or by constitutional amendment.

I am not saying which side of this argument is right, but with this state of affairs any strictly legal approach will, in my opinion, wind up in the courts for years. There may or may not be a surplus which is physically and legally exportable, but I am sure that unless new water supplies are developed, the whole proposition will end up in court, delaying water progress in California for as much as a decade. It seems to me imperative that action be taken now to avoid creating a legal Frankenstein that will paralyze water development. The answer is more water—not litigating over what we have.

* * * * *

The impasse on California water developments results from trying to divide too little water among too many people. Southern California is not going to put up its cash money in taxes to build water projects in northern California unless there is a reasonably firm assurance that southern California will receive some of the water made available by the projects. In other words, southern California is not going to buy a pig in a poke. On the other hand, northern California is not willing to promise water to southern California which may leave them literally high and dry. Since the Feather River project is the only one currently proposed for construction, each section is eyeing the amount of water available and measuring it against their prospective needs. Considering the shortages of developed water, each section thinks that it is defending its claims on the last waterhold.

What we need, therefore, is enough water development programed and in early prospect so that all claimants for the water can feel a reasonable assurance that the water will be available when needed. We currently have a State water plan which is an excellent plan but it involves over 350 projects and would take between 50 and 100 years to build. The State water plan has to be broken down into an action program of limited years, with the specific objective of producing sufficient developed water to meet the predictable needs. I suggest that a specific program for 15 or 20 years should be set up. It must be geared to the financial capability of the State, including such Federal help as can be secured, and it must provide sufficient water so that northern California as an area of origin will feel safe in making commitments to southern California, and southern California will feel safe in putting up its money to build projects to supply the water promised. Although this is primarily a State problem, I suggest that when the total quantities are finally figured and the allocations made to the various sections to benefit from the water development, a provision be included which would provide for a pro rata reduction, northern and southern, in the event of short water years. This will have the effect of continuing pressure on all hands to build the additional projects to make adequate water available at all times and under all conditions.

When this program is worked out in specific terms we then can take up the crucial item of financing.

* * * * *

I propose the joint financing of Federal-State projects where the major cost is for industrial and municipal water, as follows:

First, that the Federal Government contribute to such projects on a nonreimbursable basis an amount equal to the portion of the project allocated to flood-control benefits. This is a recognition of the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government for flood control and follows the precedent established in H. R. 8677, which, as you know, is the bill I introduced providing for the Federal contribution for the flood-control benefits from the Oroville Dam on the Feather River project. This principle has since been merged in the omnibus public-works bill which passed the House 2 years ago and was vetoed (for other reasons) by the President, and is currently embodied in last year's omnibus public-works bill (S. 497) which passed the Senate and which was voted out of the House Committee on Public Works. Congress has therefore indicated that this is an acceptable principle for Federal-State cooperation in the building of multiple-purpose projects.

Second, that the Federal Government provide a non-interest-bearing loan for the amount of the project cost allocated to irrigation. This procedure would apply the principles of the 50-year-old reclamation law under which non-interest-bearing money is provided by the Federal Government for the development of irrigation projects. It is an expansion of the principle laid down in the small projects legislation, but, of course, in this instance is limited to multiple-purpose projects primarily for industrial and municipal water where irrigation water is developed incidental to the main purpose. It is my feeling that Congress would not approve the advance of non-interest-bearing money for construction by the State of a large project primarily for irrigation, but would insist that such a project be built under the present reclamation law if it is to be financed by the Federal Government. I think it important that the traditional function of the Federal Government in building projects under the reclamation law not be invaded. However, I believe there is a good chance of getting Congress to authorize a non-interest-bearing loan to a State for incidental irrigation features of a major project primarily built for industrial and municipal water.

Third, the Federal Government will require a contract to be executed under which the State would agree that the project should be managed in such a fashion as to produce the benefits for which the Federal contribution is made. This follows the present provision for the Federal contribution for the flood-control benefits on the Oroville Dam. As to irrigation, Congress, I am sure would require that the non-interest-bearing loan for irrigation be subject to the general provisions of reclamation law. However, I expect to propose with reference to the operation of the 160-acre limitation that the same formula be applied as is set forth in the small-projects legislation, namely, that the non-interest-bearing loan apply only to lands in compliance with the 160- or 320-acre limitation and that excess acreage be required to pay an interest charge on the capital cost of supplying those lands with water.

This proposal is intended to be the basis of establishing under general law the character and extent of Federal participation in projects primarily devoted to the supplying of municipal and industrial water. However, I would like to try it for size in the State of California which, so far as I know, is the only State capable of major financing of its own projects and with water plans of large magnitude already drawn and planned primarily for supplying municipal and industrial water. I have in mind particularly the possible application of this proposal to the financing of the Feather River project, the Biemond plan for the North Bay aqueduct, and construction of all or part of the projects planned in the north coastal area on the Klamath, Trinity, and Eel Rivers. However, the priority of projects for construction under the State water plan is a matter that rests with State officials and the legislature. Some projects such as the Auburn project are logical and proper extensions of the Central Valley project and should be reserved for construction as part of that project.

It is easy to stand up and suggest that the Federal Government help by putting some cash into these major water developments. It is difficult to suggest a program for doing it that is legislatively and politically feasible. My suggestion meets these requirements. It is a logical and practical extension of the historic pattern of Federal participation in the construction of water projects. Flood control has been an accepted responsibility of the Federal Government for over 100 years, and for more than a half century Congress has encouraged irrigation development by providing money for such projects without interest.

If the State builds a project mainly for the development of industrial and municipal water which also provides some flood control and irrigation, isn't it logical to suggest that the Federal Government participate to the extent of the flood control and irrigation on the same financial basis as if the Federal Government built projects for those purposes? That is the basic logic behind my proposal—and it can make the difference between the State or some other public agency being able to build the project and not being able to carry the financial load.

Politically, the proposal makes sense because it applies with equal benefit to the East as well as to the West. For years the Eastern States have frowned on western reclamation development because reclamation law applies only to States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian. Solving eastern water problems requires the development of industrial and municipal water, with incidental flood control and irrigation. The suggested Federal-State relationship fits the eastern situation like a glove. I do not believe we could get the votes to enlarge the Federal Government's activities in water programs just for the West, but the suggestion I have made will, in my opinion, get strong support, both in the mid-West and the East, where water supplies are crucial in many areas. It is my intention, of course, to make my proposal national rather than regional in scope.

The program which I suggest for the development of water resources in the United States, on the basis of Federal participation with the States, will be of vital importance to us in California for two reasons.

In the first place, it will strike at the major problem we face—financing our water projects. The Federal Government will participate on its traditional and historic basis of supplying funds for those parts of a project which are concerned with irrigation and flood control. The State can then proceed to help itself with its own tax resources to pay for the part of a project which provides water and power for municipal and industrial use.

In the second place, the plan I have in mind will broaden the base of water development so that the people of southern California will be reasonably certain that when they put up tax money they will get a supply of water. The people of northern California will feel that with future water development in prospect and with Federal assistance guaranteed, they can afford to make commitments to southern California without fearing that at some time in the future they may be left short of water.

In conclusion, let me say that we are not short of water in California; we are short of developed water—water which is caught for useful purposes. We have a great surplus of undeveloped water, and we are in difficulty only because we are now dealing with a water program which has too narrow a base. As a result, people are in-

clined to litigate and fight over the last bucketful. The bottleneck is in financing a broader base for water development. My proposal would bring Federal assistance to a new field of water development. It has legislative feasibility because it is of interest to all the States. It presupposes that our own State will bear a substantial responsibility through its own tax resources. With such a plan, we can move ahead and need only to make plans as big as California's future warrants.

The International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the St. Petersburg Times, dealing with the proposal made by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARTIAL ANSWER TO PROPAGANDA—MONRONEY'S WORLD CREDIT PLAN A BIG STEP FORWARD

(By Henrietta and Nelson Poynter)

WASHINGTON.—There is great frustration on Capitol Hill these days, while Congressmen complain about the lack of new, original thinking in world affairs and futility of our foreign policy, or lack of it.

You go to the Senate, or a dinner party, or sit by a swimming pool on Sunday afternoon and in this election year, no one is talking politics. The arguments and conversation are all about, not only the Middle East, but the vital need for reorientation of our attitudes and actions in world affairs.

Last week, the Senate tried to do somethin about it. It passed Senator MIKE MONRONEY'S (Democrat of Oklahoma) resolution urging an international credit union to meet the Russian economic penetration without making the burden on the United States Treasury intolerable.

MIKE MONRONEY is a vital, intelligent exnewspaperman, who still has the police reporter's zeal for digging into a story. He has been working on this plan for 2 years since he attended the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Bangkok.

FIRST SIGN OF NEW IDEA

Readers of the Times may remember, that early in March, when Senator MONRONEY was encountering what looked like formidable opposition to his plan, we called attention, in an editorial, to the fact that this was one of the first signs of new ideas in foreign policy. By the time debate started in the Senate last week, the International Development Association resolution had the endorsement of the State and Treasury Departments and the World Bank, as well as strong bipartisan support on the floor.

Based on the fact that we cannot afford hard currency loans on the terms offered by the Soviets and that some of the countries which need economic development most are not eligible to borrow from the World Bank, the Monroney plan proposes an International Development Association which would be able to use the counterpart funds now piling up all over the world to fill in on dollar credits.

"The answer," he says, "does not lie in a greater degree of haphazard loans and grants solely from the United States. What is needed is a program of sustained activity in the field of international development which can draw on many nations so that loans can be extended on a multilateral basis."

COUNTERPART FUNDS

In almost all the have-not countries, money has piled up from the sale of such things as American agricultural surpluses, which remains in that country in its own currency. These are called "counterpart funds," and we usually only hear about them when junketing Congressmen spend them recklessly on wine and song. If these local currencies are made available as part of the proposed fund, the countries could help each other and the United States could accomplish more without spending hard dollars forever.

As an example of how the plan could work, Senator MONRONEY used a proposed dam in Asia, where the development association "could loan engineering funds in German deutschmarks. For earthmoving equipment, it could provide funds in French francs, with certain dollar or hard currency additions. Cement could come from some 10 countries and could be purchased in large part, with local currencies. Thus, with a worldwide shopping list and a vault filled with many local currencies, for the first time wise banking administration could make full use of local currencies, including those from the sale of our agricultural surpluses."

A TRIPLE ADVANTAGE

Emphasizing the fact that if the United States continues to accumulate bales of lira, yen, rupees and francs, the inbalance will grow to staggering proportions, the dynamic exnewspaperman from Oklahoma said: "Sooner or later these currencies must be forgiven or written off, or they must be used. If they are used injudiciously, then there will be an impact on the country of issue which could cause inflation and could destroy instead of help, the country to whom we have sold surpluses.

"The IDA would have the triple advantage of ultimately lessening the need for direct economic aid by making more effective use of local currencies; promoting the sale of agricultural surpluses tnd promoting international trade and economic well-being."

It will take work and time to iron out the various technical angles of such cooperative aid, but certainly many Congressmen and many citizens would agree with the Senator's indictment of our present program, which he called "old, tired, weary, haggard and worn out. No football coach could use the same plays year after year, in the same conference, without a certainty of winding up in the cellar position. What is true with football is also true with foreign policy."

MEETING IN RIO

We talked to an ebullient MIKE MONRONEY, whose plan had gone through the Senate with surprising ease, 62–25, as he got ready to board a plane for Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

In this world trade union of Congressmen, legislators from 54 countries are meeting in South America this week to discuss critical issues and for shop talk about the trials and tribulations of being a legislator. The largest delegation with votes are from the U. S. S. R., United States, India, and Japan. Officially they seldom deflect from their Government's foreign office line—but they can say "let's talk it over" at a tea or a cocktail party.

Founded in Paris in 1889, the group is now a nongovernmental agency in the Economic and Social Council of the U. N. Although it has no powers of enforcement, it has a representation of legislators from all over the world, with the size of the delegations based on population and the size of the national parliaments. It is, therefore, particularly in time of crisis, a forum for the exchange of ideas and has, on occasion, influenced opinion through its debates.

ANSWER THE ATTACKS

The agenda at Rio this week includes such vital subjects as foreign investment, atomic tests, an international police force, colonies, and freedom of the press. With the volume of business on Capitol Hill and the insistence of the leadership on maximum attendance for rollcalls, the American group is about half the size of that at earlier meetings. Add to this the fact that some of the Senators and Representatives formerly most active in this international body, are faced with tough primary fights, we will have a handful of Americans to answer the attacks on our Middle Eastern policy, which are sure to come from the Soviets and the satellites.

What is said in Rio may have more impact on the world than some of the other international conferences which make more headlines. Certainly, the fact that the American delegation arrives with the Monroney resolution in hand, will give some hope to our friends and some answer to the Soviet propaganda.

For there can be new ideas, and a breath of fresh air in discussions among legislators from many countries, rather than among world leaders or career Foreign Service officers, who do not have to run for election and who do not have to be aware constantly of the reaction of the people back home.

The potential importance of such meetings as the Interparliamentary Union, was pointed out to us by a Republican Senator who regretted the press of business on the Hill prevented LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND from going to Rio to meet and talk with their opposite numbers from around the world.

What Does Cause Heart Attacks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there appears in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly an article entitled, "What Does Cause Heart Attacks?" by Dr. Fredrick J. Stare, head of the department of nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health.

Dr. Stare is a recognized authority in the field of nutrition, and his presentations on the subject before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which handles funds for our health and medical research programs have been most helpful. As the editor notes in connection with the article, Dr. Stare directs one of the most active programs of research on heart disease in the country.

I feel certain that the nature of Dr. Stare's article is of interest to everyone, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DOES CAUSE HEART ATTACKS?

(By Frederick J. Stare, M. D.)

(As head of the department of nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health, Frederick J. Stare, M. D., directs one of the most active programs of research on heart disease in the country. Dr. Stare is also editor of Nutrition Reviews, a monthly scientific publication.)

The two commonest types of heart disease—hypertensive heart disease and arteriosclerotic or coronary artery disease—are not caused by any single factor, but by many, each with varying degrees of importance in different individuals.

Hypertensive heart disease is caused by an increase in blood pressure, which is the result of constriction throughout the body of the very small blood vessels known as arterioles. They become contricted—first temporarily, later permanently—and the heart must pump harder to produce sufficient pressure to push the blood through them. This additional work for the heart will in time cause it to enlarge and to develop what is known as hypertensive heart disease. Thus a part of the chain of events which leads to hypertensive heart disease is the change that takes place in these very small blood vessels. Recent researches have suggested that these changes are due in part to the formation by the kidney of a specific substance called angiotonin.

For some unknown reason, greatly restricting the intake of sodium tends to reduce the blood pressure in a fair number of individuals with the common type of high blood pressure. Thus, the reason for the use of low sodium diets, frequently but incorrectly referred to as low salt diets. Numerous drugs have also been found in the past 10 years to be helpful in reducing and controlling high blood pressure.

The most prevalent type of heart disease and the greatest killer of all is arteriosclerotic coronary artery disease, the type of heart disease which one has heard so much of since President Eisenhower had his coronary. Deposits, called atheroma, are formed in the inner lining of the blood vessels. They contain cholesterol and fat. When they get large enough, they impede the flow of blood, something like rust in a pipe. They interfere with the normal elasticity of the blood vessel wall. They may cause small or large hemorrhages within the wall of the blood vessel itself, and these further reduce the inside opening of the vessel. They may greatly weaken the wall of the vessel.

When this process takes place in the arteries of the brain, it is termed cerebral arteriosclerosis, the common clinical manifestation of which is a stroke or a CVA (cerebral vascular accident). Thus strokes and coronaries have much in common; in fact, they are basically the same disease: arteriosclerosis. In one, the arteries of the brain are primarily involved; in the other, the arteries of the heart; but most individuals who have had manifestations in one of these organs are apt to have a fair degree of arteriosclerosis in the other organ.

These are dangerous conditions. A blood clot (thrombus) is more likely to form in a vessel narrowed by atheroma. Should this happen so that the flow of blood is completely blocked, a portion of heart muscle (or brain tissue) just beyond this block will die because of a lack of blood to supply it with nutrients and oxygen. This dead heart tissue just beyond the blockage is called an infarct. Thus, a typical coronary involves the development, usually over a period of years, of narrowed blood vessels in the heart due to cholesterol and fat deposits, then the process of thrombosis, which is the formation of a blood clot in these narrowed vessels, and finally, the development of an area of infarction (dead heart muscle) beyond the clot. Whether death ensues from the coronary depends on its location in the heart, its size, and whether it is developed suddenly or slowly.

If the arteriosclerosis develops rather slowly, it is likely that a substitute or collateral circulation may be formed to take over the nourishment of the heart muscle in the involved area. This may be lifesaving when the complete stoppage of an arteriosclerotic vessel occurs by the clot.

Infarcted areas of heart muscle may be identified by means of the electrocardiograph. In fact, this is one of the chief uses of this diagnostic instrument, to determine if one has had a coronary. Further, it gives some idea of the location of the infarcted area.

What does cause a heart attack? In most cases, when speaking of a heart attack, one is referring to a coronary. Heredity, diet, and nutrition, fat content of the blood, body weight and changes in weight, exercise (lack of it), defects in the blood vessel wall, elevated blood pressure, smoking, and sex are factors known to be involved. Undoubtedly others will be discovered in the near future, as this is currently a very active area of research.

Heredity patterns of most diseases are not well understood, but they certainly exist, and strongly so in many diseases, especially in most of the noninfectious diseases of the heart and blood vessels. Just why these diseases have a strong hereditary background, or what is the nature of the defect in the germ plasm of the genes, remains for future research to find out. But without question heredity is a factor. A recent study mentions that coronary artery disease is four times more prevalent in the children of affected parents than in those of parents without this disease.

Diet and nutrition are significant factors in heart disease. Many investigators have noted that large groups of people throughout the world who consume diets low in fat have less coronary artery disease than those consuming diets high in fat. Such observations have come from Guatemala, southern Italy, Japan, parts of Africa, and elsewhere. Low fat content generally means a diet in which 10 to 20 percent of the daily caloric intake is provided by fat as compared to 40 to 50 percent in the diet with high fat content.

But in addition to the differences in the total amount of fats consumed, there are marked differences in the type of fat. The primitive and nonindustrialized societies consume what little fat they do eat largely in the form of vegetable fats—the oils of palm, coconut, corn—with smallish quantities of fish and animal fats. The high-fat diets characteristic of industrialized areas are rich in animal and dairy fats as well as vegetable fats.

During World War II, and during various famines, a rough correlation has been observed between the fat intake and incidence of heart disease. As the fat intake decreased, so did the incidence of heart disease, and when fats became plentiful, the heart disease rate increased.

However, fats are not the only dietary differences between those regions with a low and a high incidence of coronary artery disease. The former are usually low in sugar and animal protein and high in starch and fiber. The vitamin and mineral content may also differ appreciably from that in American diets.

Probably the strongest evidence linking diet and nutrition to arteriosclerosis has come from animal experimentation. In the past decade it has been possible to produce this disease experimentally in a number of different species, ranging from rabbits and chicks to dogs and monkeys. The last—being primates, as is man—may have special significance. With animal experimentation, it is usually possible to plan the study so that a single change in diet is the major variable. This is seldom possible in observations on man. While there are major dietary differences between the South African Bantu and the urban citizen of Johannesburg or Boston, so too are there a hundred other environmental differences.

Animal experimentation has emphasized the importance of the cholesterol and fat content of the blood in the production of arteriosclerosis, including coronary arteriosclerosis. Usually it is only when the cholesterol level of the blood is elevated that this disease can be produced experimentally. The amount of fat and type of fat in the animals' diets are important in this respect. Other nutrients have also been shown to be involved under certain experimental conditions. These include protein, sugar, two or three of the B vitamins, and recently even the mineral magnesium.

Because of the interest in cholesterol, it might be well to comment further about it. Cholesterol is a normal constituent of all animal tissues. One of its functions is to serve as a building block for some of the hormones. It is present in almost all foods of animal origin, but more so in some than in others. Egg yolk and milk fat are rich sources in common foods. But in addition to ingesting cholesterol, our bodies make cholesterol, mainly in the liver. Fats in the diet seem to be the food component from which the body prefers to make cholesterol. Actually it has been shown repeatedly that the cholesterol content of the diet has very little to do with the cholesterol content of the blood. It is the level of cholesterol in the blood that is of concern in coronary artery disease and not the cholesterol content of the diet.

Some researchers claim to have shown that blood clots more quickly when the fat content is elevated. This may explain why a fair number of coronary heart attacks take place late at night, 4 to 5 hours after a large meal rich in fat. Were it possible to change our food habits appreciably, many workers in this field think it would be desirable to have the large meal of the day in the morning or at noon and have the evening meal be a light snack or supper. On the other hand, there are competent hematologists who dispute the belief that high blood-fat levels favor blood clotting. This is an important aspect of the problem, on which research is continuing.

Extra body weight means extra work for the heart and extra body tissue to be nourished, but these are probably unimportant as far as coronary artery disease is concerned. Frequently during periods of rapid gain in weight the cholesterol and fat level of the blood is increased. It is during such periods that cholesterol deposits may be laid down in the walls of the blood vessels and thus form atheroma. When the weight reaches a plateau, the cholesterol in the blood may decrease somewhat, but the damage in the form of cholesterol deposits has already occurred. The hazards of overweight may not be the extra pounds, but the chemical changes in the blood which accompany the gain in weight. Thus, those who reduce should certainly make up their minds to stay reduced.

Can cholesterol once deposited in blood vessel walls be removed? This is another problem currently under investigation. There is some evidence to suggest that if the deposits are not too extensive and have not been present for too long, they may be reduced in size, possibly removed. This may be acomplished if one is successful in appreciably lowering blood cholesterol and keeping it down. Weight reduction and then keeping one's weight down are about the most useful procedure in this respect for the average person.

Exercise is important in its effect on body weight. There is only one way to use up extra calories, and that is to burn them up by exercise. The beginning of obesity in adolescence is frequently due to lack of exercise rather than excessive caloric intake. The same applies to weight gain experienced in the forties. Exercise is also important in keeping the muscles of the blood vessel wall in good tone. It is thought that a heart well exercised is better able to develop a substitute or collateral circulation should this become necessary because of the formation of a thrombus.

The important thing about exercise is that it be daily and moderate in degree. Exercise has often been ridiculed as a means of helping to control weight. This is based on two misconceptions, that most common types of exercise require only a little energy, and that increase in exercise always gives rise to an increase in appetite. The first misconception can be avoided if one will take the trouble to look at any table of energy expenditures of various activities: walking for a man of 150 pounds uses up 200 to 400 calories per hour depending on speed, running 800 to 1,000 calories. Further, the calories used up are proportional to body weight; thus a person of 200 pounds uses more calories in exercise than one of 150 pounds.

Whether exercise increases appetite depends on the extent of the exercise and whether one is usually active or sedentary. If the exercise is mild to moderate and is done by a sedentary individual, it will not increase appetite.

Most people gradually become overweight because they consume a few more calories each day. If each day they would take a little more exercise they would burn up the extra calories. One does not become overweight between Christmas and New Year's, rather between New Year's and Christmas. Hence, the practical importance of daily minimum to moderate extra physical activity. Walking still remains the most available and inexpensive type of exercise.

Coronary artery disease in this country is usually more common and severe in patients who have elevated blood pressure or hypertension, and smoking usually elevates the blood pressure. Increased pressure within the blood vessels favors development of coronary heart disease in a number of ways, one of them, for example, being the occurrence of small hemorrhages within the blood vessel wall itself with further narrowing of the vessel. A sustained or a sudden increase in blood pressure may also cause an aneurysm (weak spot) to blow out with sudden loss of blood into the brain (cerebral hemorrhage or stroke); or if the aneurysm is in the abdominal aorta, as is common in severe arteriosclerosis, into the abdominal cavity.

It is well established that coronary artery disease is more prevalent among cigarette smokers than nonsmokers and that it occurs at an earlier age in smokers. This does not prove that smoking causes coronary artery disease, but it's not much of an inducement to smoke.

What does sex have to do with heart attacks—that is, real heart attacks? It has long been known that coronary artery disease is 4 to 5 times more prevalent in the male than in the female. But this discrepancy begins to disappear after the menopause, and by the middle fifties to sixties the disease is of equal prevalence in both sexes. Attempts have been made to treat the disease in men by giving them some of the female sex hormones. But so far these studies are purely in the research stage and have little practical application.

Experimentally, a sex difference in the susceptibility to the development of arteriosclerosis has also been found in a number of different types of animals. But for some unknown reason it is frequently in the opposite direction to that found in man. Thus, female rabbits and chickens are more susceptible to arteriosclerosis than males, and their susceptibility can be lessen by giving them large doses of the male sex hormones. Likewise the susceptibility of the male rabbit or chick can be increased by giving it female hormones.

A most interesting finding in sex as it relates to coronary artery disease is the observation from a group of pathologists from Washington University School of Medicine and Barnes Hospital in St. Louis that since the 1940's there has been a marked shift in the distribution of fatal coronary artery disease. They claim that the disease is now almost as prevalent in women as in men, even as early as the forties. No real explanation is available for this startling finding, though numerous speculations are possible: increased smoking of women, less exercise because of pushbutton housekeeping, gain in weight; but let me emphasize, these are all speculations.

No mention has been made so far of stress and strain. Are they involved in heart attacks? Stress and strain are difficult to measure and evaluate. Most of us are apt to think that many Americans, particularly ourselves, are under considerable stress and strain. Stress and strain certainly exist among those people in other parts of the world where coronary artery disease is rare, though it is mostly likely caused by different events. Primitive Africans, highly superstitious and in frequent fear of their lives, are under stress—yet coronary artery disease among them is rear.

The war dances, chants, and witch doctors of primitive societies may all serve a useful purpose in exteriorizing stress—getting rid of it. Too many of us keep our stress within us.

Stress and strain are likely to be highly individualized. What may be stress and strain for one person are not for another. It is entirely possible that the stress and strain of today's civilization are in certain individuals important in bringing about, along with other factors, the changes that result in a heart attack. While there is today no objective evidence to support this idea, it should be pointed out that few serious attempts have been made to study it.

Now what does cause heart attacks? Certainly a number of factors are involved, as has been mentioned. Undoubtedly they work together, and some are of more importance in certain individuals than in others. There is nothing one can do about one's heredity. But if you have parents or grandparents who died early from coronary or cerebral arteriosclerosis, it is most important that you minimize the other factors that contribute to these diseases. Thus, you should really keep your weight within bounds, get regular exercise, eat a well-balanced diet and not too much of it, and eliminate smoking. If, in addition, your doctor finds that you consistently have an elevated blood cholesterol, there are certain things he can suggest which may lower it.

The factors which cause heart attacks are additive. This was pointed out in a recent study of the United States Public Health Service, where it was shown that men who were overweight and also had an elevated blood cholesterol and an elevated blood pressure suffered a higher incidence of heart attack than those who had any two of these findings. Those with any 2 findings had a higher rate than those who had only 1. Our heredity and sex we can do nothing to change; we can do something to minimize the other factors if we really want to.

Arteriosclerosis is a serious condition, the main cause of death in Western civilization. Your doctor is the one who should handle this problem for you, an individual patient. Do not depend on a magazine article, like this or any other one, to solve your personal medical problems. At best it can only point out current concepts and trends in generalities, but to apply these findings to you as an individual requires the skill and knowledge of a trained physician.

Reds Goad NAACP To End Moderation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles dealing with the tragic incident at Little Rock, published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

NO. III—REDS GOAD NAACP TO END MODERATION

WASHINGTON.—The success of Communist efforts to exploit the southern Negro under the guise of democratization became fully evident in 1954 and the three subsequent years. The Supreme Court's historic 1954 ruling on school segregation was in judgment on four cases brought before it by the National Association of Advancement for Colored People, which for years had been a priority objective of Communist infiltration.

The NAACP charged that Negro children in Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia were being denied their rights under the 14th amendment.

The Court did not rule on this aspect. Instead, Chief Justice Earl Warren in the written opinion declared that the Court found for the NAACP because segregated schools induced a feeling of inferiority among Negro children.

SIX BOOKS CITED

This sociological view, the Justice stated, is amply supported by modern authority. He cited six books by such modern authority.

Two of the six authorities were Theodore Brameld and E. Franklin Frazier. Between them, they have been members of or identified with 28 organizations listed as Communist, Communist-fronts or Communist-dominated.

A third authority was K. B. Clark. While arguments were being heard by the Court on the four cases, Clark was on the payroll of the NAACP as a social science expert.

A fourth authority cited by Justice Warren was the book An American Dilemma, edited by Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialst. The Chief Justice emphasized the importance of this book in the Court's deliberations by saying it was depended on generally, that is from cover to cover.

RECORDS NOTED

Sixteen of the contributors to Myrdal's book have long records of pro-Communist affiliation and activity. One, W. E. B. Dubois, identified by the Communist Party as the honorary chairman of the NAACP, had a hand in 82 parts of the book. Dubois has been identified with 80 Communist fronts, reportedly more than any other American citizen.

Dubois intervened in behalf of executed Communist spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and sent the Kremlin a message of condolence on the death of Stalin.

Myrdal himself has written that the United States Constitution is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions. Its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people, said this foreign authority on American Negro problems.

The Court's decision gave new influence to the NAACP. Its officers hailed the decision but indicated that it would not change the organization's plan for calm and orderly progress in race relations.

"We accept the decision quietly, unless there is deliberately fomented trouble," said the late Walter White, then executive secretary of NAACP.

WANTED STRUGGLES

Thurgood Marshall, chief NAACP counsel, who had argued the school cases before the Court, said, "The people will get together and work this thing out."

The Communist Party, however, wanted no part of moderation. It wanted the big, sharp struggles its leaders had forecasted, and racial unrest. Communist publications and officials shrilled for immediate implementation of the Supreme Court decision, immediate abolition of segregation, and discrimination from every facet of American life, immediate enforcement, etc.

The record from the Supreme Court decision until the climax at Little Rock makes it plain which philosophy was the dominant one.

Moderation was forgotten.

The next 3 years brought unprecedented civil disobedience and violence in the South's racial affairs. There were all-out incidents of long duration in Tuskegee, Ala., Charleston, S. C., Tallahassee, Fla., Montgomery, Ala., Americus, Ga., and Clinton, Tenn., to name only the major ones.

COMMUNISTS BLAMED

The NAACP played a prominent role in each, but the atmosphere was not the moderate one ostensibly espoused by the NAACP.

"In my opinion, every major racial disturbance in the South since 1954 has been incited and directed by the Communist Party," Mrs. Paul Crouch, widow of a former Communist leader, told the Standard-Times. Her husband was a top Communist functionary in the South for 13 years, and she was his aid throughout the period.

Communist exploitation of the Negro through the NAACP is attested by the proceedings of the 1957 national convention of the Communist Party. That convention adopted as its main resolution, "the question of Negro freedom * * * the crucial domestic issue of the day * * * requiring support of the program of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

Communist penetration of the NAACP in these important years is conceded by the NAACP itself.

ALL CHAPTERS WARNED

On February 14, 1956, Leroy Watkins, who succeeded White as NAACP executive secretary, warned all chapters to guard against the intensive efforts of Communists to infiltrate.

At that very time, however, the NAACP's official publication, The Crisis, was recommending as must background reading for Negroes, books by Claude Lightfoot, chairman of the Illinois Communist Party, and Doxey E. Wilkerson, member of the party's national committee. Both have written extensively in behalf of racial unrest.

Communist dominance of Negro civil rights developments after the Supreme Court decision is illustrated, also, in the activities of the Highlander School, influential sociological workshop in the South. Highlander, according to testimony before a congressional committee, was founded by a Communist and by a man who refused to state his beliefs.

IS PROGRAM SINCERE?

Since 1954, Highlander has held a series of workshops to develop plans for an orderly transition from segregated to integrated schols. At the last workship, held over the Labor Day weekend just before the trouble at Little Rock, the leaders of every important racial strife incident in the South since 1954 were present.

How sincere is the Highlander program for orderly transition in desegregation?

The actual curriculum at Highlander, its pamphlet statement in behalf of orderly transition notwithstanding, preached that "desegregation is more effectively accomplished in a single step than in a series of steps with delays in between."

This is fellow-traveler vernacular for the straight-out Communist program of immediate desegregation.

Among those attending the important Highlander workshop was the Rev. Martin Luther King, leader of the Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott. King was to be at Little Rock, and, in 1958, at the White House, protesting integration delay.

By the time Central High School in Little Rock was to open for its 1957–58 school year, the Communist Party was marching step by step with the NAACP, whether the good element in the NAACP liked it or not.

No. IV—DAILY WORKER LED THE CRY FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION

WASHINGTON.—"The honor of our country requires Federal intervention now, to end the organized defiance of decency and justice in the South." These words were not spoken by Mayor Mann, of Little Rock, nor by Maxwell Rabb, White House assistant to whom the mayor talked daily by telephone in the hectic days preceding intervention by the National Guard and paratroopers.

They were not spoken by an official for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the dominant United States Negro organization.

The words were an official pronouncement of the Communist Party of the United States, issued 2 years before Little Rock, and printed in the party's official political guide, Political Affairs, issue of October 1955.

UTTERED BY COMMUNIST

"The Federal Government has the power and the duty to use troops and whatever other constitutional means are available to enforce the law of the land."

Use of the word "constitutional" in the above might lead someone to think a good American had said those words.

They were uttered 18 months before Little Rock's Federal troop intervention by Benjamin J. Davis, chairman of the Negro Commission of the United States Communist Party.

"The Federal Government hasn't hesitated to use the force of jail and seizures in trying to destroy the Communists and other foes of Jim Crow," said Davis, who like other Communists, has been able to predict the future in civil-rights matters.

PRESSED FOR TROOPS

"It should not hesitate to use whatever force—troops if necessary—to put down violent defiance of the law of the land, and murderous terror against peaceful citizens seeking to exercise their constitutional rights."

From the very beginning of the Little Rock incident, the Communists pressed for dispatch of Federal troops to keep order in the South.

The Communist Daily Worker shrilled a demand for action on September 5, the day after Governor Faubus stationed National Guardsmen around Central High School.

"The insurrection in Arkansas" must be put down, strummed the Worker the next day.

"G-men must be sent," said another edition, blasting FBI Director Hoover for refusing to do so.

OTHER PHRASES

"Every prerogative" must be used by the President, was another phrase in the daily demands for use of the military.

"Threats of blood running in the streets" were cited by the Worker, without identifying the source.

Southern whites were charged with being immune to education, cajolery, and pleas of moderation, so that troops were the only recourse.

"Why wait?" asked one Worker editorial.

"Patience," scoffed another.

"Nothing is to be gained by handling Faubus with kid gloves," stated another diatribe.

Shilly-shallying was laid to the President.

And so it came to pass. On September 24, paratroopers were airborne to Little Rock. Exactly the methods advocated by the Communist ace-agitators—speed and force—were used in a civil-rights dispute.

A tremendous victory for the American people, rejointed the next day's Daily Worker.

Use of armed troops climaxed years of incitement by violence and distortion of truth by the Communists and their sympathizers. Again a helping hand came from the Supreme Court that had opened the way to Negro freedom, as the Communist Party observed, and from the misled NAACP.

Mrs. Daisy Bates, president of the Arkansas Conference of NAACP branches, had a key role at Little Rock.

MRS. BATES LAUDED

In an adulatory interview with Mrs. Bates, the New York Post's reporter Ted Poston stated, "both sides in this embattled Southern town agreed on one thing: If there had been no Daisy Bates, there would have been no 101st Airborne Division patrolling the halls of Central High School.

"And no 9 Negro children in the one all-white high school."

Mrs. Bates' husband, Lucious C. Bates, is a director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which former Communists have indicted as a Communist transmission agency, for inculcating and carrying out Communist doctrine.

The Southern Conference Educational Fund took over many of the officers and all of the publications of the old Southern Conference for Human Welfare, twice listed as a Communist front, "doing the work of the Communist Party," by the United States Government.

Mrs. Bates is listed as a sponsor of the Southern Conference Educational Fund.

ANOTHER WOMAN INFLUENTIAL

Mr. Bates was a member of the organization known as Negroes for Wallace, a Communist rallying point. He was a sponsor of the Bill of Rights Congress, a Communist Party front.

Also influential at Little Rock was Mrs. Grace Lorch, white woman who befriended one of the Negro students refused admission to Central High.

Widely published press dispatches described Mrs. Lorch as "a white housewife who protected a Negro girl before a jeering mob," and as "having defied an angry crowd of whites to offer sympathy."

It was not reported, however, that Mrs. Lorch, according to Senate Internal Security Subcommittee records, has a thorough Communist Party background.

HUSBAND INDICTED

She has been identified as a one-time Communist Party organizer in Boston, as having attended a Communist Party convention, as a member of the New England District of the Communist Party, as former vice president of the Teachers Union, and as a director of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies, both Communist fronts.

At the time Mrs. Lorch was active in Little Rock, her husband, Lee Lorch, was under Federal indictment on eight counts of refusing to answer questions on his alleged Communist background put to him by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Here, too, the Supreme Court rendered an assist. The charges against Lorch later were dismissed by a Federal judge on the basis of the Supreme Court's freeing of John T. Watkins, United Auto Workers official who refused to name Communists he knew while he was one himself.

Little Rock found the United States Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Communist Party teammates.

It was a dazzling demonstration of what can happen, to quote former Communist Joseph Kornfelder, when "the ivory tower boys picked up the theories of the Communists, not looking at what is behind the theories."

A Suggestion From a Constitutent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, during a Congresman's term of office he receives many suggestions from constituents on many different subjects. This you know. I was very happy to receive a letter from Mrs. Helen E. Bolton, of Highspire, Pa., in which she makes a very good religious suggestion that could be applied by a Congressman, especially in contemplating history-making legislation. I trust the Members may adopt the idea advanced by Mrs. Bolton. Her letter follows:

HIGH SPIRE, PA., *August 7, 1958.*
Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I am just one of your constituents who feels that the voice of the people who want our country to stay the way our forefather's planned it to be. They laid down a wonderful outline in the preamble and the Constitution which is the closest to God's way of thinking on the face of this earth. Now, I am only one person, but I will try to do my best to keep that same spirit strong in my opportunities that are open to me and you being in your position, I would love to see you do the same, we can all help one another to keep that true light bright and shinning. There has never been another country that has had the blessing and love of God poured on it in so much abundance as the United States of America, and unless we keep our faith strong in the same light as our forefathers did, God may see fit to give His blessing elsewhere. Personally, if I were to be in your shoes and I voted on any bill I would first say to myself, "Would, Jesus vote yes or no on this bill," instead of would my party approve of a yes or no on this bill and I am sure that if all Congressmen thought in that way we would really have life more abundantly than we have even now and it would truly be the voice of the people then, and not this party or that party. I personally think President Eisenhower has done a wonderful job in this respect but I am sure also, many times the party has tried to swing his will to their way instead of the common people.

My voice may seem very strange to you, but believe me that it is exactly what our younger generation is looking for. They want religion and the way to live it in every day living as well as on Sunday in church.

Your opportunity for the benefit of these children is very great and it can be done.

I would like if you would show this letter to some of your fellow Congressmen and all pull together for the same purpose and then we need fear no Red aggression.

I hope I may be of help to you in finding out what it is your constituents really want and need.

HELEN E. BOLTON,
One of the Voice of the People.

The Real Russia—Open the Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, two letters from a resident of the district I represent are most enlightening. Certainly, they were to me and I believe they will be to the public. From the background of the writer, I believe I can guarantee their authenticity:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been interested in the problem of the activities of the Soviet Union for the last 10 years and consider that I know the subject quite well. Because of this, I feel that Mr. Hearst (returned twice from the U. S. S. R.) is completely wrong in glorifying the Soviet Union. He has apparently seen only the decorative aspect. First, the real fact is that about 70 percent of the families in the Soviet Union live in one single room with the necessity of the mother of the family to do hard physical work 8 hours daily and more. Children of such families can have only a minimum comfort in order to study after school.

Secondly, all this glorification of scientific methods there is completely exaggerated. The Soviet Union would not hesitate a moment to attack the United States if they were as powerful as this stupid propaganda has been telling us for years. The miserable situation in general there in regards to food, clothing, and lodging will prevent for many years ahead the possibility of their possessing even half of our strength. The danger is in exaggerating the decorative part of the Soviet Union here which has already convinced part of the newspapers in the United States. If they succeed to convince half of Congress then we are sunk.

In order to beat it we have only one means: To request of any commission discussing and deciding question of approaching or cooperating with Soviet Russia to make only one demand. Ask the Soviet officials directly to show their faces. Open the border. Allow our citizens, newspapermen, photographers to go there freely and bring us news about the facts of their peoples lives. Allow their people to come here in the same way. Also we should convince all sympathizers and glorifiers of the Soviet Union to join with this request to open their borders. Then all this silly talk about cultural superiority, military achievement, and other socialistic progress will evaporate like a myth.

With such a knowledge (as I said, about opening the border) and left only with the exchange of selected people will only increase the deception and increase the present fear. The request of open the border would convince the confused people here who are really American and misled by clever propaganda. At the same time it would stop the talk of the admirers of the Soviet Union as they would be unable to give us a proper answer as to why such a simple and logical request cannot be fulfilled.

In addition to my previous statement, I would like to mention this: Our present struggle properly consists of winning the human mind to the side of truth. The Communists and their admirers here have succeeded in winning the human mind by lies. We have not succeeded having even used the truthful facts. Such a simple request as open the border for our travelers would serve the main purpose for thousands and thousands of American travelers to see the dreadful life over there in unquestionable detail. The true facts from a multitude of our people would act considerably better than a semiglorification of the Hearst staff (for instance) who, not long ago, visited the Soviet Union. Or a very doubtful report from the candidate for future president, Mr. Stevenson, who is traveling there now. The true facts of how the people of present Russia eat, dress, and are lodged—not only in a big city but in the country at large would expose the real pulse of life—especially in the Sovchos (Soviet farm) and Kolhos (collective farm).

Many thousands of American people saw the film Russia Today. In this picture there is an endless line of people who are waiting to see Lenin's tomb. Apparently this line is maintained in snow or rain. Are the people standing there voluntarily or compulsorily? Why cannot this subject be openly discussed and demonstrated to the Soviet sympathizers here as mental torture endured by the people of Moscow who must stand in line or be punished by the removal of their bread ration book. This process of punishment has been in existence for the last 40 years.

Boalsburg, Pa., Retains Atmosphere of Pioneer America as It Celebrates Its Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of Pennsylvania some years ago, pioneer settlers established the community of Boalsburg. Recently the residents of Boalsburg launched an observance of the community's sesquicentennial. Mr. Robert W. Boyer, a member of the staff of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, wrote the following article about Boalsburg which appeared in the August 2, 1958, edition of the Altoona Mirror:

BOALSBURG RETAINS ATMOSPHERE OF PIONEER AMERICA

(By Robert W. Boyer)

It is probable that few of the motorists who speed along the busy concrete highway, Route 322, to and from the teeming and modern university town of State College are aware, in their fleeting glance at Boalsburg, that just a village block away from the main highway lies a rare and lovely but tiny remnant of early Americana.

The traveler's eye is caught and held by the wide expanse of the impressive beauty and dignity of the 28th Division National Shrine and Memorial Park, along the highway, certainly one of this country's finest tributes to our war dead. But, the wayfarer who pauses may see the road sign, "Boalsburg. An American Village. Birthplace of

Memorial Day." And, if he turns off the roaring road and into the village, and looks with seeing eyes, he cannot escape the thrill of looking upon a street in a hamlet just as it was long ago.

AN AMERICAN VILLAGE

It is not, of course, spectacular, nor are there flashing signboards or coruscating electric signs to mark points of historic interest. It is, in truth, a quiet American village, whose flavor of the past is dispelled only by an occasional automobile, and the modern dress of its people.

THE ANCIENT STREET

The visitor who has an awareness of the past can see it come briefly to life as he stands in the diamond and looks down the tree-shaded street, lined with neat houses of weathered wood and the deep reddish brown of ancient brick. They are built directly upon the narrow sidewalk, and are obviously living monuments from the day when America was young. Fronting the diamond is a house of standing in the small community, but it is of much later construction than many of the others, late 19th century, with somewhat flamboyant carved woodwork and huge porch surrounding two sides of the house.

Today the people of Boalsburg are inviting visitors to come to them, as they observe their sesquicentennial celebration, and to live again briefly in the days when America was a new nation and the savage Shawness of the great Indian Confederacy, the Six Nations, were just giving up reluctantly this portion of their favorite hunting grounds.

The record of white men in this area extends back to 1759, when James Potter, a captain of British provincial troops defending the frontier against the French and Indians, set out on a scouting expedition from Fort August, now Sunbury.

Following along Bald Eagle Creek to its confluence with Spring Creek near what is now Milesburg, Captain Potter crossed Nittany Mountain and saw before him a beautiful country, of lush meadows, watered by a cold stream, and shaded by tall trees, and over all the heart-lifting grandeur of the mountain walls.

PENNS VALLEY

He called it Penns Valley, in honor of William Penn and his sons, the proprietaries who held title to it from the King, and also through a treaty negotiated with the Shawnees.

Nearly 10 years later, Captain Potter acquired several thousand acres in the valley, and built a fortified log house, in 1777, at what is now called Old Fort, a few miles from Boalsburg.

The Revolution now was raging, and Captain Potter laid aside his British allegiance and became a major general of Pennsylvania troops in the Continental Army. But, the valley was opened to settlers and the first town plan in the region was laid out at Aaronsburg in 1786.

Among these hardy pioneers was one David Boal in whom was mixed the passionate blood of Spain and the bold blood of the Irish. Captain Boal was a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and in 1789, received a military land grant for his service.

BUILT TAVERN

He built a tavern in 1804 along one of the main stage routes between Lewisburg and Spruce Creek, leading west to Fort Pitt, now Pittsburgh. A portion of this tavern, containing a wide stone fireplace, still stands, attached, by a short weathered wooden passageway to the home of Miss Cathryn Dale, a member of the sesquicentennial committee.

Miss Dale's family settled in the area about 1790. Her present brick home was built in 1868. Her home and the Boal tavern are opened to visitors during the sesquicentennial observance. Built against a wall of the tavern is an ancient wood cupboard, still sturdy, with tight doors, that Miss Dale uses for her stone chinaware.

Captain Boal, built, but never occupied, the central section of the present Boal Mansion. His son, David, returned to Ireland long enough to take a wife, and returned with his wife and child to Boalsburg in 1798, lived in his father's unused mansion, and built a big stone addition to it.

Young David Boal was a man of vision and varied talents, and he founded the family which has had such an important place in not only building the community, but winning for it and his family a distinguished place in American history.

The romance of old Europe and the bold adventure of America are blended in the history of the Boal family. A century later, the family estate and history were given new impetus by Theodore Davis Boal, great-grandson of David, who went abroad to study architecture, and there married the beautiful Mathilde de Lagarde, daughter of a wealthy French family and related through her mother to the family in Spain of Christopher Columbus.

ORGANIZES TROOP

Colonel Boal organized the Boalsburg Troop of the Pennsylvania National Guard in 1916, which went overseas as a unit of the 28th Division, and is believed to be the first to mechanize its machineguns on motorized carriages, Ford cars. Colonel Boal gave the land for the division's national shrine.

His son, Pierre, served as a captain in the French cavalry in World War I, and later was with the famed Lafayette Escadrille.

In 1917, Colonel Boal designed a small building on the mansion grounds to house the furnishings of the Columbus family chapel, of his wife's family, and preserved here is all the impressive beauty of this old family shrine.

COLUMBUS CHAPEL

This Columbus Family Chapel is one of the points of interest in Boalsburg. It is entered through the original hand-carved, 16th-century door, protected from the weather by an outer door. Inside are preserved the altar, gallery, railings, carved chests, religious accessories, ancient documents, and letters of the Columbus family.

Outstanding in the chapel collection are two pieces from the left arm of the true cross in the silver reliquary in which they were given to the Columbus family by the Bishop of Leon in 1817.

The museum displays early American antiques and many war souvenirs.

The mansion has been restored since Colonel Boal's death in 1938, this work being in charge of the curator, Mrs. Lillian Dickson, who has renewed the beauty of this noble old building.

On a corner of the square swings a sign typical of the American colonial period. Upon it are painted the words, "Duffy's Tavern," and over the main doorway of this stone building, which is still in operation, are the carved letters, "J and H L J," and the date, 1819. It was built in that year by Col. James and Hanna Bethesda Johnston, who had a store and lived nearby. It was ruined by fire in 1934, and later restored, from records and documents as a guide. It retains much of the atmosphere of those long-gone days when it was a favorite resting place of the gentry along the King's Highway west.

MEMORIAL DAY

But Boalsburg has another claim to fame. On May 30, 1865, there was established, so the people of the village say, the custom that grew into the Memorial Day observance.

On that day, by chance, three women of the community went to the old cemetery, to place flowers upon the graves of their war dead. Mrs. Elizabeth Meyer went to weep over the new grave of her 19-year-old son, Joe, a private, fatally wounded at Gettysburg. Nearby, Emma Hunter Stuart was placing flowers on the grave of her father, Dr. Reuben Hunter, surgeon of the 54th Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers, who died of wounds.

Still another woman grieving for her war dead was Sophia Keller Hall.

The three met, told one another of their grief, and agreed to meet at the cemetery every year at the same time to place flowers on the graves of their dead. Later, they began to decorate the graves of other soldiers, and thus, so the townspeople say, developed the honored observance of Memorial Day.

Today, Mount Nittany stands, an eternal guard of honor for the graves of veterans of 6 wars and the hallowed ground of the 28th Division Shrine, the last resting place and the memorial to men who died for the kind of life typified by that ancient tree-shaded street of Boalsburg.

A Resolution Honoring Thomas A. Jenkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF FELICITATION AND GOOD WISHES TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS A. JENKINS, BY THE OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES OF THE OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., JUNE 13, 1958

Whereas for many, many years, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS has been and is today the most loyal and devoted friend of the Ohio River and its proper development, and

Whereas his energy, leadership, and influence as a Congressman of the United States has never failed the people of the Ohio Valley, and

Whereas his counsel and cooperation have always been an inspiration to the officers, trustees, members, and friends of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, and

Whereas the friends of Congressman TOM JENKINS learn with great regret of his illness: Now be it therefore

Resolved, That the officers and trustees of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., at an official board meeting held in Nashville, Tenn., on June 13, 1958, do now and hereby unanimously express their felicitations and best wishes, with all the words of encouragement at their command, to their good friend, whom they like to affectionately call "Old Man River," and be it further

Resolved, That we hope and pray for his early recovery and restoration to good health, and to his return among us, again participating in the things he liked so well to do for his beloved Ohio River, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this document be forwarded direct to Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS and that another copy be spread upon the records of this association.

Unanimously adopted by the board of trustees, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, June 13, 1958.

HARRY M. MACK, *President*,

Attest:

KENNETH M. LLOYD, *Secretary*.

Appendix

Report of National Projects Committee to the Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the report of the National Projects Committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 45th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 14–16, 1958.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session follow:

PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Representative SID SIMPSON, of Illinois, chairman.

New England division: Member: William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood Control and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Member: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, United States Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.

South Atlantic division: Member: H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla.; vice chairman.

Southwestern division: Member: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intercoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Member: W. L. Sibley, president, Caddo Levee Board, Shreveport, La.

North Central division: Member: Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River division: Member: John B. Quinn, executive vice chairman, National Resources Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: Member: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Member: Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Member: Vice Adm. Murray L. Royar, United States Navy (retired), Washington representative, Oakland, Calif., Chamber of Commerce.

Western Inter-Mountain region: Member: E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 45TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

MAY 16, 1958.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on May 14, 1958, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 54 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proopsals examined, this committee is convinced that four constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $651,048,000. Nineteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 27 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this congress.

We find four proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

At the time of our national convention last year, the Congress of the United States was considering the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, S. 497. As the members of this Congress know, S. 497 was vetoed by the President on April 15, 1958, generally on the basis that authorization of 28 of the items included would destroy some of the most important governmental policies in the field of water resource development. No action has been taken by the Congress on the veto.

A total of 137 projects, exclusive of basin authorizations, covering all parts of the country and the Territories were included in the vetoed bill. The monetary and report breakdown of S. 497 as passed by the Congress is as follows:

Type of improvements	Number of reports or items	Monetary authorization
Navigation and beach erosion	70	$202,430,300
Flood control and multiple purpose including Mississippi River	67	566,649,500
Basin authorizations (flood control general)	12	608,300,000
Department of Interior (Missouri River)	1	200,000,000
Total	150	1,577,379,800

In addition to the above authorizations, the bill contained several general provisions, including a section on water supply which would liberalize policy applicable to advance provision of facilities needed to meet future needs. Most of the projects have been found economically justified and many of the recommended projects included in S. 497 are of high importance to the Nation's expanding economy and should be provided as soon as possible. Your projects committee, therefore, recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to give consideration to early authorization of these projects and to the appropriation of funds for construction. The section on water supply is particularly appropriate to the future planning of reservoirs in order to serve the expanding industrial economy in an orderly manner.

Since our last meeting, there has been much activity in connection with the Federal civil-works construction and investigation program and in the field of water-resource development. Floods are once again taking their toll of destruction in Texas and Louisiana and in the triangle of Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia in the Big Sandy River Basin. Last spring during the disastrous floods in the Southwest the 34 reservoirs and other flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers in operation in this region, which cost $476 million to construct prevented some $140 million of flood damages. Flood control became a major part of the national water resource investment program when in 1928 the Congress declared a national interest in preventing human suffering and economic losses from floods in the Mississippi Valley, and authorized the Alluvial Valley project. This project has yielded $6 in benefits for every dollar invested. In 1936 flood control was authorized on a nationwide basis. The 500 flood-control projects of the corps completed or placed in partial operation have been in operation for an average of about 15 years. They have already prevented flood damages totaling $8⅔ billion, which is about twice the amount invested. The reservoir system of the Corps of Engineers with millions of acre-feet of storage capacity are mitigating the damaging effects of floodwaters and are bene-

fiting water supplies, pollution abatement, recreation, and fish and wildlife. However, construction of authorized projects and additional authorizations are necessary to alleviate flood conditions in other parts of the country. The devastating floods in the Pacific Northwest and the floods and hurricane losses along the Atlantic and Gulf States during the past few years are fresh in our minds and show that much remains to be done in the field of flood control, particularly in the determination of the feasibility of projects for the prevention of these flood damages and the loss of human lives. Where and when another great flood may strike is not known but it could be in any river basin at any time.

The inland waterways which now total 22,600 miles handled an alltime high of 220 billion ton-miles of cargo in the calendar year 1956. There are over 400 improved harbors and the Great Lakes system, in addition.

The hydroelectric power production facilities of the Corps of Engineers are contributing greatly to alleviating power shortages, particularly in the critically deficient Northwest region. During the fiscal year 1957, 22 billion kilowatts were generated at projects operated by the corps, representing 18 percent of the total hydroelectric power produced by all sources in the Nation.

As we all know, the Corps of Engineers survey program is nationwide and it includes investigations called for by Congress to determine the practical means of reduction of loss of human lives and damages to property. Reports recommending flood-control works on the most severely damaged areas in New England and in other parts of the country have been completed and submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers and are included in the omnibus bill. As a result of hurricane damage to our coastal and tidal areas, three projects for New Bedford-Fairhaven, Narragansett Bay, and Texas City are included in the bill.

Many other areas severely damaged have been designated for detailed study and a number of these investigations are well advanced. Congress has also authorized investigations to study hurricanes including the securing of data on hurricane frequency and behavior and the establishment of means to prevent the loss of lives and property that have been experienced. It is evident, therefore, that the development of plans for the control of floods and minimizing the destructive force of hurricane are of paramount importance. In this connection, we must never for one moment lose sight of the objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in supporting this great program of water resource development.

The need for funds for carrying out investigations for flood control, hurricanes, navigation, and related uses is as urgent at this time as any time in the history of this program. The investigations should go forward in order that a well planned construction program can be made for the time that construction funds will be available for those projects which may be recommended as a result of these studies and that are authorized by Congress. We have watched with concern the gradual retardation of the navigation and flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, not only for new work but also for maintenance and investigations. For example, there are over 1,000 outstanding reports in the Corps of Engineers program which will cost over $20 million to complete. Although much work remains to be done in the field of water resource development throughout the country, we feel that the problem is being expertly handled by the Federal agencies in cooperation with the States concerned. The need for full scale development of our water resource program is greater today than ever before. The projects committee, therefore, considers it highly important that sufficient funds be provided in order that the Federal agencies can carry out their respective water resource program in an orderly fashion. Your committee is concerned over the large backlog of investigations authorized by Congress to be carried out by the various Federal agencies and recommends that appropriations be increased at this time in order that the backlog be reduced and that an adequate reserve of current projects may be built up for activation particularly at this time when the economy of the Nation appears to warrant construction of worthwhile public works.

We wish to commend the various Federal agencies involved in the investigations and provisions of water resource projects on their improvements in development of sound procedures of project analysis and formulation, and the increased cooperation among agencies and with the States and local interests. We believe that true partnership between the Federal Government and its citizens lies not only in the sharing of costs, but also from the common sharing of problems and their development and solution. An example is the pending hurricane studies being made along the eastern and southern seaboards, in which, the States, local municipalities and many of the Federal agencies are cooperating in making these studies.

We renew our previous recommendations that existing and proposed channels for inland navigation be studied with a view to developing a practical and rational method for evaluating their strategic importance. In 1950 President Truman appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission to study the entire field of water resource development. In its report of December 11, 1950 that Commission gave exhaustive consideration to navigation improvements, including their military and defense value, and quoted the following statement of the Office of Defense Transportation:

"If our waterways rendered no service beyond that of transporting petroleum and its products during the war they would have amply justified their improved existence."

The committee is now developing procedures under which, when specifically requested by the proponents, it may assign to navigation projects and to the navigation feature of multiple purpose projects a strategic value rating in addition to and aside from their peace time economic value. These ratings express the committee's judgment as to the relative strategic value of any project for inland navigation according to the standards, considerations and definitions which the committee has developed. The purpose of assigning such ratings is to evaluate our strategic reserve of inland water transport facilities and the coordination of these with facilities for other means of transport in order to aid local, State and Federal Governments to assess the value of the contribution by a project to such reserve so that it may have weight in the overall justification of the project. A high strategic value rating is not at all necessary to the complete economic justification of a project but such rating may serve to justify a project not justified by the application of strictly economic criteria alone. In general, the committee icludes in its definition of strategic value any existing or potential use, device or feature of a project which may be reasonably expected to importantly and specifically contribute to the defense potential of the United States, either military or civilian, with respect to its overall rail, highway, waterway and air-transport network.

The committee recommends that the executive vice president be authorized to issue to proponents, when requested by them, an appropriate certificate of classification with respect to any project classified by the committee.

Attention is called to the fact that new rules have been promulgated after last year's meeting. These rules have been furnished to the applicants of the 45th national convention and have formed the basis for current action by the projects committee.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON, *Chairman.*

(NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due appplication and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.)

(NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—Endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the congress, upon the recommendations of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such atcion is rescinded by the congress, and the congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.)

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Appendix A

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

Endorsed: This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
1081	Toledo Harbor	Ohio	North Central.
1089	Buttermilk Channel (by dredging)	New York	N. A.
1098	Miami Harbor	Florida	S. A.
1105	Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division, Missouri River Basin	North and South Dakota	Missouri River Basin, Garrison Division.

DIVISION II—MERITORIOUS

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
793-R5	Flood protection, cleves	Ohio	O. R.
890-R4	Kahului Harbor	Maui, T. H.	P. O.
1079	Turtle Creek Basin flood control	Pennsylvania	O. R.
1091	Improvement Oakland inner harbor	California	S. P.
1093	Jim Ned Creek, Pecan Bayou, general survey	Texas	S. W.
1097	Turkey Creek Reservoir	Kansas	M. R.
1097-A	Sutphen Mills Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-B	Woodbine Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-C	Humboldt Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-D	Camp Creek Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-E	Onaga Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-F	Grove Reservoir	do	M. R.
1097-G	Clinton Reservoir	do	M. R.
1102	Trinity River and tributaries	Texas	S. W.
1106	Siuslaw River and bar	Oregon	N. P.
1107	Pollution abatement works for District of Columbia	District of Columbia	N. A.
1115	Mad River Dam	Connecticut	N. E.
1117	Newfield Dam, Naugatuck River, East Branch	do	N. E.
1118	Hall Meadow Dam, Naugatuck River, West Branch	do	N. E.

DIVISION III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
843-R5	Levees east of Chandlerville (Sangamon River)	Illinois	N.C.
922-R	Atchafalaya Bay ship channel	Louisiana	L.M.V.
1008-R2	Calcasieu River, low-level dam-sea brine barrier	do	L.M.V.
1058-R	Breakwater, Monhegan Island	Maine	N.E.
1059-R	Portland Harbor	do	N.E.
1080	Toledo Harbor (by deepening)	Ohio	N.C.
1083	Southern Branch, Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	N.A.
1084	Additional anchorages, Norfolk Harbor	do	N. A.
1085	Channel to Newport News	do	N. A.
1087	Study Passaic River, Newark Bay Channel	New Jersey	N. A.
1088	Review Buttermilk Channel	New York	N. A.
1090	Hurricane flood protection of Pawcatuck	Connecticut	N. E.
1092	Passaic River Basin flood control	New Jersey	N. A.
1094	Rend Lake	Illinois	L. M. V.
1096	Port San Luis Harbor development	California	S. P.
1099	Michigan City Harbor	Indiana	N. C.
1100	Wilmington Harbor	North Carolina	S. A.
1103	Pembilier Dam	North Dakota	North Central.
1104	Bowman-Haley municipal water study	do	Missouri Basin.
1105	Survey review report on Potomac River and tributaries	Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, District of Columbia.	N. A.
1109	Columbia and Lower Willamette River deep-draft ship channel	Oregon and Washington	N. P.
1110	Bayfield Harbor	Wisconsin	North Central.
1111	Menominee Harbor and River	Michigan and Wisconsin	Do.
1112	Kewaunee Harbor	Wisconsin	Do.
1113	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal	do	Do.
1114	Flint River channelization, flood control of hydroelectric power, water conservation.	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1116	Apponaug Cove	Rhode Island	Northeast.

DIVISION IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
1082	Toledo Harbor (for anchorage area)	Ohio	N. C.
1086	Port of New York to St. Lawrence River Waterway	New York, Vermont, Quebec	N. A.
1095	Prospect Harbor, breakwater	Maine	N. E.
1101	Cold River Dam	New Hampshire	N. E.

Testimony of Kansas Corporation Commission Before the Federal Power Commission Pertaining to Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body the following testimony by the State Corporation Commission of Kansas:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF KANSAS

The concern of the State Corporation Commission of Kansas with rulemaking of the Federal Power Commission in relation to rate filings reflecting the influence of State minimum price orders is necessarily different from that of the individual concerns of producers, transmission companies, distributors, or ultimate consumers. This presentation is confined to comments and suggestions directly affecting the statutory duties of the Kansas Corporation Commission, as a regulatory body, in relation to the Kansas Hugoton Field.

STATEMENT OF MARION BEATTY, CHAIRMAN, KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

Mr. BEATTY. If the commission please, I am Marion Beatty, chairman of the Kansas Corporation Commission. With me today are the two other members of the commission, Harry G. Wiles and Richard C. Byrd. Our arguments today will be presented by our chief counsel, Clyde Milligan, and special counsel, Dale Stucky.

Before turning the matter over to them, I wish to make one general statement. The Kansas Corporation Commission as well as the Oklahoma Commission, has a duty to perform and we of Kansas interpret that duty to be to conserve and do everything possible to assure an adequate supply of gas at reasonable prices.

We do not believe it is in the public interest to permit gas to be taken out of Kansas at the lowest possible prices, cheap and wasteful prices, to the ultimate detriment of everyone, including consumers.

We earnestly request that the rule or policy to be promulgated by this honorable Commission be one that will permit us rather than prevent us from performing our duty

to conserve gas and assure an adequate supply for as long into the future as possible.

This kind of cooperation between this Commission and our commission will enure to the long-time benefit of millions of Americans who will want this ideal fuel, natural gas, for as long as our reserves will last.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF CLYDE E. MILLIGAN—RESUMED

Mr. MILLIGAN. If it please the Commission, the Kansas Commission, of course, as has been indicated by the chairman of the Commission, appreciates this opportunity to orally present to you our comments and our views on this very important matter. It is a matter of tremendous interest to the people of Kansas, both consumers as well as producers and landowners.

The concern of the Kansas Commission is, of necessity, different from the concern and interest of the producers, the transmission companies, the distributing companies, or the consumer. The Kansas Commission, of course, is interested in the conservation of this natural resource of the State of Kansas. However, before we get into the duties and responsibilities of the Kansas Commission, I think it might be well to review the history of the Kansas Hugoton Field, so that you can see the problems that had grown up in the Kansas Hugoton Field due to the manner and method in which it was developed—because then it gives you an understanding of what the Kansas Commission had to do.

Of course, as we all know, the Kansas Hugoton Field, which is a part of the Hugoton Field extending on into Oklahoma and Texas, is one extremely large common source of natural gas. Gas, of course, as we all know, cannot be transported as most other fuels. It has to be transported by pipelines. Pipelines can only be built at tremendous cost. Due to this character of gas and the necessity of transporting it by pipelines, it allowed a very monopolistic situation to develop in the Kansas Hugoton Field. We had actually, in the Kansas Hugoton Field, a situation where you had many producers or suppliers, and only a very limited number of purchasers. By considering that statement just a minute, you can see that actually you have there a situation which is just the reverse of the usual utility situation, where you have 1, perhaps 2, sellers of, say, gas, and many purchasers. Here we have many purchasers and extremely limited number of producers, rather, and an extremely limited number of purchasers. Actually, what we had were captive producers and suppliers. I don't think it can be interpreted in any other way. I think that from the facts which we set out in our brief, and from the facts which I hope to call your attention to here, it can be very quickly and readily seen that the producers and suppliers in the Kansas Hugoton Field were much more captive than the consumer ever has been in this country. It was a case where the producer either had to sell his gas or, in many cases, sell his well or be drained and lose everything. He had no choice, actually. The facts which I point out here are facts which have been taken from many hearings before the Kansas Commission, and they are price hearings, primarily.

I would like to call your attention to some specific testimony presented in these Kansas hearings, so that you can get a very first-hand view of the conditions that did exist in those early days in the Kansas Hugoton Field.

Mr. Conrad Ohm, who was secretary-treasurer and general manager of the Trees Oil Co., testified at these price hearings, and I would like to quote what he had to say as it does summarize the situation that existed there:

"As to the comparative position of our company and that of the pipeline company in so far as bargaining power in negotiations in which we sought connections for wells during this period of time, we offered to lay lines to their systems, and offered to sell gas at their price, which is 4 cents. This, in effect, gave us no bargaining power whatsoever. We could not market our gas, because there were not pipeline systems or distribution systems. We could not develop wells because of the small amount of acreage held by us. It was not economically practical. The pipeline companies gave no particular reason for not making connections. They said they were just not interested. They were drilling on acreage they owned at the time—that is both Northern Natural and Panhandle Eastern. We finally agreed to the contract we did because it was either that or nothing, with the possibility of losing what little acreage we had left."

Mr. Ohm testified in this hearing further, and stated that the first well they drilled in Kansas Hugoton Field was in 1929. I believe the discovery of gas in the Kansas Hugoton Field was in 1927, so this was 2 years later. They drilled seven additional wells to prove out the acreage surrounding the first well they had drilled. It was not until 1936 that they could get a market for that gas. At the same time, there were leases being drilled and gas being taken near or next to this acreage which had been proven, and no gas being sold. They were finally forced to sell to Panhandle Eastern for 3 cents per thousand cubic feet.

He stated that in 1937 they drilled 7 additional wells and it took them 9 years before they could find a market for this gas, so they have the same situation there as they did with the wells they drilled in 1927, or soon thereafter. Then they had to take 4 cents for their gas, either that or get it drained out for nothing.

The Trees Oil Co. is not a large company; it is just a small oil and gas company.

Also, in the same hearing, we had the testimony of Mr. Walter Kuhn, who is an individual having some gas holdings in the Kansas Hugoton Field. He stated:

"I'm familiar with the bargaining position of both sellers and buyers of Hugoton gas. There has not been any bargaining position. You take what they offer, or you take nothing."

He stated that they drilled their first well in 1931, in Haskell County, and it was 9 years before he could get a market. Then he had to sell for 4 cents per Mcf, and, in addition to that, he had to install 13,000 feet of pipeline. In addition to that, he drilled two additional wells. He had to sell those for $10 cash and $50,000 additional, for both wells, to be paid to him at the rate of 2 cents per Mcf.

I have just one more example I would like to give you.

Mr. William Broadhurst of White Eagle Oil Co., which is a small oil and gas company, testified:

"There is an instance where we were compelled to pay the royalty owners more than we got from the pipeline company in order to keep the leases."

He stated that the prices they were able to get were prices obtained under distress conditions.

I think that probably sums it up clearly and concisely.

These were distress conditions. There was no bargaining in Hugoton Field at this time. They took what they could get, or lost everything.

This does constitute only a small portion of the testimony and facts which were developed at the hearing before the Kansas Commission. The hearings lasted many days, and the testimony was voluminous.

As we see, we did have here a situation which is the reverse of the usual situation: a situation which actually led to the waste of natural gas.

There was a situation that the Kansas Commission had to meet. They had to do something about it in order to conserve this valuable natural resource.

Commissioner STUECK. May I interrupt you there for just a moment?

Mr. MILLIGAN. Surely.

Commissioner STUECK. Is there somewhere available a report and order of your Commission, which would summarize why you arrived at this 11-cent price?

Mr. MILLIGAN. There is a great deal of testimony——

Commissioner STUECK. Your brief sets out what was considered, but I wondered if there was made up a summary of evidence as to why you arrived at that price level.

Mr. MILLIGAN. At this hearing I speak of, they did consider all the evidence, and the evidence considered was abstracted at the time it went to the Supreme Court. The order and opinion which was issued does, to a great extent, summarize that, and we could furnish that to you.

Commissioner STUECK. I believe that would be helpful.

Mr. MILLIGAN. I would be glad to do that. I don't believe I have a copy of that opinion and order with me today, but I would be glad to furnish it to you. That is the action which the Kansas Commission took, which was made clear to them at the time of these hearings.

It was perhaps the best way they could achieve the goals and aims which appeared desirable, to enact a minimum price for gas at the wellhead or, as we call it, a minimum value to be attributed to gas before being withdrawn.

This Hugoton field was a different situation than the other gas fields in Kansas. It is the only gas field the Kansas Commission has jurisdiction of that they ever considered setting a minimum price. The conditions out there were so much different from the other gas fields that they had to take this action. They have numerous gas fields under their jurisdiction, and it has never been necessary in these other instances to institute such an order. This is just a unique situation that developed due to the early development of the Hugoton field, where monopolies existed that have not been present in the other gas fields.

The Kansas Commission, according to the statutes of Kansas, which were set out in the general statutes of Kansas, 1949, sections 55701 to 55713, do set out the basic duties and responsibilities of the Kansas Commission, which are the prevention of waste and the conservation of gas and the protection of the correlative rights.

This prevention of waste in Kansas, perhaps due to the definition of waste by statute, is somewhat different than in other States, in that it includes within the waste economic waste as well as physical waste.

Just what the commission—how far they can go in considering economic waste is a problem which they have before them at the present time.

Of course, by statute, the Kansas commission must set for hearing every request for an allowable to a gas well in the regulated fields of the State of Kansas.

They have had recently several applications—a good many, as a matter of fact—for allowables, where the price of gas seems to be unreasonably low. If they approve the allowable, it will quite possibly contribute to instead of preventing economic waste. Just what action they can take or what action they will take, I don't know at this time. But they are charged with the prevention of waste in production of natural gas and the protection of correlative rights.

The Commission, in setting a price order, did set these orders to prevent waste and to agree or, rather, to protect the correlative rights of the producers and landowners in the field.

As I stated, they did take many days for hearings on this, and the testimony is quite voluminous.

The minimum prices did achieve what they were attempting to do, to a great extent. It did cut out the inefficient use of gas in carbon black plants, of which we had several in the Hugoton Field at that time.

It did help the companies to take better care of the wells, in that they would seek out the leaks which were in existence and repair the pipes. They would not blow to the atmosphere the excessive quantities of gas in cleaning up the wells that they had in the past, and in all ways, it seemed to be achieving that which the Kansas commission had sought to achieve.

It did help, to a great extent, the Kansas Commission in performing their duties as they are required by law to do.

However, we do recognize that the United States Supreme Court has stated that we cannot any longer use price as a tool to effect these conservation measures. But I don't think it can be disputed by anyone that they were achieving that which the Kansas Commission hoped to achieve—reduction in use of gas for low-grade purposes, encouraging the addition development in the Hugoton field, encouraging the development of marginal and peripheral acreage, which they could not have developed with the prices, 3 or 4 cents per thousand cubic feet.

At the same time, at the time the 8-cent order went into effect, there were approximately 800 wells in existence at that time.

Today, there are 3,800, which is a tremendous increase, as you can see.

Greater care was exercised in the conservation of gas, because they didn't believe they could blow 8- and 11-cent gas to the atmosphere like they could 3- and 4-cent gas.

The Kansas commission did accomplish much by these measures.

Of course, they do not wish to go back to the chaotic situation that existed before these orders were in effect. We hope we can work together and achieve the results that seem to be desirable, both for Kansas and for the Nation as a whole.

The Kansas Commission is of the opinion that 11 cents is not at all exorbitant. As a matter of fact, it is probably too cheap.

The Kansas Commission wasn't attempting to set a true value on gas but was only attempting to set a value that would effect their conservation purposes.

The only strictly intrastate gas which we have in the State is selling for 15.55 cents per thousand cubic feet, 4½ cents above the minimum price set by the Kansas Commission.

Another pipeline getting gas in Texas runs a pipeline right through the Hugoton Field, and is paying 20 cents for it in Texas. The rate has been approved by the Federal Power Commission, as the Commission has approved other rates.

Gas is being purchased up at the Canadian border for 21 cents. That is the West Coast Transmission Co., for sale to Northwest.

Down at the Mexican border, gas is being purchased for 14 cents per thousand cubic feet. That is gas being purchased from Pe Mex company by the Texas Transmission Co.

Therefore, we feel that the Kansas Commission is not setting an unreasonably high price. That wasn't the purpose.

Commissioner CONNOLE. Mr. Milligan, when the Commission set its price, did it consider such factors as those you have now mentioned?

Mr. MILLIGAN. They did take evidence, of course, as to the price of gas in the area, which, in practically all instances, was higher, because I think they needed to—insofar as possible—to determine how the gas might be used if it were selling at a higher price; to they did consider those factors as well as the other.

I think it is only one of the elements, however, of course, that were considered by the Commission.

Commissioner CONNOLE. The prices in the gulf coast area and the other areas?

Mr. MILLIGAN. No, they didn't consider those.

No. I was only calling those to your attention to show that 11 cents isn't an exorbitant price, which, of course, you know better than I, by the prices that have been approved by your Commission.

They did not consider, to any great extent, that they were considering the prices in the area near the Hugoton Field.

As an instance, at the present time, the gas in Greenwood Field, in Sparks Field, and Rich Field, and others within a stone's throw of the Hugoton Gas Field, are now selling for 15 cents, initial filing, I think, was 15 cents per Mcf, which compares very well with the price of intrastate gas from the Kansas Hugoton Field.

I would like to make this statement, too.

Of course, the records of the Federal Power Commission will show that practically every purchaser from the Kansas Hugoton Field relied on the 11-cent price for rates they were requesting from the Federal Power Commission. But in addition to this, I know it is true that the producers, the suppliers, relied on this minimum price, too, in carrying out their additional exploration. They were counting on a certain return or profit in order to develop additional acreage, in order to go down for deeper gas, in order to develop this peripheral acreage, the marginal acreage, which they could not afford to do for 3 or 4 cents.

They did this relying—their contracts have been filed and they have been accepted, with the price attached to it, and it was thought by everyone, as a matter of fact, that the price was 11 cents.

I do not think, as a matter of fact, the Federal Power Commission stated at any time that they were not. The price was not protested, with the exception of the Magnolia case, which was a little different from all the others.

So I think they had a right to rely on the 11 cents and make their case based on that, which will lead into legal arguments, which I will not take up here.

After the price order was knocked out, there developed instances where gas was being produced from a well and being sold for 3 or 4 different prices.

As an instance, an owner may have a well on a piece of land 640 acres, and there may be 4 quarter-sections attributed to this well. One landowner sold his gas for 3 cents, and another one for 11 cents. Therefore, he had 3 cents, 5 cents, and 11-cent gas coming out of the same well.

When you try to explain that to the land or royalty owner, that he is getting 3 cents and somebody else with gas out of the same well is getting 11 cents, it is doggone near impossible to explain it to him, and the Commission is being asked that question, and we don't know what to say.

We get many complaints about situations like that.

It is also hard to explain why intrastate gas is selling for 15½ cents and interstate gas is selling for 3 and 4 cents.

I think I have probably covered quite adequately the reason why the Kansas Commission is interested in this matter before the Federal Power Commission today.

To summarize:

We want to prevent the early abandonment of wells in the Kansas Hugoton Field, because they have gone bad. By that I mean the porosity of water has eaten up the pipe. If they are getting a fair return, they will go back and complete those wells and drill new wells, if that seems to be indicated.

Testimony before the Kansas Commission indicated that in 70 to 80 percent of the wells in the Hugoton Field, the life of the well was 20 to 30 years. The first well was drilled in 1929, and subsequent wells in the early thirties, so you can see that a lot of wells are now going to have to be redrilled or recompleted, and they are going to have to plug those wells and turn the lease back. They can't afford to go in and do this work. It costs $21,000 to $50,000 to redrill a well out there, and $15,000 or $20,000, perhaps more, to recomplete a well. They can't afford that on the price of the old contracts as set out.

The only thing they can do is plug the well and let the lease go.

Of course, the landowner is going to lease this ground again for more money, and the person to whom he leases it is going to drill that well and set a price higher than the initial 3- or 4-cent rate.

Actually, it is going to work to the great detriment both of the producer out there and to—and of the ultimate consumer.

The Kansas Commission wasn't concerned only with the producer and the royalty owners out there. Their concern goes to the consumer, and I think their facts justify a retention of a stable price in the Hugoton Field in order that these conservation measures can be carried out.

Also, these old contracts, in some instances, while it is in dispute, in some instances, these old contracts cover gas from deep pays as well as from the Hugoton pays.

If they can't afford to go down to the Hugoton pays, they can't come back and drill to the deeper pays and prove up reserves that are undoubtedly there. And I think you all will agree that it is very desirable to add to the reserves of gas in this country, both for the benefit of the people in the State of Kansas and for the benefit of the people in the Nation.

I would like to just comment a couple of minutes on the refund situation.

It appears to us that little if any benefit will run to the ultimate consumer.

While I admit that we didn't have the complete facts to reach a definite conclusion, however, our estimate indicates that probably there will be $60 million that would be subject to refund, $60 million that the producers and royalty owners would be required to refund to the purchaser.

But it is our opinion, from the information that we have, that the Federal Power Commission probably has jurisdiction to compel the refund of only approximately $12 million of this to the distributing companies.

Of this $12 million, it is very doubtful that little or any of it will ever reach the ultimate consumer. It depends on the rate situations that exist, as far as these dis-distributing companies are concerned.

Even if the entire $12 million were to ultimately reach the consumer, the ultimate consumer, we probably would have a situation that is parallel to that set out in the *FPC* v. *Interstate Natural Gas Co.*, 336 United States Code, section 577, where a sum of $1,484,000 was collected under bond. Refunds to the customers averaged only 15 cents, and the actual cost of refunding was more than the average refund to the consumer.

I think we would probably have a situation here that is practically identical to that.

We are of the opinion that this small advantage, if there is an advantage, is greatly outweighed by the disadvantages of compelling a rollback.

I am of the opinion that had not the suppliers relied on the rates of the Federal Power Commission, of course, they would have not—they would have, in many instances, started proceedings to get the rate up to where they could perform and earn the lowest reasonable return on their money.

But I do think the Kansas Commission was achieving their conservation goals, and these goals and aims were quite similar to those which were set out in a report to the President on Resources for Freedom, the President's Material Policy Committee, in June 1952, where they stated in there that there are four important challenges to our natural gas economy:

One was to stimulate natural gas discovery of our resources. Two was to avoid waste in the production of natural gas, which they were doing. Three, to improve the pattern of use so that relatively more gas goes to those uses in which it has a special advantage, and relatively less to those than could be served just as well by other fuels. That, they were also achieving.

In regard to that, they had a little more to say, such as that much can still be done in improving the pattern of use so that greater benefits will be derived to the Nation from its natural gas resources.

I think that the goals are actually those which the Kansas Commission was achieving, and that which we all here today want to achieve.

In seeking the assistance of the Federal Power Commission, the Kansas Commission does not want to ask the Federal Power Commission to disregard any of its own statutory obligations. We are not asking you to do that in aiding us, but we have in our brief set out many legal principles which we feel do and will allow the Federal Power Commission to help us solve these problems.

We believe that cooperation between the State Commissions and the Federal Power Commission is desirable, and I believe this is one of the major objectives of the Natural Gas Act, as set out in section 17.

Mr. Stucky wants to take over now. Thank you.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF DALE STUCKY, IN BEHALF OF THE KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

Mr. STUCKY. May it please the Commission, in the time we have allotted to us, it may not be possible for me to cover all of the points that were presented in our brief, which is the yellow brief which has been on file with the Secretary of the Commission. I should like to devote the first part of my time to the proposition that the order of the Kansas Commission was valid until conflict between the Federal Power Commission—between Federal and State Authorities arose as a result of the exercise by the Federal Power Commission of jurisdictional indepndent producers on July 16, 1954, and prices conforming to such minimum price order were both effective and legal rates on June 7, 1954.

Now, just briefly, a little chronology. Minimum price orders are not new in this country. The first one that reached the attention of the Supreme Court of the United States was a Louisiana minimum price order for conservation purposes in 1923, which was approved by the Supreme Court as a conservation measure. The next date is 1938, when the Natural Gas Act was passed. Some 10 years after this, the State of Oklahoma used price attribution as a conservation tool in the Oklahoma Hugoton Field. The FPC had not, by that time, exercised its jurisdiction over independent producers, although it had exercised its jurisdiction over the pipeline companies. As a matter of fact, it claimed that it had no power to do so, and had the Kansas commission requested such jurisdiction by the Federal Power Commission, they would have been denied. Had any independent producer requested that its rates be approved by the Federal Power Commission, that rate filing would have been denied.

Now, it is important to remember that the act did not require rate filings—was not self-executing with respect to rate filing by the independent producers. The act provided that this Commission could require rate filings within such time and in such form as the Federal Power Commission should designate, provided they couldn't do it until 60 days have elapsed from the time of the enactment of the statute. So the time within which these filings were required was within the discretion of the Federal Power Commission. It turned out that it was 16 years before the Federal Power Commission exercised the jurisdiction which it could exercise. That was a situation when the Peerless case was decided. The Supreme Court of the United States held, in connection with the Oklahoma price order, that minimum wellhead price orders, value attribution, however you want to describe them, was a proper conservation tool to be used by the States. It also held that this was an area in which the State and Federal Governments had concurrent jurisdiction.

At that time, the FPC had not yet exercised its jurisdiction over the independent producers, so at that time, there was no possible conflict.

Now, the next date I want to call to your mind is June 7, 1954, and the Phillips case, which I am sure you are all familiar with. On July 16, 1954, the Federal Power Commission for the first time under the statute designated a time within which and the manner in which independent producers would be required to comply with other rules and regulations promulgated by the Federal Power Commission in connection with its regulation. It entered its order requiring filings to set forth rates and charges effective on June 7, 1954.

Now, on that date, all the gas purchasers and producers who had some kind of contractual relations for a price than 11 cents were complying with the 11-cent order. That was the price being paid to them. Now, the Commission, in making its 174 order here did not inquire into the illegality or the legality of any contracts. It did not inquire into the reasonableness or unreasonableness of any contractual arrangements made by independent producers. It did not examine any of these contracts to see whether they were fraudulent or illegal in any other regard. It simply said that the rates effective June 7, 1954, were the rates which were to be filed, regardless of whether they were fraudulent rates, unreasonable rates, rates resulting from deceit, lack of armslength bargaining—they were regarded as initial rate filings by this Commission. Because freedom of contract or freedom to contract, under this Commission's view, existed prior to the time it issued its order of July 16, 1954.

Now, in that connection, I want to say that it is our opinion, and we have set out authorities in support of it, that freedom to contract expired at the same time that State regulation, the power to regulate by the State, expired. The Federal Power Commission did not reexamine all the contractual relations and changes that existed since 1938. It didn't go back to determine what the original 1930 rates were. That would have been a monumental task. It accepted as initial filings the unregulated contractual rates, or the unregulated effective state of facts on June 7, 1954.

Now, by reason of acquiescence in some instances, and by reason of voluntary payments in others, the 11-cent price provision of the Kansas order was and became an integral part of the relationship between the buyer and seller in every instance. It has become a part of the contractual relationship, free of Government regulation, both so far as private negotiation was concerned and so far as State regulation was concerned, until June 7, 1954.

Commissioner CONNOLE. Mr. Stucky, did you say the order of the Kansas Commission became part of those contracts by Government order?

Mr. STUCKY. No.

Commissioner CONNOLE. Then perhaps I missed it.

Mr. STUCKY. No, I didn't say that. I think that is true, also. The point I am trying to make also is that by reason of the acquiescence on the part of both parties, and by reason of voluntary payments, and by reason of the equitable doctrines of the stop order which was set out in our brief, this 11-cent rate filing was not a rate based on a price order as such. It was a contractual rate. It may have been an illegal contract, in the sense that it was filed or was made at a time after 1938, when the Federal Power Commission could have exercised jurisdiction, but if it was illegal, every other contract that was filed as an initial filing was illegal. It was the actual arrangement. There are no filings before this Commission that are based solely on any principal price order and if you strike out, if you conceive of these orders as being made up of component parts, and strike out that portion which you conceive attributable to an 11-cent minimum order, you would have to strike out all the other portions, too. Because for the same reasons they were illegal, because they were entered into at a time when under the first assumption the parties had no right to bargain privately——

Commissioner CONNOLE. In other words, you feel that these prices are the result of bargaining between the parties?

Mr. STUCKY. Yes.

Commissioner CONNOLE. And the minimum price order may have been the stimulus or the thing which caused the parties to reach the agreement, but it wasn't the agreement itself?

Mr. STUCKY. No; it wasn't the agreement. It was part of the relationship which existed between the parties.

Now, getting back just a minute to chronology, after the order of 174, Panoma was decided. The Supreme Court held in that case that after regulation of sale of production and gathering had entered by the State of Oklahoma, a conservation order could not stand. Justice Douglas dissented in that case. He was of the view that even though the Federal Power Commission had issued order 174, still the State had the power until the Federal Power Commission actually established a maximum price which conflicted with the Oklahoma minimum price. That today has not yet occurred.

But Justice Douglas did not prevail, and the majority view was that the conflict had occurred. The order 174 was down. The situation was different from Peerless.

Then we had our Kansas case, and that case applied the Panoma doctrine to a wellhead situation.

Now the question is—I might say that in our case, the question was never determined by the Supreme Court as to when this conflict arose. The question was whether it arose.

Cities Service Gas Co. had never claimed there was any conflict between the Kansas order and the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act. They filed a petition for review, which languished in the district court of Finney County, Kans.

Then the Federal Power Commission issued its order 175. Two years later, in March of 1956, Cities Service suddenly claimed there was a conflict between the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and the Kansas order. Before that they were claiming the price was too high, there was no evidence, the Kansas Commission had no jurisdiction under the general Kansas statutes, and that sort of thing.

But there was never any claim in this case, in our Kansas case—and the record is clear on it—no specific claim that there was any conflict between the Federal Power Com-

mission and the State Commission until after order 174.

As a matter of fact—and I don't have time to point this out in any great detail—but I do want to refer the Commission to what the Cities Service Gas Co. was telling this Commission during this period of time. It is set out on page 63 of our brief. I understand that Mr. Littman was counsel for Cities Service.

Where there is a State law, he said, that State law would become a part of the contract. On the bottom of page 63:

"I am also advised further by the Federal Power Commission that there is on file with the Commission at this time this 11-cent rate. For example, in the case of Stanolind, and I think some very few exceptions, which he mentioned yesterday, of all presently effective field rates of these vendors."

He says: "We consider the issuance of the Kansas order as constituting a subsequent agreement which we have with the Stanolind Co."

The witness says: "We agreed to pay Stanolind the Kansas price order."

"Question. Where did you agree to pay Stanolind the Kansas price order?"

I think that must have been "when."

"Answer. As of the date which we started making such payment."

Mind you, this was Cities Service Gas Co.—page 65 of our brief.

"There is an agreement with them to pay the minimum price of Kansas."

The witness says: "If an agreement to pay them that money is a contract, yes, sir, there is a contract."

That is what Cities Service was telling this commission while its appeal was languishing out in the District Court of Finney County, Kans. They said that was true of every contract they had. Every gas purchaser of gas from the Hugoton Field in Kansas had sought rate increases based on such agreements or similar testimony. We don't have it all, but I am sure they have appeared here. Three of them have appeared before the Kansas commission in support of rate agreements on the theory that these were agreements or the order was binding.

We set out in our brief the doctrine of estoppel, which prevents them now from complaining that this order was invalid, taking a position inconsistent with the position they eventually took.

Commissioner CONNOLE. Mr. Stucky, without giving you the impression that I agree or disagree with what you are saying, now, just answer me whether you feel this testimony and representations that you read to us represent an agreement by Cities Service or any other to pay 11 cents, or is it an agreement to pay the Kansas minimum price order, whatever that may be?

Mr. STUCKY. I think it is an agreement to pay 11 cents.

Commissioner CONNOLE. That is your understanding?

Mr. STUCKY. Yes.

Commissioner CONNOLE. If it were an agreement to pay the minimum price order, whatever that may be, would it make a difference to you if there were no such thing as a minimum price order?

Mr. STUCKY. I'm not sure I understand your question.

Commissioner CONNOLE. What I am getting at is:

Is there a difference, in your judgment, between agreeing to pay 11 cents, wherever that may be found, or, on the other hand, agreeing to pay the minimum price order, whatever that may be?

Mr. STUCKY. I think there is a difference.

In one case, you know what you are agreeing to; in the other case, you don't.

They were agreeing to pay 11 cents. That is what they told the Commissions they were paying. That is what they got their rate increases on.

Commissioner CONNOLE. That is certainly your understanding of what the contractual agreement was?

Mr. STUCKY. Yes.

I'm not saying they have a written agreement to that.

Commissioner CONNOLE. I understand.

Mr. STUCKY. But I am saying the agreements established a contractual duty, which was the effective rate in July, on July 16, 1954, and which was the effective rate from that day.

I haven't tried to touch the other arguments. They are in our brief, where we deal with them exhaustively.

Thank you.

The complete view of the Kansas Commission was set out in the brief filed with the Federal Power Commission. Time did not permit a full presentation of all these views. The position of the Kansas Commission as to applicable principles of law may be summarized as follows:

1. Until changed pursuant to the act the filed rate is the legal rate for all purposes. Neither the commission nor the courts can go behind the filed rate as to the past. Reduction of the rate for the future by action of the commission can be ordered only after a hearing and a finding that the rate is unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, or preferential.

2. The order of the Kansas commission was valid until conflict between Federal and State authority arose as a result of exercise by the FPC of jurisdiction over independent producers on July 16, 1954, and prices conforming to such minimum price order were both effective and legal rates on June 7, 1954.

3. If the Natural Gas Act was self-executing with the effect of rendering the Kansas order void ab initio, all contracts entered into between purchasers and producers who had not received certificates of convenience and necessity were utterly void. The filed rate became the first legal rate and it cannot be abrogated in favor of an illegal rate, whether fixed by a void order or by a void contract.

4. All purchasers from Kansas Hugoton field are estopped to assert invalidity of rates based upon the Kansas order for the following reasons:

(a) All purchasers except Cities Service Gas Co. are estopped by failure to file or prosecute petitions for review of the Kansas order.

(b) All purchasers, including Cities Service Gas Co., are estopped by reliance upon validity of the Kansas order in seeking rate increases.

(c) All payments pursuant to the Kansas order were voluntary and are not recoverable.

General Gavin Cites United States Unpreparedness: "We Are in Mortal Danger"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of two articles by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin which appeared in the August 4, 1958, issue of Life magazine:

GENERAL GAVIN CITES UNITED STATES UNPREPAREDNESS

(By Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin)

(When Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin announced his retirement last winter, he touched off a blazing controversy over the state of United States defenses. As wartime commander of the 82d Airborne Division, and later chief of the Army's research and development, General Gavin proved himself both an audacious combat soldier and an imaginative military thinker. Now a vice president of Arthur D. Little, Inc. in Cambridge, Mass., he states his views in a new book, War and Peace in the Space Age.

(General Gavin's comments on limited war are particularly timely today. Last week he pointed out that the landings in Lebanon, successful as they were, may have sharply reduced our reserves elsewhere. And he cautioned, "We have got to be able to do better than that. It took us 4 days to get 3 battalion combat teams there, and they had no opposition. And if missiles had been used against the marines and the Sixth Fleet they could have been in bad shape.")

December 13, 1957, was a cold and wintry day in Washington. As I looked from my office in the Pentagon toward Arlington National Cemetery, I could barely make out the white grave markers through the swirling snowflakes. On just such a day as this the 82d Airborne Division in early 1945 had, under my command, launched its counteroffensive in the Battle of the Bulge. Near me, hanging on the wall of my office, was a picture of a soldier in that battle. He was running forward, wearing little equipment, carrying a submachinegun in one hand and ammunition magazines in the other. It was a moment of loneliness for him. He was doing what he knew had to be done and he was on his own.

I felt then as he must have, for momentarily I expected the phone to ring summoning me to appear before the Senate committee that was investigating our missile-satellite readiness. For the preceding 4 years I had been closely associated with both our missile and our satellite programs. I knew what we had done, and also what we had not but should have done. It was in the Nation's interest that military officers be honest with ourselves and that we be frank with Congress. I was aware that the risks in being forthright were great, but the stakes were high. If, in a sense, it was to be a moment of no return, then the moment was to be welcomed for its challenge, and not avoided.

The phone rang. I was told that the committee was waiting for me at the Capitol. I called to my colleague, Maj. Gen. Jack Daley, to accompany me, and I remember saying to him as we went up the hall:

"Jack, this is just like going into combat. We have searched our souls for answers to our problems, and we have made all of our preparations. Now we are going in."

For more than 3 hours I was before the Johnson committee. As the Senators listened intently I outlined the Army's position in the nationwide argument over our country's defense, an argument which had been raging ever since the launching of the first Soviet satellite. Less than a month later—in January of this year—I asked to be retired from the United States Army. My decision was prompted partly by the serious implications of my testimony before the committee that day, but it had been on my mind for months. After much soul searching I had decided that the time had come when I could serve my country better by releasing myself from the restrictions necessarily imposed on the military and telling the American people directly what I thought was wrong with the United States defense picture. And there was a great deal that was wrong.

No longer does any nation enjoy the luxury of a shield of space or time. Take, for example, the missile lag situation. The missile-lag period, which we are now entering, is one in which our own offensive and defensive capabilities will lag so far behind those of the Soviets as to place us in a position of great peril.

For quite a few years the manned bomber has been the basis of our retaliatory policy. We have assumed that it has also been the main striking weapon of the Soviets. Now, however, the manned bomber is facing early obsolescence; it will become obsolete when surface-to-air missiles carrying nuclear warheads are on site in large numbers. Furthermore, while Russia even now has an intercontinental ballistic missile, several years will have passed before we have an ICBM capability of any significance. In short, we are now entering a missile-lag period in which the Soviets will have a steadily increasing ICBM striking capability which we will be unable to match for several years. We are in mortal danger, and the missile-lag portends trouble of a serious nature.

Not just the missile situation but errors in our overall military policy portend trouble for the United States, for they bring into question of our very ability to wage war, particularly the kind of limited war that will confront us increasingly in the future. When I began my 4-year tour of duty in the Pentagon in March 1954 as Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, G–3, I looked forward eagerly to the opportunity that my new assignment offered. The Army was on the threshold of a revolution in tactics, weapons, and organization. I did not know how much time the Soviets would give us, but if past history had meaning I knew that it was going to take a long time to reorganize the Army.

That such a reorganization was overdue had been painfully demonstrated by the Korean war. All our military thinking during the postwar period had been overshadowed by the atomic bomb. Because of this, Korea was for the Army a bitter and costly experience. When the North Koreans invaded, General MacArthur scraped together two companies of infantry and a battery of artillery and some supporting weapons and had the force flown to Korea. It was all that our limited airlift could transport. Thus the great might of this industrial nation, 5 years after the defeat of the Axis powers, could airlift no more than two rifle companies and a battery of artillery to meet six aggressor divisions. Of the United States' casualties in Korea, more than 96% were ground troops. Thus our well-known slogans about using machines to save manpower were brought to a paradoxical conclusion: our casualties were once again in the ground forces who were not expected to have to do much of the fighting. Neither our imagination nor vision in the years since World War II had given us a combat capability that would provide the technical margin of advantage that we needed in land warfare to win decisively and quickly. That we could have gained this margin of advantage is clear now. That we did not is the real tragedy of Korea.

There has probably been more critical comment, both oral and written, about Korea than any war in our history. Somehow the violence of the argument and the strong personalties involved have combined to obscure the fundamental problem. It was not whether or not the war should have been allowed to expand as our commanders in the field sought victory. The problem was that only total war could bring us victory because we had neglected to develop and provide the technical means of winning anything but a total war, a total nuclear war. Korea was not that kind of war, nor were we willing to make it that kind of war.

One frequently hears the expression: "We don't want another Korea." I do not know what the speakers mean by such a statement nor am I sure that they do themselves. I once heard Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson say, "We can't afford to fight limited wars. We can only afford to fight a big war, and if there is one, that is the kind it will be." If we cannot afford to fight limited wars then we cannot afford to survive, for that is the only kind of war we can afford to fight.

Both Korea and the Indochina crisis after it had one fundamental characteristic in common, one challenge that we must learn to meet if we expect to survive. They were both limited wars, in a limited area, so located as to make it difficult for either side to support military operations profusely. In neither was there a question of the war spreading, unless we had to make it larger because of our inability to win any other way. We should have had the tactical means to strike and win, swiftly and severely. And if in the postwar years even a small part of what we spent in preparing for a one-strategy general war had been spent in developing and procuring the means of dealing with limited war, we could have settled Korea and Dienbienphu quickly in our favor. Tactical nuclear missiles, sky-cavalry (highly mobile reconnaissance and shock troops) and increased assault airlift can contribute decisively to that kind of operation. And as long as we neglect such developments we will be incapable of dealing with limited wars and we will be nibbled to death.

Limited war is a more highly specialized form of combat than global nuclear war, and we had better realize it and do something about it. It makes little sense to assume that, if you have the power to wage general war successfuly, you can, by using a little bit of that capability, ipso facto, wage a little war. A thermonuclear-equipped B–52 can contribute little more to the solution of a limited local war than a 155-mm gun can contribute to the apprehension of a traffic violator.

To some, limited war differs from general war only in that general war lasts longer. This is not true. Limited war is limited in the objectives sought, the means employed and, usually, the area in which it is fought. Limited war may be of such protracted nature as to go on for many years, as Mao demonstrated in China. Furthermore, there may be several limited wars all going on at the same time. In fact, this is the most probable nature of future war. It will start with a slow, almost imperceptible transition from a bad economic and political situation into internal disorder. Arms will be provided by the Communists to the side they choose, and sometimes which side they choose is not very important. They will throw out the original leaders and substitute their own, including their own revolution of the proletariat at a time of their choosing. Thereafter, sufficient force will be used until it no longer seems worth the West's effort to continue, or until the West is decisively defeated.

To cope with a Communist program of this nature requires good, imaginative strategic planning, as well as highly specialized tactical forces. The forces must be technically superior to anything that they encounter—decisively superior. Above all they must be highly mobile, but intelligence, communications, and missile firepower all require special consideration. All of these subjects, in their relationship to limited war, have been slighted at best, and grossly neglected at worst, in our defense planning in the past 10 years. Hence the dilemma—how to keep from losing limited wars without preparing to meet them. It simply cannot be done.

So much was clear when I reported to the Department of the Army in 1954 for duty. But, far from being able to carry out the much-needed modernizing of the Army, I was met at once with the New Look. The New Look was the Eisenhower administration's military policy based upon increasing emphasis on our strategic retaliatory power at the expense of our so-called conventional forces.

The New Look was something to be reckoned with. It seemed contrary to all of our experience in NATO, where tactical nuclear weapons would in the future be required as much and perhaps more than strategic weapons. And the tactical employment of nuclear weapons implied quite clearly increased manpower requirements rather than a decrease. The thesis upon which the New Look was based was entirely wrong, or so it appeared to the Army. It placed the Army staff at once in a very difficult position vis-a-vis the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

The question before us was whether or not, in defending the Army budget before Congress, we should agree to the basic philosophy of the New Look. To agree was to consent to many things other than the mere reduction of manpower and reliance upon strategic nuclear power that had brought us to the brink of disaster in 1950. It meant agreeing to less emphasis upon the development of tactical nuclear weapons. It meant closing our minds once again to the challenges of the land warfare of tomorrow with its implied need for long-range missiles, improved radar and communications, vertical take-off-and-landing air vehicles and an increased Air Force troop-carrier airlift. To disagree was to be insubordinate, and yet many of us were convinced that to agree would only start our Nation once again along the road to military disaster.

Whether or not we agreed personally, we had to defend the budget. An Army memorandum informs all prospective witnesses before congressional committees that "the budget as presented to the legislative body by the President is that decided upon by the Chief Executive. We, as subordinate elements, are bound to support it before the legislative body. * * * Under no circumstances should the witness voluntarily voice an opinion contrary to the Army position."

Another difficulty confronting a witness is that the administration's views may change. To keep in step with them, for instance, a senior officer will find himself charged with defending the point of view expressed by Mr. Dulles on the employment of nuclear weapons in January of 1954 and changing his point of view to support Mr. Dulles' changed point of view several years later.

In the Department of the Army staff in 1954 we were profoundly concerned with the implications of the New Look. We feared that it would result in failure to support our surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missile programs, inadequate funding to support a satellite program, inadequate funding for our research and development programs so essential to the development of land forces for the missile age, and finally in a serious reduction in manpower at a time when the trend should have been the opposite. That our concerns were well founded soon became manifest.

As of early 1954 the Army contained 20 divisions and 7 basic training organizations with divisional numbers. In accordance with the philosophy of the New Look, a critical cut in this division strength was undertaken at once. First, the Army was directed to include the training organizations in its overall division strength. The total number of divisions was then reduced in order to match the old number of combat-ready units, so that if you did not examine the numbers you would have the impression that no reduction had taken place.

As the cutback continued and Congress began to show concern, the Army was told to regroup its nondivision personnel and thus account for more divisions. For example, the forces at Fort Benning, Ga., were

grouped on paper with those in the Panama Canal Zone and called a division. Likewise, forces at Fort Lewis, Wash., were grouped with those in Alaska. To some segments of the press, these became known as Wilson divisions. At the same time Congress was assured, in the annual hearings, that our combat strength was not being reduced. We were simply cutting the fat and the nonessential service and support units. That the contrary was the case few outside the Department of the Army seemed willing to admit.

More important than manpower cuts, however, was our inability to obtain adequate funding for the missile program. In late 1954 I decided that it was in the Nation's interest that we develop, as a matter of high priority, an intermediate range ballistic missile, and that we should undertake a satellite program. After considerable staff discussions I personally recommended to the Army's Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, in March 1955 that the IRBM program be undertaken at a cost of $25 million. A week later he told me he could not possibly obtain money on that scale from the Department of Defense. If the Army were to undertake the program, he said, we would have to finance it out of the money then available to us. Since our budget was critically inadequate we decided not to start an IRBM but to advance the proposed range of the new Redstone missile from 200 miles to 500 miles. We hoped that when a range of 500 miles was achieved the Department of Defense would be aware of the national need and authorize a longer range.

We were, at the time, in a most interesting situation in missile development. In 1951 the Army had undertaken the development of a 450-mile-range ballistic missile. Then, at the direction of our missile czar, Mr. K. T. Keller, a heavy thermonuclear warhead was programed for the missile and its range of necessity was reduced to 200 miles. This was a good change since it at least assured the country of an early surface-to-surface thermonuclear missile. At the time, however, there was no interest in the Army's missile program because missiles were considered rather exotic and far in the distant future. In early 1955, therefore, when the Army decided once again to develop a missile of 500-mile range, few outside the Army staff showed any interest in it. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in fact, had agreed to let the Army develop surface-to-surface missiles for tactical use, without any range limits at all.

It was not until the other services became aware of the combat potential of missiles that Secretary Wilson issued his now famous memorandum of November 26, 1956, restricting the Army to missiles with a range of 200 miles or less. Thus the lack of awareness of the importance of missiles in 1954 had two facets: money could not be obtained for them, and there were no limits on the surface-to-surface technical missiles to be developed and used by the Army. And so the country's missile-satellite programs awaited a more favorable attitude on the part of the Defense Department. In the meantime Congress was being assured that all was well and that we were ahead of the Russians in all our military programs. As we now know, the United States was already falling behind.

General Ridgway had come to the Pentagon as one of the "good new chiefs" when all of the "bad old chiefs" left in the summer of 1953. He brought to the office of Chief of Staff a background and breadth of experience unique to that office. I had known him to be a man of extreme courage, moral and physical, and soon I was to see his resources taxed to the utmost in his efforts to maintain a combat-ready army.

Somehow, despite Secretary Wilson and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Ridgway managed to hold together an army and to continue to ready that army for the nuclear-missile-space age. And he did so despite a constantly shrinking budget. Yet from what I saw as one of his senior staff officers it was plainly not the shrinking budget that was bothersome—for the Army traditionally suffers from fiscal malnutrition in peacetime. It was the deception and duplicity of those with whom he had to work in the Department of Defense.

Mr. Wilson tended to deal with his Chiefs of Staff as though they were recalcitrant union bosses. The thought struck me a number of times that Walter Reuther, under the circumstances, would have been a more effective Chief of Staff than a professional soldier could ever be. I have known General Ridgway, after weeks of painstaking preparation, to brief Mr. Wilson on a problem with lucidity and thoroughness. At the conclusion Mr. Wilson would gaze out of the window and ask a question that had no relevance whatsoever to the subject of the briefing. Among his aides it was known as taking a briefer "on a trip around the world." It was a studied technique that he used when he had his mind already made up about what you were going to talk to him about. As I heard another Chief of Staff say, "He was the most uninformed man, and the most determined to remain so, that has ever been Secretary."

As the situation deteriorated in the Pacific after the fall of Dienbienphu and the siege of Quemoy and Matsu, we became concerned about the defense of Formosa. General Ridgway sent a general officer to Formosa to look into the situation. Upon his return he recommended that the United States provide Formosa with a sizable increase in its logistical and air defense units. This was particularly important in view of the proposed plan to base United States Air Force fighter aircraft on the island on a rotational basis. Because of the Army's reduction in strength, General Ridgway was extremely reluctant to go along with the recomendation, but he finally felt that he had to. At the same time, however, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were assuring Congress, in reply to specific questions, that additional Army units would not be required and none were under consideration.

On a later occasion—in his memorandum of November 26, 1956—Secretary Wilson stated flatly that our airlift capability was adequate. We in the Army knew that the United States could not at that time airlift a single division, either tactically or strategically.

The Defense Department had an especially annoying method of suggesting to the services that another cut in funds, say 10 percent across the board, was due. When the critical harm that would result from such a cut was pointed out, the reply was polite

"The Department of Defense understands how serious the situation is, and we realize that you couldn't stand a further cut in either funds or personnel and still meet your obligations. But suppose you go back and think the thing over. Suppose you did have to take a cut, just suppose, how would you do it?"

A week later, or perhaps a few days, you would return with an outline of the implications of such a cut. After explaining it, you would be greeted with:

"That is very good. I am glad to see you think that way. The program that you have recommended is approved."

Thus the burden of cutting was shifted to the Chief of Staff. If later there were occasion for a congressional query, and there always is, Congress would be assured that the Chiefs of Staff recommended or concurred in the reduction. I am happy to note that Secretary McElroy is trying hard to put an end to this practice, and if he continues in his present methods he will succeed.

It would be well to say at this point a word about the decisionmaking processes in our National Government that ultimately find reflection in weapons systems, adequate or not as they may be. For it is the decisionmaking processes that have been at fault. We have not lacked resources. The decisions have not only been in error but they have also been late. It is imperative for the United States to accelerate and improve the quality of its decisionmaking processes.

National defense is today the biggest industry in the United States. Furthermore, it is by far the most complicated. Each of the services deals with highly technical weapons systems, which only our topflight scientists understand in detail, and the interplay between the services and the weapons systems pose problems beyond the management capabilities of the average individual American, no matter how skilled he is in making and selling automobiles, or oatmeal, or shoes, or airplanes. As a consequence, the Secretary of Defense must rely especially heavily on the advice of those closest to him.

The time-honored principle of civilian control of defense matters is sound and absolutely fundamental in our democracy. It worked particularly well through World War II. At the time the Secretaries of the separate services had competent military staffs to advise them. The civilian Secretaries made the decisions, defended their programs before Congress and assumed full responsibility for the exercise of civilian control over their departments.

With the establishment of the Department of Defense in 1947 an additional layer of civilian management was placed above the services. Furthermore, by the law, military officers were forbidden to hold executive positions in the Department of Defense. As a result the Assistant Secretaries of Defense rely heavily on hundreds of civil-service employees, who probably have more impact on decision making in the Department of Defence than any other group of individuals, military or civilian.

Often it develops that two Assistant Secretaries differ as to the missile's essentiality. Or perhaps neither one of them desires to act upon it. Then they can refer it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Here it enters an arena where 2 Chiefs against 1 is the law. How two of them line up on an issue depends on many intangibles. A proposed missile program may remain in the Joint Chiefs of Staff for many months, and some have. By the time a final decision is made in the Department of Defense, many months, and in some cases years, have elapsed. All of the pleading and urging of those in uniform, who see national survival almost slipping through their fingers, can be of little avail if the Department of Defense declines to act. Its inability to act, in the last analysis, stems directly from the fact that hundreds of civilians, many of them lacking competence in their assigned fields, have now imposed themselves between the senior civilian Secretaries of the services, and Congress and the Executive.

Many people believe that each service develops and follows a party line, requiring its members to adhere to that line, and that this colors the process of decision-making in the Pentagon. As a friend of mine said not long ago, "Scratch a member of the Air Force and out comes an airman. They all have the same point of view and say the same things." This is not so. Within each service there are strong differences of opinion on many of the fundamental issues. With few exceptions, men in uniform think for themselves and in the higher staffs they give you their best objective judgments.

If I were to place our military spokesmen in categories, I would group them as liberals and conservatives, for it is quite evident that the differences of opinion tend to polar-

ize into such schools of thought. If, for example, one were to question an individual of any service on 1 or 2 of the following points, one could without difficulty put him in his proper place regarding military policy. Generally speaking the points of view are as follows:

LIBERAL

War, if it does occur, will begin first by Russian economic and political penetration. This will be accompanied by appropriate diplomatic maneuvers to place us in a position from which it would be difficult to respond with force. Thereafter, force would be used by the Soviets to the degree necessary to achieve their objectives, and these will normally be limited.

Our nuclear resources should be fabricated into weapons which are in such size as to be useful against tactical targets in precise military application.

Our country's military policy should reflect our national diplomatic policy. NATO, SEATO, and our other commitments should be supported fully by us with forces in being.

The control of the seas must be maintained and our Navy must be fully supported in this effort. If this means bigger and more aircraft carriers, then it is up to the Navy to judge, and if the Navy believes it needs them they should be provided.

The Nation must have an adequate Reserve force and National Guard and an effective industrial mobilization plan. War, if and when it comes, may extend over a long period of time and we should be prepared in every respect for war of long duration.

CONSERVATIVE

War, if it does come, will start with an all-out and devastating air strike at the source of strength of the Western World—the United States. With the advantage that surprise affords for a ruthless aggressor, the war could be won by the Soviets in minutes if we are not prepared for it, or if we did not launch an anticipatory attack of our own.

Our nuclear resources should be fabricated into weapons of the largest yield possible. Thus in one blow we can maximize the damage inflicted on any potential aggressor, or aggressors.

Major investment should be made in our atomic retaliatory forces. We cannot afford to squander our limited resources in packets all over the world. We should provide the necessary retaliatory forces and let our allies provide conventional forces.

Aircraft carriers, in particular supercarriers, are a waste of our national resources and duplicate the land-based atomic retaliatory forces. Our only real naval need is for submarines which can deal with the Soviet submarine menace that may threaten our commercial shipping and threaten the United States with missiles.

Only the forces in being will be effective in future war, which will be over too quickly for the participation of large reserves. There is little value, therefore, in maintaining such an establishment and in paying for an industrial mobilization program.

Officers of all services are represented in both these schools of thought. However, the Army and Navy generally associate with the liberal school and the Air Force with the conservative school. It is interesting to note also that in general the two political parties side with opposing groups—the Democrats with the liberal group and the Republicans with the conservative.

Such alinements are far more meaningful, in my opinion, than those signified by the term "interservice rivalry." It has always seemed strange to me that so many experienced businessmen, new to the Department of Defense, are horrified by evidence of rivalry between the services. It would be a very poor Army or Navy that was not fiercely proud of its own service and, with that, just as proud of its ability to serve as a team player with its sister services. Most interservice rivalry that I have become aware of has been productive of good results in the Nation's interest.

There is one aspect of interservice competition that is unquestionably harmful, however, and there is little that the services can do about it. This is industrial competition. Industry, through extravagant advertising claims and lobbying pressures on Congress and civilian members of the Department of Defense, can place members of the Armed Forces in a difficult position. If a service will go along with an industry's claims for its products it can often obtain an increased budget, sometimes for things not even directly associated with the industry-supported product. It is difficult for a service to resist such pressures, since by going along it can rationalize its postion in terms of the overall good that can be accomplished with more money. The amount of money that industry spends on nationwide advertising for hardware that is obsolete is sizable and the lobbying pressure that industry can bring to bear on Congress in terms of employment, payrolls, and effect upon constituents is impressive. Finally, when such forces come into play in the committee system that presently characterizes the decision-making processes of the Department of Defense, they can become very harmful. It is at this stage that they assume the appearance of interservice differences although fundamentally the problem is industrial and not a service one.

No organzational arrangement, no matter how skillfully conceived, can by itself solve our defense problems. It takes people and resources to solve them. But the best of people, regardless of the resources made available to them, can be thwarted and frustrated, and finally made ineffective, by a poor organization. Some of the most able and intelligent Americans in public life have in the past 10 years sought to bring order out of the decision-making maze of the Department of Defense, only to fail.

I am convinced that the most serious problem lies in the present setup of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Civilian control means civilian decision-making. But the Secretary of Defense needs the best possible military advice on which to base his decisions. How is he to get it?

The answer might appear to be that the Secretary can obtain professional military advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the Joint Chiefs do not work like that. As long as a Chief of Staff is responsible for the leadership and morale of a particular service, he cannot be expected to be party to decisions in the Department of Defense that deleteriously affect his own service.

Recently I heard a distinguished Member of the United States Senate describe in a few words the evils of the modus operandi of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was speaking to a senior general:

"The trouble with the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, General, is that it simply doesn't work. If Congress sends the Defense Department $5 billion, the Chiefs may decide to buy 5 more supercarriers and 5 more B–52 wings."

I intervened and said, "Nothing for the Army?"

And the Senator replied, "Yes, that is right. Nothing for the Army." Which tells the story tersely and well. Of course the Army could combine with the Navy against the Air Force or the Air Force with the Army against the Navy.

In effect the Chiefs occupy an impossible position. Each is supposed to wear two hats; he speaks both as the head of a service and as a member of the Defense Department. But the former cannot be disassociated from the latter. And, in fact, the record will show that interest in the former usually prevails, although entirely in a patriotic sense, since a Chief's background, loyalties and responsibilities are best served when he supports his own service.

ABOLISH THE JOINT CHIEFS SYSTEM

It is obvious, therefore, that the two functions must be separated. The Joint Chiefs of Staffs organization as such should be abolished. One solution would be to appoint the Chiefs of Staff to a senior military advisory group upon the termination of their tour of military service. As members of such a group they would advise the Secretary of Defense and fill a role comparable to what was originally intended for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Thus their military background and valuable counsel could be brought to bear on our national defense problems without their having to serve a simultaneous and often conflicting obligation of leadership to their own particular branch of service. With the separation of the Joint Chiefs from the Joint Staff that had been created to serve them, the Joint Staff, numbering over 200 officers of all services, could be made available to serve the Secretary of Defense. It would then, in effect, become the military staff of the Department of Defense, serving both the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Considerable opposition exists today to a military staff for the Secretary of Defense. There is frequent reference to the horrors of a Prussian General Staff. I am not sure that those who use that expression know what they mean by it. The fact is that in the last two World Wars Germany did not have a German general staff in the true sense. In World War I the German Army and Navy were completely independent of each other and no staff existed to coordinate their efforts. In World War II Germany's inability to achieve a quick victory has been attributed to its failure to coordinate its army and navy efforts.

On the other hand, the Staff system developed in the United States is far more efficient than anything created by any nation, to my knowledge, in military history. Good Staff organization exists now under Admiral Stump in the Pacific and General Norstad in Europe. There is no comparable Staq in the Department of Defense today.

Reforms will help, but they will not solve the Nation's problem. With each month that passes, the missile lag puts the United States in an increasingly dangerous position. How long will this last? For at least 3 and more likely for 5 years, depending entirely upon the effort we are willing to make to reduce it. The Soviets have already announced their intention of increasing their present margin of lead over us. We are in for a hard pull, and no sugar-coated reassurances of our superiority will save us. Only hard work and courage will help.

MEMORIES OF A SOLDIER: A HAPPY, DEVOUT BOYHOOD, A RIGOROUS ARMY TRAINING

"Be kitchin' with the treacle, Shamus," my mother said. For we were a poor family—perhaps not exactly poor, but certainly not far from it. And syrup was not too often on the table. When it was, it was molasses.

My mother, Mary Gavin, was typically Irish, given all too frequently to invoking the intercession of the entire Holy Family and all the saints while she lambasted me for some not too minor misdemeanor.

"Holy Mary, mother of God, where have you been, Shamus?"

"Oh, out."

"May the Lord have mercy on our souls, out where?"

"Oh, nowhere."

"Glory be to God, nowhere he says." Wham, and a resounding blow would descend on my anatomy.

The Gavins, my adopted parents (Gavin's mother and father died before he was two.—Editor), and their relatives were settled in two small villages on the edge of Mt. Car-

mel, Pa., Dooleysville and Connorsville. As a group they were idealistic and emotional, and they took their patriotism for granted. They had strong views about most things and expected other people to have too. One of my earliest memories is of being impressed with the need to work.

I loved school, for there I had a chance to read books, and I somehow could not get enough. A real windfall came when I found an entire bookcase full of books in the back rooms of the First Presbyterian Church.

I was taken to the church by a friend, and as I looked at the bookcase, I hesitated for a moment. I had been brought up as a strict Catholic and I knew very well that God would strike me dead for even going into a Protestant church. It took a few minutes to decide that my curiosity had to be satisfied. The books were very good, and just what I wanted—boys' books, and they had nothing to do with religion.

After leaving high school, I enlisted in the regular Army at the age of 17 and was assigned to Panama, where my first sergeant encouraged me to bone up for the West Point exams. After several months of hard study, I was admitted to West Point as a cadet on July 1, 1925. The first semester was a nightmare of work. The only way that I could keep up with it was to get up at 4:30 in the morning and study in the basement latrines. In December I passed my first semester' "writs" with a margin of safety. That was the turning point.

The United States Military Academy at West Point can make a tremendous impression upon a young man. Cadets use the rooms once occupied by Grant and Lee, Pershing, Patton, and MacArthur. The old chapel with the British colors taken in the Revolution, the statutes, the forts and redoubts of the surrounding hills, all burn into the young minds and hearts one thing: Patriotism.

Cadets are taught to be honest and there is a resoluteness about their honesty. Once a matter is resolved into right or wrong, the right must be chosen, and always the harder right rather than the easier wrong.

It is no wonder that I loved the place as I did. I left determined to repay her, my Spartan mother, for what she had given to me. I went forth to seek the challenge, to move toward the sound of the guns, to go where danger was the greatest, for there was where issues would be resolved and decisions made.

Resolution of American Federation of Hosiery Workers To Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolution of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF HOSIERY WORKERS, AFL–CIO, AT ITS QUARTERLY MEETING AUGUST 9 AND 10, 1958, READING, PA.

Whereas since September 1947 until September 1957 the American Federation of Hosiery Workers shrunk in membership by 76.5 percent; and

Whereas while there has always been failures and closings in the hosiery industry, the Federation prior to Taft-Hartley had continued to make membership gains and protect the economic interest of all workers through the continuing organization of non-union mills; and

Whereas this is no longer the case under Taft-Hartley; and

Whereas the union has worked terrifically hard to try to organize the unorganized; and

Whereas its organizational efforts have been met by employers protected by Taft-Hartley, and its antiunion administration with a defense-in-depth against union organization; and

Whereas the employers are protected in creating at once a climate of fear among the workers, by name calling, pressure and implied and open threats; and

Whereas workers are harangued individually and in groups with antiunion propaganda by the employers; and

Whereas the implication of reprisal against those who join the union is made clear; and

Whereas the threat that the plant will move away is sounded time and again; and

Whereas all of this antiunion activity is considered legal by the present Eisenhower board in its interpretation of the act; and

Whereas employers are given license to discharge known union leaders under the guise of discharge for cause; and

Whereas it is almost impossible to obtain reinstatement of a worker fired during an organizing or election campaign even when his discharge resulted very obviously from activity on behalf of the union; and

Whereas employers may send antiunion letters to workers predicting dire consequences if the union is voted in; and

Whereas tactics such as these have been employed against the union with increasing vigor since Taft-Hartley with immunity to the employers; and

Whereas all kinds of delaying tactics are employed by the employers who receive only a slap on the wrist from the NLRB and in most cases nothing if they promise to not violate the act; and

Whereas simply to meet with the union and collectively argue is considered bargaining in good faith by the present Board; and

Whereas this has had a disastrous effect upon the wages, working conditions, and fringe benefits of the hosiery workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this executive board of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President and Members of Congress asking for their assistance in bringing about the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act in its entirety; and be it further

Resolved, That they be asked that Taft-Hartley Act be replaced by legislation based upon the Wagner Act which would truly protect the right of workers to organize and which would encourage collective bargaining between unions and employers.

Continental Air Lines Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a proposal by Mr. Robert Six, president of the Continental Air Lines, whose base operation is at Denver, Colo. Mr. Robert Six, a dynamic aviation leader and president of the Continental Air Lines, has taken the initiative and proposed to the Civil Aeronautics Board a fare reduction in certain cases. A newspaper item from Denver, Colo., adequately explains the proposal which is as follows:

DENVER, COLO., August 11.—Continental Air Lines today proposed higher first-class fares and an experimental economy fare to provide needed additional revenue and to stimulate business.

President Robert F. Six said the Civil Aeronautics Board has been asked to let the new fares go into effect October 1.

The new rates, he noted, "are designed to bring benefits of air transportation to a much broader segment of the public" and to provide Continental with extra revenue.

The air-line plan, pending CAB approval includes: a 6-percent increase in basic first-class and coach fares; an experimental 20-percent reduction for DC–7B nonstop coach flight each day "without frills" between Chicago and Los Angeles and a 25-percent cut in winter excursion coach fares for family groups between Chicago-Kansas City-Denver-Los Angeles.

The Needed Sense of Urgency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a fine editorial, The Needed Sense of Urgency, appearing in the Boston Globe of August 4, 1958:

THE NEEDED SENSE OF URGENCY

For the successful testing of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, the Air Force can take legitimate satisfaction. This achievement, following many failures, is a real step forward.

But certain loose talk about the test, which deceives neither military staffs nor foreign offices abroad, tends to create in the American people an illusion of security. The Atlas, it is said, was sent up a year ahead of schedule. That is to the good, but how far behind were American ICBM's 12 months ago?

The Atlas, according to one comment, could now go into production. Possibly, for the missile's booster and sustainer engines both functioned for the first time. But the test was limited.

The Atlas did not travel its 5,000 miles.

"We are now entering a missile lag period in which the Soviets will have steadily increasing ICBM striking capability, which we will be unable to match for several years. We are in mortal danger."

This statement comes from Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, commander of the famous 82d Airborne Division in World War II. Until recently he headed the Army's research and development, but he has resigned from the service so that he may speak frankly. Life magazine has just published the first installment of his forthcoming book.

The truth of what he says should be obvious from the greater weight of Soviet sput-

niks, which make plain the fact that Russian rockets have a far more powerful thrust than ours possess. Knowledge of what this country faces is beginning to have its effect. That the Atlas has successfully undergone even a limited test a year ahead of schedule is evidence that a sense of urgency has penetrated the Pentagon.

This feeling can be most fruitful, in terms of results, if it leads to successful improvisation. Americans have not lost their ingenuity. The Army, which had been limited to missiles capable of only 200 miles, produced the Jupiter, the first rocket to put an American satellite in orbit.

Improvisation has won many a contest that had seemed to be lost. But new ideas, to be productive, must be received by authority with an open mind. The most valid criticism of former Defense Secretary Wilson is that he would not listen. General Gavin thinks he tended to deal with his Chiefs of Staff as if they were recalcitrant union bosses.

The Defense Department faces a difficult task in recapturing the confidence of the American people. They have long taxed themselves heavily to make the country secure. Many of them now have much the feeling experienced by Frenchmen in 1940, when they remembered the billions that had gone into the Maginot line.

Efforts to rebuild past illusions about the situation can only make matters worse. The only hope lies in a policy of straightforwardness. Give the people double talk, and they will remain confused. But if officialdom presents the true facts, soberly and without sensationalism, Americans will respond with a sense of urgency. They have always done so, whenever the need has arisen.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Our Federal Investigating Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a call from Mr. Clyde Mann, Akron Beacon Journal writer, asking me to confirm a figure of 40,000 full-time investigators on the Federal payroll. I was amazed to learn that his figure was correct.

In view of the investigations that we in the Congress have been conducting, I wonder if it is not time that we took a look at our whole investigating structure.

Is the Congress abusing its investigative powers? Millions of citizens think so. Are congressional investigations being used for political purposes. The temptation is great.

The article by the internationally known writer, David Lawrence, printed below, makes some very interesting points regarding congressional investigations:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 8, 1958]

DIRTY HANDS IN THE GOLDFINE CASE—BUGGING ISSUE SEEN CAUSING ACQUITTAL SHOULD CONTEMPT CASE GO TO COURT

(By David Lawrence)

There is an old principle of law that a prosecutor must come into court with clean hands. There must be no taint on the way the indictment was obtained.

It looks, therefore, almost like a 100-to-1 shot that Bernard Goldfine will be acquitted of contempt if a recommendation by the House Commerce Committee that he be tried for refusing to answer certain questions is adopted by the full House and later goes to court.

For there was a palpable interference in the confidential relations between client and lawyer. It came about when the chief staff investigator for the House subcommittee listened in, through a planted microphone, on the conversations in a hotel room where Mr. Goldfine was conferring with his attorney.

The fact that the chief investigator testified later that he did not hear anything of importance does not alter the legal issue. The courts do not weigh merely whether the interference was effective. There was an instance in the District of Columbia in which a confidential informant for the prosecution in a criminal case became chummy with one of the defense lawyers and obtained information for the prosecutor. The United States circuit court of appeals reversed conviction on the ground there had been interference by the prosecution.

One prominent lawyer here—who is not in any way connected with the Goldfine case but who has had considerable experience with contempt cases—told this correspondent today that, if he had been Mr. Goldfine's attorney, he would have advised the textile manufacturer not to answer a single question after the episode of the hidden microphone had come to light. He said the legal right of the House committee to continue its questioning had, from that moment, become impaired.

Mr. Goldfine has testified under oath that there was absolutely no connection between Sherman Adams and any of the financial transactions of the different textile companies on which the House committee solicited information, and that the question related to private matters not relevant to the committee's hearings.

But the chances are this particular issue will never be resolved. For the House of Representatives, itself, thus far has not fully investigated the procedure of its subcommittee in failing to make public all the testimony concerning the hidden microphone or to investigate the circumstances under which a witness was subjected to virtual espionage.

It is true the House committee dismissed its chief investigator, but there has been no investigation ordered by the House of Representatives to ascertain whether any other information or data brought before its special subcommittee in the Goldfine case was obtained by improper methods.

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, warned the House of Representatives on August 4 that the committee had failed to do its duty. He asked whether the House is to be governed by "the rules which prevail in our equity courts to the effect that 'he who asks equity must come into equity with clean hands.'" He said:

"In the process of the subcommittee investigation, it was found that the chief investigator of the subcommittee violated one of the most sacred relationships existing in Anglo-American jurisprudence, that is, the privilege of confidential consultation between attorney and client. It did so by bugging one of the rooms where the witness Goldfine conferred from time to time with his attorneys. Furthermore, the charge has been made that a member or members of the subcommittee staff were involved in the theft of papers from the hotel rooms of witness Goldfine during the subcommittee's investigation.

"The subcommittee has not reported to the House on these matters nor are these matters contained in the report the House will receive. The House needs to know some basic things:

"First, how much authority did the subcommittee give to its chief investigator to do what he did? What other improper actions was he guilty of? The mere firing of the man after he was caught does not clear the matter up.

"Second, how long did this bugging go on, and who received any information so obtained?

"Third, what is the answer to the allegation of implication in the theft of the witness' papers?

"These matters unanswered badly damage the reputation of the Congress."

It seems certain as things look now that, if the Goldfine contempt case ever gets into court, all members of the subcommittee and the entire staff of investigators will be subpenaed and required to testify in detail as to their methods of getting testimony and exactly how they obtained every piece of data which they made the basis for their questioning of Mr. Goldfine. This whole procedure doubtless will become pertinent to the court proceeding in the contempt case, which probably will be unprecedented because, in a sense, both the Members of Congress and Mr. Goldfine will be on trial.

Mr. Mann's disclosure that we are already spending $500 million a year in the investigation field, exclusive of congressional investigations certainly deserves our thoughtful consideration:

[From the Akron Beacon Journal]

SNOOPERS BY THOUSANDS—WASHINGTON CHECKERS A $500 MILLION GAME

(By Clyde Mann)

Don't try to pull a fast one on Uncle Sam. The odds are great that one of his investigators will nab you.

A check of the United States Civil Service Commission rolls reveals the Federal Government has snoopers snooping on snoopers.

There are 40,000 full-time Federal investigators probing into every phase of a person's life. In addition, there are that many part-time checkers employed by Federal agencies and about 90,000 farmers work part time policing acreage planting.

Uncle Sam's detective bill runs more than $500 million a year. Investigators for executive agencies check everything from imports on rhinoceros feet from Africa to the surveillance of Communists.

And congressional investigators include foot-and-mouth disease, paper wastage, purchase of "natural pastel" mink coats and glamour schools conducted by the Government for its girl workers.

Congress is going investigation happy more and more each session. The Senate expenditures for official investigations has increased tremendously the last 20 years. The Senate probably will spend close to $2 million on investigations this fiscal year. In 1940, it used up only $170,000 of the taxpayers' money to probe.

The House's bill for probing will run even more. During the two sessions of the 81st Congress the House spent $1,192,836 for investigations and studies.

"Sometimes persons come into your office asking the darnest questions about the craziest things," says Representative AYRES. I believe we have investigators checking on ourselves but we don't know who they are or when they are snooping.

On several occasions Congressmen have been known to work secretly with Government investigators to check on political enemies.

The Treasury Department has the most investigators—15,836—on its payroll, followed by the Department of Criminal Investigation—10,024.

There are 8,508 investigators eyeing things for the Justice Department and 5,932 regular checkers for the Department of Agriculture.

A total of 5,846 persons investigate for tax collection and 3,836 "handy men" are

available for just "general investigating" when needed.

Fresh fruit and vegetables require only 230 inspectors, dairy and poultry, 532, and wool only 1.

The Small Business Administration has 2 investigators; the Civil Aeronautics Board, 4; General Printing Office, 3; and the Tennessee Valley Authority, 1.

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is a "hush-hush" organization which does much of its sleuthing outside the country. The number of CIA agents is secret.

There is an "Information Agency" which has 12 investigators who dig for information for Congressmen and investigators who become mired in Washington confusion.

There are 48 "general investigators" whose job is to administer, supervise and perform investigative work not specified or included in other groups in general schedule.

Here is a list of the departments and the number of investigators listed on the United States Civil Service Commission:

Government Security, 10; General Accounting, 194; Printing Office, 3; State Department, 249; Treasury, 15,836; Army, 1,577; Navy, 327; Air Force, 1,322; Justice, 8,508; Post Office, 981; Interior, 471; Agriculture, 5,932; Commerce, 367; Labor, 894; Health, Education and Welfare, 665.

Atomic Energy Commission, 84; Canal Zone Government, 51; Civil Aeronautics Board, 4; Civil Service Commission, 1,100; Federal Trade Commission, 13; General Service Administration, 48; Housing and Home Finance Agency, 36; Information Agency, 12; Interstate Commerce Commission, 283.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 5; National Labor Relations Board, 214; Panama Canal Co., 32; Securities and Exchange Commission, 107; Small Business Administration, 2; Tennessee Valley Authority, 1; Veterans' Administration, 109.

General investigating, 3,836; criminal investigating, 10,024; game-law enforcement, 159; wage-and-hour law enforcement, 881; safety inspection, 665; airworthiness inspection, 343; coal-mine inspection, 228; cotton classing, 130; dairy and poultry inspection and grading, 532.

Fresh fruit and vegetable inspection, 230; grain inspection supervising, 324; meat grading, 452; processed fruit and vegetable inspection, 382; tobacco inspecting and grading, 423; wool classing, 1; tax collection, 5,846; alcohol-tax inspection, 533.

Storekeeper: Gauger, 866; public health inspection, 103; food and drug inspection, 290; imported food and drug examining, 15; food inspection, 2,722; public health quarantine inspection, 286; transportation utilities inspection, 8; customs inspection, 2,647; customs patrol, 637.

Customs examining and appraising, 665; customs marine officer, 117; customs entry and liquidating, 734; customs warehouse officer, 196; immigration patrol inspection, 1,389; weights and measures inspection, 1; admeasurement, 55; and miscellaneous, 3,717.

A Bone To Pick With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1958, I delivered remarks regarding what appears to be unwarranted action by the Senate Appropriation Committee in the appropriation of funds for the Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce. At that time I stated the committee reduced the budget request 49.9 percent but at the same time, every other office in the Department either received more funds or the same amount as received in the 1958 appropriation.

Recently, a delegation representing the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Clay Center, Kans., held a conference with Office of Area Development officials. Clay Center was interested in information and advice for improving their efforts to promote industrial and community development. A member of this delegation was Harry Valentine, editor of the Clay Center Dispatch. Mr. Valentine speaks out in his newspaper on the matter of funds for this important agency. His comments certainly are worth of attention since he has personal and first-hand knowledge regarding the activities of the Office of Area Development.

I recommend that every Member of Congress read Mr. Valentine's constructive observations.

The editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, July 29, 1958, issue of the Clay Center Dispatch follows:

A BONE TO PICK WITH CONGRESS

The thousands and thousands of cities over the Nation interested in industrial development, and that includes Clay Center, will certainly take issue with Congress, especially the Senate, for making a drastic cut in the budget of the Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce.

It is this Government agency which collects and channels information on such development to the interested cities.

Industrial development is of such vital importance to so many cities that they will do most anything to assist themselves. Our Federal Government—and the Office of Area Development—is the only agency in a position to collect valuable data from over the Nation and make it available to the various cities.

For some reason, the Senate cut the budget of this department nearly 50 percent. That might not be so bad except that every other division in the Department of Commerce got an increase, or at least no cut.

It would have been much more reasonable, if the Senate is interested in the growth of the cities, to have increased the budget for the development office. In doing so, the office could have increased its assistance and thus helped even more the cities represented by the various Senators.

It is our belief that too few cities of the Nation know of the Office of Area Development, but any local chamber of commerce office who does know of it would certainly endorse its work and ask that it be increased. If the office could be continued on its past basis, it wouldn't surprise us if Clay Center men make an effort to visit the office in Washington at least once a year to keep abreast of industrial development work. That is, if Congress will back up and take a more realistic view at the office.

Captive Nations Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, last month I submitted for consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary a concurrent resolution calling for observance of Captive Nations Days. This resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 347, has evoked considerable popular interest. I feel confident that as the significance of this resolution becomes more generally understood and appreciated, the measure will receive the considered attention it deserves.

An illustration of its significance has recently been brought to my attention by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor at Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. The idea of a summit meeting will continue to be discussed in the months ahead, and the cause of the eventual liberation and independence of the captive nations will be closely tied up with it. This close connection is exemplified by a letter recently sent by Dr. Dobriansky, in behalf of his committee, to President Eisenhower. The letter even indicates that a full and intelligent discussion of the Middle East situation is not possible without consideration being given to Russia's colonial exploitation of the resources of the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, to further its indirect aggressions in the Middle East.

House Concurrent Resolution 347 is based on this fundamental fact of Russian colonial imperialism which materially permits Moscow to engage in indirect aggressions beyond its present empire. The resolution aims to solidify our stand on the primacy of the captive nations in any dealings with Moscow. The contents of Dr. Dobriansky's letter to the President will illustrate the basic importance of this. As an illustration of the significance of House Concurrent Resolution 347, I include this letter for printing in the RECORD:

JULY 29, 1958.

His Excellency THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

The White House,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The most recent developments which have led to the blunt prospect of the Russian political criminal, Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, to appear on American soil for a summit meeting, fill the hearts and minds of countless Americans with sadness and apprehension. Those who are closely familiar with the criminal record of Mr. Khrushchev and the machinations of the imperialist Russian Communist regime cannot but view this forced development as a major and perhaps transient victory for traditionally deceitful Russian diplomacy and propaganda.

However, despite this grounded view, this committee feels that such a meeting, should it come to pass, can be fruitfully converted into an opportunity of gainful advantage to our Nation if with singular determination and courage our Government accomplishes those things which objective reality and firm leadership necessitate. It is regrettable that for the second time in 3 years our actions toward the Russian Moscow regime have been allowed to be conditioned by the domestic considerations of one of our allies. It is even more unfortunate that a situation has arisen to formalize in this manner imperialist Russian interest in the Middle East. Yet it is comforting to us, as we are sure to most Americans, that proverbial Russian bluff and bluster will not goad your administration into a hastily contrived summit circus.

In the more rational phase of exploratory preparation for a summit meeting this past spring, this committee, along with others, contributed to a memorandum entitled "The Prospect of Another Summit Conference." In behalf of its signatories, four distinguished Members of Congress submitted the memorandum to our Secretary of State, who approvingly, discussed its contents with them (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 16, p. A6375–6376). We earnestly urge that the recommendations set forth in this memorandum be applied at any forthcoming summit meeting which definitely should not be restricted to the Middle East situation. This situation is largely the effect of more fundamental causes of world tension found particularly in Russian imperialist and colonial domination of the captive countries in eastern Europe and central Asia. Your allusion to this in your recent letter to Mr. Khrushchev is most laudable.

In true conformity with historical fact we should not hesitate in present circumstances to confront the Russian imperialist regime with an agenda point covering its long list of conquests dating back to 1920 rather than just to 1940. For surely its earlier colonial conquests in the Caucasus, Ukraine, Turkestan, White Ruthenia laid the basis for the expansion of its empire in the Baltic area and to the Danube. Obivously this extended Russian Empire is now the basis, in captive resources, of Moscow's subversive infiltration of the Middle East. A complete cause and effect discussion requires that these facts be aired openly. Its impact upon the nationally conscious and newly independent countries of Asia and Africa would be tremendously favorable to us.

At the time of the NATO meeting last December we submitted another memorandum to you, dealing with our defenses about the Russian Communist empire (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 2, p. A3181–3182). In it we strongly recommended that "Because of unprecedented Russian Communist penetrations in the Middle East, the United States should formally join the Middle East Treaty Organization." In the light of recent events we underscore again this view and urge a real concatenation of NATO with METO, SETO, and our alliances in the Far East. The many problems peculiar to the Middle East and Asia, well antedating the prime global problem facing us, should not be allowed to becloud our primary interest in these regions, namely to defend independent nations against further Russian aggressions and conquests. Russian threats and blackmail, long typical of Russian diplomacy, should scarcely deter us in achieving these ends.

With every measure of support for your courageous undertakings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The United States Navy Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the United States Navy Band, the world's finest, whose leader is Comdr. Charles Brendler; assistant leader, Lt. Harold Fultz; and third leader is W. O. Anthony Mitchell:

THE UNITED STATES NAVY BAND

On Inauguration Day, March 4, 1925, President Coolidge signed a special act of Congress, which designated the Washington Navy Yard Band as the permanent official band of the United States Navy; on that day its name was changed to the United States Navy Band. Thus honored, the band abandoned its bell-bottom trousers and adopted the smart-looking regulation uniform of the Navy chief petty officer.

In the years that followed—under Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower—the United States Navy Band has played before appreciative audiences in all 48 States, as well as in Canada, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Panama, Jamaica, Haiti, and the Virgin Islands.

Today the United States Navy Band is composed of 134 individual artists, many of whom could take his place with the greatest of the world's symphony orchestras. The duties assigned to the band require unlimited versatility, its renditions of compositions from the pens of world-renowned composers have been acclaimed by critics and music lovers everywhere.

The Navy Band contains within itself a complete symphony orchestra which presents the work of the great masters as skillfully as any group in the country. On the other hand, its "Swingphonette" adds sparkling personality to light operas, and the latest Broadway show tunes. Countless weary, lonesome servicemen find relaxation in dancing or listening to the Navy Band's melodious dance orchestra and combos in USO centers and hospitals throughout the District of Columbia area. Those who desire more restful harmony can hear one of the band's soloists, trios, quartets, quintets, or the entire string ensemble in Washington's National Gallery of Art, the Phillips Memorial Gallery, or the Pan American Union.

The Navy Band's summer concert series is an institution to concert-goers of Washington and visitors alike. These concerts, beneath the imposing dome of the Capitol, and at the Potomac Watergate with the magestic Lincoln Memorial in the background, continuously draw capacity audiences of music lovers who relax on the lawns or find space on the crowded marble steps to hear this famous organization. The winter concert series at the Departmental Auditorium is considered one of the highlights of Washington's concert season. The finest music is presented at these concerts with no admission charge to the general public.

The Navy Band traditionally appears at funeral services for Navy men in Arlington National Cemetery; but by and large its duties are of a more festive nature: It is an indispensable part of Washington's colorful parades, inaugurations, ceremonies of state, and often it is the center of attraction at the White House.

As you listen to the Navy Band's glorious blending of woodwinds and brass, its mastery of strings and percussion instruments, and swell with pride as you watch its colorful parade formations, you will realize that this is the proud representative of your Navy, speaking to you and to all the people in the universal language of music. Although its fame extends the world over, the Navy Band finds its greatest pleasure in playing for Americans in their cities and towns, large and small, throughout the country. This is your United States Navy Band, the world's finest.

COMDR. CHARLES BRENDLER

The story of Commander Brendler's rise to the coveted position as leader of the United States Navy Band is synonymous with the history of the band itself. The two "grew up together". A member of the Navy Band since its inception (as clarinet soloist), he became the assistant leader in 1937, and was advanced to leader in 1942.

In tribute to his excellent leadership and outstanding ability, he became the first Navy musician to attain the rank of commander. He holds a doctor of music degree and is the one and only honorary member of the exclusive White House Correspondents Club. For his notable contributions to his art he was honored with the election to the presidency of the famous American Bandmasters' Association (1954–55).

As leader of the world's finest military band, he conducts the greatest of classical composition; but, because he is first and foremost a true musician, he endeavors to bring to the public the best in band literature. As a result, the Navy Band repertoire numbers more than 20,000, ranging in variety from the classics to the popular melodies of today, all of which he conducts without use of a written score. He is a complete master of his art.

In addition to the foregoing, Commander Brendler is listed in Who's Who in America. He holds a life membership in the Modern Music Society and the Kappa Kappa Psi, as well as membership in Phi Beta Mu. He recently was awarded the National Guard of Honor Gold Medal by the American Legion for his accomplishments in the field of music.

LT. HAROLD FULTZ

Since his entrance into the Navy in 1935, Lieutenant Fultz has distinguished himself in every imaginable musical capacity, contributing as a soloist, conductor, composer, and administrator.

He has attended West Virginia Wesleyan College, George Washington University, taught at Jackson College of Music, and graduated at the top of his class at the then newly formed Navy School of Music (1935).

Extended trips with two Presidents evoked Presidential commendation. He is also the recipient of a Medal of Commendation.

In the spring of 1956, he returned to the United States Naval School of Music as warrant officer in charge of band training, where he organized the Navy Sea Chanters, which today constitute an integral part of the Navy Band. Lieutenant Fultz was instrumental in establishing the All Eastern Band and Instrumental Clinic, serving as its chairman for the first 2 years. He is a participating member of ASCAP and a newly elected member of the American Bandmasters' Association.

For his many faithful and dedicated years of service to the Navy and its music program, he was honored with the appointment to assistant leader of the United States Navy Band with the rank of lieutenant on July 2, 1956.

W. O. ANTHONY MITCHELL

A brilliant clarinet virtuoso who has been hailed by critics and audiences alike, through every State of the Union, Warrant Officer Mitchell is one of those rare talented individuals who is equally facile with the jazz or the classical idiom. Performing in the dual capacity of solo clarinetist with the United States Navy Band and conductor of the Navy Dance Band, he became one of the original pioneers in television broadcasting, appearing as conductor and musical director of a weekly TV series that featured some of the leading artists of the day.

Warrant Officer Mitchell graduated with honors from the United States Naval School of Music, and was awarded a bachelor of music degree from the Catholic University of America.

In recognition of his ability and many years of distinguished service, he was appointed third leader of the United States Navy Band with the rank of warrant officer on July 15, 1956.

Let the States Act as Agents for Collecting the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, these are the days when all Members of Congress should be seeking ways and means to reduce the growing costs of Government. In my research into the problems of small business, I have had occasion to work with the independent oil jobbers and have become aware of some of the inequities this group of small businessmen faces with respect to the payment of taxes. The research has also led me to discover some ways in which we could reduce the costs of Government by elimination of some duplications in the collection process.

All States collect State gasoline, diesel oil, and lubricating oil taxes. A Federal tax on these items is also collected in every State. It would be no extra burden for the States to act as agents for the Federal Government and collect the Federal taxes at the same time the State taxes are collected.

My research indicates to me that the collection activity in this Department of the Internal Revenue Service costs over $141 million per year. Gasoline and lubricating oil taxes constitute one-sixth of the total revenue from all excise taxes. By permitting the States to perform these collection duties, it is reasonable to assume that we might reduce the cost of the collection activity by one-sixth. That will enable us to save some $20 million per year.

The same is true of gasoline tax refunds to farmers and nonhighway users. There is a State refund and a Federal refund. These could be processed and paid at the same time by the States and considerable administrative costs would be saved.

I have introduced legislation—H. R. 13669—which would authorize the States to act as agents for the Federal Government in the collection of gasoline, diesel oil, and lubricating oil taxes. I have also introduced legislation—H. R. 3005—which would permit the States to make Federal gasoline-tax refunds. This legislation is still pending in committee. So that all Members will know why I feel that it is feasible to make these changes and save administrative costs, I would like to outline why the collection of these Federal taxes at the State level would be advantageous:

First. The gasoline tax collecting agencies of the various States do a highly proficient job of policing gasoline sales to insure a maximum collection of taxes on gasoline. This is in contrast to the hit-or-miss job of policing performed by the Treasury Department with the result that the Treasury quite probably does not collect all taxes on gasoline properly due. If all gasoline-tax collections—both State and Federal—were made at the State level, the benefit of State policing would inure to the Treasury and possibly produce more revenues and minimize the opportunity for evasion of Federal taxes on this and other petroleum products.

Second. Instead of the Treasury Department being compelled to administer tax reports from thousands of petroleum product taxpayers they would, under this bill, be required to police only 49 reports—such being the reports from each of the 49 States. This would relieve the Treasury of considerable administrative burden, and even though some allowance might be made to the States for the handling of such taxes, in all probability the States could perform this duty at considerably less expense than that incurred by the Treasury since the States would simply be duplicating functions which they already perform.

Third. From the standpoint of most taxpayers this would relieve them of administrative burden since they could file the same for State purposes as would be used for Federal purposes, the only variation being the amount of tax per gallon. In the case of bonds required of taxpayers, a single bond could be used with the amount increased to include obligations to the Federal Government. This would be much simpler for the taxpayer; would relieve the Treasury of the administrative burden of policing such bonds, and would also work to the advantage of the taxpayer since better premiums could be obtained on the single bond than in the case of filing 2 bonds—1 for Federal and 1 for State.

Fourth. While State and Federal laws with reference to liens, extension of time for payment, provisions relating to levy on property for collection of unpaid taxes, and other regulatory provisions might differ, these could be adjusted to more uniform standards and in such a manner as to provide a cheaper means of tax collection on petroleum products with less administrative burden for the Treasury Department as well as the taxpayer involved. In those instances where laws and regulations could not be reconciled, then the State could refer such matters to the Treasury Department for further handling—a matter which they now already handle—or to the district attorney in the appropriate area. It is believed that most differences could be reconciled by conferences between Representatives of the Treasury Department and the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, the latter being a group of State officials engaged in the handling of gasoline tax collections of the various States of the Union. This latter group has done some very significant work in producing more uniform laws, better policing of gasoline tax collections, and better administration for handling of gasoline tax collections.

Fifth. Since the Treasury Department's pet objection to most changes in excise tax laws is that "it will create undue administrative burdens" it would appear that they would welcome the opportunity to work out a means whereby they would be relieved of some of the administrative burden incident to petroleum product tax collections that they now are faced with.

Sixth. Most of the States are fairly uniform with reference to tax refunds to farmers for gasoline used for farming purposes. If the States could handle the Federal gasoline tax refunds to farmers this would relieve the Treasury Department of one of the worst administrative burdens imposed on it in the past several years. Certainly the Treasury should welcome an opportunity to be relieved of this burden as well as the expense incident thereto.

Federal Scholarship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure my colleagues will be interested in a letter I received today from Fred E. Owen, president of the Paxton & Vierling Steel, Co., Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. Owen explains how many of these bright young people are taken care of without the Federal Government taking tax money away from the parents and the loaning it back to the children. Sometime Congress is going to realize that if it would stop some of this foolish spending and provide some tax relief so that the parents could keep some of their own money, they could send their children to college, and that would include all of them, not just the bright young people.

Mr. Owen's letter is as follows:

PAXTON & VIERLING STEEL CO.,
Omaha, Nebr., August 8, 1958.

Representative E. Y. BERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BERRY: We strongly urge your opposition to the Federal college scholarship and school-aid program that is now before congressional committees.

Our company sponsors four $2,000 scholarships in engineering each year (2 at Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa, and 2 at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Nebr.). This scholarship program was started in 1954 and we are pleased to state that we have many fine boys now enjoying college educations as a result of our program. However, we do want to point out to you that we still have five scholarships that we have been unable to fill since the inception of the program. We know of many companies that have discontinued their scholarship programs because like us, they have been unable to secure needy applicants with university entrance qualifications.

We have just finished interviewing 9 boys for our University of Nebraska scholarships and each of these applicants had already been awarded scholarships at the university of from $80 to $100 per year under different scholarships that were available. We were able to award only 1 scholarship this year instead of the 2 as we would have liked, as we were unable to find qualified applicants with any real need for financial assistance.

This condition of lack of qualified applicants will continue until the high schools provide proper training courses to meet entrance requirements to the universities. If the Government goes into scholarship and school programs you can rest assured that

companies such as ours will promptly discontinue any such aid as we are providing in the form of scholarships. If we are legislated into a socialistic school program you can be certain that industry will withdraw its support from the wonderful scholarship programs that they are now sponsoring.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. OWEN.

Utilization Research Has Benefited Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee held hearings on utilization research. Although the committee will not get out a bill this year, I am hopeful that they will report out a bill next year along the lines of H. R. 6800, which I introduced and which I believe represents the latest and best thinking on the type of legislation that is needed. It has become widely recognized that our past artificial high price support legislation has dried up markets for farm crops causing radical dislocation of the supply and demand relationship. It is my deep and sincere belief that utilization research to find and commercialize new crops and new industrial uses for crops will create many new markets and provide part of a permanent cure for this serious maladjustment.

UTILIZATION RESEARCH HAS BENEFITED AGRICULTURE

The record of achievement of utilization research in the Department is long and impressive. This can be illustrated most dramatically by the accomplishments of utilization research for several of our major commodities.

Utilization research is responsible for the markets that cotton now enjoys. Faced with formidable competition from synthetic fibers, the cotton industry moved to machine harvesting and drying at the gin. These processes, designed to reduce cost and thus help cotton compete with synthetics, introduced foreign materials and brought about changes in the cotton fiber, thus placing markets for these products in further jeopardy. Utilization research solved the problem of efficient, low-cost cleaning of machine-harvested cotton and of avoiding quality damage at the gin. More recently, utilization research has developed the wash-and-wear cotton fabrics now on the market. These are so much superior to synthetics or blends that consumers are turning more and more to all cotton in the wash-and-wear field. These developments have literally saved the cotton industry.

Utilization research has made possible the development of the soybean as a food and industrial crop in the United States. Extensive soybean farming and utilization research began at about the same time. Utilization research solved the problems that permitted soybean oil to become the primary food oil, and soybean meal the primary protein feedstuff in the United States. It developed industrial chemicals from soybean oil that now form the basis of paints and other formulations that are providing outlets for millions of bushels of soybeans annually. The soybean industry has grown rapidly but only as rapidly as research has permitted it. There is no better example of the value of research in agriculture today.

Inedible animal fats—tallows and greases—formerly used by the millions of pounds to produce soap, were thrown out of this market almost overnight by public acceptance of synthetic detergents. Utilization research has provided alternative markets for these fats that have converted this situation from one of crisis to the livestock industry to one where animal fats now enjoy substantial acceptance on the domestic market. Utilization research has already provided markets for 380 million pounds of animal fats annually in plastics and in animal feed. Current research is adding regularly to the annual demand for animal fats as industrial raw materials.

Utilization research, in cooperation with the Florida Citrus Commission, developed frozen, concentrated orange juice, a product that may well have been the salvation of the Florida citrus industry. As a result of this research, larger crops can now be processed and marketed efficiently to provide the consumer with a stable, high-quality product in all seasons. Frozen concentrated orange juice has absorbed over 350 million boxes of fruit worth over a billion dollars to growers.

Cottonseed meal, for decades used almost entirely as a cattle feed, is now being used extensively in mixed feeds for poultry and swine. Utilization research, spearheading a vast cooperative program with Federal, State, and commercial groups, discovered the causes of toxicity of cottonseed meal for poultry and swine and prescribed means for overcoming them. This achievement removed the handicap that prevented cottonseed meal from sharing fully in the tremendous mixed feed market. As a result, more than 1¼ million tons of cottonseed meal, having a value of $50 million, were used in broiler and swine rations up to January 1958, and the rate of use now exceeds one-fourth million tons annually.

Dehydrated foods were essential in feeding our Armed Forces overseas during wartime. Utilization research solved many of the problems associated with production of nutritious, palatable, stable, dried foods for the Quartermaster Corps. Noteworthy in this respect was solution of the problem of storage stability of dried egg. The research was not only successful in solving the problem for the military but it has placed dried egg on the pantry shelf in the form of stable, egg-containing prepared cake and pastry mixes. More than 25 million pounds of dried egg are used annually for this purpose and their use is expanding rapidly.

Many other significant accomplishments of utilization research can be mentioned.

The 50 million pound annual market for animal fats as emulsifiers for the production of synthetic rubber was saved.

Wartime research on cereals made important contributions to the alcohol-from-wheat program which utilized 258 million bushels, and to wheat wet milling which produced starch and syrup from 3 million bushels.

Our penicilin process, growing steadily in application from the beginning, has required steep liquor from 15 million bushels of corn, and the dextran process has required 3 million pounds of sugar.

Soft grit blasting has utilized 5 million tons of corn cobs. Pulp and paper have consumed 7 million tons of straw.

The value of dehydrated fruits and vegetables to which we made substantial contributions, rose to $140 million per year during the war. While it subsided immediately afterward, there is a flourishing industry today whose product is worth 65 million annually and is increasing steadily. A substantial part of this production is exported.

Our new belt-trough dryer should save the fruit and vegetable dehydration industry $500,000 annually.

The dehydrated mashed potato industry, to which our research has contributed greatly, paid $4 million to growers in 1957 and will grow steadily. Our new potato flakes will increase this outlet substantially.

Research on frozen poultry has made it possible to realize the important economies of high-temperature scalding and has brought under control the post mortem development of toughness. Annual worth to the industry is estimated at $8 million.

As a result of Department research, 35,000 tons of feathers per year are processed into meal selling at $90 per ton for feed.

These are but a few examples, taken from the list of 150 developments, illustrating the effect of Department research on the utilization of farm commodities. And these 150, representing as they do developments that are now in commercial use, do not include many that may soon become commercial realities, nor do they reflect fully the vast intangible benefits that utilization research findings have brought to those who produce, process, and consume our Nation's crops. Each is making a significant contribution to improved agriculture. Each year sees major additions to the list.

We are confident that an expanded program will accelerate the development of additional new and expanded uses, and thus more rapidly achieve the objective of full, profitable utilization of our agricultural output.

United States and Ghana Exchange Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Honorable Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana, concluded an official 10-day visit to the United States. During his all-too-short stay in this country the prime minister frequently expressed appreciation for the cordiality of his reception and the frankness of his talks with the President, the Secretary of State and other ranking Government officials. These conversations were aimed at strengthening the close ties of friendship between our two countries through an exchange of views on subjects of mutual interest and concern.

Believing the White House statement on the outcome of these talks will be of interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD together with the welcoming remarks made upon the arrival of Dr. Nkrumah in this country.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF GHANA

The visit to Washington of the Prime Minister of Ghana has afforded the opportunity for a full and friendly exchange of views between the Prime Minister and the President, the Secretary of State and other high Government officials. These conversations have had as their objective the further strengthening of the close ties of friendship and mutual respect which have characterized the relationship between the two countries since Ghana attained its independence last year.

The Prime Minister explained the importance that his government attaches to the Volta River project and also to the development plan which is being drawn up for the further economic and social development of Ghana. He hoped the Government of the United States would find it possible to assist the Government of Ghana with respect to both programs.

In subsequent conversations, representatives of the two governments explored the types and scope of assistance which the United States Government might be able to extend to the Government of Ghana. With regard to the Volta River project, the United States expressed its appreciation of the contribution this project could make to the economic development of Ghana. It agreed to continue to explore with private American interests the aluminum manufacturing phase of the project and to consider how it might assist with loans if the required private financing were assured. The United States also expressed willingness to examine any proposals which the Government of Ghana might advance for the use of power from the Volta River for purposes other than the manufacture of aluminum. The two governments agreed that it would be desirable to bring up to date the engineering reports which were prepared in 1955 and to share the cost of this undertaking.

With respect to the new development plan now in the course of preparation, the Government of the United States indicated willingness to examine the plan with the Government of Ghana and to consider particular fields in which it might be able to cooperate through development loans. The United States Government further agreed to continue and expand its technical cooperation with the Government of Ghana through programs designed to aid in the gradual diversification and strengthening of the economy of that country.

The conversations included an exchange of views concerning the situation in the Middle East. The two governments were in agreement that the solution for the urgent problems of that area should be found within the framework of the United Nations in a manner which will preserve the independence and territorial integrity of all member nations, whether large or small. With respect to the particular situation in Lebanon, the United States emphasized its desire to withdraw its forces just as soon as the United Nations can act effectively to assure the independence and territorial integrity of that State. The Prime Minister noted that this position coincided with the views of his Government.

The representatives of the two Governments emphasized their determination to work for the strengthening of the United Nations in the interests of establishment of world peace, prosperity, and stability based upon international justice. It was apparent that both countries share the same beliefs with respect to mutual respect for the sovereignty and independence of nations, noninterference in the internal affairs of other nations, social and economic progress for all peoples, and the rights and dignity of the individual.

The two Governments also exchanged views on the emergence of new African states and the growing importance of the African Continent in the realm of international affairs. The Prime Minister took the opportunity to explain the aspirations of the African states as they were expressed at the recent meeting of those nations at Accra and in his subsequent visits to each of the capitals of the states concerned. The President noted with deep interest the Prime Minister's explanations regarding the development of a distinctive African personality, emphasizing in this connection the sincere interest of the Government of the United States in the orderly political, economic, and social advancement of the peoples of the African Continent.

KWAME NKRUMAH.
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

WELCOMING REMARKS UPON ARRIVAL OF DR. KWAME NKRUMAH, PRIME MINISTER OF GHANA, JULY 23, 1958

Vice President NIXON. Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, and ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great honor for me to represent the President of the United States and the American people as we welcome you to Washington, D. C. And in welcoming you, I have memories of a visit to your country just a little over a year ago. It was a great event. It was the birth of a nation. The birth of a nation, in which you played such an important and decisive part. And, as you come to the United States, you are going to find among our people every place that you visit, tremendous interest, both in you individually and also in your country.

This interest will exist because yours is a new nation that has entered into a period now of self-government and independence, just as our own country went through this same process many years ago. There will be interest also because this has occurred in the heart of Africa and it is an indication of a great trend that is developing in that part of the world in this exciting new continent.

There will be a special interest in you in the United States for another reason which I would like to mention. We feel that we, at least, have a part of you in our country—at least in spirit. We are proud of the fact that you studied in the United States and that here you had the opportunity to know us through the students from this country with whom you came in contact at that time.

So Mr. Prime Minister, may I say, you will find every place you go I am sure the warmest and the most friendly welcome. You will find esteem for yourself, you will find affection for your people, and the best wishes for your country in the years ahead.

Prime Minister NKRUMAH. Mr. Vice President, I am most grateful to you for your kind words of welcome. I truly appreciate the gracious invitation from President Eisenhower which has brought me here today and I bring greetings from the Government and people of Ghana to the Government and people of the United States of America.

We were delighted, sir, to welcome you to Ghana during our independence ceremonies. It gives me equally great pleasure today to renew my friendship with you. I have, of course, in addition, personal and sentimental reasons for being so happy to return to this country. My visit here is a manifestation of the warm feeling of friendship that exists between the United States of America and Ghana and between our respective countrymen. We remember with gratitude the encouragement we have received from your Government in our first efforts to consolidate our independence. We are anxious to retain your friendliness and good will.

I have arrived here, Mr. Vice President, at a time of great international tension. I represent only one African state but we are in the uniquen position of being a member, both of the United Nations and of the Commonwealth, as well as having active and direct links with the seven other independent African states. We also have a direct interest in the Middle Eastern situation. I sincerely hope that it will be possible to reach agreement to hold a very early meeting within the framework of the United Nations of the heads of government of those states best able to contribute to a solution. I look forward to having fruitful discussions with your leaders. I hope that these discussions will result in greater understanding of our respective problems and policies and that they will contribute to the store of human good will and world peace. I thank you again, Mr. Vice President.

Now They Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden News, Camden, S. C., of August 7, 1958:

NOW THEY KNOW

Governor Orval Faubus, of Arkansas, commenting on his reelection told a group of reporters:

"I remember that when all of the out-of-State reporters were questioning me and I would tell them that I was doing what the people wanted me to do, they would give me that look of doubt. Now they have the answer from the people themselves".

There is no one now who can argue with him. The people spoke and they spoke emphatically. And they spoke not only for Arkansas, but for South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, Florida, Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and other Southern States.

Governor Faubus' victory was all the more outstanding when you analyze the situation. First of all we would remind you that he polled 255,000 votes while his 2 opponents polled a combined vote of 114,712. The governor thus polled more than twice as many votes as his two opponents combined.

Now, let's analyze the situation. First, we would point out that Mr. Faubus was seeking a third term. There is sort of an unwritten law in Arkansas against a third term for a governor. Next, we would point out that Mr. Faubus, as governor, had used his influence to raise virtually every tax in Arkansas, notably the sales and the income taxes. And he had advocated a property reassessment program. He had been quite critical of the powerful State highway department.

All of this would have been sufficient to have killed the chances of any ordinary candidate and would probably have killed the chances of Governor Faubus had it not been for the strong stand he had taken on integration in the public schools.

The people of Arkansas forgot about tax raises, property reassessment, highway rows, and everything else when the dark cloud of integration began to hang over the State. They recognized that the gallant stand taken by their Governor had probably effectually stopped integration moves not only in Arkansas, but all over the South. They knew that if they backed their Governor up in his stand that the whole Nation would be alerted to the fact that it is going to be impossible to integrate the schools in the deep South.

Too often the general public is led to forget the main issue and be fooled into voting against the public interest by some side issue. This was not the case in this election.

Both of Governor Faubus' opponents professed to be for segregation, but the voters knew that a vote for Governor Faubus would show where they stood.

Before the election Faubus' opponents had expressed the hope that the silent vote would

be against him. The silent vote did not materialize; neither did the opposition from organized labor that the labor leaders talked about but that the rank-and-file union men apparently ignored.

The comment of the liberal press on the election has been humorous. Their chief concern is that the vote will intimidate those Southern people who favor integration so that they will not voice their views any more. Well, there were not enough of them to count and their views carried no weight when they did express them.

Small Business Barred From Capehart Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that during recent months an increasing number of complaints have been directed at the Capehart housing programs of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, due to the fact that small-business members of the construction industry, in effect, are precluded from bidding for this work.

As we all know, the Capehart housing program identifies dwellings constructed on Government property, usually at or near military installations, for occupancy by families of those engaged in defense activities. Literally thousands upon thousands of these houses have been constructed throughout the entire United States under this program. Indications are that the program has been administered efficiently and economically but unfortunately, the invitations to bid that are issued to contractors usually require the bidder to agree to undertake to construct all of the units in any single project. Since several hundred dwellings are usually included in each project, the contracts are too large for the smaller contractors to handle.

In most cases on these projects the Government receives but a single bid due to the elimination of many able but limited funded builders.

In order for the construction work to be performed under the Capehart housing programs, the project must include at least 20 units. I would believe that a small contractor could handle such a project but it is my information that projects of this size are rarely scheduled. The average project, I understand, consists of several hundred units. At this time there are 2 or 3 projects in process, each of which calls for 1,000 dwellings. Another single project calls for 2,000 houses. Within the past week the Congress adopted the conference report on military construction (H. R. 13015). This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to construct the following family housing—Capehart housing:

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg., 150 units.
Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
Beale Air Force Base, Calif., 970 units.
Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind., 250 units.
Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., 450 units.
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 50 units.
Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C., 275 units.
Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., 525 units.
Dover Air Force Base, Del., 500 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn., 365 units.
Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., 778 units.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., 220 units.
Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 414 units.
Fort Lee Air Force Station, Va., 154 units.
Geiger Field, Wash., 168 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., 460 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., 744 units.
Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y., 270 units.
Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., 550 units.
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., 400 units.
James Connally Air Force Base, Tex., 366 units.
Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., 290 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Mich., 475 units.
K. I. Sawyer Airport, Mich.. 595 units.
Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., 490 units.
Lakes Charles Air Force Base, La., 300 units.
Langley Air Force Base, Va., 500 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Wash., 200 units.
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 150 units.
Mather Air Force Base, Calif., 220 units.
McChord Air Force Base, Wash., 1,000 units.
McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., 540 units.
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., 668 units.
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J., 1,450 units.
Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., 932 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., 200 units.
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y., 290 units.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 616 units.
Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif., 315 units.
Pease Air Force Base, N. H., 483 units.
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., 900 units.
Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., 610 units.
Robins Air Force Base, Ga., 150 units.
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich., 580 units.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., 300 units.
Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y., 220 units.
Syracuse Air Force Station, N. Y., 216 units.
Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
Truax Field, Wis., 280 units.
Turner Air Force Base, Ga., 200 units.
United States Air Force Academy, Colo., 300 units.
Vance Air Force Base, Okla., 230 units.
Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 310 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., 154 units.
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., 150 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., 618 units.

As mentioned previously, the construction contracts are awarded to a single bidder who is required to construct all of the units in the entire project. It is obvious that under any such policy small business concerns are barred.

In explanation of this situation, I am told that the Government is able to obtain a lower price from the contractors when they are permitted to bid upon the entire project; that it would be difficult to permit several different builders to participate in a single project because the sewerage and plumbing connections must serve all of the houses; that vexing problems would arise if portions of the project were allocated to different builders.

I do not doubt for a minute but that it would be more difficult to deal with 10, 15, or 20 different builders in connection with a given project than it would be to deal with only one. But, in a sense, this argument could be utilized in connection with all Government procurements and if it were applied, big business soon would monopolize Government procurements.

Big business already appears to have a monopoly in Capehart housing and I am not convinced that it is necessary. Small builders can construct houses just as good as big builders. Some method must be found whereby small business will be given an opportunity to obtain its proportionate share.

Within the past month the Congress made the Small Business Administration a permanent agency and for the first time gave that agency authority to assist small business concerns in their efforts to obtain a fair proportion of Government construction contracts. I understand that the SBA is taking advantage of this broadened power by taking action designed to bring about some improvements in the Capehart housing policies. If it finds it is unable to do so, I would expect it to suggest and submit proposed legislation for consideration during the early days of the 86th Congress. The present situation must not be permitted to continue and I shall be waiting eagerly to see the results of the efforts of the Small Business Administration along this line.

Design of the 49-Star Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, widespread interest in the American flag has been stimulated by a contest held under the auspices of the News-Press and the Gazette of St. Joseph, Mo.

The contest began 11 years ago, when statehood for Hawaii appeared to be imminent. Now, with statehood won for Alaska, certain important details of the contest are in the news again. And again interest in the American flag is stirred.

Contest rules were announced July 6, 1947. A careful study made at that time disclosed no other newspaper in the Nation holding a similar contest.

The St. Joseph newspaper stated:

The probable admission of Hawaii as the 49th State of the Union has Congress and the flagmakers of the country in a dither.

How should the 49 stars in the field of blue be arranged? The News-Press and the Gazette are asking their readers to make a suggestion.

Judges will select from the entries the five best arrangements, which in turn, will be sent as suggested to the national committee selected by Congress to pick the design.

All winners will be awarded an American flag of the new design when it is finally officially approved. Selections will be made of the best arrangement of the 49 stars in the blue field. Art ability is not necessary.

Three judges were chosen. They were I. R. Bundy, St. Joseph public librarian; H. D. Allison, mayor of the city, and George L. Blackwell, superintendent of St. Joseph public schools.

Entries closed at 6 p. m. July 19, 1947, under the contest rules. Long before that hour was reached the News-Press and the Gazette had received piles of letters and drawings.

Some of the contestants tried diligently to keep the plan of the stars pretty much as they found it; others spelled out letters and words with the stars or produced star pictures.

The judges preferred the arrangements that made the least changes in the flag. They chose 5 designs and announced 6 winners, finding it necessary to make a duplicate award in 1 case.

The winners:

1. Miss Mabel White, 2607 Faraon Street, St. Joseph. Her flag bore 6 stars in the top row, 7 in the second row, 8 in the third row, 7 in the fourth row, 8 in the fifth row, and so on to the bottom.

2. Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Liss, Kirwin, Kans. This couple planned a flag with 7 stars across and 7 down.

3. Mrs. Lue Scott, Pickering, Mo. Duplicate award for 7 stars across and 7 down.

4. Mrs. Paul Spaulding, 611 South 14th Street, St. Joseph. Her flag divided the stars into three groups.

5. Mrs. Henry Snider, Mound City, Mo. Mrs. Snider suggested 7 rows of 7 stars each, but every other row indented rather than being flush with the one above.

Sixth. Mrs. Berthan Boone, Wheeling, Mo. Mrs. Boone arranged the stars in 7 rows: 8 for the first, 7 for the the second, 6 for the third, 7 for the fourth, 6 for the fifth, 7 for the sixth, and 8 for the seventh.

A friendly letter was sent to the winners by Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the News-Press and the Gazette. The one to Miss White stated in part:

It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to congratulate you on being 1 of the winners in the recent contest for designing a new flag of 49 stars. The contest sponsored by the St. Joseph News-Press and the St. Joseph Gazette has drawn considerable interest far and wide and we are very grateful to all who took part in working out the designs.

That your design was so good gives us of the News-Press and Gazette staffs pleasure and I want you to know that your flag will be forwarded to you as soon as the final selection is made.

Hawaii, however, did not make the grade as a State. The News-Press and the Gazette told their readers that contest awards would be presented when a 49th State came into the Union and the national flag was changed.

Eleven years went by. Then came victory for Alaska in its campaign for statehood. The News-Press and the Gazette announced that their contest could be concluded.

It now will be possible to send the winning suggestions to a flag designing committee. And when that committee chooses its design and the new flag is produced, that flag can be sent to the contest winners.

The newspapers pointed out, however, that it may not be long before the congressional committee named to select a new design is thinking in terms of 50 stars rather than 49.

Fortunately, some of the winning designs in the News-Press and Gazette contest are easily adaptable for use in a 50-star flag. These will be called to the attention of the committee.

Judge Florence E. Allen, Distinguished Woman Jurist, Seeking International Law To Regulate Navigation and Transactions in Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of Ohio's most distinguished women who has served for many years as a United States circuit judge has just announced that she will present a six-point declaration of principles for the regulation of navigation and transactions in outer space to the 10th convention of the International Federation of Women Lawyers in Los Angeles this month.

With the exploration of new horizons comes the need for new concepts of international law. I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that the proposals of this eminent jurist are worthy of the consideration of us all. Judge Allen is to be congratulated for her significant contribution in this vast new area. I ask unanimous consent that the report of an interview with Judge Allen appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 7 be included in my remarks.

JUDGE ALLEN URGING SPACE LAW

To most persons, the question of a boundary between space and outer space, those ungovernable twins of modern science, is equal in importance to the condition of the madder plant in earthbound Afghanistan.

United States Circuit Judge Florence E. Allen of Cleveland, who has been much around this world (Afghanistan excepted), is concerned vitally with the vast areas of the galaxies—but simply as a woman of the law.

The judge, in an interview yesterday in her office in the Federal Building, said she was seeking an international law, through the United Nations, to regulate navigation and transactions in outer space.

Week after next, in Los Angeles, she will present a basic declaration of principles on this matter to the 10th convention of the International Federation of Women Lawyers. She is chairman of a committee on outer space.

NO TRESPASSING

The declaration lists these principles:

1. Neither outer space nor any part thereof shall be subject to appropriation by any nation.

2. Exploration of outer space shall be jointly undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations.

3. Outer space shall be reserved under international control for the promotion of the well-being of mankind exclusively through peaceful means.

4. Flight instrumentalities shall not be used in any part of outer space for any military purpose.

5. All nonmilitary flight instrumentalities shall have the right of transit through contiguous space, whether ascending or descending.

6. All space above contiguous space shall be declared free for the passage of all flight instrumentalities.

"We've got to have a definite boundary between space and outer space," said Judge Allen, "if we are going to have any law or agreements of any kind."

International lawyers talk of territorial space, that area above a nation where aircraft, as defined today, may operate. Then there is contiguous space, the area above this height.

But, as the judge said, the indispensable prerequisite for the declaration of basic law to govern exploration and use of outer space is the establishment of a practical boundary between the atmosphere (territorial space) and outer space. The definition of territorial and contiguous space, if adopted by the nations, would set such a boundary.

"You can find in 'American Jurisprudence' that we own the air way up forever, up through the galaxies," said Judge Allen. "But now, there's sputnik up there, passing over our territory. And there is Explorer up there, going over their countries.

"Nobody protested about this. No one in the world objected. There were no claims of any violation. So we kind of admitted that the law no longer obtains. All of us have waived any laws or rights."

WHOSE MOON OVER MIAMI?

What about Russia? She did not join the United States and 57 other nations in the Chicago meeting, in 1944, of the International Civil Aviation Organization, when territorial space was set up. She probably would not join in this declaration, either. Suppose she should go ahead and make it to the moon and claim it?

"Well," said Judge Allen, "she would have the moral declaration of the world against her."

She said an international convention should be formed soon, investing the International Court of Justice with jurisdiction in controversies in this field. And the International Civil Aviation Organization might be handed the task of making the principles effective.

"This is fascinating study," said Judge Allen, who has been a jurist since 1920, in common pleas court, in the Ohio Supreme Court, and now in Cincinnati. "Simply fascinating."

Hon. William E. McVey

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the

passing of our esteemed colleague, Hon. WILLIAM E. MCVEY.

During his 8 years of service in Congress he enriched the lives of every Member of this Chamber, and contributed much to the people of Illinois and the country.

His interests were diversified and he was widely known not only in the field of education but also as an author. He was an able member of the Banking and Currency Committee and always had the courage of his convictions.

Mr. MCVEY was a sincere man of simple dignity and devoted to his work. Personally I have lost a warm friend, one for whom I had great regard and affection. I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his devoted wife and family.

Dr. William M. Hudson, a Great Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was Pennsylvania's loss and Illinois' gain when Dr. William Mestrezat Hudson left the presidency of Waynesburg College in 1912 to become president of Blackburn College in Carlinville, Ill. As a former student of Dr. Hudson, who served as Blackburn's president for 33 years, I consider it a privilege to include here a biographical sketch of this great educator which appeared in a recent publication of the Carlinville Rotary Club.

WILLIAM MESTREZAT HUDSON
(By W. L. Schmitt)

Few residents of Carlinville and Macoupin County have had a more satisfying career than William Mestrezat Hudson, president emeritus of Blackburn College, distinguished educator, religious leader and all-American citizen. Liberal in his educational philosophy, conscientious and capable in his devotion to the public good, strong and alert in mind and body, temperate in all things, a man of unusual strength in intellect and character, Dr. William M. Hudson looms today among the great citizens of the community.

Born February 26, 1872, near Waynesburg, Greene County, Pa., Will Hudson, at the age of 10, following the death of his father, moved with his mother, 2 brothers and a sister, to Waynesburg.

He was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1892, first in a class of 16. He entered Princeton that fall and was graduated cum laude in 1893. In 1896 he was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary and was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church that fall, going immediately to the pastorate of the New Providence Presbyterian Church at Carmichaels, Pa.

In 1900 he spent 7 months abroad, including a month in Egypt and Palestine.

From Carmichaels he moved to the pastorate of First Presbyterian Church at Clarksburg, W. Va.

In 1905 Will Hudson married Miss Florence Ronald Barclay, of Louisville, Ky. They have 3 daughters; Mrs. A. W. Meyer, Upper Montclair, N. J.; Mrs. J. B. Callaway, South Pasadena, Calif.; and Miss Harriet, academic dean of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. The Meyers have 4 children and the Callaways 5.

In 1908 Dr. Hudson became president of Waynesburg College. After 3 years he retired to his father's old farm from which he was called in 1912 to the presidency of Blackburn College, where he served for 33 years. Resigning in 1945, he has been engaged in farming, business, and preaching, spending several winters in Florida where he served as supply pastor. He seems to be the only man we know who can spend his winters in Florida and get paid for it.

Along the way, Dr. Hudson has received honorary degrees from Princeton and Tulsa Universities, and from Illinois, Waynesburg, and Blackburn Colleges.

Probably Dr. Hudson's greatest honor came in 1950 when he was elected a Pennsylvania ambassador by the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce, the first man from his county to receive that honor. A scroll given him, signed by the Governor and secretary of State, reads: "For outstanding achievement in the best traditions of the Commonwealth, this citation is awarded to William M. Hudson, a former resident of Greene County, Pennsylvania, who has won distinction as a college president and devoted friend of financially needy students."

In 1923 the Hudson family lived abroad, the daughters attending French lycees, while Dr. and Mrs. Hudson traveled over Egypt, Palestine, and the continent.

Bear Lake County Citizens Can Take Pride in Election Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of my State of Idaho and its high turnout at the polls. Particularly am I proud of the citizens of Bear Lake County, in the southeast corner of my district.

Idahoans do not regard their franchise lightly, consistently exceeding the national average, percentagewise, in voting. And my costituents in Bear Lake County regularly exceed the Idaho average.

They are to be commended for their good citizenship, and I believe their record is such that it should be called to the attention of the Congress.

Following is an editorial from the August 7, 1958, Montpelier, Idaho, News-Examiner in which that record is pointed up:

BEAR LAKE COUNTY CITIZENS CAN TAKE PRIDE IN ELECTION VOTING RECORD

Remember to set aside a few minutes Tuesady next, August 12, between the hours of 12 noon and 8 p. m. to go to the polls and vote. Mathematically and otherwise your vote is mighty inportant. Byt the mere act of voting you translate privilege into action, and fulfill a trust and responsibility due yourself, your party and country.

In a preface to the 1958 digest of primary and general election laws, James H. Young, secretary of state, has this to say about our obligation to vote:

"This Republic has given the citizens of these United States a degree of freedom and a plan of self-government that is the outstanding achievement of all time.

"Here the individual is sovereign, and here government is with the consent of the governed.

"But it presupposes two things. The first is that the voters have the intelligence to inform themselves about the men and the issues to be voted upon, and the second is that they will be enough concerned to perform every citizen's duty of voting.

"To whatever extent we fail in either of these two things, we jeopardize our rights, our freedom, and the privileges we have in this land we love.

"Self-government is a priceless heritage, and it can be lost."

At the presidential election in 1956 Idaho ranked first among all States in the ratio of votes to total voting population, 77.3 percent, and in 1952 held a similar position with 81.4 percent. Nationally the average in 1956 was 60.4 and in 1952, 62.7 percent.

Although open for improvement, Bear Lake County ctizens can take pride in their voting record with respect to the high percentage of qualified electors registering, nearly 100 percent, as well as the number voting at elections.

Out of 4,017 registered electors in 1952, 3,608, or 90 percent voted; in 1954 there were 4,023 registered electors of which 3,320 or 83 percent voted; and in 1956, 3,446 or 85 percent out of the 4,057 registered cast votes. This places Bear Lake considerably above the State and national averages.

For a number of reasons the primary vote is considerably less than that at general elections. The primary is conceived on the principle that the elector will have the drive and intelligence to directly participate in choosing candidates, as opposed to the delegation of this important function to a few as practiced by the nominating convention procedure. Choosing the entry can be more important than the November showdown race itself.

The reader will observe on the sample ballot appearing elsewhere in this issue of the News-Examiner that there are a number of State contests, and that in Bear Lake County there are 3 contests for offices on the Democratic ticket and 2 on the Republican.

Following is a table showing the number voting at the last 10 biennial primaries, the number voting at corresponding general elections, and the percentage of primary votes in comparison with the number voting at respective general elections:

Year	Voted at primary	Voted at general	Percent voting at primary
1938	2,200	3,397	6
1940	2,021	3,898	5
1942	1,305	2,985	4
1944	1,346	3,400	3
1946	1,419	3,125	4
1948	1,522	3,375	4
1950	1,862	3,229	5
1952	2,434	3,608	6
1954	2,393	3,320	7
1956	2,164	3,446	6

Congressman McVey, a Real Public Servant

SPEECH
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great regret of the passing

of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

BILL MCVEY and I came to Congress together in January 1951. His office was only a few doors from mine and I recall the many occasions when we walked to the floor of the House of Representatives together in response to the bells for a roll or quorum call. We served together as Members of the 82d Congress.

I have lost a good and trusted friend and the country has lost a great public servant. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. McVey and her family.

Exit From Great Lakes Waters: The Lamprey Eel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have had occasion to speak of the depredations of the lamprey—a loathsome, bloodsucking eel—on fresh-water fish in the Great Lakes. The eel entered the regions early in the 1920's and all but wiped out lake trout in Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Superior.

My attention was first called to this by our colleague, the Honorable John Rankin of Mississippi, who was very much stirred over the situation and thought those of us who live on the Lakes should do something about it.

A great deal was done about it, and now it appears that the lamphrey's days of supremacy are over, thanks to chemicals and tireless research on the part of United States and Canadian officials of the lamphrey control program. Recent tests have been unbelievably successful.

A dramatic account of a new poisonous chemical known as Dowlap which affects only the lamprey and was developed by the Dow Chemical Co., appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 7. I ask unanimous consent to include this article with my remarks, believing it will be of particular interest to my colleagues in the Great Lakes region.

PETROMYZON MARINUS GIVES UP THE GHOST

This is a happy fish story where the big one didn't get away.

Petromyzon marinus, more familiarly known as the loathsome lamprey eel, has at last been conquered.

In language rarely used by scientists, the head of the lamprey-control program has just reported unconditionally successful results with a selective chemical larvicide.

A poison now can be used which hits only the lamprey and leaves game fish, animals drinking treated water and plant life completely untouched.

Lampreys are little salt-water bloodsuckers which first entered Lake Erie via the Welland Canal (without paying tolls, yet) in 1921. They never flourished here, due perhaps to warm streams along our shores.

The story was different in Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior. There the lampreys adapted to fresh water life and proceeded gradually to wipe out the lake trout in Michigan and Huron. Superior's remaining trout population has almost vanished too from their depredations.

Right after World War II the United States and Canada initiated a lamprey-control program which went into high gear in 1954. Electric fences at stream entrances first were tried. They work but are expensive and allow too many generations of lamprey to live which have already escaped into the lakes.

Two years ago Dr. Vernon C. Applegate, director of the lamprey experimental station at Rogers City, Mich., together with Dr. James W. Moffett, began chemical studies.

Somewhere along the way, as they plowed through 6,000 different poisons, Dr. Clarence L. Moyle, of the Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich., came into the picture. He introduced a substance now called Dowlap, a fungicide discovered back in 1941 but set aside.

In October of 1957 a test stream, Little Billie's Creek, near Cheboygan, Mich., was picked for a trial. Four hours after the chemical was introduced in the water windrows of dead lamprey larvae grew larger and larger and attracted gulls and sandpiers by the hungry hundreds, reports the latest Dow house organ, the Brinewell.

Dowlap killed 95 percent of the lamprey larvae. A second test in April of this year worked even better on another river. Dr. Applegate, who called the research "unconditionally successful," now proposes to treat 65 lamprey-infested streams feeding Lake Superior. Later Lakes Michigan and Huron will get the poison applications.

While it may be 20 years before lake trout can recover (because of their slow life cycle), this represents a magnificent victory. Industry and government have teamed in what once seemed a completely hopeless endeavor. To all we say "good fishing" and heartiest thanks.

Reds Ready To Paint Latin America Red

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an enlightening report on the designs of Communist Russia in Latin America has been written by Mr. William Giandoni, Latin American editor for the Copley newspapers.

This article appeared in the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate and other Copley newspapers, and it is worthy of reading for its shows the Communist ambitions in the Western Hemisphere.

I was extremely interested in Mr. Giandoni's report because, in 1954, I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression that exposed the first Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere—that which occurred under the administration of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala.

The Arbenz regime in Guatemala was overthrown by the late patriot, Col. Castillo Armas, reestablishing the toehold of democracy for the heel of communism in an important area of our hemisphere.

I wish to remind my colleagues in the House that the subcommittee, of which I was chairman and which consisted of the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, and the Honorable Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, and which was bolstered by the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, found in 1954 that the Communists were extremely active throughout Latin America and that the Armas victory in Guatemala was by no means a final one.

There was no dispute within either the subcommittee or the full committee on Communist aggression of 1954 that the Reds would continue their relentless campaign to control the United States through intervention in Latin America unless this country awakened to the need and ambitions of our good neighbors to the south.

Mr. Giandoni's recent report for the Copley newspapers almost 4 years later is ample proof of the prospectus gathered by the subcommittee that the Communist leaders in the Kremlin and Peiping are dedicated to the domination of Latin America as a major goal toward the ultimate conquest of the United States.

Mr. Giandoni's informative report on the current situation in Latin America as related to the boasts of Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung follows:

Mao Tze-tung and Nikita Khrushchev have confirmed widely-held suspicions that Communist agitation is on the upswing in Latin America.

The Chinese Communist party chief and the Soviet premier said in their long communique issued in Peiping Sunday that "China and the Soviet Union give firm support * * * to the national independence movements of the peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

The statement appeared to constitute formal admission by the Communist big two that Reds are behind much of the trouble in the American Republics. It was also noted that one of the other participants in Communist summit conferences Vassily V. Kuznetsov, acting foreign minister of the Soviet Union, recently completed a quiet tour of Latin America.

These are the trouble spots where competent observers say the hand of world communism is most evident:

MEXICO

Mexico: Another wildcat strike on government-run national railways of Mexico is causing serious damage to the country's economy. Ostensibly, the tieup was the result of a squabble within the railroad union itself but, Government spokesmen say, the Communist-led dissidents refuse to use normal, peaceful means to solve the problem. The Reds are seeking to pressure the Government into giving them control of the union, without bothering with the formality of a union election. Threats of similar situations exist in the national teachers union, in the union covering employees of the Government oil company, and in the telegraphers union.

Venezuela: Communists and leftists are taking advantage of the freedom they found after overthrow of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship in January to increase a situation of lawlessness and disregard for authority.

Already there has been an army attempt, led by defense minister Gen. J. M. Castro Leon, since exiled, to replace the ruling 5-man junta with a tougher government. Castro Leon also wanted press and radio censorship and the outlawing of both the Communists and the leftist Democratic Action party. An additional stake in Venezuela is the multibillion dollar United States investment in oil and iron ore deposits there.

ARGENTINA

Argentina: The Soviet Union has offered Argentine President Arturo Frondizi a long-term, low interest government-to-government loan for oil development. The Red offer came just before Frondizi announced that his government was concluding a billion dollars worth of contracts with private American and other foreign oil companies. If nothing else, the Soviet offer may be used by Frondizi's critics as proof that he might have obtained better terms had he dealt with Communists rather than Western capitalists.

Other nations with economic problems the Communists have been trying to nettle against the United States include Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, and even little Bolivia.

Bolivia, like Argentina, has been the recipient of a Soviet offer to finance additional development of its petroleum resources.

The other nations are chiefly troubled with overproduction of coffee or copper. And, while the United States is promising relief in the future or studies of ways of easing the situations, the Soviet is reaping propaganda advantage with well-timed and highly publicized offers to buy surpluses.

Panama is the last important trouble spot. There the Reds have long been cheering on the nationalists who would like to take the Panama Canal away from the United States or, at least, receive more than the $1,930,000 a year the United States now pays for use of the Canal Zone.

Lake Springfield: Municipally Owned Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting article from Public Power Magazine, the official publication of the American Public Power Association.

This article, by Mary Meyer, describes the highly successful municipally operated water, light, and power development in Springfield, Ill.

LAKE IS MUNICIPAL UTILITY DIVIDEND—LAKE SPRINGFIELD, PLAYGROUND OF CENTRAL ILLINOIS, BOOSTS MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP

(By Mary Meyer)

Lake Springfield, the playground of central Illinois, is a big dividend of municipal ownership of Springfield's water and electric utilities.

The idea of municipal ownership of the utilities is unquestionably strengthened in many ways because of the close association of the city's water, light, and power department to the lake.

Bond issues for construction of the lake, a lakeside filter plant, and powerplant were all approved by voters of Springfield during the years from 1930 to 1933. The lake was the answer to a longstanding problem of an adequate water supply for the city. Construction of the lakeside municipal powerplant more firmly established the future of the up-to-then shaky fortuned municipal electric power system.

Approval of the bond issue by the voters in 1930 followed a long and colorful fight by former Commissioner Willis J. Spaulding to establish an adequate water supply for the city.

Mr. Spaulding's crusade began during the campaign for mayor in 1909, when he organized a torchlight parade in which a banner was carried with the words "Clean Water and Clean Politics." After this election, Mr. Spaulding was appointed superintendent of waterworks. With the adoption of the commission form of government in 1911, Mr. Spaulding became the first commissioner of public property.

Many improvements in the treatment of the water supply and service were initiated by Commissioner Spaulding; however, it became apparent in the late 1920's that the well-water supply at the city's old river plant was not adequate for the growing city. After various studies, a lake supply was considered the surest and cheapest in the long run.

The amount of the original bond issue for the construction of the lake was $2,500,000. This investment gave the people of Springfield a water supply rated among the finest in the United States for taste, purity, and softness; in addition, the people have received many other benefits almost equally important.

The Department of Public Property, under whose domain fall the utilities and the lake property, has been quick to point out to the public the jewel they possess as a bonus of municipal ownership.

During the 22 years since the lake was built, operation and maintenance of Lake Springfield has come entirely from operating revenues of the water and electric utilities, not from any kind of taxation. At the same time both water and electric rates of the City Water, Light, and Power Department are among the lowest in the United States.

Moreover, when the lake was first built it was planned that the taxpayers would pay 50 percent of the cost and the water and light systems would pay the other half.

To make a good thing even better, the water department has been able to assume the entire obligation out of operating revenues. The people of Springfield have not paid 1 cent in taxes for the construction or maintenance of their pride and joy, Lake Springfield.

The lake contains 21.4 billion gallons of water under normal conditions, with 57 miles of shoreline. Average depth is 15.4 feet. Greatest depth is 40 feet.

In developing the lake area, great consideration was given by the Department to control of marginal land. A part of the land was leased for residential areas but with the city keeping 60 percent for public recreational purposes. This development of marginal land for recreational purposes is unique, and Lake Springfield is one of the few water supply reservoirs in the United States where recreational activities of any kind are permitted.

The biggest parcel of land provided by the department of public property to the citizens of Springfield was the 200 acres of rolling shoreline used for an 18-hole championship golf course. A long-time dream, the course opened last summer for the enjoyment of Springfield and central Illinois. Actual operation of the course was relinquished by the department to the Playground and Recreation Commission of Springfield.

Public areas operated by the department are seven parks equipped with playgrounds, picnic tables, ovens, running water and electric lights. There are two public sand beaches with water slides, high and low diving boards.

A 60-acre tract of shoreland, maintained by the Abraham Lincoln Memorial Garden Foundation, Inc., attracts State and national interest as the first and only living memorial to Lincoln. Wooded trails duplicating those of the north woods are to be found in the area known as the Wildlife Sanctuary. The department works closely with the State of Illinois Conservation Department on stocking fish and game.

Lake Springfield is one of the best fishing areas in the Middle West. The lake is well stocked with crappie, black bass, catfish, bluegill, ring perch, sunfish, white perch, and carp.

City Water, Light and Power, in cooperation with the Sportsmen's Club and the State conservation department, each year raises its own fingerlings in two rearing ponds located east of the dividing dam.

In addition to public recreation areas, certain land is set aside for club areas. There are a total of 14 clubs at the lake with a combined membership estimated at 2,000.

Six camps for boys and girls are located on the lake, operated by Boy and Girl Scouts, the YMCA, and various church groups. In addition, a 40-acre site is leased to the Springfield Municipal Opera Association for presentation of musical programs in the summer.

Future plans for the lake include the beginning of a music camp offering college credit in the fields of operatic and instrumental music and drama and play production.

There are more than 590 homes gracing the shoreline of Lake Springfield on leased sites.

The water purification plant, the electric steam generating plant, and lake area property are valued today at approximately $25 million.

Generating capacity of the Lakeside powerplant has grown from the original 10,000 kilowatts to 80,000 kilowatts. Plans are now underway to increase the installed capacity of the plant to 113,000 kilowatts before 1960, to meet the increasing demands of the community for city electricty.

The Lakeside filter plant can deliver 40 million gallons of water per day to the city as a result of a recent expansion of plant facilities.

In the words of former Commissioner Spaulding, under whose dynamic administration the lake and enlarged public utility system was conceived and born, "Lake Springfield is a monument to the ability of the people to serve themselves and build for posterity."

Old Vineyard Named Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, ghosts of the past flitted through the trees at the site of Leland Stanford's vineyard when the Historical Landmark Advisory Committee of the State of California designated it as a State historical landmark.

Viniculture is not new in California having been introduced by the early mission fathers. However, it was not until the late 1860's that vines were imported from Europe and California joined the ranks of the great wine producing areas of the world.

Today the Weible Champagne Vineyards operated by Mr. Rudloph Weibel carry on the tradition established by Leland Stanford in 1869.

The following newspaper announcement is taken from the Hayward Daily Review for August 5, 1958:

OLD VINEYARD NAMED SITE

FREEMONT.—The Weibel Champagne Vineyards at Warm Springs near Mission San Jose, site of wine growing pioneer Leland Stanford's famous vineyard, has been named a State historical landmark, it was announced today.

Sanford, who also was United States Senator and Governor of California and founder of Stanford University, founded the famed vineyards in 1869 and later grew grapes there which produced quality wine equal to great European vintages.

Notification of the selection of the site as a landmark was made by the Historical Landmark Advisory Committee, Sacramento, to Weibel, Inc.

Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. As a representative of this outstanding district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of the people through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies and departments. To help accomplish this, I maintain on a year-round basis a congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally during trips back to the district when my official duties permit. While I am in Washington, a competent staff is in charge of the Cleveland office.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents a concise accounting of events and opinions on Capitol Hill.

During my service in the Congress, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on important legislation. This year with Congress in nearly continuous session, I have not been able with intervening committee work to return to Cleveland as much as I would have liked. Therefore, in accordance with the practice I initiated 4 years ago, I am bringing a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d District. This method of meeting wih the public has been tremendously popular and it gives me a wonderful opportunity to discuss and learn at firsthand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the understanding that Congress will not be in session during the early part of October, I will again this year from October 6 through October 17 follow the same procedure and have a series of conference meetings so that every resident of this suburban district can conveniently meet with me. These are not group meetings but office conferences for the individual which will enable them to discuss their views and problems personally. No appointments are necessary, and I urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient. Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to talk over problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems they might have with the Federal Government, or just to chat and get better acquainted. The knowledge thus obtained will better enable me to represent the residents of the 23d District in the Congress of the United States.

Following is the schedule for these office conferences:

Community	Location	Date	Time (p. m.)
Bay Village	Bay Village Townhall, mayor's office, 350 Dover Center Rd.	Monday, Oct. 6	2-4:30
Westlake	Westlake City Hall, 27216 Hilliard Blvd., rooms 10 and 11.	do	6:30-9
Lakewood	Lakewood City Hall, relief office, 14532 Lake Ave.	Tuesday, Oct. 7	2-4:30
Rocky River	Rocky River City Hall, mayor's office, 21012 Hilliard Blvd.	do	6:30-9
North Olmsted, Olmsted Township, Olmsted Falls.	North Olmsted City Hall, Dover Center Rd.	Wednesday, Oct. 8.	2-4:30
Fairview Park, Parkview, Linndale	Fairview Park City Hall, 20785 Lorain Rd.	do	6:30-9
Berea, Middleburg Heights, Westview, Riveredge Township.	Berea City Hall, 47 East Bridge St	Monday, Oct. 13	2-4:30
Strongsville, North Royalton	Strongsville City Hall, mayor's office, 18988 Royalton Rd.	do	6:30-9
Brecksville, Broadview Heights, Independence.	Brecksville Townhall, 49 Public Square	Tuesday, Oct. 14	2-4:30
Parma Heights, Brookpark, Seven Hills, Brooklyn Heights.	Parma Heights Townhall, 6281 Pearl Rd	do	6:30-9
Warrensville Heights, Warrensville Township, North Randall, Woodmere, Orange.	Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4700 Warrensville Center Rd., mayor's office.	Wednesday, Oct. 15.	2-4:30
Chagrin Falls, Chagrin Falls Township, Hunting Valley, Moreland Hills, Bentleyville.	Chagrin Falls Library, 100 East Orange	do	6:30-9
Solon, Glenwillow, Oakwood, Bedford Heights.	Solon Village Hall, council chambers, 6315 SOM Center Rd.	Thursday, Oct. 16	2-4:30
Maple Heights, Bedford, Walton Hills, Valley View, Cuyahoga Heights.	Maple Heights City Hall, mayor's office, 5353 Lee Rd.	do	6:30-9
Shaker Heights, Beachwood	Shaker Heights City Hall, mayor's office, 3400 Lee Rd.	Friday, Oct. 17	2-4:30
University Heights, Pepper Pike	University Heights City Hall, 2300 Warrensville Center Rd.	do	6:30-9

I am most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Remarks of New York State Supreme Court Justice John E. Cone, Chairman, Committee To Ban Teen-Age Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the New York City Committee To Ban Teen-Age Weapons, of which John E. Cone, Justice of the New York State Supreme Court is the chairman, I am submitting the statement he made at the hearings before the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Wednesday, July 23, 1958.

The House of Representatives has passed during the session H. R. 12850 which prohibits traffic in switchblade knives. Led by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, who first introduced this legislation in 1953, many Members of Congress, particularly from the New York-New Jersey area, sponsored identical bills. Congressman DELANEY and I testified in favor of this legislation during the hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House of Representatives. H. R. 12850 passed the Senate on July 31, 1958.

REMARKS OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JOHN E. CONE, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE TO BAN TEEN-AGE WEAPONS, FOR DELIVERY AT HEARING OF UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, JULY 23, 1958

I am John E. Cone, justice of the New York State Supreme Court. I am appearing here today as chairman of the Committee to Ban Teen-Age Weapons.

Our group was formed last year in response to the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency experienced by New York City and State. Many public spirited citizens including 2 Congressmen, 3 district attorneys, 8 State legislators, many judges, members of the clergy, educators, and community minded citizens helped organize our committee.

Our purpose was to put more teeth in existing State, Federal, and city laws with the view of reducing the terrible incidence of youth crime. Our prime objective was to ban the switchblade knife and its successor the deadly gravity knife.

In 1954, through the efforts of a similar committee as I now represent, the switchblade knife was banned in New York State. As you now, these knives open upon the slight touch of a button. Certain knife manufacturers, seeking to circumvent the law, started to manufacture and advertise the gravity knife. This weapon opens and locks automatically at a quick flick of the wrist. Technically, they are not switchblade knives, but they are just as dangerous.

It is worthy of note that last year the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency instituted an extensive study and field investigation of the switchblade and gravity knife situation. The results of this survey fully supported and emphasized the need for this legislation.

The committee found that over 1 million switchblade and gravity knives are distributed and sold each year in this country. These knives are sold chiefly to juveniles. Some 200,000 are imported.

New York State and 11 other States took action in an attempt to halt the flow of these weapons into the hands of juveniles. This year New York outlawed the manufacture, sale, or possession of the gravity knife. The measure received overwhelming support in the State legislature.

Helping to spark our drive were several of the major metropolitan newspapers and radio station WMGM. We realized, however, that despite our State law, we were relatively helpless in fully meeting the challenge of the gravity and switchblade knives. Thousands of these weapons were being bootlegged into the State from other countries and other States. These weapons had become the symbol, as well as the weapon of the teen-age gang. And they are still easy to purchase.

Advertisements by mail-order houses, in sports magazines, in outdoor magazines, all offer these knives for sale.

The only way the individual State can effectively bar the switchblade and gravity knives and remove the handcuffs now binding law-enforcement officers, is for you to enact appropriate Federal legislation. You must prohibit their introduction into interstate commerce, close the mails to them and ban their importation.

Switchblade and gravity knives have no possible legitimate use. They can do nothing worth while that other types of knives cannot do better. A fish knife is more useful to a fisherman, a hunting knife to a hunter. Switchblades are good for just one thing—sneak attack.

They can be easily concealed and called into action at a moment's notice. Their blade, like the tongue of a deadly snake, darts forth with great speed and force.

You can see from the weapon that I hold in my hand that this is not the type of a knife we used when we were boys, or that the Boy Scouts used. This weapon is designed to be used exclusively for strong-armed purposes.

In support of our stand, I would like to present you with the signatures of 250,000 persons who have signed our petitions and have written post cards urging this legislation. These people represent all walks of lives. One woman wrote to us saying that her son lost an eye because of the brutal switchblade knife. Teen-agers backed the proposed legislation, too.

It was heartening to us to receive the support of the Camillus Cutlery Co., one of the Nation's foremost knife manufacturers. This group is represented here by Mr. Lewis A. Pinkussohn, Jr. This company has worked diligently to rid the market of the death dealing gravity and switchblade knives.

Other leading citizens, such as City Councilman Jack Kranis, State Senator Frank J. Pino, Albert M. Leavitt, president of the Youth Service League, Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, Representative EDNA F. KELLY, Captain Frederick Ludwig, to name a few, are largely responsible for calling the threat of this weapon to the attention of the public and for helping to pass the legislation in New York.

The rest is up to you. You can strike a deadly blow at teen-age gangs. You can wrest the gravity knife and switchblade knife from the hands of the young hoodlums. You must grant approval to the bill now under consideration, and ban the gravity and switchblade weapons. Thank you.

Failure To Extend Public Law 480 Is Bad News for Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have called on the leadership of this Congress for extension of the surplus disposal law, Public Law 480. A prominent newspaper in the First Congressional District has done farmers a service by presenting an excellent editorial on the value of this legislation, and what the loss will mean to everyone—farmers and people who depend on a prosperous agriculture indirectly for their income.

The full impact of the failure to extend this law is admirably described in the following article which appeared in the Waseca Journal, Waseca, Minn., and which was reprinted in the Faribault Daily News.

This important law has been passed by both Houses of Congress. Since there is a difference in the two bills, they must go to conference. At this late date it is shocking to note that conferees have yet not been appointed:

BAD NEWS

Every day the Democrat-controlled Congress fails to reenact Public Law 480 spells more bad news for the farmer. And the farmer has had plenty of bad news since June 30 when the law passed by the 83d Republican-controlled Congress expired.

A few days ago the United States Department of Agriculture issued its report on the accomplishments of Public Law 480 during the fiscal year ending June 30. The 6.6 million metric tons exported under this law covers nearly every farm food and fiber commodity.

Acclaimed as one of the greatest pieces of all agricultural legislation in all time, this Republican-sponsored law was largely responsible for the increased export of farm products during the Eisenhower administration.

The increase was sizable, too, nearly double that of 1952—94 percent by volume, to be exact.

The law alone cannot take all of the credit for this outstanding Republican accomplishment. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson deserves much of the credit. His agricultural attachés, 50 of them, serving in over 100 foreign countries, negotiated readjustments of tariff barriers, ironed-out conflicts with producers abroad, and otherwise made possible the greatest export of farm products the world has ever known from any nation.

Dairymen in this part of Minnesota should be particularly grateful for this legislation and its accomplishments. During the year ending June 30 dairy exports totaled 84,365,000 pounds.

Soybeans, which have become Waseca County's major crop, were supported on the home market through Public Law 480 exports which totaled a staggering 402,814,000 pounds of soybean oil. Corn in the amount of 24 million bushels was sold abroad and the wheat surplus would be even worse were it not for the Public Law 480 export of 175,485,000 bushels, to say nothing of the nearly 37 million pounds of wheat flour.

The export of beef was more than 11 million pounds while that of tallow was nearly 5 times greater or 54,429,000 pounds.

First Minnesota District Congressman AL QUIE warned of the danger of letting the valuable farm legislation expire on June 26, 4 days before the June 30 deadline. Now the opposition has no one to blame but themselves for the great loss that is being suffered every day by First District farmers.

That loss will continue even beyond the day the law is reenacted, for it will take considerable time to get the massive export machinery in operation. In the meantime, foreign sales lost during the past several weeks show little chance of being recaptured.

National Defense Education Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, have my full support.

The greatest paradox in history is that here, in the world's richest country, thousands of gifted youngsters are not able to use their abilities to the fullest, due to a lack of funds. Many people feel that the Federal Government should not directly participate in education. While I strongly support local control of primary and secondary school education, we must, as a Nation, develop to the fullest our greatest natural resource—namely our youth.

The Education and Labor Committee deserves a great deal of credit for the comprehensive bill they have prepared. Ever since January 1954, when I introduced the first bill which provided for a system of scholarships for those with unusual scientific abilities, I have felt very strongly that we must aid those who are intellectually gifted but unable to attend a college or university due to the lack of funds. The first Russian sputnik was the catalyst which finally brought the full attention of the American people to our educational needs—particularly at the higher levels.

The purposes of this bill are to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school. It is designed to accomplish these objectives by, first, establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education; second, providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools; third, establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of lan-

guages; fourth, assisting in the expansion of graduate education; fifth, assisting in the improvement of guidance, counseling and testing programs; sixth, providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes; and, seventh, improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

America is confronted with a serious and continuing challenge in many fields. The challenge—in science, industry, government, military strength, international relations—stems from the forces of totalitarianism. This challenge, as well as our own goal of enlargement of life for each individual, requires the fullest possible development of the talents of our young people. American education, therefore, bears a grave responsiblity in our times.

It is no exaggeration to say that America's progress in many fields of endeavor in the years ahead—in fact, the very survival of our free country—may depend in large part upon the education we provide for our young people now.

A number of provisions in the bill are aimed specifically at reducing the waste of needed talent which results when students with great potential ability drop out of school or college too soon. Several other provisions are designed to encourage an improvement and expansion in the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. Another provision recognizes the need for more college teachers to prepare future scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields.

Although our national security is handicapped by shortages of highly trained persons in all fields of endeavor, many thousands of young people with high ability drop out of high school before graduation or fail to attend college subsequent to graduation. This is a loss not only to these young people, but to the Nation as a whole. The bill provides grants to support improved State and local programs of counseling, guidance, and testing to help identify able students and encourage them to remain in school and achieve their optimum of performance based on their intelligence and aptitude. The bill also provides a program of loans to college and university students to help those who need financial assistance to continue and complete their education.

There are not many men such as Thomas Alva Edison who in spite of poverty and humble beginnings have made such tremendous contributions to mankind. What else might this genius have contributed to the world had he been able to take advantage of the loan provisions of this bill at the age of 18 in the year 1865? How many similarly brilliant intellects have been lost to mankind, and are being lost every day, because of the inability to finance further study? This bill is a great step toward a better educated America.

It is unfortunate that an amendment to the original bill struck out the provisions for a limited program of Federal scholarships. One of the chief criticisms of the scholarship provision seemed to be based on the fact that there are already private foundations as well as States offering scholarships. The main point these critics seemed to ignore is that in spite of this so-called abundance of scholarships, a large percentage of those high-school graduates qualified for college, and capable of contrbuting greatly to this Nation's welfare, do not attend college—mostly due to financial reasons. The vast majority of scholarships do not come anywhere near covering the cost of the individual's college course. This was well pointed out in the report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School:

A recent survey covering 147 representative public and private colleges and universities during the period 1950–54 showed that nearly two-thirds of all scholarships paid less than 20 percent of all the college expenses of the holders. Graduates reported a median total 4-year expenditure of $5,020, of which only 6.4 percent, or $320, came from scholarship funds.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of adequate scholarships, many extremely brilliant individuals are indiscriminately deterred from following the avenues in which they could make their greatest contributions—not because of lack of interest but because of the economic difficulties of their parents. It has been said that it is discriminatory to give one individual a scholarship and another a loan. But, is it not even more discriminatory—against our Nation as a whole—to deny an impoverished individual the right to make his contribution to society?

It is my fervent hope that in the near future we will make even greater strides toward a better educated America by giving each individual the opportunity to fully develop his skills, physical or mental, regardless of his financial status. In this way this Nation will always continue to lead the world in all forms of endeavor.

A Dulles Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the most perceptive and illuminating comments on the current Middle East crisis have been made by the noted columnist, Walter Lippmann. One of his recent articles clearly points out America's present position in this critical area, and I consider it well worth the attention of our colleagues. The article follows:

While we do not know much about the meeting at Peiping over the weekend between the Russians and the Chinese, we do know that it has added a new complication to a summit meeting. Khrushchev's original proposal had the great practical advantage that it looked to the Middle East without raising the problems of the Far East. On this essential point, Gen. de Gaulle's proposal took advantage of what really was an important concession, and offered to meet at the summit without Red China participating.

But our own counter proposal, which insisted upon imbedding a summit meeting in in the Security Council, meant not only that Mao was not to be present but that Chiang had the right to be present and in case there was any voting under the Council's procedure, to exercise a veto.

Now Mr. Dulles has missed the bus, and if there is to be a summit meeting at all, we must expect that in one way or another Mao will have a part in it.

In my own view I am unhappy and apprehensive about the way we are being pushed backward with our minds confused into a summit meeting. For judging by Mr. Dulles' press conference last week he has not cast himself in the role of a statesman who knows that to make progress toward stability in the Middle East he must give as well as take. He is playing the part of a litigating lawyer who hopes to win an argument. He is out to prove first, that the intervention in Lebanon and Jordan was legal. Having been done at the invitation of the legitimate governments, it is not, therefore, aggression. This is undoubtedly true. And second, he means to turn the table, and charge the Russians and the United Arabs with indirect aggression. If someone had tried to devise a formula most likely to set off a rhetorical explosion which will poison the air, he could not have found a more surefire mischiefmaker.

Someone to whom the President will listen should warn him that he will make a great mistake if he thinks that he can dominate the summit conference with charges of indirect aggression. For the truth is that indirect aggression—that is to say, propaganda, infiltration, bribery, subversion—is an old instrument of power politics, and in our time it is the way the cold war is fought. Both sides use it when they think they can do so to their own advantage. It would impair, not enhance, the President's moral credit if he were to become blindly self-righteous, and were to tell a knowing and skeptical world that we do not resort to what he calls indirect aggression and that only our adversaries do.

Panama will be sitting on the Security Council, a living reminder of how the United States obtained the Canal Zone in order to build the canal. Guatemala was only recently the scene of a successful coup, publicly applauded by Mr. Eisenhower himself, to oust an anti-American and fellow traveling government. The President will be reminded of what happened in Iran when Mossadegh was pushed out. Over the whole of the President's denunciation of external interference against existing governments will hang the Dulles theory of the liberation of eastern Europe, and the obvious fact that if we knew a way to overturn the existing governments without the enormous risks of war, we should be only too happy to use that way.

The central fact is that in the cold war today, the opportunities open to our adversaries are much greater than those open to us. For we are opposing three big revolutionary movements—the Russian, the Chinese, and the Arab—which has a potent appeal to the intellectual leaders and to the masses of backward countries. Not all countries are vulnerable to these revolutionary movements. But a great many countries are, and it is in them that indirect aggression works. Governments are not easily overthrown from abroad unless there is already within the country a strong disposition to encourage and to receive external aid.

The thesis, propounded by Mr. Dulles and accepted by Mr. Eisenhower, amounts to a demand that in the weapons of the cold war, our adversaries shall disarm, and in effect acquiesce in their own military containment, as for example, by the remaining members of the Baghdad Pact. Mr. Dulles is telling the President to demand the impossible, and

national policies based on impossible demands are very unwise indeed. They are likely to lead a country into a dilemma where it must choose between a retreat which is humiliating and an advance which may be disastrous.

Mr. Dulles is concerned, and rightly so, by the progress of the revolutionary movement in the Middle East. But he is indulging in a legal daydream, and is in the highest degree unrealistic, if he thinks the President can induce Mr. Khrushchev, or the United Nations, to agree to a legal prohibition that is more than a pious platitude. It is a startling footnote to Mr. Dulles' thesis that having announced his doctrine about indirect aggression on Thursday, he followed it up on Saturday by recognizing the revolutionary government of Iraq, presumably a product of indirect aggression.

The real problem of the western statesmen is to find the ground on which an accommodation can be reached with the revolutionary movements which now dominate so much of Asia, and are reaching into Africa. That ground is not easy to find. But Mr. Dulles, it appears, is not seriously looking for it. He is too busy, too tired, too discouraged, too stale. What Mr. Dulles is doing is to resist and then to retreat, as generals do when they have no better option than to fight a series of rearguard actions.

It is beginning to look as if the President, who has to be carried along by his advisers, needs the help of some fresher minds.

Goal for the Next Congress, Creation of a Commission on Country Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress nears adjournment, it is apparent to me that a tremendously important piece of legislation for the rural communities of our Nation will not be enacted during this session.

This is H. R. 13505, which I was privileged to introduce along with my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Congressman BROOKS HAYS, legislation which would establish a Commission on Country Life to study social and economic changes in rural communities.

I regard it as unfortunate that this Congress has not taken steps to establish a Commission on Country Life. In my remarks today, I intend to discuss at length the value of this proposed Commission, because I feel it should be one of the first orders of business for the next Congress.

One sure way to determine the value of such a commission is to study the trail-blazing accomplishments of a similar commission which existed in the past—a commission which made historic contributions to improved country living as we know it today.

PURPOSE OF THE FIRST COMMISSION

Fifty years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt created a commission of identical purpose and objective. In a special message to Congress transmitting the report of this commission, the President underscored the value and purpose of the group.

The President wrote that the objective of the commission of 1908 was to call the farmer's attention to the opportunities for better business and better living on the farm.

If country life is to become what it should be—

The President added—

and what I believe it ultimately will be—one of the most dignified, desirable and sought-after ways of earning a living—the farmer must take advantage not only of the agricultural knowledge which is at his disposal, but of the methods which have raised and continue to raise the standards of living and of intelligence in other callings.

Those engaged in all other industrial and commercial callings have found it necessary, under modern economic conditions, to organize themselves for mutual advantage and for the protection of their own particular interests in relation to other interests. The farmers of every progressive European country have realized this essential fact and have found in the cooperative system exactly the form of business combination they need.

Now whatever the State may do toward improving the practice of agriculture, it is not within the sphere of any government to recognize the farmers' business or reconstruct the social life of farming communities. It is, however, quite within its powers, which it can control for calling public atttention to the needs and the facts.

The President clearly assessed the accomplishments of the first Commission on Country Life in the same message.

He wrote:

The Commission has tried to help the farmers to see clearly their own problems and to see it as a whole; to distinguish clearly between what the Government can do and what the farmers must do for themselves; and it wishes to bring not only the farmers but the Nation as a whole to realize that the growing of crops, though an essential part, is only a part of country life.

Crop growing is the essential foundation; but it is no less essential that the farmer shall get an adequate return from what he grows; and it is no less essential—indeed it is literally vital—that he and his wife and his children shall lead the right kind of life.

President Roosevelt pointed out in that message that as a result of the Commission's findings—

The United States Department of Agriculture, through which as prime agent the ideas the Commission stands for reach the people, should become without delay in fact a Department of Country Life, fitted to deal not only with crops, but also with all the larger aspects of life in the open country.

The Chief Executive's philosophy in creating this Commission might well be considered as a guide for us who are encouraging a similar Commission to study today's needs.

Our object—

Wrote Theodore Roosevelt—

should be to develop in the country community the great ideals of community life as of personal character.

In listing the great general and immediate needs of country life which stood out in the report, the President said that they included—

Effective cooperation among farmers, to put them on a level with the organized interests with which they do business • • • (and) a better means of communication, including good roads and a parcels post which the country people are everywhere, and rightly, unanimous in demanding.

To these—

He said—

may be added better sanitation, for easily preventable diseases hold several million country people in the slavery of continuous ill health.

Years later, Gifford Pinchot wrote—

The report of the Country Life Commission was the first effective step ever taken in America toward the solution of the rural-life problem.

He pointed out some examples of the progress which came to pass as a direct result of the Commission—advances in farm cooperation, in better roads, better schools, sanitation, and in rural electrification.

Today, the student of rural life can see the enormous good the first Commission was responsible for. The Agricultural Extension Service was a direct outgrowth of the Commission's recommendations as was the movement for better libraries, highways, and more advanced social and cultural outlets.

THE NEED OF A COMMISSION TODAY

The tremendous contributions of Theodore Roosevelt's Commission Country Life serve to point up the need for a commission today. If 1908 country living needed a thorough study and exploration with a view to legislative action, certainly there is even a more urgent necessity for a commission in 1958.

Certainly no Member in this Chamber can deny that enormous changes and shifts in modes of living have occurred in country communities during the past half-century.

Now, what does this bill propose and what objectives would it set out to accomplish?

Under the terms of the bill, a commission on country life would consist of 25 members. Fifteen of these members would be appointed by the President of the United States—and of this number, not more than 9 would be affiliated with the same political party. From this group, the bill provides that the commission would select the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission, from it's membership.

Five members would be appointed by the Vice President of the United States acting as Presiding Officer of the Senate and five by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of these groups of 5, 3 would be from the majority party and 2 from the minority party.

The duties of the Commission would be sixfold.

The Commission would collect data and statistics to illustrate the major trends affecting country community living today.

The Commission would then evaluate the data to isolate the major gaps between the problems of country residents and the organized means to handle their problems.

The Commission would—using interpretations drawn from the data—point out the need for cooperation between the

institutions, agencies, church groups and organizations serving country people.

The Commission would analyze the impact of technological developments on current modes of living—as well as the means of earning a living in the country community.

The Commission would assess the shifting composition of country community population from the basis of social and economic criteria.

Finally the Commission would develop an overall blueprint of approach to be used as a masterplan for legislation and work to improve country living in the future.

Within this framework, many current problems besetting rural communities can be classified and studied, problems such as bettering the standard of living for low-income farm families as well as new marketing techniques and cooperative efforts on the part of community and church agencies to develop solutions.

Mr. Speaker, the time was ripe during this session of Congress for the authorization of such a Commission. The need will even be more crucial by the time the 86th Congress convenes in January.

Support and enthusiastic work for the creation of such a Commission has been widespread.

The National Catholic Rural Life Conferences—an organization within the Roman Catholic Church which is dedicated to the bettering of the social and economic status of rural life has long been in the forefront of any effort to improve rural living.

The Reverend Michael P. Dineen, executive secretary of the NCRLC, wrote me recently stating:

On behalf of the officers and members of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, may we commend you in your efforts to establish a second Presidential Country Life Commission. As you probably know, the NCRLC has supported its establishment from the very beginning and we are most pleased that you are cosponsoring the bill with Mr. HAYS.

Testimony before the House Family Farms Subcommittee shows that the National Council of Churches Committee on Rural Life Commission and the National Lutheran Council are in solid support of this measure.

Mr. E. W. Mueller, representing both organizations, testified that in his view—

This Commission could put into focus and give real stature to the importance of agriculture as a major industry and that the people would need to be concerned that our agricultural economy is sound and that life in the rural community is wholesome and complete.

A prominent and highly regarded daily newspaper in the First Congressional District of Minnesota has added its endorsement to this legislation.

The Albert Lea Daily Tribune commented editorially not long ago that the bill contains a plan from which the entire world could well profit.

The implications are enormous—

The Tribune said—

Out of such a study could come an agriculture prosperous beyond our wildest dreams.

This is a measure that deserves support of the entire United States—rich or poor, rural or urban, Republican or Democrat. It would appear the only loser would be the demagog who prospers from misinformation, distrust, and chaos.

According to the bill, the Commission's life would extend for 2 years—at the conclusion of which it would submit to the President and the Congress its final report which draws the entire body of data together and recommends certain legislation. The Congress and the President—as well as all the people of the Nation—would have, Mr. Speaker, the recommendations and considered thinking of a panel consisting of some of the most brilliant, incisive individuals in the country, representing spiritual, cultural, and economic areas of study.

OUR NATION: A BENEFICIARY

Our Nation would then be the beneficiary of this blueprint for legislation. Thus the work of the Commission would extend into the future—far beyond the time of its original expiration.

If there is a more eloquent argument for this Commission than one written by Theodore Roosevelt, then I have not seen it.

Fifty years ago, the President of the United States voiced the enduring need of the Commission in words that are just as meaningful today as when they were uttered.

I warn my countrymen—

Roosevelt said—

that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness as well as the prosperity of life in the country.

The men and women on farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations; to supply the city with fresh blood; clean bodies and clear brains that can endure the terrific strain of modern life; we need the development of men in the open country who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace.

Hemisphere Summit Meet Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New Orleans States of August 8, 1958, entitled "Hemisphere Summit Meet Sought," and an article from Editor & Publisher of July 26, 1958, entitled "Shop Talk at Thirty," as follows:

[From the New Orleans States of August 8, 1958]

HEMISPHERE SUMMIT MEET SOUGHT

Agreement between Secretary of State Dulles and Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek to seek a summit conference of American Presidents perhaps warrants a "this is where we came in" response.

Following the Dulles-Kubitschek talks, sources at the presidential palace in Brazil said the 21 American Ambassadors will meet in Washington next month. They will arrange the chiefs of state conference which will seek to bind the countries of this hemisphere closer both politically and economically.

It was just 2 years ago that 19 of the 21 American Presidents met in Panama and signed a document which, as we recall, established in principle the same intent.

Said the chiefs of state then:

"The full realization of the destiny of America is inseparable from the economic and social development of its peoples and therefore makes necessary the intensification of national and inter-American cooperative efforts to seek the solution of economic problems and to raise the standards of living of the continent."

Two years ago this month the Organization of American States, seeking to implement the principles of the declaration, met in Buenos Aires.

That conference, however, was an admitted failure. A discouraging pall was cast over hopes for closer harmony among the peoples of the hemisphere.

And that was a meeting which the United States entered with the realization that we had not done our utmost toward advancing hemispheric solidarity; that our surplus farm products disposal program was hurting South America on the world market; that the Latin nations were suffering mounting deficits in their trade with this country; that our neighbors were smarting over being practically disregarded in our aid program.

Those issues and problems were left unresolved in 1956 and, against the background of critical world conditions, we even lost sight of their existence. Consequently disharmony festered.

Now, once again, preparations are under way to convene another meeting of American heads of state.

There are differences this time, though, that may make the conference more productive:

A United States Vice President is mobbed in two South American countries. Communism realizes Latin gains through this country's default. A United States Secretary of State is greeted with "Dulles, go home" shouts in Rio de Janeiro.

The events of the past 2 years, and principally of the past few months, demand that the next American summit meeting bear fruits.

[From Editor & Publisher of July 26, 1958]

SHOP TALK AT 30

(By Robert U. Brown)

If newspapers were guilty of pursuing all the special interests with which they are charged from time to time, they wouldn't have space or time for anything else. They wouldn't be newspapers, they would be puff sheets.

The best defense newspapers have against these charges is to point out the number and variety of the complaints. If they were all justified no one would read a newspaper. If there is ever any justification for the charges they must apply to a small minority of newspapers. But those who criticize the press never give chapter and verse. It is easier to smear all with the same brush.

The latest blast against the press comes this week from the paid lobbyist of the protectionist tariff group. He is O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy which is made up of diversified industries and trades which oppose free-trade fearing recriprocal trade agreements and resulting competition.

In a press release Tuesday, Mr. Strackbein charged that freedom of the press "has been sullied and subverted ignominously by the great metropolitan press in the battle over the reciprocal trade program." He said the predominant press has withheld from the public the facts and reasoning of the opposition, has played up the Government's side "after the manner of a subservient press in a dictatorship."

That's pretty strong language which he justifies by saying the press is a party in interest in the dispute.

"The importation free of duty of the many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of newsprint and woodpulp used by newspapers of this country is something that the newspapers owe, for its preservation, to a duty-free binding agreed to in two trade agreements; and the gratitude shown by the press for this favor engineered by the State Department 20 years ago is a wondrous tribute to the power that Government can gain over the souls of men, purportedly free and honorable, when it knows the chemistry and biology of gratitude."

This allegation is ridiculous. The importation of newsprint has been duty free since 1913. It is asinine to contend that newspapers are paying off a 45-year-old obligation in their treatment of news about the reciprocal trade program. There probably isn't 1 newspaperman in 10 that knows newsprint is duty-free, and there probably isn't 1 in 100 that knows it has been so for 45 years.

Hold That Camel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, no more forceful picture of our Government can be conceived than that of the proverbial camel with its head in the tent. Experience has demonstrated that a program once begun, as an emergency, as an experiment, as a weak or compromise piece of legislation, seldom disappears, but rather, with the head of the beast once in the door of the tent, the camel soon has worked his way completely inside, and things become crowded indeed. Such is the promise of the TVA. The following editorial from the Times Recorder of Zanesville, Ohio, for August 7, 1958, asks Congress to act with caution:

HOLD THAT CAMEL

TVA, the socialistic camel that got its nose in the free enterprise tent awhile back, is doing some more shoving. Senate bill 1869, passed by that body last year, and recently approved by the House Public Works Committee, proposes to expand the service area of this tax-built, tax-consuming (but not tax-produced) power octopus by 25,000 square miles—so that it might logically be called the "Mississippi Valley Authority." Further, and perhaps more devastatingly, it proposes for the first time in the sad history of Government-operated businesses to sell bonds ($750 million worth) to the investing public and incidentally bypass congressional control.

With the passage of this bill, Uncle Sam would be giving the taxpayers the back of his hand, since it would wipe out the present requirement that TVA repay to the Treasury in 40 years the $1.2 billion of tax money now owed. Repayment would only be made after the bondholders' claims are paid, and TVA could use its power revenues (which should go to the Treasury) to build still more producing capacity without congressional approval.

It does not take much imagination to see this camel (which we might as well start calling the Mississippi Lower Authority) kicking the whole private tax-paying electric power industry out of the tent. With the continuance of such unbridled expansion there can be no other outcome. And yet, that is but the beginning of the end. With electric power generation completely in Federal hands, the "nationalization" (a nice word for seizure) of all industry and all business would logically follow. The planners doubtless have the details worked out now—a progression of control so gradual we would never be quite sure at what point, or on what day, we finally became slaves.

Congress, to save its own waning prestige and to check the erosion of its powers by the williwaws from the White House and the snows from the Supreme Court, should arise in whatever might it still possesses and reject legislation degrading to that body. But the Senate has already passed this bill. And unless there are cries of outrage from home, the House, stricken with adjournment fever, will pass it—and quickly.

But Americans who cherish any hopes for capitalism, to say nothing of ever getting the Government out of business, must not let this happen.

Retirement Eyed by Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, kindly, patient, and understanding, Mrs. Marie Tinsley Smith, who has served San Leandro so faithfully, will finish a chapter of her life when she goes into retirement.

Leona Ward, colorful and capable writer of the Hayward Daily Review, reports on the story of her life, service, and accomplishments in the following article published on August 5, 1958:

RETIREMENT EYED BY LIBRARIAN

(By Leona Ward)

SAN LEANDRO.—On November 1, just 20 years to the day since she came to San Leandro as city librarian, Mrs. Marie Tinsley Smith will retire.

Her term of service, marked by the city's phenomenal growth, has seen the library expand from a tiny reading room with a few hundred volumes and one librarian, to an institution with 67,000 volumes and a staff of 23.

Soon a $1.5 million modern community library and cultural center will replace the 40-year-old outworn and outgrown library structure on grounds that include the present site at 302 Estudillo Avenue.

"I am content to leave," says Mrs. Smith, "with a beautiful building to become a reality in 1960, with so many dreams come true in the matter of service and personnel, and with the city growing so rapidly and yet so well."

RICH HERITAGE

Behind her Mrs. Smith will leave a rich heritage of western lore—a collection of hundreds of volumes of what she calls California. Actually they cover all the Western States: Washington, Oregon, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The beautiful and rare books she loves, now crowded into makeshift shelves, will one day find themselves in the spacious California room of the new library.

"There they'll have ample space to preen themselves," she said.

"There people may browse and enjoy them, beautiful bindings, fine print, rare illustrations, and especially the contents—all the glamor and adventure of life in the thirties, forties, and fifties, when a new State was struggling to be born."

All California books are interesting to her, whether acquired through routine channels or discovered like a rare stone in a pile of rubble.

People moving away often call the library to come and get some books. Always, fingers crossed, Mrs. Smith has hastened to comply.

HISTORY BOOK

"Sometimes there has lurked among the boxes of old books a rare book on California history or an emigrant's journal, and we have rejoiced."

For example: When an old time residence was leveled to make room for the new Lucky Store, there was Harlan's "California '46 to '88"—a proud addition to the library collection.

A cherished part of the collection is William Heath Davis' Sixty Years in California and Seventy-five Years in California. Hence, when a young man doing research on Davis' life sought out Mrs. Smith for help, it was her pleasure to refer him to Davis' daughter, Miss Lilly Davis, then living across the street from the library.

When later, Andre F. Rolle released his book, William Heath Davis, Mrs. Smith made haste to acquire it—with a "strangely exciting feeling of having helped in a small way to produce it."

Big Oak Flat Road is another in which Mrs. Smith shared the authors' jubilation, having watched Mrs. Emil Schlichtmann of San Leandro (Mrs. Schlichtmann and Mrs. Paden, coauthors) through some of the preliminary research in the library.

R. R. Stuart, who wrote a history of San Leandro while she looked over his shoulder, helped her to acquire Mrs. Mae Helen Bacon Boggs' book "My Playhouse was a Concord Coach," an astounding collection of newspaper clippings and other material on those who made California history between 1822-88.

Excitement is a mild word for the feelings that beset her when she opened a parcel one day from the head of a historical society in the valley. Inside was a Thompson and West atlas of Alameda County containing a map of early San Leandro which the curator thought seemed more suitable in this vicinity.

Inherited from her predecessor was a rare set of leatherbound works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, a gift from A. B. Cary, son of J. K. Cary, donor of the library site.

One last gift that is particularly meaningful in the library collection came from Mr. and Mrs. George Helms (she's a 36-year veteran on the library board of trustees). It is the Pony Express published at Placerville, from the first copy of volume 1, June 1839.

Under the subject Good Topics To Browse In, Mrs. Smith has her Western Americana library cataloged as follows: Story of California's Constitution and Laws; Fun and Recreation in Early California; Entertainment in California; Beauty Spots; Big Trees, Oldest Things on Earth; Water and Power; Cable Cars in the San Francisco Hills; California's Medical Story; Agriculture; the Chinese in San Francisco; Vigilantes; Mormons; Pine Presses and Newspaper Men; Cattle Industry; Cattle Trails; Trappers and Trailblazers; Women as Pioneers; Early Doctors;

Outlaws and Crime; Hawaiian History; The Northwest and Its Opening; The Donner Party; Missions of California; Gold Rush Days; The Wine Industry; Architecture; International Expositions; Gardening; Pony Express; Overland Mail; Artists in the West; Early Transportation; Railroads and Their Builders; Santa Fe Trail; Sacajawea and the Lewis and Clark Party; Spanish Period in California History; Junipero Serra and the Padres; Educational Institutions; History of Banking in California; History of Bench and Bar in California; Russians in California; French; Chinese; Old Spanish Ranchos; San Francisco, Glamorous City; California Writers; Political Leaders; Intrepid Travelers.

Carrying the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the East Texas, the official publication of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce. The author, Hubert Harrison, was executive director for 30 years, serving tirelessly the East Texas community. His short graphic analysis of the meaning of a stamp is typical of his thoughtful understanding and expression, which his many friends will always remember:

CARRYING THE MAIL
(By Hubert M. Harrison, Dallas, Tex.)

American business has developed a pride in getting the job done well, which reflects itself in our marvelous progress.

In the oilfields the common expression for doing a good job is "carrying the mail." There is in this an implied compliment to the American postal system that is not usually recognized. In spite of storms, icy roads, broken wires, raging blizzards, or blazing heat, the mail must go through.

A stamp is the world's greatest bargain. It is an investment in a miracle of modern efficiency. One stamp commands the efforts of countless thousands of men and women throughout this Nation and other nations, who carry the mail to the ends of the earth, on foot, horseback, dogsleds, in automobiles, trucks, trains, ships, and airplanes. A stamp is the magic cachet that carries its message of love to the home circle from the absent one; it will rekindle celestial fires on the altar of a mother's heart; it will convey comfort and cheer to the sick; it will encourage the downhearted; it will inspire the slothful; it will cheer the almost forgotten friend; it will steal into the home where there is the hush of death and help to soften the blow of crushing sorrow; it will recall the absent son to the ideals learned at his mother's knee; it will bring laughter and joy to the saddened heart; it will carry your thoughtful message of congratulations in an eventful hour; it will start in motion a chain of human contacts that will promote projects and change the life of a community.

With a stamp you can conjure miracles and summon to your service a train of minions that march like an army with banners. With a stamp you can play upon the strings of some understanding heart with that priceless gift of congenial and sympathetic communion with an absent friend.

All this you can buy with a stamp.

You Can't Eat Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the Anderson Independent of August 11, 1958, entitled "A Negro Leader Cites the Facts; Says 'You can't Eat Integration.'"

The editorial is based on writings of Davis Lee, a Negro newspaper publisher and editor, who says, among other things:

If the liberals and agitators are the Negro's friend and southern whites are his enemies, then someone needs to protect him from his friends.

In addition, Lee says that Negroes cannot eat integration.

The Anderson Independent sums up its editorial most appropriately with the comment that Lee's views are widely prevalent among the level-headed Negroes in all walks of life, contrary to the professional propagandizers and paid agitators of the NAACP.

Mr. President, no truer words were said regarding the situation in my State. Were it not so, then we would be having the same terrible riots and race problems that we have seen in other places in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEGRO LEADER CITES THE FACTS; SAYS "YOU CAN'T EAT INTEGRATION"

Davis Lee is the publisher of a number of Negro newspapers, including the Herald, which appears weekly in Anderson.

Recently he is reported to have spoken in Anderson at a meeting at Delia Street Holiness Church, and is quoted as saying:

"Better citizenship is more than registering and voting. You must become a part of the community in which you live and assume the responsibility of good citizenship."

And editorially he had timely comment on the integration-segregation issue which has threatened to destroy long standing friendships.

"The liberals who are frothing at the mouth and shedding crocodile tears over the plight of the poor Negro in the South, will gladly offer him integration, but won't give him a job or provide his family with clothing or bread.

"The southerners don't want him to have integration, but they will gladly give him a job, and help clothe and feed his family.

"The liberals will open their schools to Negro children, but they won't hire many Negroes as teachers. The South won't admit the Negro children to its schools, but they will give the Negro his own school manned by teachers of his own race. And all of this is given without cost.

"There are forms of segregation that are degrading and humiliating, but to have one's own school and teachers is not one of them. Giving the Negro his own school and teachers is more in keeping with that concept of freedom, just and equal opportunity that the Founding Fathers had in mind than an integrated system of education."

Publisher Lee continued:

"Not once during our existence has the South attempted to tell the people of the North, East, and West how to run their schools, churches, etc., and in no section of this country does the Negro enjoy the educational, employment and economic opportunities which he enjoys in the South.

"The labor unions are pouring thousands of dollars into this integration movement, yet southern Negroes are working at jobs that northern Negroes cannot get, because the unions will not accept them as members.

"There are more Negro carpenters, bricklayers and building contractors in North and South Carolina than there are in the 33 integrated States. Negroes can't eat integration. They need jobs. They need the opportunity to develop their talents, skills, and abilities in fields of their own choosing. The South is the only section in this Nation that offers such opportunities.

"If these liberals and agitators are the Negro's friend and southern whites are his enemies, then someone needs to protect him from his friends."

Lee's views prevail widely among level-headed Negroes in all walks of life, contrary to the professional propagandizers and paid agitators of the NAACP.

Why the United States Must Continue Its Nonrecognition of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time one hears various arguments being advanced that the United States Government would be more realistic and intelligent in serving its own long-range interests if it were to give official recognition to the Communist regime in Peiping and support its admission to the United Nations. The President and the Secretary of State have repeatedly stated the reasons why such action would, on the contrary, be completely unrealistic and a dangerous disservice to our interests to those of our allies in the Far East and to freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

A comprehensive reexamination of the arguments pro and con has just been released by the State Department. It makes crystal clear that our Government's position is not based on emotionalism over Korea, or blindness to facts, or sheer stubbornness, as sometimes charged; it is based on the most realistic recognition and hardheaded evaluation of all the facts, including the key fact of the behavior of the Chinese Communist government. It stubbornly refuses to change its international conduct so as to qualify for recognition or admission to the United Nations. It is its own actions, not ours, that keep it excluded.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the State Department memorandum is included:

Policy toward Communist China has been an important issue since the Communists came to power there, and it is of critical significance to the United States and the free world today. In the United States the

issue is a very real one to the vast majority of the people. As a result of Korean and Chinese Communist aggression in Korea, the United States suffered 142,000 casualties, bringing tragedy to communities all over the country. Nevertheless, despite the emotions thus engenered and the abhorrence of the American people for the brutality and utter lack of morality of Communist systems, the policy of the United States Government towards China has necessarily been based on objective considerations of national interest. It also reflects a continuing appraisal of all available facts.

Basically the United States policy of not extending diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime in China proceeds from the conviction that such recognition would produce no tangible benefits to the United States or to the free world as a whole and would be of material assistance to Chinese Communist attempts to extend Communist domination throughout Asia. It is not an inflexible policy which cannot be altered to meet changed conditions. If the situation in the Far East were so to change in its basic elements as to call for a radically different evaluation of the threat Chinese Communist policies pose to United States and free world security interests, the United States would of course readjust its present policies. However, the course of events in the Far East since the establishment of the Chinese Communist regime in 1949 has thus far confirmed the United States view that its interests and those of the free world are best served by withholding diplomatic recognition from the regime in Peiping.

The basic considerations on which United States policy toward China rests are twofold. First, the Soviet bloc, of which Communist China is an important part, is engaged in a long-range struggle to destroy the way of life of the free countries of the world and bring about the global dominion of communism. The Chinese Communist regime has made no secret of its fundamental hostility to the United States and the free world as a whole nor of its avowed intention to effect their downfall. Today its defiance of and attacks on the non-Communist world have reached a level of intensity that has not been witnessed since the Korean war. The second basic factor is that East Asia is peculiarly vulnerable to the Communist offensive because of the proximity of the free countries of that area to Communist China, the inexperience in self-government of those which have recently won their independence, their suspicions of the West inherited from their colonial past, and the social, political, and economic changes which inevitably accompany their drive toward modernization.

The Chinese Communists see the victory of communism in Asia as inevitable; and now that they control the vast population and territory of mainland China they are utilizing the advantages these give to encompass their ends. Chinese Communist leaders have shown by their words and their acts that they are not primarily interested in promoting the welfare of their people while living at peace with their neighbors. Their primary purpose is to extend the Communist resolution beyond their borders to the rest of Asia and thence to the rest of the world. Liu Shao-chi, the second-ranking member of the Chinese Communist Party has said: "The most fundamental and common duty of Communist Party members is to establish communism and transform the present world into a Communist world." Mao Tse-tung himself has said that his regime's policy is "to give active support to the national independence and liberation movements in countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." That these are not empty words was shown by Chinese Communist aggression in Korea and provision of arms and other assistance to the Communist rebels in Indochina.

United States policy in Asia, as elsewhere in the world, is to promote the domestic welfare and to strengthen the independence of free nations. Because of the proximity of many Asian nations to mainland China and the disparity in size and power between them and Communist China, this can be done only if the Communist threat is neutralized. The first need of United States policy in the Far East is to deter Communist aggression, else the free nations would be in grave danger of succumbing to Communist pressures before they had gathered the strength with which to resist them. The United States has sought to accomplish this by military assistance to the nations directly in the path of Chinese Communist expansion—Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam—and by a system of mutual defense arrangements with other nations of the area. We have been successful in this effort and since 1954 the Chinese Communists have not been able to make further gains through the open use of military force.

The measures the United States and its allies in Asia have taken to preserve the security of the free nations of the area are of vital interest to the other free nations of the world. Loss of the rest of East Asia to communism could have a disastrous effect on the free world's ability to resist effectively the encroachments of communism elsewhere. The consequences for Australia and New Zealand would be especially serious. Loss of the islands of the West Pacific and of the Southeast Asian peninsula would isolate these countries and place them in a strategically exposed and dangerous position.

Efforts to halt further Communist expansion cannot be confined to military deterrence alone. Countermeasures against Chinese Communist subversion and political infiltration are equally necessary. This is especially so as, since 1955, Peiping has increasingly resorted to propaganda, subversion, "people's diplomacy," and political maneuvering in its dealings with its Asian neighbors. Pieping seeks to win by this means what it apparently does not dare attempt through military conquest. The United States therefore considers that in preserving the peace and security of Asia it is as important to be alert to the threat of subversion as to that of open military attack.

In the effort to block Peiping's attempts to extend Communist rule in Asia the withholding of diplomatic recognition is an important factor. The extension of diplomatic recognition by a great power normally carries with it not only increased access to international councils but enhanced international standing and prestige as well. Denial of recognition on the other hand is a positive handicap to the regime affected and one which makes it that much the more difficult for it to pursue its foreign policies with success. One basic purpose of United States nonrecognition of Communist China is to deny it these advantages and to that extent limit its ability to threaten the security of the area.

In the case of China there are special considerations which influence United States policy with regard to recognition. For one thing, although the Chinese Communists have seized the preponderant bulk of China, they have not completed their conquest of the country. The generally recognized legitimate Government of China continues to exist and in Taiwan is steadily developing its political, economic and military strength. The Government of the Republic of China controls the strategic island of Taiwan and through its possession of a sizable military force—one of the largest on the side of the free world in Asia—presents a significant deterrent to renewed Chinese Communist aggression. Recognition of Communist China by the United States would seriously cripple, if not destroy altogether, that Government On the other hand, continued United States recognition and support of the Republic of China enables it to challenge the claim of the Chinese Communists to represent the Chinese people and keeps alive the hopes of those Chinese who are determined eventually to free their country of Communist rule.

Recognition of Communist China by the United States would have an adverse effect on the other free governments of Asia which could be disastrous to the cause of the free world in that part of the world. Those nations which are closely allied to the United States and are striving to maintain their independence on the perimeter of Chinese Communist power, especially Korea and Vietnam, would be profoundly confused and demoralized. They would interpret such action as abandonment of their cause by the United States. They might reason that their only hope for survival lay in desperate measures, not caring whether these threatened the peace of the area and the world. Governments farther removed from the borders of China would see in American recognition of Communist China the first step in the withdrawal of the United States from the Far East. Without the support of the United States they would be unable long to defy the will of Peiping; and some would probably conclude that their wisest course would be speedily to seek the best terms obtainable from Peiping. Needless to say, these developments would place the entire free world position in Asia in the gravest peril.

Another special consideration in the case of China is that large and influential overseas Chinese communities exist in most of the countries of southeast Asia. The efforts of these countries to build healthy free societies and to develop their economies would be seriously retarded if these communities were to fall under the sway of the Chinese Communists; and a grave threat of Communist subversion through these overseas communities would arise. Recognition of Communist China by the United States and the decline in the fortunes of the Republic of China which would inevitably result would have such a profound psychological effect on the overseas Chinese that it would make inevitable the transfer of the loyalties of large numbers to the Communist side. This in turn would undermine the ability of the host countries to resist the pressures tending to promote the expansion of Chinese Communist influence and power.

Still another factor which must be considered in the case of China is the effect which recognition of the Communist regime would have on the United Nations. Recognition of Peiping by the United States would inevitably lead to the seating of Peiping in that body. In the view of the United States this would vitiate, if not destroy, the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace. The Korean war was the first and most important effort to halt aggression through collective action in the United Nations. For Communist China, one of the parties against which the effort of the United Nations was directed, to be seated in the United Nations while still unpurged of its aggression and defying the will of the United Nations in Korea, would amount to a confession of failure on the part of the United Nations and would greatly reduce the prospects for future successful action by the United Nations against aggression. Moreover, the Republic of China is a charter member in good standing of the United Nations and its representatives there have contributed importantly to the constructive work of that organization. If the representatives of the Chinese Communist regime were to be seated in their place and given China's veto in the Security Council,

the ability of that body in the future to discharge the responsibility it has under the charter for the maintaining of international peace and security would be seriously impaired.

Those who advocate recognition of the Chinese Communists often assume that by the standards of international law applied to such cases the Peiping regime is entitled to diplomatic recognition. In the view of the United States diplomatic recognition is a privilege and not a right. Moreover, the United States considers that diplomatic recognition is an instrument of national policy which it is both its right and its duty to use in the enlightened self-interest of the Nation. However, there is reason to doubt that even by the tests often cited in international law the Chinese Communist regime qualifies for diplomatic recognition. It does not rule all China, and there is a substantial force in being which contests its claim to do so. The Chinese Communist Party, which holds mainland China in its grip, is a tiny minority comprising less than 2 percent of the Chinese people, and the regimentation, brutal repression, and forced sacrifices that have characterized its rule have resulted in extensive popular unrest. To paraphrase Thomas Jefferson's dictum, this regime certainly does not represent "the will of the populace, substantially declared." Finally, it has shown no intention to honor its international obligations. One of its first acts was to abrogate the treaties of the Republic of China except those it chose to continue. On assuming power it carried out a virtual confiscation without compensation of the properties of foreign nationals, including immense British investments notwithstanding the United Kingdom's prompt recognition of it. It has failed to honor various commitments entered into since, including various provisions of the Korean Armistice and the Geneva accord on Vietnam and Laos, as well as the "agreed announcement of September 1955," by which it pledged itself to permit all Americans in China to return home expeditiously.

The United States policy toward recognition of Communist China is then based on a carefully considered judgment of the national interest. Nonrecognition of Peiping, coupled with continued recognition and support of the Republic of China, facilitates the accomplishment of United States policy objectives in the Far East. Recognition of Peiping would seriously hinder accomplishment of these objectives and would facilitate the advance of Communist power in Asia.

In the process of determining its policy toward China the United States has taken into account the various statements and arguments advanced by proponents of extending diplomatic recognition to Peiping. One of the most commonly advanced reasons for recognition is that reality must be recognized and 600 million people cannot be ignored. While superficially appealing both statements themselves overlook the realities of the situation. United States policy is, of course, based on full appreciation of the fact that the Chinese Communist regime is currently in control of mainland China. However, it is not necessary to have diplomatic relations with a regime in order to deal with it. Without extending diplomatic recognition the United States has participated in extended negotiations with Chinese Communist representatives, in the Korean and Indochina armistice negotiations and more recently in the ambassadorial talks in Geneva. Similarly, United States policy in no sense ignores the existence and the aspirations of the Chinese people. Its attitude toward the people of China remains what it historically has been, one of friendship and sympathetic understanding. It is nonetheless clear that our friendship for the Chinese people must not be permitted to blind us to the threat to our security which the Communist regime in China now presents. Moreover, the United States is convinced that the Chinese Communist regime does not represent the true will or aspirations of the Chinese people and that our policy of withholding recognition from it is in actuality in their ultimate interest.

It is sometimes contended that by recognition of Communist China it would be possible to exert leverage on the Peiping regime which might ultimately be successful in weakening or even breaking the bond with Moscow. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to support this belief and there are important reasons why it is unlikely. The alliance between Moscow and Peiping is one of long standing; it traces its origin to the very founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921, in which representatives of the Comintern played an important role. It is based on a common ideology and on mutually-held objectives with respect to the non-Communist world. All recent evidence points to the closeness of the tie between the Chinese Communists and the U. S. S. R. rather than in the other direction. The Chinese Communists were outspoken in championing the armed intervention of the Soviets in Hungary and have given unqualified endorsement to the execution of Nagy and the other leaders of the Hungarian revolt. They were also leaders in the recent Communist bloc attack on Yugoslavia for its attempts to pursue national policies independent of Kremlin control. These and other facts make it apparent that the two partners in the Sino-Soviet alliance clearly realize their mutual dependence and attach great importance to bloc unity vis-a-vis the free world.

Furthermore, the alliance with the U. S. S. R. has a special importance for the Chinese Communists since it provides them with a dependable source of arms and military supplies. The Chinese Communist leaders, including Mao Tse-tung himself, came to power through their command of military force. They are therefore keenly conscious of the importance of military force to keep themselves in power against domestic and external opposition and to achieve the goals of their foreign policy. It is scarcely credible that they would dare risk any course of action which could lead to loss of their source of military supplies. For this reason alone, it would seem unrealistic to believe that recognition of Peiping by the United States or any other leading nation would have the effect of tempting the Chinese Communists to play a "Titoist" role.

In fact the opposite is quite likely to be the result. Were the United States to grant diplomatic recognition to Peiping—with all that this would entail by way of enhanced international prestige—its leaders would most likely feel confirmed in the correctness of their policies and the advantages of continued close cooperation with Moscow.

It is often alleged that recognition of Communist China is a necessary step in expanding trade relations with that country. For the United States this is, of course, not a consideration, since the United States embargoes trade with Peiping under the Trading With the Enemy Act as a result of the Korean war. But even for countries which so desire to expand trade with mainland China, the facts do not support the contention that trade is dependent on recognition. To the contrary, Great Britain, which recognized Communist China in 1950, has found that she buys more goods from Communist China than Communist China buys from her. West Germany on the other hand does not recognize Peiping and enjoys a favorable trade balance with the mainland China. In any case, trade opportunities with Communist China are severely limited by a shortage of foreign exchange which is likely to persist for many years to come. Moreover, such trade would always be at the mercy of Communist policies. Peiping uses trade as a means of exerting pressure on the trading partner whenever it deems this to be expedient. A striking example is the case of Japan, where the Chinese Communists recently retaliated against Japanese refusal to make certain political concessions by cutting off all trade and even canceling contracts which had already been entered into. It would therefore seem that over the long run the advantages of trade with Peiping will prove more ephemeral than real.

An argument often heard is that the Chinese Communists are here "to stay"; that they will have to be recognized sooner or later; and that it would be the course of wisdom to bow to the inevitable now rather than be forced to do so ungracefully at a later date. It is true that there is no reason to believe that the Chinese Communist regime is on the verge of collapse; but there is equally no reason to accept its present rule in mainland China as permanent. In fact unmistakable signs of dissatisfaction and unrest in Communist China have appeared in the "ideological remodeling" and the mass campaign against "rightists" which have been in progress during the past year. Dictatorships often create an illusion of permanence from the very fact that they suppress and still all opposition, and that of the Chinese Communists is no exception to this rule. The United States holds the view that communism's rule in China is not permanent and that it one day will pass. By withholding diplomatic recognition from Peiping it seeks to hasten that passing.

In public discussions of China policy one of the proposals that has attracted widest attention is that known as the "two China solution." Briefly, advocates of this arrangement propose that the Chinese Communist regime be recognized as the government of mainland China while the government of Taipei remains as the legal government of Taiwan. They argue that this approach to the Chinese problem has the merit of granting the Communist only what they already control while retaining for the free world the militarily strategic bastion of Taiwan. However, it overlooks or ignores certain facts of basic importance. The Republic of China would not accept any diminution of its sovereignty over China and could be expected to resist such an arrangement with all the means at its disposal. If a "two China solution" were to be forcefully imposed against its will, that government's effectiveness as a loyal ally to the free world cause would be destroyed. Peiping too would reject such an arrangement. In fact over the past year Chinese Communist propaganda has repeatedly and stridently denounced the "two Chinas" concept and, ironically, has been accusing the United States Government of attempting to put it into effect. Peiping attaches great importance to the eventual acquisition of Taiwan and has consistently reserved what it calls its "right" to seize Taiwan by force if other means fail. There is no prospect that it would ever acquiesce in any arrangement which would lead to the permanent detachment of Taiwan from China.

The "two Chinas" concept is bitterly opposed by both Peiping and Taipei. Hence, even if such a solution could be imposed by outside authority, it would not be a stable one. Constant policing would be required to avert its violent overthrow by one side or the other.

It is sometimes said that nonrecognition of Peiping tends to martyrize the Chinese Communists, thereby enabling them to pose, especially before Asian neutralists, as an innocent and injured party. It would be impossible to deny that there is some truth in this. But this disadvantage is far outweighed by the disadvantages that would result from following the opposite course. It

is surely better that some neutralists, who are either unable or unwilling to comprehend the threat inherent in Chinese Communist policies, mistakenly consider Peiping unjustly treated than that the allies of the United States in Asia, who are the first line of defense against Chinese Communist expansion, should be confused and demoralized by what to them could only appear to be a betrayal of the common cause.

Forty-five non-Communist countries recognize the Republic of China. Only 19 have recognized Peiping, and most of these did so before the Korean War in 1950. Recognition by a leading free world nation would therefore be interpreted as an important victory for the Chinese Communists, as a sign of free world reluctance to stand up to Communist pressures, and as damaging evidence of a serious difference of opinion within the free world concerning the problem of how to deal with the expansionist forces of international communism. It would have an especially serious effect in the Far East where the free world nations most directly exposed to Chinese Communist expansionist pressures would be dismayed and confused and some would no doubt be tempted to follow suit for fear of being left alone in the face of Communist power. Nations in other areas of the world whose governments are less conscious of the critical nature of the situation in the Far East and less immediately affected by developments in that area might follow the example thus set. The inevitable consequence of recognition of the Chinese Communist regime by other free nations would be greatly to enhance its prestige, influence, and power and to make more difficult the effort to maintain free world security interests in the Pacific area.

Private Development of Power in Sonoma County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, The Geysers of Sonoma County will soon be used to drive low pressure steam-driven electric generators to produce electric power.

This fact is covered in an excellent editorial in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat, which I submit for the information of my colleagues. This editorial very cogently points out:

While the politicians in Congress have effectively blocked President Eisenhower's partnership idea for private development of power through sale of the use of falling water at Government-owned dams, private enterprise has not been so reluctant. At the Vallecitos atomic plant, the utility company buys steam in an atomic reactor by General Electric. At The Geysers it will buy steam explored for and brought to the surface by a company formed by private risk capital.

This represents another first which has been pioneered, not by socialized power agencies, but by private companies. It won't please the self-appointed guardians of the peoples' resources whose Federal or nothing policy calls for only Federal development of our natural resources. They seem to say that only the Federal Government should develop power from Trinity falling water, from the atom, or probably even from steam that comes out of the ground.

But in their zeal to cater to the favored few they neglect to consider the interests of all the people.

In the case of Trinity, if the Federal Government builds the power facilities the favored few only will benefit and to the direct detriment of all the people.

The Sacramento Utility District is now getting almost three-fourths of the power generated by the Central Valley project in which all the people have invested some three-quarters of a billion dollars. Now these self-appointed guardians want the Federal Government to build the Trinity power facilities so that this same SMUD can get another slice of Federal power—and below its actual cost of production.

Testimony before the congressional committee on the Trinity partnership proposal, which is embodied in my bill, H. R. 6997, left no doubt that a big bulk of Federal Trinity power would go to SMUD at less than its cost of production. Under my bill the benefits from Trinity falling water would truly accrue to all the people—all the consumers of electric energy in northern California, not just SMUD—all the Federal taxpayers, all the water users of the Central Valley project, and all the State and local taxpayers.

Maybe it is time to unmask these Federal-or-nothing advocates and self-appointed guardians of all the people and see just what really motivates them.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial of July 28 from the Santa Rosa Press Democrat:

P. G. & E.'s NEW PARTNER

Pacific Gas & Electric Co., first power company to commercially generate electricity using atomic power as a source of energy, will also be the first in the United States to utilize natural steam to drive generators.

The atomic plant at Vallecitos involved pushing through to new frontiers of science. The natural steam plant at The Geysers, Sonoma County, will, to some extent, resemble returning to the horse-and-buggy days of electric power. It's probably been a generation since a low-pressure steam-driven generator has been built in the United States. But that's the sort of steam nature originates at the Geysers and the generator will be tailored to fit the supply.

Power to drive electric generators, like gold, seems to be where you find it. And like gold, it's usually found by those who are not afraid to try something new. P. G. & E. variously uses falling water, steam generated by burning fuel oil, steam generated by burning gas, steam generated by atomic power, and now steam generated by Mother Nature.

While the politicians in Congress have effectively blocked President Eisenhower's partnership idea for private development of power through sale of the use of falling water at Government-owned dams, private enterprise has not been so reluctant. At the Vallecitos atomic plant, the utility company buys steam in an atomic reactor by General Electric. At the Geysers it will buy steam explored for and brought to the surface by a company formed by private risk-capital.

In all probability, when all the risks have been taken, politicians seeking office will start to yell loudly that electricity generated by atomic power should belong to all the people and be manufactured only by a Government agency—and that steam that comes out of the ground falls in the same category.

One fatal defect to progress under socialism lies in the fact that socialism is operated by bureaucrats—and a bureaucrat feels his job is safer if he sticks to routine and does no experimenting or seeking for improvement.

The only areas of major power shortages in this country are where Federal agencies own and operate the power generators. Every new and less costly development in the manufacture of power has been pioneered, not by the socialized power agencies, but by private companies.

But that won't keep the self-appointed guardians of the people's resources from trying to take over, once private enterprise has taken the risks, found the answers, and developed new types of power generation.

Equal Opportunity for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, we have indeed suffered many disastrous and discouraging diplomatic and propaganda defeats at the hands of Soviet Russia. These too-often-repeated disasters have seriously depreciated our prestige in and claim of leadership among the free nations. We call ill afford another major defeat by the Kremlin, particularly in the field of propaganda against our claim and desire for leadership in the areas of economic development and social justice. Unhappily, most authorities agree we are gravely threatened with such further defeat unless a federally encouraged effective program to alleviate national conditions of substantial unemployment in certain economically depressed areas is promptly initiated.

Over the past decade increasing evidence has developed to convincingly demonstrate that our vaunted boast of having the highest living standards anywhere is in danger of being exploded and exploited as another American capitalistic myth. May Divine Providence, a determined Congress, and a united people, forbid.

It is most unhappily apparent that substantial economic decline is visiting increasing hardship and lowering the living standards in large areas of the country, particularly in New England, along the eastern seaboard, and in certain southern sections. There are varied causes for this catastrophe but principal among them are the migration of industry from New England, technological changes, such as those affecting the coal industry, and the disjointed advantages, through our foreign trade program, given to foreign competitors of multitudinous domestic industries.

All of these causes add up to chronic unemployment and permanently distressed areas which present a double threat against our internal development and our external security. Our internal development has been based on a constantly growing domestic market and

that development will obviously be sabotaged if buying power is taken away from large numbers of our people. Faith in our external security has been based upon the idea of being always able to realize and utilize our full productive strength and resources and that security is obviously threatened if a great many willing wage workers can not engage in our national production effort.

Clearly then, chronic unemployment and permanent depression anywhere in our economy is a subject of national concern and primarily so in this emergency struggle with Russia.

Responding to this challenge, in patriotic thought and purpose, a great many Members, including myself, have filed legislative proposals designed to forestall and prevent this economic tragedy.

Substantially all these proposals provide for the creation of an Area Redevelopment Administration, to formulate and project an overall industrial rejuvenation program, in cooperation with local authorities, for those distressed areas suffering from persistent and enlarging unemployment.

In summary this program would include loans for industrial projects, grants for public facilities, and financial assistance, through the cooperation of the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, to expand vocational training programs.

Most of these provisions, with added features, are contained in the Senate passed bill, S. 3683, now waiting upon our action in the House. At stake is our continuing national well-being and high morale, our world reputation of providing equal opportunity for all our citizens, and our ability to defend ourselves and assume the offensive in the vitally important propaganda battle with Russia. I most earnestly urge that this measure will be presented to and adopted by this House before any further idea of adjournment is entertained.

Invasions of Rights of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 29, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, advances in the field of electronics in perfecting eavesdropping devices offer frightening possibilities for the invasion of our right of privacy. If permitted to continue unabated, it could bring about much sooner the situation predicted by Orwell for "1984".

Our constitutionally guaranteed freedoms leave no room for big brothers to watch our actions and to listen in on our every conversation.

The statement a short while ago by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the Bureau had in operation 90 telephone taps was most disturbing. The Federal Communications Act specifically forbids such action on the part of anyone regardless of position or motive. If this country is to remain a government of laws and not of men then those sworn to uphold the law and engaged in its enforcement must themselves abide by the law.

We must be concerned with the example such illegal actions on the part of law enforcement officials may have on others. Recently, an investigator for one of the subcommittees of this body decided to emulate the FBI example and "bug" a private hotel room. While this action was immediately denounced by the subcommittee when it came to light, nevertheless, the incident does serve to show how debasing of moral values can be the example of lawlessness on the part of law enforcers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from the Washington Post with respect to both these matters.

THE LAW AND THE FBI

When FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover acknowledged in a filmed television interview on Sunday that his Bureau was operating 90 telephone wiretaps across the country, he in effect pleaded guilty to 90 violations of Federal law. The tapping of telephone wires is a crime. It is a crime whether done by private detectives for purposes of blackmail or by the FBI for purposes, as Mr. Hoover put it, of keeping tabs on internal security cases. Congress, in 1934, adopted the Federal Communications Act with a section 605, providing that:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

And when the Department of Justice argued that this statute applied only to private persons, not to Government officers, the Supreme Court ruled unequivocally in 1937 that:

"The plain words of 605 forbid anyone, unless authorized by the sender, to intercept a telephone message, and direct in equally clear language that no person shall divulge or publish the message or its substance to any person."

The pretext on which the FBI has violated the Federal Communications Act ever since its adoption is that President Franklin Roosevelt, in 1941, when the country was on the brink of war, advocated legislation which would authorize wiretapping in cases involving espionage or sabotage against the United States. Such legislation has been advocated in session after session of Congress. But Congress has never adopted it. Unless or until Congress in its wisdom decides to change the clear stipulations of the Federal Communications Act, every wiretap will be a Federal crime; and it will remain a crime whether authorized by the Director of the FBI, by the Attorney General, or even by the President of the United States. This is a government of laws; and laws can be made only by legislatures.

BATTLE OF THE BUGS

"Thou shalt not nede to be afraid for eny bugges by night": such were the words chosen by Miles Coverdale to render the 5th verse of the 91st Psalm. Allowing for a considerable difference in connotation, they also pretty well express the purpose of the bill that Representative KEATING of New York intends to introduce and, if he can, to push through Congress.

For Coverdale and his contemporaries the noun "bug" seems to have suggested any kind of otherwise nameless terror, real or imagined, or as we might spell it nowadays, a "b-o-g-e-y." What Representative KEATING has in mind is something more tangible and familiar—a mechanical electronic contrivance that enables unauthorized persons to eavesdrop on private conversations. The danger, if not the device, however, seems to have been well known even in Coverdale's time, for it was then that the proverb about walls having ears came into the language and also the warning about eavesdroppers, meaning those who placed themselves like raingutters (eavesdrips) "vnder menes walles or windowes" to collect and carry away other persons' secrets.

What seems to have persuaded Mr. KEATING about the need for remedial legislation against mechanical eavesdropping was the recent episode involving Baron I. Shacklette, who in the course of collecting information for the Harris subcommittee is said to have planted a "bug," or microphone (a i. e. kind of electrical drip-catcher), in a hotel bedroom occupied by Jack Lotto, public relations consultant to the munificent Bernard Goldfine. This kind of electronical snoopery, said Mr. KEATING with an angry disdain of metaphorical congruity, "goes to the very marrow of our individual freedoms."

And so of course it does. But the penetration of privacy has been going on for a long time, with and without the aid of gadgets. It is unlikely that the problem can be solved by any remedy so simple as to prohibit the manufacture of such devices or their use except by such special sanctions as court orders, however desirable such restraints might be. It sometimes seems that our best hope is that the same human ingenuity which has produced these gadgets will presently produce the means of frustrating them.

We Just Don't See Eye to Eye—Exchange of Correspondence on Public Housing With Representatives of United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency has approved a good housing bill, primarily intended to help private enterprise build and sell more homes and to help the average family to purchase a home. I am extremely hopeful that the parliamentary situation which now has this bill bottled up will change in the very near future so that we can get the bill before the House for a vote, and have the legislation enacted into law before adjournment.

There is very little in this bill dealing with public housing. All it would do on that score is to continue existing authorizations for new public housing until the presently authorized units are actually constructed.

Nevertheless, we did take extensive testimony in the Housing Subcommittee on public housing as well as on all other phases of national housing policy. After the conclusion of our hearings, I received a very interesting followup letter from a man who had testified as the

spokesman for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. George W. West of Atlanta, Ga. I am inclined to think that as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, my reply to Mr. West might be of general interest to many of the Members of the House who are interested in housing problems, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. West's letter to me and my reply, as follows:

WEST LUMBER CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., August 1, 1958.

Congresswoman LEONOR (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I feel that I am always indebted to the members of a congressional committee who will listen to me, and especially so I am indebted to you, Chairman RAINS, and the others for listening the other day as I appeared as a director and in behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

I also have a feeling that your time is so precious and limited that every word spoken must be in haste and the statements incomplete.

I was interested in your question to me the other day as to the chamber's policy about Government housing and whether or not they had ever offered a substitute. Of course their substitute, as I attempted to explain, has simply been that this is a question so intimate and so local that the Federal Government should never have attempted to take part in it at all.

Shelter is one of the prime necessities of mankind and something he must use most of his life and from day to day. I am sure every person is willing to subscribe to a local family welfare society or agency to study all the poor families in the neighborhood and attempt to bring them up to standard. This is not an unusual occurrence. It has always happened automatically. As a matter of fact, the colored people in the South in my lifetime, and until recent years, have been their brother's keeper, and many of them have not only shared what they had with their poor relatives, but many of them have raised children unrelated without imposing the cost on the State. So it has always been in the rural areas.

I believe the difficulty of raising money for charities through community chests in recent years has been the attitude of the average giver and his belief that the Federal Government had plenty of money and intended to take care of all the poor people.

Certainly we will agree that the ideal situation in this country would be to have every family above substandard and to remain so always. Such will never be the case, but we should remember that the condition of people changes from day to day and time to time.

I recall one of my good friends in Washington who undertook to help a colored family in Virginia many years ago, with 11 children. After studying their problem and contributing to them for many years, it was his story that as these children became of working and earning age, they finally possessed a $400 to $500 a month income. Of course there is always a point of change. As these older ones marry off and leave the aged, they should be sold on their responsibility to take care of their parents and relatives, as the system in this country has always provided. Such, I believe, is part of the Mormon doctrine, if I understand it.

Anyway, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States does not believe that substandardness of families is a permanent status.

Government housing is in direct competition with everyone who desires to own more shelter than they themselves require, commonly called landlords. I am sure that you and I know people, and sometimes widows, with children to raise who rely on rents from a part of their shelter as income. I know of many, and yet Government housing competes with them and they, in turn, must become a ward of the State.

There is nothing in our social makeup in this country that calls for Government housing. The poorer people have, of necessity, ridden in second hand automobiles or walked with a thin soled pair of shoes. They have always occupied second hand shelter, which can be just as warm and dry as any other kind, and some of the finest people in this country have been raised from such surroundings. The man with such a home is not to be frowned upon nor should he be placed in competition with a $15,000 or $20,000 rental unit possessing, in the main, one-third the space of his shelter. Government shelter is of the kind and variety that no landlord can afford to build and to have and to hold and to rent.

The mere fact that housing authority bonds are income tax free, and intentionally so, leads me to believe the idea was not sold by well meaning people, because the moneyed class of people are caused to invest their funds in this socialistic enterprise, a sad and leveling situation in this country, which was never intended.

I appreciated your time and wish that on some of my visits to Washington that you could give me an hour or two to discuss in greater detail Government housing.

By the way, our president of the chamber is from St. Louis, and we are very proud, indeed, of his ability to represent us in this office. I believe he will agree with my opinions on the shelter subject.

Let's get the Federal Government simplified and out of debt. It had no business in the first place of engaging in such welfare work.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. WEST.

Mr. Speaker, my reply to Mr. West was as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 12, 1958.*

Mr. GEORGE W. WEST,
West Lumber Co., Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. WEST: Thank you for sending me your further thoughts in answer to the question I asked you when you testified last month as the representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States before the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

When you testified in opposition to public housing, it was my recollection that the chamber of commerce had always been against public housing but had never suggested any alternative plan for helping the lowest income groups to get out of the kind of slums which are completely unfit for human habitation. Your answer to the question I directed to you on this point confirmed my understanding of the chamber's position.

You made clear at the hearing, as you also do in your letter, that the chamber has taken this position because it simply does not believe the Federal Government should have any responsibility whatsoever in this field, maintaining that this is a matter solely for the localities to handle. And you deplore the deterioration of self-reliance which you find on the part of those the Government does help.

I suppose it's true that people are less self-reliant than they used to be in many respects. I can think back to my own childhood to bear that out. My parents reared nine children, and it was always a struggle for my father to make ends meet, to provide the absolute necessities. Many a time my mother fed us on a nourishing but austere diet consisting of soup made from soupbones and vegetables. We never owned a home, instead, we moved often from rented place to rented place as the size of the family changed or as reverses forced us into cheaper quarters. It was, for my parents, a hard struggle all of the time, a very hard struggle. But they never once asked for any charity or help of any kind, although I am sure the circumstances often might have suggested seeking help.

And, of course, I thank God I had a father and mother who were devoted to their home, to each other, and to their children, and that no matter how hard the times were, we managed to get along somehow. This is, of course, the kind of self-reliance which you and the chamber of commerce applaud, I am sure.

I mention all of this not to identify myself with the underprivileged, because, frankly, we never considered ourselves underprivileged in our family. Many, if not most, families in St. Louis in those days were in similar circumstances. Most were similarly self-reliant. Of course, they had little choice in the matter, however; there were few places to seek help and a sort of lasting shame in accepting it.

But it occurs to me that a family today going through the kind of economic troubles which beset my parents in rearing nine children would find itself far less able to cope with the situation than we were if only because times are different and standards are different, and relative conditions among the population are completely different. To deplore the passing of the old days and the old standards will not bring them back, and to my mind that's a good thing, too.

Certainly, families were far more self-reliant then without unemployment compensation, amortized and insured mortgages to make home purchases simple and easy, bank deposit insurance to prevent being wiped out in recession or panic, social security, and so many of the other economic reforms of the past 25 years. But thinking back on it, I can see where such programs—had they been in effect then—could have been a godsend to my family and to millions of other self-reliant families in deep financial traits years ago. And as a family of 11 persons, we could perhaps even have qualified from time to time for public housing, had such a thing been in existence.

Would these programs have destroyed our self-reliance and made us want to become career wards of a benevolent government? I am sure they would not. I am sure we have retained the determination to pull ourselves up by our own efforts the while being most appreciative of some needed help along the way. And I think you'll find the same thing true today of most of those families being helped by the various programs I mentioned, including public housing.

Of course, it is true that some tenants of public housing have been unwilling to help themselves. I'm afraid that in any group of human beings we will find some who are indolent or lazy or shiftless; but we have millions of others in this country—decent people—who are ill or disabled or widowed or orphaned or temporarily down on their luck for one reason or another who can and will build a better life for themselves if given the right help and encouragement. Thousands of such families have been helped to get out of the slums and to go forward on their own after having benefited from public housing. These are the ones for whom public housing is intended.

As one of the most confirmed friends of public housing in the Congress—because I have seen the tremendous good it has done and can do—I am still able to see its occasional shortcomings and faults and to want to try to correct them. I have been extremely critical of policies which have been brought to the attention of our subcommittee from time to time, in our investigations,

which show laxness on the part of some administrators in getting rid of undesirables. Also, I have made no secret of my opposition to the high-rise apartment buildings in the crowded centers of major cities for families with young children just because limitations on unit costs in the projects make it impossible to build the garden-type units. But when I am critical of public housing it is in the desire to make the program succeed.

On the other hand, I can see no merit in the position of the chamber of commerce that private enterprise should be left alone to provide housing, as best it can, for the lowest-income groups. We know that from a practical standpoint private enterprise can no longer provide—if it ever could provide—decent shelter for the lowest-income groups. Nor can cities rebuild and eliminate the festering sores of unimaginably abominable slums without Federal programs such as we now have. The two go hand in hand: Urban renewal and public housing. Neither can succeed without plans for meshing them together in a common objective: to eliminate the slums from the centers of our major cities so that they are once again attractive places in which to live.

I do not consider public housing as competition for private enterprise in this objective if we are administering public housing properly. True, the landlord of a broken-down, rat-infested, insect-ridden, heatless, bathroomless, tarpaper shack may find it difficult to rent it for exorbitant amounts to a family which could qualify for an available public-housing unit, but is it that kind of private enterprise we should hesitate to compete with? I should think that it is instead the kind of private enterprise which all of us, including the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, would want to join together enthusiastically to eliminate entirely from the housing scene. I am not referring to warm, dry, solid secondhand homes of the kind you mentioned; I mean the kind of wretched, miserable slums from which public housing gets most of its tenants. They are abominable. And they are frequently rented on unbelievably profitable terms by owners who are not the poor widows or orphans or small investors you mentioned, but big operators who know every possible means and loophole for getting around public-health requirements.

Frankly, Mr. West, while I appreciate the time and effort you have devoted to the legislation before our subcommittee and your concern to make sure that I received a full and complete answer to the question I asked you when you testified, I am afraid that on the issue of public housing we just don't see eye-to-eye. I think the chamber of commerce has pursued a coldhearted attitude on this issue as it has on most welfare issues, and while we can argue back and forth, we just don't seem to convince each other.

Nevertheless, it has been stimulating to read your letter; in fact, I should probably apologize for having been stimulated into such a long reply. But I did want to return the compliment by making clear why I feel as I do on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN.

Putting the Geysers to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Healdsburg Tribune of July 31, 1958, entitled "Putting the Geysers To Work."

This is another first for this regulated California utility. It is another first for private enterprise and will dumfound those Federal-or-nothing advocates who keep yelling for Federal construction of hydroelectric plants for atomic power plants and yes, even of steam plants such as TVA.

Their glib talk about looking out for all the people when in effect they are solicitous only of the favored few should fool no one.

We have had a seige of investigations lately. Maybe we should investigate why these self-appointed guardians of all the people keep insisting that Trinity power facilities be built by the Federal Government so that Sacramento can buy the power at less than cost. Or why this same Sacramento can get a rural electrification loan of over $23 million at 2 percent interest. All the people are being taxed so that Sacramento can get a Federal loan at a lower interest rate than it costs Uncle Sam.

Yes, let us put The Geysers to work and let us all go to work and stop being misled by those who advocate taxing all the people for the benefit of the favored few.

PUTTING THE GEYSERS TO WORK

Old Faithful, probably the most famous geyser in the world, has been steadily at work for generation as an entertainer and a salesman of the wonders of nature. Now some of its California cousins are going to work for people who need electricity.

P. G. & E.'s plans for a $2 million generating plant at the geysers are the first American effort to harness the natural power-producing heat of geysers. The project also will be, as far as we know, the world's only privately financed geothermal installation. The Italian, Mexican, and New Zealand Governments have subsidized such plants, or are planning to, but no private concerns have until now.

It was only about a year ago that P. G. & E. started delivering electricity generated by the Nation's first privately financed commercial nuclear powerplant. Having harnessed the atom, it is now tapping another ancient but heretofore unused source of natural power. It seems that nature's bounty is endless, so long as man's ingenuity and inquisitiveness refuse to accept limits, too.

And the news of P. G. & E.'s plans must have been heartening to all those who had the faith in the geysers and the men who were trying to harness this power.

The Freight-Rate Differential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 3, 1958, issue of the Cottage Grove (Oreg.) Sentinel and in which Editor and Publisher W. C. Martin points up problems related to the freight-rate differential.

NOT FAR ENOUGH

Congress has voted to eliminate the 3 percent transportation or freight tax, which has helped hamstring the Northwest since World War II and which was at the time considered as an emergency measure, but Congress did not go far enough; the freight-rate differential should also be eliminated.

Why should it cost more freight to ship a sack of potatoes from here to Chicago than it does to ship it from Chicago here? That's a puzzler that nobody has answered so far as we know, and it's a good project for our Senators and Representatives to work on if they want to do something for the economy of Oregon and help attract new industry into the State.

Or perhaps you were not aware a situation of this sort existed, but it's one of the sources of our present trouble, which it seems to us can not be cleared up until the situation is corrected. It has not been too long ago that we became interested in trying to do what we could to attract new industry into our locality. In so doing we realized that we would have lots of competition in our efforts and that practically every community would like to do the same thing. In talking to those who have had some experience in starting a new business or industry, it's been quite interesting.

For instance we talked with Mr. Troendly, who runs the Troendly Manufacturing Co. at Elkton. This manufacturing company has made, or has caused to be made, a number of small articles and gadgets. Mr. Troendly has lived in both the large and small communities and knows the advantages and disadvantages of both. While it's nice to live in the small community where things are not so crowded, being close to the source of supply and market is an advantage that is difficult to overcome. At the present time a flower pot holder of his design is being made in the Chicago area where a large market exists and where the raw materials cost about half of what they would here.

Mr. Troendly says he has never been able to understand why the freight rate from Cottage Grove to Chicago cost more than from Chicago to Cottage Grove nor has he been able to figure out why the freight on an article should be one price one time and the next time a different price. At any rate the problem of the manufacturer who would bring a new payroll into the community isn't as simple as making something the public wants. There are a lot of other factors which must be figured in in determining whether or not the project will be a success or failure.

The Steel Price Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a good many addresses have been made in the Senate concerning the steel prices. Having compiled the minority views, after a long investigation in that field by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I simply say that a good many of those statements will not stand up as a matter of fact. I think, therefore, that the RECORD should contain certain editorials which set forth the essential facts with respect to the recent increase in the price of steel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Steel Price Rise: Misconceptions Are Many," published in the Iron Age magazine of August 7, 1958; an editorial entitled "Steel, Investigators, and Life," published in the Wall Street Journal of August 5, 1958; an editorial entitled "1959 Steel Strike Is Feared If Pay Raises Demand It," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 6, 1958; and an editorial entitled "Suspicion Is Not Enough," published in the Journal of Commerce of August 7, 1958,

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Iron Age of August 7, 1958]

THE STEEL PRICE RISE: MISCONCEPTIONS ARE MANY

The steel price rise is a fact. But a lot of talk, reports, and rumors about it are far from the facts. It is charitable to call the backwash misconceptions.

This is no alibi or excuse for the steel industry. Steel firms made the price increases for reasons they thought were sound and businesslike.

They also studied the situation to death with the result that hikes were less than had been expected and came later than had been expected. That cost all steel firms a lot of money. And it puts the smaller companies in a tight squeeze.

Even some of the medium size firms are in a tight squeeze because of the size of the rise and the feet-dragging caused by the competitive situation.

The steel price rise was born in 1956 when the steel industry was clobbered with a fantastic wage bill following a 5-week strike—and back-door pressure from the administration to settle.

Pressures from customers and the market place have combined to force steel firms to limit their rise to direct labor cost increases. This means some steel firms are going to have a tough time meeting their plans for expansion, maintenance, and proper returns for their stockholders.

Had there been no wage increase in July there would have been no steel price increase last week. The President of the United States seems to be one of the few in Washington who knows this. Senator KEFAUVER is a good politician. But he appears a little hazy on steel industry problems and on labor's power. He seems to be more interested in personal publicity than in labeling the unions as more responsible for the steel price increases than are the steel firms themselves.

Then, too, there are the sideliners who argue that the way to run a business is to see what Washington thinks about it. It's about time we let Washington take care of its own troubles. If Congress wants to make an investigation, let it be made—but let it not be preceded by press conference threats and pressures not based on facts or commonsense.

And another thing: Why always pick on the steel industry for running its business in a manner it thinks is fair and honest?

TOM CAMPBELL.

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 5, 1958]

STEEL, INVESTIGATORS, AND LIFE

Major steel companies, after much backing and filling, finally are posting higher prices.

And Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, has announced an investigation.

Neither development is very startling. The steel companies' labor costs went up July 1, as a result of a contract negotiated with the United Steelworkers. The companies wanted to raise prices that date, and some said they would, but due to slower steel sales at that time there was no price increase.

Now, however, steel sales have been picking up. The mills are operating at some 60 percent of capacity, up modestly from recent weeks, while a deeper slump had been predicted for July. There is a widening belief by business that the recession generally has not only bottomed but is lessening. Against this background of a demand pickup and higher costs, the only startling thing would be if steel prices did not go up—granting, of course, a belief in a free market and the profit motive as the reason for being in business.

It is not surprising that Senator KEFAUVER has announced his investigation because he announced it once before—only when prices failed to go up he was left temporarily high and dry.

The Senator is a long-standing believer in the idea that steel prices are not subject to market forces, but rather can be raised at will by the big companies, and it was on this basis that he seemed set to conduct the first investigation. And while he has had a recent illustration that this is not always the case, we shouldn't be surprised if the administered price idea became a main one in the forthcoming investigation.

But that is life in a political world. Of course, if the investigators really want to look at an administered price system they might check into what brought the higher costs that made higher prices seem necessary as well as desirable to the steelmakers.

They would find those higher labor costs are truly administered—by the industrywide union monopoly.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 6, 1958]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE STEEL STRIKE IS FEARED IF PAY RAISE IS DEMANDED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Next year may see the biggest steel strike in American history. For the steel industry, which has just absorbed about half of the automatic increase in wages—fixed by a previous contract made in boom times—cannot afford to do so again. In 1959, when the labor contracts are up for renewal, a strike seems certain unless there is an abandonment of demands for higher wages by the unions.

If the steel companies had put up their prices this time to offset entirely the full labor costs, the increase of $4.50 per ton announced recently would have had to rise to around $7 or $8 a ton.

The statisticians in one major steel compnay say that, if there had been no price increases since 1955, it would today be operating $30 million a year in the red.

The steel companies, moreover, have to find a way not only to meet the direct increases in wages imposed by the industrywide union in steel but to offset the price rises for the raw materials the steel companies buy which are themselves affected by the upward trend in steel wages.

AN EXTRA $1.50 A TON

Thus it is estimated that, apart from the $7 or $8 a ton of increased costs due to direct wage increases, another item of at least $1.50 a ton has to be absorbed which comes from the higher costs of wages in brick plants, alloy plants, acid plants, and in the purchase of such materials as aluminum, vanadium, nickel, and zinc.

What is the answer? It is to be found in greater productivity per man-hour by labor or in technological improvements through larger and larger capital expenditures. The latter course has thus far saved the steel companies from bankruptcy as they have introduced new mechanical gadgets and bigger and better powerplants. But to do this requires millions and millions of dollars of more capital, and the investor is not attracted to industries which don't give a substantial return on the money invested.

Since the steel industry recently raised its prices, a howl has gone up from spokesmen for a congressional committee. An assistant attorney general at the Department of Justice in charge of antitrust laws speaks of the possibility of an investigation to see if any statutes were violated.

But why is the obvious overlooked? Hasn't anybody heretofore ever heard of industrywide bargaining—the practice sanctioned by Federal law which imposes a uniform wage cost on the steel companies?

Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of a Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly Problems, asks:

"Why are identical price increases put into effect by all companies at the same time when each has different costs? This is the key question."

Of course, it is the key question, and it has been ever since the Congress permitted labor unions to group together in a single monopoly in each industry.

Each company has to base its prices on what kind of earnings and rate of return on the invested dollar must be obtained to attract the investor. This also means a rather uniform pattern. A company that thinks it can get larger volume by cutting prices is likely to find itself mistaken and also bankrupt. For the wage costs are such that if it were not for the price increases announced by the leaders in an industry, the others would put their own prices even higher.

So the effect is to bring about minimum rather than maximum price increases, and the answer to the key question about prices in big industries is to be found in the industrywide bargaining process which fixes the same wage rates for all companies.

There have been frequent demands that the President call a wage-price conference to exert a moral influence on economic groups. But the Chief Executive is powerless to bring about remedial legislation. The Congress, which could abolish monopolies and keep prices down, isn't doing anything about labor legislation designed to reduce the monopoly power of big unions in America. The Congress is dominated by the big labor unions which regularly make substantial campaign contributions to a large number of the candidates for Congress on the Democratic Party ticket. And the Democrats control what legislation shall be passed by Congress.

Under the American system of private enterprise there must be self-restraint on both sides—labor and management—if economic anarchy is to be avoided. The answer does not lie in a Government-subsidized or controlled industry but in the commonsense that inevitably must be applied when there is a full expositon of all the facts. A constructive result could be achieved if a statesmanlike approach were taken by a congressional committee of inquiry.

[From the Journal of Commerce of August 7, 1958]

SUSPICION IS NOT ENOUGH

We don't like to see a top prosecutor of the Federal Government team up with a congressional committee for the purpose of putting an industry group on the spot by helping to create bad publicity for it.

The latest phase of Senator KEFAUVER'S Antimonopoly Subcommittee hearings on steel prices was not an inspiring spectacle when the Justice Department's Antitrust Chief, Victor R. Hansen told the committee members that he was suspicious of the steel

industry's current pricing practices, but could not prove anything to make out a case against the industry for violation of the antitrust laws.

Nevertheless, he revealed that his agency is carefully scrutinizing current steel industry pricing methods in order to decide whether the matter should be bought before a grand jury.

Such investigations are, of course, perfectly proper. They are part of the Justice Department's responsibilities if there is suspicion of a law violation. But just as proceedings before a grand jury are guarded against premature publicity, deliberations even prior to the start of such grand jury proceedings should be guarded even more carefully.

We are amazed, therefore, that Mr. Hansen was willing to have this case—which really is not a case at all because he himself admitted the absence of proof—tried in the newspapers prior to a Justice Department decision to ask for an indictment or to drop the investigation.

We do not question Senator KEFAUVER's right to get the Justice Department's reaction to the latest increase in steel prices. But we would seriously question the propriety of conducting such an interrogation in a public hearing. We believe that an executive session would have been more appropriate for such a discussion. Such a session would have been fully adequate for the subcommittee's purposes and could not have been interpreted—rightly or wrongly—as an attempt to give the steel industry a bad press.

Trustbuster Hansen regretfully stated that finding evidence of companies getting together on prices remains the Justice Department's greatest problem.

The Department of Justice is looking into the latest round of steel-price increases to determine whether they are the result of a conspiracy to fix prices or are an indication of monopoly control over the industry.

This, we are afraid, is a typical closed-mind approach. Mr. Hansen sees two alternative explanations; both bad. He does not even mention the possibility that the steel companies were justified in making these price increases and that price competition being what it is, uniform prices are not evidence of conspiracy but of competition.

Instead, the antitrust chief came up with a new wrinkle in legal procedure which, we hope, any court in the land would throw out immediately as immaterial.

Fully aware of the fact that no industry will sit down around a conference table to cook up a price conspiracy—and then send a written report about the meeting to Mr. Hansen's office—he told Senator KEFAUVER that he is "intrigued by the way in which newspapers and trade press have been utilized to convey the news, so to speak, among the steel producers."

As an example, Mr. Hansen quoted statements by some steel company officials to the effect "that they must raise prices because of the recent wage boosts but that they had to wait and see what the big companies would do."

We commend to Mr. Hansen's attention the conduct of John W. Gwynne, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who in a subsequent appearance before the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee—as did Mr. Hansen—said that he knew of no price-fixing conspiracy by the steel industry. But unlike Mr. Hansen, the FTC head stopped right there and declined to indulge in a long list of witch-hunting suspicions.

The Hansen approach to the steel industry pricing problem not only is a demonstration of dubious tactics but also once again demonstrates the futility of using a purely legal approach to this kind of issue instead of putting it into its proper economic perspective.

As long as the economic significance of uniform prices is not recognized and the economic ties between wages, determined on the basis of industrywide collective bargaining, and prices ignored, social reformers will have a free field as champions of antitrust prosecutions to the detriment of the economy.

A Clarification of the Situation in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the quality and extent of the Communist danger in Venezuela are imperfectly understood by many in the United States. In a letter by my friend, Eduardo A. Acosta H., the very able chargé d'affaires, Embassy of Venezuela, to the Washington Post, August 11, 1958, this situation is clarified. Under a previous consent I include the full text of this letter:

AUGUST 5, 1958.

Mr. PHILLIP L. GRAHAM,
President and Publisher, the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: The Venezuelan Embassy has, of long, made a habit of reading with the greatest of pleasure the interesting news published in your important newspaper, the Washington Post and Times Herald.

We, for our part, have always received the best of attentions from your daily regarding matters of mutual interest to both the United States and Venezuela, involving the protection and furtherance of cordial neighborly relations between the two countries.

In your issue corresponding to Monday, August 4, 1958, it has come to our attention a report by Larry Allen transmitted by the Associated Press from Caracas, dated August 3, which possibly, due to information obtained from unreliable sources, contains erroneous concepts about the political situation in Venezuela and the activities of the Communist Party there.

It is stated in said report that "there are Communist Party members in all key trade unions, in businesses and industries, in civic and student organizations, and in offices of the Government." This leaves the impression that the Communist Party dominates labor, business, education, and government. This is far from being true. All Venezuelan political parties are represented in the labor movement and it is significant that there have been no strikes in Venezuela with the exception of a symbolic nationwide strike organized in protest against a possible military coup stirred by a minority of military men aimed at overthrowing the country's democratic government.

Among the students there may be some sympathizers of communism, but the party itself is far from having control of the student body. As far as the Government is concerned, it can be emphatically denied that there are any Communists holding important positions in any of its branches. The Junta itself is composed of 3 civilians and 3 military men who have no connections whatsoever with the Communist Party. The head of the Junta, Rear Adm. Wolfgang Larrazábal, has very recently made the statement that "as he is a Catholic and against Communist ideas, he is against outlawing the Communist, because no idea can be suppressed by law." He added in the same statement that ideas should be fought with ideas and complained that reports published by some United States publications regarding his position with respect to the Communists were not true. He said that "communism is aided by being outlawed, since it is in clandestine movements when it becomes dangerous and that the best way to curb communism is by developing a wide policy of social justice." What is remarked here of the Junta members is also true of cabinet members, of the State and Territorial Governors which comprise the Republic of Venezuela, of university heads and chiefs of diplomatic missions.

Mr. Allen, in his personal appreciation says that "outside Larrazábal's governing five-member military-civilian Junta, there is rising alarm over the Red riptide, particularly within the army, that might crystallize into action long before national elections expected in November." There are, of course, differences of opinion among Venezuelans with respect to the activities of the Communist Party. I can assure you that by far the majority of the people do not view with such alarm the activities of this small political faction and would dismiss as absurd the idea of a possible Red coup in Venezuela. The reasons in support of this are very abundant. First of all, the interests of the Venezuelan Nation lie with those of the free world, and our trade relations are exclusively with countries of the Western World, especially with the United States of America. Venezuela has no trade relations with Communist nations or with countries controlled by the Communists, although other Western countries do have this sort of relations. Venezuela is, as any other country of the free world, interested in defending democracy as the only form of government that would stand for dignity and justice; therefore, Venezuela is determined to reject any idea directed to destroy such a system. Venezuela knows that its national defense and national security are linked to those of the American countries and to the countries of the free world.

It seems as though Mr. Allen was highly impressed by the gathering of more than 100,000 Venezuelans to protest against demands made to the government by a minority headed by the former Defense Minister, whose feelings cannot be attributed to our whole Armed Forces where there are so many capable, honest, public spirited, and true citizens. That public demonstration of protest was not stirred or organized by the Communist, but by all of the Venezuelan political parties. Moreover, the symbolic strike not only took place in Caracas, but in all of the important cities of the country and is to be taken as a genuine expression of the Venezuelan people in all of its social classes, intellectuals, business men, bankers, workers, students, and a vast majority of the loyal members of the armed forces. The night of the 23d of July and the morning of the following day saw the announcement by our chambers of commerce, professional associations, student organizations, and labor unions of their public rejection of the absurd demands of the small group headed by the ex-Minister Castro-Leon.

Mr. Allen's ideas, as expressed in his report from Venezuela, are unrealistic and not altogether clear. The Communist Party in Venezuela is not new at all. In fact is the oldest party organized in the country and its foundation goes as far back as 1931 during the regime of Dictator Gómez. The party has shown a tendency to be favored in its development and growth under dictatorial regimes. During the iron hand dilapidating administration of Pérez Jiménez, the party became stronger, because its ideas and goals could not be fought in the progressive social field of a democracy.

In a democratic form of Government the Communist cannot offer social advantages

not already granted by that type of government. This point will in all probability be proved in Venezuela once a democracy is permanently established. To defend this democracy we Venezuelans have brushed aside all other minor problems. It is our main objective to elect a constitutional president and to start the country on the path of democratic life which means the recognition of everyone's duties and the respect of everyone's rights. We intend to form with the nations of the free world and, especially, with those of the Western Hemisphere, a strong bloc of nations united by a common ideal of peace and respect and progress. Venezuela is eager to help its sister nations with its human resources as well as with its natural resources. We are aware that we have an important role to play in the American continent but, for this we need a permanent democratic form of government. To achieve this type of government Venezuela cannot destroy its unity at this moment. A more important thing is at stake. Later, once a constitutional government is formed and the country goes back to the normal exercise of a democracy, the political struggle in the country will take care of any sharp edges that might be dangerous to the democratic life of the country or imperil its friendly relations with countries in the continent and in the free world.

On the other hand, the Communist Party in Venezuela is not as strong as Mr. Allen and others have presented it. During the 1946 elections the party, the oldest organized political body in existence, only obtained 50,000 votes against 150,000 votes favoring the Social Christian Party (Copei) which at the time was the youngest political fraction. We are positive that in the coming elections the Communists will have comparatively less votes than in 1946.

The world has witnessed in Venezuela, just a few days ago, a nationwide rejection of the policy of the coup d'etat. It means that the policy of the military push to overthrow a democratic government has become obsolete and old-fashioned and that Venezuela is decided to protect its democracy above all things. It stands to reason that if the Communist Party would plot against the Venezuelan democracy, the nation would again stand up and fight. Venezuela would not accept any kind of dictatorship.

Mr. Allen says that "even the Roman Catholic church, often the spearhead against communism, is highly cautious in Venezuela. Only occasionally is there the mildest reference to Venezuelan communism in the church's organ La Religion." Again this is not accurate. The newspaper known as La Religion has always given the Communist inside and outside the country the bitterest of attacks. In the past few months, after the defeat of the opprobrious regime of Pérez Jiménez, several editorials and articles have been published in said paper to combat Communist ideas and principles. If it is not done more often it is because the Communists are ultracautious to avoid criticism. It is to be remarked that the newspaper La Religion, through its editorials and articles, was the leading opposer of Pérez Jiménez' regime.

From Mr. Allen's report one is lead to think that the whole Venezuelan armed forces are plotting against the Government because of its disapproval of Communist influence and infiltration. This is absolutely erroneous as it is proved by the attitude of the Venezuelan Navy and Venezuelan Air Force during the last failed coup. As for the army, only a very small minority of officers had a hand in the attempted coup. It can be affirmed without the least of doubts that the armed forces in its totality are loyal to the cause of democracy. It is to be remembered that the Communist Party exists in other countries of the continent. Its ideas are best fought through public opinion. After all, the best way to do it is by making its members stay in the open where it is known what they do. Moreover, if something against the country stability is tried by them, then our laws and courts will take care of it as it is done in this great country of the United States.

Reports as this of Mr. Allen are in more than a way harmful to neighborly relations between countries of the American Continent. They create distrustfulness and are destructive. Economic relations are impaired and no one profits by it. It is really impossible to understand why anyone would not feel inclined to lend a hand to a country tenaceously and firmly decided to establish a permanent democracy.

Before closing, again may I express to you that the Venezuelan Embassy counts on you as one of its best friends and that your assistance in this matter will be highly appreciated.

With best regards and the deepest of feelings of sincere friendship, it is a pleasure to remain,

Very truly yours,

EDUARDO A. ACOSTA H.,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

Largest Scholarship Fund Ever Received by University of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Grand Forks Herald, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., regarding the largest scholarship fund ever received by the University of North Dakota. This contribution was made by the Honorable Maxwell Upson, a former North Dakota resident, who is now the chairman of the board of Raymond International, Inc., one of the world's largest construction firms.

As the senior Senator from the State of North Dakota, I am extremely grateful to learn of this significant contribution which will enable many deserving young people to attend the University of North Dakota, and on behalf of the State of North Dakota, I extend to the Honorable Maxwell Upson our sincerest thanks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LARGEST UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP RECEIVED

The largest scholarship fund ever received by the University of North Dakota has been donated by Maxwell M. Upson, prominent New York construction engineer and university alumnus.

Upson, who grew up on a farm near Cummings, N. Dak., received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of North Dakota in 1896 and an honorary doctor of engineering degree from the University of North Dakota in 1931. He is chairman of the board of Raymond International, Inc., one of the world's largest construction firms.

A trust has been established with the United States Trust Co., of New York, the income from which will provide $8,000 a year in perpetuity. Consisting of 16 annual scholarships of $500 each, the program will begin this fall with grants for the 1958-59 academic year.

In announcing the gift, Upson said, "I hope this effort will stimulate a raising of standards for the student body and provide more good citizens to take the responsibilities of the coming generations."

FUTURE LEADERS SOUGHT

Stipulating that preference in selection be given to North Dakota residents, the trust agreement said "the grantor desires to initiate a program designed to search out, preferably in the schools of North Dakota, young men and women who possess the greatest overall promise of future leadership, and to provide a money award to attract them to the University of North Dakota and help defray the expense of their education and to secure for them the benefits which that university can confer upon them."

PRAISED BY STARCHER

The Upson scholarships will be granted on the basis of need, mental competence, dependability, character and motivation, acceptance by contemporaries, capacity for leadership and a sincere intention to complete 4 years of study at the University of North Dakota.

Dr. George W. Starcher, university president, in accepting the gift, said "this scholarship program is going to inspire new hope for many worthy youth of North Dakota, advance the quality of the work of the university and be a peak of excellence in our 75th anniversary year."

Gov. John E. Davis said, "this is a very significant gift to the people of the State of North Dakota. I am impressed by the vision which Dr. Upson has shown in establishing this living symbol of encouragement for worthy boys and girls throughout the years ahead."

J. Lloyd Stone, university alumni director, stated, "Intelligence, character, and resourcefulness are not distributed to our young people in accordance to the wealth of their parents. This belief of Dr. Upson's has been nobly demonstrated in the establishment of the scholarship fund. Alumni of the university express sincere thanks to one of their most loyal graduates."

MEETS REAL NEED

Dean D. J. Robertson, secretary of the university scholarships committee, said: "The gift meets a real need. Our committee knows from experience how many good students there are who need help and how deeply appreciative these students are of the help they get."

Loyde C. Thompson, Grand Forks, national chairman of the university development fund, said: "Dr. Upson's generosity will make it possible for many North Dakota young people to attend the university who might not otherwise be able to do so, and for the university to attract a higher type of student. In all the years to come the recipients of his scholarships, the university and people of our State will be grateful to Dr. Upson for his great gift to his alma mater."

Administration of the fund will be handled by the university scholarships committee. Inquiries should be sent to Robertson's office at the University of North Dakota.

BORN IN MILWAUKEE

Upson was born in Milwaukee, Wis., and at the age of 5 moved with his family to a North Dakota wheat farm north of Cummings. He received his early education from a minister who lived with his parents and at the age of 13 went to Grand Forks to continue his schooling.

After receiving his bachelor of arts degree at the University of North Dakota he went to Cornell University, where he received a mechanical engineering degree in 1899. He then became a managing engineer with Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Co., of New York, and while there invented and patented an automatic gas producer, and designed and built

the first reinforced concrete industrial building.

In 1905 he joined Hockanum Mills Co., of Rockville, Conn., as chief engineer and assistant to the president. During his 2 years with the firm, he was responsible for the development of the first all-reinforced concrete textile mill.

JOINED CONCRETE FIRM

In 1907 Upson began his career with Raymond International, then known as Raymond Concrete Pile Co., serving as secretary-general manager and chief engineer. In 1917 he became vice president; in 1931, president; and since 1946 has been chairman of the board. He continues to devise new applications and equipment for concrete construction.

In 1957 the UND Alumni Association awarded Upson a distinguished service citation for "distinguished achievements as a construction engineer, inventor, administrator and humanitarian."

He is a member of several professional societies, including the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and American Society of Civil Engineers, and of various advisory groups, including the Committee for Economic Development. He has contributed several writings in the fields of engineering, economics and social science.

Upson is widely traveled, having represented his company in Europe, the Orient, and South America and other countries.

Missile Mobility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Missile Mobility," written by Maj. Patrick W. Powers, and published in the magazine Ordnance for July–August 1958. Major Powers is currently studying at the Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILE MOBILITY

(By Maj. Patrick W. Powers)

Recent events have highlighted the vulnerability of our proposed bases for long-range ballistic guided missiles. Such large fixed installations will be constructed in overseas areas and within the continental United States for the intermediate-range and intercontinental ballistic missiles (IRBM's and ICBM's) which are rapidly approaching the troop-testing stage.

Several NATO nations already have expressed concern over establishing such prime atomic targets in their countries. A few military analysts, notably George Fielding Eliot, have commented on the susceptibility to attack of these bases when they become fixed structures as compared with the relative immunity of a mobile, shipboard missile base.

The problem is recognized, then, as one which influences the future effectiveness of this new weapon. Friendly nations do not want to risk nuclear attacks on these bases, and we may never be able to fire a missile in retaliation if its launcher is neutralized by a sudden surprise attack. A solution to this perplexing situation is to make the ballistic missile base mobile on land.

The present concept for these potent carriers of mass-destruction warheads is a true weapon system approach. This includes all the related equipment, materials, services, and personnel required solely for the operation of the weapon so that this instrument of combat becomes a self-sufficient unit of attacking power within its intended operational environment.

Specifically, the weapon system can be broken down into (1) a base of supporting equipment and facilities, (2) the firing platform or launcher and its integrated equipment, (3) the delivery means, or the missile in this case, and (4) the payload or warhead.

All these system components are to be concentrated in a large area of unusually complex installations and manned by technicians who will groom the missile for its destructive mission. The cost of such a base—some of it underground—has already been estimated by the Department of Defense to be over $100 million. This will include liquid-oxygen generators, fuel-storage tanks, check-out and electronic missile gear, and huge cranes and lifting devices.

Peculiar to the base itself will be thousands of tons of concrete, air-conditioning and heating units, hinged steel doors, self-sufficient, radiation-proof living quarters for the crew, Geiger counters, and automatic alarm systems.

Some of this equipment is absolutely necessary for the missile weapon system while the rest of it results strictly from the permanency of the installation—and the resulting invitation to attack by the enemy.

This is the ballistic missile system that represents the latest means of firepower designed to achieve mass destruction of targets. In the strictest sense it is still a weapon—and all weapons are subject to attack. The best enemy defense against such a threat—whether it be nuclear, chemical, biological, or high explosive—is the detection and destruction of the source. In this case, the source is the launcher and its base of supporting equipment.

There are several conventional military examples of this doctrine. Land forces strive to neutralize enemy artillery before a combat operation so that the maneuvering troops can assemble and launch the attack with the least amount of interference. The search for atomic delivery means will be especially vigorous on any future battlefield.

Naval forces must attack enemy ships, surface, or undersea, whose means of weapon delivery threaten the sea lines of communication. The Air Force is committed to aerial counterattack in the initial stages of a war before its aircraft can seek selected tactical targets. These attacks are directed against aircraft, which represent firing platforms, and airfields that are the supporting bases.

What are the means of attacking the missile launcher and its support base? First, there is the obvious type of attack by enemy missiles and aircraft. This might very well be accomplished by an atomic detonation in the installation area. Secondly, a covert attack by enemy agents or guerrillas could easily cripple the vital innards of the complex missile machinery. This would be a more subtle and equally effective method—just the right cable, severed in two, would insure that a missile would never leave the ground.

Security against these means of attack is difficult to devise. There is no problem of detecting the launcher and its base, because in this instance they are permanent. The location is widely known from news mediums and the knowledge of the local population harboring enemy agents or sympathizers. This same problem squarely faces the Strategic Air Command bases and the established military depots around the world. Active air defense including antiaircraft and antimissile elements for this type of installation is possible but costly in both critical materiel and money.

Protection against the covert threat of enemy agents is just as difficult. These bases will employ many foreign civilians, and screening of such personnel is always a problem. The presence of any civilian within a hand grenade's throw or even a mortar's range of the installation may be dangerous. Sabotage, then, will always be an eminent threat.

Normal passive security from enemy attack for any weapons system includes protection by terrain features, dispersion of equipment, camouflage, and the mobility of the firing platform. Mobility is the decisive ingredient of a weapons system that enhances its offensive combat capabilities while at the same time affords a positive defense against attack.

In military terms, weapon-system mobility is the rapid shifting of firepower. It has been a prime prerequisite of artillery through the centuries and is listed as one of the principles of war. Mobile firepower combined with the maneuver of troops has won battles from the time of Caesar to the war in Korea. But the mobility of firepower has also meant security (another principle of war) from attack for the particular weapon system used. This is the aspect of employment that will be so vital to the ballistic guided missile.

An analysis of the mobility of a weapon system discloses some interesting facts. The system has previously been defined in a general sense as composed of a base of support equipment, a firing platform, a delivery means, and a payload.

As an example, the infantry soldier is part of a weapon system. He is actually the firing platform supported by the base of supply facilities of his company. The delivery means is the rifle he carriers that shoots a payload of a quarter-ounce steel-jacketed chunk of lead.

The mobility of this weapon system depends on the firing platform which moves into battle at an average rate of 2½ miles an hour and which can take rather definite protective measures once its location is detected by enemy firepower.

A more sophisticated land weapon system for comparison is the Honest John rocket. It is supported by a mobile firing organization of battery or battalion size. The firing platform is a standard 5-ton Army truck on which is mounted a simple rail launcher. The delivery means—the 27-foot, 3-ton rocket—carries a payload of an atomic or conventional explosive warhead. The mobility of this system is that of the truck launcher which can easily negotiate most types of terrain and move rapidly from one firing point to another to prevent being located by the enemy.

Much attention has been focused lately on naval ships as a mobile component of a weapon system. Obviously, a ship can provide a sea-mobile supporting base for an aircraft that can be considered as the firing platform for a bomb type of delivery means. The bomb carries a payload of a wide variety of mass destruction elements.

The most widely heralded application of ballistic missiles by naval means is the submarine-fired missile. Here the firing platform and the supporting base are on the submarine itself, while the delivery means is the rocket, such as the Navy's Polaris, with a nuclear payload.

It is important to note that unusual mobility exists in the capabilities of the atomic submarine, giving this weapon system a definite tactical and strategic advantage over a surface ship, both offensively and for its own security from attack. However, the problem of precisely determining any location at sea must be solved before this weapon

system can accurately deliver a warhead on a land target.

While an aircraft has the greatest mobility of any manned vehicle, its land-based airfield has none. This is an important fact for this discussion because, for the first time, the supporting base of equipment is fixed while the firing platform is extremely mobile.

The aircraft by its mobility can deliver a tremendous assortment of payloads by dropping them on a target. If enemy firepower seeks to destroy it, the aircraft can escape through its control of the time and distance factors of speed and maneuver. In contrast, the airfield is fixed and as such can be accurately located by the enemy and attacked by any one of the methods outlined previously.

Three important points have been emphasized so far by this analysis: (1) In an offensive weapon system, the firing platform is always mobile and its support base is usually mobile; (2) An effective firing platform is mobile to accomplish its mission and for its own security from attack; and (3) A mobile support base has the best chance to survive enemy attack because it is difficult to locate.

Now how does this apply to the present ballistic missile concept? It simply means that the missile base and its launcher should be mobile to exist on the worldwide battlefield of the IRBM and the ICBM. However, this is not being planned for our Thor, Jupiter, Atlas, or Titan systems. These systems will be established in fixed installations, some of them partly underground.

To illustrate the point, the British have announced lately that their ballistic missile under development is superior in many respects to United States systems because theirs can be fired from an installation completely underground. These concepts seem to violate the aspects of mobility as applied to any weapon system.

Although the long-range ballistic rocket is 15 years old in the history of warfare, the German V–2 is still the only weapon of this type which can be examined for the principles of employment in combat. It was designed to be transportable over the German railway system, and consequently part of the support base was restricted to the supply of missiles by flatcar and the transport of propellants (which included liquid oxygen) by tank car. The rest of the support and handling equipment, including the missile transporter and launcher, was moved by truck. In this case the firing platform, and to a lesser degree the support base, were mobile.

This limited mobility, nevertheless, reduced the effectiveness of the countermeasures that the Allies employed against the V–2. Following established doctrine, they attempted to detect and destroy the launching sites. This was relatively ineffective because the launcher was mobile and could be set up on any hard stand of ground.

Once the rocket was fired, the firing unit moved to a new location, often in towns or woods. The radius of action was restricted somewhat by the proximity of a railhead although, fortunately for the Germans, Europe has an unusually dense railroad network.

Factories, laboratories, and assembly points were bombed, but the firings stopped only when the launching areas were seized by the advancing allied land forces. It is still an amazing fact that this weapon was successfully employed under conditions of overwhelming allied air superiority and in an occupied country hostile to the Germans.

The V–2 was a primary target because of its tremendous effectiveness against British cities and the British people, even with what is considered today to be an ineffective warhead—less than 1 ton of TNT.

Perhaps the most significant lesson learned from the history of the V–2 is how mobility played such a vital part in the security from attack for this weapon system. All suspected launching sites were attacked by all available means, but since the launcher and its support base were mobile, these countermeasures were ineffective.

The Germans had well learned their lesson from the employment of the V–2 after its initial launching sites were destroyed because they were permanent, easily located installations.

The corollary of this discussion is that security lies in mobility for any firing platform and its supporting base. It appears that this principle should apply equally well to any modern weapon system—which certainly includes the long-range ballistic missile. If this is the case, then our present concept of employment of this system needs to be reexamined.

Even a cursory investigation into the support equipment of a missile that, fully fueled, weighs from ten to one hundred tons discloses the requirement for large pieces of handling gear that can accommodate size as well as tonnage. Yet the empty missile weight seldom exceeds 10 percent of the firing weight in the case of a liquid-propellent rocket. In addition, the rocket body is often made in several sections that can be transported by vehicle or railroad car.

Thus most of the tonnage for any ballistic rocket is in the propellent, which can be shipped in suitable containers for liquids or possibly in sections for a solid propellent rocket. As a result, mobility can be achieved for the ballistic missile as far as tonnages are concerned.

Several ballistic missile systems have already been produced and employed using a mobile launcher and support base. The V–2 weighed about 14 tons fully fueled, and it used rather simple support equipment based on rail and truck transportation. The United States Army's Redstone missile is a more recent example of a mobile system. The missile body is broken down into 3 sections, each hauled by truck and trailer combinations.

The Redstone is assembled at a selected firing site, erected on its small launcher by a simple truck-mounted erection device, and fueled by several liquid oxygen (LOX) and alcohol tank trucks of conventional design. It is interesting to note that the LOX is manufactured by a portable generating plant that moves with the missile support base.

These examples of missile systems illustrate that they can be designed to be mobile. When the tonnage requirements exceed a feasible truck-trailer solution, a railroad-based concept is practical. Standard flatcars have a load capacity of as much as 100 tons, and their volume capacity can meet all requirements for complicated, heavily instrumented electronic and mechanical equipment. The construction of railroads is a normal, logistical function of large military forces which in World War II constructed and rehabilitated thousands of miles of railroad tracks throughout the world.

An almost forgotten example of a railroad-mobile weapon system is the railway gun. The 14-inch naval railway gun car weighed 267 tons, and it was used along the Allied front in World War I. The complete gun battery was made up into a train of 14 cars, and this unit was an efficient, self-contained weapon system. It passed from the military scene not because it was mounted on railroad cars but because more efficient guns were developed for truck transport, and bomber aircraft extended the range of firepower beyond the feasible capabilities of any gun.

Mobility also makes an important contribution to a reduction in the cost of a missile weapon system. The total capability of such a system with fixed launchers depends first upon a network of launching sites, the loss of any one of which reduces this capability.

Second, the density of the target complex that includes the fixed launchers also affects the system capability. This density determines the estimate of the priority of attack on such an area and the effect that such an attack will have.

A mobile launcher system allows a maximum capability in a desired area with a requirement of only a fraction of the number of launchers and support equipment needed for a fixed installation with a resulting decrease in overall cost.

The present ballistic missile systems should be evaluated not only as to cost, range, and accuracy but also as to their effectiveness under actual combat conditions. The missiles and their firing sites will be first-priority targets because any enemy must prevent their retaliatory blows.

The strategic airfields spotted around the world are vulnerable targets, but they achieve some mutual security in numbers. In addition, each airfield supports many mobile firing platforms in the form of the long-range bomber that can take off and land at another base if necessary.

The IRBM or ICBM fixed base enjoys no such advantage. It integrates a support base with a fixed firing platform and its output of delivery means or missiles per unit of time is drastically limited in number. These bases are so expensive that not more than a handful can be constructed. Each one will be easily located and designated for attack by the enemy if he decides to start a general war. Security against a surprise attack is almost nonexistent.

If the missile base is in an allied country, its continued utilization may depend on the political party in power. A change of government or an awkward incident might mean the loss of an expensive and vital installation of equipment to the free world. Likewise, any loss of military control of the missile-base area means the loss of that particular set of equipment.

This rather untenable military position can be avoided if our long-range ballistic-missile systems are mobile—to any degree. Even if the missile and its supporting equipment could be moved in a matter of days or if the system depended on a railway network, a large measure of security could be gained.

This security is absolutely necessary for this weapon system to survive an initial attack and be successfully employed in future operations.

On February 27, 1958, the New York Times stated that a new 500- to 5,500-mile missile system had been approved which envisages underground installations, harboring solid-fuel ballistic missiles, several miles apart to make them less vulnerable to enemy attack.

This latest missile concept also violates the principle of mobility for the support base and its launchers. It should be noted that being underground offers little more security than being above ground because a nuclear explosion can create tremendous overpressures against the installation, and it leaves large amounts of residual radiation in the area of ground zero.

But what can be done about this situation? Remember that none of these fixed bases have been constructed yet and no launching equipment has become operational. This would be the opportune time for industry and the services to take an objective look at our fine ballistic-missile sytems and consider the advantages of mobility as a positive security measure against enemy attack.

Appendix

The Moral Aspects of the Alcohol Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for me, personally, the nonuse of alcohol has added to my enjoyment and appreciation of life. I am a teetotaler, but I am not a prohibitionist.

The excessive or intemperate use of alcohol is one of the serious social, economic, and moral problems of our times. One of the most important and able leaders in this field of education is Dr. Titus A. Frazee, executive director of the Oregon Temperance League.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of the inspirational and educational address by Dr. Titus Frazee entitled "The Moral Aspects of the Alcohol Problem," delivered to the ninth annual session of the Institute of Scientific Studies for the Prevention of Alcoholism at Loma Linda, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL ASPECTS OF THE ALCOHOL PROBLEM

(By Titus A. Frazee, executive director, Oregon Temperance League, Portland, Oreg.)

Four hundred years before Christ, Socrates may have passed judgment on the lecturers at the Institute of Scientific Studies for the Prevention of Alcoholism.

Said Socrates: "The partisan, when he is engaged in a dispute, cares nothing about the rights of the question, but is anxious only to convince his hearers of his own assertions."

We are not here for a debate, but each of us recognizes we are discussing, perhaps, the most controversial subject of the century. I'm also willing to freely admit, I want to convince my hearers.

* * * * *

So I plead guilty to a portion of the Socrates indictment, if indictment it be, and state that because I do care so very much about the rights of the question I would love to convince my hearers—or I would have stayed in Portland.

THE CURRENT MORAL CLIMATE

Kierkegaard has said: "To venture causes anxiety, but not to venture is to lose one's self * * * and to venture in the highest sense is precisely to become conscious of one's self."

Psychologists are in basic agreement that the chief problem of people in the middle decade of the twentieth cenutry is emptiness. So many people not only do not know what they want; they often do not have any clear idea of what they feel.

They lament their inability to make decisions; they feel swayed this way and that with painful feeling of powerlessness but their underlying problem is that they have no definite experience of their own desires or wants. One person put it: "I'm just a collection of mirrors, reflecting what everyone else expects of me."

* * * * *

Many people could say out of their own inner experience the prophetic words T. S. Eliot wrote in 1925:

"We are the hollow men
We are the stuffed men
Leaning together
Headpiece filled with straw. Alas.
Shape without form, shade without colour,
Paralyzed force, gesture without motion."

* * * * *

But this emptiness, this hollowness, is cropping out in many different ways in our society. David Riesman, in The Lonely Crowd, finds the same emptiness in his fascinating analysis of the present American character. * * *

But the present typical American character, Riesman goes on to say, is outer-directed. He seeks not to be outstanding but to fit in; he lives as though he were directed by a radar set fastened to his head perpetually telling him what other people expect of him. This radar type gets his motives and directions from others. * * *

WE START WITH OURSELVES

* * * * *

William James once remarked that those who are concerned with making the world more healthy had best start with themselves. We could go farther and point out that finding the center of strength within ourselves, which we can find only through a power above and beyond ourselves, is in the long run the best contribution we can make to our fellow men.

* * * This is what our society needs—not new ideas and inventions, important as these are, and not geniuses and supermen, but persons who can be, that is, persons who have a center of strength within themselves. It is our task, in this brief hour to sense this need if we are to successfully challenge the alcoholic and the alcohol problem. We should not attempt to delve into the moral aspects of the alcohol problem without some such minimal background.

THE SCAPEGOAT OF REHABILITATION

Dr. Selden D. Bacon, lecturing at the Yale University School of Alcohol Studies in 1948 said: "Both the ethical and the therapeutic approaches to the problem of alcoholism must be based on an understanding of alcohol, drinking, and the physiology and psychology of the human being. Many of those who attempt to control alcoholism are like those who attempted to control lightning without knowledge of electricity."

Dr. Bacon is correct. But in my concept of the real problem, Dr. Bacon has only half said it. * * *

* * * In dealing with the problem of alcoholism, we already know more than we do. Knowing is not our problem.

As I have traveled this Nation from coast to coast, both as a student and as a lecturer in this field, I have reached the conclusion that the number one moral aspect of the alcohol problem is the all-too-prevalent assumption that rehabilitation is the answer. * * *

ARTIFICIAL GULF

Nor do I accept the great gulf fixed between the problem of alcohol and the problem of alcoholism. Many do. I cannot join in that emphasis, believing it to be the most deceitfully dangerous doctrine with which men are being duped and damned.

* * * As I returned to my study I picked up the evening edition of the morning Oregonian. One of the standout headlines read "Man Dies on Curb in Crash." The man turned out to be a 17-year-old Portland boy who was standing on the curb in front of his home. A 63-year-old man struck the youth's parked car with his own, which then hit the victim, killing him instantly.

* * * * *

My point in breaking in on this dignified paper with this current drinking-driving tragedy is that it is of little consequence to the family of the boy who was killed by the unguided missile whether the man who killed their son was an alcoholic or not. The moral implications are just as clear and just as grave, whether the driver was "high" from an office party where men and women of distinction had had just a few drinks to limber up, as though he were an alcoholic with 20 years of binges to his credit.

THE MORAL PERIL OF PSEUDO-OBJECTIVITY

Ralph Daniel, executive director of the Michigan State Board of Alcoholism gave a highly informative lecture at a workshop-conference on alcohol education and alcoholic rehabilitation in March of this year. He was brilliant and witty in his portrayal of his client—Ethyl Alcohol. The lecture was presumed to be objective. Please listen to the pertinent paragraphs of his presentation, So This Is Ethyl. * * *

"Ethyl was a child of Mother Nature. Paternity was never established, and some believe that she is illegitimate. * * *

"Many of the events of her early life are documented. She had an affair with Noah. Following the great flood Noah cultivated her friendship in the form of a vineyard. On at least one occasion he partook too freely of the fruit of the vine which had been either blessed or cursed by Ethyl, and in a drunken condition he disgraced his family.

* * * * *

"* * * People came and went, but Ethyl carried on unchanged until about the 11th century when she met a young Frenchman by the name of De Still. The courtship was short and they were united in 'holy matrimony' with benefit of science if not with benefit of clergy. There are some people who insist that they were united in 'unholy matrimony' but the fact that their offspring were known as 'Spirits' makes me believe that it must have been 'holy matrimony.'

* * * * *

"And so society drank a new toast to the Ethyl-De Still combination and it was potent.

"The people of the world began to formulate definite attitudes toward Ethyl. It became apparent that she was here to stay, and there have evolved four classes of opinions. * * *

"The first class of opinion is made up of people who believe that Ethyl is all bad and has no good qualities. * * *

"There are others in this first class who are so convinced that Ethyl is exerting a dangerous effect on all who come in contact with her that they feel it their social responsibility to banish her from the lives of others as well as their own lives. These people have adopted a who-needs-you attitude toward Ethyl.

"The second general attitude in Ethyl's environment is one of social acceptance

within certain limits. These people invite Ethyl into their homes and to their parties and meetings. Still they have some rules for her conduct. * * *

"These people enjoy a social acquaintance with Ethyl. These people claim a right to associate with her. They, more than the other three groups, are responsibility for the availability, and accessibility of Ethyl. She owes her existince to this group.

"The third general attitude about Ethyl is held by people who were originally found in the second group. On certain occasions these folks get carried away with Ethyl. Most of the time these people associate with Ethyl in socially acceptable ways, but at times they become intoxicated with her charms. * * *

"These are the people who have an occasional affair with Ethyl.

"The fourth group of attitudes about Ethyl is made up of an estimated 4 million souls in this country who have become so involved with Ethyl that their whole lives revolve around her. * * * The experts label these people as sick people, because of their uncontrollable drives to be with Ethyl and their inability to see the catastrophe that is ruining their lives.

"And so we see the four most important factors in Ethyl's life. First are the people who say 'Who needs you?' Second, those who socially acquaint with Ethyl. Third, those who have an occasional affair with Ethyl. And last, those who try to keep going steady with Ethyl.

* * * * *

"Ever since Eve first convinced Adam that no harm would come from eating the forbidden fruit, we men have been having trouble with our women. We can't seem to get along with them and we can't get along without them. * * *

"Thus it is with Ethyl."

I have given you in this portion of our consideration of the Moral Aspects of the Alcohol Problem direct quotes from Ralph Daniel's lecture to which I referred earlier. It has not been taken out of context and would, I am sure, be considered a fair condensation of his total paper So This Is Ethyl?

We hear the word "objective" applied to many such speakers and writers. It has occurred to me that one of the most immoral aspects of the alcohol problem is to have passed off as objective that which is patently partisan.

Going back to Mr. Daniel's description of Noah's experience, he refers to "the fruit of the vine which had been either 'blessed' or 'cursed' by Ethyl," it isn't spelled out, but the thought is implanted: beveraged alcohol has been a curse but it can be a blessing.

Again in reference to the marriage of Ethyl to the Frenchman by the name of De Still, it is a marriage in "Holy Matrimony" because their offspring are known as "Spirits" and consequently he cannot go along with those who would call it "Unholy Matrimony." Objective?

Still another, "It became apparent that she was here to stay." Could this analysis possibly have a tinge of wishful thinking in it—any subtle planting of the germ of "we have it; we need it; we're going to have it; almost everybody wants it; it may do some damage but we must learn to live with it?"

Repeatedly this would-be objective authority uses the phrase "so satisfying are her charms," failing at any time to add the sequel, "At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." I shall never forget a cryptic comment made by Dr. Arthur Bietz at the second session of this Institute: "Danger is never in a lie; it is always in a half-truth."

We find such phrases as "the experts label these people as sick people"—with the implication that they have uncontrollable drives to be with Ethyl because they are sick—not because Ethyl is a drug.

Dr. Karen Horney warns, "Freud's discarding of moral values has contributed toward making the analyst just as blind as the patient."

And, finally, the analogy that "ever since Eve first convinced Adam no harm would come from eating the forbidden fruit we men have been having trouble with our women. We can't seem to get along with them and we can't get along without them. * * *"

The colossal effrontery, the unmitigated gall of a man making distilled liquors and my wife syonymous in our American culture. Could a public relations counsel for the distilleries do any more effective lobbying for the votes of the people than this man has done, not employed by the distilleries, but appearing as an objective authority? "Here are men" he tells us "who have found the burdens of life unbearable and glamorous Ethyl has soothed their fevered brow and made life bearable * * *."

* * * * *

SIN OR SICKNESS OR BOTH?

To the person concerned with the ethical dimension of living it is not satisfying to stop on the bold assertion that alcoholism is a sin, or that it is a sickness. Every personal and social problem is also a moral problem.

From the questionnaires returned by the ministers who attended the Yale University School of Alcohol Studies, Howard Clinebell, Jr., found not only a considerable variety of opinion but also some confusion regarding the nature of the ethical problems involved. Here is an evaluative summary of some of the more frequent conceptions:

1. Alcoholism is a sin and not a sickness. * * *

2. Alcoholism begins as a personal sin and ends as a sickness. This would seem from the questionnaires to be one of the most common views held by clergymen. * * *

3. Alcoholism is a sickness which involves the sin of abuse. This is among others the Roman Catholic point of view. The sin is the sin of excess involved in becoming and remaining an alcoholic.

4. Alcoholism is a sickness which is caused by a combination of factors involving both sin and sickness. This is the view of many ministers and of Alcoholics Anonymous, though Alcoholics Anonymous takes no sides in the matter and does not regard drinking as morally wrong.

5. Alcoholism involves sin in the sense that it has destructive consequences. One minister wrote: "It is a sin in the sense that it detracts from his relationship with God, his family, and his community." * * *

COMPULSIONS

In this summary, the opinion is also given that "the alcoholic is a compulsive person even before he becomes a compulsive drinker." In the thinking of your speaker today is another half-truth. This is not to deny the scientific fact that some alcoholics are compulsive persons, even before they become compulsive drinkers. It is to emphasize that some alcoholics are compulsive persons before becoming addicted and others become addictive drinkers through the process of drinking.

Outstanding in the field of psychologists who have devoted themselves to the study and treatment of alcoholism is Dr. Charles H. Durfee. Dr. Durfee is quite certain that "No one is born an alcoholic and there is no such thing as an alcoholic type." * * *

Dr. E. M. Jellinek, former director of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies and currently Director of World Health Organization, said "Neurotic or diseased personalities. * * * probably constitute 40 percent of the inebriate population; but 60 percent come to alcoholism from an entirely normal origin and only in the course of drink. They are not seeking release, they are conforming to certain habits of their set."

REPRESSIONS AND MORALS

There are authorities and millions of followers of those authorities who believe that man should not be repressed; that man, consequently, should take a drink if he desires a drink.

* * * * *

* * * Discipline and restraint are viewed as harmful to the character. "Be self-expressive; religion and morality are destroying your personality."

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen counteracts this school of thought when he says, "If a man is really made better and saner because he gives way to his sexual instincts and is uninhibited by the Christian law of life-long marriage, why should not a man be better because he gives way to other instincts, such as the hunting instinct? Why not organize a kill your enemy hunt, uninhibited by the moral taboo of a Fifth Commandment? * * *"

Fulton Sheen fails to make the application, but it is our considered opinion that the analysis the bishop has made regarding sexual instincts and morals must also be applied to men's attitudes and actions regarding alcohol and morals.

* * * * *

MORAL NOT DIVORCED FROM SPIRITUAL

* * * Everyone here, I suppose, has been greeted with the friendly salutation "What do you know for sure?" And its implication is that there is very little a man can be certain of, can know for sure. The psychologists write books telling us how to get washed without getting wet, while some preachers turn their pulpits into distributing centers for soothing syrup and aspirin.

* * * * *

"What do you know for sure?" I know that moral distinctions are real and I know that our labors must be rooted and grounded not merely in logic but in love.

* * * * *

I shall ask God to give us grace to hold before our eyes the broken body of our Lord and Master who throughout his ministry kept taking out the sin rather than taking it out on the sinner. I will add the prayer that we may be compelled by the compassion of Christ to come to Him in contrition with our carnal lives, not just to be corrected but to be conquered; that His redemptive power will be revealed in us that we may not only have some small part in the solution of the alcohol problem but in the overall problem of mankind itself which alcohol complicates.

Mr. Philadelphia Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Bulletin dated August 10, 1958:

MR. PHILADELPHIA REPUBLICAN "AUS" MEEHAN ALWAYS KEEPS HIS WORD AND, IN POLITICS, THAT MAY BE BAD

(By John C. Calpin)

Speaking as an individual, we think that the honor being paid to Austin Meehan by

the Republicans on September 7 is long overdue.

The GOP city committee and a group called Friends of Aus Meehan are holding "Aus Meehan Day" at Willow Grove Park for "Mr. Philadelphia Republican."

This is the first time he has been so honored. Friends say he has turned thumbs down on past efforts to hold dinners and similar affairs for him. This year, they wouldn't take no for an answer.

If there is any gratitude and honor among the 3,100 committeemen and the other party workers and members, a huge crowd should be there.

For years, the openhanded "Sheriff" has been pouring out his own money for the party (or his faction of it in primaries) with little tangible reward.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS IN POLITICS

He has held 2 offices in his 35 years in politics: a short tenure on the registration commission and a term as sheriff. While he was sheriff, he literally gave his salary away. The "payroll" and the sycophants were there on payday, waiting with palm outstretched for alms. Probably it cost him twice as much a year to be sheriff as his salary brought in. This was aside from his political campaigns.

As a paving contractor, Meehan has not needed the political jobs but took them as part of the game. And what may seem strange to some people, he has had as many paving contracts from the Democratic administrations as he had under the Republicans. Last week, he was low bidder on $589,000 work on Chestnut Street.

For several years now, Meehan has been the principal "angel" for the upkeep of the GOP city committee.

INDEPENDENT CRITICS

The GOP outsiders who sneer at him and what they consider his pretensions to the leadership never paid a dime, or as the boys say, in the vernacular, "a fishcake."

Because they had become infected with the poison spread by Democratic campaign orators of the past, these independents look down their noses at the man who made his money the hard way and spends it freely on his hobby. They would like to have a scapegoat.

These are the people who think that he should step aside as leader, because of recent GOP defeats. Others ask why that should be, and ask also whether or not the reason for the defeat doesn't lie elsewhere. They point out that Meehan was the original Eisenhower backer in the local GOP in 1952 and delivered his delegates early for the general.

Some of the State GOP leaders don't like it that Philadelphia has such a powerful voice in party affairs. They would like to keep it to their own clique of backwoods and rural leaders—a case of the tail wagging the GOP dog.

MANY IN HIS DEBT

Perhaps others should defend Meehan against these attacks. However, it can be stated that without the rotund "sheriff" there wouldn't be much of a GOP here.

Every committeeman who got his division money on past election days got it because Aus Meehan. Some estimate that he has put up $500,000 for the party over 25 years. The unpaid loans after elections pile up each year.

Perhaps he should not have been a big-time politician, for he has what seems to be a fatal weakness—he is too tenderhearted and forgiving. Also, he keeps his word. That's bad, in politics, according to some.

CHARGES UNPROVED

He has forgiven all but a few of those who have vilified him during his political days, when he was made a whipping boy by the Democrats, who, to this day, have never proved a single thing that they said about him.

Certainly, he was a politician, and certainly, he made deals, and certainly, he doled out patronage. But they never proved he profited thereby.

The committee in charge of the day has had 15,000 tickets printed, to be distributed to the various wards. These tickets are $5 a family, $3 for an individual.

A Momentous Journey: Latin American Tour of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, from April 27 to June 16, 1958, the New York Philharmonic, under the sponsorship of the President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations administered by the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—gave 39 concerts in 21 cities in 12 Latin American countries. This program is made possible by congressional appropriations. The orchestra, conducted by Leonard Bernstein and Dimitri Mitropoulos, was received with acclaim wherever it played.

At each concert the Philharmonic included in its program at least one work by a United States composer and often a work by a Latin American composer. Music, it has often been stated, is an international language. The recent Latin American concert tour by the New York Philharmonic has served to reemphasize this fact by the genuine good will engendered in our sister republics to the south and the building up of their respect for our cultural achievement so important to them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from President Eisenhower commenting on the tour, and a report of the tour by David M. Keiser, president, New York Philharmonic.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1958.

Mr. DAVID M. KEISER,
President of the Board, the Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KEISER: The reports of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra's tour of Latin America have been very gratifying to me. It was heartwarming to learn that this splendid orchestra was received with acclaim wherever it performed.

By sharing with our neighbors to the south the skills of one of the great orchestras of our country, we have drawn closer to the ideal of mutual understanding and friendship which is our goal. I am especially glad to know that the success of the orchestra's mission, founded on the fine musicianship of each member of the orchestra and of the brilliance of the conductors, Dimitri Mitropoulos and Leonard Bernstein, was further enhanced by the personal friendliness and warmth of the conductors and musicians.

Please convey to the members of the orchestra and to Maestros Bernstein and Mitropoulos my hearty congratulations for their excellent accomplishment of an important undertaking.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC TOUR OF LATIN AMERICA

The 7-week tour of Latin America by the New York Philharmonic was greeted as a momentous happening by each of the 12 countries visited. In city after city the concerts were called the most important artistic events of recent times, and in several instances the most important in the history of the country. The orchestra's visit was also welcomed everywhere as an act of good will on the part of the United States Government and of the people of the United States.

Audiences in unprecedented numbers packed into theaters, open-air amphitheaters, and even great arenas heretofore dedicated to popular sports events. The Philharmonic's activities and its extraordinary successes were day after day reported on the front pages of the press. Ovations were described as delirious, frenetic, interminable, and without recall in our memory. The rapid sellout of tickets often created special public problems for local sponsors as literally thousands had to be turned away from box offices. In one capital city people brought food and mattresses and slept on the sidewalks 24 hours prior to the opening of the ticket sale; in another, crowds even tried to break down the doors of the overfilled theater and stop the concert if they were not allowed admission. Editorials calling for greater protection of public safety appeared in some cities after theater entrances, aisles, and backstage areas had been jammed with standees throughout a concert.

It was a highly moving experience to be present when thousands of students cheered and stamped in wild enthusiasm in Santiago's Madison Square Garden, the Caupolican; when the initial reserve of the musically sophisticated audience in the Colón in Buenos Aires turned into one of the memorable ovations in the history of that magnificent theater; when the United States national anthem was very notably applauded several days after the unfortunate demonstrations in Lima; when 18,000 people listened in intent silence in the enormous cavern of the Maracanazinho in Rio and exploded into a thunder of applause and cheering after each number, and when many of the audience openly wept as the crowds joined in singing of the national hymn of Brazil at its stirring repeat performance at the conclusion of the program; when great crowds surged about our conductors in the streets after concerts in almost each provincial city in which the Philharmonic played, expressing appreciation that their city had not been overlooked when the trip was planned. These are but a few moments from a tour rich in rewarding experiences.

From the nature, extent, warmth, and spontaneity of public attention and response, it became readily apparent that the impact of this tour would be deep and long-ranging. This was the first orchestra from abroad to visit many of the cities. Its quality of performance will be regarded as a new standard, it was often stated, and local orchestras will no doubt benefit by a stimulated public interest and the prospect of greater local support. Some cities expressed their delight that vast popular audiences had been discovered for symphonic concerts.

This tour came at a moment when evidences of strain in relations with our southern neighbors were being dramatically demonstrated. The welcome given to the or-

chestra was therefore not only gratifying but especially significant. I often heard it expressed that in sending the Philharmonic, the United States was sending its best, and for this symbol of our country's highest achievements there was only universal and heartwarming admiration. Representatives of local governments and of our own foreign missions, as well as private United States citizens living in our host countries, were outspoken in their pleasure at the flood of friendly feeling engendered by the orchestra's presence.

I feel that all who take pride in this Nation's artistic achievements will join me in paying grateful tribute to the officers of the Government and of ANTA who have shaped this international music program, and to the men of the Philharmonic, its two conductors and management who so brilliantly carried through this rewarding mission.

JUNE 23, 1958.

DAVID M. KEISER,
President, New York Philharmonic.

No Need for Panic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Need for Panic," from the Anderson Free Press of Anderson, S. C., for August 7, 1958.

The editorial succinctly points out some facts which should be borne in mind by every Senator in considering the issue of Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO NEED FOR PANIC

We have heard much of the alleged plight of the Nation's schools, ascribed to grossly inadequate pay for teachers, inadequate buildings of physical facilities, and other such neglects. The commonly proposed solution is Federal support of education.

Now, however, the Institute of Social Science Research has issued an exhaustive study which reaches very different conclusions. It is signed by Roger Freeman, an acknowledged authority in this field who, among other things, was consultant on school finance to the White House Conference on Education.

Here are some of the points Mr. Freeman makes and substantiates: In terms of cost, education is the largest public service in the country next to national defense. Between 1929–39 and 1955–56, personal consumption expenditures doubled, whereas public-school expenditures tripled. In 1956, we spent $103.94 per capita on education as against $34.17 in Russia. In late years, the number of certified teachers has increased materially more, on a percentage basis, than the number of pupils. In these years, in addition, college majors in education have increased by 33 percent where majors in other fields decreased by 28 percent. The classroom shortage has been greatly exaggerated and is rapidly decreasing.

Finally, in 1957 teachers' pay, on the average, was 94 percent above the 1929 level; earnings of all workers were 82 percent above.

The study certainly does not claim that everything is perfect in education. But it does show that our educational problems have been magnified out of all reason. There's no need to press any panic buttons.

The Development of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Is Out in Front of Ike on A-Energy," published in the Louisville Times of August 6, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS IS OUT IN FRONT OF IKE ON A-ENERGY

Once again Congress has shown itself to be more realistic than the President regarding the Govenrment's proper role in the development of atomic energy. This is reflected in an enactment authorizing expenditure of $386,679,000 for this purpose, or nearly twice the amount Mr. Eisenhower had asked for.

Reluctantly he has signed the bill, but in doing so he has indicated that he may advise the Atomic Energy Commission against going ahead with some of the projects authorized. Biggest of these is a proposed $145 million plutonium-producing reactor which could be converted later to the production of electric power.

This feature of convertibility was fought in Congress by opponents of public power. They saw it as a step toward enlarging the Government's power-production program at some future date, contrary to the administration's so-called partnership policy that gives preference to private utilities. The congressional foes of public power tried unsuccessfully to amend the bill to provide for a reactor plant that could be used only for producing plutonium.

In his statement criticizing the bill, Mr. Eisenhower noted that such a single-purpose plant would cost $25 million less than the convertible type. Yet elsewhere in the same statement he gave what we consider the soundest of arguments for building the dual-purpose plant ordered by Congress, although that, of course, was not his purpose.

What he said was that the Defense Department had advised him that necessity for more plutonium for military purposes has not been established. He went on to say that until this has been done, "I consider it unsound to proceed."

Obviously, in the circumstances, it would be unsound to proceed with construction of a plant which could never be used for anything but the production of plutonium. That's exactly why the majority of Congress followed the advice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and authorized a plant that could be converted to peacetime uses as a producer of electric power if and when military needs for plutonium have been fully met.

It would be worse than unsound, of course, to run any risk of underestimating present or future military needs for plutonium. The bill passed by Congress serves the double purpose of avoiding such risk and at the same time safeguarding taxpayers' investment in an additional plutonium plant by specifying that it be convertible. The additional cost over a single-purpose plant is small in comparison with the investment it would insure against premature obsolescence.

Moreover, there is—quite aside from military demands—an urgent need for this country to step up its development of atomic-generated electric power. We lag badly in this important new field and the reason we do is the administration overreliance on its partnership policy. As Congress has indicated, the Government must assume a bolder role.

Proposal To Ship Surplus Food Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now the Food Out of Our Mouths," from the Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N. H., of August 11, 1958, which I recommend to all the Members of the Senate and the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW THE FOOD OUT OF OUR MOUTHS

Do you remember this newspaper's proposal to store our surplus food all around the United States in easily accessible places so that in the event of a terrible disaster, such as a hydrogen war, each community could be assured of enough basic foods so that its population would not starve?

It has been estimated by experts that it would take 2 years after such a hydrogen bomb attack to get our farms producing again the food which we must have in order to live. Storing seems a sensible and rational plan, but if the United Nations has its way we will not be allowed to do any such thing.

At a recent meeting in Geneva of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations it was decided that the right thing to do would be to have any nation with a surplus of food, such as the United States, ship that food to underdeveloped countries, such as India, Communist China or any other nation which needs food. If this plan was followed before war broke out, the United States would have been conveniently deprived of its food by its enemies for the benefit of its enemies.

A neater trick this newspaper cannot imagine, but unless someone with brains steps in in Washington, you can be sure this is exactly the sort of thing this Nation will do. We will wake up some morning to find ourselves under a threat of attack and all our surplus food storage given to our enemies.

It is bad enough to give away our money, our airplanes and our armaments to potential enemies, but to give away the food on which our very lives depend is even worse. It will certainly happen unless enough citizens protest.

Five Mideast Illusions That Befog Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the rising tide of nationalism in the Middle East must be recognized in its true perspective if America and the western nations are to avoid grave mistakes in the months ahead. An article, written by Peggy and Pierre Streit, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, August 3, served to clarify and enlighten this vast movement of peoples seeking their own destinies, and I commend it to the scrutiny of all Members. The article follows:

FIVE MIDEAST ILLUSIONS THAT BEFOG US

(By Peggy and Pierre Streit)

The crisis of our policy in the Middle East stems in large degree from the misconceptions that we hold about the area, from our tendency to equate our standards and ideals with those of the Arab world. It is vital to recognize the difference between the mirage and the reality. Having done so, we may hope that a fresh approach will give the Middle Easterners reason to rid themselves of illusions they have about us.

The most persistent and significant misconceptions about the Middle East are set forth below:

Misconception No. 1: That the tumult and ferment in the Middle East have been caused by Khrushchev and Nasser.

It is tempting to believe that if Nasser were overthrown and the Soviet Union rendered impotent, tranquility would return to the land and oil would flow unthreatened from Middle East wells. But such a thesis ignores basic forces now churning the Middle East and surging from the depths of empty stomachs and ancient resentments.

At least three dynamics dominate life there today. First is the impatient, rapidly accelerating demand of the people for a better life. Second is the passionate resentment toward foreign domination, direct or indirect, real or imagined. Third is the rise of nationalism—the desire of the people to be master in their own house. Recently this nationalism has grown to encompass the ancient ideal of Arab unity.

History and the mercurial Arab temperament—not Nasser or the Soviet Union—are responsible for these forces. No doubt, however, the Egyptian leader, with the aid and approval of Moscow, has ridden and promoted them, for both he and Russia thrive on unrest.

Misconception No. 2: That the Middle East can still be dominated by the traditional ruling classes that have held sway there for centuries.

In general, Middle Eastern society has been composed of two groups. The first was the small ruling elite comprising the landed aristocracy, tribal chieftains, and the great merchants. Often highly cultured, broadly traveled, foreign educated, this group lived its own life with little or no contact with the people who inhabited and tilled the land.

These comprised the second group—the peasants, villagers, small artisans, and shopkeepers. Their lives were agonizingly simple, for they sought merely to exist. All of their energies were consumed in this struggle and what they desired most from their rulers was to be left in peace.

Contact between these two groups was usually limited to the levying of taxes and the mustering of troops.

In the past decade there has been profound change. The voiceless, voteless, illiterate "little man" of the Middle East—who accounts for upward of 85 percent of the population—is emerging as a political force. Partly as a result of the social awakening everywhere; partly because of the sudden gush of oil wealth; partly because of Soviet as well as American emphasis on raising the standard of living of the world, the old walls of peasant fatalism are crumbling.

There is a snowballing awareness of the good things this earth can offer and a surging, impatient desire to share them. The growing middle class—the semieducated technicians, mechanics, interpreters, and civil servants—give greatest voice to the new aspirations and old resentments; and their words trickle back to the villages.

Today the peasants are beginning to beat their plowshares into swords and their pruning hooks into spears. After centuries of social stability, the Middle East now echoes with the demand for change—change of any kind at any price. The people who aspire to it are, for the most part, uneducated, prone to be unreasonable and susceptible by temperament to the rantings of any demagog who promises them something new. Very probably, social unrest resulting from the awakening demands of the people will churn the Middle East for some time to come, for it seems likely that no leader, no matter how able, will meet the demands of the masses now that they have been aroused.

Misconception No. 3: That the Middle East is ready for western representative government.

Western forms of representative government have been introduced gradually into the Middle East over the last 50 years: "Constitutional" monarchies have been established; "parliamentary" governments instituted. What the West and many well-meaning middle-eastern leaders frequently fail to realize, however, is that the strength, viability, and effectiveness of representative government, developed in the West over centuries, does not lie in these forms. It must stem from the people themselves, from their sense of responsibility, from the respect they hold for the rights of each other and for the law that governs them.

In other words, a functioning, representative government implies a number of preconditions which we in the United States tend to take for granted, but which only partly exist in the Middle East.

Implied, for example, is a literate electorate, capable of informing itself relatively well about the issues, men, and problems of its government. In the Middle East, illiteracy in some countries runs as high as 85 percent, thus precluding the existence of a mature electorate. Also implied is a degree of economic independence enabling a man to express his vote without threat to his very existence. In the Middle East economic independence is almost nonexistent. It is futile to expect a tenant farmer to vote against a landlord who can utterly dispossess him.

The functioning of effective representative government requires, in addition, a degree of civic consciousness and a tradition of respect for law. In the Middle East the fight for existence has tended to pit man against man, leaving only respect for the law of survival. Without some of the preconditions outlined here, parliamentary government tends to be an empty shell that serves to clothe the traditional ruling class in a mantle of legitimacy and to soften the opprobrium attaching to authoritarian rule.

Furthermore, these governments have frequently proved themselves unwilling to bring about change. Many of them have been and are composed of the old-guard kings, landlords, sheiks, and merchants whose power and wealth is rooted in the feudal system and who see in reform their self destruction. Sometimes, under the pressure of the times, gestures toward basic improvement of social and political conditions have been made, and laws have been passed, but with little thought of implementation.

Misconception No. 4: That the Middle East thinks, as we do, that authoritarian government is evil.

Actually, authoritarian rule has always prevailed in the Middle East. Despite the trappings of parliamentary forms, most of the traditional governments were and are dominated by strong men. What happens in the Middle East when a "constitutional" regime is overthrown by a military junta, is not (as Westerners tend to view it) the destruction of a Western-type representative government and a retrograde step toward totalitarianism, but merely the replacement of one authoritarian rule by another.

The new regimes may or may not speak and act in the interests of the people. But it is likely that these interests must increasingly be taken into consideration. When they are, and the ground swell for social and economic change is measured against the weakness of existing political institutions in the Middle East to enact change in a peaceful and orderly fashion, it becomes clear that some form of authoritarianism will probably fill the vacuum. Rightly or wrongly, many Middle Easterners believe that today only a dictator—and a ruthless one, if necessary—can cope with the overwhelming problems at hand.

Misconception No. 5.—That the Middle East agrees with us that Soviet policy represents a threat to personal liberty and political independence.

This belief assumes that the people of the Middle East attach the same value we do to personal and political freedoms. How can they? Except for the sophisticated few among the ruling elite, individual freedom and its retinue of rights are nonexistent. The mass of the people cannot fear the loss of something they do not have. And for those a cut above the mass—the white-collar workers, the young army officers, the intelligentsia—individual freedoms are frequently considered luxuries which have little of no bearing on the pressing social and economic needs of the time.

What the United States also overlooks, when it seeks Middle East support against the Soviet threat to freedom and independence, is that it is the West, and not Russia, which for many years has constituted that threat. The Middle East has had a long and bitter personal experience with Western domination. It has had virtually no such direct experience with Soviet imperialism. It is expecting a great deal of dispassionate thinking and political discernment from the majority of the Middle Easterners to expect them to perceive that what is red is really black and what is black is actually white.

Furthermore, in appraising the Soviet Union through the eyes of the people and the new leaders of the Middle East, one fact looms larger than communism's ruthless denial of freedom. It is that Russia, once a weak, underdeveloped nation facing many of the social and economic problems the Middle East faces today, has mastered these in less than a lifetime and has not only raised the standard of living of its people but has emerged as one of the most powerful nations in the world. In the context of the aspirations of the Middle East today, the Soviet experiment offers more instructive, practical parallels than the democratic experiment symbolized by the West.

Our foreign policy in the Middle East has suffered grave consequences as a result of these misconceptions. One of the gravest is the readiness with which we attribute all our

troubles and discomfitures to Nasser and the Soviet Union. This has tended to blind us to the real problems and to make us seek solutions where they can't be found.

Simply stated, the policy of the United States Government has been to keep Soviet influence from flowing in and to keep oil flowing out. To do so, the United States has sought to maintain stability in the Levant.

Implied in this policy is a static view of the social, political and emotional climate of the area. When it is realized that the Middle East is entering a period of basic change, that this change is not likely to be tranquil and that consequently instability is likely to be the norm, a policy that seeks stability is likely to fall out of step with events.

Furthermore, in seeking stability in the Middle East, the United States has backed, however reluctantly, regimes that have tended to be repressive, reactionary and increasingly unrepresentative of the growing aspirations and demands of the people. Thus, United States policy has unwittingly tended to bottle up the ferment and add to the explosive force of events.

It may be easy to point to shortcomings of United States policy. It is another matter to suggest remedies. Nevertheless, some broad suggestions may be attempted.

The United States must frame its policies in terms of what are realities for Middle Eastern countries, as well as realities for us. Internal social and economic pressures in the area presage a period of turmoil. Governments and regimes must be expected to come and go, reflecting the area's search for eventual stability. We must be able, or at least try, to ride with the changes.

The recognition we extend to any government should be more circumspect than it has been in the past. We should not tie our fortunes too closely to governments that, by their nature, may not be able to withstand the tide of events.

And we must, in some way, identify ourselves with the legitimate aspirations of the people of the area.

Bold Action on Depreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the points of Adm. Ben Moreell as chairman of the board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., as well as the views of Steel, the Metal Working Weekly, of Cleveland, Ohio, should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States, I am submitting the following items for the RECORD.

Adm. Ben Moreell has been the outstanding advocate of getting things done. He has been the successful head of the Seabees in the Pacific during World War II when so much was done in building advance airfields with so little, but with the tremendous enthusiasm of thousands of young men whom he led.

Ben Moreell, since his retirement from the Navy, has been associated in many executive capacities with Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., one of our big steel producers. He has just retired as chairman of the board, in which position he has been setting the policy of this important steel producing union in the capacity of the United States.

JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 16, 1958.

Congressman JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I am forwarding to you with this letter an article which appeared in the April 28, 1958, issue of Steel magazine entitled "Let's Leap to Recovery With Bold Action on Depreciation."

It is generally held by most economists that the greatest single stimulus to economic activity is capital investment by industry. The records indicate that such investment exerts a stimulating effect beginning with the production of raw materials at the mine and in the forest, and that this effect permeates throughout the economy.

While I am not sure that the enclosed article defines the most realistic and effective procedure for stimulating capital investment, it is certainly a long step forward in the right direction.

It has been said that, because of what appears to be overcapacity in many lines of industry, a fast tax writeoff law would not be effective. I do not agree with this point of view. Taking the steel industry as an example, I know that there are huge expenditures which should be made now in order to improve quality or reduce production costs. While neither of these would result in an increase in quantity, they would both have the effect of increasing the productivity of the working force. The steel industry, in common with many other industries, is now laboring under the disadvantage that results from an increase in employment costs since the end of World War II which far exceeds the increase in productivity.

The stimulation of expenditures designed to redress this imbalance, at least in part, would have the collateral and very desirable effect of stimulating the entire economy.

I feel certain that the same situation exists in other industries.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of the enclosure and whatever action is feasible to promote legislative authority for accelerated amortization.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

BEN.

[From Steel magazine of April 28, 1958]

FIGHT ON RECESSION: WILL YOU JOIN US?

A bold yet simple program to correct the recession and to halt the march of inflation is proposed by the editors of Steel. It is based on these facts:

The recession got its start (and has its deepest roots) in the capital-goods industries.

Capital-goods dollars have more bounce than soft goods and service dollars.

The quickest, surest way to correct the recession is to stimulate spending for capital goods—spending for reequipment and, where needed, spending for new plants.

The most direct method to encourage spending for tools is to free industry from our straitjacket depreciation laws.

Steel's program has only two steps:

For the short term, allow any equipment, building, or land acquired from January 1, 1958, until June 30, 1959, to be amortized for tax purposes in 5 years—if the owner elects to do so.

For the long pull, set up an industry-Government commission to modernize the depreciation setup on a permanent basis.

The program has its genesis in letters and conversations with our readers. Scores of you who are participating in this publication's cost crisis competition (its aim: The updating of capacity and equipment to lower unit production costs) have suggested that depreciation reform is essential to keeping our industrial machine modern.

You have said that investment triggered by liberalized depreciation will do more to regain high-level employment and output than any stopgap measure aimed at putting more dollars into the consumer's pockets. You have pointed out that the updating of our industrial machines (as opposed to outright expansion) is an immediate need in slendering costs, boosting output per man-hour of labor input, and holding down prices.

We realize that one publication alone—or one company or one industry alone—cannot overcome the inertia that is blocking depreciation reform. Pleas made in the past by industry and publications—in editorials, in speeches, in corporate reports, in testimony before congressional committees—have been like drops of water falling on the desert. They have evaporated before they could form a reservoir to build up enough pressure to get action.

With the Nation groping anxiously for a way to stem the recession, we believe the time for concerted action is now.

In the weeks ahead, the editors of Steel will continue to spearhead the drive for short- and long-term depreciation reform. Our voice will reach all Congressmen and appropriate Government officials.

Will you join us in the fight?

WALTER J. CAMPBELL,
Editor.

LET'S LEAP TO RECOVERY WITH BOLD ACTION ON DEPRECIATION

The United States can take a giant step toward halting the recession and checking inflation with this two-point program:

1. Allow any equipment, building, or land acquired from January 1, 1958, until June 30, 1959, to be amortized for tax purposes in 5 years, if the owner elects to do so. (Congress should enact the enabling legislation now.)

2. Appoint a Government-industry committee (like President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Trade Policy) to study what can be done for permanent depreciation reform. A new system should be ready to go into effect July 1, 1959. We must abandon the Government's rigid concept of useful lives for facilities, as embodied in the Internal Revenue Service's Bulletin F. Recommended is the adoption of a bracket system, advanced by the National Machine Tool Builders' Association and following somewhat the Canadian pattern which is working so well. Adopted in 1949, it has withstood the test of 9 years' use.

IMMEDIATE RELIEF

We have, in effect, declared depreciation moratoriums twice before—in 1940 and in 1950 when 5-year amortization was enacted. Both contributed immeasurably to the productivity and prosperity of those periods by stimulating capital expansion.

Today, the recession is caused primarily by a decline in capital spending. The recession has since fed on itself and has brought unemployment and other ramifications in virtually every segment of the economy. To get things going again, we have to move the capital equipment and industrial construction industries off dead center. It has been proved that moratoriums can provide such stimulation, by giving industry the impetus to buy facilities to make new or improved products at less cost.

Previous moratoriums were designed to increase capacity in times of war. Now we need more facilities that will cut costs so that American goods can be priced back into the domestic and world markets.

We need the moratorium in the battle against inflation. Increased productivity is the most effective way to combat it. And

the most effective way to make significant gains in productivity is through improved equipment.

Thus a moratorium on our straitjacket depreciation rules that force much of industry to write off its equipment in 20 years and its buildings in 40 to 60 years would stimulate the basic capital equipment and industrial construction industries. That would strike at the core of the recession. Reequipment boosts productivity and lowers costs. That would strike at the core of inflation.

Sentiment is rising for a temporary return to fast amortization. Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican, of California, has just introduced H. R. 11863 which would return 5-year writeoffs for 1958. Herbert I. Segal, president, Van Norman Industries, Inc., New York, suggests its return as part of his program for recovery. J. A. Swaney, assistant to the treasurer at Harris-Intertype Corp., Cleveland, believes it would be a godsend to the printing and printing equipment industries.

LONG TERM CATALYST

We need a permanent depreciation policy that is sane. Ours is the most archaic among industrial nations of the world.

Standard machine tools are usually depreciated over a 15 to 25 year span in America. In Canada, the depreciable life normally allowed for machine tools is 5 years. In England, it's about 8; in West Germany, it's not over 10; in France, it's 6 or 7; in Italy, it's 7; in Switzerland, it's about 8; in Sweden, it's 5 for machines acquired after 1952 and at the discretion of the taxpayer on what was acquired before then.

A President's commission on depreciation would have scores of reform proposals to study, plus plans in other nations, virtually all of which are more liberal than ours.

USEFUL LIVES

America's depreciation ills stem primarily from two sources—from the rigid concept of useful lives for facilities and from inflation. A solution that attacks the first problem will probably help with the second because more flexible and liberal schedules of useful lives will allow more rapid writeoffs. The faster the amortization the less chance for inflation.

That's why the majority of depreciation experts interviewed by Steel agree with E. F. Gibian, staff director for industrial engineering at Thompson Products Inc., Cleveland: We should tackle the useful-life problem first. Proposals that aim at both get complicated and have less chance of congressional acceptance.

Steel prefers the bracket approach as the solution to the useful-life difficulty. It's simple. It follows generally the system working so successfully in Canada and other nations. (It already has the backing of powerful groups such as the tool builders.

Under it, the limited physical life concept would be scrapped. "Even the most expert machine tool builders and engineers could not compile a list of average lives for every machine tool that would be meaningful," says Jerome A. Raterman, president of Monarch Machine Tool Co.

The multitude of confusing Internal Revenue Service schedules in Bulletin F, with its requirements of salvage and residual values, is a unique American phenomenon. No important foreign country uses them, nor does any other country make the computation so difficult, arbitrary, and inequitable. NMTBA proposes that Bulletin F should simply be a statement of policy and practice which would properly recognize obsolescence. The 1920 and 1931 editions of Bulletin F followed that pattern—giving the principles to be considered in the estimation of useful lives. Detailed schedules had been published separately but were not incorporated into the bulletin itself until the 1942 edition.

Instead of the detailed, obscure schedules, brackets of useful lives would be set up, within which the user could select his own writeoff period. For machine tools and comparable productive equipment, the brackets would be 7 to 10 years; for buildings, 20 to 30 years; for short-lived facilities, such as cars and trucks, the present 3 to 5-year bracket. The bracket idea parallels the Canadian system which sets maximum rates for 14 general classifications of facilities.

If the user is within the brackets, the IRS would not challenge him. However, if he tried to go below the brackets—3 years, say, for a machine tool—he would have the burden of proving that as a reasonable period.

Greater flexibility in our depreciation laws would allow for a new factor influencing obsolescence today. Listen to Roger W. Bolz, editor of Automation: "There is a growing need with automation to consider entire production lines, or plants, as expendable tooling, useful only for the short duration of effective product sales life. Automation equipment, unlike machinery in past years, is often of no value for economically turning out products other than those for which it was designed."

Hear a maker of automation equipment, Frank White, president of Automation Development Corp., Willoughby, Ohio: "Under the ideal depreciation setup, equipment should be written off as an expendable item in relation to the life of the product it makes. Since we don't have that, many of our customers, in effect, keep double records—one for slow tax depreciation purposes and one for their own information on how long the machine will be useful to them."

But not every company will bother with double records. Because of our horse-and-buggy depreciation laws, much of industry tends to reequip on a horse-and-buggy basis to conform with bulletin F's schedule of useful lives. Many companies tend to buy new equipment only when their old has been fully or nearly fully written off for tax purposes. Depreciation reform will get around that industrial prejudice and stimulate much of metalworking to reequip on a more realistic basis.

INFLATION

Many proposals for depreciation reform aim primarily at the inflation problem. Most embody some device to figure tax writeoffs on a replacement basis, rather than the traditional original cost approach. If depreciation on all industrial facilities were figured at current prices, Machinery & Allied Products Institute figures American industry this year would not be paying income taxes on $6 billion.

Congress can hardly be expected to accept depreciation on a replacement basis when the concept isn't generally accepted by industry or the accounting profession. One hope: A recent survey of businessmen and heads of business schools by the Institute of Certified Public Accountants shows 74 percent favor shifting to the replacement method. Ten years ago, only 30 percent advocated such a change.

The institute's committee on accounting procedures pretty much dictates accepted practices. Methods set forth in its bulletins are accepted, for example, by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The committee has had the matter of price-level adjustment of depreciation on its inactive agenda since the 1948 survey. At its June meeting, it will consider moving it to the active agenda. But even then, it might be a year or two before a bulletin is issued.

So, the time is closer (but not close enough) when we can at last persuade Congress to accept the replacement cost concept. Steel believes the most workable proposal for the replacement concept is "reinvestment depreciation," which has many sponsors, including the steel industry. It applies the LIFO concept of inventory accounting to capital spending. An index is applied to facilities to bring their value up to today's dollars. If the facilities are disposed of, the updated value may be credited to the depreciation account of the company in the year they were disposed of, if new facilities are installed to take their place.

WILL TAX REVENUE BE LOST?

We have had 5-year amortization twice before, but it has been dropped twice on the grounds that it cost the government tax revenue. Evidence is to the contrary.

Corporate taxes hit $32.4 billion in the 5 years beginning in 1940 and $89.9 billion in the 5 years beginning in 1950. Up until that time, those were record or near-record receipts. Of course, tax rates were higher during most of those years than they are now, but the figures show there's little ground for worry about tax losses.

Canada, Britain, West Germany, France, Switzerland, and Sweden all have more liberal depreciation laws than we have. All have equally urgent tax revenue problems. But they're not killing the goose that lays taxable eggs. We are by excessively taxing income-producing equipment and buildings through our archaic depreciation setup.

More liberal amortization may defer taxes, but it does not forgive them. They will be paid eventually. By generating more prosperity, speedy writeoffs could conceivably increase taxes. In the long run, fast amortization now and more liberal permanent regulations beginning in 1959 will be cheaper for the United States than the tax cut proposals now being considered as antirecession remedies.

CONCLUSION

Needed is an imaginative approach to the depreciation problem. Bulletin F, with its physical lives based on the history of the 1930's and 1940's, is unfair and leads to interminable controversy between industry and Government. Think of the savings in time and money to both if those unproductive arguments end. That aspect of the situation is bad enough. Another handicap is even worse. If we don't get a more constructive depreciation system, we'll be fatally handicapped in fighting inflation and achieving long-term prosperity.

We have had capital expansion in the last decade partly because 5-year amortization has given us a partial moratorium on our outmoded depreciation laws. But fast writeoffs were virtually killed last year by legislation sponsored by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia. That has contributed to the capital goods recession, which is completely unmasking the deterrents and inequities of our depreciation system. What are we going to do about it?

Steel's answer: Adopt a two-point program—return to fast amortization temporarily while an industry—Government commission has time to forge a permanent, liberal depreciation system.

TALE OF THE MILLION-DOLLAR TURRET LATHE

How does our present depreciation system penalize industry? Thompson Products Inc.'s tale of the million-dollar turret lathe bears repeating because it's becoming a classic.

In 1942, Tapco bought a Warner & Swasey 3–A saddle-type turret lathe for $12,000. Federal tax laws permitted the company to depreciate the original cost over 14 years.

In 1956, the lathe became obsolete. It had a resale value of $1,000, and the company had $12,000 to add to that with which to buy a replacement.

But the replacement cost in 1956 was $35,000 for a lathe that would perform the same function as the old one, or $67,000 for

a new one with attachments to meet today's more exacting needs.

Thompson had only $13,000 to do a $67,000 job. The difference of $54,000 had to come out of profits. To get that amount in 1956, the company had to earn a profit of more than $112,500 before taxes because $54,000 was all there was left after the Government took its corporate profit tax of 52 percent.

And, to earn that profit, the company had to sell more than $1,250,000 worth of products. Hence, the million-dollar turret lathe.

The Sherman Adams Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., relating to the Sherman Adams case:

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 21, 1958]

THE PRESIDENT REALLY NEEDS ADAMS

How greatly President Eisenhower depends upon Sherman Adams in administering the affairs of state is a point that must be grasped to understand the full and tragic significance of the controversy surrounding the Presidential Assistant. No other President has depended any more upon one man, and thus it is understandable why the President wants to retain Adams as his right-hand man, his chief of staff. "I need him," Mr. Eisenhower said the other day. It was a pathetic admission.

It was Sherman Adams who exercised a considerable weight in influencing Mr. Eisenhower to run for the Presidency in 1952. Then it was Sherman Adams who did much of the master-minding of the Eisenhower campaign in 1952. Inexperienced in politics and government, Mr. Eisenhower upon being elected turned to Adams for help in getting adjusted to the ways of governmental operations. To a great extent, Sherman Adams assumed responsibility for handling domestic matters. The President depended upon Secretary Dulles and his military chiefs for help on foreign and military matters. Adams' responsibility became much greater after the President became ill in 1956.

As pointed out by the New York Times, Adams "presides over the White House staff, screens requests for appointments with the President, and has wide powers of decision over which matters get to the President's desk. Many stop right at Mr. Adams' desk. The legend 'O. K.—S. A., or 'No—S. A.' on a document carries almost as much weight throughout the executive branch as the President's signature."

There has been a comparison of the acceptance of gifts by Sherman Adams and by Gen. Harry Vaughan, President Harry Truman's military aide. But this is as far as the comparison goes. General Vaughan held a ceremonial position and was somewhat of a presidential crony, but he exercised little influence, as far as is known, in governmental affairs. Next to the President, Sherman Adams is the most influential man in the White House.

About General Vaughan or any other one White House aide, Harry Truman need never have pleaded that "I need him." On the other hand, it would be difficult indeed for President Eisenhower to get along without his Sherman Adams.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of June 25, 1958]

AMMUNITION SUPPLIED BY GOP

No one has questioned the honesty or integrity of Sherman Adams, who is under fire from members of his own party for what he and President Eisenhower are pleased, for want of a better term, to call imprudence, but the question that naturally arises is how anyone so stupid, politically, could become involved with vicunas, hotel bills, and oriental rugs. The assistant president, as he is wont to be called by many, accepted lavish gifts from Bernard Goldfine and now is engaged in explaining that appointments and contacts he made with Federal agencies in behalf of Mr. Goldfine have no unusual significance.

David Lawrence, who has been going to great lengths to explain just how it all happened, now has followed the lead of others—who can offer no valid reasons in support of such acts by members of their own party—and has gone back to democratic delinquencies. He cites numerous cases along the same line as proof, we presume, that it's all right to perform such extracurricular services so long as both parties indulge in it. But Mr. Lawrence, like many others who believe that the best defense is reference to past sins of others, misses the point entirely when he says that Senators and Representatives are equally guilty with Mr. Adams in carrying complaints to department heads when asked to do so by constituents.

If any Senator or Representative gets a $700 vicuna coat, then he is as guilty as Mr. Adams of stupidity and incompetence if he intercedes for a friend with some Federal agency. The same applies to a $2,500 hotel bill or the loan of a $2,400 oriental rug. Few Representatives in Washington receive elaborate gifts from the folks back home. The constituents generally want free service and lots of it, and they think their Representatives should go all out just on the simple ground of friendship. When constituents begin to send them handsome gifts, if this ever is the case, then it's time for the Representatives to begin a careful study of the situation and perhaps return a few gifts.

The suggestion that Mr. Adams has outlived his usefulness in government did not come from the Democrats. The ammunition all has been supplied by members of Mr. Adams' own party. The Democrats readily agree that he should step aside, but we are inclined to think that many of them would be glad to have him continue to serve in the administration, since he would provide the party with a fine whipping boy for the November elections.

Statement of the Milwaukee County Council of Churches on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the Middle East crisis by the International Relations Committee of the Milwaukee County Council of Churches:

In the present Middle East crisis, we, as Christian churches of Milwaukee, Wis., reaffirm our Christian faith. We believe in God's creative love and power. We believe in Christ's redeeming love and sacrifice. We believe in the Holy Spirit, effectively available through Christ to all men. We therefore call upon the Christian people to seize at once the opportunities now at hand for the advancement of the brotherhod of nations.

We call today for Christian repentance, in that we have enjoyed prosperity without helping Arab nations lift their standard of living, and in that we have failed to understand or appreciate Arab national aspirations or to practice full democracy of nations. We have been overconcerned with the conflict of East and West, and underconcerned with the struggle of the Middle East for welfare and prosperity, unity and freedom.

While we regret the use of military force in the situation, we commend the leaders of our Government for the good order and restraint with which they have tried to stabilize conditions in Lebanon and for emphasis on prompt United Nations evaluation and control.

We call upon our American leaders to commit themselves not to support any individual leaders at the expense of the welfare of Mideast nations and peoples. We ask for a U. N. commission to guide a program of relief and reconstruction for the Arab peoples, without dependence upon dictators, swollen military forces, or the shipment of competitive armaments by outside powers.

Our greatest united opportunity today in the Middle East lies in the development of a program for the provision of food and water, medical and technical skill, education and social welfare. We have abundant evidence of the ability of U. N. specialized agencies to provide technical help sufficient to guide these Arab nations into economic health, stability and self-reliance. We believe that profits from oil production should go primarily to the producing nations, but that other nations now dependent upon this source of oil supply should be enabled to purchase it for a fair price.

Historically, culturally and economically, all nations both East and West have vital interests in the Middle East. Now we have reached the point of no return. Either we must do much or we have already done too much. We pray God that American leadership may be used to enlist the nations of the world upon a bold and imaginative program of action for the good of this region and of the world. To this end we humbly ask God's help and guidance.

The Reader's Digest Spotlights the Trouble in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of Reader's Digest contains a very interesting article concerning Latin America by Michael Scully, entitled "What's Behind Our Trouble With Latin America?" I would like to quote two paragraphs from this article:

Another source of anti-Yankee ammunition is our superfluous friendliness toward

Latin dictators. A United States Ambassador in Buenos Aires once hailed Peron, the Argentine demagog, as a great leader. When an assassin shot dictator Somoza of Nicaragua, a White House physician was flown down to try to save his life. The dictators of Venezuela and Peru were decorated by the United States for their fight against Communist subversion.

Red propagandists treasure these items. They help to convince student-age Latins that our championship of democracy is hypocrisy.

If we are to regain the confidence and respect and admiration of the people of Latin America, Mr. Speaker, we must change our attitude toward dictators and democracies south of the border. Vice President NIXON put it very well on his return from his recent trip to Venezuela when he said that there should be formal handshakes for dictators and warm embraces for democracies. In this I agree with him wholeheartedly. It is my sincere hope that this attitude may soon be incorporated in our official policy toward Latin America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the entire article.

WHAT'S BEHIND OUR TROUBLE WITH LATIN AMERICA?

(By Michael Scully)

In Caracas, Venezuela, last May 13, the Vice President of the United States and his wife were spat upon and stoned by berserk mobs. This happened in a land where not long ago you would have had to look far to find a professed enemy of the United States.

Why?

The quick, but only superficially accurate, answer is "communism." The truth is that Communists were only picking the fruits of a tree of distrust and misunderstanding planted and nurtured by the well-meaning, unwary, literate but ill-informed people of all American nations—and their governments.

For weeks, Venezuela's newly legalized Communists had fomented a get NIXON campaign among students and young workers. Their newspaper stirred a caldron of hatred, using a few bitter truths (for which the United States is to blame) to spice a stew of fantastic lies and distortions. Sample distortion: The United States had welcomed and sheltered their despised ex-dictator, Pérez Jiménez. Truth: He was admitted on parole, as many of his political foes have been. Venezuela, on the basis of legal charges, can at any time make a request to our courts to extradite him and return him home for trial. As of mid-June it had not moved to do so.

Such exploitation of the uninformed and easily swayed created the explosion of May 13. The duped mob had no idea it was acting as a boobytrap for its own and 20 other nations. Had the plan behind the explosion succeeded, it would have wrecked United States relations with Latin America. This would have collapsed the weak economies of many southern nations and led to the hunger riots, political upheaval, and chaos on which communism thrives.

Only the superb control of NIXON's Secret Service guards averted disaster. The mob-manipulators' aim was to provoke them into firing one shot. What would have been the consequences?

Tragedy, of course, NIXON might have been killed. Certainly others would have died. The blackest incident in inter-American history could have led to a break in United States-Venezuelan relations, leaving Venezuela, without a United States market for its oil, forced to deal with Iron Curtain countries on their terms. It could have meant the overthrow of the present friendly government and its replacement by quasi-Communists.

But a broader objective of the mob promoters was to trap the United States into armed intervention in Latin America. When President Eisenhower, alarmed by NIXON's peril, sent troops to Caribbean bases, advising the Caracas government they would fly to Venezuela only at its request, the very gesture stirred protests in some Latin lands. Had the Caracas violence reached a stage to compel armed rescue of the Nixons, Red propagandists, masters of misrepresentation, could have produced a United States Invades Latin America story that might almost erase Latin memories of Soviet massacres in Hungary, East Germany, and Poland. By creating a monstrous lie from a grain of fact, they might have swung critical segments of Latin opinion and political decision against the United States. And they knew the Latin American climate was right for such a move.

That returns us to why?—the key word of this article.

Why did NIXON, in most of the eight South American lands he visited, meet heckling and boos from a minority, silence from a majority, friendliness from only a few? Why is anti-Americanism rising to the south? Most important, why does it take such an explosion as that at Caracas to focus United States' attention on Latin America and compel us to ask, "Why?"

One colossal fact is almost willfully disregarded in both Americas: The welfare and strength of each are absolutely vital to the other. Let us look at that fact.

Could we have won out in World War II without Latin-American minerals, tropical industrial crops, medicinal sources? Or without Latin bases for the buildup in Africa? How would the Latins have existed without our Navy-convoyed imports and exports, without the machinery and funds we provided for their imperative industrialization?

In peace, we are equally interdependent. In 1953, a midway postwar year, the United States sold Latin America 50 percent of its imports ($3.1 billion), taking 48 percent of its exports ($3.4 billion). Such figures mean millions of jobs, in both Americas.

How is it, then, that regions so vitally linked reached a situation where a few conspirators could create the explosion at Caracas? Or the no less insulting stone-throwing by students in Lima, Peru?

During World War II, when our Good Neighbor policy lavishly recognized interdependence, we set up a huge agency to help the Latins fight disease, increase food supply, broaden education, and train technicians. Our vast spending for war materials helped to set off a Latin-American industrial boom. Then, after the war, the Latins say, we let them down.

They cite the record: Of $62 billion the United States has put into foreign aid since mid-1945, Latin nations have received only 2.7 percent. Of $3.6 billion voted for the mutual security program for fiscal 1958, it is planned that the Latin nations will receive 96 million—for arms and a minimum technical aid program.

Another sore point is that the cost of United States goods has gone up and up since 1945, while prices for Latin-American minerals and export crops have dropped, forcing the Latin countries to borrow and pile up debt if they are to trade with us at all.

Even our efforts to help some nations have offended others. When we sold surplus wheat at cut rates to Brazil, for instance, Argentina, the normal source of Brazilian wheat imports, could not supply the demand, but it protested that our low price was depressing its market. Surplus United States cotton sold to Colombia and Chile created resentment in Peru, a cotton exporter. Our cut in oil imports from Venezuela and a move in Congress to raise tariffs on lead, zinc and copper (major exports of Peru, Mexico and Chile) created widespread alarm.

Another source of anti-Yankee ammunition is our superfluous friendliness toward Latin dictators. A United States Ambassador in Buenos Aires once hailed Perón, the Argentine demagogue, as "a great leader." When an assassin shot dictator Somoza of Nicaragua, a White House physician was flown down to try to save his life. The dictators of Venezuela and Peru were decorated by the United States for their "fight against Communist subversion."

Red propagandists treasure these items. They help to convince student-age Latins that our championship of democracy is hypocrisy.

Friendly, informed Latins say patiently they can understand that the United States, faced with the problems of a chaotic world, may be tempted into using expedients with dictators now and then. What they cannot understand—and this is their major source of grievance—is our policy on Latin America's postwar development.

After 1945 Washington, faced with rebuilding Europe and fighting fires in Asia, adopted a new Latin-American policy. It reasoned that no southern nation had suffered by the war, that some had made big export profits, that none was immediately imperiled by communism. It argued that our aid to Europe was reviving Latin America's European markets and providing primary military protection. We insisted that the Latin solution for big-scale development plans was to attract private foreign capital, as the United States had done in the 1800's.

Since 1946, private United States investments to the south have swelled from $3 billion to $8.5 billion. "Fine," say the Latins, "but that money is almost entirely in oil production, mining, and manufacturing. It has increased jobs and helped to build huge cities. But it has aggravated our whole situation." And they are right.

Most Latin boom cities are crowded islands of discontent. Movies, bright show windows, and advertising give millions new desires. Politicians and labor leaders turn desires into expectations. But, as prices rise faster than wages, and as shortages of water, light, fuel, and transportation grow, there is frustration. One-fourth of Rio de Janeiro's 3 million people, for instance, spend 6 hours or more daily on trolleys, trains, and buses so inhumanly packed that broken bones and riots of protest are far from rare.

Explanations are simple. Population is fast outgrowing food supply. Great untouched areas can produce food and raw materials, but the vital need is for railways and highways to open them, for irrigation systems, storage facilities, river transportation. Private capital doesn't provide such things. It also shies away from low-profit utilities. Schools, hospitals, and water-supply systems are not in its province.

Since 1948, Latin nations have asked Washington for help—not for giveaways, but for a hemispheric banking fund big enough to lend $500 million or more per year for the next step in their social-economic revolution. The problem, they have argued, offers both Americas a historic opportunity. Successful solution would mean a solid hemisphere of allied democratic nations with complementary economies, militarily invincible. Moreover, much of our industrial output for a generation could be profitably absorbed in developing their vacant spaces and welding isolated areas into strong nations.

But Washington has clung to a policy of delay, emergency loans, and unproductive factfinding surveys.

Our share of the blame, however, cannot be put entirely on Democratic and Republican administrations since 1945, nor on Congressmen who push high tariffs and subsidies

that may briefly benefit their districts but hurt the Nation's interest. A big part of it traces to our massive national misunderstanding of Latin America. It is axiomatic with the United States press that Latin America is newsworthy only when something goes bang—a revolution, an earthquake or an anti-American riot. The rest of the time we are left unaware of the ferment in a region nearly three times the size of the United States—a ferment which will lead either to a body of strong democratic nations or to submission to communism.

But when the American of intelligence and wide interests looks southward, he is bewildered by a paradox. He sees nations settled 400 years ago and still underdeveloped; lands with vast, diverse resources and one-crop economies; constitutional democracies ruled by dictators; lands where innumerable revolutions seem to have solved no basic problems. His interest is likely to fade.

This leads to the deepest "Why?" of all. Latins themselves must bear the responsibility for such bewilderment and for much of the inter-American friction which offers temptations to home-grown demagogues as well as to communism.

The one natural reason for Latin America's underdevelopment is a geography of mountains, jungles and areas of alternating flood and drought. But today's technology and medical science cancel that reason. Vast healthful regions of South America's interior can be populated. Other areas can be made healthful.

Latin America's major obstacles are man-made. The greatest is that nations democratic in form and spirit are still under the ghostly influence of long-dead absolute kings.

The regions now covered by 18 nations were cut into segments which the Spanish Crown called "those kingdoms." They belonged, not to Spain, but to the king. He named officials, held a monopoly over all trade, collected all revenues. He was the complete dictator.

The Latin nations that won independence in the 1800's had none of the political experience that began to the north in 1608. They modeled their constitutions on those of the United States and France. But the governing machinery was a revised absolutism with a strong presidency replacing the king. The executive either named governors or had power to overrule or remove them. Today he usually can deny civil rights, disregard congress and the constitution, and rule by decree. This top-to-bottom rule makes the presidency the grand and only political prize.

Today in many Latin-American countries the growth of industry, unions, the middle class, and intellectual ideologists has made politics a year-round free-for-all. Some have 10 to 15 parties and subparties. This leads to minority presidents who must win support of other parties by favors that include the gross overloading of public payrolls with their henchmen. In Congress it means incessant debate, delay, amendment, and weak compromise legislation. This often leads to tolerance of a legal or thinly disguised Communist Party whose small votes and aggressive tactics can give a non-Communist coalition the margin it needs for victory. A major objective of communism at the present is to promote such fragmentary parties and finally paralyze the democratic process.

This instability of government has produced a dozen other evils that drain a nation's strength. Often the bickering near-paralysis of a multiparty congress tempts a military clique to seize the presidency and, while restoring order, fill its own pockets. When it in turn is overthrown, there is chaos until fiscal and foreign policies are changed, departments and foreign service restaffed, the army and police reorganized—and often the constitution rewritten. Business awaits government decisions. The loss of national revenue is terrific.

Since 1945, there have been 27 such upheavals of government. Six ex-dictators or ousted presidents—Arbenz of Guatemala, Prío Socarras of Cuba, Magloire of Haiti, Perón of Argentina, Rojas Pinilla of Colombia, and Pérez Jiménez of Venezuela—and their cohorts have escaped with at least $1 billion. A 1941 survey found $551 million from Latin America in United States banks, part of it deposited by the wealthy to guard against currency collapse at home, part by politicians to insure comfort in exile. Under stable governments, such sums would be building prosperity at home.

More costly is the enormous waste of productive manpower. Some countries still are more than 50 percent illiterate because their leaking economies do not provide revenues for schools, and their illiterates, almost without exception, live on a bare subsistence level, producing nothing for the national good. The necessities of multiparty politics have forced Brazil to employ 3 government workers where, by expert estimate, only 1 is needed. Uruguay, still a two-party country, keeps a delicate political balance by employing twice as many government workers as necessary, on a year-round half-day basis. The same burdens on productive workers are evident in many other Latin countries.

The United States cannot solve the whole problem by piecemeal loans, tariff cuts or price stabilization for coffee. It must frame a coordinated big-scale program of economic assistance through which its aid will be used for each nation's broadcast welfare. But all the gold in Fort Knox will not remedy the root evil of political instability that drains the economies of most southern countries and gives communism its chance. The solution for that half of the inter-American problem must be, and can be, found by the Latin American nations.

Candidacy of Hon. Thomas K. Finletter for the Democratic Nomination to the United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some editorials and statements regarding the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter of New York.

I believe most of the Members of this body are familiar with the long and distinguished career of Mr. Finletter in the service of his country. He was a right-hand man to Cordell Hull during the important period when our foreign economic policy was being formulated. He was Secretary of the Air Force during the Korean war and he played a leading role in many key public and private undertakings in New York State.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's column My Day]

Thomas K. Finletter has announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for Senator from New York. IRVING IVES, a Republican, is retiring this year on account of his health, and this gives the Democrats an opportunity to try to place in the Senate someone who has the capacity to grow and become as important a statesman as former Senator Lehman was.

While Lehman was there, we could be proud of his stature among his colleagues. He was called "the conscience of the Senate," and on several occasions stood alone, or almost alone, for what he thought was right. The other Republican Senator, JACOB JAVITS, is a good man, but I doubt that he can grow to be the influence and the leader that Lehman was.

The only candidate that I see with the potentialities to give New York State the representation it should have is Finletter. He has already proved his competence in office. He is known in the national field and even internationally. His friends know that he has integrity.

When he says that the Senate "is one of the most powerful instruments for peace and freedom in the world," he knows that he can offer qualities to help make the Senate achieve these ends. For these reasons I am hoping that the New York State Democratic convention will see fit to nominate Finletter, and that all our party leaders will work for his election.

[Telegram to Mr. Finletter from Hon. Herbert H. Lehman]

Delighted that you have announced your candidacy. Heartiest congratulations and warmest good wishes. I am confident that you will make an outstanding Senator, and therefore, I look forward to participating actively in your campaign for election. Regards.

HERBERT LEHMAN.

[Excerpts are from an editorial in the New York Times, Friday, July 25, 1958]

Thomas K. Finletter's announcement of his candidacy for the New York State Democratic senatorial nomination is no surprise, but is welcome all the same.

A prominent lawyer who was Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman and has had long experience in public affairs in an appointive capacity, Mr. Finletter is a man of highest caliber. His willingness to undergo the trial by ordeal of running for elective office is much to his credit. Offering as the most important reason for his candidacy the deteriorating diplomatic and military position of the United States, Mr. Finletter rightly points out that "next to the Presidency itself the United States Senate today is one of the most powerful instruments for peace and freedom in the world."

* * * * *

Mr. Finletter has the endorsement of an influential segment of the Democratic Party, including such personalities as former Senator Lehman and Mrs. Roosevelt, and he would also probably have the backing of the Liberal Party as well. His official entrance into the race makes it more interesting than ever.

[Excerpts are from an editorial in Newsday]

Averell Harriman is going to be renominated for Governor, and on the basis of his record deserves to be. Who will get the nod to run for United States Senator on the same ticket remains to be seen, but we would enjoy watching a wide-open fight for this job. Our candidate is Thomas K. Finletter.

Finletter by all odds is the best hope for the Democrats. He is a statesman, a man with a vast knowledge of world affairs, and a former Secretary of the Air Force.

[From the New York Post of July 24, 1958]

Thomas K. Finletter's formal announcement that he is seeking the Democratic

nomination for the United States Senate is welcome news.

Finletter is an able, thoughtful citizen with a distinguished record of Government service. He has strong convictions about the failures and follies of United States foreign policy; he feels deeply about the cause of human equality. These were matters on which the voice of Herbert Lehman was heard so eloquently in the Senate; Finletter belongs to the same tradition.

His candidacy is given special significance by events of recent days. Few Democrats have shown any willingness or capacity to debate the great issues of foreign affairs so pointedly exposed by the Middle East crisis. As a Member of the Senate Finletter could—among other things—make an enduring contribution to such a debate. We believe his candidacy would be a rallying point for many independent voters, and that his election would be an eminently good thing for the country.

[Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's comment on Finletter's book, Foreign Policy the Next Phase]

Mr. Finletter's book is persuasively argued, broad in its outlook, yet always closely reasoned. He evades none of the tough issues which face United States foreign policy in the years ahead. Though the book is especially outstanding in the area of Mr. Finletter's special competence, military strategy, he does not neglect other dimensions of foreign policy, such as new patterns of foreign aid and disarmament. Mr. Finletter's practical experience and clarity of judgment combine to make this a book deserving the attention and reflection of thoughtful Americans.

[Comment by Senator STUART SYMINGTON on Mr. Finletter's book]

As usual, Mr. Finletter writes with knowledge, clarity, and vision, especially because of his vast background of experience in the defense and diplomatic fields.

Schooling the World's Scientists in Nuclear Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was delighted to read in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor an article entitled "Argonne Schools World's Scientists."

It reports that no less than 421 scientists and engineers have been participants in the first 7 sessions of the International School of Nuclear Science and Engineering, established at the Argonne National Laboratory outside Chicago, in 1955.

In this marvelous educational work, we are carrying out Dwight D. Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace program.

In my judgment, Mr. President, this sort of American leadership will pay off a thousand-fold. It will pay off materially, because it will expand the world's technical know-how in capitalizing on peaceful use of the atom.

It will pay off intangibly in terms of good will for America.

The Atomic Energy Commission is to be congratulated for the fine job which it has performed in training foreign technicians.

As senior minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I know what this international training program means in terms of impacting the world's peoples, especially peoples in the underdeveloped regions.

I hope that this program will not only continue, but that it will expand.

Although unique in certain characteristics, it is part and parcel of the overall picture of American education and training, such as are provided for by the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

For the foreign engineers and technicians not only learn how to deal with nuclear reactors, they learn about America, itself. They learn about its people, its homes, its way of life, its freedoms, its friendship for all mankind.

Let America become still more a center of education and training, not only in the technical sciences, but in the social sciences and in the humanities.

Let us be more than ever before a Mecca of learning, of truth, of insight into man's problems, both material and spiritual.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Monitor article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGONNE SCHOOLS WORLD'S SCIENTISTS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—Mitsuho J. Hirata in Tokyo dreamed of controlling fusion reaction and going to Mars by fusion-reaction-propelled rocket. He came here to the Argonne National Laboratory to learn nuclear knowledge that would provide some substance to his aspirations.

From all over the world they come, these dreamers of imaginative, atom-powered dreams, from Afghanistan, from Egypt, from Iraq, from Israel, from Venezuela, from Yugoslavia, from the Philippines, from Greece, from India, from France, from Germany—from 42 foreign countries in all.

LEADERSHIP PROVIDED

A total of 421 scientists and engineers have been participants in the first 7 sessions of the International School of Nuclear Science and Engineering, established at Argonne in 1955 to implement President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace program.

Thus Chicago, with its Argonne nuclear school, has become the global center for those who would, in their own countries, unlock the secret of the atom and its peaceful use, for those who have been designated to carry the nuclear torch throughout much of the world.

Moreover, in a quiet but effective way, Chicago is providing leadership in the rapidly shaping world of nuclear science. Dr. Norman Hilberry, director at Argonne, explains how this is coming about:

"These men," he says, "gain a feeling while here that they have a second home, a scientific home right here, a place where they can work out their problems among people they know and understand."

Dr. Hilberry says that when these scientists go home, "all to key nuclear positions," they continue to turn to Argonne for help in their problems, through correspondence.

The 4-month training period here is designed to give each participant a balanced program in advanced science and engineering theory and practice. Though primarily concerned with nuclear reactors, the course also includes other specialized studies that are important to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

It is almost on-the-job training. Students usually work with hypotheticals, however, since there is insufficient time for carrying an actual project to full conclusion.

Laboratory work includes procedures which are basic to the entire reactor technology for large-scale experiments in reactor engineering and in preparation and reprecessing of reactor fuel. There is also training in the techniques of nuclear research, in nuclear chemistry and physics, and in nuclear engineering.

ARGONNE FIRSTS

Participants at the International School operate and perform experiments with the Argonaut, Argonne's low-power reactor. For certain experiments they use Chicago pile 5, the laboratory's principal reactor for scientific research. Arrangements are being made for use of Argonne's caves for experiments which involve highly radioactive materials.

Argonne National Laboratory is the senior United States center for research into peaceful applications of nuclear energy. Its site, covering 3,700 acres, is located near Lemont, Ill., in the western suburbs of Chicago. Among its staff of 2,900 are nearly a thousand scientists and engineers actively engaged in basic and applied nuclear research.

Among Argonne firsts since the laboratory was established in 1946 are discovery of the process for separation of uranium and plutonium by solvent extraction, first production of electricity from nuclear energy, and development of the fast-breeder power reactor, a type that produces nuclear fuel while generating steam to run an electric turbine.

PLANTS VISITED

The seventh class of the International School here is now underway. The participants, from 25 foreign countries and the United States, toured atomic energy facilities in the eastern United States before coming here.

They stopped at Oak Ridge, Tenn., National Laboratory; the Detroit Edison atomic power reactor development and planning center; nuclear-energy laboratories at the University of Michigan; and the Shippingport, Pa., pressurized water reactor operated by the Duquesne Power and Light Co.

Two universities participate with Argonne in the International School training: North Carolina State College and Pennsylvania State University. Basic course work is presented at these universities in a 17-week period that preceded the training here. Each of the schools has a nuclear reactor and conducts a training program in nuclear science and engineering.

Instruction at the nuclear school here is conducted by a full-time staff augmented by members of Argonne's research and development staff, who present lectures on specialized topics and who assist in the direction of special projects.

An Oregon Hero Passes to His Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's great heroes died early this

month. When Leslie Matlock, of Heppner, Oreg., was laid to rest at the age of 84, many of the older citizens of his community paid their respects to the man who was responsible for their being alive. Leslie Matlock was a man who knew what to do in an emergency. When cloudbursts in the late evening of June 14, 1903, deluged the high plateaus of Morrow County and churned Willow Creek into a 60-mile funnel of death and destruction, Matlock and his pal, Bruce Kelly, riding horseback, outdistanced the flood and cried a warning to hundreds within its path. In human lives, the flood's toll reached several hundred. But for the heroic action of Matlock and Kelly, hundreds who survived would have been swept to their deaths under the angry torrent that poured into the Columbia River on that stormy Sunday night.

Mr. President, visitors to Heppner over the years found Leslie Matlock a friendly, approachable man. He would retell for them the story of the ride in simple, modest terms, if genuine interest were indicated; he knew a hero's deeds speak louder than any words.

Candy Johnson, Heppner correspondent for the Pendleton East-Oregonian, has informatively reported the funeral in the July 19, 1958, issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEPPNER BURIES HERO; WON RACE WITH TIME

(By Candy Johnson)

HEPPNER.—Funeral services were held in Heppner yesterday for one of Morrow County's most unforgettable heroes—Leslie Matlock—whose courageous warning ride in the face of the Heppner flood of 1903 saved hundreds of lives in Lexington and Ione.

On that fateful afternoon, more than 50 years ago, Matlock had finished a quiet dinner with relatives and returned to his room at Palace Hotel when Willow Creek broke its bounds, joined with its tributaries and sent great walls of water crashing into the streets of Heppner.

CALLED FRIEND

The 29-year-old man called his best friend, Bruce Kelly, and together they "borrowed" a couple of horses hitched to the railing outside the hotel, broke into a Sunday-closed hardware store for a pair of wire cutters and set out cross-country, cutting fences and shouting warnings as they rode.

Accounts of the fabled ride quote Matlock as saying:

"We started over the hills toward the northwest * * * the lightning kept the country bright as day. * * * I still don't know who was scared the most—the strange horses or Bruce and I—but, by pushing them, we finally managed to get a few miles ahead of the water just below Lexington. * * *

"All along the way we shouted at every farm house * * * no one seemed to doubt our word * * * as we passed we could see the oil lamps blown out and the families starting for higher ground. * * *

SIX HOURS

"I don't know how long it took us to make the ride * * * but we spent 6 hours getting back to Heppner and the piled-up bodies we saw along the way were an awful sight. * * *" Matlock's ride is credited with saving hundreds of people in the Lexington-Ione area, although 325 lives were lost in Heppner and damages reached the half-million mark.

The flood broke June 14, 1903, lasted only 1 hour, and took, proportionately, more lives than any other flood in the United States.

Matlock was born November 6, 1873, at Heppner and was a charter member of the Heppner Elks Lodge 358. His family crossed the plains in a covered wagon in 1853 and settled here in 1871. His father was once sheriff of Morrow County.

A tall, erect and handsome man, the Paul Revere of Heppner died at the age of 84, Tuesday night at his home after an illness of almost 2 years. He had returned to his home a week ago after hospitalization in Portland.

Still with him at the time of his death was one of his most treasured possessions—a goldheaded cane given to him by the people of Ione and bearing this inscription:

"Leslie Matlock, presented by the people of Ione in grateful remembrance of his heroic ride during the flood at Heppner, June 14, 1903."

New York State Housing Code Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, New York State, which under the leadership of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and our former colleague, Gov. Herbert E. Lehman, pioneered in extensive State housing programs for many years, established a precedent 3 years ago when its first large-scale middle-income housing program was initiated. Low-rent public housing totaling nearly a billion dollars in cost has been constructed by the State of New York since 1938 under Republican and Democratic administrations. My State has shown over the years that effective leadership and assistance by State governments can stimulate vigorous local rehabilitation and conservation programs to overcome the scourge of slums and blight and prevent their recrudescence.

I wish to invite attention to an important housing study prepared by the New York State Division of Housing, the head of which is the highly regarded former staff director of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Joseph P. McMurray. This three-volume report, entitled "Housing Codes, the Key to Housing Conservation," represents an auspicious milestone in the development of urban renewal techniques to cope with the problems involved in a successful rehabilitation and conservation program.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of August 4, 1958, commenting on this report, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE HOUSING REPORT

A 2-year study by the State division of housing shows that more than one-third of our 1,600 cities, towns and villages do not inspect new construction to assure safety, sanitation and restraint of fire hazards. There is even less inspection of older buildings. Many communities have no building code. Where there is a code enforcement usually is undertaken only in specific cases after citizens have complained of violations.

State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray, in his report to the Governor on the survey findings, has pointed out that this situation produces new slums, while vast sums of public and private money are being spent to redevelop old slum districts.

While large-scale demolition and rebuilding is the only way to root out the advanced slums, this is a slow and costly task. The report suggests that slum clearance be complemented, in every case, by code adoption and enforcement to arrest the spread of blight. It proposes that small communities, unable to afford full-time technical and enforcement personnel, pool their resources and engage in joint programs.

This and other recommendations are contained in the report, issued in the form of 3 handy booklets. Among the contents are a model ordinance of minimum housing standards, an administrative guide for local conservation programs and a series of code-enforcement problems with suggested solutions.

The Federal Government, which has made grants totaling more than $100 million for slum clearance in New York State, urges increased emphasis on neighborhood conservation and rehabilitation. It contributed half of the $145,000 required for the survey, the other half being State money. The greatest possible good can be realized from this small investment if officials of every community study the proposals for local application. Copies are available at the State division of housing.

Multiple Use of Forest Lands: A Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the multiple use of forest lands, written by Charles A. Connaughton, regional forester of the United States Forest Service in California, and an editorial which recently appeared in one of the outstanding newspapers of my State, the Bakersfield Californian, commenting on the article.

Perhaps no man in the Service must know and apply in each operation of his area the principles of multiple use in forest problems as constantly as Mr. Connaughton, and it is proper to observe that since he has become regional forester, he has ably demonstrated his knowledge of these principles and his grasp of administrative and policy problems.

Mr. President, approximately one-third of California's area of 100 million acres has forest and watershed purposes as its chief value. The scenic and recreational resources therein are outstanding. Deposits of numerous kinds

of minerals are found in many sections.

With the growth of population and the concomitant demand on the part of hundreds of thousands of American families for greater opportunities to enjoy the outdoors, I have felt that increasing emphasis should be given to the recreational values. As a part of this approach, the need for preserving wilderness areas as one of the multiple uses to which specific limited areas can be put should be carefully studied. I was interested in Mr. Connaughton's statement that wilderness use is one of the multiple uses of the forests which is essential and highly desired.

I have no doubt that the increasing interest in land use planning in the development of California gives importance at this time both to Mr. Connaughton's studious essay and to the Bakerfield Californian's comments on it.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULTIPLE USE FORESTRY

(By Charles A. Connaughton)

MULTIPLE USE IS A CONCEPT

Multiple use of forest land—how often have you heard this phrase? How vivid a picture of land use does it convey to you? And are there any uncertainties as to exactly what it means?

In spite of the many years foresters have talked about multiple use all of us still do not have a common and precise understanding of its meaning. This comes about because multiple use is a concept rather than a system or method of land use. As a concept it is not subject to precise and universal meaning when applied area by area.

A forest may have major value for sawlog production with intermingled values for recreation, water yield, grazing by domestic livestock and wildlife, and mining. Another area may have no timber production but have vital recreation and watershed values. Actually there are innumerable combinations of use varying with the area.

As a general rule, however, multiple use is simply a concept of management which involves the combination of uses or services of the land in such a way that full utilization is realized consistent with managerial objectives. This situation presuppose that the uses and services will be combined in a manner so that they are complementary, insofar as attainable. When this is not attainable minor uses must be adjusted to exclude conflict with the major or dominant use or uses.

MULTIPLE USE APPLIES TO LARGE AREAS

The multiple-use concept is conceived to apply to large areas, such as watershed units. As such, it is a misconception if it is thought to specifically apply acre by acre. If, in the process of application, multiple use of individual acres is obtained—and this does happen frequently—there is no conflict with the definition; but such pinpoint application is purely incidental and is not intended or necessarily desired.

Multiple use is thoroughly workable, therefore, if more than one compatible use for an area as a whole is conceived in the plan of management. The dedication of individual acres to single uses within a management unit is a perfectly logical procedure consistent with the multiple-use concept.

OBJECTIVES MUST BE DEFINED

In applying multiple use to an appropriate area the first determination involves a definition of land management objectives. These objectives are those of the land manager or owner and may be determined by a number of factors. On private land it probably means that the objectives are influenced most strongly and properly by profit considerations. On the public lands it may mean full use designed to satisfy the overall public needs which may or may not be tangible as measured by income. When a dominant use determines primary objectives, with lesser uses subordinated and restricted, the effect is something short of full use. However, irrespective of the ownership, the objective of management must be clearly understood prior to the application of the multiple-use concept.

Once objectives of land management are defined the techniques of using the individual resources in a manner complementary to each other comes into play. If all values and services can be used to a maximum without conflicts the ultimate is obtained. Such full use isn't usually attainable, particularly under intensive management. In short, a harmonious combination of uses to arrive at the maximum overall service from the land usually requires some concessions in individual use. As for example, in managed forests the maximum production of wood might be adjusted downward to benefit wildlife or water yield if the defined objectives so dictate.

In considering applied multiple use it is significant that the demands of an expanding population with corresponding pressures on all land uses make it more difficult to secure full use of all services from the land. Certainly, under intensive management, the land administrator must be infinitely more skillful in combining the uses, at the same time minimizing conflicts.

MULTIPLE USE NOT A UNIVERSAL ANSWER

One feature of land management needing emphasis in terms of multiple use is the fact that full utilization of resources isn't always the best management for a given tract of land. The case frequently prevails where 1 or 2 uses may be so completely dominant that all other uses must be subordinated or eliminated. As an example, watershed values of certain southern California mountains require that during high hazard fire weather all human use be eliminated. Or, in the established and designated wilderness areas in national forests and parks, some uses are completely eliminated in deference to the dominant wilderness values and use.

CONFLICTS ARE FREQUENT

In closing this brief discussion a few instances illustrating the complexities of multiple use will serve to bring out the realities in its application. One of the most complex aspects of multiple-use application involves conflicts within uses rather than between uses. For example, mass recreation requires roads and improved travel facilities, whereas wilderness use is conceived and carried out without these facilities. The two are not harmonious, yet both are essential and highly desired. In timber production the harvesting rotations necessary for pulpwood or other small products are distinctly different from those required for producng sawlogs, yet both are desirable in their own particular circumstances.

Conflicts between uses may arise, such as between grazing of domestic livestock and big-game production, between forest management for recreation and timber production, and between watershed management and timber production. These are only examples which can be multiplied many times with each combination presenting its own particular problems and solutions.

MULTIPLE USE APPLICATION REQUIRES SKILL

In applying multiple use the land manager is faced, therefore, with reconciling conflicts in such a way that overall objectives are attained. The manner in which objectives are reached is a measure of the manager's skill and success. Objectives are best fulfilled by securing the highest degree of multiple use that the characteristics of the land will permit. There should be full recognition, however, that frequent exceptions to the general rule exist. Where these exceptions occur management systems must be designed and carried out with infinite skill to achieve most effectively the objectives of the particular ownership involved regardless of the level or degree of multiple use secured.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of May 23, 1958]

MULTIPLE USE EXPLAINED

In view of new and energetic advocacy of expanded wilderness area allotments in the national forests and resultant confusion in the concept of the axiom of multiple use in the policy of the United States Forest Service, it would be well to turn our attention to this idea of multiple use and its application to the overall problems that face the Forest Service in its assigned task of administering public lands placed in its care.

One of the clearest and most complete statements of the principle has been enunciated by Regional Forester Charles Connaughton of California, able head of the Forest Service in region 5, which includes California and tackles the many problems imposed on the service by the expanded population, recreation use, demand for more of its natural resources and need for greater watershed protection.

Perhaps no man in the service must know and apply in each operation of his area the principles of multiple use in forest problems as constantly as Mr. Connaughton, and it is proper to observe that since he has become regional forester, he has ably demonstrated his knowledge of these principles and his grasp of administrative and policy problems.

In his recent statement, the California regional forester observes that multiple use is a concept rather than a system or method of land use and as a concept it is not subject to precise and universal meaning when applied area by area. He notes, for example, that a forest may have major value for sawlog production with intermingled values for recreation, water yield, grazing by domestic livestock and wildlife, and mining; another may have no timber production but have vital watershed and recreation value, and there are innumerable combinations of use varying with the area.

"As a general rule, however, multiple use is simply a concept of management which involves the combination of uses or services of the land in such a way that full utilization is realized consistent with managerial objects," according to Regional Forester Connaughton; "This situation presupposes that the uses and services will be combined in such a manner so that they are complementary, insofar as obtainable. When this is not obtainable, minor uses must be adjusted to exclude conflict with the major or dominant use or uses."

Mr. Connaughton goes on to say that the multiple use theory is well applied to large areas, such as watershed units, which of course are exceptionally important in California, and is not primarily designated to be applied acre by acre. The first determination in applying multiple use involves a definition of land management objectives, and on public lands this may mean, and often does, the full use designed to satisfy public needs which may or may not be tangible as measured by income. He also notes significantly that the demands of an expanding population with corresponding pressures on all land uses make it more difficult to secure full use of all services from the land, and certainly under intensive management, the land administrator must be infinitely more skillful in combining the uses and at the same time minimizing conflicts.

Noting many such conflicts in his discussion, several of which we are familiar with even in this area, the regional forester observes that "objectives are best fulfilled by securing the highest degree of multiple use that the characterizations of the land permit," and where exceptions exist, management systems must be designed and carried out with infinite skill to achieve most effectively the objectives of the particular ownership involved, regardless of the level or degree of multiple use secured.

This reasonable and clear explanation of the multiple use principle by Regional Forester Connaughton serves to increase public respect for his organization and widen the conviction that we have an able and thoughtful administrator at the head of the Forest Service in California.

The NORD-Godchaux Baseball Team From New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the NORD-Godchaux all-American baseball team, from New Orleans, La., visited Washington, D. C., on Monday of this week. They stopped by here en route to Johnstown, Pa., where they are taking part in the national championship playoff of the All-American Amateur Baseball Association.

NORD stands for New Orleans Recreation Department. The team is made up of those young men in the 17- to 19-year age bracket who survived a hotly contested championship round in New Orleans for the honor of representing the Crescent City in this national tournament.

The boys are sponsored by Mr. Leon Godchaux, of New Orleans, and are here because they voted to come by bus in order to visit the Nation's Capital, and it was the pleasure of Senator ELLENDER, Congressman BOGGS, and myself to show them some of the highlights of our Capital.

This is the eighth time the New Orleans team has competed at Johnstown. Four times they have won the championship; twice they were runners-up. This year's team is a capable successor of those former champions, and it stands for all of the high ideals we seek from an American program of recreational activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the players, coaches, and sponsors who are with us from the city of New Orleans:

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fred Schwartz; Bob Terrell; Allen Armstrong; John Majoria; Sheldon Gebbs; Buel Bourgeois, Jr.; Gene Faust; Richard L. Dixon; Fritz Miller, Jr.; Lou "Rags" Scheuermann; Eldred Paternostro; John Brechtel; Gerald Brady; Bob Foret; Darrlyn Tschirn; Jack Boasberg; Gus Lamana; Thomas A. Fox; Jay Handelman; Morris Powell; Lloyd Webre; Bob Delpidio; Ed Wahden; Fritz Miller, Sr.; Bernard Smith; Richard R. Dixon; Buel Bourgeois, Sr.; Rogers Roberts.

The United Nations General Assembly and the Mideast Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has already been noted on the floor of the Senate that the President and Mr. Gromyko have spoken in the United Nations. Thoughtful people are asking, "What has taken place? Is there a possibility of an effective agreement being reached? What is an effective agreement?" It is certainly not a mere piece of paper. It must be an agreement which is mutually advantageous to both sides. Otherwise, we know from the Kremlin's past actions that it will not amount to very much.

So far as the Kremlin is concerned, this maneuver has all the earmarks of another Communist scheme, as I see it, to gain a foothold and then stand by patiently until the time is ripe for a complete takeover.

There appears in today's Washington Evening Star an article entitled "Peril in Unconstructive Criticism," written by David Lawrence, which I feel Senators can read with profit. It speaks of the hindsight kibitzers of United States policy. This is no time for us to be indulging in that particular kind of talk. What we should seek to do is to see if we can be of assistance to the executive department in finding our way through the troubled waters of the Mideast.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERIL IN UNCONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM—HINDSIGHT KIBITZERS OF UNITED STATES POLICY WHO CAN'T BE SPECIFIC ARE CRITICIZED

(By David Lawrence)

Critics of American foreign policy, both inside and outside of the Democratic-controlled Congress, are having a hard time being specific. They generally bemoan what seems to them a lack of positiveness, and they even blame the President and the Secretary of State for not having a secret microphone in the Kremlin to get minute-by-minute reports of what an erratic Khrushchev plans to do throughout the world.

The tendency after every crisis is to complain either that the intelligence reports of the United States were not adequate or timely, or that the United States has failed somehow to checkmate Soviet moves in the world.

Partisan politics and the hope for some advantageous issue from a political standpoint undoubtedly are back of most of the criticism, especially the mimeographed speeches and statements that flow from certain quarters in and around the Democratic membership of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The doctrine that "partisanship ends at the water's edge," an American tradition, seems to have been replaced by an attitude which says, in effect, that any criticism of the United States—even if the Soviets pick it up for their own radio broadcasts—is good sniping in the game of politics-above-patriotism.

There are, of course, some critics, inside and outside Congress, who are not trying to be partisan at all but who find themselves baffled by world events to the point where they see only American surrender and appeasement as the way out. They mistakenly believe it will prevent American involvement in war, though history tells us a sure way to get into war is to emphasize constantly your own weakness and lack of resoluteness.

The main criticism seems to center on the charge that the United States should have foreseen the way things have shaped up in the Middle East. Just how is never made clear. But the idea most widely advertised is that the United States should have taken Nasser unto its bosom and loaned him billions for the Aswan Dam, even though he indicated clearly beforehand that he intended to seize the Suez Canal and secretly got arms from the Soviets.

Sometimes it is argued by the hindsight critics that the western allies never should have allowed the State of Israel to be created in the first place. This is a favorite gripe, particularly among some people who want to continue to do business with the Arab countries and feel that it is expedient to apologize constantly for America's interest in Israel.

There never seems to be any inclination to search the real estate titles in the Middle East and to go back far enough to discover that the people of Israel may possibly have lived there long before the modern Arab monarchies or colonies came into being. World War I took most of Asia Minor away from Turkey and enabled some new republics and monarchies among the Arabs to start up in business. But simultaneously Israel's right to existence as the Palestinian homeland was recognized in public declarations made by the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain and by the President of the United States.

The issue today isn't Israel, or Arabian supremacy, or colonialism, handy as it may be to toss slogans around that reflect the prejudices of the interested parties. The real issue in the world today is the same as it was before World War I and before World War II. It's whether a single power—an authoritarian government and dictatorship—shall threaten the peaceful life of the free democracies or true republics of our times.

Most of the international mischief perpetrated in the Middle East, the Far East, and inside Europe, Africa, and North and South America—usually called subversion or infiltration—can be traced to an espionage apparatus of worldwide proportions financed and directed by the evil men in the Kremlin.

Some of the critics want a blueprint or an affidavit to this effect signed by Khrushchev before they'll believe it, although the intelligence reports are overwhelming. Some gullible critics still doubt that Iraq or Lebanon have been victimized by the Soviet spy rings. They call it just a people's uprising when the king and his family are murdered and their bodies mutilated. What kind of Arab nationalism is it that not only assassinates kings and prime ministers but also drags through the streets the bodies of Americans deliberately removed from their hotel and killed? Wouldn't this be more realistically described as "Arab barbarism"?

There is only one way to keep the peace in the world. It would have saved us participation in two world wars. It's to build militarily a strong alliance with Western nations that believe as we do, to say again and again that force will be used to secure respect for our rights, and to mean it.

That's the only positive policy America can pursue—to be ready to go to the brink of war and let the world know it. But such a policy cannot succeed if there's internal disunity and if kibitzers deride firmness as brinkmanship and thus weaken the hand of their own Government. Criticism is helpful always when it is constructive, and there isn't any difficulty recognizing when it is and when it isn't. Unity inside the United States and inside the Western alliance is worth as much militarily as many divisions of troops.

Modern Art: A Pertinent Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with the Brussels Fair, as in connection with many other activities of Government in which the Congress has a direct interest, either through appropriations, or authorization legislation, including Government buildings, activities of the United States Information Service, cultural exchange activities, Members of Congress have advanced varying opinions about modern art. That the modern artist has not achieved, or striven for, universal comprehension may be impolitic on his part but should neither affect his credibility as an artist nor public acceptance of his efforts.

In an issue of Art News dating back to the summer of last year I came across an article of such clarity and so specific on what modern art is and what it is endeavoring to accomplish, that I thought it worthy of the interest of Members. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD abbreviated somewhat so as to comply with the requirement of space of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERATING QUALITY OF AVANT-GARDE ART—THE VITAL ROLE THAT PAINTING AND SCULPTURE PLAY IN MODERN CULTURE

(By Meyer Schapiro)

In discussing the place of painting and sculpture in the culture of our time, I shall refer only to those kinds which, whether abstract or not, have a fresh inventive character, that art which is called modern not simply because it is of our century, but because it is the work of artists who take seriously the challenge of new possibilities and wish to introduce into their work perceptions, ideas, and experiences which have come about only within our time.

In doing so I risk perhaps being unjust to important works or to aspects of art which are generally not comprised within the so-called modern movement.

There is a sense in which all the arts today have a common character shared by painting; it may therefore seem arbitrary to single out painting as more particularly modern than the others. In comparing the arts of our time with those of 100 years ago, we observe that the arts have become more deeply personal, more intimate, more concerned with experiences of a subtle kind. We note, too, that in poetry, music and architecture, as well as in painting, the attitude to the medium has become much freer, so that artists are willing to search further and to risk experiments or inventions which in the past would have been inconceivable because of fixed ideas of the laws and boundaries of the arts. I shall try to show however that painting and sculpture contribute qualities and values less evident in poetry, music, and architecture.

It is obvious that each art has possibilities given in its own medium which are not found in other arts, at least not in the same degree. Of course, we do not know how far reaching these possibilities are; the limits of an art cannot be set in advance. Only in the course of work and especially in the work of venturesome personalities do we discover the range of an art, and even then in a very incomplete way.

In the last 50 years, within the common tendency towards the more personal, intimate and free, painting has had a special role because of a unique revolutionary change in its character. In the first decades of our century painters and sculptors broke with the long-established tradition that their arts are arts of representation, creating images bound by certain requirements of accord with the forms of nature.

That great tradition includes works of astounding power upon which artists have been nourished for centuries. Its principle of representation had seemed too self-evident to be doubted, yet that tradition was shattered early in this century. The change in painting and sculpture may be compared to the most striking revolution in science, technology, and social thought. It has affected the whole attitude of painters and sculptors to their work. To define the change in its positive aspect, however, is not easy because of the great diversity of styles today even among advanced artists.

One of the charges brought most frequently against art in our time is that because of the loss of the old standards, it has become chaotic, having no rule or direction. Precisely this criticism was often made between 1830 and 1850, especially in France, where one observed side by side works of neo-classic, romantic, and realistic art—all of them committed to representation. The lack of a single necessary style of art reminded many people of the lack of clear purpose or of common ideals in social life. What seemed to be the anarchic character of art was regarded as a symptom of a more pervasive anarchy or crisis within society as a whole.

But for the artists themselves—for Ingres, Delacroix and Courbet—each of these styles was justified by ideal ends that they served, whether of order, liberty or truth; and when we look back now to the 19th century, the astonishing variety of its styles, the many conflicting movements and reactions, and the great number of distinct personalities, appear to us less as signs of weakness in the culture than as examples of freedom, individuality, and sincerity of expression. These qualities corresponded to important emerging values of the social and political life of that period, and even helped to sustain them.

In the course of the last 50 years the painters who freed themselves from the necessity of representation discovered whole new fields of form-construction and expression (including new possibilities of imaginative representation) which entailed a new attitude to art itself. The artist came to believe that what was essential in art—given the diversity of themes or motifs—were two universal requirements: that every work of art has an individual order or coherence, a quality of unity and necessity in its structure regardless of the kind of forms used; and, second, that the forms and colors chosen have a decided expressive physiognomy, that they speak to us as a feeling-charged whole, through the intrinsic power of colors and lines, rather than through the imaging of facial expressions, gestures, and bodily movements, although these are not necessarily excluded—for they are also forms.

That view made possible the appreciation of many kinds of old art and of the arts of distant peoples—primitive, historic, colonial, Asiatic and African, as well as European—arts which had not been accessible in spirit before because it was thought that true art had to show a degree of conformity to nature and of mastery of representation which had developed for the most part in the West. The change in art dethroned not only representation as a necessary requirement but also a particular standard of decorum or restraint in expression which had excluded certain domains and intensities of feeling. The notion of the humanity of art was immensely widened. Many kinds of drawing, painting, sculpture and architecture, formerly ignored or judged inartistic, were seen as existing on the same plane of human creativeness and expression as civilized western art. That would not have happened, I believe, without the revolution in modern painting.

The idea of art was shifted, therefore, from the aspect of imagery to its expressive, constructive, inventive aspect. That does not mean, as some suppose, that the old art was inferior or incomplete, that it had been constrained by the requirements of representation, but rather that a new liberty had been introduced which had, as one of its consequences, a greater range in the appreciation and experience of forms.

The change may be compared, perhaps, with the discovery by mathematicians that they did not have to hold to the axioms and postulates of Euclidian geometry, which were useful in describing the everyday physical world, but could conceive quite other axioms and postulates and build up different imaginary geometries. All the new geometries, like the old, accepted one, were submitted to the rules of logic; in each geometry the new theorems had to be consistent with each other and with the axioms and postulates. In painting as in mathematics, the role of structure or coherence became more evident and the range of its applications was extended to new elements.

The change I have described in the consciousness of form is more pronounced in painting and sculpture than it is in any other art. It is true that music and architecture are also unconcerned with representation—the imaging of the world—but they have always been that. The architect, the musician and the poet did not feel that their arts had undergone so profound a change, requiring as great a shift in the attitude of the beholder, as painting and sculpture in the beginning of our century. Within the totality of arts, painting, and sculpture, more than the others, gave to artists in all mediums a new sense of freedom and possibility. It was the ground of a more general emancipation.

Even poets, who had always been concerned with images and with language as a medium which designates, poets, too, now tried to create a poetry of sounds without sense. But that movement did not last very long, at least among English-speaking poets, although it was strong at one time in Russia and exists today in Holland and Belgium.

This sentiment of freedom and possibility, accompanied by a new faith in the self-sufficiency of forms and colors, became deeply rooted within our culture in the last 50 years. And since the basic change had come about through the rejection of the image function of painting and sculpture, the attitudes and feelings which are bound up with the acceptance or rejection of the environment entered into the attitude of the painter to the so-called abstract or near-abstract styles, affecting also the character of the new forms. His view of the external world, his affirmation of the self or certain parts of the self, against devalued social

norms—these contributed to his confidence in the necessity of the new art.

Abstraction implies then a criticism of the accepted contents of the preceding representations as ideal values or life interests. This does not mean that painters, in giving up landscape, no longer enjoy nature; but they do not believe, as did the poets, the philosophers and painters of the 19th century, that nature can serve as a model of harmony for man, nor do they feel that the experience of nature's moods is an exalting value on which to found an adequate philosophy of life. New problems, situations and experiences of greater import have emerged: the challenge of social conflict and development, the exploration of the self, the discovery of its hidden motivations and processes, the advance of human creativeness in science and technology.

All these factors should be taken into account in judging the significance of the change in painting and sculpture. It was not a simple studio experiment or an intellectual play with ideas and with paint; it was related to a broader and deeper reaction to basic elements of common experience and the concept of humanity, as it developed under new conditions.

In a number of respects, painting and sculpture today may seem to be opposed to the general trend of life. Yet, in such opposition, these arts declare their humanity and importance.

Paintings and sculptures, let us observe, are the last handmade, personal objects within our culture. Almost everything else is produced industrially, in mass, and through a high division of labor. Few people are fortunate enough to make something that represents themselves, that issues entirely from their hands and mind, and to which they can affix their names.

* * * * *

What is most important is that the practical activity by which we live is not satisfying; we cannot give it full loyalty, and its rewards do not compensate enough for the frustrations and emptiness that arise from the lack of spontaneity and personal identifications in work: the individual is deformed by it, only rarely does it permit him to grow.

The object of art is, therefore, more passionately than ever before, the occasion of spontaneity or intense feeling. The painting symbolizes an individual who realizes freedom and deep engagement of the self within his work. It is addressed to others who will cherish it, if it gives them joy, and who will recognize in it an irreplaceable quality and will be attentive to every mark of the maker's imagination and feeling.

The consciousness of the personal and spontaneous in the painting and sculpture stimulates the artist to invent devices of handling, processing, surfacing, which confer to the utmost degree the aspect of the freely made. Hence the great importance of the mark, the stroke, the brush, the drip, the quality of the substance of the paint itself, and the surface of the canvas as a texture and field of operation—all signs of the artist's active presence. The work of art is an ordered world of its own kind in which we are aware, at every point, of its becoming.

All these qualities of painting may be regarded as a means of affirming the individual in opposition to the contrary qualities of the ordinary experience of working and doing.

I need not speak in detail about this new manner, which appears in figurative as well as abstract art; but I think it is worth observing that in many ways it is a break with the kind of painting that was most important in the 1920's. After the First World War, in works like those of Léger, abstraction in art was affected by the taste for industry, technology, and science, and assumed the qualities of the machine made, the impersonal and reproducible, with an air of coolness and mechanical control, intellectualized to some degree. The artist's power of creation seems analogous here to the designer's and engineer's. That art, in turn, avowed its sympathy with mechanism and industry in an optimistic mood as progressive elements in everyday life, and as examples of strength and precision in production which painters admired as a model for art itself. But the experiences of the last 25 years have made such confidence in the value of technology less interesting and even distasteful.

In abstraction we may distinguish those forms, like the square and circle, which have object character and those which do not. The first are closed shapes, distinct within their field and set off against a definite ground. They build up a space which has often elements of gravity, with a clear difference between above and below, the ground and the background, the near and far. But the art of the last fifteen years tends more often to work with forms which are open, fluid or mobile; they are directed strokes or they are endless tangles and irregular curves, self-involved lines which impress us as possessing the qualities not so much of things as of impulses, of excited movements emerging and changing before our eyes.

The impulse, which is most often not readily visible in its pattern, becomes tangible and definite on the surface of a canvas through the painted mark. We see, as it were, the track of emotion, its obstruction, persistence or extinction. But all these elements of impulse which seem at first so aimless on the canvas are built up into a whole characterized by firmness, often by elegance and beauty of shapes and colors. A whole emerges with a compelling, sometimes insistent quality of form, with a resonance of the main idea throughout the work. And possessing an extraordinary tangibility and force, often being so large that it covers the space of a wall and therefore competing boldly with the environment, the canvas can command our attention fully like monumental painting in the past.

It is also worth remarking that as the details of form become complicated and free and therefore hard to follow in their relation to one another, the painting tends to be more centered and compact—different in this respect from the type of abstraction in which the painting seems to be a balanced segment of a larger whole. The artist places himself in the focus of your space.

These characteristics of painting, as opposed to the characteristics of industrial production, may be found also in the different sense of the words "automatic" and "accidental" as applied in painting, technology and the everyday world.

* * * * *

Conscious control is only one source of order and novelty: the unconscious, the spontaneous and unpredictable are no less present in the good work of art. But that is something art shares with other activities and indeed with the most obviously human function: speech. When we speak, we produce automatically a series of words which have an order and a meaning for us, and yet are not fully designed. The first word could not be uttered unless certain words were to follow, but we cannot discover, through introspection, that we had already thought of the words that were to follow. That is a mystery of our thought as well.

Painting, poetry, and music have this element of unconscious, improvised serial production of parts and relationships in an order, with a latent unity and purposefulness. The peculiarity of modern painting does not lie simply in its aspect of chance and improvisation but elsewhere. Its distinctiveness may be made clear by comparing the character of the formal elements of old and modern art.

Painters often say that in all art, whether old or modern, the artist works essentially with colors and shapes rather than with natural objects. But the lines of a Renaissance master are complex forms which depend on already ordered shapes in nature. The painting of a cup in a still-life picture resembles an actual cup, which is itself a well-ordered thing. A painting of a landscape depends on observation of elements which are complete, highly ordered shapes in themselves—like trees or mountains.

Modern painting is the first complex style in history which proceeds from elements that are not preordered as closed articulated shapes. The artist today creates an order out of unordered variable elements to a greater degree than the artist of the past.

* * * * *

Another aspect of modern painting and sculpture which is opposed to our actual world and yet is related to it—and appeals particularly because of this relationship—is the difference between painting and sculpture on the one hand and what are called the "arts of communication." This term has become for many artists one of the most unpleasant in our language.

In the mediums of communication which include the newspaper, the magazine, the radio and TV, we are struck at once by certain requirements that are increasingly satisfied through modern technical means and the ingenuity of scientific specialists. Communications, in this sense, aims at a maximum efficiency through methods that ensure the attention of the listener or viewer by setting up the appropriate reproducible stimuli which will work for everyone and promote the acceptance of the message. Distinction is made between messsage and that which interferes with message, i. e., noise—that which is irrelevant. And devices are introduced to insure that certain elements will have an appropriate weight in the reception.

* * * * *

The methods of study applied in the theory of communication have been extended to literature, music, and painting as arts which communicate. Yet it must be said that what makes painting and sculpture so interesting in our times is their high degree of noncommunication. You cannot extract a messsage from painting by ordinary means; the usual rules of communication do not hold here, there is no clear code or fixed vocabulary, no certainty of effect in a given time of transmisssion or exposure. Painting, by becoming abstract and giving up its representational function, has achieved a state in which communication seems to be deliberately prevented. And in many works where natural forms are still preserved, the objects and the mode of representation resist an easy decipherment and the effects of these works are unpredictable.

The artist does not wish to create a work in which he transmits an already prepared and complete message to a relatively indifferent and impersonal receiver. The painter aims rather at such a quality of the whole that, unless you achieve the proper set of mind and feeling toward it, you will not experience anything of it at all.

Only a mind opened to the qualities of things, with a habit of discrimination, sensitized by experience and responsive to new forms and ideas, will be prepared for the enjoyment of this art. The experience of the work of art, like the creation of the work of art itself, is a process ultimately opposed to communication as it is understood now. What has appeared as noise in the first encounter becomes in the end message or necessity, though never message in a perfectly reproducible sense. You cannot translate it into words or make a copy of it which will be quite the same thing.

But if painting and sculpture do not communicate they induce an attitude of communion and contemplation. They offer

to many an equivalent of what is regarded as part of religious life: a sincere and humble submission to a spiritual object, an experience which is not given automatically, but requires preparation and purity of spirit. It is primarily in modern painting and sculpture that such contemplativeness and communion with the work of another human being, the sensing of another's perfected feeling and imagination becomes possible.

If painting and sculpture provide the most tangible works of art and bring us closer to the activity of the artist, their concreteness exposes them, more than the other arts, to dangerous corruption. The successful work of painting or sculpture is a unique commodity of market value. Paintings are perhaps the most costly man-made objects in the world. The enormous importance given to a work of art as a precious object which is advertised and known in connection with its price is bound to affect the consciousness of our culture. It stamps the painting as an object of speculation, confusing the values of art. The fact that the work of art has such a status means that the approach to it is rarely innocent enough; one is too much concerned with the future of the work, its value as an investment, its capacity to survive in the market and to symbolize the social quality of the owner. At the same time no profession is as poor as the painter's, unless perhaps the profession of the poet. The painter cannot live by his art.

Painting is the domain of culture in which the contradiction between the professed ideals and the actuality is most obvious and often becomes tragic.

* * * * *

But granting the importance of all those perceptions and values which find no place in painting today, the artist does not feel obliged to cope with them in his art. He can justify himself by pointing to the division of labor within our culture, if not in all cultures. The architect does not have to tell stories with his forms; he must build well and build nobly. The musician need not convey a statement about particular events and experiences or articulate a moral or philosophical commitment. Representation is possible today through other means than painting and with greater power than in the past.

In the criticism of modern painting as excluding large sectors of life, it is usually assumed that past art was thoroughly comprehensive. But this view rests on an imperfect knowledge of older styles. Even the art of the cathedrals, which has been called encyclopedic, represents relatively little of contemporary actuality, though it projects with immense power an established world view through the figures and episodes of the Bible. Whether a culture succeeds in expressing in artistic form its ideas and outlook and experiences is to be determined by examining not simply the subject matter of one art, like painting, but the totality of its arts, and including the forms as well as the themes.

Within that totality today painting has its special tasks and possibilities discovered by the artists in the course of their work. In general, painting tends to reinforce those critical attitudes which are well represented in our literature: the constant searching of the individual, his motives and feelings, the currents of social life, the gap between actuality and ideals.

If the painter cannot celebrate many current values, it may be that these values are not worth celebrating. In the absence of ideal values stimulating to his imagination, the artist must cultivate his own garden as the only secure field in the violence and uncertainties of our time. By maintaining his loyalty to the value of art—to responsible creative work, the search for perfection, the sensitiveness to quality—the artist is one of the most moral and idealistic of beings, although his influence on practical affairs may seem very small.

Painting by its impressive example of inner freedom and inventiveness and by its fidelity to artistic goals, which include the mastery of the formless and accidental, helps to maintain the critical spirit and the ideals of creativeness, sincerity and self-reliance, which are indispensable to the life of our culture.

The Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jenner Hits Export of United States Jobs."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of August 4, 1958]

JENNER HITS EXPORT OF UNITED STATES JOBS

In a withering attack on internationalists, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, in the United States Senate the other day, pertinently declared that the so-called "reciprocal trade program," in combination with other inane internationalist programs, "is in fact a system for exporting American jobs to other countries."

Far from increasing job opportunities or wages paid in the United States, Senator JENNER declared that this vicious system is stimulating the export of American working capital to make many thousands of jobs in other countries at the expense of the American workingman. The output of the holders of these exported American jobs, completes a vicious circle by coming into the American market to compete with the output of American factories and farms.

With obvious prophetic certainty, JENNER forecasts that surrender to a still further expanded directed international economy, will fall heaviest on the workers of the United States whose high wages depend on our vastly superior machinery and equipment, provided out of the savings of Americans, reinvested in employment here at home.

"The reciprocal trade program is by now so great a detriment to American economic life," said JENNER, "that it is almost impossible to describe it in temperate language." He added that is so incredibly malevolent to American interests that "it is almost impossible to make it creditable to those who have not looked behind the fleecy clouds of propaganda to see the cold unvarnished truth."

Senator JENNER described at length to the Members of Congress the genesis and development of this specific entity of a veritable wave of schemes submerging the best interests of America to the benefit of every improvident country in the world. He cited how, in enacting the reciprocal trade law in 1934, Congress indeed voted to surrender its legislative responsibility to the executive branch of the Government.

The executive branch originally asked for this power to implement an overall policy approaching free trade in its disturbing ramifications. And after World War II, the executive branch compounded its evil sell-out of American interests by surrendering its derivative legislative power to an international body, of which we are 1 of 36 members.

JENNER graphically described how it would be grimly humorous if it were not so serious, to contemplate how, paradoxically, this international body is not concerned primarily with free trade, but with is very opposite—an elaborate worldwide system of quotas and allocations of markets, which is under no obligation to put American interests above those of its 35 members in any manner whatever. And that it interlocks with a host of other international bodies operating above the Congress and the Constitution, and in accordance with the principles of a directed, not a free economy.

Senator JENNER explains how this not only does nothing whatever to increase the volume of world trade, or reduce the controls on freedom of trade employed by other nations, but also actually is a limitation on the total of world trade, and a transfer of a share of the world market from American production to foreign production under specious arguments about a dollar shortage.

JENNER cited how, the one worlders behind the reciprocal trade gimmick report huge foreign aid giveaways as foreign trade, which the Senator debunks for the specious misrepesentation that it is. "If they (these reported exports) were foreign aid, they were not exports," said JENNER. "They were not paid for abroad—and the cost was met by taxes on American workers," he added, then citing how Indiana's proportionate share of those taxes is higher than anything that appears in these dishonest statistics on foreign trade."

Challenging the Congress to take action to deal with this international division of wealth, the Senator predicted, "if we do nothing, the division of wealth will continue until we average the income of Americans with those of Cambodia and Egypt. I ask you, what kind of average do you get if you divide up the incomes of 173 million Americans with the incomes of over a billion people in the under-privileged areas?"

Once again we are justified in being proud of our Hoosier Senator because once again he is so right.

Germany's Friendship for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, with events moving so fast, it is most refreshing to read a calm and understanding analysis of the present world crisis. I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on July 29, 1958, titled "Khrushchev Favors Turmoil."

I have often disagreed with the editorial policy of the Sun-Times, but I want to compliment the editor for a most scholarly analysis of the present world crisis and the problem in the Middle East. I was particularly interested in the reference to the Adenauer administration's position vis-a-vis the Middle East and Israel.

I ask permission to have this editorial inserted in the RECORD so that all my colleagues may have the benefit of reading this splendid presentation of a most complex problem.

I have before me also a letter to the editor of the Chicago Sun-Times written by Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago. He is well known as an able man and a keen analyst of world affairs.

After he finished a useful study of defense programs in Europe a few years ago, I took the floor at that time, as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done before, to pay tribute to that fine citizen-soldier for a mission well done. Many of the recommendations made in the general's mission report have been adopted. Others should have been followed, but that is beside the point today.

General Klein's letter to the editor of of the Sun-Times contains the answer in which I, and I am sure my colleagues concur respecting our country's relationship with our present German ally.

I think the Sun-Times editorial and General Klein's reply show us how wise our Government was in pursuing the policy it did regarding postwar Germany. Chancellor Adenauer has done all be could to make Germany a loyal and true democratic ally and thus bring the German people to atone for the terrible sins and crimes committed under Hitler. We are not unmindful of the historical turn of events which saw Germany become a stanch supporter of the newest democracy and fortress of freedom in the Middle East—the State of Israel.

I applaud not only Chancellor Adenauer but also the Chicago Sun-Times for their editorial recognition of this historical achievement and for making the splendid presentation they did on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial, together with General Klein's reply.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of July 29, 1958]

KHRUSHCHEV FAVORS TURMOIL

Soviet Premier Khrushchev torpedoed the idea of a UN summit conference at New York yesterday. He went back to his previous insistence that the Middle East is a powder keg that can be deactivated only by his previous proposal for a summit conference attended by only five powers, the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union and India.

By this move Khrushchev tried again to give the impression that the peace in the Middle East is threatened by the United States and Great Britain and not by the militancy of Arab nationalism and the long-standing feud between Israel and the Arab states. Khrushchev seeks to put the United States and Great Britain on trial at a summit; he is not interested in getting down to the source of the trouble in the Middle East.

A recognition that any summit conference must deal with such basic problems was given Sunday by West Germany.

The West German Government added its voice to those who believe that Israel should participate in a summit conference if Arab States are included.

This stand by the German Government is especially interesting inasmuch as West Germany recently has enjoyed particularly good relations with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

Germany has been doing business on a relatively large scale with the UAR. Just last Sunday President Nasser opened Egypt's first steel plant near Cairo. It was built by German technicians. Nasser publicly thanked them, saying, "We shall not forget those who worked with us under difficult circumstances."

It is ironic that the nation which, under Hitler, persecuted its Jewish citizens and hastened the formation of a homeland for refugees from anti-Semitism, should now be a supporter of Israel. But Germany has been consistent in its remorse since the death of Hitler for his treatment of Jews. West Germany has made a substantial donation to Israel's development. It is paying in restitution funds $714 million to Israel over a period of 12 years.

It has been said that the turmoil in the Middle East will not subside until the Western Powers accept the ambition of Arab nationalists to form a federation of Arab nations, or even a single Arab State. Even if this should happen, there would still be instability in the area unless Arab leaders accept the fact that Israel is here to stay and that cooperation between Israel and her neighbors is necessary and inevitable.

On the other hand, Arab leaders profess the fear that Israel, beacuse she is not self-supporting, inevitably must expand her boundaries at their expense. A discussion of boundaries—with guaranties for both Israel and her neighbors—is imperative for any discussion of Middle East problems. Both sides will have to realize that there must be some form of compromise on boundaries. The refugee problem also cries out for solution.

The proper place for a discussion of these basic problems is in the United Nations, at a meeting at which the great powers can show their sincerity by sending their heads of state. By his reply, turning down such a U. N.-sponsored meeting, Khrushchev has shown once again that he is not interested in stabilizing the Middle East but in keeping it stirred up.

JULY 29, 1958.

EDITOR,
Chicago Sun-Times,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I would like to congratulate you on your July 29 editorial, Khrushchev Favors Turmoil. Your calm and statesmanlike analysis of the real problem facing the free world in connection with the proposed summit conference on the Middle East is superb.

I saw Chancellor Adenauer only 3 weeks ago and he discussed with me freely his burning desire to contribute all he can to bring peace out of the present chaotic situation which can only lead to world catastrophe. He further expressed his great personal interest in the Middle East problem about which he has shown great and genuine understanding.

It is with special interest that I read the following paragraph in your editorial:

"It is ironic that the nation which, under Hitler, persecuted its Jewish citizens and hastened the formation of a homeland for refugees from anti-Semitism, should now be a supporter of Israel. But Germany has been consistent in its remorse since the death of Hitler for his treatment of Jews. West Germany has made a substantial donation to Israel's development. It is paying in restitution funds $714 million to Israel over a period of 12 years."

You are right. That is what the Adenauer government has been and is doing. Let me say that I consider Adenauer one of the great, if not one of the greatest, European statesmen at this moment. His loyal support of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in their position against the Communist bloc, his great love for humanity, his firm and courageous stand on present world problems are characteristic of the principles which have animated the entire life of this deeply religious and noble gentleman.

I believe when history is further written it will record Adenauer as having contributed one of the most important chapters toward establishing permanent peace to the world. America is fortunate in having such an ally.

The Eisenhower and Truman administrations should be congratulated for the wisdom with which they dealt with Germany. We are now reaping the dividends of this bipartisan American approach toward a former foe—now a loyal ally.

We must do all we can to cement this friendship and alliance as Germany today stands as a bulwark against the Communist steamroller and the democratic, western way of life.

JULIUS KLEIN,
Major General (Retired).

Construction and Improvement of Certain Roads on the Navaho and Hopi Indian Reservations

---

SPEECH
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa demanded a second, because I think he, more than any other Member, should support this bill.

In 1950 the Congress passed the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act to provide a rehabilitation program for these tribes. It might be called a domestic point 4 program, if the gentleman would like to call it that, to enable these Indians—who occupy a land area almost as large as the entire State of West Virginia—to develop their resources.

This legislation authorizes the expenditure of money for the construction of two main highways across these reservations. There is none at the present time. They are needed to carry out the educational, health, and resource development programs needed on these reservations.

The specific purpose of the legislation is to increase the authorization of the original bill from $20 million to $40 million so these roads can be completed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman referred to this as a domestic foreign aid program. Let me say to the gentleman that I never considered the American Indian a foreigner.

Mr. UDALL. Nor do I, but I was suggesting something I thought would appeal to the gentleman, for he is always saying that we ought to do something about our own problems and put our own people first. We have health, education, and roads programs under our mutual security program, and I believe we should not do less for our own people.

I would say to the gentleman that you cannot even travel in this vast area of the United States, almost as large as the State of West Virginia, in a regular motor vehicle. How then, in these areas, can you carry out programs of rehabilitation and betterment unless you have adequate access to the people who must be served?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said that we should pass this bill because he thought we were doing so much for people abroad.

Mr. UDALL. I thought that argument might appeal to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean and does he really think we ought to look after our own people first?

Mr. UDALL. I have always held that point of view, and that is the reason I favor this particular legislation. I think this should have a priority over much of the legislation we have already passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that make the gentleman an isolationist?

Mr. UDALL. No, I would not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to look after our own folks.

Mr. UDALL. I thought the gentleman would concur in my point of view on this matter.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that title III of what is now the Civil Rights Act of 1957 was stricken by the Senate from the bill as it passed the House and thus was not included in the final legislation as it became law. Title III authorized the Attorney General to bring actions in the name of the United States Government to enforce rights guaranteed by the Constitution, which would include enforcement of the Supreme Court's decree on school desegregation.

In an article in the August 1958 issue of The Progressive, Dr. Charles Alan Wright, professor of law at the University of Texas, has observed that segregation will be ended in the South only if the Government of the United States recognizes that it is its function and its responsibility to require compliance with the Constitution. Title III, referred to above, would serve to bring about that recognition. It is the subject of several bills before the Congress. Title III is essential in the national interest and will have to be enacted by the Congress if we are to effectively guarantee the constitutional rights of Americans, especially in those areas of the Nation where there is a reluctance to recognize that those who share the obligations of American citizenship, such as serving in the military forces, must also be accorded the rights of American citizenship. I append Professor Wright's article hereto.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the August 1958 issue of the Progressive, entitled "School Integration: An Almost Lost Cause," written by Dr. Charles Alan Wright, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL INTEGRATION: AN ALMOST LOST CAUSE
(By Charles Alan Wright)

In the course of his campaign in the primaries leading up to the 1956 Democratic National Convention, Adlai Stevenson commented that it would be a fine thing if desegregation of the public schools could be completed by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. For this statement he was roundly denounced, by Negro leaders and by liberal groups, as a gradualist and a go-slower. It is a measure of the extent to which southern conditions and northern hopes have deteriorated that today it is entirely clear segregation will not be ended by 1963. Even more frightening, it is now entirely conceivable—perhaps even probable—that in major parts of the South the schools will never be desegregated.

It has been far too easy to be complacent about the future of desegregation, to assume that because the Supreme Court has spoken, the South must ultimately go along. This complacence is fed by the well-publicized success of integration in places like Louisville and San Antonio, and by the figures released from time to time showing hundreds of southern schools now open to children of all races. These gratifying developments have caused those who do not follow the situation closely to overlook the insolence of Dallas, the intransigence of Georgia—to ignore, in a word, the reality of what has been happening and will happen in the South.

Integration has come, on the whole, only in those places where it is easy, where white supremacy is not a vital article of faith, where the cost of two separate—though almost never equal—school systems has been a crushing financial burden, accepted by the taxpayers only out of habit. In the States and cities where these conditions exist, the Supreme Court decision must have been secretly welcomed, no matter how the politicians waved the Confederate flag, because it provides a graceful excuse for ending this expensive obeisance to a virtually forgotten ancestral memory.

Texas, for example, has a patently invalid law which purports to make it a matter of local option for school districts to decide whether they will or will not comply with the Constitution of the United States. In the only election which has been held under this absurd statute, the people of Pleasanton, Tex., voted quite decisively in favor of integration. They did this, however, only because the local Negro school was so shockingly inadequate as to offend the sensibilities of usually tolerant State officials. If the voters of Pleasanton had rejected integration, they would have been faced with the alternatives of paying heavily for an adequate Negro school, or of losing accreditation and State aid for all the schools of their district. Pleasanton is in south Texas, where the Negro population is small and prejudice traditionally has been directed against Mexicans rather than Negroes. Under all the circumstances, it is not surprising that Pleasanton accepted integration. These, however, are not the circumstances which exist throughout the Deep South.

No Negro child has yet been admitted to a white school in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, or in east Texas, and there is no sign that any will be admitted in any reasonable period of time. No Negro child has yet been admitted to a white school in Virginia or Louisiana, though in those States litigation intended to cause some desegregation is well advanced, and the future is unpredictable. A handful of Negro children do go to previously white schools in North Carolina, but their admission is openly described as a mere token, designed to obscure the fact that the overwhelming majority of Negro children in that State are being denied equal protection of the laws. More than 4 years have gone by since the Supreme Court announced that the Constitution of the United States forbids racial segregation in public education, but the Deep South remains committed to its old ways, its defenses not even seriously attacked much less dented. Prospects that this situation will change are bleak indeed.

There was a time when many people hoped that the South would end segregation simply because segregation is no longer lawful, and the Southern gentleman—or so the myth runs—is a law-abiding person. Four years have been more than enough to show how naively unrealistic that hope was. Southern legislatures vie with each other in passing resolutions of defiance of the court and laws intended to circumvent enforcement of its decrees. Southern political leaders—even those regarded as liberal on other issues—bid for voter support by denunciations of integration and promises that it will never take place during their administration. Otherwise responsible newspapers, with few exceptions, fan the fires of lawlessness with distorted and inaccurate criticisms of the Supreme Court, and proud boasts, like that of the Dallas Morning News, that the policy in their area is all deliberate delay. It is plain that segregation will not be ended in the Deep South merely because it is contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

Others have comforted themselves with the hope that a God-fearing South would end segregation because segregation is morally wrong. This hope, too, has been forlorn. Many southern clergymen have behaved splendidly on this issue. Almost the only white voices which have been heard to speak favorably of desegregation have been voices trained for use in the pulpit. Unfortunately these are voices crying in the wilderness, ineffective to persuade even the faithful. Segregation remains almost invariably the pattern within the church itself, and at church-run schools. Two Episcopal bishops, one in Virginia and one in Texas, met defeat at the hands of the pious and respectable church leaders who make up a diocesan convention when they proposed this spring that summer camps operated by the church should not be racially segregated—and this despite the influence and prestige which bishops historically enjoy in the Episcopal Church. So long as lay people will not follow their spiritual advisers even as to race relations within the church, it is idle to hope that they will let religious teaching dictate their action in public affairs.

There is a final possibility. If the South will not end segregation because it is contrary to law, if the South will not end segregation because it is immoral, there remains the possibility that segregation will be ended by orders of the Federal courts. Such orders there surely will be. That they will end segregation is far less clear. Mansfield, Tex., was ordered to end segregation in its schools by the Federal court in August 1956. No

Negro child has yet attended those schools. A threatening mob, unrestrained by local and State authorities, was enough to intimidate would-be Negro applicants, and to keep the school for white students only. The University of Alabama was ordered to admit Negroes in 1955. No Negro has yet attended that university, except for the day or two that Autherine Lucy risked her life to get to the classroom. Nine Negro children did attend Central High School in Little Rock, thanks to their own fantastic courage and the might of the United States Army. Under Judge Lemley's order, they will not be allowed to return to Central this fall.

If a handful of juvenile delinquents, goaded on by their elders and their governor, can create enough unpleasant incidents within an integrated school, then, so Judge Lemley ruled, the constitutional rights of Negro children must yield to the desire of the community for peace and order in its schools. It is hard to imagine a clearer or simpler blueprint for thwarting desegregation. Perhaps Judge Lemley's order will be reversed on appeal—though I wouldn't bet on it. Most Southern States are already armed with another answer, statutes which provide that any school occupied by Federal troops is to be closed, while the white children are educated in private homes, churches, or any other place that can be found. Probably the courts will be able to see through such laws. Perhaps the Federal Government will have the determination to insist on reopening of the school, and to protect Negro children who go there. But even if, after long court struggles, Negroes are admitted to a particular school, new and more subtle statutes will surely have been enacted to remove them from that school, and thousands of other schools will remain segregated.

Violence may be the principal weapon for keeping schools segregated, despite orders of the Federal courts, but it has a powerful ally in the delaying legalism. It has been 2½ years since the United States Supreme Court ruled, after years of litigation, that Virgil D. Hawkins cannot be denied admission to the University of Florida law school because of his race. Since the Court spoke, Hawkins' case has been back and forth through the Florida courts again, has gone once more to the Supreme Court, and now is in a lower Federal court. Hawkins has helped make a good deal of law, but he has not yet been admitted to law school. Last winter a Federal court in Dallas finally issued a decree, after the case had been appealed three separate times, calling for an end of segregation in that city. But the Dallas School Board has announced that there will be no integration there next year, because, so it says with breathtaking hypocrisy, it does not know which is controlling, the Federal court order or a Texas law, enacted since the litigation began, requiring continued segregation.

The problem of integration is, in ultimate analysis, a simple question of law enforcement. A State which discriminates according to race in admissions to its schools is breaking the law. Usually when a government has a law forbidding certain conduct, the full resources of that government, including its police and its prosecutors, are devoted to preventing and punishing such conduct. Quite frequently private persons who have a special concern with the unlawful conduct may also bring their own lawsuit, but this is a supplement to the efforts of the government to enforce the law, rather than a substitute for such effort. It is virtually unprecedented to leave enforcement of the law of the land exclusively to private lawsuits, brought and financed by private persons, as we now are doing with that provision of the 14th amendment prohibiting school segregation.

There are special reasons why private law enforcement will not suffice to end segregation. Individual Negroes, denied their constitutional right to attend an integrated school, cannot possibly be expected to carry the brunt of litigation. The cost of these lawsuits is prohibitive. Necessarily they must combine their efforts, as they have done in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, but such an organization immediately becomes an obvious target for harassing investigations and legislation, and is forced to divert much of its energy and its resources into battling for its right to exist.

Even were the NAACP free to pursue its course unmolested, it is a rather puny David forced to do battle simultaneously with a number of alert Goliaths. In this battle the Southern States have every advantage. These lawsuits are extremely expensive and the funds which the NAACP is able to raise by private contribution are a pittance compared to what southern legislatures are willing to appropriate from otherwise impoverished State treasuries for the cause of preserving segregation. The States resisting integration have the edge with regard to legal talent. It is no disparagement of the dedicated lawyers who have worked tirelessly for the NAACP to say that, good as they are, they are not the outstanding lawyers of the South.

The South has the tremendous advantage of being able to revise at will the rules of the game. Let one segregation statute be held unconstitutional by a Federal court and the legislature in that State will hasten to enact a new package of laws which must be attacked and invalidated one by one before an end to segregation can be ordered. Finally, the South has the advantage of the seeming neutrality of the Federal Government. It is the Constitution of the United States which the NAACP is seeking to enforce, but the Government of the United States acts as if it is a matter of complete indifference to it whether segregation continues, in defiance of the Constitution, or whether it is ended. It is true that the Federal Government did intervene, effectively and powerfully, at Little Rock, but its intervention came at the wrong time and for the wrong reason. Segregation in the public schools is fully as unlawful in Biloxi, Miss., where no court action has even been begun, as it is in Little Rock, Ark., where a court has decreed its end.

Court orders must be obeyed, in a law-abiding country, and it is right that the Government should see to it that they are, but a court order has no stronger claims to obedience than does the Constitution itself, from which the courts derive their authority. For the Federal Government to remain idle in the face of open violation of its supreme law, except in the rare case where private persons have secured a court order calling for compliance with the law, is, in effect, to concede the ultimate victory to those States which are determined not to obey the law.

The South will not end segregation because the Supreme Court says it must, nor because the churches denounce segregation as immoral, nor because the NAACP, laboring manfully with inadequate resources, brings a pitifully few lawsuits looking toward this end. Segregation will be ended in the South only if the Government of the United States recognizes that it is its function and its responsibility to require compliance with the Constitution. The Federal Government alone has the money and the legal manpower and the patience and the power to force recalcitrant States to obey the law. Decisive Federal action in support of integration is the only thing which will persuade the South that the end of segregation is inevitable, and that nothing is to be gained by throwing stones outside a Central High School or spitballs within. And, not irrelevantly, the Federal Government has express constitutional authority, conferred by section 5 of the 14th amendment, to see to it that every person in the land enjoys the rights that amendment guarantees.

It has been only a year—though it now seems ancient history—since Congress came close to putting the responsibility for ending segregation on the Federal Government, where it properly belongs and where it must rest if segregation is to be ended. Title III of the bill which ultimately became the Civil Rights Act of 1957 authorized the Attorney General to bring actions to enforce school integration and the other rights given by the 14th amendment. The House of Representatives passed the bill in this form, and it was no secret that the bill gave the Attorney General this power. Before the bill came to the Senate, Telford Taylor, in an article in the New York Times magazine, referred correctly to title III as "the most important provision of the bill." But title III soon fell victim to southern adroitness and administration vacillation. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, blasted title III as "the most cunningly devised and contrived piece of legislation I have ever seen," and suggested that it had been sneaked into the bill without the knowledge of the President. Senator RUSSELL must have scented victory when the President told his press conference the next day that his objective in the bill was merely to protect voting rights, and that he had read the bill that morning and found phrases in it he didn't understand.

This did not quite end the matter. The day the Senate agreed to consider the bill President Eisenhower issued a statement in which he said that one of the four objectives of the bill was "to provide a reasonable program of assistance in efforts to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens"—an obvious reference to title III—and that, though the Senate might make changes in detail, he hoped all four of these objectives would be retained. Unfortunately, the very next day, again at a press conference, he made a remark which the newspapers and the Senate understood to mean that he was not convinced that it would be wise to permit the Attorney General to bring school integration suits. It is doubtful that this is what the President actually meant to say, or what he thought he had said, but when no action was taken to correct this interpretation of his remarks, title III was dead. One week later it was formally interred. Despite the lack of clear encouragement from the White House, Senator KNOWLAND was able to hold a majority of Republicans to support of title III, and they were joined by some—but far from all—liberal Democrats. But the Senate voted, 52–38, to delete from the bill all except an unimportant remnant of title III, and thus to deny to the Federal Government the power to compel obedience to the Constitution of the United States.

All that has happened since that day—the wearing and unnecessary battle over the jury trial amendment, passage of the Civil Rights Act itself, the dispatch of troops to Little Rock, Judge Lemley's decision—has been a diverting but fundamentally meaningless sideshow. When title III was discarded, so too was any reasonable hope that school segregation will be ended in the foreseeable future. A few moments before the Senate voted on the deletion of title III, Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, said, with deep insight: "Today's vote is supremely important. It starts the process by which the whole ball game can be lost."

The whole ball game can indeed be lost. I think it is being lost. It will remain lost unless and until some future Congress corrects its mistake of last summer by adopting a statute similar to title III. More is at stake here than the right of Negro children to go to school with white children in the South, important as that right is. If the Supreme Court's decision that segregation

is unconstitutional is allowed, because of Federal inaction, to become a dead letter in places where it is unpopular, we can abandon our proud boasts that we live in a strong Federal Union, rather than a loose confederacy of States, and that we enjoy constitutional government under law.

Limitation of Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Stymied Jenner-Butler Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of August 1, 1958]

THE STYMIED JENNER-BUTLER BILL

Paradoxically, while legislation requested by the administration, to limit Supreme Court authority over the executive department has been passed, or well advanced toward passage, in short order, the Senate has done nothing about the infinitely more important Jenner-Butler bill, which was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and reported to the Senate floor more than 2 months ago.

The Court curb bill, drafted by Indiana's United States Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, and extensively amended by Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, of Maryland, would curtail the authority of the Supreme Court in some fields in which it has usurped the constitutional rights and functions of the Congress and the States, and in doing so has given aid and comfort to Communists.

Senator JENNER commendably agreed to many changes in his bill, as amended by Senator BUTLER, assisted by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, which resulted in the Senate Judiciary Committee approving the revised bill by a 2 to 1 majority.

The Jenner bill amendments appear to eliminate anything that could in any manner pose any curbs on the Supreme Court's authority to review legal questions—or in any other manner interfere with the constitutional entity of the Court as the duly ordained judiciary branch of our Government.

However, it is vitally important that the revised bill retains the provisions that would void recent Supreme Court decisions by making clear the intent and rightful prerogative of Congress in laws affecting the investigative power of congressional committees in the antisubversive field, prosecution of sedition by the States and Federal Government of antisubversive legislation.

It is also salutary that provisions have been retained and approved by the Judiciary Committee which clarify and reffirm the traditional division between the judicial and legislative powers as prescribed by the Constitution. They would salutarily restrain the High Court from its recent penchant for making law, rather than confining itself to its proper province of merely interpreting it.

Indeed, the Jenner-Butler measure reaffirms with unmistakable clarity the strict division of all three of the powers of our tripartite form of government—the executive, as well as the judicial and the legislative. It asserts what certainly needs to be asserted, and that is that the Supreme Court has no supremacy over the Constitution any more than the other two branches of our Government have.

Senators JENNER, BUTLER, and BRIDGES and other United States Senators have given this proposed legislation most earnest thought, and the Senate Judiciary Committee devoted intensive study to it and strongly approved it in its most fair and effective modified form and reported it to the floor of the Senate.

Ordinarily, the Senate would have lost no time in debating and voting on so important a measure, concurred in by 10 members of a major congressional committee. However, the Jenner-Butler bill has been quickly and unceremoniously shelved and ignored. But why? Well, as in everything, there has to be a reason or reasons, and Senator JENNER puts his finger on one when he says it is because of Senate politics. He referred to the well-reputed fears of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON that if the bill were permitted to come to a vote, a lot of patriotic Democrats would vote for it—there would be a sharp split in the Democratic ranks on the matter of curbing the High Court, and that this would look bad for the Democratic Party in the November election.

But Senator JENNER realistically points out that there also would doubtless be a split among the Republicans—that the modern Republicans undoubtedly would oppose curbing the power of the court, as much as the New-Fair-Deal Democrats would.

The hour is indeed late when the Senate has for more than 2 months ignored so important a bill, so impressively endorsed by its own Judiciary Committee, and which would so importantly restore to the Congress itself the vital legislative powers decreed by the Constitution, which have been usurped by the Supreme Court.

We reiterate that with congressional adjournment just 2 or 3 weeks away, it is late. However, it is not too late, if the Senate will, still, at long last, act to retrieve the supremacy that was vested in the Congress by the Constitutional Convention.

The President's Address Before the General Assembly of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I took time out of a busy schedule to listen to the President's marvelous speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York.

As I listened, I was struck anew by the realization that when we elected the President to his second term we were fortunate enough to continue in office a leader with enormous prestige who can speak with great sincerity and authority to representatives of all the nations of the world, as he did so plainly and eloquently this morning when clarifying the picture in the Middle East, especially with regard to the position of the United States in the Middle East.

The President brought out most forcefully that since the birth of our Republic we have shared our wealth and our know-how, but have never sought territorial gains through aggression.

I believe the American people will agree with me that their investment in Dwight D. Eisenhower, as President, was beautifully exemplified this morning and it seems to me that he spoke for most of us when he said, "We want nothing, we give much, and we get so little."

Activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities During the 2d Session of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activties during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. This report covers the period from January 1, 1958, to and including July 31, 1958. Under the date of August 30, 1957, I inserted in the RECORD a report on the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 1st session of the 85th Congress:

REPORT BY CHAIRMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

During the period beginning January 1, 1958, and ending July 31, 1958, the committee interrogated 105 witnesses in public session and 60 witnesses in executive session. In addition, several hundred persons were interviewed by committee investigators.

Espionage

Pursuing connective information derived from United States counterspy, Boris Morros, the committee interrogated a number of persons in formal session, as well as in informal investigative interviews respecting the Soviet espionage apparatus in the United States.

While much of the information thus derived by the committee cannot for security reasons be publicly divulged, the committee is in the process of preparing a summary report outlining patters of Soviet espionage activity in the United States based upon some two dozen cases which have been the subject of extensive investigation.

Communist infiltration in basic industry

Communist penetration of basic industry has been a major focus of the committee work during the past several months. Hearings held in Gary, Ind., in which 14 witnesses testified in public session and 3 in executive session, disclosed a pattern of Communist colonization by highly educated, hard core party members who erase their identity, education, and background as they procure menial jobs in heavy industry in order to engage in Communist activity. The pattern of Communist penetration of basic industry developed in the hearings in Gary, Ind., was confirmed by data received by the committee in hearings in other key areas of the Nation.

Current organizational structure of the Communist Party

The current organizational structure of the Communist Party, its present techniques of operation and the scope of its functioning were developed in extensive hearings, espe-

cially during those hearings held in Boston, Mass.

Armando Penha, an undercover operative for the FBI from 1950 to the date of his appearance in March 1958, testified extensively concerning the inner workings of the higher echelon of the Communist conspiracy.

Assessing the current seriousness of the Communist Party, Mr. Penha declared:

"Based on my experiences, I feel—and I am sure that I am absolutely correct—that the Communist conspiracy, by and large today, is much stronger than it has ever been. * * * The party has strengthened itself every time that it weeds out weaklings, those that they suspect, those who do not accept the party discipline, and as such it becomes stronger."

During the 8 years that he was in the Communst Party, Mr. Penha had known approximately 400 members of the party. In the course of his testimony, he identified by name over 200 Communist Party members he had personally known, including topflight functionaries of the national committee of the Communist Party.

Communist propaganda

The progressively increasing flood of Communist propaganda stemming both from abroad and from domestic sources received committee attention in a number of hearings designed to develop factual material on which to base legislative recommendations to stem the tide of this phase of Communist cold war. Testimony was received by the committee from various sections of the country to the effect that notwithstanding the registration and labeling provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act the international Communist apparatus is directing huge quantities of subtly designed Communist propaganda to all segments of our society for the purpose of undermining our resistance, and propagating the basic foreign policy of the Soviet Empire in its drive for world domination. A new technique used by the Soviet apparatus for avoiding the labeling requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act was revealed in the form of the devious tactic of channeling Communist propaganda into the United States through non-Communist countries. The emphasis placed by the Kremlin-controlled international Communist-propaganda on student and youth groups in the United States and throughout the free world was given particular attention by the committee. Two of the principal Communist conduits for capturing the minds of youth were revealed to be the International Union of Students, founded in 1946, with headquarters in Prague, Czechoslovakia, which has branches in most countries; and the World Federation of Democratic Youth which claims over 85 million members in 97 countries of the world.

Red infiltration of entertainment industry

Exploitation by the Communist apparatus in the United States of persons in the entertainment media was the subject of committee hearings in New York City. These hearings disclosed a design of Communist use of persons prominent in the entertainment industry as sounding boards for the Communist line as well as a source of revenue to finance the activities of the apparatus in this country. A number of persons who had been identified as Communists under oath by responsible witnesses before the committee were interrogated respecting current activities in the entertainment industry. The hearings shed a new light on the current methods of Communist infiltration in an area of our society which is of vital importance in formation of public opinion.

Communist penetration in the South

That Communist colonizers, propagandists, and agitators are presently active in the rapidly developing industrial centers of the South was clearly established in hearings held by the committee at Atlanta, Ga. The testimony revealed that trained, hard-core Communists based in Red nests in metropolitan areas of the North are operating in various Southern enterprises including textile plants, publications, and organizations in which they are masquerading behind a facade of humanitarianism.

Typical of a number of witnesses who were interrogated by the committee during the Atlanta hearings were Eugene Feldman who had been identified under oath by a former undercover agent of the FBI as a member of the Communist Party, and, though presently in residence in Chicago, Ill., is publisher of the Southern Newsletter which carries the Communist Party line into the South; and Carl Braden, likewise, identified by a responsible witness under oath as a Communist who is a field representative of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., which is a successor organization to the one-time Communist front, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

REPORTS

Organized communism in the United States

This report, a detailed study of the Communist movements in America from the date of inception to and including 1958 was prepared and released by the committee.

Chronicle of treason

The committee published a series of articles by its chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, on various episodes of the Kremlin secret war against America, including the activities of Harry Gold and the Rosenbergs, who stole some of America's vital military secrets for the Soviet Union; Judy Coplon, who kept her Communist masters informed about the efforts of the Government to root out espionage and subversion; Louis Wheaton, who betrayed his countrymen while they were fighting for survival in Korea; and Rudolph Abel, colonel of the KGB, the overseas intelligence arm of the Soviet Union.

About the Committee on Un-American Activities

Two publications about the Committee on Un-American Activities and its work were prepared and released. The first is a booklet entitled "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, What It Is, What It Does." This booklet in question-and-answer form covers the principal queries which from time to time have been posed by our citizens respecting the committee and its work.

The second publication about the committee is a study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, entitled "Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities." This study sets forth in detail the great body of legislation which has been enacted by the Congress following recommendations made by the committee from 1941 until 1958. The study reveals that bills were introduced in the House of Representatives embodying 80 recommendations made by the committee; that all but 2 of these bills were offered after 1949; that actual legislation enacted by the Congress carried out 35 of these committee recommendations and that there are pending in the 85th Congress 26 bills embodying committee recommendations.

The Internal Security Act of 1950, the Communist Control Act of 1954, and various provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, are among the more important legislative enactments in this field. In addition, executive agencies of the Government have put into effect policies, orders, and regulations relating to 13 recommendations made by the committee.

The Erica Wallach story

Based upon extensive interrogation both in Europe and in the United States of Erica Glaser Wallach, who was formerly active in the Soviet underground in Europe, but who has since broken with the Communist operation and is now a resident of the United States, the committee issued a report revealing techniques of Communist justice and the utopian nightmare, which produces—even to its inherents—the bitter fruit of assassination, torture, and enslavement.

Who are they?

Continuing the series of thumbnail sketches of the leaders of the Soviet Union and international communism, the committee this year published brief biographies of Vincente Lombardo Toledano, secretary general of the Popular Party of Mexico; Luis Carlos Prestes, general secretary of the Communist Party of Brazil; Enver Hoxha, first secretary of the Albanian Workers (Communist Party), and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, first secretary of the Rumanian Workers (Communist Party). The intrigues, double-dealing and ruthlessness of these leaders of the forces of communism in their respective countries give still further emphasis to the words of Emerson: "Don't say things. What you are stands over you the while, and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary."

CONSULTATIONS

A series of consultations with authorities on each of the many facets of the total war which the Soviet Empire is waging with the United States of America as its principal target were conducted by the committee.

The Communist program for world conquest

Economic and psychological weapons rather than the launching of a third world war comprise the current Communist program for world conquest, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer warned in a consultation with the committee. One of the top strategic planners of World War II, General Wedemeyer was present at many international conferences as adviser to the President. He attended the conferences in Washington, London, Cairo, Quebec, and Casablanca before going to China as theater commander in 1944.

"They (the Communists) are attaining their objectives without the use of military force," General Wedemeyer said:

"If I were the senior planner in the Soviet hierarchy, I would advise Khrushchev: 'Continue to do exactly what you are doing now. Do not involve the Soviet Union in a major war but employ the satellites in brush fires or limited wars against our enemies, the capitalist countries. Continue penetration economically and psychologically, utilize economic or military aid to as many countries in the world as possible. They can be made indebted to the Soviet, and if not loyal, at least they will not be opposed to the Communist movement.'"

Communist psychological warfare (brainwashing)

Communist psychological warfare is now winning such extensive victories in the United States that the Red bloc will not need to employ direct military force against us in order to win the total war which they are waging with this country the principal target, Edward Hunter, American expert on Communist brainwashing, asserted.

Mr. Hunter, whose career as a foreign correspondent, author, editor, world traveler, and specialist in propaganda warfare, qualifies him as an authority on Communist propaganda techniques, stated:

"I spent 30 years, a little bit more perhaps, in countries under various forms of Communist pressure and attack. What I am witnessing in America is no different from what I saw in those other countries. I am often referred to as someone who has made phenomenal predictions that proved correct on things to come. Actually, I have never made a prediction as such in my life. I have

only predicted in the manner that one predicts the total of 4 after seeing the figures 2 plus 2.

"I have been watching developments under communism in other parts of the world, and now I see exactly the same developments here in America."

Communist propaganda activities in Canada

The sum of $20 million to $30 million yearly is collected by Soviet agents in Canada as customs duties on food and clothing parcels sent by Canadian citizens to the Soviet Union and is used to finance the activities of approximately 100,000 Communists in Canada, Milan Jakubec, president of the executive council of the Mutual Cooperation League of Canada and president of the Slovak Legion, stated.

These customs duties average 150 to 175 percent of the cost of the article itself, he emphasized, and are part of a sum of at least $100 million a year in similar duties which Soviet agents collect from citizens of the free world.

The Mutual Cooperation League of Canada, which Mr. Jakubec heads, consists of 18 ethnic groups originating from behind the Iron Curtain; and the Slovak Legion, of which he is president, consists of veterans who fought during the last war in French, British, and other Allied armies.

Mr. Jakubec stated that there are about 23 Communist newspapers in various languages in Canada. Other Communist propaganda publications in Canada include the Soviet News Bulletin, published by the Soviet Embassy, and Northern Neighbors, which is financed from the Soviet Embassy.

Communist psychological warfare (thought control)

The Soviet Union today is engaged in a gigantic campaign to win the cold war by mobilizing public opinion in western nations against their own governments, Prof. Constantin W. Boldyreff declared.

Professor Boldyreff, formerly on the faculty of Georgetown University and once a member of the Russian Cadet Corps, was one of the organizers of the NTS (National Alliance of Russian Solidarists), which is dedicated to the overthrow of the Communist regime in Russia.

The Soviet Union's propaganda campaign "is a totally new phenomenon" in international conflict, Professor Boldyreff continued. "History knows several cases when nations fought each other by economic pressure (the blockade of Napoleonic France) or even by harassing the enemy on the periphery (England and Spain) without actually resorting, for quite some time, to organized military operations. In the past this was a strife of one government against another government, with every citizen of the opposing nation being considered an enemy. In the present conflict, the main efforts of each of the striving governments are mainly directed to influence the citizens, individual citizens, of the opposing nation over the head of their own government in an attempt to capture their allegiance."

Communist encroachment in the Far East

"The Communist infiltrators are seating themselves in places of power in every level of our society and every organization we have," the late Gen. Claire Lee Chennault stated.

General Chennault organized and led the famed American volunteer group known as the Flying Tigers in the Sino-Japanese War. Later he commanded the 14th United States Air Force in the Far East during World War II. He has been a leader in the free world fight against communism for 20 years. The civilian airline which he organized after World War II—Civil Air Transport evacuated thousands of Nationalist Chinese who fled the Communist conquest of the China mainland in 1949.

The Communist world threat is so critical and the hour so late, he declared, that only a reversal of today's passive policies toward the Reds by the remaining non-Communist nations can save freedom.

What is behind the Soviet proposal for a summit conference?

The Kremlin looks upon a summit conference solely as another weapon in its program of global conquest, four experts on international communism asserted. The experts—Dr. David J. Dallin, Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Dr. James D. Atkinson, and Mr. Francis J. McNamara—declared that in seeking an international conference, the purpose of the Soviet Union is not to negotiate peace but to disarm the West intellectually and psychologically.

The ideology of freedom versus the ideology of communism

The beliefs which sustain the free world can win the ideological struggle with communism, Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman and executive director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, stated. The Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order is an all-faith organization dedicated to opposing by spiritual means communism and all forms of totalitarianism and to renewing religious and moral foundations.

Dr. Lowry characterized the beliefs which sustain the free world as:

"The dignity, innate value, and inalienable rights of man; * * * the providence of God; * * * the integrity and ultimate sovereignty of the people; * * * the limitation and the division of governmental power; * * * and the dream and the vision of a new and fairer age of liberty and democracy for all people.

Dr. Lowry emphasized, however, that the ideological struggle was but the deepest phase of a total struggle with communism involving also military, political, and economic forces.

REFERENCE SERVICE

The reference service, maintained by the committee for Members of Congress, executive agencies of the Government, and the committee staff for the purpose of supplying data from the public files of the committee has received during the first 7 months of 1958, 1,625 requests for information on 5,197 individuals and 1,073 organizations, periodicals and general subjects. All of these have been answered with written reports.

WORK IN PROGESS

For the remainder of the year 1958 the committee has a heavy schedule of work in process including hearings and investigations, reports and consultations.

Benson Policies Beneficial to Specialty Crop Farmers of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to point out an incident which shows that the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and this Republican administration have been beneficial to the specialty crop farmers of California.

The principal problem of fresh, dried, and canned fruit producers in California has been the surplus created by the loss of our overseas markets following World War II. Secretary Benson and the Departments of State and Commerce have rejected the idea of subsidizing fruit growers and have worked long and hard to once again build up our traditional foreign markets. The degree of their success was dramatically focused with a recent announcement by the United Kingdom establishing commercial import quotas on fresh, dried and canned fruit for the 1958–59 season in excess of $22 million. This announcement and an earlier one by the British Board of Trade clearly indicates a return to normalcy and an intention to make no further arrangements for British fruit imports under United States aid programs.

This is the first time the United Kingdom has permitted entry of United States fruit on a normal commercial trading basis since World War II.

Here is an example of a sound policy, without a single cent of subsidy, solving a major problem for a huge segment of our farm economy. We California farmers can thank God for men like Ezra Taft Benson.

United States Action in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,
New York, N. Y., August 12, 1958.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
United States Representative from Michigan.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: The farsighted and courageous decision to prevent an eventual Soviet-Communist takeover of strategic points in the Middle East, has bolstered the prestige of the United States and given new life to the hopes of all her anti-Communist friends. The expectancy has been aroused that this firm stand will be followed by a comprehensive political action aimed at clearly identifying the aggressive colonial imperialism of Soviet communism, not only in the indirect aggression in the Middle East, but also in the overt aggression in central and Eastern Europe. The essence of this expectation lies in the hope that finally in central and east Europe also, new political tactics will be used commensurate with the nature and gravity of the overall Communist threat. It is in view of this expectancy that I take the liberty of respectfully submitting to you the following:

Posing as a champion of the Arabs, Khrushchev exalted national liberation and the right of the people to build their own life as they see fit, urging that foreign boots no longer be planted on their soil (Moscow speech, July 22, 1958). Khrushchev later added in his letter to President Eisenhower of August 5, that "no state * * * can assume the right to interfere in the affairs of small countries" and that "the peoples of

Eastern Europe have freely chosen their present way of life and will not allow anyone to change it." It seems that no political use has been made by the United States until now of these pronouncements in the field where they most pertinently apply; namely in the issue of Eastern Europe as related to the crisis in the Middle East.

President Eisenhower, in his note of August 1, to Khrushchev, refers of course to the system of political domination imposed by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, but no practical political charges and demands are expressed, a thing which not only would be in support of freedom, but highly profitable to the tactical-political interests of the United States at this juncture.

In the Rumanian sector, a situation has arisen which, together with the Hungarian case, would amply justify a certain move by the United States to expose the fraudulency of the Soviet pretense in the Arab national liberation question. Marshal Konev, commander of the Warsaw Pact forces, cryptically announced on May 26, that Soviet troops who have occupied Rumania for the last 13 years will be withdrawn "soon." In other words the "foreign boots" which Khrushchev could not stomach for 6 days in Lebanon, caused him no qualms during the 13 years in Rumania.

What is the reality of the so-called withdrawal of the Russian troops from Rumania? How can such a withdrawal be ascertained and what is, under the circumstances of Soviet domination in East Europe, its significance? Up to now the only information on Russian troop movements comes from Communist quarters: on June 15 the Communist Tanjug reported that "Soviet troops began pulling out" of Rumania; then on July 4, the Bucharest Communist Radio broadcast that "Soviet military garrisons in Constanta and Dobrogea regions in Rumania left by rail yesterday"; and on July 26, the same radio said the last Soviet troops had left Rumania.

No reliable source has corroborated this information. Moreover in the actual situation of Rumania, it would be difficult if not impossible, to ascertain for a fact a withdrawal of Soviet troops. It is relevant in this respect to remember the discrepancy in the estimations of the number of Soviet occupation troops in Rumania, ranging from 40,000 to 300,000. Another facet of this problem is the considerable numbers of non-uniformed Russian agents which, according to our underground information, amounts in the Bucharest area alone to 20,000. Again, as the country is surrounded by Communist dominated states, having nearly all its frontiers under Soviet control, the displacement of Soviet troops from one frontier to another, is in itself of very little importance. Any Soviet troop moves in the Warsaw Pact area belong basically to a mere strategic reorganization.

There is in consequence an immense difference between the alleged Russian withdrawal from Rumania and an eventual withdrawal of American marines from Lebanon, out of which the Kremlin will make its biggest propaganda barrage at whatever General Assemblies, summit conferences, etc., materialize. On one side, in Rumania, a declared withdrawal in the obscurity and secrecy of the Iron Curtain, which must be accepted on the Kremlin's word, in the absence of any international limelight of either the press, United Nations observers, or the interested diplomatic representatives; and on the other side, in Lebanon, an eventual departure in the limelight of publicity and cameras, watched by the whole world every hour on the hour. Why should this double standard of international behavior be accepted or passed over in silence?

Khrushchev is proclaiming the sacred right of people "to build their own life as they see fit" and the principle of "national independence." These principles are correct, but should they not be applied generally? And, if so, is not just to implement them also in a country such as Rumania, which has been, for 13 years, subjected to the Soviet military yoke, and where the people, kept in bondage, are denied the most elementary right of expressing their desires and aspirations? Is the noble debate on freedom and human rights as proposed by Khrushchev to be circumscribed to Lebanon and Jordan, as he intends, or should the United States turn forcefully the limelight on Eastern Europe?

It is unfortunate that the United States has recognized the Communist nonrepresentative governments in Eastern Europe and brought them to the United Nations, which fact makes it apparently awkward to denounce the real situation in the enslaved countries. But if the United States does not want to be reduced to a great extent to the role of merely a defender of her oil and military interests in the Middle East, while Khrushchev and Nasser will be the champions of national independence and the right of people to freely choose their governments, the United States should finally raise the question of East Europe and not just rhetorically, but politically.

This is the only strong card the United States has in order to turn the tables on Khrushchev and make him a defendant instead of an accuser. A firm decision should be taken at this 11th hour to bring before the United Nations the issue of Soviet interference in Central and Eastern Europe, with all its immense documentation, and draw the political conclusions which would expose unequivocally, especially to the peoples of Africa and Asia, the colonial and predatory true policies of the Soviet Union. There is conceivably no more powerful psychological antidote for the subtle buildup of the Soviet Union as a champion of liberation and noninterference for those peoples than such an exposure. If the United States opens this campaign, the Soviet propaganda against the United States will publicly be cut down to size and the virulence of Russian subversion noticeably checked.

As concerns the so-called withdrawal of Russian troops from Rumania, the United States and the United Kingdom have the right through the peace treaty they concluded with the Bucharest Communist Government, to supervise the military circumstances of that country. The legal basis on which the United States Government could avail itself for ascertaining the size of the Rumanian forces, and, in the process, the foreign troops situation there is clearly provided in the treaty, as well as it is for an inquiry into the implementation of the treaty regarding human rights and fundamental freedoms. The announced withdrawal should thus suggest two political moves on the part of the signatories, especially the United States: (a) As one of the side-attack responses in the General Assembly's Lebanon-Jordan session, a demand for an international verification of the military buildup in Rumania; (b) in connection with Khrushchev's demand in the Middle East debate that people be free "to build their own life as they see fit," another counter-attack to his accusations, a demand for international inspection of the human rights functioning and guarantees in Rumania and other countries. Such tactics would broadly apply to the whole area of Eastern Europe. Together with the Hungarian case, the announced move of Russian troops out of Rumania, constitute the most appropriate political field for a limited counterattack: Lebanon-Jordan versus Rumania-Hungary.

Allow me to draw your attention to the most important aspect, as far as the Rumanian situation is concerned. Under the tremendous Soviet pressure, embedded in the Kremlin's strategic expansion line and controlled by an apparatus infiltrated with Soviet agents, even in the event of an actual withdrawal of Russian troops—if no international political intervention materializes—the only way left for the population to regain their rights and liberties is through insurrection. In such a case what would be the attitude of the United States? In view of the Hungarian revolt and the brutal Soviet military intervention and the hands-off policy of the United States; in view of the Iraq revolt backed by the Soviets, with the enthusiastic moral defense of the right of the people to revolt and more substantial threats of sending "volunteers"; what if in the near future a revolt should take place in Rumania? Would the United States again assist passively to a Soviet military intervention as in Hungary? Would it not be wise to prepare in advance for such an eventuality?

The Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has presented on May 15, 1957, a report on policy toward the satellite nations, which recommended some moves that should be made in this respect, but nobody has used these recommendations. The only recent quasi-authoritative declaration on the United States policy in the matter has been Senator KENNEDY'S statement of June 8, to the effect that "we are not going to help them revolt, or send arms", with the implication that if a spontaneous insurrection should break out, the United States would do absolutely nothing and thus give the Russians a free hand to massacre women, children and men fighting for their freedom. Was the Senator speaking for the administration?

The reluctance of the United States to sincerely bring up the issue of the Soviet enslavement of Eastern Europe and the constant refusal of the United States to support in any concrete manner the rights of these peoples to freely choose their own governments, have widely consolidated the belief that the present administration has either endorsed a previous deal between Russia, Great Britain, and the United States giving East Europe to Soviet domination; or there has been a new, post-1952, understanding between these powers, to the effect of not interfering with the Soviet subjugation of Eastern Europe, save for innocuous figures of speech from time to time. Moreover the rumor has spread that the Soviet intervention in Hungary has been partly facilitated by assurances of nonintervention by the United States. These impressions seem to be confirmed by Senator KENNEDY'S statement. Is his point of view shared by the Congress? If this is not true and it is felt that such a horror as that in Budapest should not happen again with the United States acquiescing in it by inaction, it is timely that a declaration of principle be made against Soviet military intervention, followed by an implementation of a constructive plan—the minimum basis of which could be the Kelly report—in order that any future bid for freedom by the enslaved peoples would have at least a chance and not be totally condemned in advance, as heretofore has been the case.

It may seem to some that the matter I am submitting is unrelated to the present concern with the Middle East, but as the Secretary of State himelf stressed again on August 6, in Rio de Janeiro, the unique cause which deeply subverts and threatens the freedom and peace of the whole world is communism. As all Communist actions are interrelated, so in order to be effective, it is necessary that the counteroffensive moves be also interrelated.

I remain yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

Freedom Is Still in the Hearts of the People Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Declaration. It also commemorates the 25th anniversary of man's inhumanity to man by the diabolical creation of an artificial famine in the Ukraine by the infamous Red rulers of Russia in 1932–33.

It would be well for our people to read the story related in the attached documents of man's revolt against domination and slavery. The Ukrainians in America—and we have many in my State of North Dakota—have not forgotten this tragedy, or their desire to see their former country free again. For myself, too, I may be forgiven for feeling this danger so intensely because my own German-born parents suffered a like fate when the forerunners of the Russian Communist Party first took over the Ukraine.

This should be a lesson to us to fight the inroads of communism wherever and whenever we see it crop up its ugly octopus-type encircling arms. It has happened in other countries. God forbid that it ever happen in ours. Let us encourage the renewal and growth of our cherished freedoms in other lands. Take heed from what has happened elsewhere lest it ever happen in ours.

So that it will be available for all to read, I am inserting a letter from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., together with a statement entitled "Famine in Ukraine a Warning for the West," and a memorandum of the events as they transpired:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., July 31, 1958.

The Honorable OTTO KRUEGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KRUEGER: I am taking the liberty of writing you that all over the United States and North Dakota special manifestations were held by Americans of Ukrainian descent to mark the tragic 25th anniversary of famine in the Ukraine, artificially created by Red rulers in 1932–33.

Twenty-five years ago the Communist rulers in the Kremlin instituted what history may one day record as the most inhuman act ever perpetrated on any nation, the famine which was deliberately started and maintained by the Russian Communists, in an all-out effort to break the spirit of the Ukrainians, and to eradicate an element in the Soviet Union that milder methods failed to sway.

In 1933, through the streets of Kiev, Kharkiv, Odessa, and other cities, the miserable wrecks of humanity dragged themselves on swollen feet, begging for crusts of bread, or searching for scraps in garbage heaps, frozen and filthy. Each morning wagons rolled along the streets, picking up the emaciated remains of the dead. The year 1933 brought death to the villages of Ukraine. Many which had formerly boasted a population of from 2,500 to 3,000, now counted some 200 to 300.

The Russians attempted to destroy the Ukrainian Nation as they did the Volga-Germans, Krymian-Tartars and others after World War II, and there has been, perhaps, no disaster of comparable magnitude that received so little international attention.

Recent events indicate that no people enslaved by the Russian Communist colonial empire either within the U. S. S. R. or as so-called satellites are willing to submit to oppression forever and without a fight. The Ukrainians, like other enslaved people, are just as willing and ready to make a bid for freedom as were recently their comrades in slavery, the Hungarians. It is therefore most fitting that at this moment of world tension and restive opposition to Soviet rule, we of the free world demonstrate our unity of purpose with those behind the Iron Curtain.

Ukraine's armed and prolonged resistance to Communist military aggression likewise provided the Hungarians with an opportunity to oust the puppet Communist regime of Bela Kun in 1919 because Lenin, forced to wage bitter war in Ukraine, was not in a position to intervene by force of arms in Hungary in 1919, something which Khrushchev and Zhukov were quite free to do in 1956–57.

Speaking for our blood-brothers in slavery, therefore, I respectfully request on behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota, and 20,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in our State, that you present to the United States Congress, this dreadful situation in the Ukraine and condemn the Red rulers of Moscow for their antihuman terror and to give hope to those people behind the Iron Curtain, who have kept glowing the flickering flame of freedom in Ukraine, in Hungary, in Poland, in East Germany, in the Baltic and Balkan States.

Enclosed please find memorandum, a booklet, The Golgatha of Ukraine, and a manifestation leaflet entitled: "Famine in Ukraine a Warning for the West."

Our committee would appreciate inserting the memorandum and our manifestation leaflet, including this letter, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a matter of public record. Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,
DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.

FAMINE IN UKRAINE A WARNING FOR THE WEST

(Statement of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State branch of North Dakota)

The Kremlin today dominates one-third of the world and threatens the entire free world with subjugation and tyranny. The picture of conditions in the subjugated territories and enslaved nations shows only terror, slavery, mass genocide, persecution and misery.

This manifestation is being held upon the 20th anniversary of one of the most horrible crimes committed by the Kremlin upon its victims—an artificial famine calculated and carried out to break the will of the Ukrainians in their resistance and opposition to the regime.

Ukraine, with a population of 45 million has the richest farming land in Europe, 60 million acres of land produce wheat for 20 million tons of bread. From 1909 to 1913 Ukraine provided 20 percent of Europe's grain supply. It was known as the grainery or breadbasket of Europe.

In 1920 the Russian Communists overran Ukraine and made it their colony. They utilized the resources of Ukraine to develop their power and plans for sowing the seeds of chaos and revolution in the world. They introduced a system of slave labor in order to obtain products and goods cheaply and in this way to undermine the world economy.

In 1929, taking advantage of the economic crisis in the world, they began a 5-year drive against the peasants, forcing them into the collective farms. The Kremlin used the most diabolical methods on its resisting victims. In Ukraine, where the inhabitants by nature and tradition are most radically opposed to collectivization and state regimentation the effects were unbelievably horrible. From 1929 to 1932 the Moscow Communists confiscated 500,000 farms; drove 2,500,000 people, with their children, and aged out of their homes; deported 1 million peasants with their children, wives, aged, and ailing to slave labor camps into the tundras and Siberia to die of exhaustion and hunger.

With resistance still strong, Moscow resorted to extreme measures and calculated a plan of starvation. All food products in Ukraine were designated for export. By official edict of August 2, 1932, the peasants were forbidden under penalty of death to take any of the food they produced. They were forbidden to leave their villages in search of food beyond the borders of Ukraine, while throughout the other territories of the Soviet Union food was plentiful. Entire families died in the streets of the villages in the terrible tortures of starvation. Cannibalism was widespread. The grain elevators were overflowing, but they were vigilantly guarded by the armed Communist militia to prevent the people from reaching the life-giving grain—all of which was removed from Ukraine. The International Red Cross offered aid and relief to the victims of Moscow but the Soviet Government vehemently denied the very existence of famine and the need for aid. As a result of this famine between 6 and 7 million Ukrainians died.

Such methods are used by the Kremlin to Russify and subjugate the captive nations in the U. S. S. R. Even these methods, however, are not completely successful. The love of freedom is so strong and so firmly entrenched in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainians that they continue to this day to resist actively and passively, the tyranny in their land. They will continue to resist until their final goal of a free and independent nation is achieved. And these gallant people deserve the support and encouragement of every American who believes in the principles of democracy and human rights.

The suffering and misery of the Ukrainians throughout their long enslavement in the Soviet Union should serve the free world as a warning. We should not permit ourselves to be blinded to the real aims of the Kremlin by the current Russian peace offers. For the Kremlin offers the world not peace, but misery and enslavement.

FAMINE IN UKRAINE OF 1932–33—METHOD OF RUSSIAN POLICY OF PEACE AND BUILDING OF COMMUNISM

(Memorandum of Ukrainian Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota)

This year is the 40th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

On January 22, 1918, a free and democratically elected Parliament and Government of Ukraine issued in the capital of Kiev a solemn act of proclamation and the reestablishment of Ukraine as a sovereign independent nation called the Ukrainian National Republic.

This sovereign Ukrainian State was immediately and duly recognized by a large number of foreign nations and diplomatic relations were established with them forthwith. Recognition was even granted by Soviet Russia, but this did not prevent its Government

and Communist Party from opening hostilities against the new Ukrainian State.

Ukraine was conquered by Moscow's armed forces and occupied, but the people have not acquiesced and are refusing to be slaves of Moscow to this day.

In spite of the military victory, the Soviets had to face serious difficulties in governing Ukraine. Those Ukrainian Communists—the fifth column—who gave them their support, hoping for an autonomous Soviet Ukrainian Republic, were soon disappointed in their hopes. They were all entirely liquidated in the early 1930's when Ukraine was once again subjected to Red terror. At the time of the first 5-year plan, and the forced collectivization, the Ukrainian workers, peasants, and intelligentsia rose united to oppose the Soviet policy. The purges and large-scale deportations were conducted under the personal supervision of the highest party officials—the Russian Postyshev, Kaganovich, and Khrushchev. It is they and their Kremlin masters who must be held responsible for the terrible famine in Ukraine in 1932–33 which took a toll running in millions of lives for the barbarous destruction of Ukrainian learning, science, and religion, for the persecutions of hundreds of thousands of innocent and peace-loving people.

This year is also the tragic 25th anniversary of the most appalling crime in history, the famine deliberately planned by Moscow in Ukraine, in the years 1932–33.

By this almost incredibly atrocious deed more than 7 million Ukrainians died of sheer starvation.

This happened in the smiling Ukraine, agriculturally the richest country in Europe, the owner of the famous black soil.

There was no natural cause for this famine; it was purposely created by Moscow to break the resistance of the Ukrainian peasants to the collective farm system—a system of slavery, and was planned to teach the Ukrainians a lesson by the grim method of starvation to force them to recognize the supremacy of Russia to accept Russia domination over Ukraine.

After the Communists had overrun Ukraine, Stalin soon made it clear that the time had come for a new reign of terror. The year 1930 brought the order for compulsory collectivization of all the land and the means of production. The peasants were ordered to turn over their land and animals to the collective farm or be deported. Naturally this aroused tremendous opposition. In many places the peasants killed their cattle rather than turn them over and a condition of near revolt covered most of the Ukraine. Large forces of the NKVD and even military units were sent to the villages to force the people into the collective farms and those who hesitated or showed any opposition were forced into them or deported without possessions. There were hardly in Ukraine a village in which, under the instructions of Moscow, 5 to 15 percent of the population were not uprooted. In many cases their houses and barns were actually destroyed so that there would be no trace left of the enemies of the people.

When these methods failed to break the opposition of the peasants to the idea of the collective farms, Stalin decided upon a still more drastic device: the starvation of the Ukrainian village. This was carefully planned and worked out in the greatest detail.

During 1931 the demands for the delivery of grain reached an unprecedented height. New and extra delivery quotas were imposed upon the villages and the collective farms alike, and all the grain thus secured was either removed to the Russian Republic or was sold on the foreign market at dumping prices or even for the costs of unloading in some places in Italy. By these and other methods, the entire grain reserves were removed from Ukraine and so were all other crops that might support the population. The grain harvest of 1932 was somewhat below normal as a result of drought but the population could have survived, had there been the normal grain reserves.

Signs of the approaching famine were evident in the autumn of 1932 but they increased rapidly during the winter months and shortly after the beginning of 1933 the storm broke with all its fury. To strengthen the hand of authorities, the Council of Commissars of the Union in Moscow passed on August 6, 1932, a law for the "protection of Socialist property." This made it illegal to pick a single head of Socialist grain in the fields or even to pick up a stalk that had been overlooked in the harvesting. The same regulation applied to everything that was the nominal property of the collective farm.

To enforce this, Moscow sent to Ukraine, Pavel Postyshev as second secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine with 7,000 political workers from the Russian Republic. These men were formed into special commissions for investigating the thefts of food by the peasants. They swarmed through the villages; they sounded the walls of the houses to make sure that no grain or other foodstuffs had been hidden in them; they investigated every place in the courtyards where the earth showed signs of having been disturbed.

The country became desolate. In the spring of 1933 there were many villages where the entire population had perished and almost one-third of the houses in some places were empty. There was no one to bury the dead. The bodies were hauled away on carts or thrown into ravines and allowed to lie as they fell, for no one had the strength to dig graves.

It is difficult to estimate the actual number of casualties during this artificial famine, for there is no doubt that it was artificial. In fact when Chubar, the chairman of the Soviet Commissars, Premier of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, appealed to Stalin for food at least for the starving children, he received the definite answer from Stalin: "No remarks on that question." It was not long before Chubar disappeared as an enemy of the people.

The most conservative estimate is that there were between 6 and 7 million deaths. No graphic account however, can truly show the depth of this triumph of man's inhumanity to man.

That this was an artificially devised famine can be proven by the following facts:

1. There was no famine in Russia. In Russia normal Soviet life went on, monotonous and wretched, but nobody died of hunger.

2. In Siberia there were enormous supplies of government grain. When the grain was taken from Ukraine to Siberia, there was no place to store it, there were no warehouses.

3. The Ukrainians were forbidden to go to Russia for grain.

4. Russia gave no aid to Ukraine and rejected aid offered from abroad.

5. The rural population was forbidden to buy grain in the cities.

6. The Soviet NKVD staff in the cities and villages were well fed through the system of closed restaurants, entrance to which was forbidden to the starving village and town population.

7. In party institutions and factories of state importance, the workers received 4 pounds of bread a day.

8. It was forbidden to mention the famine under the threat of severe reprisals.

9. There was absolutely no mention of famine in the press and it was even emphasized that there was no famine and that the happy Ukrainian people thanked "the leader of the world proletariat" Joseph Stalin, for his 'liberality.'

10. It was forbidden to give medical treatment to those dying of hunger and to receive them in hospitals.

11. If any of the starving did get into a hospital, it was forbidden to make the diagnosis "exhaustion from hunger" and to give hunger as cause of death.

12. It was forbidden to make statistics of the starving and of the rate of mortality.

To understand properly the atrocities of Postyshev and Khrushchev in Ukraine and the masterful plan of Stalin and his bloody counselors regarding the liquidation of Ukrainian opposition, we must review briefly the historical relationship between Russia and Ukraine and the growth of the Ukrainian movement in the first decade of the Soviet power in Ukraine.

Ukraine always posed a vital problem for Russia, in all the latter's stages of development. The nationality problem has been the Achilles' heel of all the regimes and political systems of this semi-feudal and colonial slave state. Therefore, Russia's policy, with respect to the other Nations has always been the same: ruthless and extreme. Brutality and police terror, including physical liquidation of all those who in one way or another aspired toward freedom, social justice and the national and political independence of their people, were always the outstanding characteristics of Russia with respect to the non-Russian peoples.

By no means did the historic importance of Ukraine's independence end in 1920. The physical embodiment was destroyed then, but the fiery spirit of independence has lived to this day. It has for long been clearly evident that the destruction of the independent Ukrainian state laid the foundation for Moscow's subsequent aggressions and imperial aggrandizements. What Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, White Ruthenia, Turkestan and other non-Russian nations suffered at the beginning of the twenties the Baltic nations, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and others experienced in the forties and fifties. Now, significantly enough, the same threat in this series of conquests confronts the United States, Canada, and countries of Western Europe, Middle East and others in the free world.

In spite of suffering and suppression, the Ukrainian people continue to this day to resist, actively and passively, tyranny in their country, and they will continue to resist until their final goal of a free and independent nation will be achieved.

Respectfully submitted by:

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota.

Hon. William E. McVey

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of shock and sincere grief that I learned of the death of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Dr. WILLIAM E. MCVEY. He was a great educator and statesman who dearly loved his country, and the fine contribution that he made to Government in the 8 years that he served in Washington will

live long in the annals of the United States Congress.

To his family and friends, and to the people of his congressional district, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Comments on Needed Labor Legislation by Individual Union Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include another series of comments which I have received from individual union members. I believe the Members of the House will find these comments on possible labor legislation to be of considerable interest and will serve to give the Members some indication as to the feelings of individual union members:

This so-called right-to-work law should be banned by Federal Government. The workingman has no security whatsoever, I think an investigation should be made as to the origin of this. The workingmen of this country sure do not want it. Please think about this closely.

CRANE OPERATOR.

I am in favor of not using union dues for political purposes if the same applies to corporations, companies, and officials of the same. What's good for the goose is good for gander.

TOOLMAKER.

Right-to-work laws will not seriously affect unions except to keep them on their toes to maintain their membership. I don't think they should be handed a 100 percent membership on a platter.

Also anyone should be able to work at the craft for which he is qualified and have the right to make his own decision on union membership.

The company I work for does not have a union shop and the union is strong and effective.

There is no doubt in my mind that unions are necessary and they are here to stay. But they must be controlled and I think a certain political party (Democrats to you) had better wake up before it is too late or the Reuthers and Soaps will have the whole darned country and the Dems will be wondering what happened.

FACTORY WORKER.

While I am a member in good standing of the CIO–UAW and definitely not antiunion, I feel that there should be some limitations or governmental regulations of their power.

SHOP WORKER.

7C: Strike votes may be secret as far as voting goes but should be counted in presence of company and union representatives because no one really knows for sure just what the vote is (my idea).

Union members should be allowed to vote to accept or reject any proposal made by the company because once the strike starts the member has nothing to say what he will accept, until the union representatives get what they want, and show no worry over the members being out of work without funds or incomes.

MOTOR WHEEL WORKER.

7A: I think the labor unions generally have done an excellent job of running their own business.

7C: I have been a member of the labor union since 1910 and we have always had a secret free ballot for strikes and election of union officers.

7E: A buck for PAC a voluntary contribution should be allowed.

FACTORY WORKER.

No. 7: Should do more checking into union busines than they already have. Too many bad deals taking place that nobody knows anything about. Don't like them having all this extra money for strikes. If they don't use it, where does it go to. They sure don't give it back to us (the worker).

ELECTRICIAN.

No. 7: This is a touchy subject for me to answer for I am a good union man and intend to stay that way as long as I work for any corporation.

A. I think the unions should have no objection for public inspection on any of its different funds. They are published once every year.

C. There is less chance of an illegal strike or election if union members demand secret ballots. I am in favor.

E. It is not fair for any organization to use dues for political purposes.

If there ever is a law posted, national or local, in our State to ban union shop, I will fight it forever. We have had to go through hell with strikes and many other hardships to get working conditions where they are today and a ban on union shop will start it all over again. That is a good way to really get gangsterism started in all the peaceful unions.

In regard to 7E: Unions have as much right to use their dues money for political purposes as business has to use their profits for the same.

TOOLMAKER.

7A: The recent disclosures in the union racketeering hearing point out a need for investigations of corporations, as their hands do not appear lily white.

AUTO PLANT WORKER.

I would like to have our Congress pass a law to ban all closed union shops and let us work the American way and not the Russian way.

TOOLMAKER.

I think the time has come where the Government should decide how big labor organizations should get. The Government should keep a close watch on Reuther. His ideas are too Socialist. Through Williams he is trying to run the State of Michigan and I believe through Williams he is trying to get into the White House.

TIMEKEEPER.

7D: I'm in favor of a national right-to-work law to the extent that I'm opposed to the closed shop and there should be no pressure or discrimination against anyone who selects to be a nonunion worker.

TOOLMAKER.

7: The right-to-work laws are misnamed. People who have to work for others to earn a living do not want them but the States that have them appeal to companies in their advertising to come there. In other words, the exploiting of laborers is not just condoned, it is given official help.

TOOLMAKER.

7D: I really do not favor this sort of right. I have worked where they have both and I favor union shops. It never looked right to me for most all of the men to have to pay union dues, strike assessments, and stand on picket lines, and then the man that pays nothing, does nothing, reaps the harvest. It is easy to see the point of the man with a large family depending each week on his check, why he feels he should be allowed to work. If it is carried out like it should be, this sort of man should be taken care of through their strike money.

PLANT PROTECTION.

The New Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a review of Milovan Djilas' new book The New Class has appeared in the May issue of the scholarly Reading Guide published by the Publication Society for the Law Library of the University of Virginia.

I commend the review to the attention of my colleagues active in the contest against subversion and infiltration by the Soviet-Communist staff. I also recommend the reviewer's own book Speaking of Politics to be read as a preface to The New Class. It is a remarkable coincidence that two such widely separated and socially unrelated authors as Djilas in The New Class and Salisbury in Speaking of Politics have reached such a similar evaluation of the true economic basis of modern Communist societies—whether Soviet-Communist, Sino-Communist, or Titoist. Both Salisbury's Speaking of Politics and Djilas' The New Class are significant contributions to our efforts in the not-so-cold war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD this brief review from the Reading Guide of the University of Virginia of May 1958, which reads as follows:

THE NEW CLASS

(Book written by Milovan Djilas)

(By Franklin C. Salisbury)

This is a book describing the rise of a new capitalist class throughout the Soviet Communist world. It is secondarily an informative analysis of that transient type of communism which some of us in this country label "Soviet communism" or "Stalinism" to distinguish it from other historical and Christian Communist ideologies. Soviet communism was imported into Russia after the long-delayed, but overly savage, revolution. Its success as an import into war-torn Russia encouraged its cancerous spread into other primitive areas. It ate away the feeble tendrils of local self-government and consumed with feverish haste the beginnings of nongovernmental enterprise and industrial ownership. This was particularly easy in Russia and in Yugoslavia where self-government by the individual had never been seriously tried and private capitalism, like Soviet communism, was a foreign import.

The author assisted in the adoption of Soviet communism by his native land. He does not apologize, for he points out "a Communist movement always begins as one of the highest idealism and most selfless sacrifice, attracting into its ranks the most gifted, the bravest, and even the most noble intellects of the nation." Indeed, as he observes, even Soviet communism can be, to many of its followers, a secular faith of high moral demands "True, these are the morals of a sect, but they are morals on a high plane." Too late the author realizes that these Soviet Communist moral values, while useful in a civil war, are meaningless when the physical strife is successfully completed.

The new class, with which the author is concerned, is a logical development in any society where the privilege of ownership of the means of production has been shifted from the individual, alone or in nonstate groups, to the state. The author explains that he has in recent years equated Communist with state capitalism, or more precisely, with total state capitalism. Although, from our vantage point of a relatively safe distance, we may remind the author that total state capitalism is but one-half the story of Soviet communism, the observation shows a greater objectivity on the part of Djilas amid peril than many of our commentators and scholars are able to conjure up amid plenty. The economies of any Communist system are those of state capitalism. The other half of the Communist theory is even more objectionable to the American temperament than state capitalism, namely, that all Communists foster and encourage dictatorships. This aspect does not loom as important to Djilas as the social consequences of state capitalism. But it is the dictatorship which keeps him in prison, and it this dictatorship that threatens the Western World with total destruction, not its adventure into monopoly capitalism.

Djilas' crusade against his friends and fellow travelers in the new class does not arise from "sour grapes." He reached the heights in the dictatorship, and he was as eligible as anyone in Yugoslavia to be an active member of the new class. He was a member of the policymaking arm of the Yugoslavian state—the Soviet Communist staff, which propagandists and their victims continue to label the "Communist Party." He fought side by side with Tito in liberating what private productive properties there were in his native land from the prior state capitalists of the aristocracy and the visiting firemen of private enterprise, mostly from abroad. He helped turn the wealth of the nation over to its new managers and owners, the bureaucrats and staff members. But, for idealist persuasions, he rejects this membership in the second most exclusive club in the world. He made and acted on an agonizing reappraisal. He sits in prison for his pains while the Soviet Communist staff grows fatter and jollier daily.

The author complains that "wherever Communists come to power, their assault on private ownership creates the illusion that their measures are primarily directed against the ownership classes for the benefit of the working class. Subsequent events prove that their measures are not taken for this purpose but in order to establish their own ownership."

And, as he further explains: "To divest Communists of their ownership rights would be to abolish them as a class. To compel them to relinquish their social powers, so that workers may participate in sharing the profits of their work—which [private] capitalists have had to permit as a result of strikes and parliamentary action—would mean that Communists were being deprived of their monopoly over property, ideology, and government."

Djilas' book will hardly help to influence this new class of state capitalists, the true monopoly capitalists, to give up their privileges which make them the envy of the propertyless liberals throughout the world. But it may make these materialist liberals pause in their campaign to elevate themselves to the new class at the expense of every freedom known to man. Just as the former slave makes a hard taskmaster, so the newly-propertied liberal makes a stern conservative.

Let the liberal and the egghead ponder the sufferings of Djilas as he wrote this grand book. For Djilas is a liberal and his predicament a tribute to his unhappy start as an egghead. Remember that Soviet Communists aspire to a total dictatorship and a total state capitalism and that you, if you are a liberal, may someday spurn the fruits of such a change of ownership and thus lose both your property and your freedom. Like the author, Milovan Djilas, you may end up in a prison of your own making.

Progress in the Plywood Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the progress made by the plywood industry is most encouraging. United States Plywood Corp., International Paper Co., and Georgia-Pacific along with other plywood plants, are to be congratulated on their resourcefulness in cutting their costs and providing for maximum utilization.

The following article appeared in Business Week for July 26, 1958, and is an excellent account of progress in the plywood industry. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the entire article:

PLYWOOD PLAYS HOB WITH RULES

For more than 2 years, the plywood industry has been behaving as if it knew nothing of the precepts of classical economics. The charts above display the industry's paradoxical antics. While prices have been falling because of chronic overproduction and overcapacity, there has been at the same time only a slight slowing in plans to add even more capacity.

Plywood makers big and small—from giant United States Plywood Corp., International Paper Co., and Georgia-Pacific Corp., on down—are spending millions on new plants to turn out hundreds of millions more square feet a year. Already, production is setting records; this year, it's running at an annual rate of 5.7 billion square feet, a good 12 percent over 1957's previous alltime high.

But with the new facilities, this output only takes 80 percent of capacity. And this spring, after a February drop in the price of quarter-inch plywood panels to $64 per 1,000 square feet, more than 30 mills closed down to await a return to price levels where they could break even or at least lose less money. Since then, a burst in building starts has bolstered demand, and the price has climbed back to $72. But privately, at least, few industry realists think it will stay there long. Topheavy capacity and fierce price rivalry are just too powerful as downward influences.

Answering the riddle

Why is the industry still building new plants? It isn't because they were late starting on projects conceived during the boom—several of the mills were planned at the time prices were skidding most rapidly. The answer is that in today's market, plywood makers are able to turn a profit only with modern, integrated mills, where production costs are low.

In the high-price era—particularly 1950, when plywood was selling for $97, and 1954, when the price was around $90—dozens of small plants entered the industry. More than 75 percent of the Nation's plywood comes from the Pacific Northwest, and the number of Douglas-fir plywood plants in the region jumped from 50 in 1948 to more than 120 today. As long as the price stayed over $80, most of these fragmented, nonintegrated producers could make money. Plywood sales—the biggest share of it to home construction—increased fourfold in 10 years.

Now a new price level is emerging, reflecting both the plentiful supplies and the new low-cost production techniques, and the transition won't be easy. Most plywood still is made in small, high-cost plants. Many of these won't be able to survive with prices below $75.

But an integrated producer with a new plant can make money not only at the present $72 price but, in many cases, at $10 to $12 below that as well. And this explains the rush to build new capacity.

I. USP SHOWS THE WAY

An example of what's been going on is United States Plywood's new $2.8 million, 72 million square feet annual capacity plant at Roseburg, Oreg. Completed last May, it's just now beginning to flex its production muscles.

The very fact that USP built a new plant in Roseburg at all indicates that it wanted lower production costs. If its aim had been simply another conventional mill, it could have bought one of the existing plants for sale in the area. But it figured only a streamlined operation has a chance today.

Integrated two ways

USP's new Roseburg layout is on a railroad near a bounteous supply of old-growth Douglas-fir—some of it Government owned, some of it a 1 billion board-feet stand acquired by USP through purchase of two smaller lumber companies. The mill is integrated both vertically and horizontally. It starts with standing timber and ends up with finished products, and it can produce either plywood or lumber. Modern chipping and chip handling facilities dispose of by-products profitably.

According to George French, general manager of the new plant, and Marshall Leeper, division manager in charge of USP's $30 million Oregon investment, it should be possible to sell plywood from Roseburg for $60 and at least break even, but actual production costs won't be nailed down until the plant has been in full operation for a couple of months.

Challenge

To an outsider, the Roseburg mill wouldn't look too different from most other new mills. And, basically, it isn't. Improvements in plywood mills come from meticulous attention to every detail in the production process.

But there is one big difference at Roseburg. USP expects to increase yield and lower costs by challenging a basic concept of the Northwest lumber industry—the idea that high-grade veneer can only come from the biggest, most expensive logs. Traditionally, the very best logs from the thick base of the trees—called peelers—go to plywood plants, the leftovers to sawmills for conversion to lumber products. Too often, the sawmill is quite literally left with the short end of the stick, and it can't develop its full profit potential.

How a fir grows

This situation arises from the way a fir tree grows. Its lower limbs, denied access to light, wither and die and drop. In a comparatively short time, the lower portion of a tree contains clear, knot-free wood. In early stages of growth, there's only a shallow layer of this perfect wood—called shallow clear. But as the tree ages, the good wood thickens. By the time it's 3, 4, or even as much as 8 feet in diameter, it holds a generous amount of the perfect premium wood known as deep clear.

Deep clear logs are ideal for plywood. Cut into 8-foot lengths, debarked, and spun against a scalpel-sharp blade on a huge peeler machine, they yield a continuous ribbon of veneer thousands of feet long. The larger the "peeler log," the more veneer it contributes and the more efficiently the lathe that does the peeling operates, since it doesn't have to be shut down so often to switch logs.

Expensive material

But deep clear logs are costly. A typical old-growth fir gives up three 8-foot lengths of grade-A, deep clear logs from its lower quarter. Above the deep clear may come two 32-foot sawlogs—still relatively knot-free and suitable for top-grade lumber. Higher still, where the wood becomes knotty and old branches cling to the trunk, the wood is good enough for low-grade sawlogs. Often, though, this part of the tree is consigned to the chippers and chopped into fine flakes for particle board or paper pulp.

The first love of plywood plants is deep clear logs. If a plywood mill cuts its own timber, it usually trades its sawlogs to a lumber mill for deep clear peelers. Log-trading deals are common throughout the Northwest.

Since plywood mills have been increasing much faster than lumber mills, good peeler logs have been becoming scarce. So Roseburg is taking a new approach. After all, veneer from shallow clear logs is just as good as that from deep clear logs, even though there's less of it per log. So USP is going after shallow clear as its prime source. It will be able to peel its deep clear logs, too, of course. But if the price is right, it can assign them to the lumber mill for conversion to premium-quality, straight-grain lumber products.

Cooked logs

It took a lot of innovating for USP to be able to process shallow clear logs at less than competitive costs. To do the job, Roseburg plant manager George French drew on hardwood plywood techniques. As a prelude to peeling or slicing a hardwood log into brittle veneer, you must first steam it to soften the fibers and melt pockets of hard sap. French reasoned that if this trick increased the yield of hardwood, it would do the same for fir. So after Roseburg's logs are debarked—on a machine that handles more than a log a minute—they are dunked into big steam vats for several hours.

When the logs emerge, they cut like butter. For the first time in the industry, it's possible to get top-quality veneer not only from clear wood but also from sapwood—the outer layers of living fiber near the bark. Ordinarily, brittle sapwood with its damaging sap pockets comes off the lathe in a wavy, irregular cut. And the hot logs cut so much better that the lathe can trim them closer to their intended size. It just never made sense to me, says French, to spend a lot of money getting A-grade veneers for the top layer and then sanding two-thirds of it away when the plywood is sized.

Gentler logging

French went after a lot of other things that had never made sense to him—all the way back to the logging operation. He had to change the methods of handling logs, since sapwood layers had suddenly become a valuable veneer source. Extra care was necessary in felling a tree to prevent damage to upper parts of the trunk. In loading logs, slings took the place of big pinchers that pierced the bark. Loggers learned to cut the top and middle of a tree so that it would be easily divisible into 8-foot lengths for the plywood mill.

Revolution came even to the traditional mill pond. No longer do men with sharp pike poles jab logs into the chutes. Remote-controlled water jets nudge the logs along as gently as an Indian with a birch-bark canoe.

Accent on speed

The debarker and lathes were engineered for fast action. Lathe operators are selected for lightning-fast reflexes. Throughout the plant, the men's work is at hip level, so that no one has to bend over to pick up tools or material. "We figure," says Leeper, division manager, "that keeping the men fresh lets us produce 25 percent more."

USP saves money also in the clipping section, where the long sheets of veneer from the peelers are clipped into 4-foot wide sheets suitable for panels and defects removed. The standard industry practice is to slide the veneer through two clipper stations at 125 feet per minute, with a marker and a clipper to do the job. At Roseburg, USP installed three clippers and slowed the rate to 100 feet per minute. At this speed, a clipper doesn't need a spotter to help him. The result: Three men handle 50 feet more veneer every minute than 4 men do ordinarily.

II. INDUSTRYWIDE PATTERN

Other plywood producers are planning along the same lines as USP. Among the largest of the new plants will be Georgia-Pacific's at Coos Bay, Oreg., slated for completion this year. Independents are doing the same. Portland's Dwyer Lumber Co. added a plywood operation to its lumber business this year in a move to gain more horizontal integration—with a $1.5 million, 42 million square-foot capacity mill. Says Tony Dwyer, one of the owners: "Our plan calls for getting by at $64 price levels, but we'll have to operate for a while before we know we can do it."

Willamette Valley Lumber Co., of Foster, Oreg., also stepped toward more integration last February when it decided to invest $1.7 million in a plywood sheathing mill.

Who's who

In today's plywood industry, Georgia-Pacific is the biggest producer, with about 500 million square feet annually. Its 12 million board feet of timber make it almost self-sufficient. United States Plywood has capacity for 440 million square feet, but its markets twice again as much through long-term contracts with 3 independents and open-market purchases; it is by far the largest plywood marketer. Simpson Logging Co. turns out 364 million square feet annually, and Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. follows with 185 million square feet.

The attitude of these giants toward their industry today may well have been summed up by what United States Plywood's president, S. W. Antoville, recently told Business Week. "In a way," Antoville said, "I almost feel that I ought to apologize for building a new plant at this time. But with the good timber we had, it would be foolish to do anything else at Roseburg. If we can build a plant with operating costs 5 percent to 10 percent below our own best existing plants, that's the kind of competition we're going to have to play against in the future."

Facts on TVA Self-Financing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. S. R. (States Rights) Finley, the distinguished son of a distinguished former Member of Congress, and president of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, has written a cogent letter and fact sheet regarding S. 1869, the TVA self-financing bill which will shortly be considered by the House. Under unanimous-consent agreement, I insert this excellent letter and fact sheet in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter and fact sheet follow:

TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC
POWER ASSOCIATION,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of 6 million users of TVA power we want to request your earnest and favorable consideration of S. 1869 recently reported out of committee and shortly to come to the House floor. This bill amends the TVA Act of 1933 and places further normal electrical facilities' expansion upon a revenue bond basis, replacing the present appropriation method. The committee report makes clear the urgent need for its passage, without crippling amendments.

S. 1869 has been favorably approved in the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 61 for and 20 against. It represents a reasonable compromise of many views upon this matter. The bill has the approval of all three members of the TVA Board—all of whom have been appointed by the present administration. In four budget messages the President has expressed a need for TVA bond legislation, stating that it would do away with the necessity for Federal appropriations for further TVA power needs.

We are aware that Members of the House have recently received an expensively prepared brochure that predicts dire and unfactual results if the bill is passed. In answer to it we submit a mimeographed fact sheet upon the important features of the bill. The simple facts about S. 1869 are it (1) does away with the need for Federal appropriations to finance normal electrical TVA growth; (2) requires TVA to make larger cash payments to the United States Treasury than are now called for; (3) maintains congressional control over TVA but does not establish Budget Bureau control over TVA bond funds; (4) places definite restrictions upon the TVA service area and reduces (not increases) the area which could now receive TVA power; (5) puts a reasonable ceiling upon the amount of bonds which TVA could have outstanding at any one time; (6) gives Congress the right to disapprove new TVA power producing projects. It is a fair and good bill.

TVA, the sole source of power for we 6 million people, has had no appropriations for new power capacity for 6 years. Its only source of funds for this purpose has been the use of TVA's own revenues. These are not sufficient to care for the normal growth needs. The passage of S. 1869, unamended, is sorely needed. We earnestly ask for your favorable consideration of it.

Respectfully yours,
S. R. FINLEY, *President.*

FACT SHEET ON TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL

STATUS

Senate last summer passed S. 1869 (KERR) by a bipartisan vote of 61 to 20. Voting for were 36 Democrats and 25 Republicans; voting against were 5 Democrats and 15 Republicans. Republicans voting for were AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DWORSHAK, HRUSKA, IVES, JAVITS, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, MORTON, MUNDT, PURTELL, REVERCOMB, Mrs. SMITH, THYE, WILEY, and YOUNG. Democrats voting against were BYRD, ELLENDER, ERVIN, HOLLAND, and PASTORE.

House Public Works Committee on July 30 favorably reported S. 1869, by a vote of 19 to 15. All Democrats were for, except FALLON (Maryland); all Republicans against except MACK (Washington).

PURPOSE

To give the Tennessee Valley Authority the right to issue revenue bonds in the private money market to finance future power generating facilities in the TVA area. TVA has had no Federal appropriations for new power facilities since 1953, and is able to meet the power needs of 6 million people now only because it is using its revenues from the sale of electricity to finance construction of some 1,715,000 kilowatts of capacity. TVA must have another source of funds—and this bill would send TVA into the private money market for those funds.

The TVA Board of Directors—all Eisenhower appointees—issued a statement on July 29 that passage of S. 1869 "is urgently required to enable TVA to meet the growing defense and domestic demands for power in the area."

BACKGROUND

Revenue-bond financing for TVA has been recommended by President Eisenhower in his last three budget messages. In January 1955, the President said: "TVA is giving immediate attention to the possibilities of financing further expansion of its power system by means other than Federal appropriations." In his 1956, 1957 and 1958 budget messages the President recommended that Congress pass such a bill, last January saying: "I hope that action on appropriate legislation will be speedily concluded in order that the Tennessee Valley Authority may be in a position to meet approved needs for new generating facilities." The administration favors revenue-bond financing because it does away with the need for Federal appropriations for TVA power.

TVA is the largest user of coal in the Nation, using some 20 million tons last year. Passage of this bill will further expand the market for coal, and will create jobs through construction of new steam electric generating units.

FEATURES OF BILL

Substitutes revenue bond financing for Federal appropriations to finance normal electrical growth in Tennessee Valley. Sends TVA to private money market, through issuing revenue bonds which will be paid off, principal and interest, by power users in valley; which will not be obligations of United States Treasury; and which are subject to Federal income taxes. This bill will not require any appropriations.

In addition, TVA will make even larger cash payments to United States Treasury than are now required. Such payments will consist of (1) a yearly cash payment which would cover the Government's average cost of money on the amount of Treasury funds invested in TVA power; and (2) a $10 million annual payment in reduction of the appropriation investment. At present, the total of these payments would amount to at least $42 million a year which TVA would pay, in cash into the Treasury, as a return on and in reduction of the Government's appropriation investment.

Puts a ceiling of $750 million on amount of bonds TVA may have outstanding at any one time. This is a 5- or 6-year program, and the ceiling makes it clear that TVA must come back to Congress within this period for further authorization, thus giving Congress a chance to review the success of revenue bond financing for TVA.

Maintains congressional control of TVA, but keeps TVA policy decisions in hands of TVA Board—where Congress placed responsibility—and not in hands of the Bureau of the Budget. Opponents of this bill (private power companies, United States Chamber of Commerce) have raised issue of adequate congressional control, but real issue is too much control of TVA by Budget Bureau and Secretary of Treasury. The TVA Board needs the management flexibility to issue bonds when they are needed, to secure the most favorable terms and to operate in the most economical and efficient manner.

Puts definite limitations for the first time on TVA's power service area, in general restricting TVA to counties now in Tennessee River drainage basin and TVA power service area. This more than cuts in half the amount of territory TVA could serve.

TVA will continue to submit its budget to the President, through the Budget Bureau, for transmittal to the Congress. This budget would include estimates on the amounts of bonds TVA planned to issue in the next fiscal year. In addition, Congress has the power to disapprove new TVA power producing projects, and Secretary of Treasury has the right to delay TVA bond issues for 3 months to prevent conflict with Treasury issues.

SIGNIFICANCE

This is a life-and-death matter for TVA, which must have another source of funds for its power program since it has had no appropriations for new power capacity for 6 years. By the end of calendar year 1960 TVA's loads will be equal to the system's assured load-carrying ability, with no margin for unforeseen developments. By contrast, the normal private utility reserve margin is about 15 percent. Present estimates are that 600,000 to 1,200,000 kw should be added to the TVA system before the end of 1961. An official TVA statement declares: "It would be necessary * * * to begin construction expenditures early in fiscal year 1959 in order to have this capacity in service in the fall of 1961."

Private power companies, United States Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Council of State Chambers of Commerce, and others are going all-out to kill this bill, because they want to kill any measure that would permit TVA to continue to function effectively. S. 1869 is a compromise bill, with its proponents already having agreed to many restrictive amendments. This compromise bill must be passed at this session of Congress—without further amendments.

A Phase of the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include 2 of a series of 6 articles, delineating a phase of the Communist conspiracy apparently not as yet recognized by much of America. These brilliant and important articles were written by a renowned Communist fighter, George Todt, of the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times, and appeared in that newspaper July 28 through August 2, 1958:

[From the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times of July 28, 1958]

RED THREAT TO MENTAL HEALTH PLAN

(By George Todt)

"By psychopolitics create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies. And bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known." (Beria, Lenin University address to American students, 1936.)

Well, the fat is in the fire. Last Friday, Senator Hugh P. Donnelly, Democrat, of Turlock, made the forthright accusation that mental health programs in the United States are part and parcel of a long-range Marxist scheme to seize control—through cunning, treachery, and stealth—of the minds of the people of our country in order to aid and abet the criminal Communist international conspiracy to set up a Red world government.

This came at a session of the State interim committee on education and wound up in a two-and-a-half-hour questioning of the man who has been administering mental health questionnaires in the Los Angeles school system, Dr. Wayne McMillen. He was brought to the local area by the Welfare Planning Council of Los Angeles to direct its mental health survey.

Now it is not the purpose of this article to go into the background of Dr. McMillen.

And it is not my purpose, either, to attack the principle of appropriate research and assistance to those unfortunate souls who have had their lives blighted with some form of mental health affliction. They deserve every help which we, their more fortunate brethren, can afford to give to them—and what is there that we cannot afford from our very hearts in this instance?

So put me down as a friend of those legitimate and sincere persons who are working hard to better the lives of those who have been afflicted with a terrible sickness that is beyond their powers to prevent or cure without the understanding sympathy and charity of their fellows. I will help carry the water for them any time I can be privileged to do so.

But at the same time, all of us must keep our eyes open and be alert to the possible infiltration of unworthy and even criminal types of mentalities into this kind of program which might attempt later to usurp its control to their own evil and wicked purposes.

Here I am referring to the Communist conspiracy specifically in all of its devious ramifications and overall plans of attack against the American people. For we must be defeated, utterly and completely, if the Communist dream of world domination may one day become reality. The Red warlords, while not shunning physical combat, would much prefer to gain our surrender by psychological means—through a weakening of our national will and determination to carry on the struggle against them—and this method has come to be known as psychopolitics. It is actually a phase of geopolitics, the study of which is not well enough known in the United States—although to such Marxist Socialist dictators as Adolf Hitler, Josef Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, Josep Broz Tito, and their ilk, it was always considered a must when viewed from any angle. And it still is, of course.

Now what is psychopolitics, anyway? There is a considerable body of intelligent

and well-educated opinion in our country today which holds that it is perhaps the greatest of all present threats to the traditional American way of life—built upon the free enterprise system and a concept of government through the consent of governed.

Perhaps one of the most illuminating works on this matter is a small book of large circulation by this time called Brainwashing, which is a synthesis of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics. A complete address by the hated Beria, now liquidated by his erstwhile pals in the Kremlin, is set down verbatim as he gave it to a group of quisling American students of the course at Lenin University in 1936. The balance of the well-documented work gives us the hideous Bolshevik Communist concept of the way to bring the American people under Red domination through the fifth column strategy advocated in the book.

This revealing book may be obtained for $1 by writing to Truth, Inc., P. O. Box 10188, Fort Worth, Tex. For those who want to know what all the shouting is about, this text can became a real eye opener into certain questionable activities now going on behind the scenes, in a manner of speaking. Whether one agrees or disagrees that this may be a menace to our Republic of the first magnitude, there is only one way to know how we think about it—and that is to read the Russian handbook on psychopolitics, itself.

The man who authored this work, called Brainwashing, was a dues-paying member of the Communist Party of the United States from May 2, 1936, to October 10, 1939. He operated under his own name of Kenneth Goff and also under the alias of John Keats. In 1939 he appeared voluntarily before the Un-American Activities Committee in Washington under Congressman MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas. Goff's testimony may be found in volume 9 of that year's Congressional Report.

Read his book and find out what it reveals.

[From the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times of July 29, 1958]

AS BOLSHEVIK BOSS PUTS IT

(By George Godt)

"Treachery, though at first very cautious, in the end betrays itself."—Livy.

What was it that the cruel Beria, a subhuman Bolshevik high priest of modern Luciferianism before he was fortunately liquidated by his best friends several years ago in Moscow, had to say on the devilish science of psychopolitics to American quislings at Lenin University in 1936?

Why not give you his exact words, as reported by ex-Communist Kenneth Goff, in his amazing book Brainwashing, which is a synthesis of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics? It may be obtained for $1 from Truth, Inc., P. O. Box 10188, Fort Worth 14, Tex. Its contents are as fascinating as the gaze of a cobra from 3 feet away. Why not try it on for size? Here is one revealing excerpt from the book:

AN ADDRESS BY BERIA

"American students at the Lenin University, I welcome your attendance at these classes on psychopolitics.

"Psychopolitics is an important, if less known, division of geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of mental healing.

"By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our first most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression, and scientific turmoil. At last a weary populace can seek peace only in our offered Communist state; at last only communism can resolve the problems of the masses.

"A psychopolitician must work hard to produce the maximum chaos in the fields of mental healing. He must recruit and use all the agencies and facilities of mental healing. He must labor to increase the personnel and facilities of mental healing until at last the entire field of mental science is entirely dominated by Communist principles and desires.

"To achieve these goals the psychopolitician must crush every homegrown variety of mental healing in America. Actual teachings of James, Eddy, and Pentecostal Bible faith healers among your misguided people must be swept aside. They must be discredited, defamed, arrested, stamped upon even by their own Government until there is no credit in them and only Communist-oriented healing remains. You must work until every teacher of psychology unknowingly or knowingly teaches only Communist doctrine under the guise of psychology. You must labor until every doctor and psychiatrist is either a psychopolitician or an unwitting assistant of our aims.

"You must labor until we have domination over the minds and bodies of every important person in your Nation. You must achieve such disrepute for the state of insanity and such authority over its pronouncement that not one statement so labeled could again be given credence by the people. You must work until suicide arising from mental imbalance is common and calls forth no general investigation or remark.

"With the institutions for the insane you have in your country which can hold a million persons and can hold them without civil rights or any hope of freedom. And upon these people can be practiced shock and surgery so that never again will they draw a sane breath. You must make these treatments common and accepted. And you must sweep aside any treatment or any group of persons seeking to treat by effective means.

"You must dominate as respected men the fields of phychiatry and psychology. You must dominate the hospitals and universities. You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse among you the high incidence of foreign birth and training. If and when we seize Vienna you shall then have a common ground of meeting and can come and take your instructions as worshippers of Freud along with other psychiatrists."

Hon. William S. Hill

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding, devoted Congressman, and a true and loyal friend who is retiring this year from Congress. I am speaking of the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL—or BILL HILL, as we all know him—of the State of Colorado.

In his 18 years here in the Congress, BILL HILL has established a reputation and a record which have earned for him the admiration, respect, and affection of us all. So it is with sincere regret that we see him leave the Congress this year. This body needs men like BILL HILL.

We all know of his outstanding contributions as a ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Small Business. Bill is highly qualified by experience and training for his service on both of these important committees.

But in addition to experience and training, Representative HILL also is highly qualified for his service here by temperament and disposition. He has a great wealth of understanding and tolerance, and a pleasant sense of humor. All these attributes are very serviceable here. For, despite all the pressures and hectic activity here, BILL HILL always maintains a sound perspective on the overall requirements and responsibilities of the Congress.

These very warm and human attributes do not prevent him from being forceful and direct on issues before the Congress, however. He constantly demonstrates his enthusiastic devotion to his responsibilities here and to the interests of his constituents in Colorado; he maintains a standard of high principles and his actions are based on them.

I am going to miss the friendly companionship, the good commonsense, and the inspiration for better service which BILL HILL provides. He and his wonderful wife plan to return to Colorado to enjoy all year around the wonders of that colorful State. Our very best wishes and sincere affection go with them and we all hope they will continue to have a very fruitful and rewarding life among the friends and neighbors whom they represented in such outstanding fashion in Congress for all these years.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America and Auxiliary Hold 23d National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the 23d national convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America and its auxiliary is scheduled to be held August 13 to 17, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

I am glad to give them a hearty welcome to the Nation's Capital, and to wish them a fruitful convention. I feel sure that my colleagues extend a like hand of welcome to the thousands of officers, delegates, and members who will convene here, and to their families and friends from among 40 of our States.

One of the larger veterans organizations of our country, the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliary constitute a powerful force for peace in America and throughout the world. They have long been active in civic and patriotic affairs through their own and with other vet-

erans' groups: They foster proper development of the young, protection of the aged, sick, and needy and friendless veterans and their dependents.

The members of CWV and CWVA fight to keep America strong as eagerly as they strove to preserve her in periods of national danger. Their motto—For God, for Home, for Country—is a holy one, and their work to assist others, in accordance with such noble ideals, is not kept within a small, secluded segment, but is extended to all members of America's society. In like broad measure we extend our friendship and encouragement to them.

The Catholic War Veterans ever hold dear the first amendment of our cherished Constitution: They firmly believe in, for themselves and others, the principle of the freedom of the individual to worship God according to his own conscience. They do not believe there is any inherent conflict between state and church; rather, they believe the two should work in harmony for the greatest good of all; separately where it is necessary, together where possible, but always with the thought that man is the child of God, a merciful, loving, Father to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this body that today I receive from Peter J. Hopkins, national commander, and M. Joseph May, chairman of the 23d national convention, a short background note concerning the Catholic War Veterans and an outline of their programs and plans. The report follows:

THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND AUXILIARY

States of America will have the honor of holding their 23d national convention in Washington, the District of Columbia, August 13 to 17, 1958. This is their first such convention in the Nation's Capital. Their auxiliary will hold its convention at the same time and in the same headquarters.

The Hilton-Statler Hotel has been selected as convention "home" for both the CWV and its auxiliary. Delegates to the convention, national officers, members and their families will be housed there and elsewhere; however, all the sessions and the chief social functions of the convention are to occur in the Statler. Upward of 5,000 people including families, and friends will be attracted to this world capital: for this reason the 23d CWV national convention is called the family convention. Special tours and surprises are being prepared for the children so that they may get to learn more of the Nation for which their parents sacrificed themselves in times of national emergency.

A highlight of the convention will be the military field mass to be celebrated at Arlington National Cemetery Amphitheater. CWV's national chaplain, Father Bede Scully, OFM, CAP, will be the celebrant. This event will be an occasion of prayer for all the war dead of America, and will be observed on the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven. This Nation, our beloved America, is dedicated to the Mother of God under another title. A century ago the Catholic bishops of the United States dedicated the United States to the patronage of the Immaculate Conception of Mary; this is the same title under which the Catholic War Veterans and auxiliary are dedicated. Brazil and Portugal, our friends, are likewise dedicated.

It is fitting too, that this convention is placed under the patronage of His Excellency Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, within whose see is located one of the greatest religious shrines in North America. This is the rapidly rising, beautiful, National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, on the grounds of Catholic University. It is a structure that will embellish the beauty of this magnificent Capital and stand as a mark of respect to the greatest of all women, the Jewish maiden, Mary, Mother of the Prince of Peace.

Perhaps it is no mere coincidence that the founder of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, of Astoria, N. Y., the pastor of the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception in that city. Monsignor Higgins, an Army chaplain of World War I founded CWV in 1935, when there was great need to protect veterans and their families.

Another highlight of the convention will be a parade on K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Friday evening. Thousands of veterans and members of military, civic, and service organizations, and marching and musical units of the Armed Forces will participate. This parade is designed to inspire the young to patriotism and the mature to a deep reflection and consideration on world affairs, and how they may be directed and lead the world to peace.

Of outstanding importance to the convention will be its annual banquet and military ball, which will be enjoyed by well over 1 thousand delegates, officers and members.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, and His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, have approved the work of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Harry S. Truman, and President Dwight D. Eisenhower have also approved the patriotic activities of CWV and their earnest work for peace and the welfare of the veteran in distress and for his family and community.

It is proper here to conclude with words from the Constitution of the Catholic War Veterans, organized as it is, "To promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home: (a) For God: to promote * * * a greater love, honor and service to Him; (b) for country: through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through the active participation in the promotion of its ideals of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to develop a more zealous citizenship, encourage morality in Government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanancy of our free institutions; (c) for home: to promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened, patriotic, American youth, to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans; (d) these objectives are encouraged without regard to race, creed, or color."

The remarkable fact about those words is that they were written in 1935. It is no wonder that such ideals have inspired the Catholic War Veterans to become a vigorous organization in the forefront of solid Americanism.

Practical Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Gary (Ind.) Anselm Forum has won a national recognition back over the years in its successful experiment and accomplishments in combating bigotry and improving race and religious relations in the Calumet region of Indiana.

I am here submitting a reprint of October 5, 1956, from the Gary Post-Tribune which elaborates upon the integration policies originated by the Gary (Ind.) Anselm Forum.

I am also including with my remarks a letter from Mark C. Roser, supervisor, pupil personnel department of the Gary schools, to Mr. Reuben E. Olson, director of the Anselm Forum, Inc., in answer to an inquiry concerning the success of this integration problem:

[From the Gary Post-Tribune of October 5, 1956]

GARY POLICY WAS BEST

It has been evident from the start that the House subcommittee's investigation into the District of Columbia's schools was essentially an attack on the racial integration policy. Whatever committee members may say, it is intended to bolster the South's case for integration.

But if there is a fair appraisal of the evidence the committee has collected, it must be labeled as damaging to the South.

Negro children are not standing up equally with the white children of the same age in school tests—that is not surprising. What that really means is that the South has been short-changing its Negro youngsters in the separate but equal schools. It has not been giving them an education of equal value to that of the white students. Instead of discrediting the integration policy, the House committee in fact has been disclosing an important reason for adopting it. * * *

There are other factors, of course. When youngsters come from slum homes, when their parents have had little or no education, it can hardly be expected that they will do as well in classes as youngsters who come from adequate homes, with literate parents. * * *

There is much truth to statements that the integration program was advanced too rapidly in the District of Columbia. The Supreme Court ruling, it should be remembered, did not call for precipitous action but provided for gradual steps. * * *

More and more, recent developments are reflecting credit on the Gary school board for the integration policy it followed here. The gradual method, starting with the lower grades, took somewhat longer but it avoided the difficulties that have been revealed in the Washington schools.

It is doubtful if any other community has done a better job than did the Gary board. Some cities probably can integrate in one long step without trouble, if the percentage of Negro students is not large. But where integration involves a major change, schools would be wise to shape their policies after that which Gary used so successfully.

(Gary's integrated school policy adopted in 1946. Indiana's integrated school policy House Act 242, adopted 1949. Making Indiana the seventh State to so adopt.)

GARY ANSELM FORUM.

SCHOOL CITY OF GARY,
Gary, Ind., July 3, 1958.

Mr. REUBEN E. OLSON,
Director, Anselm Forum, Inc.,
Gary, Ind.

DEAR MR. OLSON: This is in answer to your inquiry concerning the board policy established in 1946, whereby Gary children are to attend the school in the district in which they live, regardless of race, creed, or color.

At the time it was the thinking of the school authorities that the implementation of this policy would best be accomplished by

starting with kindergarten through the third grade. Then, each following year the grade level would be advanced by one.

Experience has shown that for many reasons this best suited the psychological and social needs of our children and parents. This method utilized the natural prejudice-free attitudes of children so that democratic relationships could be established in the classroom. Thus, by the time adolescence was reached the children were better prepared to meet the usual stresses and strains of this period of emotional growth.

It was also found that parents, as well as teachers, could better relate themselves positively to younger children of differing culture and race than they can to the adolescent, where there is so much tension normally present in the personalities.

It is almost impossible for even neurotic adults to consistently hate a small child. Race hate, therefore, is reduced tremendously by first integrating young children. The other efficient method is work with mature personalities and start with colleges and graduate schools.

Yours truly,

MARK C. ROSER,
Supervisor, Pupil Personnel Department.
V. R. CHARLSON,
Director, Special Services Division.

Large-Scale Propaganda Drive in Latin America Agreed Upon at Soviet-Red China Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Americas Daily of Miami Springs, Fla., on Thursday, August 7, 1958:

LARGE-SCALE PROPAGANDA DRIVE IN LATIN AMERICA AGREED UPON AT SOVIET-RED CHINA CONFERENCE

LONDON, August 6.—The Communist diplomatic offensive has been officially and formally extended from the Near East to Latin America, and therefore, the war of propaganda is taking place in the United States own backyard.

The extension of the offensive is the result of a decision taken jointly by the Kremlin and the Communist regime of Peiping, during the secret conversations of 3 days between the Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, and the head of Communist China, Mao Tse-tung.

What can be expected now is a large-scale propaganda offensive in the Latin American nations, with the United States as the main target of attack.

Forty-eight hours after the decision of Peiping, the Communists opened fire with an attack against the enslaving police action, which the United States presumably develops in Latin America.

The decision of the Red bloc is seen in the joint Chino-Soviet communique issued in Peiping Sunday, at the end of the secret deliberations of Mao and Khrushchev.

Communist China and the Soviet Union agreed formally there and then to lend firm support to the just struggle of the peoples of the United Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq and all the other Arab countries, as well as movements for national independence of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, according to the communique.

The fact that Latin America was included with the Arab nations, leaves little doubt of the aims of the Red leaders.

ANTI-UNITED STATES FLAMES IN LATIN AMERICA

TOKYO, August 6.—A semiofficial Peiping newspaper today continued Red China's bitter attack on United States policies in Latin America by declaring that anti-American flames are burning everywhere in Latin America.

The Communist-run Kwangming Daily, commenting on United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' visit to Latin America, added:

"The tide of national independence will not be checked by Dulles and his kind. No matter where they go, Dulles and his ilk will be received by fists and curses."

This was the third editorial attack in 2 days by the mainland's strictly supervised press.

Tuesday the Peiping People's Daily, official organ of the Communist regime, and the semiofficial Ta Kung Pao lashed out at the United States for exploitation and subversion of Latin America.

They charged the United States with fostering armed coups in Haiti and Venezuela and attempting armed intervention in Cuba.

The Kwangming Daily, in language strikingly similar to that used in Tuesday's editorials, said, "Latin America has been regarded by the Wall Street bosses as their backyard.

"It has been exploited and controlled by them. But the struggle against oppression and enslavement by United States imperialism is spreading in Latin America and the contradictions between the imperialist and the Latin American people are sharpening."

The newspaper said that in recent months Vice President RICHARD NIXON met a hostile reception, President Eisenhower's brother, Milton, encountered demonstrations in Panama and Nicaragua and Assistant Secretary of State Roy R. Rubottom met demonstrations in Brazil.

The Injustice of Public Law 84–676

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter by my good friend Robert W. Collins, of Yazoo City, Miss., which was written to the editor of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register. It appeared in the August 2, 1958, edition of that publication.

Mr. Collins' suggestion merits the attention of the House Committee on Armed Services, and I hope Congress will be given the opportunity to consider changing the effective date of Public Law 84–676.

URGES CONGRESS CORRECT OWN MISTAKE

DEAR SIR: The magnificent and prompt action of the President in sending a sizable marine force to rescue the integrity and independence of Lebanon brought many serious thoughts to many like myself who was privileged to serve in the Korean war as a career reservist. Perhaps the whole Nation can now get the meaning of the Korean war in a better sense of appreciation. Reappraisals are now being called for. Congress will be expected to and will support the actions commenced today. At this time of sober reflection on the Korean war the White House and the Congress can now correct an injustice to the two-war, former Reserve career officers who were released involuntarily after the end of those recent hostilities by applying the following remedy, to wit:

Reenact and approve Public Law 84–676 with one very simple and justiciable addition, as follows: "(i) This section shall be effective on July 1, 1954."

The Congress should reenact this public law on its own motion as a simple matter of correcting an injustice. Public Law 84–676 shows on its face why it fails in its stated purpose; to provide a lump-sum benefit to the members of the Reserve components who had served in World War II and the Korean war and were released involuntarily. The fact of the matter is that on the effective date of this statute, approved on July 9, 1956, practically all of the members of the Reserve components intended by the stated purpose of the legislation to be so benefited had already been released involuntarily in 1954 and 1955.

Sad to relate this anomaly is written into the hearings on H. R. 6725 and H. R. 9952 (both of the 84th Cong.), to which attention is invited. Public Law 84–676 is identical to H. R. 6725 save in one particular. It provided an effective date of July 1, 1954. H. R. 6725 was approved by the Armed Services Committee of the House on July 26, 1955. In the meantime it was withdrawn from the Rules Committee and the effective date of July 1, 1954, was deleted. On February 3, 1956, a new set of hearings commenced on H. R. 9952. What the responsible committeemen thought of the changed version was expressed by the chairman, as follows: "The committee went into the question of cost. It was a financial situation rather than wisdom." Thusly, H. R. 9952 was enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate and Public Law 84–676 became law on approval by the President on July 9, 1956.

Congress can correct its own mistakes, particularly its admitted and recorded errors of resort to false economy in place of its stated wisdom in the premises. Accordingly, it is strongly urged that the Congress on its own motion reenact Public Law 84–676 with a change in its effective date to July 1, 1954.

ROBERT W. COLLINS,
Commander, United States Naval Reserve (Retired), Yazoo City, Miss.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Eight Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have made it a practice to distribute widely among my constituents a questionnaire on the topics of the day. The replies to my 1958 questionnaire have now been tallied and I ask unanimous consent to insert the results in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Do you favor:

1. Agreement with Russia to end nuclear bomb testing without foolproof inspection?

Yes, 14 percent; no, 81 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

2. United States moral support for the independence of Algeria? Yes, 31 percent; no, 33 percent; undecided, 36 percent.

3. Broad tax cut by raising individual exemptions from $600 to $800 as an antirecession measure? Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

4. Large program of federally financed public works to create jobs? Yes, 33 percent; no, 61 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

5. Repealing excise taxes on autos, appliances, communications and transportation, luggage, and jewelry? Yes, 71 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

6. Tax reform? Yes, 87 percent; no, 4 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

7. Stronger laws to prohibit the use of untested chemical food additives? Yes, 97 percent; no, 0 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

8. Use of troops to enforce civil rights court orders as in Little Rock? Yes, 49 percent; no, 34 percent; undecided, 17 percent.

9. Granting the Interstate Commerce Commission power to terminate unprofitable railroad commuter service without regard to public need? Yes, 24 percent; no, 59 percent; undecided, 17 percent.

10. Legislation to safeguard employee health, welfare, and pension funds? Yes, 89 percent; no, 4 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

11. Stiffer penalties for distributors of obscene materials by mail? Yes, 88 percent; no, 3 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

12. Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as is? Yes, 47 percent; no, 28 percent; undecided, 25 percent.

Records Are Set by Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statistical article on the Panama Canal which appeared in the New York Times of August 11, 1958:

RECORDS ARE SET BY PANAMA CANAL—TRANSITS AND TOLLS AT A HIGH BUT EFFECT OF DIP IS FELT IN DECLINE OF CARGOES

BALBOA, C. Z., August 10.—The Panama Canal Company has released figures showing that although it got through fiscal year 1958, ended June 30, virtually unaffected by the recession in the United States, signs of diminishing world trade were beginning to manifest themselves.

Commercially, it was the best year in the canal's 44-year operating history. Transits of oceangoing commercial vessels—nongovernment ships of 300 tons net or over—totaled 9,187 against 8,579 in 1957, the previous high. Toll collections on ocean-going commercial vessels totaled $41,796,000 as against $38,444,000 in 1957.

Total transits for the fiscal year 1958, including ocean-going commercial vessels, United States Government vessels, and vessels of less than 300 net tons or 500 displacement tons amounted to 10,553. The equivalent 1957 figure was 10,137.

TOLLS AT RECORD LEVEL

Toll collections were $42,834,000, some $3,180,000 higher than fiscal year 1957, and a record. The difference between the total tolls and the tolls for commercial vessels is represented by $991,000 in interagency credits for transits of United States Government ships.

It is in the volume of cargo carried through the canal that the recession's effects show. The 48,124,809 long tons of commercial cargo shipped through in fiscal year 1958 is 3.2 percent below fiscal year 1957's record figure.

The discrepancy does not show in the tolls collected, as the Panama Canal knows only two basic classes of customers—ships laden and ships in ballast. If a vessel carries as little as 1 ton of cargo it pays the same rate as if it transits fully loaded.

CARGO VOLUME DOWN

Strangely enough, even as the total volume of cargo dropped, a new 1-day record was established. Some 1,010,000 long tons of cargo more than last year moved through the canal from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean. But the 2,588,000 fewer tons moving from the Atlantic to the Pacific caused the overall drop.

According to Panama Canal Company statisticians, the prime cause for the drop in southbound, Atlantic to Pacific, cargo was the reduction in shipments, principally of scrap metal, to Japan.

In fiscal year 1958 the top 10 cargoes shipped through the canal from the Pacific to the Atlantic were: ores, 7,559,000 long tons; lumber, 3,323,000; wheat, 1,985,000; canned food products, 1,285,000; bananas, 1,082,000; sugar, 1,068,000; nitrate of soda, 1,046,000; various metals, 901,000; petroleum and petroleum products, 746,000, and barley, 711,000.

SOUTHBOUND CARGOES

Ten top cargoes from the Atlantic to the Pacific were: petroleum and petroleum products (excluding asphalt), 5,964,000 long tons; coal and coke, 3,849,000; iron and steel manufactured products, 1,922,000; phosphates, 1,257,000; soybeans, 814,000; sugar, 654,000; various ores, 564,000; scrap metal, 532,000; chemicals, 482,000; raw cotton, 354,000.

United States registered ships were the canal's best customers during the year. There were 2,023 such transits. Many ships whose regular runs are routed through the canal made several transits each. Next-best customers were British-flag ships, which logged 1,205 transits. Altogether ships bearing the flags of 35 nations used the canal in fiscal year 1958.

Meanwhile, the size of new ships using the canal is making the traffic problem no easier. They must get what the canal calls a daylight, clearcut transit.

Vessels accorded such transits make the whole journey by daylight (normally the canal is on a 6 a. m. to 10 p. m. basis) and may not be passed by any other vessels in the 8-mile-long Gaillard Cut.

Lutheran Laymen's League Sponsors Radio Meditations and Prayers for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the membership of the House I present herewith in the RECORD the script for seven 2-minute radio meditations and prayers for peace which have been sent to every radio station in the United States with the compliments of the Lutheran Laymen's League, sponsors of the Lutheran Hour, the Family Worship Hour, and Day by Day With Jesus.

These messages were presented to the radio stations by the Lutheran League with the sincere hope that their use would help allay the fears and tensions of these turbulent times.

A recording and the script were presented to President Eisenhower on August 11 by the Lutheran Hour speaker, Dr. Oswald Hoffman.

The seven meditations and prayers follow:

LOOKING TO THE FOUNDATION

The world crisis flared up suddenly. Like a wolf in the snows of winter, it was upon us.

The struggle has only just begun, nor is the end in sight. In the midst of troubles, our people look to their defenses; actually it may be more important in these days to look to the foundation.

The foundations of national life are laid in our homes, and in the lives of those who dwell there. Have the foundations of your life, your home, been laid on shifting earth or on the rock that cannot be moved, though wind and stream beat vehemently upon it? This is no time to look for an easy way out. The days are at hand when we must look to the foundations. They call not only for convictions, but also for people who act upon conviction.

Listen to these solemn words of Jesus Christ about the foundations of conviction and action:

"Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock. But he that hearth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great." (Luke 6:47-49)

Will you pray with me?

Look upon us in mercy, O God, and let not our sins destroy us. Turn not Thou away from us in our time of testing, but give us strength to stand up and acquit ourselves as men, Thy men through Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

STRAIGHT THINKING

In a time of national crisis, it is important to keep our heads. The national welfare calls for straight thinking and thoughtful, well-considered words and action.

It is straight thinking to remember God in these troubled days. Listen to the Psalmist in a time of trouble:

"Lord, how are they increased that trouble me. Many are they that rise up against me. Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God. But Thou, O Lord, art a shield for me; my glory, and the lifter up of mine head. * * * I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, that have set themselves against me round about. Salvation belongeth unto me Lord: Thy blessing is upon Thy people." (Psalm 3:1-6, 8.)

God rules; no one has usurped His power. Though they be increased that trouble us, though attempts be made to panic us with the thought that there is no help in God, God reigns.

God's blessing is upon His people. Have faith in God, and be numbered among His

people. Salvation and deliverance belong to the Lord, His express gifts to all men in Jesus Christ, His Son and our Savior. Have faith in Christ, Himself the divine guaranty that, though we may not always be right and often may be wrong, God loves and God cares, win, lose, or draw.

Pray to God in the confidence of the Psalmist: "I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, that have set themselves against me round about." With trust in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, lay yourself down to sleep and awake refreshed, for the Lord will sustain you.

Discipline

A time of national and international crisis calls for discipline. For a free people, the highest form of discipline is self-discipline, the finest restraint is self-restraint. That's what the Book of Proverbs means when it says: "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit then he that taketh a city."

Steadfastness of purpose requires no angry words to make its way, even when groping through the modern jungle of international politics.

God rules; He is still in control. The Almighty cares about what is happening in the world these days, and about what is happening to you. Remember it always, but most of all now.

How do I know that God cares? I have an answer for that question: Because God sent Jesus Christ. Remember the claim of Jesus Christ upon you, especially His claim to your trust and confidence. That kind of faith in God can carry you through these tense days with the qualities it transmits: Love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, fidelity, adaptability, and self-control—above all, self-control that no law can produce because it comes from inside a man.

Will you pray with me?

God, stay close to us and all associated with us in these days, that we may not give way to fear or uncertainty, but may live confident of Thy care and kindness, through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Being Alert

The crisis hanging over the world imposes upon our citizenry as much as it does upon the leadership of our country the necessity of alertness.

We live in a trigger-happy world, living behind closed doors, any one of which could open suddenly to disclose the threat of destruction rather than the offer of friendship.

At the same time, we must be alert to recognize the clasp of friendship and reconciliation when it is offered. It is often hard to distinguish the friendly hand from the mailed fist in the murky darkness of self-interest and suspicion that characterize our time.

This is a time when all of us, whether we have previously paid attention to God or not, whether we have listened to Him carefully or lackadaisically, should be alert to His voice. I have no doubt that God is employing these days of trouble and tension to teach us all some lessons He wants our world to learn: that He is God; that we are members of His family, whether we recognize the fact or not, by virtue of His divine creation and by right of purchase through the sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ; and that He expects us to live in a manner worthy of His sons and daughters. To this kind of alertness God himself calls each one of us in the words of St. Paul: "Be on your guard, stand firm in the faith, live like men, be strong. Let everything that you do be done in love." (I Cor. 16:13).

Will you breathe this prayer with me?

God, our Heavenly Father, in these dark days, make us alert to the opportunities for service Thou dost place before us by Thy holy will and in Thy most gracious favor through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen

Meeting Realities

When events arrive at a crisis, they can no longer be ignored. Either one comes to grips with the problems they present, or runs away to let someone else find the solution.

Free people help to make the right decisions by their willingness to meet and deal with hard realities. The existence of a threat to world peace is one of these hard realities which cannot be blinked away. Selfishness and self-interest present their own hard reality to people as well as to peoples. Indeed, the presence of evil itself is a hard reality, evident in faces that can smile for the cameras one moment and harden into fine lines of cruelty the next.

The hardest reality of all is God, whose eternal existence and almighty power have been so lightly regarded in times past by some of the very people who imagine themselves to be the spokesmen for reality.

The past, including our own, stands under the judgment of God. There is only one way to meet this harsh reality—to repent as a people and as a Nation of the pride and self-will that have caused us, as well as others, to ignore God's will and transgress His commandments.

The future is in God's hands. There is only one way to deal with this sure reality—to trust in His love and hope in His mercy. If we should be minded to run away from reality in these times of tension, the Bible calls us back to the great reality of His merciful and reassuring presence:

"The counsel of the Lord stands for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations. Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people whom he has chosen as his heritage." (Psalms 33)

Rediscovering Resources

We are in the midst of a crucial world situation where the position of the world is encountering political, economic, social, and possibly military challenges in every part of the world from forces that, apparently, will not be satisfied until they have discredited all that we are and everything we stand for.

To meet this mortal challenge, we need to discover new resources or rediscover others too long neglected, more powerful than the arsenal of weapons which the opposing forces in the world will one day, if they do not now, possess in equally destructive profusion.

Without discounting the necessity of developing political, economic, social, and military resources of the free world, I firmly believe that spiritual resources will play a much larger role than any of them in resolution of the tensions now fettering the world.

We cannot create spiritual resources, but we can discover them. We shall not find them in ourselves, if we find them at all.

In God's warming love can be found renewing and energizing power—love reaching out to all men, of every class and condition, in the Son of God, Jesus Christ, appointed by His Father to be the lifegiving, self-sacrificing Savior of the world, inviting the faith and devotion of men everywhere.

Don't be ashamed to pray to God for strength in these days. What the Psalmist said is still true: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." (Psalms 127:1.)

Ordinary Courage

In the midst of crisis, ordinary people often show the way, and simple things become important—faith, for example, and courage, and decency.

Things looked bad till an ordinary shepherd boy came out to visit his three older brothers doing military service in an army paralyzed by fear. The enemy proudly paraded his armor, and his spokesman prated "Give me someone to fight."

Everyone knows what happened when the ruddy and handsome youth went out alone to accept the challenge. His unforgettable courage has been preserved in words handed down to us over 30 centuries: "You come to me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come to you in the name of the Lord of hosts, whom you have defied."

The kind of world in which we live demands courage at home and in the factory just as much as in the frontlines. It takes fortitude to hold a righteous position firmly while waiting out the time which will determine whether there is to be war or peace. This is a time to seek those extraordinary qualities of firm and calm courage which derive their strength from trust in God—the kind of trust expressed by David in the 34th Psalm:

"I sought the Lord, and He answered me, and delivered me from all my fears. * * * The angel of the Lord encamps around those who fear him, and delivers them. O taste and see that the Lord is good. Happy is the man who takes refuge in him." (Psalms 34:4–8.)

Will you offer this prayer with me?

Lord God, the refuge of all who trust in Thee, give us faith to sustain our courage with the extraordinary power that comes from Thee alone. Amen.

Mary Ryder Homes for Elderly Women Base Rates on Average Budget of $60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major social problems facing the American people as our population's average age increases is to provide adequate housing at moderate rates for elderly couples and individuals, particularly those unable to work and with very limited incomes. It is one of the problems to which we on the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency have devoted many hours of study. The omnibus housing bill which our committee has approved and which is now awaiting clearance for House debate would help somewhat in solving this problem by providing low-interest guaranteed loans to nonprofit organizations in providing good rental housing for the elderly.

One courageous person in St. Louis who saw this problem in all of its grimness some years ago and went ahead and did something about it is Mrs. Mary E. Ryder, who established the Mary Ryder Homes for Elderly Women and has been operating these homes successfully despite all kinds of difficulties associated with that sort of practical social welfare activity. She is particularly concerned over the housing needs of the infirm who cannot work and whose incomes average perhaps $60 a month on old-age assistance.

Mrs. Ryder recently wrote about some of the difficulties in meeting the housing needs of this group in an article which appeared in the St. Louis Labor Tribune. In it, she told how the Mary Ryder Homes try to keep elderly people safe, clean, well fed, and comfortably housed on a rate schedule of only $45, $48, $50, $52.50, $55, and $70 a month.

The Mary Ryder Homes for Elderly Women are a remarkable achievement by a remarkable St. Louis humanitarian, and I believe Mary Ryder's report on the problems of operating these homes under present conditions will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Consequently, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article from the St. Louis Labor Tribune referred to, by Mary E. Ryder, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF OLD, INFIRM, MARY E. RYDER URGES FACING TRUTH WITHOUT THEORIES

(By Mary E. Ryder)

Every day, we read or hear on radio or television of conferences, surveys, press interviews, talking, speeches, and quiz panels concerning social issues without one single improvement or a real solution offered on the subject matter under discussion or any real action resulting therefrom.

Recently, a 2-day session on old-age problems was conducted in St. Louis, and one of our Government agencies, that is pitifully limited for funds to operate with, sent its representative out to St. Louis to offer a solution for the problems of the aged, which seemed to have for its purpose to put old people to work.

That is fine for those able to work and especially those who want to work. No one can find fault with that suggestion.

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHERS?

But what about the millions of old people who are unable to work, and never will be able to work again? Why do we never mention them at these conferences?

This is the group, due to their physical and mental conditions, whose problems will never be solved by a job. And, why doesn't someone touch on the truth: that this group, not provided with even a substandard budget, but merely a starvation budget, called $60 a month although it doesn't even purchase one-half of that value.

John Kenneth Gailbraith, a Harvard economist, recently wrote in a book entitled "The Affluent Society," a fact expressing what, with our economic system, many thoughtful people have been feeling is wrong. But will anything be done about it?

He points a finger to the contrast between private luxury and public squalor.

If it were not for the United Fund subsidizing the agencies which are trying to help the low-income elderly people of St. Louis, St. Louis County and St. Charles, quite a few would be living in the squalor which Professor Gailbraith refers to.

NEW DANGERS THREATEN

And now new dangers threaten the agencies which are helping to ameliorate the conditions of the helpless, old, and sick, and infirm, trying to live on squalor budgets.

In an effort to correct unsafe and unsanitary conditions, our State and local authorities find it necessary to impose costly alterations that certainly have caused the cost of care of elderly people to soar to where only homes which must ask for from $150 to several hundred dollars a month budget can expect to operate. To pay for this care on a $60 a month budget is something that is never discussed at old age conferences.

So, to let the public see for themselves, we invite the public to visit the Mary Ryder Homes at 4360–62 Olive Street and 4341 Westminster and see what is being done for the poor elderly women who must live on their low budgets.

We want the citizens of St. Louis to see how the Mary Ryder Homes try to keep elderly people safe, clean, well fed, and comfortably housed. We knew we cannot ask for an increase of rates. Our rates are $45, $48, $50, $52.50, $55, and $70 a month, because these old people do not have sufficient incomes.

Where can they go if we are forced to liquidate this service?

TRUTH NOT THEORIES

Let's have the truth, and not so many theories.

Let the people who, after all, support all of these institutions, be the judges.

And let those whose spiritual duty it is to help tell the truth—let them join this crusade and remove the fear that so many seem to have, a fear of truthful expression, in these confusing days.

Maybe the truth will finally set us free if we all meet facts squarely, and have some real action applied with truthfulness and not so many conferences and theories.

In the Name of Fair Play—Further Facts on the Official Snubs Accorded Admiral Rickover

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of greatest experiences of my life was to have the opportunity in April 1956, to accompany other members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on a 12-hour voyage aboard the nuclear submarine the *Nautilus*. I understand that I was the first woman to be aboard the revolutionary atomic submarine at sea, and that, of course, made the experience even more exciting.

But the thing which impressed me most during the 12-hour trip, 8 hours of which were spent below the surface of the ocean, was the dedication of Adm. H. G. Rickover and the sense of excitement he imparted to all of us over the potentialities of this amazing naval vessel. It was an experience similar, perhaps, to being taken on one's first airplane ride by one of the Wright brothers, or of sharing the triumph of a great pioneer in any field of human endeavor.

Admiral Rickover impressed all of us with his visions of the achievements of nuclear submarines in the future. Of course it was no surprise to us when the *Nautilus* was revealed to have made the first undersea transit of the Northwest Passage under the ice at the North Pole because we were ready to accept and believe the possibility of this submarine and others like it doing anything Admiral Rickover and his fellow pioneers in the field of nuclear propulsion set them to do.

However, I was deeply disappointed after this great feat had been accomplished by the *Nautilus* that Admiral Rickover was not even invited to the White House ceremonies at which the announcement was made.

Now, through the concern of a good friend, who has written me about it, I have further facts bearing on the official snubs being accorded Admiral Rickover and the picture this letter presents is far from pretty.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter referred to from Mr. Charles P. Muldoon, a St. Louis friend, who is a practicing attorney in Washington and who is in close touch with the military services and a keen observer.

I think every Member of Congress who believes, as I do, that Admiral Rickover has been very shabbily treated considering the monumental contributions he has made to America's defense and to the cause of freedom, will be interested in Mr. Muldoon's letter to me, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 11, 1958.*

The Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
1313 House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: It certainly is regretted there was no room for the father of our nuclear Navy at the White House ceremonies last week celebrating the transpolar voyage of the *Nautilus*. For Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover—the fiery little man who fought for a start on the nuclear submarine program—not to be invited, I understand, has come to be the usual treatment he expects when something he had long dreamed, carefully planned, valiantly battled for, comes to fruition. To me this is a shameful situation which compels me writing about it to you.

If you will stop a moment to recall, it took newspaper prodding to get him a place at the ceremonies marking the completion of the world's first nuclear powerplant for peaceful uses exclusively. He was finally allowed a few minutes on the radio and a seat on the platform. None of the young scientists and engineers in his nuclear reactor group who worked day and night to complete the Shippingport Power Plant were invited, a great disappointment to their wives and children who had to live without them for years and who had been looking forward to witnessing their hour of triumph. There were, however, plenty of others present who were not and had never been connected with the program, who did nothing to contribute to its final achievement but who were there largely, it is suspected, for the publicity involved.

Now once again it is rumored the first atomic submarine with two reactors will be launched, the huge *Triton*. The idea of using two reactors was again Admiral Rickover's and I believe you know that he had to fight every inch of the way to get it accepted. The hour of this particular success is, as usual, again one of personal pain to him. He had been given assurance that at least one of his submarines would be launched by his wife. It is difficult to understand on what basis the many ladies who have been launching A-subs were chosen, except, of course, Mrs. Eisenhower and Mrs. Strauss. But this time Admiral Rickover thought his wife would do it. But no, the Navy rejected the proposal made by many prominent people involved with the building of the *Triton* including, it is said, the officialdom of General Dynamics itself and the honor went instead to the wife of an obscure admiral who at no time has been connected with and who has done nothing for nuclear propulsion.

I also hear that Groton, Conn., is busily preparing to entertain—the number given

is 100—personal friends of this admiral's wife, friends whom she has invited to the ceremony. It must be assumed she is paying off social debts of many years standing at the taxpayers expense. As you know, these launchings are very expensive and the cost involved is written off as necessary advertising which of course is questionable.

Nevertheless, the total disregard of the personal insults involved to Admiral Rickover as a result of all this backstage maneuvering to grab the spotlight undeniably creates the impression that the top personalities in the Navy are only interested in that service to further their own personal ends.

Consequently, in the name of fair play it would be my hope that something could be done to bring this situation to light.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

CHARLES P. MULDOON.

The Wild Blue Yonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader of August 6, 1958, entitled "The Wild Blue Yonder." This editorial which reviews the published testimony from one of our congressional committees points out the reckless and irresponsible spending of the Department of Defense under this administration. This disclosure of the facts has aroused my constituents, some of whom are registering their complaints with me. I hope that the publication of this criticism will arouse the administration to corrective action.

THE WILD BLUE YONDER

Early next month, the United States Air Force will open its new Air Force Academy near Colorado Springs. More than a thousand cadets will move in, the vanguard of a student body that in time will climb to 2,500 men. They will find waiting for them just what the Air Force originally sought to build: the finest institution of its kind in the world. That was the USAF's mission 4 years ago; and though a great deal of work remains to be finished, today the Air Force can say, with a smile, mission accomplished.

And the American taxpayer can add, with a groan, at what fantastic cost.

The records are not complete on this fabulous oasis in the Rockies. It is doubtful if the Congress ever will be able to add up everything and draw a line at the bottom, for the Air Force, disdaining economy and laughing at fiscal controls, has spent money with the arrogant ease of a Roman emperor and juggled funds with the slick skill of a three-card artist at a county fair.

In the beginning, former Secretary Talbott represented to the House that a complete, turn-key job could be had for approximately $126 million. That, in itself, seemed a fairly incredible sum, but on the promise that the Academy could be made ready within that figure, the Congress authorized a beginning. That was in the 1954–55 fiscal year.

As nearly as anyone can figure out today, total authorizations and expenditures now amount to something in the neighborhood of $170 million, give or take $10 million. A House committee reported last month that if the Air Force carries out all the plans now on paper, the total cost may reach $300,900,000. Witnesses for the Air Force, though they have termed this particular figure preposterous, have been careful not to deny that such a figure may be reached. They say only that they have no present intention of going after it.

The site originally was to consist of 10,000 acres. It now consists of 17,800 acres. The State of Colorado, it was said, would provide the land through a donation of $1 million expected to be sufficient to cover the 10,000 acres at $100 an acre. Land in the original area actually came to nearly $300 an acre. Total real-estate costs to the Federal Government, exclusive of Colorado's contribution, amount to $4,256,000.

On close inspection, it was found that the chosen site was subject to severe conditions of soil erosion. Retaining walls amounting to $4 million have proved necessary. Water supplies present a serious problem; an expensive irrigation system is the answer.

Designers for the Air Force sought to achieve a sense of spaciousness. Thus the Academy buildings and staff facilities are dispersed widely over an area half the size of Washington, D. C. One result: The central steam plant is nearly a mile from the center of the academic area. Utilities alone have cost $24 million. Street lights, along 70 miles of roads, amount to $2 million more.

The cadets will spend most of their waking hours in the area shown above. This includes the academic building, physical education building, dining hall, and half a dozen other structures. Originally, these were to cost $28,468,000. The current figure is $44,721,000.

Consider two of these buildings only:

The academic building, once budgeted for $14,322,000, is now fixed at $20 million. In the course of the building's construction, 225 change orders were made; the structure grew from 850,000 square feet to 965,000 square feet in the process. For esthetic reasons, the ground floor is largely open; the third floor is completely open. Only 58 percent of the gross area is net usable space.

Not far away is the cadet dining hall. Because the students will be in relatively small classrooms and dormitory rooms most of the time, it was felt they would benefit spiritually from a feeling of wide open spaces at mealtimes. Officials of the Academy did not see how the daily schedule could be modified so that cadets and their teachers could eat on two shifts. Thus, the Air Force erected one of the most astonishing dining halls ever brought into being. It is 252 feet square. It will feed 3,000 persons at a sitting. The floor is terrazzo, the ceiling of enameled steel panels; the walls on three sides are of glass from floor to ceiling. Diners will have a fabulous vista of the Rockies. The entire space is open. In the committee's estimate, the use of spaced supports would have achieved a saving in steel and roofing of about $275,000. Had conventional acoustical tile been used on the ceiling, an additional $140,000 might have been saved.

It is a temptation to comment also on the administration building, which was to have cost $1,439,000, and has wound up at more than double that figure; part of the added cost came (this is in Colorado Springs) for air conditioning. An Air Force spokesman stated that it was felt that having windows opened at various angles would not be in keeping with the esthetic standards of design set for the Academy. Other Air Force spokesmen have denied this was a consideration.

In 1956–57, the Air Force obtained approval from Congress for 405 staff housing units. Only 46 of these have been built—44 professors' houses at $43,690 apiece, and 2 rectories at $56,000 each. The authorization included a superintendent's house at $90,000, but this will not be constructed at the present time since the superintendent is not satisfied that a suitable residence can be constructed for $90,000.

This feeling that nothing could be too good for the superintendent characterized the project as a whole. Although the Air Force's original directive asserted that "insofar as possible, standard cataloged items will be provided," this proved not to be possible very far. The only standard catalog item the committee could find in the cadet dormitory was a $5 wastebasket. Everything else was custom made, including a medicine cabinet for each cadet at $71.76. The successful bidder on the medicine cabinet contract, in a desperate concern for his fellow taxpayers, suggested a less expensive alternative—a seamless, more sanitary, easier to keep clean cabinet, which he could manufacture "exactly to your overall measurements" for $51.70 each. "If you are interested in saving thousands of dollars and getting a superior product," wrote the contractor, "we will be pleased to submit a sample before an award is made." The Air Force was not interested in saving thousands of dollars. The contractor's offer was received on April 30, 1957, and rejected on the morning of the following day, May 1, 1957.

"Did you go into that thoroughly?" asked Congressman LAIRD, of Wisconsin.

"We consider we went into it thoroughly," replied a Colonel Jones of the Air Force. "We work pretty fast out there."

"Perhaps too fast," said Mr. Laird.

There will be a great thundering performance of the Air Force anthem when the Academy opens next month: Off we go, the cadets will sing, into the wild blue yonder. The West Point of the Air will be soaring high. And if a small, still voice from Virginia may be excused, permit us to add the observation that so is the national debt soaring high. And reading the RECORD, we begin to understand why.

People With Names Ending in "ski" Have Been in This Country as Long as Smiths, Jeffersons, Randolphs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Polish Star of July 10, 1958, recalls an interesting bit of Americana. Americans have been of many racial extractions from our beginnings. This is and has been our great strength. The article follows:

PEOPLE WITH NAMES ENDING IN "SKI" HAVE BEEN IN THIS COUNTRY AS LONG AS SMITHS, JEFFERSONS, RANDOLPHS

(By Bill Frank)

Most of us think that anyone with a name ending in "ski" is of a generation of newcomers, fresh from the old country.

And a lot of people also assume that anyone with a name that has a combination of "z" and "r" or "c" is of parentage that came to this country in the steerage of huge ocean liners filled with immigrants from mid-Europe.

But it's high time we came to realize that the people with names ending in "ski" have been in this country as long as the Smiths

and the Jeffersons, the Randolphs and the others with more pronounceable names.

TOO LITTLE ABOUT POLES

A guess a great deal of what we know about peoples in American history depends upon how well certain historians have popularized certain personalities.

Up until now, there's been too little published about the contributions of the Poles, for example.

The average American, I'm sure, has an idea that the Poles in our country came here along about the 1880's or soon after that, and the immigration from Poland was stepped up in the early part of the 20th century.

Also, the same average American thinks that the only Poles who ever made any contribution to this country before the last decade of the 19th century were Kosciuszko and Pulaski.

I certainly don't want to depreciate the valiant services these two noted Poles gave to these United States—particularly Pulaski, who died for the young democracy.

But now along comes Vincent J. Kowalewski of the Polish-American Congress in Delaware, and sends me a brochure that has opened my eyes.

ANOTHER JOHN SMITH STORY

Every American school kid knows that an Indian girl, Pocahontas, saved the life of the fabulous Capt. John Smith but—

How many know that two Poles, Zbigniew Stefanski and Jan Bogdan, also saved the life of the intrepid captain when he was about to be ambushed by Indians?

We read a great deal about the first families of Virginia, etc., but not enough about those first Poles who helped to save Jamestown from total failure.

THEY WERE SKILLED CRAFTSMEN

Let's go back a little in American history and pause at the year 1607.

That was the year when Jamestown was founded by the Virginia Company of London.

The newcomers were faced with all kinds of problems in the new world. They especially needed skilled craftsmen, whose services were essential to the survival of the colony.

Where to get them?

The Englishmen remembered that for years Poland had been England's principal source of pitch, tar, rosin, flax, masts, wainscots, and glass.

ENGLAND TURNS TO POLAND

There England could enlist the craftsmen for the great adventure in the new world.

And so on October 1, 1608—350 years ago—the ship *Mary and Margaret* arrived in Jamestown with a company of Poles. The roster contained such names as Michael Nowicki, Stanislaw Sadowski, Jan Mata—all journeymen in the crafts that were badly needed. And they were soldiers, too; good fighters.

Capt. John Smith knew Jan Bogdan personally, having met him in Poland in 1603, and it was with great joy that men of his type were welcomed to Jamestown.

Within 3 weeks after the Poles arrived in Jamestown, things began to hum. A glass furnace was roaring—the first factory in America.

And within 2 months, the ship *Mary and Margaret* was on its way to England with American-made materials—the first export of manufactured goods—soap ashes, tar, pitch, green glass bottles, and vases.

THE BIG STRIKE

Later, other Poles arrived. They were dreamers, too, and adventurers, in a way, but they also had a very practical outlook on life. The romantic stories of early America just never gave them a break.

Then came the big strike for civil liberties.

Fed up with the finagling in the colony of Jamestown, Capt. John Smith decided to return to England. The Poles refused to stay behind. They'd have none of the shenanigans.

They went to London but not for long. The Virginia Company implored them to return to Jamestown and help the colonists attain industrial self-sufficiency. Reluctantly, the Poles agreed but on one major condition: There were to be more rights for the people.

DENIED VOTE

Everything went along all right until they were denied the right to vote for members of the legislative assembly.

And the reason?

A flimsy and vicious one.

It was said that the Poles couldn't vote because they were still in debt for their passage from England to America.

All right—so the Poles just went on strike. They stopped working in the glass factory.

Gov. George Yardley tried to reason with the Poles—but he probably had never bumped up against the dogged stubbornness of Poles sticking up for what they believe are their rights. Some of the most infamous dictators of Europe have had apples out of that barrel, even in our day.

THE STRIKE ENDS

The whole mess became a first-class stench that seeped over to England, and eventually it was decided that concessions be made to the Polanders, and the strike was ended.

The first strike in America—not for economic gains, but for civil liberty.

All this and a lot more about the contributions of Polish craftsmen and workers are to be found in the dusty annals of American history, hidden far too long.

It is most refreshing to learn that Poles all over the United States are going to observe the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Polish immigrants to these shores.

It should knock the theory that Poles are "furriners" into a cocked hat.

"The Things That Should Be Done"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequent quotes from Abraham Lincoln, in recent years, that attempts to justify Government projects, is to the effect that Government is justified in doing for the people the things that should be done, which they are unable to do, or to do as well, for themselves.

It seems to me that many times we are so eager to project Government into the realm of our economic and commercial fields, for the sake of creating jobs, making so-called improvements, developing projects, and so forth, that we fail to use proper care to determine whether or not the object is really worth the cost. In other words, we are overlooking that phrase, "that should be done."

I can go along with the quote that is ascribed to Lincoln if we take it in its entirety. Those things that should be done can be done. They can be done without harming the national economy. If the object brings to the Nation a benefit that is greater than the cost, then the Nation is better off by having it accomplished. In this case, also, there can be no inflationary or other harmful results. The economy is made stronger by the accomplishment of any project that will yield benefits greater than the cost of the project. This reasoning does not apply, however, to the many projects that cost in excess, and many far in excess, of any possible benefit that can be realized.

I say this is a consideration in recent year. Traditionally the Government did not engage in economic or commercial activities. These fields were left entirely to the people. The Government provided and enforced laws to prevent wrongs, not to provide rights. People were free to do and to achieve for themselves. The law or the Government merely prevented abuses. This system gave to the Federal Government only such powers as were contained in the Constitution, and reserved to the States and to the people all other rights or powers. In other words, the Federal Government could do only those things the people authorized it to do. Conversely, in the Old World, where there were socialistic republics instead of our constitutional republic, the matter was just the reverse. All rights were vested in the Government. The people could do only those things that the Government permitted them to do. This difference is the difference in being free or not being free; the difference between citizen and subject. Which system is best is hardly necessary to mention to any American. History has made the answer most abundantly clear. Current events indicate which system is looked to to carry the burdens of the world. Just simply ask or observe who it is that is expected to pay the cost, who puts up the money for our international undertakings. Our system, which is maligned and abused by many so-called peoples democracies, is always there when it comes to paying the cost of our international or cooperative projects among the nations.

I am not indicating that all of this is wrong. I believe there are many things Government can and should do "to promote the general welfare." There is however a right way to do it. There are also many wrong ways to do it. In our eagerness, not our urgency, we are inclined to look so high and so straight at the object that we fail to see many of the curves and pitfalls that exist between us and the object. We run recklessly ahead, our eyes so completely upward, that we can easily stumble and fall.

Many of the projects that we have tried, and many that are now being offered, under the guise of "progress and development," fail to square with that clause "that should be done." Many are not sound, not worthwhile. Their cost far exceeds any possible benefit that can be realized. Some of them, perhaps, the people themselves can do; others the States or local jurisdictions can well handle, even to a better efficiency than the Federal Government. This is true of almost all local projects.

Then I would say a word about our major Federal projects. When we enter a field to develop it; we should have in mind that our purposes are to establish

the project; get it to a point where it will be self-supporting, then release it to independent enterprise. Our nuclear power development is a good case in point. I do not believe we would have this great new power today if the Government had not in large measure, along with private enterprise, carried the major share of the cost of its development. This new power which holds so much promise for the future, even now is a major deterrent to war and indirectly at least is a great factor in our national security. Surely it indicates that Government moving to do for the people those things, which should be done, and which they are unable to do, or to do well, for themselves, is justified. The new era which lies ahead of us due to the development in this field is most promising indeed. It is still a hazardous new area. Again we are pioneers. It is exciting to contemplate. Now Government and private enterprise are partners, working together, as the development stages are being continued.

Once the development stages are ended, however; and the project has proven itself successful and useful, then it is time for Government to yield to independent enterprise. Let the field back to the people. Let independent enterprise take over, and let Government continue to follow its proper course. A good case in point where the Government should now accept the fact that the development stages are over would be our great Tennessee Valley Authority. Surely the years and the hundreds of millions that have been spent in this development of a power project are sufficient to prove it and establish it as a going concern. The growth and development from this venture has been eminently worth while. The power production facilities have been accomplished. The market for the power has also been developed. If the power is sold, and if the facility is economically operated, surely TVA as an independent producer could now stand on its own feet, pay its normal and fair share of taxes to support the Government along with others in its field and be a going independent, American enterprise. This then would be a shining example of what I am talking about. Here would be a case where the Government stepped in and did something, that the people appear to have been unable to do for themselves; something that should be done; something that is worthwhile, now proven to be self-sustaining and a real asset to our economy; and a something once developed, largely at Government expense, now can and will live, function, meet its normal requirements, benefit the citizens, and pay its proportionate share of the cost of Government.

There are those who will disagree. Herein lies the danger of welfare projects. Those whose jobs are now apparently secure; those whose power rates are exceptionally low due to Government subsidy, and others who have a selfish interest will all decry against it. But those who are paying the taxes for the subsidies; those whose taxes might tend to be lower if TVA were paying taxes along with other utility companies; and those in free enterprise that are looking for employment; all of these, will perhaps see the fundamental soundness of this suggestion.

These two enterprises are merely two of the hundreds that are now in being; and which are already proposed. There are thousands yet to come. Surely it is time that we fixed a policy of operation. Let the Government give aid in the development of the projects that give reasonable assurance that they are worth while. Once the project is developed let the Government withdraw and let the project then, having been born and nurtured to maturity, take its place in our free economy along with other enterprises. This seems to me to make sense. This then would get right now, a large number of so-called Government corporations, that are in full operation, with a record of many years, off the budgetary requirements of the Government; off the backs of the taxpayers; upright among other American corporations, doing their worthwhile services and paying their just taxes in support of the Government.

Let it ever be kept in mind: The people support the Government. The Government does not, cannot, support the people.

A Jam in the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before Congress adjourns this session there should be favorable action on the omnibus judgeship bill. In Iowa, as in many other States, we have a logjam of cases crying for decisions. There just are not enough judges to hear all of these cases, and delay piles up on top of delay. Another Federal judgeship for Iowa would certainly go a long way toward easing and eventually eliminating the problem.

An editorial in the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register of August 10 states the problem as it relates to Iowa and I know that this same situation applies to other States as well.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

A JAM IN THE COURTS

The congestion in Federal courts has been a problem for a long time.

In 1955, the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended that Congress pass an omnibus bill creating 21 new judgeships. Not a single one of those judgeships has been provided. The congestion problem in the meantime has grown more acute. Now the need is for at least 50 additional Federal judges.

That need has been established by a scientific method. It is based on statistical studies, district by district, of the handling of all types of criminal and civil cases in Federal courts.

The Judicial Conference, which makes the final recommendations, includes the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the chief judges of the circuit courts, and a judge representing the district courts of each circuit. The Judicial Conference's goal is to get the courts on a basis where an ordinary case can be disposed of within 6 months from the time of filing to trial. But in only 7 of the 94 districts has this goal been reached. The median time for disposing of cases in 1957 was 14.2 months. It took around 47 months to dispose of private civil cases in 1 New York district.

The omnibus judgeship bill now before Congress is one that very definitely should not be forgotten in rush for adjournment.

The obstacles are petty, unworthy ones. They include efforts of Congressmen to get more judges for their own States, regardless of need. Some Congressmen don't want the appointments made by a Republican President and would like to delay action on the bill until after the next election. The major explanation for Congress' failure to act, however, may be that the public hasn't become sufficiently aroused to demand action.

Iowans have a special interest in this bill because it provides for creating an additional judge for this State. The Judicial Conference first recommended a roving judge for Iowa—in addition to the two present judges—in 1953 and has renewed that recommendation at every session of Congress since then.

Iowa has a larger population than any of the other 33 two-judge districts in the country. It has a larger population than 6 States which have 3 judges each and 2 other States which have 4 and 5 judges. The Iowa judges also have to travel extensively. There are six places for holding court in both the northern and southern districts.

Despite the efforts of the two judges—Judge Henry N. Graven for the northern district and Judge Edwin R. Hicklin for the southern district—the congestion problem grows more acute. Both are holding court this August, the traditional vacation period for judges.

Criminal cases get first priority. There is little delay in handling them. The personal injury cases get next priority. The business cases—involving taxes and patents and other complicated matters that require long hearings—are at the bottom of the heap. It becomes a matter of years—not 6 months—before some of them can be disposed of.

The Iowa situation is no different than in other areas of the country where the Judicial Conference has recommended that additional judgeships be created. The congestion is far worse in some districts. It can be remedied by creating more judgeships.

Statement of Walter H. Sammis Submitted to the House Committee on Public Works, 85th Congress, 2d Session, July 29, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a statement made by Mr. Walter H. Sammis, who is president of the Ohio Edison Co.

In my opinion, Mr. Sammis in clear and concise words has expressed the

views of we who believe in free enterprise and in the liberties for which many of us fought. Mr. Sammis made an excellent statement before the Public Woks Committee and I highly recommend the reading of his statement to all of my colleagues in Congress.

His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WALTER H. SAMMIS SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, JULY 29, 1958

My name is Walter H. Sammis. I am president of Ohio Edison Co., an electric utility company with general offices in Akron, Ohio, and president of its subsidiary, Pennsylvania Power Co., with headquarters in New Castle, Pa. I am a past president of the Edison Electric Institute, have served on the board of the National Association of Electric Companies and have been active in industry affairs for more than 30 years. I have been asked by representatives of our industry to submit a statement to your committee.

I appreciate the opportunity of being permitted to express an opinion in opposition to S. 1869 as passed by the Senate last August 9, which would authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of financing additions to its power system. I had the privilege of appearing in opposition to the bill on June 6, 1957, when it was being considered by the Flood Control Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I also had the privilege of appearing before the Flood Control Subcommittee of your committee in opposition to bills containing similar proposals introduced by Representatives CLIFFORD DAVIS (H. R. 4266) and ROBERT E. JONES (H. R. 3236).

I am aware of the fact that since I testified in opposition to S. 1869 it has been amended in certain respects. However, so far as our industry is concerned such amendments do not remove our objections to this bill, and we are just as much opposed to the issuance by TVA of revenue bonds as we were when I testified in May 1957, before your Flood Control Subcommittee.

I realize that the time allowed for these hearings is limited, and that there are other electric utility witnesses who desire to express opposition to S. 1869. Also, inasmuch as my testimony in opposition to TVA's being authorized to issue revenue bonds is a matter of record, I do not wish to unnecessarily consume the time of this committee. Nevertheless, I wish to reaffirm the testimony that I have previously given and dispel any thoughts, if there are any, that the amendments which were made to S. 1869 prior to its passage by the Senate removed our industry's objections to the bill.

The issuance of revenue bonds by TVA as proposed in S. 1869 could complicate and impede, if not permanently bar, the correction of the basic inequities of TVA's existing tax and interest benefits, which are so involved in the economics of TVA's electric operations, and which result in unjust discrimination between electric customers using TVA power and electric customers of investor-owned companies.

Further, the declared intent of the bill as expressed on page 11, line 25, and page 12, lines 1 through 9, which I respectfully suggest deserves your close scrutiny, remains the same, namely, to aid TVA in "discharging its responsibility" to assure an ample supply of electric power in the area in which it conducts its operations. As I stated in the earlier hearings, I know of no constitutional or statutory mandate which requires TVA to assume the responsibility of furnishing present and future power requirements in the area served by TVA. Nor do I believe that the Federal Government should assume such a responsibility as provided in S. 1869. Finally, I do not believe that the Federal Government should engage in any proprietary business, including the electric power business, where taxpaying businesses are willing and able to do the job.

United States Cultural Aid in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Jerusalem Post, Israel's only English language daily newspaper, recently reprinted here in the America-Israel Bulletin. It gives a favorable report of the results of one small part of our mutual security program. The editorial follows:

Since World War II the United States has progressed rapidly toward the realization that generosity is a good policy. From an originally isolationist stand, the United States has developed a system of aid to war-impoverished and backward countries, backed by the realization that too much wealth concentrated in a single country, or even a half continent, will in the end suffocate trade. If the wisdom of this policy needed to be demonstrated, this could not have been more effectively done than by the fact that Soviet Russia has attempted to copy the method, despite far more limited resources at her disposal.

The grants-in-aid are, of course, a one-sided affair. One state grants, and the other is aided, applying for funds with a greater or lesser degree of supervision, as circumstances may dictate, but usually through the normal channels of the government at the receiving end. As a result, the population benefits, but in many cases the individual scarcely recognizes, and certainly fails to appreciate, the source from which his most pressing financial troubles are lightened a little.

In this respect the information mediums guaranty system introduced in Israel by the United States, as in other countries, has been an exception. Nor is it entirely a one-way traffic. Israel is enabled to buy books and other publications from America with Israel currency, which is deposited in favor of the American Government, which pays the publishers in dollars. As an avid book-reading country that now favors English over any other foreign language, Israel piled up a total of IL-7.2m by 1956, or four-fifths of the entire moneys accruing through the I. M. G. funds in all the countries in which the system is operated. It was then decided that the Israel currency should be applied to cultural and scientific progress in Israel, on the overall principle that the projects selected should tend to strengthen Israel-American ties.

Mr. Bernard Katzen, who was then appointed to select the projects that would benefit, has now been here again to see this work being carried out and leaves Israel today with a sense of gratification at what he has witnessed. Nothing would have been easier than to present an alternative list; there are few people who could be found to agree on priorities in matters of culture and teaching.

THE LARGEST GRANT

The largest single grant, of a million-and-a-half pounds, is going to the building of an archaeological museum to house Israel's treasures, which have been almost totally inaccessible to students for lack of exhibition space—a necessary luxury that Israel would not have been able to afford for many years to come. With this go such practical matters as the IL-200,000 grant for the furthering of research in desalting water, in which considerable progress has been made here, and where even a modest success could be of untold benefit to America itself as well as to Israel.

Many of the 44 grants are directly concerned with presenting America to Israel, including the establishment of 5 chairs in American studies at the 5 institutions of higher learning of Israel, and care has been taken that the facilities will reach all sections of the population of Israel including, of course, the minorities.

Many of the projects will have a permanent character, and taken together they may certainly expect to impress themselves much more clearly on the public consciousness than the much greater grants-in-aid to the Government itself.

It is pleasant to consider that their origin lies in the Israelis' own urge to buy and read books and thereby unwittingly contribute to a large and generous scheme.

Danger of Flight From the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of August 13, entitled "Flight From the Dollar":

FLIGHT FROM THE DOLLAR

One of the more puzzling things around Wall Street these days has been the sharp upward march of the stock market in the face of lower earnings, reduced and sometimes omitted dividends. And as brokers, economists, and other commentators seek an explanation, we hear more and more often a very ominous phrase.

A few examples will illustrate many. The E. F. Hutton Co. thinks the rising stock market and declining bond market underscore the flight from the dollar. Reynolds & Co. comments that last week "the flight from the dollar, which has been gathering momentum in recent weeks, turned into a stampede."

The same note is struck across the country. Wayne Hummer & Co. of Chicago observes that the "answer can be that investors have more confidence in the future value of stocks than they have in the dollar's stability." And the market comment of Daniel Reeves & Co. of Beverly Hills is both pointed and poignant: "It is sad but true that few people any longer believe that our currency can ever be worth more in terms of buying power and most likely will ultimately be worth considerably less."

Now admittedly many market comments are not necessarily compendiums of wisdom. Still, brokerage houses are by the nature of their business close to people who are concerned about how to manage their savings for an uncertain future. And when they note, with so much unanimity, such a strong feeling of fear about the dollar then it is surely time to pay attention.

In this instance, too, the feeling is confirmed by the figures on what people are doing. The bond market, including the market for obligations of the United States Government, has been depressed. Plainly the generality of people do not want to

lend money to their Government. They know the Government will pay them back dollar for dollar with interest. What they fear is that they will be paid back with eroded dollars.

Moreover, the economic figures from Washington suggest that the people's fears are not unfounded.

The already huge Government debt is again being lifted; the deficit this year alone will be $12 billion or more. Getting the money for this deficit would be a terrible problem anytime. With a country already inflation-conscious, it is almost an insurmountable problem. The Treasury is very likely to find that it can borrow little, or nothing, from the public savings; it may well have to turn to the Federal Reserve to create all the necessary credit dollars in the banking system. And almost everyone knows nowadays that this is just a fancy way of printing money.

Finally—and this is the saddest part of all—the political facts of Washington suggest that nobody is going to do anything about it. * * * Congressmen talk sorrowfully about the terrible things that inflation does to people, particularly the little people, and casually build the budget bigger.

The basic problem of inflation is not new. But what is suggested by these scattered and independent market reports is that the people may be developing a new attitude toward it. There is a strong suggestion that people generally are beginning to abandon hope that those appointed to manage their Government will halt inflation, an implication that the country may come to accept the rotting of the dollar as being as inevitable as death and taxes.

And that is why we think Washington had better heed the ominous tone in these reports. For though this country has suffered from its past inflations, all those troubles will be as nothing to what we shall have to bear if the people, privately and quietly, once get it into their minds that they can no longer put any trust for the future in the dollars of the United States.

Newsweek Given Correct Information About TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to write Mr. Raymond Moley, the distinguished columnist of Newsweek magazine, in regard to the facts about the TVA and the self-financing bill pending before the Congress. Under unanimous-consent agreement, I insert this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

JULY 28, 1958.

Mr. RAYMOND MOLEY,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MOLEY: Reference is made to your recent comments which appeared in Newsweek magazine—which I have read with interest—concerning the pending bill in the Congress relating to the self-financing bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I know that you would not want to communicate any inaccuracies in your statements to your readers, and while you are correct in some of your facts there are other statements that are subject to an erroneous interpretation and accordingly I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to some of these observations.

1. In the first paragraph of your column you state that the TVA is required to pay a small amount of the investment periodically to the United States Treasury. You later make the correct statement that the TVA is required to repay the full investment in power over a 40-year period.

The facts are that the TVA has repaid into the United States Treasury a total of $240 million from power revenue. This amount is far in excess of the amount required by law to be repaid annually. In other words, the TVA is paying annually into the Treasury, from power revenue, more than the law requires. Most great multipurpose Federal developments, and other Federal projects provide for an amortization payout on a 50-year basis. The TVA act requires full repayment of power investment on a 40-year basis and, as indicated, TVA is far ahead of its schedule, and over a lesser period than for other developments.

2. You indicate lack of payment or failure of payment of interest on the Federal investment. The TVA is owned by the Government and it is not customary for the Government to pay interest to itself. However, the profits of the TVA have amounted to a 4-percent return on the investment; the amount of the payback above indicated, represents more than a 2-percent return on the Government's investment in TVA power facilities.

3. Your statement might give the impression under the Kerr bill that the TVA would be required to pay only a minimum of $10 million annually. The fact is, that under the Kerr self-financing bill, the TVA would be required to pay:

(a) Interest on the net Federal appropriated investment in power facilities equal to the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its total marketable public obligations estimated at more than $30 million annually.

(b) The TVA would also be required each year to either make repayments of the Government's investment to the Treasury from the reserves or to reinvest its annual depreciation reserves in new power facilities—thus further increasing the equity of the Government in its investment—or both.

(c) The bill would require the TVA to pay a minimum of $10 million annually into the Treasury in such repayments of principal and over and above interest. In short, the Kerr bill provides that the Federal Government would receive both interest on its investment, repayment of the investment, and an increase in value of the Government's ownership of this property, all through income from power proceeds.

4. You state that the overall Federal investment in the TVA is $2 billion. The total overall Government investment is less than $2 billion. The investment in power facilities, with which you are concerned, is only $1.4 billion. From this amount please subtract the $240 million which has been returned to the Treasury. This will give a true and more accurate picture of the Federal investment in TVA's power operations.

5. The general impression of your statement is that the Kerr bill is an attempt to free the TVA from control by the Congress. Actually, the TVA makes annual reports to the Congress as do other Government agencies. The TVA submits to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress its annual budget and is constantly before committees of Congress who oversee and supervise the agency, probably closer than other Government agencies are supervised by Congress.

The Kerr bill would continue these budgetary controls provided by the Government Corporation Control Act. In addition, the bill provides that except with the approval of the President during a period of defense emergency, the TVA cannot build new power facilities with bond proceeds until the TVA notifies the President and the Congress of its plans in this area. Following such notice, the Congress may pass a concurrent resolution disapproving any proposed new construction. This is indeed control by Congress.

6. Concerning limitations of power service area: The TVA has never exceeded its territorial limits and is in fact not serving all the territory within its present limits. The Kerr bill specifically defines and limits the area to the counties now served or which lie in or in part within the Tennessee Drainage Basin. The one exception being that the TVA may serve the United States or defense agencies and interconnect with other utility systems for exchange power arrangements.

Please do not overlook and fail to emphasize, Mr. Moley, that more than 50 percent of the power produced by the TVA, goes to defense agencies of the Government, such as the AEC and Army Rocket Research Centers and others. The power costs of the Government are thus enormously reduced.

The navigation and flood-control features of the TVA alone justify its operations. Lives and property have been saved and commerce promoted. In addition, the TVA is a great symbol of democracy in action and the hundreds of visitors, dignitaries, and heads of state from foreign countries interested in this great Government agency's success serves an added purpose of usefulness to the United States.

Let us give all the facts and let us press the positive and affirmative advantages of the TVA. I believe that in view of the above provisions you should agree that the interest of the Federal Government and of the taxpayers is adequately protected.

I hope that you will reconsider your criticisms or give your readers the benefit of the above facts so that they may make a judgment based on the complete facts.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am.

Very sincerely yours,

JOE L. EVINS.

The Anatomy of Discontent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on August 12, 1958:

THE ANATOMY OF DISCONTENT
(By Walter Lippmann)

Last week, speaking as a man who is deeply concerned, Senator FULBRIGHT brought into the open the dismay and anxiety about our foreign policy which are so widespread in this country today. There is, to be sure, no massive popular discontent such as there was, for example, when the Korean war had degenerated into a bloody stalemate. But among the leading minds and spirits of the country there exists a sense of foreboding that much of the postwar structure of our policy is undermined and that we are in grave danger of losing control over our affairs.

It might not take more than one more spectacular entanglement and embarrassment, like the present one in Lebanon and Jordan, to provoke so serious a public reaction that it might be impossible to correct our errors and agree upon a coherent and rational policy. We must, therefore, take a close look at the discontent with our policy in the hope that it will throw light on the problem.

Among the discontented critics of the Eisenhower-Dulles conduct of foreign policy, there are two principal schools of thought. The one holds that we could and should be powerful enough to contain, and some would say to reverse, the revolutionary movements which have their centers in Moscow, Peiping, and Cairo. The complaint of these critics against the administration is that it has starved our military establishment, and that it lacks the courage and resolution to intervene forcibly when, as for example in Iraq, a former ally of the West is submerged by the revolutionary tide.

The other school holds that our foreign policy in the postwar era, though often constructive as in the Marshall plan and NATO, has been in many ways vitiated by a very unsound estimate of the power available to the United States and of the forces at work in the contemporary world. Those of us who take this view believe that, while the United States must work to keep even in the race of armaments, it can never be powerful enough to contain, or to push back, by military force the enormous revolutionary movement of the postwar era. We believe, moreover, that the attempt to contain the revolutions by military force has led us to make a series of commitments which cannot be fulfilled without inordinate and incalculable risk.

Our commitments about the offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu, on the China coast is, so we have been told, deliberately uncertain. But that does not improve it very much. An American defense of these islands is a strategic absurity, and it does not enhance our prestige in the world to say that we may, though we may not, go to war about these islands. Another such commitment was the promise of President Chamoun of Lebanon that we would land Marines if he asked for them. As for the recent London meeting of the remaining Baghdad Pact countries, we are in the sorry position of not knowing what Mr. Dulles has promised to do in a part of the world which is strategically at the end of our reach.

There are, in brief, those who think that our troubles can be cured if we arm more heavily and intervene more readily. And there are those who think that the United States has become overextended, that it has promised to do more things than it can do, and that the way out of our difficulties is to reduce our military commitments in the Far East, and in the Middle East, and to seek accommodations with the revolutionary movements.

This is, like deciding to diet or to live not on credit but on income, a painful thing to do. It is our equivalent in fact of what Britain and France have been going through in accommodating themsleves to the fact that they are no longer the great powers in the world that they were in the 19th century. We are no longer so great a power in the world as we seemed to be in 1945 when Russia had been devastated by the war, China was in the throes of a civil war, the Middle East had not yet risen in revolt, whereas we were intact, wealthy, and invincible.

The period of American supremacy was, as we can now see, a passing phase in human affairs, and our failure to learn to live with this great fact of life, the persistence of the illusion among us of our own supremacy, is almost certainly the root of our miscalculations in foreign policy.

It is the reason why Mr. Dulles has gone around the world promising every nation that would accept the promise an American military guaranty. In this, Mr. Dulles has shown himself to be not a prudent and calculating diplomat but a gambler who is more lavish than any other Secretary of State has ever dreamed of being with promissory notes engaging the blood, the treasure, and the honor of this country. The President who endorses all these promissory notes, is the man who, when they threaten to be cashed in, shrinks from the consequences and pulls back the country and Mr. Dulles from the brink.

It all adds up to the kind of policy which Theodore Roosevelt used to denounce as forcible-feeble. It is forcible in its promises and it is feeble in its deeds. That will not for long satisfy a Nation which respects itself and means to be respected abroad.

The Serious Condition Existing in the Field of Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter I just received from Dr. Pascal F. Lucchesi, executive vice president and medical director of the Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia, Pa., in which he requests that I bring to the attention of the Congress the serious condition existing today in the field of nursing.

Doctor Lucchesi is one of the most outstanding men in the field of medicine today and has made a careful study of this nursing problem.

I sincerely believe his proposal to provide Federal nursing scholarships is excellent and would do much to alleviate this critical condition.

His letter follows:

ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 8, 1958.

Representative WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARRETT: Since the southern division of the Albert Einstein Medical Center and other hospitals are located in your congressional district, I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention the nursing shortage problem.

This shortage reaches to virtually all hospitals in the United States. A few months ago, the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor disclosed that the Nation was short 70,000 trained nurses. If anything, the situation has worsened since then. It is acute in Philadelphia, but this is only one of many cities with a critical nursing shortage.

As you know, many hospitals including the Albert Einstein Medical Center, maintain schools to train nursing students. The schools operate at a financial loss to the institution. At Einstein Center, for instance, the charge to a student for the full 3-year course—including tuition, food, private room, uniforms, and books—is $455. A survey made last year by the center disclosed that it costs us $4,290 per student nurse for the 3 years, including both direct and indirect costs. As you can see, the cost is almost 10 times the charge to the student. We also provide a number of free scholarships.

Thus, you can see that hospitals such as ours are doing their best to supply nurses for the ill persons of the Nation.

However, because of the steadily rising costs in all operations, hospitals have reached the point where we are financially unable to increase our burden in this respect.

It would seem that the time has come for Congress to study this problem and to provide some help. There is more than a moral justification for Congress to step in at this point.

As a matter of fact, the armed services and Veterans' Administration do not train any nurses, but draw heavily on the trainees of the civilian hospitals.

As institutions operated by patriotic Americans, our civilian hospitals are proud to have our trainees enter military service and the Veterans' Administration.

However, I do not believe the shortage and financial problem, as I have outlined it above, is fully recognized. I think if Congress is made aware, it will take steps to provide nursing scholarships, at least to the extent that our graduates go into Government nursing service. This would help to bring more girls into nursing and, thus, to reduce the appalling shortage faced by the Nation.

I am writing as an individual, speaking only for the Albert Einstein Medical Center. But it is a fact that national organizations in the fields of medicine, hospital administration and nursing have all taken cognizance of the shortage and the need.

Anything you can do to bring the facts to the attention of the entire Congress would be most helpful at this time.

Respectfully yours,
PASCAL F. LUCCHESI, M. D.,
Executive Vice President, and Medical Director.

Outlook Shifts for Both Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln appearing in the Washington Star of August 7, entitled "Outlook Shifts for Both Parties."

OUTLOOK SHIFTS FOR BOTH PARTIES

Political leaders and strategists of both Democratic and Republican Parties are taking a new look at the situation and the issues. Election day, November 4, is still almost 3 months way and much can happen in that period—just as it has since the beginning of the year.

Earlier the Democrats were riding high, wide, and handsome. The big issues which they counted on to make big gains in both Houses of Congress and to elect Democratic governors of States have somewhat faded. First there was an uproar over the Russian sputniks. The Democrats claimed the Republican administration had permitted the United States to fall far behind the Soviet Government in the matter of scientific discovery and accomplishment; that this coun-

try was in imminent danger of becoming a second rate power militarily.

But now we have successfully launched four earth satellites of our own. In addition, and most important from a national defense point of view, we have just had remarkable success with an intercontinental missile, designed to hurl a tremendously destructive warhead more than 5,000 miles.

RECESSION MEASURES

Second, according to Democratic prophets earlier, this country was on its way to a depression that would rival that of the early 1930's. All kinds of panaceas, costing billions of dollars, were proposed in Congress.

President Eisenhower and his advisers, however, refused to be stampeded into these huge spending programs. The administration went to work on a saner course. It declined to recommend a reduction in taxes which some of the Democratic economists demanded, too. The economy has taken a distinct turn for the better. And most unexpectedly from the Democratic standpoint, American farm income has gone up and up, until in the first half of this year the net income of agriculture has increased about $3 billion. The Democrats may have to make a new estimate of their party's pulling power in the agricultural States of the Midwest, the East, and South.

Also, earlier in the year, and, indeed, more recently, President Eisenhower's foreign policy was under heavy fire from the Democrats.

They charged that the President was exerting no leadership; that things were at sixes and sevens, and that we had lost both prestige and all our friends, if we had ever had any, abroad. The sudden further development of the Middle East crisis, however, brought prompt and immediate action by President Eisenhower, who ordered the marines into Lebanon. Even after he had taken this necessary step, he was harshly criticized for imprudence which might hurl the world into a third world war. But that, too, has now changed. The Communist nations have taken no steps toward armed conflict, although Khrushchev ordered military maneuvers on the borders of Iran and Turkey, in a further effort to frighten the nations of Europe and the United States. It did not work. The British sent their troops into Jordan.

U. N. SITUATION CHANGES

Now there is strong likelihood of a special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on the Middle East issue, possibly attended by heads of governments. Should such a meeting be attended by a measure of success in settling the Middle East problem, and the world can breathe easier, much of the credit will go to President Eisenhower. And another Democratic issue for the closing campaign will have faded into insignificance.

Since this country became immersed in the Middle East situation, the Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine incident, rated by the Democrats as a first-class issue against the Eisenhower administration and the GOP, has assumed more correct proportions. The House investigating committee has tried desperately to tar Mr. Adams, the President's first assistant at the White House. But it has failed to show any corrupt action, or attempted action by Mr. Adams.

Mr. Goldfine, the Boston industrialist and the giver of many presents to many men, Democrats as well as Republicans, is still under strong attack. However, Mr. Goldfine has testified that he contributed even more liberally to Democratic campaign funds than to Republican.

So far, the Democratic attempt to prove there is a mess in the Eisenhower administration has not progressed. Undoubtedly the House committee will keep at it. Up to date, what it has disclosed is a pale picture as compared to the mess in Washington during the last Democratic administration, when even the head man in the Internal Revenue Bureau was found to have transgressed.

The Republicans, who were down in the dumps—far down—a few months ago have plucked up courage. Democrats are wondering if everything is as rosy as they had believed. Early in 1948 and far into the summer the Democrats seemed in for a terrific defeat at the polls. Things changed in the last few weeks of that campaign. It could happen again.

Public Power Magazine Calls Private Utility Lobbyists Arrogant, Cynical, and Hypocritical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks we have witnessed one of the most massive lobbying attempts of recent years in the effort of the private monopoly utilities to prevent the consideration by this body of the TVA self-financing bill. In this connection and under unanimous consent, I call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial in the August issue of Public Power which cogently and pointedly comments on the arrogance and hypocrisy of this attempt to cripple one of our great agencies and even to prevent debate on a measure which is essential to assure that 5 million of our people will be able to share the economic progress of the entire Nation. The editorial follows:

NEW WAR ON PUBLIC POWER

Reports of the recent Edison Electric Institute convention indicate that the private power companies have declared all-out war on all segments of public power. Speaker after speaker harangued against public power, and one wonders when this so-called statistical and fact-finding organization found time to devote to its avowed loftier purposes.

It took little time after the EEI convention for the power companies to implement their decision to wage allout war against public power. The recent hearings before the House Public Works Committee on the TVA revenue bond financing bill were one of the most arrogant, cynical and hypocritical displays of massive economic (and hence political) power that has been witnessed in Washington for many years. These are strong words, but they are backed up by the facts.

Massive economic power? This is proven by the unparalleled aggregation of utility executives and their allies who jammed the hearing room for this spectacle. A number of veteran observers said that never before in their memory had so many high-ranking power company officials appeared at a single congressional hearing. No less than 25 power company officials and their cohorts requested time to testify. These included presidents of some of the largest power companies in America. It is perhaps significant, too, that in the audience were Edgar H. Dixon, partner in the Dixon-Yates debacle; Edwin Vennard, managing director of the Edison Electric Institute; and top staff members of the National Association of Electric Companies and the electric companies' public information program, the lobbying and propaganda arms, respectively, of the private power industry.

Arrogant? How else could you describe a coal company official's message to a United States Senator that he should not testify in favor of the TVA self-financing bill?

Cynical? This is a mild word to use for the coal industry's opposition to the TVA bill. The coal industry's position is perhaps a classic example of biting the hand that feeds you. TVA is today the biggest single coal customer in the country. Moreover, its leadership in promoting electric house heating has opened up vast new markets for coal through increased use of electricity. Yet, the coal industry argues against a bill that will assure the continued successful operation of its largest customer.

Perhaps the coal industry's position on this bill can be explained more logically by two other factors: First, the fact that the private power companies are the coal industry's biggest class of customers (and power company suppliers have been known in the past to take up the cudgels for their clients); and, second, the fact that TVA's insistence on buying coal through competitive bidding has brought about a yardstick in utility coal-buying practices—a yardstick that has proven uncomfortable to the coal companies but beneficial to those electric utilities which truly want to keep their costs as low as possible.

Hypocritical? For years the private power companies have been saying that TVA should stand on its own feet. But now that TVA has proposed a method by which it will go out in the private bond market for its capital and finance its program through bonds that will not be exempt from Federal taxes, the private power companies appear en masse to attempt to block such a program.

Perhaps even more hypocritical is the sudden defense by some of the opponents of TVA of the appropriations process. To argue now for appropriations comes with poor grace from those who for years have fought TVA appropriations tooth and nail, and who even now would fight bitterly against appropriations for TVA power facilities.

The private utility campaign proves again that the power companies have only one objective: to take every opportunity to strike a death blow against public power, equally on the local and Federal level. And lest one think that these companies may be against Federal power but are tolerant of local public power, we should take note that some of the same companies whose officials testified against the TVA revenue bond plan were at the same time putting the squeeze on municipal systems in their own backyards (witness the case of Ohio Edison against Prospect, Ohio).

It is to the credit of the majority of the members of the House Public Works Committee that they saw through the arguments of the private power companies and approved the revenue bond financing bill, shortly after the close of hearings, by a vote of 19 to 15, and it is hoped that the House will enact this important, constructive legislation, which was approved in the Senate by an overwhelming vote last year, before the adjournment of this session.

Before continuing with such an extravagant campaign of vilification and this massive display of economic power, the more sober-minded utility executives may want to ponder where this course of action will take them. If socialism ever comes to this country, it will be brought in not by so-called public power zealots but by popular disgust with backward-looking, selfish groups whose tactics continually block more moderate programs designed to serve the people of the Nation.

The Danger of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Star of August 7, entitled "Appeasement Leads to Defeat."

APPEASEMENT LEADS TO DEFEAT—DULLES' WARNING AGAINST LETTING SOVIET THREATS WEAKEN US CITED

Sometimes in a few sentences in a public utterance there is epitomized the whole background of a crisis in the world. Secretary of State Dulles, speaking in Brazil this week, said:

"The international situation is critical. Atheistic, materialistic, and aggressive forces that would dominate all the world, talk boldly; they suggest that efforts to halt them will mean nuclear war.

"We do not in fact believe they want war or would invoke war. No sane people want war. War would be for all an inexpressible disaster.

"The question is whether their threats will cause us to weaken and give in and thus sacrifice the genuine independence of nation after nation. That is not the path to peace. It is the road to war."

The foregoing is an eloquent answer to those critics here and abroad who frivolously exclaim that America has no foreign policy.

It is a courageous answer to those who keep on giving the impression that the American people are terrorized and that there is only one thing to do—to make concession after concession to the Soviets and the Red Chinese as well as to their stooges in the Middle East.

Many a so-called plan has been proposed by panicky-minded persons who seem to feel that the alternative to war is just plain surrender. They cloak their proposals in fancy phrases—indeed, they bring out the old cliches about neutralization of certain regions and talk glibly about bold and imaginative ideas for revising American policy. But paths of appeasement lead only to the same goal—defeatism.

For there are only two ways to try to maintain peace in the world. One of them involves military force, and this not always, but sometimes, means war. The other involves moral force, and this—when backed by a unified country and a willingness to use military force if every other effort fails—could succeed in keeping peace.

Some of the critics have derisively called this "brinkmanship." They use the term because Secretary Dulles once endeavored to express the need for courage in foreign policy and said that sometimes it is necessary to go to the brink of war in order to avoid war. He did not mean that he would merely resort to bluff. What he did mean is that, while it is imperative to exhaust every means of making a settlement, no nation which believes in the justness of its cause can avoid going to the very brink of war, itself, if that is necessary to impress its adversary that it is deeply in earnest.

There is a great advantage in applying moral force to the limit. If, for instance, war does come, it is then recognized by the people as the only choice left. Moral force means public discussion, good propaganda, debate in the forum of the United Nations General Assembly or in the press of the world or over the air waves. The theory is that people will control the hand of a government that threatens war. This is logical up to the point where censorship and suppression of ideas by a totalitarian government build an insurmountable barrier to communication between peoples.

Just now America has the most convincing case a nation ever had in the international arena. The United States stands for maintenance of the territorial integrity and political independence of all nations and is willing to supply military might, if necessary, to uphold that principle. For this is the key to peace in the Middle East and in every other area. To condone aggression, direct or indirect, is eventually to invite a world war.

America's record is untarnished. Though engaged victoriously in two world wars to defend its interests, it has not annexed a single foot of territory. When it has landed Marines anywhere, the reason always has been to protect the lives and property of its own citizens. The United States sent military forces to the Middle East last month to accomplish two purposes—to protect American lives there and to help preserve the political independence of a small nation, thus demonstrating to the Communists and their allies that the people and Government of this country are not pacifistic but ready to fight in the future as in the past for a just cause.

The fact that America, itself, may be in military danger unless such a determined stand is taken now is not perhaps generally appreciated. It wasn't widely understood either during the 1930's when it was being said that in the battle between the democracies and fascism the frontiers in the defense of America may be in the Middle East.

The United States has drawn a line in the Far East beyond which it has said the Communist forces must not advance. In an analogous fashion—through the Truman and Eisenhower doctrines—notification has been given that communistic infiltration of free countries in Europe and the Middle East can reach a point where, if necessary, it will be challenged by arms. The hope is that peoples everywhere will perceive the real issue and restrain any dictatorship governments from taking chances in a delicate situation that could break down the peace of the world.

United States in Mortal Danger, Lieutenant General Gavin States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin's book entitled, "War and Peace in the Space Age," with the review written by Mr. Orville Prescott, and which appeared in the New York Times of Monday, August 11, 1958:

"We are in mortal danger." This grim statement is made by a man singularly well qualified to assess the nature and degree of our peril. Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, who retired last March from the Army he loved, felt that he could not speak his mind while under the restraint of its discipline. Now, as an angry, middle-aged ex-soldier, he has spoken it bluntly and passionately in a frightening book that may be one of the important volumes of our time, War and Peace in the Space Age.

General Gavin, who was a brilliant leader of parachute troops in Sicily, Normandy, and Germany in World War II, is no ordinary soldier. An intellectual who likes to quote poets, philosophers, economists, and historians, he has thought long and hard about the Nation's problems of defense in the atomic age—soon to become the space age. General Gavin's opinions are often caustic and violent. His criticisms of the Department of Defense and former Secretary Charles E. Wilson are savage. The department is accused of dilatory and muddled methods of decision making.

DENUNCIATION OF INDECISION

The general observes that the United States is years behind the Soviet Union in missile and satellite development and has only its own folly to thank for the plight. He says that we relied until recently upon manned bombers delivering nuclear bombs as a deterrent to war in an era when manned bombers had been made obsolete by surface-to-air missiles and that we wasted time and money on outmoded weapons and committed many other major mistakes.

He denounces the establishment of a separate Air Force, cuts in military budgets, reductions in military manpower, delay and confusion in launching a thorough missile and satellite program, the decision-making maze of the Defense Department and the pressure of industry for the continued manufacture of obsolete weapons.

Asserting that the lethargic procedures of the Defense Department could delay a decision for years, General Gavin continues: "All of the pleading and urging of those in uniform * * * can be of little avail if the Department of Defense declines to act. Its inability to act stems, in the last analysis, directly from the fact that hundreds of civilians, many of them lacking competence in their assigned field, have now transposed themselves between the senior civilian Secretaries of the services and Congress and the Executive."

The civilian for whom General Gavin has the least regard is Secretary Wilson: "He tended to deal with his Chiefs of Staff as though they were recalcitrant union bosses. The thought struck me a number of times that Walter Reuther, under the circumstances, would have been a more effective Chief of Staff than a professional soldier. As I heard another Chief of Staff say, 'He (Mr. Wilson) was the most uninformed man, and the most determined to remain so, that has ever been Secretary'."

The Soviet Union now has long, medium and shortrange nuclear missiles ready for action. The United States may overcome its lag, General Gavin says, but it will require an all-out effort and he is not certain that we are willing to make the necessary sacrifice. And so for the first time in our history we have field armies deployed overseas confronted with weapons against which they can neither retaliate nor defend themselves.

PREPARATION FOR LIMITED WARS

Although strategic nuclear missile attacks on urban centers may come in world war III, General Gavin believes that limited wars like those in Korea and Indochina are more likely and that they will be fought with tactical missile nuclear weapons. Some of the weapons, he notes, will be small enough to be fired from a man's shoulder. To be prepared for such wars, the general suggests, many new weapons will be necessary: pilotless drone reconnaissance planes, reconnaissance satellites, manned satellites, which he expects by 1965, and antimissile missiles.

Looking a little further ahead, General Gavin predicts the use of satellites as cameras, as communication centers, as weapons and even as antisatellite satellites. His forc-

casts are all dreadful and all convincing. He foresees the day when a United Nations force could control outer space, but suggests that if the United Nations should not undertake to do this we must be able to do so ourselves.

War and Peace in the Space Age is a brutally realistic work based upon one fundamental assumption: that the Soviet Union is at war with the West right now. A limited war probably seems a reasonable risk to the Kremlin, General Gavin reasons, but not a general war. He adds: "If we cannot afford to fight limited wars then we cannot afford to survive, for that is the kind of war we will be confronted with. That is the only kind that we can afford to fight. There is but one way to deal with such a war, and that is by having superior means at hand to respond to the aggression, swiftly and severely." And he contends that we do not have such means now.

In addition to its often rather technical military facts and arguments, this book contains a brief account of General Gavin's youth and Army career and an able analysis of Soviet military theory and capacities.

South Sends an SOS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the August 11, 1958, edition of the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N. C., has a very fine editorial in connection with the efforts that have been made recently to have a farm bill considered in the House.

The Star editorial entitled "South Sends an SOS" points up the fact that it is the textile industry and the farmer who will suffer if the House fails to take action on a farm bill at this session. I believe the editorial will be of interest to every Member of the House, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SOUTH SENDS AN SOS

Members of the House of Representatives will be doing the textile industry and the cotton farmers of the South a grave disservice if they adjourn without passing a new farm bill.

It appears that House Members want to give up on the farm bill because they failed to muster a two-thirds vote to pass it under a suspension of the rules. Speaker SAM RAYBURN has stated that as far as he is concerned farm legislation for this session of Congress is dead.

It's all right with us if Speaker RAYBURN and his fellow Democrats want to be piqued at Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and the Republicans for the opposition which defeated the bill.

But in the process they're cutting off a couple of prominent noses in the South to spite the Republicans' face. We're speaking, of course, of our textile industry and our cotton farming.

Alternative to the passing of a farm bill will be a serious cutback in cotton acreage, already dangerously low. It will mean a further market setback for cotton and strengthening of synthetics competition.

True, acreage reduction will raise the price of cotton (hurting cotton textiles in the process) and one might get the impression that this would help the cotton farmer. But it will actually work against his interests.

Anything which hurts the sale of cotton products hurts the farmer who produces. Furthermore, to leave cotton and rice farmers with overly rigid quotas for next year will hurt the farmers themselves—not Benson and the Republicans.

Lack of a new farm bill would mean a 22-percent cutback in cotton acreage to Cleveland County alone.

Speaker RAYBURN and Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee, need to take the bull by the horns and do battle for their fellow Democrats in North Carolina and elsewhere in the South.

These two House leaders are still free to seek a rule under which the bill could be freely debated and, we hope, passed by majority vote. There is clearly a majority in the House in favor of granting the cotton and rice farmers acreage relief next year.

To throw in the sponge now in the hope that the Republicans will get the blame would be meaningless. House Democrats should forget anger and politics and battle for the farmers who stand to be hurt.

Bring the bill back out. Get it debated and amended as the House desires. Chances are it will pass in some form and could then be reconciled with the Senate version in conference.

But, please, for the sake of the cotton textile industry and our cotton farmers, do not be content to say: "The Republicans did it to you."

It can be undone.

Saline Water Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on August 12, 1958, during the discussion of the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 135—which provides for the construction by the Department of the Interior of 5 demonstration plants for testing and laboratory work and the discovery, if possible, of ways and means to produce water suitable for agricultural, industrial, and domestic use and any other likewise beneficial uses, I was at that moment unable to participate in the debate on the floor of the House, but was graciously extended unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I accept this opportunity to state my wholehearted support of this legislation. I not only congratulate and compliment our committee in bringing this to our attention at this time, but I congratulate them on the apparent thoroughness with which they have produced for our information basic material and factual data upon which it is apparent the committee knows and believes we can rely.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this great legislative body 12 years ago I brought with me a specific and diligent interest in this subject matter. Shortly after my arrival I authorized a bill in this House of Representatives along somewhat the same lines as Senate Joint Resolution 135, and the legislation introduced in this body by the distinguished gentlemen from California: to wit, Messrs. ENGLE, TEAGUE, HOLIFIELD, WILSON, and ROOSEVELT, as well as by Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Being from California as we are, it is quite natural that we should be vigilantly interested and active in cooperation on any worthy program which would help relieve the water problem in my native State of California. Its rapidly growing population; with its expansion of all types of industry, and also with the rapidly extending and demanding agricultural uses of water, it is self-evident that California must have some relief from an on-pressing and tragic result if there is no relief available in the next several years. Additional fresh-water sources and supplies simply must be found. Not only does this statement apply to California but to many other States as well. The water problem is not an individual State problem, it is a nationwide problem. No doubt a sound and wise and extended use of our natural water sources would be of further benefit than they are at present, but even that supply would normally be sharply limited and found inadequate as a source of national supply. Therefore, to find ways and means to economically and practically produce saline water is an essential element and factor for us to give continuous attention to. The $10 million in this legislation involved is but a drop in the bucket. To illustrate, I think my memory is correct in stating that that portion of California commonly known as southern California by itself and alone financed the expenditure of about $220 million to bring fresh potable water from the fairly distant Colorado River in order to supply our reservoirs and to keep on tap this fresh water supply which is absolutely necessary for the survival of humankind, as well as agricultural products.

Having lived for many years on the seashore of the blue Pacific at Long Beach, Calif., I frequently used to dream of the time when it would be found practical to produce from those waves beating themselves on the beautiful seacoast beaches of California potable water available to mankind and beast and agriculture, too.

Members of the committee in charge of this bill have given such a thoroughgoing explanation thereof that I will not speak longer on the subject at this time. I repeat that I cordially support the passage of this bill and urge all Members to do so.

Are We Headed for Dayton, Tenn., Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a sermon delivered last Sunday

at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Chuch, by the Reverend Dr. Ernest T. Campbell, minister of the First Presbyterion Church, of York, Pa.:

ARE WE HEADED FOR DAYTON, TENN., AGAIN?

(By Rev. Dr. Ernest T. Campbell)

Back in the year 1925 the most talked about community in the United States was a small town in northeastern Tennessee. The name of the town was Dayton, a quiet agrarian community, capital of Rhea County, boasting at that time a population of about one thousand. Some have referred to it facetiously as the buckle on the Bible belt.

Dayton was catapulted into fame or notoriety (as you will) by a court trial that pitted the State of Tennessee against one John Scopes. In March of 1925 the State legislature had passed a law forbidding the teaching in public schools of anything which denies the story of the creation of man as taught in the Bible and the teaching instead that man is descended from a lower form of animal. John Scopes, a young schoolteacher, had allegedly broken the law.

The trial was billed as a "to the death" struggle between science and religion. Excitement was whipped to a whitened heat when the news broke that William Jennings Bryan, the peerless orator would be the leading voice of the prosecution, and Clarence Darrow, the wiley, crafty, criminal lawyer from Chicago, the dominant voice of the defense.

The Scopes trial was a sad chapter in the history of American Protestantism. Why sad? Did not the prosecution win? True enough, the State won its case. The trial wore on from July 10 to 21 and climaxed in a verdict of guilty against the defendant. So shaky was the evidence against Scopes, however, that the penalty exacted was nothing more than token, a mere $100 fine. Furthermore, the victory was short-lived. Two years later the State appellate court reviewed the case and reversed the decision.

Why sad? Sad, because in the minds of the general public the position that the State took was assumed to be the Christian position. In fact, the legislature that passed the controversial law reflected the convictions of but a small right-wing minority.

Sad, too, because nothing really vital was at stake. Far from being science versus the Bible, it was science versus one man's interpretation of the Bible. In the 17th century A. D. Bishop Ussher had attempted a chronology of the Scriptures. With the limitations under which he worked, he did an admirable job. He overstepped his cause, however, when he stated flatly that God had created the world in 4004 B. C. Bryan and his colleagues seemed bent on making this date stand up.

There can never be a tension between legitimate science and legitimate religion since God is one and cannot contradict Himself. It is a matter of domain. To science it is given to tell us the when and the how of creation: The Bible tells us Who—"In the beginning God." The creation narratives in Genesis do not have to be taken literally to be taken seriously.

And the Scopes trial was a sad event for us in that it depicted the Christian as a reactionary against truth. Scientists and philosophers alike suffered during the Middle Ages at the hands of a church to whom new modes of thought were heresies. We had come to expect something nobler from descendants of the Reformation. Where had freedom of inquiry gone?

The play, Inherit the Wind is based on the drama that unfolded in the Dayton courtroom. Toward the end of the first scene in the second act Brady (Bryan) and Drummond (Darrow) meet alone where tomorrow the trial will begin. Brady says with genuine warmth, "We were such good friends once. I was always glad of your support. What happened between us? Why is it, my old friend, that you have moved so far away from me?" Drummond's reply is perceptive, "All motion is relative. Perhaps it is you who have moved away by standing still."

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth.
They must ever up and onwards
Who would keep abreast of truths".

The Scopes trial was a sad chapter in the history of American Protestantism. Better that it never should have happened. But why bring it up today? We do so because of signs abroad that we are headed for Dayton, Tenn., again. In 1925 science was made the whipping boy for all that was unholy. In some circles of Christian thought today science is again being blamed for the woes of humanity. Reactionaries are with us still.

Science, of course, has worked some profound changes in the life of every one of us. We do not communicate or travel as we used to. Our health is protected by new and superior methods. Our military defenses are different from those that our fathers raised. The atom has yielded up its power. The privacy of outer space has been pierced. And the end is not yet.

How should a Christian respond to such an hour? There is, I feel, a right way and a wrong way. The wrong way is one of childish condemnation. A radio preacher whom I chanced to hear recently revealed his mental poverty when he said, "Man is overreaching himself by attempting to travel in outer space. Had God wanted man to venture into these yonder regions, he would have equipped him for the experience." The speaker went on to affirm his belief that only when the Christian is clothed upon with a resurrection body will interplanetary travel be possible.

This view, I contend, is puerility of the simplest kind. Finless, we have learned to negotiate the ocean depths. Wingless, we have learned to fly through the air. Outer space could well be the next to fall.

Such obscurantism denies the God-given faculty of curiosity. Pat Miller of Life magazine asked Albert Einstein if he would give his son, William, a word of advice before the young man went to college. The incomparable physicist replied, "Young man, never lose a holy curiosity." Holy, because God gives it. The truths of the universe do not lie on the surface where the indifferent may gather them. They are buried deep (or high) to tease and whet and challenge our curiosity.

The early chapters of Genesis reveal that God who engineered this universe enjoined upon man two responsibilities: To dominate the earth, and give names to every living thing. Science to this day continues to subdue the earth for man's good and classify the data that research has uncovered. No discipline can be faulted for following a divine directive.

I suspect that the protesting radio preacher was just fed up with change. How much more comfortable to stay as we are. It is not easy to adjust to changes that come in torrents. The boys at Annapolis say of the new submarines that they come up only often enough to allow the crew to reenlist. In this age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, Russia is but 18 minutes away from the United States. Such developments leave us breathless. But we can no more hold back the tides of progress than we can the tides of the sea.

There is a response more worthy of a Christian. Such a response would include three steps. First, we should not let ourselves or our generation forget that science is not total, but partial. It is not the be all or end all of life. While it can work wonders, there is much that it cannot do. It labors under some severe limitations.

Science can build a gorgeous house, but science cannot make that house a home. Science can give us fabulous schools complete to the latest appointments, but science cannot make scholars of the pupils that attend. Science can hold before us the promise of increased longevity, but science cannot tell a discouraged soul why he should want to live longer. Science can deal with the symptoms of my guilt, but science cannot reach in and down to remove the rooted cause.

There is more to life than science, another side. It is heartening to remember that M. I. T., the mecca of all technological studies, has a dean of humanities. Life has its goals, its purposes, its nobility, its poetry, its music, its immeasurables, and its God.

Secondly, we should never forget that it is God's world that is being explored. I understand that a quiet tension has existed for some years between the pure scientist and the applied, between the man who labors in unspectacular research and the man who converts the gains of science into marketable conveniences. Back in 1879 Professor Rowland, of Johns Hopkins University, said in an address to his fellow physicists: "He who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before, is the benefactor of mankind; but he who obscurely worked to find the laws of such growth is the intellectual superior as well as the greater benefactor of the two." And the Christian goes on to affirm that the God who invested the universe with such discoverable laws and energies is infinitely greater than both.

J. B. Phillips in one of his books proposes a test that a friend of mine who is president of a midwestern university tried out. He visited a classroom of seniors and asked the question, "Does God understand radar?" With but one or two exceptions, the answer was "No." How can we be so naive. The creation cannot outgrow its creator. Call the planets by name or by number, the whole incredible host, and the Christian accounts for them each one as part of the all things made by Him without whom nothing was made. He's got the whole world—the exposive expansive, ever-changing, volatile world—He's got the whole world in His hands.

Finally, we should meet the hour in which we live with a renewed determination to be more fully Christian than we have ever been before. The pity of our age is not that the scientist has been too scientific, but that we Christians have not been Christian enough. There is a truth that our generation needs to hear from our lips, and an attitude that it yearns to see alive in us.

The truth is that men can be renewed into the likeness of their God. It is man's destiny to be over nature and under God. We have majored in the first and forgotten the second. Consequently, human nature—and not science—is the real culprit. Men are not what they ought to be because they are not God's.

It is ours to tell the world of Christ who makes a specialty of transforming men and women and bringing them back to God. This is good news for dark days, that the liar can become honest, the miser generous, the self-seeking self-giving, the drunkard sober, the proud humble, and the crooked straight.

And the attitude that our fellows yearn to see in us is one of compassionate care and understanding. Science is so impersonal. It cares for no man as such. Busily it charts trends, computes averages, and conducts research in cold, antiseptic objectivity. But people are still people, and they need to be wanted and loved. Many are lost for want of the touch of a hand made warm by Christ. Scientific advances will never render such concern obsolete.

Alexander Irvine has given us a memorable picture of his mother in the book, My Lady of the Chimney Corner. Born to poverty she makes a Christian home of a sparse

cottage in a fishing village in Ireland's County Antrim. Her favorite chair is a rocker by the hearth. To this chair her townsfolk come in time of need.

On one occasion a neighbor lady, Elizabeth, lost her grown son in an accident at sea. With her heart to the point of breaking she goes instinctively to Anna. Anna tells her to kneel by the bed and pray for comfort. This done, the woman asks, "And what shall I say to Him now?" "Ask Him to lay His hand upon your head in blessing." Elizabeth doubts that God would go so far for her, but she prays. And as she does, Anna lays her hand on the sobbing woman's head. Elizabeth rises to her feet, a new light in her face. "What was it like?" Anna asks. "Why it was soft and gentle like the fall of a leaf in autumn. And, Anna, it felt just like your hand."

Anna replies, "The hand was mine but it was God's too. God takes a han' wherever He can find it, an' jist dizs what He likes wi' it. Sometimes He takes a bishop's hand, an' lays it on a child's head in benediction; then He takes the han' of a docther t' relieve pain, th' han' of a mother t' guide her child, an' sometimes He takes the han' of an auld craither like me t' give a bit of comfort to a neighbor. But they're all han's touch't by His spirit, and His spirit is everywhere lukin for han's to use."

Does He have the promise of your hands in this grand and awful hour?

The New York Times Inspired Cuban Unrest and Interference in Cuba's Internal Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I again warn that the New York Times, and others who are knowingly or naively unknowingly part and parcel of the Communist line in this country are propagandizing to upset our friendly relations with legally established governments in the Caribbean, causing international complications, and harming our defense plans in that area.

Appearing in a wirephoto of the Associated Press is Fidel Castro's brother, who kidnaped some 50 United States servicemen and citizens, together with his chief lieutenant, Argentine National Ernesto Guevara, known as Che Guevara. The Time magazine in a previous special interview with Fidel Castro admitted this Che Guevara was a Communist follower.

Has the New York Times ever disapproved of the kidnaping of United States servicemen and citizens? Does the New York Times forget that kidnaping in the United States is a Federal offense punishable by death? Is not the dual editorial policy of the New York Times piling problems upon the United States Armed Forces responsible for the defense of the Caribbean? Is not the New York Times willingly or unwittingly conforming to the policy of Russia to create strife, diversions, and distractions to United States military commanders, in this very important part of our hemispheric defense of the Caribbean and the Americas?

Mr. Franz Pick, editor of Pick's World Currency Report, of New York, has this to say:

Cuban peso. The Banco Nacional de Cuba has once more conserved the value of the peso. Cuban bank note circulation has increased only 4 percent and is covered by 91 percent in gold and dollars. Cuba's debts are rather small: They amount to about 860 million pesos, or 136 pesos per capita. Cuba's national income of about 2 billion pesos, or 312 pesos per capita, is the highest in Latin America.

The peso is at par with the American dollar. Does the New York Times wish to wreck such a record as it tried to do by its propaganda during Castro's war of nerves and shootings in April 1958, when a run on the Cuban banks was stopped by the strong financial position and resources of Cuba's equivalent to our Federal Reserve System, the Banco Nacional de Cuba?

Will the New York Times ever realize that if orderly processes of government in Cuba are upset, the United States then would have great trouble appeasing 6 million Cubans thrown into turmoil by the results of the Times' propaganda campaign, producing unrest, trouble, and anarchical conditions in the Caribbean, to the heart's content of Russia and her Communist and pinko sympathizers?

Will the New York Times realize that Cuba is one of the few nations that do not come to us with hands extended for loans and giveaway funds because Cuba has a self-sustaining government?

The New York Times, a rabid fan of Fidel Castro, and some of those Castro fans at the State Department who follow its line of thinking are not playing only with propaganda, interests and diplomacy but are playing dangerously with fire and by lack of foresight aiding Russia's aims to establish a bridgehead in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I shall insert an editorial from one of America's great newspapers, the Charleston News and Courier, under date of August 3, 1958, exposing the part of the New York Times in this unwarranted and persistent attack on a friendly government and people and on the purposes of United States defense in the Caribbean:

[From the News and Courier, Charleston (S. C.) Sunday, August 3, 1958]

UNITED STATES YIELDING TO CUBAN REBEL DEMAND SMACKS OF INFORMAL RECOGNITION

In reporting the removal of United States marines from an outpost in Cuba, the Associated Press said the action was designed to correct a touchy diplomatic situation.

The marines, 6 or 8 of them at a time, were sent at the request of the Cuban Government to protect the waterworks which serves the United States Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay. The waterworks are situated in the area where Fidel Castro's rebels operate. The rebels said assignment of the marines guard was an "invasion of the sovereign territory of Cuba."

The withdrawal of the marines in response to Castro's objections raises a question whether the State Department has given diplomatic recognition to the rebels.

As far as we know, the State Department itself has not used the term "diplomacy" in connection with its dealings with Castro. Nevertheless, it appears that the AP has recognized the Department's actions as a kind ordinarily reserved for dealings with legally recognized regimes.

The State Department has not indentified the channels through which it maintains communication with the rebels. Judging from the speed with which Castro followers are able to make themselves heard in Washington, it seems possible that they have some sort of secret ambassador in this country.

The rebels, of course, have well-known friends on the mainland. To put it another way, President Batista has enemies who have allied themselves with the rebels.

Among his enemies is the New York Times, a newspaper whose influence in some parts of Washington is conceded. When dispatch of the Marines to the waterworks was first announced, the Times said that Castro's word of honor not to permit his men to bomb the waterworks should be accepted as protection in place of the Marines. Long after the Times editorial was written—long enough for a copy to have reached the hills of Oriente Province—the rebel protest was announced.

Is the Times a secret ambassador for Castro in Washington?

If such is the case, that will explain why the Times denies the right of the United States to protect its interests in Cuba while supporting the same right in Lebanon.

The Marines have the same right to guard the waterworks that serves Guantanamo Bay that they have to occupy Beirut. In both cases they were invited in by friendly governments in trouble with rebels. It makes no more sense to pull guards away from the waterworks to please Castro than it would to pull United States troops out of Lebanon to satisfy the Lebanese rebels.

If the State Department has recognized another government in Cuba beside the one with headquarters in the Capitol at Havana, it should come out and say so.

Unity in Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, military analyst for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an interesting and provocative editorial of August 12, 1958, raises some questions concerning the adequacy of our military service schools to produce a sufficient number of properly qualified officers to serve as staff of unified commands, for duty in the Defense Department and with the Joint Staff, for joint military missions and military assistance advisory groups in foreign countries, and for technical liaison at installations of the other services, such as the missile ranges at Cape Canaveral and White Sands, N. Mex.

General Phillips points out that unification in the Armed Forces is more a matter of spirit and attitude than of organization.

He further points out that no individual or group at the Department of Defense level or in the Joint Staff has

any defined responsibility for planning interservice education and experience.

General Phillips takes a major premise from a statement made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur that "if the boys fight together, they must be trained together, and the training should begin at the earliest time." And that real unity in operations is impossible without unity of training at the early stages before the officers' minds are set.

He also states that a competent authority estimates "that requirements for officers qualified for joint staff and command duty have multiplied 20 times since the end of the last war. He maintains that interservice education at the upper level is able to supply only a small percentage of officers needed with adequate training for joint staff and command duty." General Phillips states, "the total gaining such experience and education is thus about 1 percent of the officers in the armed services."

Mr. Speaker, this is a subject of vital importance to the Nation and it is deserving of study. The educational process should equip individuals to take their places in society in their chosen fields. Does the present military service training setup adequately equip its graduates to do their work in unified commands and in other situations where unity in spirit is a prerequisite? General Phillips' editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, August 12, 1958]

MILITARY UNIFICATION APPROVED, BUT PENTAGON MAKES NO PLANS FOR INTERSERVICE EDUCATION—INQUIRY DISCLOSES THAT NO INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP HAS DEFINED RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT MANY CONSIDER MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT OF UNIFIED DEFENSES

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired))

WASHINGTON.—Unification in the Armed Forces is more a matter of spirit and attitude than of organization.

Investigation in the Pentagon reveals that no individual or group at the Department of Defense level or in the Joint Staff has any defined responsibility for planning interservice education and experience.

Steps to improve the receptivity of officers to unification and to break down the parochial loyalties to one service and lack of understanding of other services are considered essential before unification becomes a fact.

No one disagrees with the President's statement that "separate ground, sea, and air warfare is gone forever," and that "peacetime preparatory and organizational activity must conform to this fact."

Few will disagree with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's testimony before the Congress that "if the boys fight together, they must be trained together, and the training should begin at the earliest possible time."

While the President has received from the Congress the legislative authority to reorganize the Defense Department, no new attention has been given in the Pentagon to the more important problem of increasing the acquaintance of all officers with those of the other services, nor of expanding interservice education and training.

TWO MAIN ASPECTS

The problem can be broken down into two main aspects:

1. To acquaint cadets and young officers with their contemporaries in the other services and to give them a basic understanding of the other services' traditions, missions, weapons, methods, capabilities, and limitations; and

2. To give joint training to officers, after they have become thoroughly grounded in the techniques of their own service—estimated to require 10 or 12 years—to fit them for duty on the staff of unified commands, for duty in the Defense Department and with the joint staff, for joint military missions and military assistance advisory groups in foreign countries, and for technical liaison at installations of the other services, such as the missile ranges at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and White Sands, N. Mex.

These are problems that require no legislation. Arranging for cross-service education and experience can be done entirely within the adminstrative authority of the Defense Department. Many believe that this aspect of unification is far more important than any organizational framework. Nevertheless it has been almost entirely neglected.

Oddly enough, the greatest effort has been made where it is precisely the most difficult to find the necessary time—for the cadets in the United States Military and Naval Academies. These institutions are primarily engaged in giving basic education at the undergraduate level. Military training and education must be imposed on top of an arduous college course.

THREE-WAY APPROACH

The Military and Naval Academies have met the need for interservice acquaintance and understanding in three ways:

1. Near the end of the third year all the cadets spend a weekend, from Thursday afternoon to Sunday afternoon, exchanging places with a cadet from the other Academy. Every cadet has this experience—he sleeps in the other man's dormitory, he attends his classes and he participates in his place in his opposite number's social activities.

2. In the summer or late spring of their third year all the cadets visit installations of the other service.

3. The two Academies hold joint maneuvers for all the cadets who have finished their third year, in the summer between the third and fourth years.

Discussions were initiated in April by the commandants of Military and Naval Academies with the commandants of the Air Force Academy and the Coast Guard Academy to extend their program to cover all four academies.

At present 25 percent of the graduates of the Military and Naval Academies are commissioned in the Air Force. After the Air Force Academy starts graduating officers an optional 12½ percent will be authorized to transfer to another service on graduation.

The Academy program has been highly successful and the cadets approve it enthusiastically. But only a small percentage of the officers in the Armed Forces are graduates from military academies.

OTHERS NEGLECTED

Little, or nothing, is programed to carry on the excellent Academy acquaintance, experience, and cross-service education program until an officer has had 15 or 20 years of service, at which time he becomes eligible for joint training at senior service schools.

By this time many of them have developed a narrow one-service loyalty and education, and joint staff work comes too late to change the parochialism of many.

A majority of military officials with whom the Post-Dispatch has discussed the problem of cross-service acquaintance and experience for junior officers agree, as a generalization, that it would be a good thing. But they also agree that administratively the solution is very difficult.

There are many who feel that too much time is already spent in service schools by officers. They look with horror on the idea of taking a young officer away from his job for a few months for service with another component of the Armed Forces for acquaintance and experience.

It would be difficult to place several thousand young Army and Air Force officers annually with the Navy for temporary duty on ships for example—hard to do without them in many units, and very difficult for the Navy to accommodate them on ships.

EXCHANGE IS FEASIBLE

Nevertheless, such an exchange for a brief period is feasible. What is needed, and is lacking, is a wider appreciation at the highest levels in the Pentagon that such action is essential if real unification is to come about in less than a generation. (It took the generation between World War I and World War II for the Army to unify itself.)

For senior officers, although for many it is too late for the education to take, more opportunity for joint education and joint duty is available. At the Army's Command and General Staff College and the Air Force's Air Staff College (the Navy has no equivalent school), there are instructors from the other services to give courses on their services.

Unfortunately, many officers are not enthusiastic about this duty and shun it, so that often the most able officers, who should be given such assignments, are just the ones who avoid them.

These schools have a small quota of students, 12 from each of the other services. Army officers take such assignments avidly, but the Navy and Air Force have difficulty filling their quotas.

At the senior service colleges, the Army, Navy, and Air Force War Colleges, the annual quota from the other services is 10 each.

There are three joint senior service schools: The National War College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. The Armed Forces Staff College has two 5-month courses annually with 378 students divided equally among the services.

OTHER COLLEGE QUOTAS

The National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces conduct courses of 10 months and take 99 and 120 students, respectively, annually from the three services.

Thus cross-service education in the military service school system is being given to about 660 officers annually out of a total of more than 260,000 officers.

It is estimated that about 2,000 other officers are on joint duty in the Pentagon, unified commands, military missions, and military assistance advisory groups. The total gaining such experience and education is thus about 1 percent of the officers in the armed services.

One competent authority estimates that requirements for officers qualified for joint staff and command duty have multiplied 20 times since the end of the last war. He maintains that interservice education at the upper level is able to supply only a small percentage of officers needed with adequate training for joint staff and command duty.

His solution for a minimum start is to double the capacity of the Armed Forces Staff College. The facilities are not available and would require appropriations.

There are some easy and simple ways of getting officers of the separate services to work together. These are not large in scope, but still useful. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and the State Department all conduct separate language schools. These could be combined in one with great advantage in instruction and economy. The students from the three services would have a year of close association with their brother officers of the other services.

PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

The same combination can be made in separate service information schools, intelli-

gence schools, counter-intelligence schools, military police training schools, and the like. The number is legion.

The Gerow Board in 1946 recommended the establishment of a joint national security university with five coordinate colleges: administrative college; intelligence college, national war college; industrial college; and State Department college. The requirements today for joint education parallel those at the time of this report, except that they are much more urgent. No positive action was taken on the recommendations.

Many experts believe that the whole subject urgently requires attention. However, few in the Pentagon are concerned about it. But, there is a definite body of opinion that unification will continue to drag, regardless of changes in organization, until a majority of officers are able to get cross-service acquaintance, experience and education.

The Bang-Jensen Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, following up a previous insertion in the RECORD on the case of Mr. Bang-Jensen, I wish to include hereunder another article from the Brooklyn Tablet under date of July 26, 1958, which I think is important to all of us Members, and I think the people would be interested to know what has happened in this shocking case.

The article follows:

DETAILS CRASH PROGRAM TO GET MR. BANG-JENSEN—CHARACTER ASSASSINATION AND FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS CITED—TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE—MEANWHILE ATTEMPTS IN U. N. TO SABOTAGE ANTI-RED REPORT GO UNPUNISHED

(By Don Zirkel)

The Bang-Jensen story is understandable only if one is aware first, that there are Communists in the United Nations whose loyalty is not to the international organization but to the international conspiracy; and second, that Mr. Povl Bang-Jensen is an intelligent, dedicated and resourceful anti-Communist and for that reason must be destroyed.

It was the good fortune of the free world to have Mr. Bang-Jensen appointed in January, 1957, as deputy secretary of the U. N. committee to investigate the Russian aggression which followed the Hungarian anti-Communist revolution of 1956.

SABOTAGING THE REPORT

The Reds' job, naturally, was to sabotage and smear the committee's investigation, its report and its authors, particularly Mr. Bang-Jensen. This is the story of their efforts.

William Jordan was named secretary of the committee but according to Mr. Bang-Jensen "whatever instructions Mr. Jordan had, it soon became obvious that he carried them out in such a way that it (the report) would be full of errors, many of such a nature that it would be easy to make it an object of ridicule for anyone who wanted to undermine confidence in its conclusions." Obviously the Communists wanted to undermine confidence in its conclusions.

Among the examples of Mr. Jordan's affinity for error is the statement that Imre Nagy was Prime Minister of Hungary for the first time in 1946–47 (the Prime Minister at that time was Ferenc Nagy, who is currently living in exile in the United States).

"After long argumentation," Mr. Bang-Jensen asserts, "Mr. Jordan agreed to delete the incorrect sentence; a day later I found, however, that he had not done so. When I again took up the matter, he refused to make the deletion before the rapporteur (the official assigned to draft the report) had seen the draft. However, after prolonged discussion, he promised that he would call the error to the rapporteur's attention.

"When the draft came back from the rapporteur, the error had not been corrected. Mr. Jordan first claimed that he had pointed the error out to the rapporteur; when I expressed doubt that he had done this since it had not been corrected, he admitted he had not but declared as follows:

" 'When the rapporteur has approved a draft and it states that Imre Nagy was Prime Minister in 1946, then as far as I am concerned, Imre Nagy was Prime Minister in 1946.' "

ATTEMPTED SUPPRESSION

Mr. Bang-Jensen pointed out many other errors and omissions in the report. Perhaps one more will suffice here because it concerns the central point in the committee's investigation: whether the intervention by Soviet military forces November 4, 1956, took place upon the request of the legal Hungarian Government.

While the report was being drafted, the secretariat came in possession of the full text of an address given by President Istvan Dobi of Hungary May 9, 1957.

Mr. Bang-Jensen reports that "Mr. Jordan, in spite of many arguments, refused to inform the members of the committee that Mr. Dobi in this official address to the Hungarian National Assembly had admitted that:

"* * * On November 3, Janos Kadar asked for the help of Soviet troops and, on November 4, as the constitutionally appointed premier of the country, began his wise and purposeful work * * *.

" 'As it had become obvious that the activity of Imre Nagy and his government had endangered the state and social order of the Hungarian People's Republic, the presidential council of the Hungarian People's Republic on November 4 withdrew its confidence from the government of Imre Nagy * * *.' "

Thus Kadar's request for foreign troops took place prior to his appointment, while Imre Nagy was recognized as the legitimate Prime Minister.

Mr. Bang-Jensen reports that "Mr. Jordan, after some arguments, finally sent a copy of this long address to the members of the committee together with many other papers during one of the last meetings of the committee, but he maintained that the Secretariat was not obliged nor permitted, to draw the particular passages in Mr. Dobi's address to the attention of the members."

The ousted Danish official explains the significance of this: It was not possible for any member of the Secretariat to master more than a part of the facts because there were 2,000 pages of oral testimony plus laws and regulations, Hungarian newspapers, transcribed broadcasts, photostats of important documents, many memorandums about special problems, etc.

"The committee had to trust that the Secretariat, as it could reasonably expect, would direct attention to it if important facts of interest to the commitee's investigation were found in the huge mass of material," Mr. Bang-Jensen says.

How could the members of the committee find errors, he asks, "if the Secretariat kept silent about them, as Mr. Jordan frequently did?"

Another of Mr. Bang-Jensen's attempts to correct the report was a memorandum to Mr. V. Duckworth-Barker, press officer of the committee:

"Mr. Duckworth-Barker asked me to do him the favor of dictating a memorandum about the errors instead of telling him orally so that he, with explanation and suggestions in writing, could make his corrections more quickly. I did so and went to lunch while the memorandum, which was addressed on the top to Mr. Duckworth-Barker, was being typed by a secretary.

"When I returned, I was told that just as the secretary was finished typing it, Mr. Jordan had come and taken the memorandum and the copies from her. I went to Mr. Jordan; he refused to give it back to me or to give it to Mr. Duckworth-Barker. He also refused to give any reasons. Nor was he willing to discuss the errors of facts."

Many similar examples could be given but space does not permit. We are merely trying to establish the background for the next phase, the punishment of Mr. Bang-Jensen for his role in salvaging the committee report and translating it from a comedy of errors into one of the most magnificent documents turned out to date by the United Nations.

Many serious errors were eventually corrected but "on the day the report was finally adopted by the committee, Mr. Jordan told a colleague that it was not worth the paper it was written on and should be thrown in the East River."

THE ATTACKS BEGIN

On June 4, 1957, Mr. Bang-Jensen called some examples of sabotage to the attention of United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold and his executive assistant, Andrew Cordier, an American. Three days later, Mr. Hammarskjold indicated in a short handwritten note that he would like to discuss the matter. That discussion has still not taken place.

Instead (now notice the Communist pattern) when Mr. Bang-Jensen reported new examples of sabotage one of the Under Secretaries threatened him "with disciplinary action and dismissal if I continued, by which he apparently meant bringing new examples of sabotage to your attention; he called me repeatedly a vilifier and accused me of making 'wild allegations,' while at the same time he refused to look at the evidence I offered him. 'It would be ridiculous to spend even 5 minutes to look at it,' he told me."

On August 26, Mr. Bang-Jensen was suddenly, without explanation, relieved of his duties as deputy secretary of the Committee on Hungary.

On December 4, the Secretary General established the so-called gross group in circumvention of the staff rules, according to Mr. Bang-Jensen, who charges it "has usurped the advisory functions of the Disciplinary Committee and the Joint Appeals Board."

SECRET CHARGES

The Gross group was composed of Constantin Stavropoulos, Philippe de Seynes, and a so-called independent outsider, Ernest A. Gross, an American.

Mr. Bang-Jensen asserts: "Though the latter acted in his professional capacity as a lawyer, for an unknown fee, the public was given the carefully cultivated impression that the United States Government, through Mr. Gross, was participating unofficially in the investigation; it was pointed out in United Nations press releases that Mr. Gross was a former Assistant Secretary of State and former Deputy Representative of the United States to the United Nations."

The Gross group invited the appellant to appear December 13 and 16 and to bring relevant documentation. The meaning of the term relevant was uncertain since Mr. Bang-Jensen did not know the charges against him; besides he did not have access to his documents in his office in the U. N.

building, from which he was accompanied by two guards December 4 and instructed not to come back.

During those two meetings, the administration promised to produce certain essential, nonconfidential documents; however, they have not been made available to this day.

He was permitted no counsel during those two interviews and after he protested meeting again without his counsel, he was not invited to return.

The transcript of the December 13 and 16 meetings, which he obtained only upon repeated requests "proved in some cases to report the contrary of what he said; many of his answers as transcribed were so garbled that they did not make sense; others were marked inaudible; altogether 231 of his answers were so incorrectly reported that the transcript was beyond correction."

On December 21, the Gross group suddenly turned itself into a committee to investigate Mr. Bang-Jensen's conduct and released its preliminary findings to the press without notifying the appellant; on January 15 it similarly released another interim report.

On the following day, Mr. Bang-Jensen and his counsel charged the report contained several indisputable errors of fact and several new allegations; but the Gross group refused them the opportunity to submit an answer although it did not present its final report to the Secretary General until February 8.

DENIED RIGHT TO COUNSEL

Informed that the Gross report was being submitted to the Joint Disciplinary Committee, Mr. Bang-Jensen on March 4, again requested the right to be represented by independent legal counsel and to have made available the necessary documents.

Although the U. N. had used independent counsel (Mr. Gross), it refused the same right to Mr. Bang-Jensen and offered a staff lawyer, who, according to Mr. Bang-Jensen, "would be placed in a most embarrassing position in relation to high secretariat officials."

After actions by the staff lawyer which made one doubt whose side he was on, he was fired by Mr. Bang-Jensen but continued to try to represent him.

On April 9 the committee announced that it would accept a statement from Mr. Bang-Jensen up to April 21, although the promised documents had not yet been provided.

On April 15 the committee reaffirmed its April 21 deadline and 4 days later Mr. Bang-Jensen appealed "for the Secretary General's personal protection against violations of due process and fundamental human rights" and took the first step in an appeal to the Joint Appeals Board.

On April 21, Mr. Hammarskjold refused "to intervene in or countermand any decision by the committee," although the charges had not yet been properly referred to the committee under staff rule 110.1 and the committee had not been properly constituted and convened by the Secretary General, under rule 110.5.

On May 27, the appellant was informed by the Secretary General's representative, Francis Green, that the case would rest in the Disciplinary Committee until final disposition of the appeal.

Nevertheless the committee proceeded in secret and on June 5 recommended that Mr. Bang-Jensen be fired. On July 3, he was.

He has been dismissed, he suggests, "in the hope that the appellant, when off the payroll, would not have the necessary financial means and the energy to carry the case through to the Appeals Board and the United Nations Tribunal and then, as others before him, would be willing to accept an offer of termination indemnity plus 3 month's salary."

RIGHT TO RELEVANT DOCUMENTS?

But he intends to appeal to the U. N. tribunal in the fall on the basis that "a defendant is entitled to have access to the relevant material necessary for his defense and to the testimony and all documentary material on which grave charges against him are based."

The Secretary General and his aids have not claimed that a single one of the 87 documents requested is secret or irrelevant.

Can there be any other credible answer for the refusal to provide them, Mr. Bang-Jensen asks, "than that the requested documents are much too relevant for the comfort of the administration?"

He claims that some of the documents referred to by the administration do not and never have existed and that some of them state something quite different from what they are reported as saying. It would seem reasonable to expect, if the appellant is in error, that the administration would remove the shadow of guilt over it and release the documents.

Mr. Bang-Jensen claims that Mr. Cordier's failure to produce the documents might be partly due to the fact that several of them will prove very embarrassing to Mr. Cordier himself. It would seem reasonable to expect, if the appellant is in error, that Mr. Cordier would be eager to remove himself from suspicion.

One of the most mysterious angles to the situation is the United Nations refusal to produce the testimony in clear violation of its own high-sounding Draft Convention on Human Rights.

Meanwhile, the Communists are apparently achieving their aim of discrediting the report by having the U. N. discredit its author.

The campaign of vilification includes stories placed in circulation that he was mentally unbalanced, an alcoholic, a psychopathic troublemaker, a McCarthyite, etc.

TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

Besides the character assassination, Mr. Bang-Jensen is the victim of framed-up charges which were railroaded through an illegitimate committee and rubberstamped by an illegally convoked disciplinary committee which never heard the defendant, who has been denied counsel and the documents he is entitled to and who has been victimized by broken promises and flagrant violations of due process of law, staff rules, and the universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Compare the activities of Secretary Jordan and Deputy Secretary Bang-Jensen and note who is the target: not the culprit but the anti-Communist.

Indirect Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under date of August 5, 1958, in the Christian Science Monitor, a daily newspaper published at Boston, Mass., appeared the following editorial on the front page thereof. As it deals with a subject which is ever present to our daily attention these days, I felt sure that you and all my other distinguished colleagues in this legislative body would be pleased to have the same directed to your attention. The editorial follows:

INDIRECT AGGRESSION

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in isolating "indirect aggression" as the grave and great issue to be dealt with at the proposed summit conference, has singled out that phase of Soviet policy which has been disturbing, baffling, aggravating to a whole series of United States Secretaries of State.

When President Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union back in his first term, the pledge of good behavior most desired from Moscow was a forswearing of international agitation. The Communists never gave that good behavior.

Now, once more, if we may credit not only Mr. Dulles' press conference remarks but various "inspired" stories since, President Eisenhower intends to tackle Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev personally and with utmost seriousness about Moscow's practice of "indirect aggression"—meaning attempts to burrow into, intimidate, and overthrow existing governments by means of intensive propaganda, infiltration of arms and conspirators, threats of assassination, subtle intrigues, and devious pressures.

It is very useful for Washington to let Moscow know how seriously it regards the tactics of international communism, even as it was useful 2 years ago for Sir Anthony Eden, then Britain's Prime Minister, to warn Mr. Khrushchev how seriously the British regarded the Soviet threat to their oil lifeline in the Middle East. The pattern of "indirect aggression" is, in Mr. Dulles' eyes, visible all the way from Morocco to southeast Asia and in Latin America as well. President Eisenhower is ready to tell Premier Khrushchev that this practice, if unchecked, could lead to major war.

There is a serious question whether a klieg-lighted summit conference is the best forum for a thoughtful discussion with the Soviet leader. It is also worth asking whether this kind of charge against Moscow—valid though it is—is all that the world expects from Washington at a climatic meeting of the great powers on the Middle East.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Dulles feels that now is the propitious moment, when the world is intensely watching, to unveil his great exposé of Soviet behavior.

Will the President, with all his earnestness, be able to obtain from Moscow a sudden promise to behave? The United States will be demanding that conspiratorial, grievance-exploiting international communism change its fundamental nature. Balked from military conquest by the nuclear stalemate, Moscow aggresses by indirection. Washington will be asking communism to stop being revolutionary.

As for a warning about "major war," this would be more persuasive if Washington were not at this very moment permitting Moscow to maintain a dangerous advantage over the United States in long-range ballistic missile development.

Conceivably, through the United Nations, some of the world's subversive practices could be documented and arrested; there is a plan, for instance, to set up monitoring stations to publicize before the world the lies and hates and assassination calls spewed forth by the Cairo radio. A permanent U. N. observer corps could be established, ready to mount guard against infiltration across threatened boundaries.

Some of Moscow's sinuous aggressing, however, is desperately difficult to pin down to isolate. The U. S. S. R., for instance, wins friends by loans, trade treaties, scholarships. These cannot be outlawed.

And when the delegates get right down to cases, although Egyptian-Syrian arms may have played a small role in Lebanon, and Egypt's example spurred the Iraqi revolution, still the hand of Moscow was very indistinct and distant. In fact, the street mobs and many intellectuals of the Middle East regard the Soviet Union as friend and champion. Charges of indirect aggression will not be very persuasive in that simmering area.

It is surpassing strange that Washington at this critical junction is not preparing to come forward with a much larger message on the Middle East. This is a time to have ready plans for territory neutralization, border guaranties, bans on arms shipments, economic development programs. This is a time to deal constructively with Arab nationalism. Perhaps Secretary Dulles will yet see fit to unveil the programs of this sort which other officials hint are being readied. Otherwise he will seem to have his eyes steadily fixed on Moscow the exploiter when the great grievances and problems which Moscow exploits are thousands of miles away.

Scholarship and Loan Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of education programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, last night, the Delegate from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, paid a call to my office to express his keep interest in this bill, and especially his concern over the fact that the bill treats Alaska as a Territory rather than as a State.

Delegate BARTLETT's question had been anticipated by the committee. As chairman of the Subcommittee of Special Education, I submitted on July 9, 1958, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the question of whether it would recommend any amendments to H. R. 13247 insofar as Alaska was concerned. This was occasioned by the epoch-making decision of the Congress of a few weeks ago admitting Alaska to statehood. In reply to my letter, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pointed out that under Public Law 508 of the 85th Congress, Alaska will not become a State until the holding of the elections, and the issuance of the Presidential proclamation required in section 8 of the act.

So until the elections are held and the proclamation is issued, I believe that the treatment of Alaska as a Territory, as is done in H. R. 13247 is, therefore, technically correct.

Many laws administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare authorizing programs of Federal assistance to States and individuals, analogous to those which would be authorized by H. R. 13247, contain special provisions on Alaska similar to those in this bill.

The Department advises me that it is now undertaking a careful study of all such provisions of existing laws with a view to developing sound and consistent policies for the treatment of Alaska which take due account of its new status as a State, and with a view to submitting to Congress such legislative proposals for amendment of these statutory provisions as may be appropriate.

Special treatment for Alaska, as a Territory, is also characteristic of many Federal assistance laws administered by Federal departments and agencies other than the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has assured me that its forthcoming recommendations for the treatment of Alaska, as a State, will be coordinated with whatever policies and recommendations these other agencies develop on the basis of similar studies which they are making.

So, Mr. Chairman, may I say that it is my judgment that it would not be wise for us to try to legislate further about Alaska in this bill.

So far as I am concerned, this is a matter that will have my continuing interest, and I look forward to helping enact appropriate legislation in this field.

Why Bernard Goldfine Should Be Cited for Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House the following statement of certain matters which should be considered in connection with the recommendation of contempt proceedings against Bernard Goldfine unanimously made by both the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

WHY BERNARD GOLDFINE SHOULD BE CITED FOR CONTEMPT

(Statement of Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman, Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)

There are several matters which deserve most careful consideration in connection with the Goldfine proceedings. The jurisdiction of the subcommittee; the subject of the inquiry; the manner in which the Securities and Exchange Commission is involved; and the pertinency of the questions to the inquiry which Mr. Goldfine refused to answer are topics which require explanation if we are to have a clear understanding of the significance of the challenge made to the right of the subcommittee to ask the questions cited in the report submitted to the House today.

The Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was granted authority pursuant to House Resolutions 99 and 191, 85th Congress, to review, study, and examine the execution of the laws by the administrative and independent agencies of the Government, within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Resolution 99 expressly authorized the committee or any subcommittee thereof to make investigations and studies including, among others, the following matters:

"(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities acts:

* * * * *

"(13) The administration and enforcement by departments and agencies of the Government of provisions of law relating to subjects which are within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Resolution 99 also provides that for the purpose of such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may hold hearings and require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses.

The purposes of the subcommittee and the scope of its jurisdiction has been stated in several places. By press release of Thursday, April 18, 1957, the then chairman of the subcommittee stated its purposes, the agencies to be examined by it and the subjects to be considered. On Monday, June 16, 1958, the present chairman of the full committee and of the subcommittee restated some of such purposes as follows (transcript 1553):

"The House of Representatives has charged this subcommittee with the responsibility of investigating the manner in which certain independent commissions or agencies are administering the law. We are directed to inquire if these administrative agencies are functioning within the scope of the statutes which established the independence of such agencies or commissions, if any of these agencies have improperly enlarged upon the scope of their statutory authority, whether or not any of the existing statutes require amendments in order to enable the administrative commissions properly to perform their licensing, regulatory and adjudicatory duties, if there are ambiguities in existing statutes which require correction in the public interest, and whether or not commission decisions are impartial and free from extra-record representations or pressure.

"These are fundamental questions concerning which this committee is bound to investigate and make appropriate recommendations to the Congress. This is our duty. This is our objective."

It must be remembered that except for the few constitutionally established departments of Government, the administrative and executive agencies exist only by the will of the Congress. There is no question but that Congress has the power to investigate these agencies to ascertain how they are functioning and to enact legislation expanding, contracting, or modifying powers granted to them by statute. There is also no question but that Congress may exercise such constitutional legislative authority through the medium of committees and subcommittees duly established by it.

The SEC is an administrative agency within the direct control of Congress and is subject to the investigatory powers of the committee and of the subcommittee. As I shall point out later, the questions which Mr. Goldfine refused to answer are concerned, exclusively, with the manner of functioning of the Securities and Exchange Commission; with the adequacy of the existing Securities Acts and with the eliciting of data useful and necessary to assist the subcommittee in

devising legislative proposals which it determines to be appropriate in the public interest.

On Monday, June 24, 1958, hearings were held at which Mr. Edward N. Gadsby, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, its general counsel, its director of the division of corporation finance, and others, appeared and testified as witnesses. Before questioning of these witnesses the subcommittee's chief counsel said (transcript 2001):

"The hearing today concerns a series of episodes involving the Securities and Exchange Commission, the East Boston Co., and its controlled subsidiary, the Boston Port Development Co. It will be developed that, irrespective of any other issue in this case, there is a need for corrective legislation and for improvement in the administration of the Securities and Exchange statutes."

Counsel also stated:

"It is expected that in due course in connection with other cases more extensive hearings into Securities and Exchange matters will further develop the inadequacies of the present statute and allow us to evaluate and appraise whether these statutes are being administered in accordance with the intent of Congress."

Mr. Goldfine is the majority and dominant stockholder of the East Boston Co. which is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. He is also the dominant stockholder of its controlled subsidiary, the Boston Port Development Co. As shown in the committee report, page 11, he owns or controls more than 70 percent of the East Boston stock and 79 percent of the publicly held shares of the controlled subsidiary. In turn, East Boston owns 51 percent of the stock of its subsidiary, the Boston Port Development Co.

Companies registered with the SEC are required, under section 13 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, to file with the Commission annual financial reports. From 1948 to 1956, East Boston Co. and its controlled subsidiary failed to file such reports. During this period, also, East Boston Co. and its subsidiary, the Boston Port Development Co., held no stockholders' meetings and rendered no reports to stockholders.

In April 1954, the SEC undertook legal proceedings to compel East Boston to file the necessary reports. The motion for summary judgment on this injunctive action brought in the Federal district court, at Boston, Mass., was heard on June 20, 1955. On July 15, 1955, the district judge ordered that such reports be filed by August 1, 1955. The order entered on July 14, 1955, changed the required filing date from August to November 1, 1955.

After the failure of the companies to file the reports as required by the judgment, the SEC, on November 4, 1955, filed a civil contempt petition against East Boston Co., Alwyne F. Jealous, H. Maxwell Goldfine, Roland M. Packard, and Bernard Goldfine.

On November 8, 1955, the Federal judge who had granted the motion for summary judgment in July 1955, disqualified himself. The case was then transferred to Judge Wyzanski.

On November 18, 1955, Judge Wyzanski entered an order granting the SEC's petition for contempt and imposed a suspended fine of $20,000 against East Boston Co. The contempt petition was dismissed as to the individual defendants. On December 16, 1955, the SEC received 10–K's from East Boston Co. On January 10, 1956, Mr. William H. Timbers, General Counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission, advised the Federal court, the East Boston Co., and its officers and directors, that the 10–K's as filed were materially deficient.

On February 6, 1956, the SEC moved in court for an order that the East Boston Co. pay the $20,000 suspended fine. In so doing, the SEC submitted the affidavit of its chief accountant, alleging the failure of East Boston to file proper reports. Among other things, it was stated in the affidavit that the financial statements accompanying the reports were not certified to by an independent accountant, as required by section 13 (a) (2) of the act. It was also pointed out that the accounts receivable had not been classified to show transactions with directors and principal stockholders.

On April 2, 1956, the SEC filed an application in the Federal Court for an order to show cause why the defendant, East Boston, should not be punished for criminal contempt alleging, in part: (1) Defendant willfully failed and refused to file on or before November 1, 1955, the required reports; (2) defendant willfully disobeyed the order by filing reports which were improper in numerous respects, including the following:

(a) None of the financial statements included as part of the reports filed by the defendant were certified to by an independent public accountant;

(b) The profit and loss statements of Boston Port Development Co. included as part of said reports were false and misleading in that they understated said company's net loss for each of its calendar years;

(c) The balance sheets of Boston Port Development included were false and misleading.

Furthermore, it was alleged that uncollectible notes barred by the statute of limitations were included as current assets; interest on non-interest-bearing notes and uncollectible interest were included as accounts receivable in current assets; a defaulted mortgage receivable in the sum of $500,000 was included as a current asset with no notation as to collectibility; unupaid real estate taxes were understated by more than $18,000, and balance sheets and profit and loss statements of the East Boston Co. failed to give effect to losses sustained by its subsidiary, Boston Port Development Co.

On April 5, 1956, on stipulation of counsel for the SEC and East Boston, the court entered an order dismissing the contempt proceedings without prejudice and ordered the defendant, East Boston, to pay $3,000 in civil contempt to the Securities and Exchange Commission in reimbursement of SEC's expenses incurred by it in the proceeding against East Boston. The court also ordered that, within 90 days—from April 5, 1956—corrected profit and loss statements and corrected balance sheets for the years 1948 to 1955 should be filed by East Boston, and for the years 1947 to 1954 by Boston Port Development Co.

On November 7, 1956, the SEC filed another petition in the Federal court for an order directing East Boston to show cause why it should not be adjudged in civil contempt and for an order appointing a receiver.

On November 26, 1956, the SEC requested withdrawal of its petition for civil contempt and for appointment of a receiver on the ground that since November 7, 1956, namely, on November 15, 1956, the East Boston Co. had filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission its annual report on form 10–K for its fiscal year ended March 31, 1956.

On November 27, 1956, the court permitted the SEC's petition to be withdrawn without prejudice.

On March 23, 1956, Mr. Benjamin Brown, CPA for the East Boston Co., filed with the SEC an adjusted financial report as at December 31, 1954, for the Boston Port Development Co.

Each of the 22 questions which Mr. Goldfine refused to answer are based upon statements contained in this adjusted report on file with the SEC. The report is part of the record in the hearings before the subcommittee. Schedule B of such report is also incorporated in the committee report herein at page 16.

At page 10 and following, of the committee report herein, it is pointed out that the subcommittee is in possession of data showing derelictions by Mr. Goldfine as majority stockholder in the East Boston Co. and its controlled subsidiary, Boston Port Development Co., which have not been reached by the SEC or have not been adequately dealt with by the Commission. Data showing such derelictions is contained in the Brown CPA report on file with the SEC.

In essence, the subject matter of the inquiry deals not only with the failure of the companies to file required annual financial reports for many years and the failure of the SEC to require such filing, but also with the fact that when these reports were filed they disclosed numerous financial irregularities concerning which the Commission has no effective action. Whether this nonaction is because of inadequacies of the law or other reasons is a matter which requires most careful study. The questions directed to the witness and which he refused to answer were designed to obtain complete underlying information as to these pertinent matters.

As stated in *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U. S. 178) at pages 206, 207:

"The Congress has practically abandoned its original practice of utilizing the coercive sanction of contempt proceedings at the bar of the House. The sanction there imposed is imprisonment by the House until the recalcitrant witness agrees to testify or disclose the matters sought, provided that the incarceration does not extend beyond adjournment. The Congress has instead invoked the aid of the Federal judicial system in protecting itself against contumacious conduct. It has become customary to refer these matters to the United States attorneys for prosecution under criminal law.

"The appropriate statute is found in title 2, United States Code, section 192. It provides: 'Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.'"

Parenthetically, it should be noted that the Watkins case is not strictly applicable to the present matter because at page 200, in a footnote, the Supreme Court there states:

"We are not concerned with the power of the Congress to inquire into and publicize corruption, maladministration or inefficiency in agencies of the Government."

However, if the sanction of contempt is to be successful, it must be established that the witness has refused to answer a question pertinent to the question under inquiry and that the pertinency of the question to the inquiry has been brought home to the witness.

Before the 22 questions were propounded to Mr. Goldfine, and after they were propounded, the pertinency of these questions to the inquiry was fully explained to him. This appears in the committee report herein at pages 9–13 and again at pages 29–30. The witness was told clearly that the questions asked related to subjects under inquiry and study by the subcommittee relating to the Securities Acts, the rules and regulations issued by the SEC, the administrative enforcement of the law and regulations by the Commission, and the necessity or desirability of remedial legislation for the

protection of the public generally, and of minority stockholders. Also, Mr. Goldfine was given the opportunity in executive session of the subcommittee, at which his counsel was present, to reconsider his refusals to answer. This he declined.

All the questions asked Mr. Goldfine were directly related to a specified legislative purpose, and this legislative purpose was twice explained at length to the witness.

Under all the circumstances, I believe that there is no justification for the failure and refusal of Mr. Goldfine to answer the questions when directed to do so. If witnesses before committees can successfully refuse to answer questions pertaining to ascertaining the adequacy of existing laws and of their administration by regulatory commissions, the ability of Congress to enact sound laws based upon complete knowledge of pertinent facts would be most seriously impaired.

Citizenship Day and Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the State Bar of Texas, through its committee on American citizenship, has called for statewide observance of two highly significant events in September. These are Citizenship Day, September 17, and Constitution Week, designated by the President for observance, September 17th through the 23d.

The State bar this week communicated with officials of 190 local bar associations, urging them to help organize in their respective communities—including local civic and service clubs, women's organizations, churches, schools, city officials and the news mediums—appropriate programs which will bring about a spirit of public rededication to the great document of freemen—the Constitution of the United States.

In view of the significance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week to freedom-loving peoples of the earth, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the admonitory foreword included with instructional and informational materials sent by the State bar to local bar associations of Texas:

FOREWORD

They are not alarmists who warn that once again our Nation is in grave peril. A godless, evil force not only threatens the security of the United States, but the security and freedom of the world.

The tangible and devastating force of subversion and aggression, characteristic of Communist Russia, make more significant the meaning of freedom, the most cherished of American heritages. If our cherished way of life is to endure, we must remain dedicated to the principles set forth in one of history's greatest documents: the Constitution of the United States.

What are the historic and basic concepts of constitutional government? What are the privileges of, and the responsibilities which go with, being an American citizen? The answers to these questions should be known by every American citizen, if we are to counter, effectively, Russian propaganda based on deceit, doubletalk, and plain lies.

The State Bar of Texas places equal emphasis on six long-range objectives. No. 1 is as follows:

"The preservation of representative government in the United States through a program of public education and understanding of the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship."

Two particularly significant, closely related events will be observed in September: Citizenship Day, September 17, and Constitution Week, which has been designated by the President for observance, September 17–23.

Your bar association can and should organize your community and provide the leadership in planning and executing observance programs and activities to point up these important events.

Property on the Moon Is in Great Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the proposed shot at the moon has its serious and amusing aspects according to reports from the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior that they are deluged with requests and applications for property on the moon and even on Mars.

Hope burns eternal in the human breast. Who can say what may be revealed from our exploration of outer space and the possibility of interplanetary communication and travel.

Who could have anticipated the great treasure discovered by Christopher Columbus before he landed on the shores of the Western Hemisphere, then unknown to the civilized world.

The following requests and applications indicate an amusing, serious and an avid interest in the future of outer space.

PROPERTY ON THE MOON IS IN GREAT DEMAND

(By Harry Kursh)

Now that the astronauts are getting closer to landing a rocket on the moon—the Air Force will fire one right at it shortly—the troubles of the United States Bureau of Land Management are apt to multiply.

As a matter of fact, the Bureau's troubles already have begun. Hardly a day passes without scores of letters, many requesting a homestead on the moon, arriving from all over the country.

Here are some excerpts from the letters:

"Gentlemen, I would greatly appreciate details on the cost and procedure of staking out a claim on the moon."

"DEAR SIR: I wish to file claim to those sections of the moon known as the Sea of Conflicts, Sea of Serenity, and Gulf of Dews."

"Gentlemen, please send me a deed to 5 acres of land on the moon for my four friends and me."

"SIR: Is it still possible to file homestead claims on the moon?"

Many citizens keep two steps ahead of the United States air space program, already are claiming land on other planets.

Typical is this letter received by the Bureau:

"DEAR SIR: I wish to register a claim on the planet Mars. I base this claim on the fact that I have studied this planet very thirly [sic] with telescope and in many books."

More than one American foresees good business opportunities in outer space. One wrote to say that he would be interested in obtaining the streetcar franchise on the moon; another requested all available information about land "on any of the planets or the moon * * *" to open some business."

But the Bureau of Land Management, which is responsible for granting leases and deeds for 380 million acres of the public domain in the United States, flatly refuses to accept the lunar burden. Its replies to prospective homesteaders on the moon, therefore, are discouraging.

On July 1 the Bureau began sending out this standard reply: "DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter in which you asked about land on the moon or planets.

"It is not now, nor has it ever been, possible for anyone to make application for or obtain the rights to land on the moon or planets through the United States Government.

"The United States has as yet made no claim to any territory beyond the earth. To our knowledge, there are no specific provisions of national or international law covering outer space.

"Until there is some legal basis for regarding such lands as public lands of the United States, there is no method by which they may be officially claimed or obtained by anyone."

The Rot Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, although Lebanon is in the spotlight at the moment, it is not only that country which Nasser views with greed. In the following column by Joseph Alsop, Mr. Alsop points out that Libya and the Sudan are being eyed by Nasser as being vulnerable to acquisition.

I commend this column, as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 10, 1958, to the attention of our colleagues:

THE ROT GOES ON

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In its incorrigible way, the administration has been trying to tell the country that everything will now turn out for the best in the Middle East. Meanwhile, the administration is really sweating with fear that everything will shortly turn out for the worse. The signs of more trouble ahead may be itemized as follows:

Item: Apparently at the haughty request of Gamal Abdel Nasser, King Saud of Saudi Arabia and his brother, Prime Minister Crown Prince Faisal, have just received the Chief of Staff of the Egyptian Army, Gen. Hakim Amer, at the royal summer palace in the hills, at Taif.

It is known that the main subject of discussion was the return of an Egyptian military mission to Saudi Arabia, for the ostensible purpose of training the Saudi Army. The former mission was ejected from Saudi Arabia after the Egyptian military attaché was caught, red-handed, organizing terrorist groups for the overthrow of King Saud's government. It is further known that Gen. Hakim Amer paid hardly more than a cour-

tesy call on the King. Almost all his time was spent with the Crown Prince, who has been the real ruler of Saudi Arabia ever since the King's virtual abdication was forced by Nasser's customary propaganda-and-conspiracy pressures.

It seems highly likely, therefore, that the Egyptian military mission will soon rejoin the Saudi Army. In this event, Saudi Arabia's days of comparative independence are almost certainly numbered, and the transformation of the Saudi realm into another Nasser province must eventually be expected. This reading of the Saudi signs is made more likely by the further fact that King Saud's most anti-Western foreign affairs adviser, Sheikh Yussuf Yassim, is on his way to Cairo.

Item: Egypt's vulnerable neighbors to the south and west, the Sudan and Libya, have been subjected to the most extreme and flagrant propaganda-and-conspiracy pressures in the last 2 days. In both countries, the situation is rated as precarious at best.

A Nasser triumph in the Sudan will open interior Africa to Nasser and the Kremlin. A Nasser triumph in Libya will effectively rule out any peacable settlement between France, Tunisia, Morocco, and the Moslem population of Algeria. The American Strategic Air Command's most important single overseas base, Wheelus Field, will also be lost if Nasser wins Libya. The same threat, of course, hangs over the Dahran air base in Saudi Arabia, which is not used by SAC, but is invaluable for our world air transport plan.

Item: The position in Jordan is so critical that it may perhaps erupt in trouble, or even end in a surrender, before these words are printed. Not so very long ago, President Eisenhower was declaring that the security of Jordan was essential to the United States. Now the British and American Governments are anxiously talking about the need for King Hussein to abandon his little country, which his naked courage saved from Nasser and the local Communists only 15 months ago.

The idea is for King Hussein to announce that he is leaving the country (presumably in the same aircraft with the British paratroopers who are there now), so that his people can hold a free plebiscite. The Jordanians will be ironically offered the chance to invite their King back if they choose. So the surrender of Jordan will be gracefully covered up if this scheme is adopted.

The reasons for discussing this extraordinary scheme are highly practical. All Jordan's borders are now closed, and there is no access to the country except through the mud-hut port of Aqaba and by American transport overflying Israel. The overflights of Israel are the only real means of supplying the 2,000 British paratroops sent to guard Hussein against the conspiracy. After receiving a grossly threatening Soviet note, the Israelis recently withdrew permission for the overflights. In answer to strong United States protests, they have now allowed the overflights to continue, but only for a few days.

Hence the Jordanian position is literally untenable for the long pull, unless measures are taken to break the military blockade of Jordan that has been imposed by Egypt's Syrian province, the new Iraqi Government and Saudi Arabia. A partial withdrawal of United States Marines from Lebanon has not been started as yet, solely because of the desperate need to provide a kind of cover for the British troops in Jordan.

In short, the rot in the Middle East is proceeding more rapidly than ever. This was, of course, certain to happen when the British and American Governments took only the phoniest half measures to stop the rot that began in Baghdad.

Veterans' Hospital and Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session, I made a speech pointing out that the budgetary policies of the administration had, by the first of this year, resulted in the closing of 4,974 hospital beds which the Veterans' Administration is now listing as "not required to meet current operating plans." At that time, I stated that a more honest classification would be "sufficient budget not provided Veterans' Administration to operate these beds." I expressed the opinion then, and I continue to hold the opinion, that the administration is circumventing the intent of laws enacted by Congress which provided these facilities to the Veterans' Administration for the care of eligible veterans.

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been concerned with this important issue and has just completed an extensive series of hearings, seeking to determine the reasons of the Administration for curtailing the veterans' hospital program. In its report which accompanied H. R. 10028, the committee stated that it was its opinion that the intent of the law enacted by the Congress is being circumvented by arbitrary administrative decisions, the result being that approximately 5,000 hospital beds made available to the Veterans' Administration for the care of eligible veterans are not being used, even though a large waiting list exists in all areas of the country.

The waiting list officially admitted by Veterans' Administration is in excess of 25,000. During its hearings, the Veterans' Affairs Committee challenged the authenticity of the Veterans' Administration waiting list and, at the demand of the committee, the Veterans' Administration produced evidence of its real waiting list, which is double that previously admitted by the Veterans' Administration and stands at about 52,000 veterans. In defending its failure to use its available beds, the Veterans' Administration has contended that there is not a demand in many areas of the country by eligible veterans for hospital care. Of course, if such a contention is to be advanced, it is embarrassing to admit the full extent of the waiting list as it actually exists.

Responsibility for closing 5,000 hospital beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital system, at a time when 52,000 eligible veterans are seeking care, must be laid squarely at the door of the White House. On April 22, 1958, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee wrote to the President of the United States and asked the following question:

Will you please advise as to whether the closing of approximately 5,000 Veterans' Administration hospital beds * * * is being accomplished with the knowledge and approval of the President?

On June 13, 1958, the President replied to the chairman's letter and ignored entirely the pertinent questions raised by the chairman and stated that more detailed information would be provided by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

During the 3 weeks of hearings conducted by the committee, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs tried every way possible to obscure the facts of the situation, but the record is now clear that the preparation of the Veterans' Administration's budget was under direct supervision of the Bureau of the Budget and that the budget of the Veterans' Administration approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the White House contemplated a sharp curtailment of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities. When he appeared before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee to discuss the Veterans' Administration budget, Administrator Whittier made the following statement:

If the figure stands as it is now, as it has been submitted in this budget, it will mean the probable closing of a number of hospitals as far as we can estimate at this time—if the budget stands as submitted we would probably have to close seven hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration originally estimated that it would need $733,966,000 for in-patient hospital care for fiscal year 1959. This was cut to $707,100,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. In addition to cutting the operating budget of the Veterans' Administration and thereby curtailing the veterans' hospital and medical program, the administration has been seeking to curtail the program by the imposition of three arbitrary policies, as follows:

1. Veterans' Administration plans for the development of a program of care of long-term chronic or intermediate type patients will not be expanded.

2. Beds which are eliminated through alteration, modernization, or conversion programs may not be replaced.

3. Beds withdrawn from a particular use, such as the treatment of tuberculosis patients, may not be converted for the care of patients with other disabilities.

During the hearings, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs claimed that he had secured a major concession from the Bureau of the Budget, which would allow him to convert tuberculosis beds for other purposes. Despite the claims of the Administrator, the concession by the Bureau of the Budget is meaningless, as can readily be seen from the following sentence from the Bureau of the Budget's letter conveying the authority:

The Bureau agrees that the VA shall have the right to make conversions of TB beds when there is need to convert them to other uses. Except in such instances, TB beds will be closed when they are no longer needed. In carrying out this policy it should, of course, be understood that it is subordinate to any over-riding policies which may be established by way of limitation on operating beds or daily patient load, and any financial limitations which may be imposed by reason of appropriation action."

In plain English, this means that the Veterans' Administration may convert a TB bed to other uses if it does not increase the patient load or spend any more money than it was planning to spend before the conversion. Under such a limitation, the only way that the Administrator can convert TB beds is to close the equivalent number of beds in some other hospital.

The Veterans' Administration is now preparing its budget for the next fiscal year. During the hearings, the witnesses of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget were repeatedly questioned concerning the intent of the administration in recognizing the rising cost of medical care. Twenty-three hospital managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals in the western States met early this year and adopted the following resolution:

The managers of the 23 Veterans' Administration hospitals, centers, and domiciliaries located in the 7 Western States have met to consider our hospital program for the next 2 years. Our deliberations have revealed a simple, stark reality. Current appropriations will not support presently legislated benefits and accepted concepts of veterans' medical care. The floodtide of price increases on all fronts is recognized throughout the hospital field. Voluntary hospitals, State hospitals, and university hospitals have experienced the effect of rising costs. With the possible exception of a few State hospitals, the costs are reflected in large rate increases and substantial appropriations each year. In nongovernmental hospitals these costs are passed on directly to the patients.

Our Veterans' Administration hospitals have not received funds over the past several years sufficient to keep abreast of these ascending costs. We are endeavoring to maintain a medical program equal to that offered in the community on preinflation appropriation levels. Neither have the managers funds adequate to discharge their specific responsibility in protecting the Government's investment in the physical plant and in equipment. We have economized to the extent that essential care to our patients is inevitably deteriorating.

Our 23 hospitals must have a substantial increase in fiscal year 1959 and a specific increase of $10 million for 1960 over and above the appropriation for 1958 in order to retain an acceptable level of medical care and to maintain our physical plants. These sums do not include whatever might come in a general pay raise for Federal employees or the automatic wage boost for the blue-collar workers.

Unless these sizable sums are made available, Congress must face these alternatives: (1) Lower quality of medical care and further deterioration of the physical plants, (2) reduced beds with the reduction in patient load; close selected hospitals throughout the country or close whole sections of beds in many hospitals.

We therefore unanimously resolve that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of the United States be apprised of this basic issue and be requested to take clear-cut remedial action.

This resolution was read to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Bureau of the Budget. However, no assurances were received that the views set forth by the 23 western Veterans' Administration hospital managers will be given full consideration in the preparation of the budget.

I agree with the expression of the committee in its report that new legislation on this subject is not necessary. Congress created a Veterans' Administration hospital system with a rated bed capacity of 127,832 beds, yet Veterans' Administration is operating only 120,526 of these beds. It is understandable that there will be a few beds unavailable for patient care at all times because of modernization and conversion work and, in some cases, the necessary medical personnel cannot be recruited. Aside from beds closed for these purposes, there is no legal basis for the Veterans' Administration withdrawing beds from use by eligible veterans purely as a result of the arbitrary administrative determinations of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House. If the Veterans' Administration persists in flaunting the intent of Congress in this regard, it will be necessary that Congress enact a bill such as H. R. 10028, reported by the committee, which will set a specific number of operating beds and specify the average daily patient load to be cared for. In the committee's bill, it recommended a minimum of 125,000 operating beds to provide care for an average daily patient load of 113,000. If the policy recommended by the committee is carried forward, about 4,500 of the beds withdrawn from use by the Administration would be restored to operation.

The veterans hospital and medical program is second in importance only to the program of compensation for the service-connected disabled veteran. There is nothing of greater importance we can do for a veteran than to give him medical care when he is sick and unable to provide for himself. The veterans hospital and medical program should enjoy the highest priority, and it is my intention to do everything that I can to seek restoration of the beds which have been arbitrarily withdrawn from use by veterans by the Administration.

Plight of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Elmer Price in the Lincoln County (Oreg.) Leader:

PLIGHT OF THE RAILROADS

We are glad to see that Congress and many States at long last have begun to take up the plight of the railroads of the Nation and attempt to solve some of the problems which have been strangling them for many years.

The railroads of the country had become the whipping boy of a host of Federal controls, State legislation, of counties and cities through which they operated, and of restrictive and oppressive union controls.

So serious had the problem become that few railroads have managed to operate profitably in recent years.

Some suggested as a solution that the rails should be taken over and operated by the Government. But this has never solved the basic problem of a business operating in the red. It merely means that Government should subsidize them, and, as in most Government functions, add the bills on in the form of higher taxes.

That railroads have been regulated to death goes without saying.

Being a monopoly enterprise, in many cases, they have been subjected to an overdose of Government regulation. And yet, because they are actually private enterprises, high taxes are piled on them not only by States, but by counties and cities.

And because they are one of the Nation's older and mature industries and long liberal in their thinking toward their employees, they were hamstrung down through the years by the demands and impositions of the strong unions which dominated them.

Toss all of it into the same kettle and one comes up with a strangling brew. It is the story of an industry so overregulated, overtaxed, and overunionized that its entire future is in jeopardy.

Add to this the industry's own basic lack of imagination in promoting its services to the public and we have one apparently dying on the vine.

Yet railroads are a basic industry and vital to the continued growth and development of the Nation. They need help and should get it as soon as possible.

Lone Tree Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to California I had the privilege of attending the Memorial Day services held in Lone Tree Cemetery in Hayward.

Lone Tree Cemetery is on the crest of one of the gently rolling hills that form the saucerlike Castro Valley. It is a beautiful wooded spot now completely surrounded by rambling ranch-type homes. This was not always so. Like many such institutions it was once way out in the country. It derives its name from the fact that once only a single tree grew within its boundaries.

One of those who participated in the services was my old and good friend Col. N. W. Armstrong. Colonel Armstrong was born not far from the site of Lone Tree. He has served his country honorably from the Mexican border to World War II. And, like any old soldier, chaffed and squirmed when the powers that be ruled him out of the Korean incident.

Colonel Armstrong is an old newspaperman and I asked him to prepare a story on the history of the cemetery and the services we attended. As one who loves and reveres Alameda County and her institutions, he did so. I am pleased to preserve it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LONE TREE CEMETERY
(By Col. N. W. Armstrong, U. S. Army (Retired))

Lone Tree Cemetery at Hayward, Calif., is one of the historical landmarks of Alameda

County. It was established in 1870 by the purchase of 34 acres of land by an association of leading citizens formed for this purpose. Original incorporators of the association were George Brown, Thomas Cunningham, H. W. Rice, C. Ward, and E. Dole. Prior to 1870 burials of Protestants took place at nearby Squatterville, San Lorenzo, or in Oakland.

The cemetery is located about a mile and a half east of Hayward and commands a splendid view of Castro Valley to the north and the city of Hayward to the west. Lone Tree, according to legend, was the only tree in a certain location of the cemetery where at one time a lovelorn Indian maiden hung herself.

Many prominent pioneers have been laid to rest in Lone Tree including William Hayward, after whom the town of Hayward was named. One studying the grave markers will find names of immigrants who came to California in the first days of statehood from every country of Europe, indeed from all over the world. Private mausoleums contain the remains of entire families of pioneers.

Early in the history of Lone Tree a section known as Veterans Plot was set aside at the request of the Hayward Veterans League, a group of Civil War veterans. Members of the Grand Army of the Republic kept the plot in good condition for over half a century, planting lawns, and shrubs, and laying sidewalks.

After the last Civil War soldier was laid to rest, veterans of the Spanish-American War continued the upkeep of Veterans Plot. Today a committee composed of veterans of all wars has undertaken its care.

Many of the leading citizens of the area have shown a keen interest in this patriotic program. Among them are Capt. Harry A. Bradford, son of the late Alonzo Bradford, a Civil War veteran who is buried at Lone Tree.

Allen Strutz who now carries on the tradition of maintaining the cemetery is due a great deal of credit for his determined efforts in this enterprise. Mr. Strutz is prominent in civic and charitable affairs and a veteran of World War II.

Each year on Memorial Day appropriate exercises are held in this historic spot for the honored dead who rest there. Children from the public schools and ladies from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliaries together with their families decorate every grave with fresh flowers.

For more than 50 years, starting during his days in grammar school, the writer of this article has participated in the Memorial Day ceremonies. The only exceptions were absences during service at the Mexican border and in World Wars I and II.

A typically well planned program was presented on Memorial Day, 1958. The committee responsible for arrangements was comprised of Allen Strutz, chairman, Bernie Overmiller, Anthony Ojeda, George Emerson, Edna Black, Arnold Luebeker, Harley Turkington, Burhl Harwood, William Brun, Arthur Varella and Joseph Spina. Mrs. Norene Overmiller headed a committee in charge of decorating the graves.

Judge Thomas Lester Foley, a past commander of Hayward Post 68, American Legion, delivered the principal speech of the day.

Veterans of the Spanish-American War headed by Comrade John Morgan cooperated with representatives of the Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, World War I Barracks, Order of the Purple Heart and the auxiliaries of all these splendid organizations in contributing time and talent for the occasion. Through the generosity of the musicians union the Hayward Municipal Band conducted by Leonard Rapose presented a musical program and concert.

Rev. James R. Swanson, pastor of Bethel Assembly of God Church, offered the invocation. The pledge to the flag was led by Andy Olivan, of Boy Scout Troop 528. Joe C. Martin, well known vocalist, led the audience in singing America.

General Logan's order and address were read by Robert Pomeroy, commander of World War I Barracks 306. A quartet from Epiphany Lutheran Church Choir offered several vocal selections." F. J. McNaughton, commandant, Marine Corps League of Hayward, read Lincoln's Gettysburg address.

A procession from the main gate of Lone Tree to the veterans plot was headed by the colors of the several veterans groups. The Marine Corps League and the Hayward Municipal Band was in the line of march followed by veterans and those attending the ceremonies.

Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, Eighth District, California, was among the distinguished visitors in the audience. Congressman MILLER is a former first vice commander of the department of California, American Legion, and charter member of the Veterans of World War I, Oakland Barracks.

Also present were former Mayor John Purchio, of Hayward, a member of Hayward Post 68, American Legion; Peter J. De Bernardi, Sr., chairman of the Hayward Memorial Building Committee; Louis J. Silva, recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I.

Dr. Nelson Clemens, prominent Legionnaire; George Dasher, whose father rests in the Grand Army section of the veterans plot; Publisher George Henry Oakes, whose grandfather fought side by side with General Taylor in the Mexican War; George Perry, World War I veteran, and Del Brennan, who wears the coveted Purple Heart, also attended the ceremonies. Former Mayor Art Phillips, a veteran of World War I and prominent Hayward businessman and civic leader, played in the municipal band.

Judge Foley voiced the thoughts and sentiments of many of us at this memorable occasion. The text of his inspiring address follows:

"MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH GIVEN BY JUDGE THOMAS LESTER FOLEY AT LONE TREE CEMETERY, MAY, 30, 1958

"Ladies and gentlemen, 10 years ago today, in 1948, it was my privilege to speak here on this occasion. It was shortly after World War II. We thought of Iwo Jima, Pelielu, of the Battle of Britain, of the Battle of the Bulge—we reflected on the battles of World War I and we discussed the spread of communism in western Europe. Most of us had just returned from service in World War II.

"As I look about me today, I see many of the same friends and the same faces of 10 years ago, and I think of you men, then young, having just established yourselves after World War II, full of ambition, full of hope for the future, intensely patriotic, and most respectful of the dead we come here to honor.

"Now your positions in this community have given you greater responsibilities, and your families greater cares, yet each year most of you have been present on this occasion to honor those friends of ours, who so unselfishly served their community, their State, and their Nation.

"I want you to contemplate and reflect on those friends and comrades who served our country, who were here with us on that occasion 10 years ago, who are not here today—comrades and friends who stood here with us honoring our service heroes in the last few years, who have joined those heroes and we in turn are honoring them today. I can't help but think of Spike Shannan, Jesse Blankenship, Charlie Jarvis, Dave Pressley—to name a few—and of all the rest. I think of all the sad trips to San Bruno National Cemetery that many of you have made with me during these past 10 years, to say goodbye to comrades that have stood here with us on this occasion in the past.

"For these reasons this holiday and this service has ceased being a meaningless abstract holiday, but has become to me, and I am sure to you, a sad but warm personal occasion.

"This holiday is the most beautiful holiday on our national calendar. It is the only holiday that has not been corrupted by brash commercialism—it is a holiday that brings us closer to God, closer to our deceased comrades, and closer to each other because we have joined together to honor them today.

"It is not necessary for me on an occasion such as this to sermonize and pontificate, and try in my humble way to inspire those present, for the mere fact of your presence on this solemn but happy occasion is indicative of your intense patriotism, loyalty to your country, and respect for those who have gone before you.

"However, in paying respect to our deceased comrades, let us reflect on the horrible history of the past 10 years.

"Not one of us could have anticipated or foreseen in 1948, that in a few short years, once again, we would be enlarging the rolls of our honored dead in that bloody conflict of 1950, 1951, and 1952, called the Korean war.

"On this occasion in 1948 we were worrying about the spread of communism in the United States. We had not yet apprehended and convicted the Sobels and the Rosenbergs and their ilk. Not one of us could have anticipated or foreseen the spread of communism through Western Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Indochina, and now in South America.

"Who could ever have dreamt in 1948 that in 1958 the Vice President of the United States would be stoned by Communist students while on a goodwill mission in countries of our own Western Hemisphere.

"When I think of the peaceful years of my childhood until 1917, and of the peaceful years of the twenties, and of the peaceful though difficult years of the thirties, it is hard to believe the bloody horror of the forties and the fifties and the condition of our world today.

"I have purposely omitted today any reference to the great wars, the great battles of our country's brilliant historical past. In all humility I have tried within my inadequate abilities to bring about a realization that this holiday is not only a time in which we revere our honored dead, is not only a holiday when we review our historical past, but a holiday that is ever present to those of us who each year join on this occasion in Lone Tree Cemetery.

"It is a holiday when we forget our personal cares, when we forget our personal problems, it is the holiday when we rededicate ourselves to our community, our State, and our Nation."

Capital Gains Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I spoke before this body on July 30 relative to the widespread public response I had received to a bill—H. R. 12709—I introduced on May 27 proposing a 50-percent reduction in the present Federal capital gains tax.

Frankly, I am surprised by the extent of this response. To date I have had hundreds of letters and telegrams from highly responsible individuals, bankers, financial and small business institutions—and they all endorse my proposal as a "shot in the arm" for the overall American economy.

This is very definitely a tax reform measure to create new jobs for the American people and additional tax revenue for the Government. It will do exactly that, because it will encourage investors to liquidate present holdings and reinvest in new enterprises and in small business. I short, it will set free a vast amount of investment capital now immobilized by an excessive tax rate which actually amounts to confiscation.

As I stated in my July remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to press for passage, or even committee consideration, of this bill during the present session of Congress. My purpose now is to arouse interest in the proposal, with the objective of reintroducing it early in the 86th Congress. In the meantime there will be instituted a more comprehensive survey as to its probable effect on the national economy.

I wish to emphasize that the very term, "capital gains," is misleading in that it intimates such profits are socially evil and should be heavily penalized. For the most part, this tax is not a tax on income. It is largely an outright levy on capital. The gain or profit involved may have resulted principally from currency debasement and Government-induced inflation.

Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, and other major nations do not impose such a tax. Why should we do so? Perhaps it was originated before our corporate tax rates were jacked up to 52 percent, and was designed primarily to collect taxes on income of corporations that was not distributed as dividends to shareholders. As long as there is a corporate income tax, there is no excuse for a capital-gains tax on long-term stock transactions.

If the intent of Congress in continuing this law on the statute books was to help destroy investment incentive, job security, and new job opportunities, it has succeeded. I am positive, Mr. Speaker, that such was not the will of Congress.

Furthermore, this tax was not designed to cruelly confiscate, as it does, the assets of elderly owners of homes and farms who, having raised their families, wish to sell their holdings and live in smaller and more economical circumstances.

We all should realize, Mr. Speaker, that the essence of private American capitalism lies only in the ability of some of us to produce more than we consume and put the difference to work in hope of a fair return in providing, directly or indirectly, job opportunities and better living standards for less fortunate people. Unless this system is to perish in favor of some form of statism, the laws of this land must continually encourage individual thrift, savings, and investment.

The capital-gains tax destroys this incentive by sterilizing huge pools of investment capital, large portions of which would otherwise be employed in new and small-business enterprises, thereby creating new jobs.

For the benefit of my colleagues, on whom I will call for support of this overdue legislation, I wish to herewith insert excerpts from additional letters I have received from highly qualified business leaders and investors throughout America.

The excerpts follow:

"Your bill, H. R. 12709, is certainly a fair one, and I am hopeful that the national survey will bear out your opinion that the Federal Treasury will not lose revenue if it is enacted. Strengthened by such a report, your bill should gain support and ultimately become law." (C. R. Gamble, president, Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.)

"I know it is not necessary to tell you that a businessman will concur in your objective. We believe that anyone who is a student of economics will subscribe to the fact that the tax on long-term capital gains deters progress in the American system of individual accomplishments." (F. S. Elfred, chairman, Peabody Coal Co., St. Louis, Mo.)

"I certainly heartily agree with your view that the present long-term capital gains tax is largely a levy on capital and not on income and tends to sterilize billions of risk capital, a substantial portion of which would otherwise find its way into investment in new and small businesses, thereby providing many new job opportunities." (Kendrick R. Wilson, Jr., president, Avco Manufacturing Corp., New York.)

"Please be advised that I am in complete accord with this bill and shall support it in any manner that I can." (Samuel G. Rautbord, president, American Photocopy Equipment Co., Chicago, Ill.)

"I heartily endorse your bill. It will be a step in the right direction." (J. S. Fluor, president, the Fluor Corp., Ltd., Los Angeles, Calif.)

"As a matter of fact, the complete elimination of the capital gains tax would provide for a free and unfettered movement of capital assets. This, in turn, would result in an increase of equity funds for the purchase of new capital improvements. The amount of revenue involved in the so-called capital gains tax is not, and should not be, the controlling factor; rather the emphasis should be upon its effect on the economy of this country." (William L. Keady, San Francisco, Calif.)

"From personal contacts and experience I can assure you that this bill would release hundreds of thousands of dollars in this area. I have many friends that are sitting tight on very substantial investments that they would like to dispose of. I know of no easier, painless way of raising funds than through a change in law such as your bill provides. Second, I am positive the bill would increase the tax money to the Federal Government tremendously and in a way that no one could take exception to." (Milton H. Frank, vice president, Franklin Van Sant & Associates, Madison, Wis.)

"I thoroughly agree with you that the present capital gains tax rate of 25 percent does have the effect of retarding investment, particularly in small business. There is no question in my mind but that a reduction in the capital gains tax would encourage investment to the point of providing job opportunities." (Dan Gerber, president, Gerber Baby Foods, Fremont, Mich.)

"You indicate your bill rests upon an assumption that the rate reduction in question will not reduce the yield to the Treasury Department of this tax but will, instead, actually increase it. Accepting this assumption, I do not think there is any question but that your bill is a meritorious one." (C. J. Fitzpatrick, president, Chicago & North Western Railway System, Chicago, Ill.)

"I favor a bill which provides that the tax rate on capital gains be greatly reduced from the maximum of 25 percent, or be eliminated. My reasons are that such a tax has the following faults: (1) It mixes capital and income; (2) it freezes investment; (3) it prevents Government receipt of taxes in proportion to current ability to pay; (4) it greatly reduces the value of the stock market as a social institution for encouraging investment and appraising the value of invested capital; (5) it causes great injustice to savers and investors in times of inflation; (6) it interferes with saving." (Lewis H. Hanley, economic consultant, Port Washington, N. Y.)

"With regard to your bill, I agree that the tax on long-term capital gains is largely a levy on capital rather than income. I also agree that it unfairly penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms. I agree that a serious national survey to study this problem would be of great value." E. L. Teale, president, New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N. J.

"I have felt for a long time that our present method of taxing capital gains—gains from appreciation in value of property disposed of—is a shortsighted one and needs drastic revision. I am happy to learn that you are attempting to bring about some change in the present law." (F. J. Blaise, Asst. secretary-treasurer, the Pure Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.)

"Basically, Mr. WILSON, I believe that Congress faces the necessity of reducing basic Government expenditures as well as reducing the tax rates on capital gains. It appears that the two go hand in hand." (W. R. Persons, president, Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.)

"Your proposal has been advocated on a number of occasions by the securities exchanges and should be of real interest to investors. It is clear that the tax burden carried by corporations and by the American people today is very heavy. We recognize, of course, the pressing problems in meeting the heavy costs of Federal Government, but we feel strongly that the tax structure must preserve the incentives necessary for the continued dynamic growth of this Nation. Accordingly, any progress toward reducing the tax burden and distributing it more equitably would, in our view, be beneficial to the overall economy." (F. R. Kappel, president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York.)

"Your bill would go a long way toward freeing equity capital markets from the artificial restrictions created by the 25-percent tax on long-term capital gains. If, as seems probable, its enactment would increase rather than decrease tax revenues, it would certainly be a boon to our economy." (A. S. Glossbrenner, president, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio.)

"Although I would like to see general relief from oppressive high taxes which are destroying the incentives of individuals to work, I nevertheless am in accord with your proposal. It is a step toward what I think should be an objective—namely, to abolish entirely all taxes on capital gains." (A. C. Ruber, president, Union Oil Company of California, Los Angeles, Calif.)

"This bill, which would reduce the capital-gains tax to 12½ percent, would, I believe, result in a substantial improvement in the Government's system of taxation. The present tax has not only frozen investors into many securities, but has also prevented such venturesome investors from supporting the new and speculative enterprises which are so necessary for the country's growth and prosperity." (Ernest J. Howe, president, Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Rochester, N. Y.)

"I want to commend you for undertaking the task of securing the enactment of this legislation. The present tax rate no doubt slows market activities in property and securities in which the transaction would come within the classification of long-term gain or loss. Legislative action that will stimulate trade in that field will be helpful to our economy. It may very well be that the increase in trade resulting from the enactment of such legislation would actually increase the amount of taxes paid to the Federal Government. Certainly any plan that has a possibility of reducing the national debt should be supported." (Paul B. McKee, president, Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland, Oreg.)

"It is clear to my associates and to me that any reduction in—and preferably the elimination of—the capital-gains tax will stimulate investment in new and small business." (Charles T. Silloway, president, Chemway Corp., Mountain View, N. J.)

"It is my opinion that all taxes are too high at the present time particularly those paid by corporations and individuals who have sufficient income to supply the capital to continue this country's growth. The long-term capital gains taxes are, of course, applicable to these classes of taxpayers." (F. S. Hales, president, Nickel Plate Road, Cleveland, Ohio.)

"There would seem to be few situations where a tax can be decreased and result in added revenues to the Government, but from the evidence I have it seems that enactment of H. R. 12709 might do just that. Should the contemplated survey indicate that the Federal Treasury would not lose money I personally believe that the proposed legislation should be enacted as speedily as possible." (Reuben E. Sommer, president, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., Peoria, Ill.)

"I share very strongly the point of view expressed in your letter of July 18. I am also firmly of the conviction that a reduction in the tax rate on long-term capital gains would actually result over the years in a very substantial increase in tax revenues." (F. Ritter Shumway, president, Ritter Co., Inc., Rochester, N. Y.)

"I would think that this would be a worthwhile piece of legislation providing it did not materially affect the revenue to the Treasury Department." (C. S. Parke, president, the Harshaw Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio.)

"The present working of the capital gains tax in effect accelerates the trend toward the formation of larger and larger business complexes and makes increasingly difficult the role of smaller business in the economy. As I see it, the reason for this is that investments, already now long standing in the major and older corporations, are, in effect, locked in. The owner of these equities pays an enormous penalty in withdrawing his investment and placing it elsewhere, perhaps in a smaller enterprise, even though the smaller enterprise may, and often does, pay a higher rate of return. This prevents the smaller enterprise from obtaining equity capital, with a resulting disadvantage to its growth and future profitability. I am sure that you are going to be able to assemble some very convincing evidence in support of your program and you should be confident, I would think, in having the backing of every thinking individual in the United States." (Austin Goodyear, New Canaan, Conn.).

"With reference to your letter of July 18, I feel that your suggestion that the tax rate on long-term capital gains be reduced from the present maximum rate of 25 percent to a rate of 12½ percent would be a constructive amendment to our tax law and would probably result in increased tax revenues to the Federal Government." (Ernest R. Acker, president, Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.)

"I am interested in the bill you plan to reintroduce in the next Congress, and particularly interested in the national survey now being conducted. If the survey does convincingly indicate that the Federal Treasury will gain by this tax reduction, I and other businessmen cannot but endorse the move heartily." (Robert S. Solinsky, president, National Can Corp., Chicago, Ill.)

"We believe your measure is a very important step forward. We also think you are correct in your position that the Government itself will not lose in total revenues collected, even though this tax itself is reduced or eliminated. The removal of the tax, we think, would tend to create an economic environment in which people would be willing to take risk, thereby producing taxes on income—if they did not have to worry about the taxing of resulting capital gains." (W. J. Good, executive vice president, the Trane Co., La Crosse, Wis.)

"Your idea is excellent as it certainly will stimulate the turnover of capital. It would appear to me when an incentive is provided that will stimulate investments to create capital gains the result is bound to mean a gain eventually for the Federal Treasury." (George J. Pecaro, president, the Flintkote Co., Inc., New York.)

"I strongly support H. R. 12709 which you have introduce to the House. It is my opinion that the 25 percent capital gains tax results in a stagnation of billions of dollars of risk capital, which are sorely needed by the country. As investment bankers, we are constantly reminded that successful investors find the capital gains tax a barrier in the efficient use of capital funds. Lowering the capital gains tax to 12½ percent would accelerate the conversion of successful investments into new areas of risk, and attract funds to the risk capital field because of the added opportunity for a return commensurate with the risk. I believe it is entirely possible that the reduction in the capital gains tax would result in a larger total tax revenue from this source. Even more important to the Nation would be the increased availability of funds for new fields of investment." (Howard Butcher III, Butcher & Sherrerd, Philadelphia, Pa.)

"In my opinion there should be no place in our tax structure for a capital-gains tax. It is a confiscation of capital and, as such, is economically unsound. Many people believe, and I am inclined to agree, that its abolishment would ultimately produce an increase of revenue rather than a loss to the Treasury. We believe your program is constructive and we thoroughly endorse your opinion as to the benefits which H. R. 12709 would provide." (Frank L. Magee, president, Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

"Agree 100 percent with your philosophy that a reduction of the capital-gains tax from 25 to 12½ percent would not only be constructive from the taxpayers' point of view, but nationally as well, because I think, without question, it would increase the tax revenue." (C. E. Kohlhepp, president, New Jersey Power & Light Co., Denville, N. J.)

"I think your ideas are very good and trust that the bill (H. R. 12709), which you have introduced in Congress, will meet with success." (A. E. Heimbach, president, General Railway Signal Co., Rochester, N. Y.)

"I thoroughly agree with your purpose in introducing a bill (H. R. 12709) to reduce the tax rate on long-term capital gains to 12½ percent. It has seemed reasonable to me that doing away with what amounts to a penalty on the use of capital would free capital for greater use; consequently, it would appear logical that a reduction in this levy would actually increase the revenues to the Government from this source." (A. Lightfoot Walker, president, Rheem Manufacturing Co., New York.)

Is a Co-Op Apartment for You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with cooperative apartments increasing in popularity, the following article which appeared in Today's Living of August 10, 1958, is most informative and timely. I commend its reading to the attention of our colleagues:

IS A CO-OP APARTMENT FOR YOU?

(By Arthur Owens)

Would it cost you less than renting? How much money would be tied up? Could you sublet your apartment? Could you eventually sell it? How much would you save in taxes? How much say would you have in running the building? Could you remodel as you saw fit? Would you have a voice in picking your neighbors?

Growing numbers of Americans are finding a solution to their personal housing problems in cooperative apartments. In the New York area alone, some 35,000 families have become co-op owners since World War II, and similar housing for another 27,000 local families is now either under construction or in the planning stage.

Why this sudden trend to co-ops? As one answer, consider the case of Bill and Edna Turner:

For years the Turners had lived in a small but comfortable apartment on New York's East Side. They liked the convenience of city living. But they'd become more and more irritated at their landlord's apparent reluctance to make needed repairs. And they couldn't help resenting the fact that they had nothing but canceled checks to show for the thousands of dollars they'd paid out in rent over the years.

Sure, they'd considered buying a split-level in Suburbia. But despite the obvious advantages of home ownership, they probably wouldn't have been happy living on Long Island or in Connecticut. For one thing, it would have meant leaving most of their old friends. For another, Bill just wasn't the type to enjoy spending an hour or so on a commuter train to come home to an overgrown lawn.

What the Turners obviously wanted were the advantages of both home ownership and apartment dwelling without the drawbacks of either. Surprisingly, they're now getting exactly what they wanted—without moving out of the city.

They have bought a cooperative apartment.

By doing so, they have eliminated the landlord's profit. So their monthly costs amount to less than they were paying as rent. And they can reduce expenses still further by taking the same type of income deduction for real estate taxes and mortgage interest that they would have been entitled to as homeowners. What is more, they will be acquiring an increasing amount of equity in their apartment. This may be turned into cash if they ever decide to sell.

Besides these economic benefits, the Turners and their fellow tenant-owners are virtually guaranteed permanent occupancy. And they can have the kind of maintenance and service they want—so long as they are willing to pay for it.

Their approach to the housing problem is not a new one: Cooperatives have existed for more than a century in England—and for more than 50 years in New York City itself. They did not become popular in this country

though, until the 1920's. Then, following the stock market crash in 1929, resale prices plunged. As a result, co-ops fell into disfavor, although the basic values were still there. It was not until about 15 years ago (when safeguards were provided and when the Federal income tax laws were revised to permit co-op owners to deduct their share of interest and property taxes) that cooperative ownership really started to snowball.

NOT ALL IN LUXURY CLASS

Perhaps the most significant fact about the current uptrend is this: More than half the cooperative apartments built in recent years have been planned expressly for middle-income, rather than upper-income families. Here is why:

A few years ago the Federal Government realized such families could no longer afford the rents then being asked for most privately owned residential apartments. So it authorized the Federal Housing Administration to insure long-term, low-interest mortgages on new co-op. This made it possible for private developers to put up attractive apartment buildings without investing much cash, and to sell them at prices most people could pay.

Meanwhile, the owners of many luxury apartment buildings found it more profitable to sell them to cooperative groups than to go on operating them as rentals.

Today cooperative housing is available to all but the lowest-income groups. A New Yorker, for example, can pay a small fortune for a cooperative palace—or he can buy a comfortable four-room apartment for about $1,000 down and $110 a month, including gas and electricity.

Assuming you can afford a co-op apartment, should you consider buying one? The answer is not simple. To help you decide, let us see how a typical cooperative works:

The plan of operation will vary somewhat according to whether it's an FHA-backed, middle-income project or a luxury building—so-called because of some special feature such as an exceptional view, a fashionable address, or maid service. We'll focus first on the typical luxury co-op. Later we'll see how the typical FHA project differs.

WHAT YOU'D REALLY OWN

As a tenant, you don't actually own the apartment you live in—but you have most of the rights and obligations of ownership. What you do own is a block of stock in a corporation set up to operate the building on a noprofit basis. This, in turn, entitles you to a long-term, renewable "proprietary" lease. You may continue to occupy your apartment as long as you hold the stock allocated to it. In other words, an individual apartment and the stock with it are inseparable.

The co-operative corporation's chief purpose in issuing stock is to raise money to meet that part of the purchase price of the building that's not covered by the mortgage. This amount (known as total equity) is equal in value to 100% of the corporation's stock.

Once the total equity has been determined, the selling agent decides how many shares of stock will be issued altogether. He then apportions the shares among the various apartments according to what he judges to be their respective rental values. Thus, if you selected a large, sunny suite overlooking a park, he'd naturally assign more stock to it than he would to a small, dingy apartment that boasted a fine view of the neighborhood delicatessen.

The original equity, or purchase price, of your apartment is determined in this way: The selling agent first divides the total equity by the total number of shares of stock to establish the value of one share. He then multiplies this figure by the number of shares allocated to you. The result is the amount you pay for your right to a proprietary lease.

YOUR MONTHLY CHARGES

You pay no rent in the usual sense. But you do pay a type of monthly rental that's usually called a "maintenance charge," representing your share of the corporation's estimated cash requirements for operation, maintenance, interest and amortization on the mortgage, real estate and other taxes, insurance, and a reserve for contingencies. The percentage of total maintenance charges that you pay is based on the number of shares of stock you hold.

If you're buying into a new building, you may sign a contract while it's still in the blueprint stage. You won't have to pay any maintenance charges except on your own apartment, and then not until you take possession. Reason: The seller normally assumes financial responsibility for the maintenance of any units that remain unsold when the cooperative corporation takes title. (Later he tries to recoup his expenses by selling these apartments for more than their original prices.)

When you do start paying maintenance charges, you'll find the amount is by no means constant; it fluctuates along with the co-op's expenses. But you have some indirect control over costs and all other policies except those covered by the lease.

WHO RUNS THE BUILDING?

Since it's impractical to call a stockholders' meeting to decide every minor question that comes up, the tenant-owners elect a board of directors—usually from their own ranks—to represent them. The board hires a professional managing agent, who operates under its direction. The agent's job is to see that the building is run the way the tenants want it run, and to prepare the annual budget.

The board's responsibilities are mainly supervisory. It must approve all changes in the budget, in operating policies, and in the building itself. Its approval is also needed before any tenant-owner can sublease or resell his apartment.

What happens when your proprietary lease expires? As all the other tenants' leases expire on the same date, this question, too, must be decided by a vote. If a majority so decides, the property can be sold and the net proceeds distributed among the members of the co-op. Generally, though, all leases are renewed for another long term.

That, briefly, is how the typical luxury co-op works. The FHA-approved project operates in much the same way. But from the point of view of the tenant-owner, according to Herbert Fischbach of Herbert Charles & Co., New York, specialists in this field, there are these differences:

Most important, perhaps, is the cost. A New Yorker can buy an apartment in an FHA co-op for about $500 a room equity and monthly carrying charges of about $35 a room. Comparable housing in a privately financed building, on the other hand, would cost him approximately twice as much. One reason for the difference: FHA mortgage terms are generally more favorable. Another reason: The developer's profit on an FHA co-op is limited by law to a fair fee for putting up the building.

Veterans get preference in the purchase of an FHA-approved apartment. And they don't lose any of their privileges under the GI bill.

Whereas the proprietary lease on a luxury apartment may run anywhere from 15 to 99 years, the FHA tenant signs an occupancy agreement that's effective for only about 3 years. But the term of the lease makes little difference, since both types are renewable.

Profits from resales of FHA-backed apartments are limited by Government regulations, but with privately financed apartments there's no limit. Also, the FHA co-op corporation itself has a 30-day option to buy an apartment before it's offered for resale on the open market.

WHAT YOU STAND TO GAIN.

Now that we've examined the principles of both types of cooperative ownership, let's take a closer look at their advantages, drawbacks, and possible pitfalls. First, the advantages:

You're assured of permanent occupancy. (That is, of course, unless a majority of the stockholders vote to sell the building—which isn't likely to happen—or unless you can't meet the payments.) So, unlike a rental tenant, you don't face the need to negotiate periodically for the renewal of your lease. You can go ahead and invest in decorations and furnishings with the assurance that you'll be there to enjoy them for a long time to come. Or you can sublease or sell it as specified in your lease and subject to the directors' approval of the new tenant.

The monthly cost is less than it would be for a rental apartment. After buying the equity, you pay only your share of actual operating costs. The corporation makes no profit, and waste is held to a minimum. So you're likely to pay anywhere from 10 to 30 percent less per month than you would to rent similar quarters. And the saving is even greater after taxes. To illustrate:

Suppose you're paying $200 a month in maintenance charges for a 6-room apartment with an estimated rental value of $300. Suppose, too, that your share of real-estate taxes and mortgage interest comes to $70 a month, or $840 a year. This means you can deduct $840 from your gross income before figuring your personal income tax. If you're lucky enough to be paying some of your Federal tax in the 50-percent bracket, you'll save $420 a year, or $35 a month, in Federal taxes alone. And if you live in New York State, you'll also save on your State income tax. Thus you'll be getting a $300-a-month apartment at a net cost of less than $165 a month. (But remember, you're losing whatever income you might get from the capital you've tied up in the apartment.)

You have some control over standards of maintenance. You and your fellow tenant-owners, acting through the board of directors and the managing agent, can thus prevent your property from deteriorating. As a result, the market value of your equity should remain at a high level. On the other hand, you also have the power to reduce your expenses by eliminating unnecessary services and uneconomical practices.

Your equity keeps on increasing. This, in effect, acts as a savings account. You can withdraw your savings by selling your apartment. If you do, you may make a sizable profit in addition to the equity you've paid in (unless your apartment is in an FHA building). At least that's been the experience of most luxury co-op owners who've cashed in their stock in recent years.

You aren't personally liable for the mortgage. It's strictly a corporate debt. Even if you're unable to continue paying your maintenance charges, a three-way escape clause in the typical proprietary lease allows you to free yourself of further financial responsibility in any of these ways: (1) You can sell your stock and lease; (2) you can sublease your apartment; or (3) failing both of these, you can turn over your stock and lease to the corporation, which will then assume the responsibility of selling or leasing your your apartment to pay current charges. (But here you'll be sacrificing your equity, as we'll explain later.)

Your neighbors are handpicked. The directors screen each prospective buyer to make sure his character, social standards, and degree of financial responsibility are acceptable to you and the other tenants.

CONSIDER THESE LIMITATIONS

Impressive as these advantages may be, you'll be wise to postpone signing a proprietary lease or occupancy agreement until you've also considered the negative aspects of cooperative ownership:

You must replace all equipment and do all the decorating in your own apartment. Being in a sense your own landlord, you're expected to pay the entire cost of any replacements, additions, remodeling, or redecorating. (The co-op corporation will normally replace any wornout equipment that's part of the building itself—such as faucets and wall switches. It will also redecorate and repair or replace equipment in those parts of the building shared by all tenants.)

Your maintenance charges may go up. If operating costs should rise, or if the majority of the tenants should vote to increase services, you'll naturally have to pay more per month. This could happen if the price of fuel went up, or if the corporation decided to hire another porter or doorman. You may also get hit with extra one-shot assessments—for redecorating the lobby, say, or for converting the building from direct to alternating current. The building's tax load may go up, too.

You can lose some or all of your equity. If the market prices of co-op apartments in general should plunge, as they did in the 30s, the value of your equity would automatically be diminished. But, says one New York realtor, "I can see no leveling off of prices yet."

A more serious threat to your investment lurks in the possibility that financial reverses will make it impossible for you to pay your maintenance charges. True, in such an event you could protect your investment by subleasing or reselling. But should you fail to find a buyer or lessee acceptable to the directors, and to do so within the time limit on arrears specified in your proprietary agreement, you'd not only be evicted but you'd also lose part or all of your equity.

You can lose eligibility for taxable-income deduction. Many apartment corporations rent some of their space to retailers and professional men in order to reduce the owners' maintenance charges. Ordinarily this has no effect on the tax-exempt status of that portion of maintenance charges that goes for real estate taxes and mortgage interest. But the Federal Revenue Act stipulates that such deductions are allowable only if the corporation receives at least 80 percent of its gross income from tenant-stockholders.

It's highly unlikely, therefore, that any such corporation would deliberately plan to get more than 20 percent of its income from rent. But suppose its rental income normally amounted to only slightly less than the 20 percent maximum. Then, if several stockholders defaulted in their payments, and if their apartments couldn't be resold immediately, the corporation would have to do one of two things: (1) Lease the evicted tenants' apartments—in which case the remaining owners would lose their tax advantage—or (2) levy a special assessment to cover maintenance charges on the vacant apartments. In either case, the tenant-owners would lose money.

You may not be able to sell or lease your apartment when and to whom you choose. Some proprietary leases will not allow the tenant-owner to evoke the escape clause during the first couple of years of ownership. And some severely limit the term for which an apartment may be leased.

Remember, too, that the board of directors has absolute authority to disapprove a prospective buyer—even, unless local law is violated, on grounds of race, religion, or nationality. Its judgment cannot legally be challenged. Nor does it have to explain its decisions. This right has been upheld by many courts.

Still another reason your apartment may be hard to resell is that its purchase cannot be refinanced, since there is no mortgage on an individual suite. The buyer must pay the entire value of the equity in cash. And, because this value increases with each successive year of occupancy, it becomes harder and harder to find someone with enough cash to close the deal.

You have no individual control over operating standards. There is no choice but to go along with the majority of tenants in such matters as doormen's hours, redecorating the lobby, garbage removal, and so on.

You have not full freedom to remodel your apartment. Here again, you must get the director's advance approval. The reason: Certain types of structural changes would increase the building's operating costs or impair the salability of your apartment.

You cannot use your stock and lease as security for a loan. These would be of little value to a lender unless he could demand possession of your apartment in case you defaulted. But he could not do so without the cooperative corporation's approval, which could not be given in advance. So a proprietary lease and stock are not usually regarded as acceptable collateral.

You cannot pay off your share of the mortgage at will. The corporation's indebtedness applies to the entire building, and is amortized over a specified number of years. So it is generally considered impractical for one tenant-owner to pay off his portion while the others continue to make monthly payments.

If you are seriously looking for a cooperative apartment, the Federal Housing Administration or your local real estate board can refer you to reputable sales agents who specialize in co-ops.

A LIST OF POINTS TO CHECK

The preceding article discusses a typical apartment co-op. But they aren't all alike. So, to be sure the particular co-op you're considering is a sound one, check these points:

Is it in a desirable neighborhood? (New construction within a radius of a few blocks is one sign that the area is probably on the upgrade.)

Is the apartment itself attractive? Is the layout convenient?

How do the monthly carrying charges compare with the cost of renting a similar apartment? (Make this comparison on a per room basis without taking tax deductions into account.)

If the co-op has been in operation for a while, has it been living within its budget? (Ask to see financial statements for the past several years.)

Are any major repairs needed? (These might soon necessiate heavy assessments.)

Does the proprietary lease give you the right to resell or sublease your apartment, subject to the board's approval?

Is it the co-op's policy to elect directors from among the tenants? Are the directors' decisions subject to the approval of the stockholders?

Is any immediate increase in maintenance charges or assessments being contemplated?

Is the economic status of the other tenant-owners similar to your own? (This may affect your future ability to pay maintenance charges and assessments.)

Is any legal action pending against the apartment corporation? Has it received any notice of violations of the building code?

Blonde, Bright, and Breezy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, merit is the essence of the civil-service system. There is no merit in the President's nomination of Mrs. Barbara Bates Gunderson as Commissioner for Civil Service. The letter below speaks for itself as does the editorial from the Washington Post, August 13, 1958, both included under leave granted previously to extend my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1958.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: The confirmation of Barbara Bates Gunderson is of course a matter properly for the Senate and, initially, for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which you are chairman. I trust you will permit me to express my opinion, however, for the consideration of the committee.

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and as a citizen, I protest. Mrs. Gunderson is not qualified. She admits it. This is a brutal slap in the face for 2¼ million civil-service employees and of the civil-service system itself.

I have no doubt that Mrs. Gunderson is, in the words of the picture caption in yesterday's New York Times, "blonde, bright, and breezy." But nothing in her experience equips her for the $20,000 per year position of Civil Service Commissioner. She is quoted as saying she had never made a study of the Civil Service Commission but "I sure intend to." This will make her the highest paid trainee in the Government.

This is an affront to all the able women in this country. There are many women superbly equipped by training and achievement to be a Civil Service Commissioner. It matters not to me that Mrs. Gunderson is a vigorous Republican Party official except that one supposes other qualifications to be essential also.

My earnest recommendation is that you use your considerable influence to persuade the administration to withdraw this unfortunate nomination or, in the alternative, that the Senate refuse to confirm her appointment.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

LETDOWN FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Most of the enthusiasm over the appointment of Barbara Bates Gunderson to be a member of the Civil Service Commission appears to be concentrated in the person of Mrs. Gunderson herself. She is a woman of boundless energy, and her eagerness to take on the assignment is readily apparent. But she does not claim any special qualifications for membership on the Government's top personnel agency, and indeed her experience in this field has been nil. Thus her nomination is disappointing.

The recent withdrawal of Bernard L. Flanagan's nomination to the CSC after he

had admitted errors in his own applications for civil service jobs should have been followed by the strongest appointment the President could make. Something extraordinary was needed to recover from that fumble. But the President has been content to bestow the post on the Republican National Committeewoman from South Dakota. The appointment is said to be in line with the President's policy of attracting more young people (Mrs. Gunderson is 41) into Government service, especially women. But it has all the earmarks of a routine political nomination, at the behest of Senator MUNDT, to a body created to keep politics out of the selection of Government personnel.

It is to Mrs. Gunderson's credit that she intends to resign her political office if she is confirmed and to refrain from participation in politics. Nevertheless, the naming of an active party official to the Civil Service Commission is almost as unfortunate as nominating an active politician to the bench. The CSC needs to do its work in a spirit of nonpartisanship. Public confidence in its devotion to the merit principle will be difficult to maintain if political patronage appears to dictate the choice of Commission members. Coming immediately after the Flanagan hearing, therefore, Mrs. Gunderson's nomination is a letdown regardless of how energetic and conscientious she may be.

Theory or National Safety?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following strong and forceful editorial on an important subject matter that should invite the attention of all patriotic Americans desirous of protecting our way of life from those who seek day after day to undermine our Government. This article appeared in the August 14 edition of the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes entitled "Theory or National Safety?"

THEORY OR NATIONAL SAFETY?

Six Communists who were convicted of subversion in 1956 and given sentences of from 1 to 5 years were set free last week by a ruling of 3 judges of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in New York City.

The 3 judges ruled the Government had failed to show the 6 Communist officers had urged people to do something rather than just to believe in something.

This was a distinction laid down by the Supreme Court in June 1957. The high tribunal said then the act does not forbid teaching overthrow of the Government as an abstract principle divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end.

Sometimes we wonder how silly the courts can get, from the highest to the lowest. Has devotion to purism and technicalities overshadowed devotion to principle? Has a desire to adhere to the strictest interpretation of the law become more important than the preservation of the Republic of the United States?

You may teach the principles of communism in the United States to our younger generations so long as you don't tell them to overthrow the Government of the United States, says the Supreme Court.

It would appear that the Supreme Court and its followers in the lower judicial echelons have lost sight of the fact that the very teaching of Communist principles is but one step toward the overthrow of our Government as we know it and have learned to respect it.

As we look back in retrospect, we have a distinct recollection of how communism was spread and developed in the minds of the Russian people.

First, it was an attack on religion, because Communist leaders were clever enough to realize that as long as people had religion they could not cleave to communism under the Marxist teachings and the even more radical ideas which were being developed under the early leaders of the U. S. S. R.

From the very beginning of their assumption of power in Russia the men in the Kremlin realized that they could not persuade the older generation to accept their theories of government. These older folks still felt the strong pull of religion and on Good Friday they were permitted to visit their churches and toll the bells in acknowledgment of their misdeeds and in atonement for the wrongs they might have committed in the year just past.

But the wily leaders of the Kremlin, realizing that they could not pierce the solid foundation of religion inherent in the older people, set out to teach the younger groups.

Of course, it took a couple of generations to instill the thought that religion, home, and parents were things to be discredited and that the state alone was supreme.

The idea took root slowly, at first, because the older folks still endeavored to bring up their children in the ways of righteousness, but as time marched on the older groups died off or were disposed of in the manner specifically provided by the Kremlin for those who opposed its wishes, and in due time there grew up a new generation of young men and women who despised all the things in which decent people believed, with the result that we now have a godless people whose only belief is down with God and up with the state, having in mind the conquest of the world.

To get back to the ruling of the Supreme Court which we have discussed and subsequent rulings by lower courts, upholding the right to teach "the principles of communism" provided actual overthrow of our Government is not urged, we get right back to what happened in Russia.

We can understand why it may be necessary to understand the evils of communism and that these evils should be explained to our students in high school or college, but we also believe that the instillation of the principles of communism may in time fill the minds of our youths to the end that they, like the younger people of Soviet Russia, will rise and scoff at the principles which we, of an older generation, hold dear and for which many of our young men have fought and died to uphold.

To say by pure technicality that it is right to teach the theory of communism in the schools of the United States or in public forums held for the general public is permissible is to open the way to the ultimate breakdown of our form of government.

Repetition of a falsehood, we have learned, is one of the most efficient methods of having that falsehood accepted as truth.

If our younger generations hear enough about the ideals of communism, enough of them may be impressed in their early years to accept those ideals, with the result that much sooner than we of the present day think we shall see the acceptance of communism here in our own country with the loss of everything for which we have stood since the Declaration of Independence brought a new era of freedom to the world.

Theory, as practiced in the courts of our land, may be one thing, but when theory is developed so tenuously that it could lead to the loss of our country to falsehood, then it is time for the Supreme Court to take stock of the situation and be guided not by theory but by practicality.

Their strict adherence to words and not meaning could well result in the wiping out of their own body, and jurisprudence, as we know it and have developed it from the English common law down to our present-day statutes, could well disappear from the earth.

We believe in freedom of speech as we believe in freedom of the press and freedom of religion, but if that right becomes license and such freedom of speech might extend itself to an eventual overthrow of our Government, then it is a right which should be curbed and the courts made aware, by act of Congress, if necessary, of the will of the majority of our people.

Laws were made for man by men and, fortunately, in our country the vast majority of our people obey and respect the law, but when a narrow construction of the law by any court in the land leads to a possible destruction not only of the law but of our Government, then a stricter ruling should be found to prevent what happened in Russia, once the Communists took over, from happening in this land of ours.

Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the daily radio roundup for August 6, 1958, of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF THE FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN., AUGUST 6, 1958

The latest farm price report from the United States Government shows that farm prices dropped again between June 15 and July 15. They are down to 83 percent of parity now, and with the big new harvest hitting the market places, farmers are rapidly losing the small price gains they had chalked up since 1956. This naturally focuses even more attention on the farm bill in Congress, which probably will be either passed or rejected by the time you hear this broadcast.

But, to be realistic about it, both the Senate and House bills are such cut-up and hamstrung versions of what real farm legislation should be, that many farm people feel they would be better off without either one. And the dealing that is going on behind the scenes now, around the House bill, amounts to almost an insult to farm people, who deserve far better than what either the Democrats or the Republicans are talking about giving them. Just take a look at what is happening now, according to the newspaper reports. Apparently there's a lot of wheeling-and-dealing going on, with the result, as one headline puts it, that "Ike Hopes To Block Farm Bill."

How would he do it? Another newspaper story tells how administration Republicans and Secretary of Agriculture Benson are try-

ing to make a deal with SAM RAYBURN, the Democratic leader in the House, and JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader, to pass the House version and shoot it over into conference with the Senate. And that's where they'd chew it down to the 60-percent level acceptable to the administration and Benson. If they made a sure-death deal like this on the farm bill, it certainly would reflect with discredit on both Democrats and Republicans, at least in the farm areas. Farmers know what's going on, because they have their own good sources of information to get the facts, and they wouldn't be taken in. As a matter of fact, we don't believe that the farm Senators and Representatives from our area would be a party to such dealings, any more than GTA and the Farmers Union would.

Farm people have every right to be indignant over this administration plan to deal from a deck with five aces in it. The newspapers say that on Tuesday, White House liaison man Jack Anderson was over in Congress to talk with RAYBURN and MARTIN. He wanted to get "advance assurances" the newspaper said, that the bill would get Bensonized in the Senate-House conference, if the administration let it pass the House. When the votes are tallied, we'll see how successful he was.

We can't help but feel that farmers would have preferred a straight "yes or no" on farm legislation, rather than this slinking around behind the scenes. It's an amazing performance for an administration and a Secretary of Agriculture that publicly hold themselves above subterfuge. Maybe the attempts to work out deceitful deals behind the scenes won't work, but we won't know that until the farm measure is either rejected or approved. Either way, farmers are the losers, because with no farm bill, they'd go on as they are, and any bill that could pass would have to have administration approval, which would mean lower price supports.

It's the kind of a problem that will have to be answered after 1960, because that's the first chance farmers will have to vote for whatever changes they think are necessary in high Government offices.

Thanks for listening. This is GTA, the co-op way.

Why the Fight Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able editorial from the Richmond News Leader of Richmond, Va., entitled, "Why the Fight Goes On."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of July 30, 1958]

WHY THE FIGHT GOES ON

Now and then, when it appears that everything has been said about school segregation that possibly could be said about school segregation, some events come along in the news and once again the necessity arises for a restatement of basic consideration.

Such a time is at hand now. A number of parents, who possibly have not pondered the problem wholly, are asking why the various Virginia localities are not permitted to go their own way. Here in Richmond, it is termed absurd to risk the closing of Westhampton and Nathaniel Bacon schools to prevent half a dozen Negro pupils from attending classes with a thousand white children. In the Arlington area, a few apostles of panic are protesting the possibility that even one child may lose as much as a single day from public school.

It may be useful, in view of the crisis now only a month away, to set down anew the reasons that underlie Virginia's policy of "massive resistance." What is the State fighting for?

Three things:

1. To preserve a constitutional position that ought never to be voluntarily surrendered.

2. To preserve the ethnic and social structure of the South against forces that would destroy it.

3. To preserve the greatest possible educational opportunities for the greatest number of children, white and Negro alike.

Those are the State's aims. They are the only aims. But it should be understood that meeting these aims demands a great deal of the people of Virginia. We are asked to rise above those interests which are personal, concrete, and immediate, and to dedicate ourselves instead to goals that, to a degree, are abstract and remote. We are asked to think earnestly upon the Constitution of the United States and the structure of the American Republic, and these are big things, hard to catch hold of. We will be asked, some of us, to accept temporary sacrifices that affect our own children, and this is hardest of all to understand.

But the fight is worth making. If Virginia quits now, we will repudiate the political heritage passed down to us, and we will leave to succeeding generations a shameful inheritance. It is no disgrace to be defeated, and in the end we may be defeated. The disgrace lies in failing to resist.

THE CONSTITUTION

The constitutional position taken by Virginia is simple, direct, unambiguous. Virginia entered the Union in 1788, at a time when she could have remained forever apart, upon certain clear understandings: This was to be a Federal union of sovereign States, in which the States would delegate certain limited powers to the Federal Government they were creating; all other powers, apart from those prohibited to the States by the Constitution itself, were to be retained by the States individually. This structure of the Union was in no way altered by the War of 1861–65.

After the war, when the 14th amendment was forced upon the South, northern legislators inquired what effect the amendment would have upon the maintenance by the States of racially separate schools. Proponents of the amendment agreed that the amendment was not intended to prohibit this power to the States; the power, therefore, was to be reserved to them. For a long period thereafter, pursuant to this explicit understanding of the correct meaning of the amendment States, both North and South, continued to maintain segregated schools. Their power to do so was repeatedly reaffirmed by the highest State and Federal courts; this construction of the 14th amendment, directly and vitally affecting millions of people and enormous investments in school property, became, in effect, a part of the Constitution of the United States.

The South's position is that the Constitution may be amended in one way only: That is by the consent of not fewer than three-fourths of the States, expressed in the ratification of a specific amendment. The Constitution cannot be amended by mandate of the Supreme Court. The Court's function is to interpret the Constitution; and as the Court applies its interpretive powers to new situations, so the Court properly may shape the Constitution to changing times. But the States power to maintain separate schools was not a new situation in May of 1954; it was an old situation, dating back to the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868. And Virginia's position is that in the school cases, the Supreme Court usurped the amendatory power that is vested in the States alone.

Virginia's position is not limited to the school matter only. If the Court may usurp power so drastically in this instance, we have said, then the Court may usurp power in every instance. The concept of a Federal Union of States, held together by checks and balances, will be lost altogether.

If this trend is to be halted at all, it will be halted only because the States resist it—resist it dramatically, resist it steadfastly, resist it in every legal and honorable way that can be devised. If it takes a noise to arouse the rest of the country, then we must make that noise. If it requires a court fight to attract attention, then we will have to fight in court. Quiet submission to the Court's revolutionary demands would be an invitation to new judicial excesses. Stubborn and unyielding resistance, if it accomplishes nothing more, may deter the Court from fresh encroachments. This constitutional fight is of primary importance. It must not be abandoned.

THE SOCIETY

The second reason for Virginia's policy lies in subjective considerations that are most difficult for outsiders to understand—at least until they have experienced, over a considerable time, the much mocked "southern way of life." Our entire society is predicated on, and influenced by, the intimate coexistence of two races. This relationship has operated, until recently, upon well understood rules—rules that were not static, rules that in fact were steadily undergoing change—and under these rules the Negro people were making astonishing progress. What the Supreme Court has attempted to do is not only to amend the Constitution, which it had no right to do, but to revolutionize the social structure of the South, which it has no power to do.

This is because the public schools are perceived not only as educational institutions, but as social institutions also. In rural areas, especially, the schools provide a center for all community life. Everywhere else, the two races may meet and pass—in business, in farming, in transportation, in employment. It is only in schools that both races would be thrown together, social equals, in a compulsory relationship, intimate, personal, and prolonged.

The white South cannot accept the long-range prospect of such a relationship. We of Virginia know, in a hundred ways that our distant critics cannot know, something of the differences that divide white and Negro in the South. These are ethnic differences, racial differences—differences in morals, in behavior, in language, in inhibitions, in aspirations. The South acknowledges, of course, the achievements of many Negro citizens of exceptional competence and ambition; and the South is ruefully aware of its "po' white trash." But we view the classless society as sheer fiction. In one way or another, all men are divided into classes. And what the South holds is that the harm done by segregating these classes in the public schools (and admittedly, there is harm done) is infinitely less than the social chaos and civil decline that would follow inexorably in the wake of massive race mixing.

We are not talking here of the consequences this year, or next year, or the year after that. These are consequences 20, 30, or 50 years hence. And Virginia has only to point to the dismal history of civilizations dominated by mixed blood to insist that such a fate must be resisted here.

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The least of the considerations, though it may seem the most important to distressed parents whose children are directly affected, is the aim of keeping every public school open every single day. Virginia does not need any lectures on the importance of public schools; everyone concedes the importance of public schools. But the ultimate goal is not necessarily public education, by which is meant tax-supported education in publicly owned buildings. The ultimate goal is simply education. In one fashion or another, satisfactory educational opportunities must be provided, and they must be provided for the children of both races.

Virginia's position is that the public school system, as a statewide system, can be preserved for the foreseeable future only as a racially separate system. A little integration will not preserve the system. A little integration will destroy the system. This is because integration anywhere means inevitably, integration everywhere. And once a precedent is set, disruption follows. Talk of massive school closings. If Virginia were to accept integration in principle, in time Virginia truly would see massive school closings, county by county, city by city, in the wake of violence, bloodshed, and bitterness never knows before. And instead of facing the problems of establishing a relatively few private schools, Virginians would face the problems of private education across the whole State. In the resulting atmosphere of hatred and resentment, education would be all but impossible.

It now seems likely that as a consequence of Federal court orders and unyielding State policy, some schools will not be opened in Virginia in September. That will be unfortunate, regrettable, and to the parents directly involved, damnably inconvenient. But this newspaper does not regard the immediate prospect as catastrophic. The resourcefulness of the people will not let any substantial number of children go long without some adequate educational opportunity.

Virginians have known sacrifice before, and they have met hard challenges before; they are not lacking in character or energy. We can meet the multiple emergencies of September calmly, without panic, without violence, without hysterical pleas to surrender. All that is required is that we hold to the long view, abide by the law (no law compels Virginia to operate any schools), and maintain a steadfast faith in the inherent rightness of Virginia's position.

Pentagon Fiscal Planners Squirm as Defense Costs Keep Going Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pentagon Fiscal Planners Squirm as Defense Costs Keep Going Up," which appeared in the July issue of Aeronautical Procurement magazine. The author, Allen M. Smythe, is a financial writer who has written many articles on defense procurement policies for a number of financial, business, and military journals.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON FISCAL PLANNERS SQUIRM AS DEFENSE COSTS KEEP GOING UP

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Mounting defense costs are again causing concern in the Pentagon. If the services manage to keep their expenditures within budgetary limits—which is questionable—it will be at the expense of conventional aircraft, naval vessels, and other weapons. Defense Secretary McElroy is reported to have asked his fiscal experts for new analyses of spending trends.

Why the problem? New pay raises for military and Government defense workers will add substantially to defense costs. Maintenance costs for supersonic aircraft and liquid-propellent missiles are skyrocketing. Construction spending for dispersal of Strategic Air Command bases is rising toward a billion dollars a year. Broader and more intensive research requires increasing amounts of money and more is being committed for development.

Recent fiscal reports show that these increases more than equal the planned increases of $1.5 billion in the 1959 defense budget.

Pentagon's hesitancy to commit itself on future spending doesn't mean that it's going to cut expenditures for military hardware. But the rising costs and the faster shift to missiles and spacecraft than was anticipated 6 months ago mean that planners are having to do a tough and thorough screening job on all military projects.

Navy and Air Force have been having financial difficulties this last quarter of fiscal 1958, and will continue to have them into early 1959, despite additional appropriations. Army is in better fiscal condition. But all three services are under strict budgetary limitations and quarterly expenditure control.

The Defense Comptroller's efforts to hold expenditures for military hardware to $14 billion a year are painful to military contractors now. They will be agonizing in the next fiscal year.

The huge sums necessary for spaceships, ballistic missiles, Mach 3 aircraft and atomic submarines will be squeezed out of funds originally planned for conventional weapons. This shifting of funds for major procurement items is one of the most important and difficult duties of Pentagon officials at the moment.

Impact of technological progress is severe on combat planning as well as fiscal programing. For example, ground-to-air guided missiles have almost supplanted the 90- and 120-millimeter antiaircraft gun battalions. The last battleship has been retired. Naval gun factories and proving grounds have new duties. The Air Force has just about replaced all of the Convair B–36 piston-plus jet bomber wings with the Boeing B–52.

These changes were taking place even before the sputnik era. Now the demand is for more effort on advanced scientific projects and for less effort on programs likely to be made obsolete soon by technological progress. The 1959 fiscal year budget will reflect these trends, but spiraling costs may make the choice of approved projects very selective. For example, Secretary McElroy will continue to allow money to be spent for both the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's; but as soon as one shows a clear-cut advantage over the other, the boom will be dropped—fast—on the runner-up.

THE UPKEEP'S EXPENSIVE, TOO

McElroy has expressed concern over the high cost of field weapons. Previously, when new or improved weapons were approved, often it was performance only that was considered. McElroy now insists that mobility, and costs for shipping, storage, maintenance and operation, and for production, be considered.

Pentagon fiscal officials have produced some interesting comparisons. Today's operational fighters fly twice as high and 3 times as fast as World War II fighters—and cost 20 times as much. They also cost more to operate and maintain.

A World War II submarine cost less than $5 million. The *Nautilus*-type atomic submarine costs $45 million. A Polaris-equipped submarine—five are now planned—is expected to cost $100 million. McElroy has said that a Polaris system—the ship, missiles, spares, and shore supplies—would cost more than $200 million, which explains his opposition to the plans of a House group to appropriate for four more of the subs. He feels he can use the billion dollars better elsewhere.

An antiaircraft battalion equipped with the Western Electric-Bell Labs-Douglas Nike-Ajax missile costs about three times as much as the conventional AA gun battalions. The Nike-Hercules, which will soon be replacing the Ajax, will be three times as expensive, not counting the nuclear warhead. When the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile is installed, it will cost several times more than the Hercules.

The Air Force estimates on the cost of the Convair B–58 bomber are being scrutinized by the Defense Department. Average cost of the more than 2,000 Boeing B–47 medium bombers, now out of production for over a year, was less than $3 million, including spares and extra parts. The last extension of the contract carried a price tag of around $1.6 million each, flyaway. At the time, Air Force figured another 48 percent for spares and extras, making a total unit cost of about $2.4 million.

Five years of top-priority development of the B–58 have reportedly cost over $600 million, all under letters of intent. The first 77 planes will cost around $16 million each, flyaway. Air Force expects to hold cost of spares and extras under 30 percent, as a result of reliability planning and tests. This still would make the initial cost of the B–58 system around $20 million per plane.

Unit costs are expected to drop materially as production continues. However, the size of future orders will be influenced by the amount of money needed to complete the Boeing B–52 program, and the need for funds to push the second generation of solid-fueled ballistic missile projects.

Navy has been considering, at the highest level, three carrier fighters—the Chance Vought F8U–3, McDonnell F4H, and North American F3J. Although all had been programed for sizable production orders, it will be a surprise now if funds can be found for reduced orders for two of them.

Air Force has already stretched out its program for the Republic F–105 and Convair F–106, because of new spending controls. No contract extensions for the McDonnell F–101, Convair F–102, or Lockheed F–104 are in sight. Plans for extensive ground installations for the Boeing Bomarc area defense missile are being held up while Defense officials compare estimated costs with those for the Nike.

AGAINST THE TREND

To brighten this gloomy picture of rising defense costs, Army is able to light a couple of hopeful candles. The Martin Pershing solid-propellent missile, which is soon to replace the liquid-propellent Chrysler Redstone, is expected to cost only half as much as the $1 million Redstone. Elimination of the LOX fuel will drastically reduce shipping, storage, and maintenance expenses, Army Ordnance officials say. They expect

this highly mobile field weapon to have a range of over 700 miles.

The solid-propellent JPL-Sperry Sergeant is also expected to cost somewhat less than the $100,000 Gilfillan-Firestone Corporal which it will replace; its shipping and operating costs will be substantially lower. The nuclear warhead is not included in the costs. Sergeant is expected to be smaller and more mobile than Corporal, but to have the same range—80 miles.

Private Housing Starts Hit 2½-Year High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Private Housing Starts in July Hit 2½-Year High."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 14, 1958]

PRIVATE HOUSING STARTS IN JULY HIT 2½-YEAR HIGH—ADJUSTED ANNUAL RATE WAS 1,160,000—RISE IN USE OF FHA, VA MORTGAGES CITED—FNMA SHARES CREDIT

WASHINGTON.—Private housing starts in July mounted to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,160,000—the highest adjusted rate since January 1956, the Labor Department reported.

The boost in the annual rate for July over the 1,090,000 for June came from the contra-seasonal rise in private housing starts during the month, the agency said. Private housing starts during the month totaled 107,300—the highest private total for any month since May 1956. The latest figure compared with 104,500 for June, and 93,900 in July 1957.

Prodding the total of private starts upward, the Labor Department indicated, was the increase in the number of homes begun under Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration mortgage insurance programs.

Congress last spring provided the Federal National Mortgage Association with $1 billion of authorization for the purchase of mortgages backed by the FHA and VA on lower-cost homes—up to a value of $13,500.

Since the program was begun in April of this year, Fannie Mae has committed about $600 million for the future purchase of these mortgages. Housing industry officials have asserted that the Fannie Mae program has been responsible for much of the pickup in housing, although the increased availability of mortgage money also has received a good share of the credit.

Despite these views, Government housing officials have not yet publicly changed their estimates that about 1,100,000 private homes will be built in 1958.

When averaged for the first 7 months of 1958, the Department said, the annual rate of private starts thus far in the year comes to 1,013,700 units. At this time last year, the average of the annual rate was 970,000.

Total nonfarm housing starts—including both public and private—amounted to 111,000 in July, the Department reported. This was a drop of 4,000 units from June, the agency added, but the decline was less than usual for this time of year. All of it, however, was in public housing. The total number of housing starts in July 1957, came to 97,800.

Preliminary building permit reports indicate that the advance in private homebuilding came primarily in the North Central and Western States, although the South showed continued strength.

At the end of the first 7 months of 1958, a total of 605,200 private homes had been started—topping the figure for the like period of 1957 by 26,000. Housing started with FHA and VA mortgage assistance, the Department said, accounted for about two-thirds of the overall gain in private starts so far this year over the like period of last year.

Appointment of Miss Bertha S. Adkins To Be Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three newspaper articles concerning the appointment of Miss Bertha S. Adkins to the position of Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One of these articles appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Tuesday morning, July 22, 1958, and is a news dispatch from the Washington bureau of the Sun. The second article appeared in the women's section of the Baltimore-American of Sunday, July 27, 1958. The third is an editorial in the Washington Post of Friday, July 25, 1958.

Miss Adkins is a distinguished citizen of Maryland. All Maryland is proud of her and is pleased with her appointment. I am proud to number Miss Adkins among my friends.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 22, 1958]

IKE NOMINATES BERTHA ADKINS—PICKS HER TO SERVE AS UNDER SECRETARY IN CABINET

WASHINGTON, July 21.—President Eisenhower today nominated Bertha S. Adkins, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

If her nomination is confirmed by the Senate, Miss Adkins, who lives in Salisbury, Md., will succeed John A. Perkins, who resigned March 1.

Miss Adkins has a long history in education and politics, but this will be her first job in government.

"It's exciting to think of the possibilities, provided the Senate approves," Miss Adkins said.

"AM PLEASED"

"I, of course, am pleased that the President and Dr. Flemming feel I can help them," she added.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University, will become Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare August 1, succeeding the present Secretary, Marion B. Folsom.

Miss Adkins said today that "if confirmed" she will leave her Republican National Committee post as soon as she can wind up her political affairs.

She is the second woman to be plucked from the Republican party for a sensitive Government job.

ASKED ABOUT IDEAS

Mrs. Anne Wheaton, former director of women's publicity of the Republican women's organization, was named by President Eisenhower in June of last year to be associate presidential press secretary.

Asked whether she would carry any definite ideas with her to her new duties, Miss Adkins replied:

"I'll have to wait until I get there. I'll work with Dr. Flemming on whatever he and the President want."

Long an advocate of women in politics, Miss Adkins has been a GOP national committeewoman from Maryland since 1948. Since 1953, she has been head of the women's division of the national committee in addition to being assistant chairman.

[From the Baltimore American of July 27, 1958]

MISS ADKINS DESTINED FOR GOVERNMENT ROLE

Some women are born to politics and some are raised on politics but Miss Bertha S. Adkins, of Salisbury, swallowed politics when, at a tender age, she gulped down a Taft-for-President button which is now the proud possession of the Federation of Republican Women of Maryland.

This button may have caused an educator to become a politician and the politician then to turn to educational fields, for Miss Adkins, one of the top feminine politicians in the country, as assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee and its director of Women's Activities, has been nominated by President Eisenhower to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

If approved by the Senate, she will be the first woman to hold the $21,000 a year post. Miss Adkins is quite pleased and gratified at the nomination.

As an educator Miss Adkins was, for 8 years dean of women at Western Maryland College and, for 4 years, dean of residence at Bradford Junior College in Massachusetts.

Being an Eastern Shore woman might have made Miss Adkins change from educational endeavors to politics since politics is taken seriously on the Shore. She plunged into politics in 1946 when she helped to elect Representative EDWARD T. MILLER, the first Republican from Maryland's First District in 25 years.

Her first political training was on the precinct level and she has never stopped preaching "everywhere" at "everytime," "everyone" must start on the precinct level. She emphasized that campaigns are won on this level.

Since 1948, she has been Maryland's national committeewoman. Recognition of her efficiency as national committeewoman led to her selection as executive director of the women's division of the national committee in 1950. She then was made assistant to the chairman of the national committee.

One of Miss Adkins first acts after the 1952 Republican Presidential victory was to set up regional and national conferences of Republican women leaders as a campaign strategy to maintain and further political gains and to keep women in the field posted on the Eisenhower administration's accomplishments.

An alumna of Salisbury High School and the Baldwin School in Bryn Mawr, Pa., Miss Adkins holds a bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley and a master of arts degree from Columbia University. In June, 1953, she was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Maryland College and in 1955 she was elected a trustee of American University in Washington.

She is a life member of Pi Lambda Theta, an honorary society for women in education. Recently President Eisenhower appointed Miss Adkins to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and the members elected her chairman of the executive committee.

She has served as a board member of the Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs and the Maryland branch, American Association of University Women.

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1958]

EQUIPPED FOR THE JOB

The dual background of politician and educator that Miss Bertha S. Adkins possesses makes her especially fitted for the position of Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to which she has just been nominated. The importance of political experience for a Government executive was once pointed out by an outstanding bureaucrat, who when asked what contributed most to his success, said it was the knowledge of people he attained in his early campaigning for office. Although Miss Adkins has never run for office, she has been in the thick of national politics since 1950, when she became executive director of the women's division of the Republican National Committee. Later she became assistant chairman of the committee. In these positions, and in her campaigning for President Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956, she had wide opportunity to meet at the grassroots the people the Government serves. As a former college teacher and dean of women, she has personal knowledge of the problems of education. Her background intelligence and vigor should enable her to handle successfully her new job, which she terms a "challenge"—not a reward.

Distinguished Service Citation to George Garrett, President of the Federal City Council

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two brief articles about a distinguished citizen of the Nation's Capital, Mr. George A. Garrett. Mr. Garrett was recently honored on his 70th birthday with the Federal City Council's first distinguished service citation.

An editorial and news story in the Washington Daily News of August 5 summarizes some of his many contributions to the physical and cultural improvement of Washington, D. C.

Mr. Garrett's abilities have received bipartisan recognition. Under a Democratic administration, he served as this country's first Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland, and more recently he was selected by President Eisenhower to expedite the important Southwest Washington redevelopment program.

Residents of the Capital City are indebted to him, and to his distinguished colleagues of the Federal City Council, for their tireless labors to give the Nation a modern, well-planned Capital.

Out of respect and admiration for Mr. Garrett, whom I know, I am making these few remarks about him.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE GARRETT GIVEN CITY COUNCIL AWARD

The Federal City Council presented its first distinguished service citation for distinguished leadership to its president, George A. Garrett, today on his 70th birthday.

Mr. Garrett once served as President Eisenhower's personal representative to expedite the District's southwest redevelopment program. He was Ambassador to Ireland under President Truman.

President of the council since it was founded, Mr. Garrett has been instrumental in speeding up area development.

Last December he helped negotiate the $5.8 million loan for construction of the first units in pilot area B in the southwest.

Mr. Garrett's career started here 50 years ago as vice president of the Dupont National Bank. Since 1940 he has served as general partner with the investment banking firm of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith at 719 15th Street NW.

He also has served as president of Emergency Hospital, vice president and director of the National Symphony Orchestra, and in the American National Red Cross.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY

We would like to add ours to the many Washington voices wishing George A. Garrett, president of the Federal City Council, a happy 70th birthday.

For over 50 years he's been a real wheelhorse in a long series of civic achievements, especially in the field of zoning, metropolitan area development and improvement, and redevelopment.

We're thankful that, through the years, Mr. Garrett has shown willingness and a gift for coming to grips with difficult problems and removing roadblocks. This he has consistently done in the southwest redevelopment program.

His days are long and full. But even so, Mr. Garrett has a reputation for taking time out to be a genuinely nice person.

Scholarship Program for Superior Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have said many times that the great challenge of our day is to make our educational system match in its effectiveness the brilliant achievements of our scholars and scientists. It is not enough that we produce a handfull of distinguished men; it is imperative that we give every student with the capacity to grow an opportunity to fulfill his possibilities.

Members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin have been giving serious and sustained attention to the question of how we should go about expanding opportunity in the field of higher education. Sometime ago I placed in the RECORD a copy of a statement adopted by the faculty of the university. One of the leading persons in this searching inquiry is Prof. Joshua Lederberg, chairman of the department of medical genetics in the school of medicine. Dr. Lederberg is a brilliant scientist whose contribution to genetics is acclaimed around the world. I am glad indeed that Professor Lederberg has applied his great gifts to the problem of providing opportunity for the gifted student to receive the kind of education he deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Professor Lederberg to me, and his proposal for a comprehensive national scholarship program.

There being no objection, the letter and the proposal were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, May 29, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Many of my colleagues and I have been delighted to note and second your determined and active interest in encouraging our national leadership in education and scientific research.

There are two pending bills which I would recommend to your sympathetic attention. One is the Health Research Facilities Act which I understand is in committee now. To complement the splendid research and training programs of the NIH which have done so much to advance medical research during the past decade we urgently need a steady expansion of the facilities to house the research activities of our eager young scientists. There is hardly a university or research institute in the country that could not make a splendid return on the investment of construction funds.

The second is the national scholarship program as envisaged in the pending bills, S. 3163 and S. 3187. Both bills have many splendid features marred by what I hope are only transitory defects, such as the vague statutory prescriptions for science and languages. These are so indefinite it would be better to delete them. I am also dubious about the effectiveness of the secondary programs which require matching funds and complicated administrative machinery to allocate them directly to private and public colleges in the several States. For this session, I would hope therefore that maximum emphasis be placed on the scholarship programs while we take time to work out the best formulas for supporting the institutions themselves.

I do have my own suggestions for such a formula which, I believe, can sidestep many of the purported hazards of Federal aid to education. This proposal would utilize the scholarship system to furnish automatic machinery for institutional support. My major premise is that financially healthy and independent universities are the best source of initiative in meeting the Nation's challenges in higher education. I am enclosing a memorandum outlining this bill of rights for gifted students which I suggest is the safest and most constructive way to encourage both these students and the institutions which must serve them.

More immediately, I would also criticize the criterion of need as an important factor in a scholarship program for gifted students. My arguments are summarized in appendix (2).

With all best regards.

Yours sincerely,

JOSHUA LEDERBERG,
Chairman, Department of Medical Genetics.

PROPOSAL FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Any scheme of comprehensive Federal assistance to institutions of higher learning is bound to evoke reasonable fears of central domination of educational policy. The private institutions understandably will be particularly reluctant to have to justify their programs to central State or Federal authorities as a basis of allocation of funds; on the other hand the financial straits of all our universities, the support of which is too often thought of as philanthropy rather than investment, are tied up with the ambiguous incentives to our gifted youth to make their own investment in higher education.

The national stake in higher education is too vital for us to contemplate putting it on the market in a traditional sense—we cannot now afford to limit it to students who have private means to pay, but one way or another it must become economically self-sustaining if the colleges and universities are to achieve the health and self-reliance that mark other aspects of our free-enterprise culture. A comprehensive scholarship program can be devised that would, at the same time, insure that our most gifted students will be unimpeded in the pursuit of scholarship and reward and sustain our universities fairly, with a minimum of bureaucratic interference. This program has had a successful precedent in the postwar GI bill of rights, and is paralleled to some extent in the fellowship programs of pending bills and those now operative by the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation. What is perhaps new in this proposal is that the fellowship-scholarship program can be used to administer Federal support to the institutions as well as to the scholars in the most effective way.

The basic features of the program would be: (1) A national (or multi-State) scholarship examination; (2) stipends to the highest scoring students sufficient for minimum needs in college; (3) an award, to the institution of each student's choice, sufficient to cover the actual cost of his education, including liberal provisions for renewal and maintenance of facilities and expansion; (4) loan funds to cover unusual personal requirements, for example, family obligations.

Minor adjustments can be made through formulas of allocation of numbers of scholarships among the States. A liberal minimum should be established for item (3), and the award might indeed be fixed at a uniform high level. In this way, outstanding achievement by a school would be recognized by the interest of superior students in attending it. The diverse values of different kinds of institutions would be recognized by the free choices of the potential students. In general, the program would establish an effective market (in a technical economic sense) in which the consumers in whom the Nation has the greatest stake would be given the means to effect the national investment.

2. Need. The criterion of family income is often an unrealistic measure of individual needs, especially in advanced education. Since we still do not have a deepseated national respect for learning, many families may be reluctant, even hostile to supporting their children in scholarly studies, regardless of their apparent means. A means test carries an implication of charity rather than national investment, which is in any case likely to be repaid as taxes returned on augmented income, as well as the now recognized social values of scholarly and professional vocations. The administrative machinery needed to attempt a fair administration of a means test is already a fair argument against it. Finally, the progressive income tax is the fairest, most versatile and a sufficient tool for allocating the burdens of national activity on the basis of ability to pay: Why should the already tax-ridden middle class be specifically discriminated against in a national program of investment in higher education?

Greetings To National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon in Mobilizing the Independent Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is not very often that I comment on the floor of the Senate with regard to what might be considered as partisan matters. I would, however, like to say just a word with regard to the splendid efforts of the 1958 Committee of the National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon.

I am delighted to see that this organization is operating in high gear so as to give our President and Vice President the most effective teamwork in the next Congress.

It will be recalled that, in the 1952–56 Presidential elections, the National Citizens Committees for Eisenhower-Nixon played a leading role in the victories.

The reason is obvious.

INDEPENDENTS HOLD THE MARGIN OF POWER

There are millions of Americans who may not be affiliated with regular Republican organizations and who consider themselves as independents who were attracted by the National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon and who voted accordingly.

In talking with my Republican friends, I have repeatedly brought to their attention the fact that it is the independent voter in my own State, and in other States, who holds the margin of victory in his or her hands.

The President of the United States, and the Vice President of the United States, deservedly still hold the allegiance and the good wishes of millions upon millions of independent voters and, yes, millions of voters who ordinarily vote in the Democratic column, as well.

VOTERS CAN GIVE IKE AND DICK FULL TEAMWORK

In this November 1958, election, the electorate of our country will have a historic opportunity to vote for an 86th Congress which can carry out the ideals of Dwight D. Eisenhower and RICHARD NIXON.

We all realize that the fight for the ballots in November involves an extremely difficult series of Senate and House races for the Republican Party.

We wish, therefore, the greatest of success to the National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon in mobilizing independent voters on behalf of GOP candidates who will work hand in hand with the present Republican national administration.

REGULAR REPUBLICAN STRENGTH ESSENTIAL

Naturally, we know that the Republican National Committee, under Meade Alcorn, will continue to do a great job, as well. A strong Republican National Committee, together with the State organizations, is essential in this year in particular. In Wisconsin, the State voluntary committee is hard at work in our 71 counties on behalf of our National and State candidates.

LISTING OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEEMEN

I send to the desk now a list of the distinguished citizens who serve as officers and members of the general committee of the National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon.

I congratulate the organization for the very high caliber of individuals associated with it this year, as in previous years.

By their diligent efforts, I am sure they are going to help bring an impressive vote to the Republican column in the crucial 1958 races.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of officers and general committee members be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1958 COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS FOR EISENHOWER-NIXON

Officers: Lloyd F. MacMahon, chairman; Mrs. Valley Knudsen, cochairman; John W. Callaghan, treasurer; John H. Norris, field director; Robert P. Patterson, Jr., secretary; Robert L. Clare, Jr., general counsel; Frank Di Iuglio, campaign activities; Dan Donaldson, speakers bureau; Raymond C. Baker, publicity director.

General committee: John D. Ames, George H. Bailey, Thomas B. Butler, George M. Cheston, Jack F. Chrysler, Mrs. J. C. Cowdin, Mrs. Frank H. Cowgill, Nate L. Crabtree, James C. Dezendorf, Warren R. Dwyer, Howard S. Fahey, Jr., Helen Hayes, Leonard D. Henry, Mrs. Edwin I. Hilson, Michael J. Horan, Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Mrs. Ada Fisher Jones, Thomas R. Knudsen, Robert P. Marcus, Gavin P. Murphy, James L. Murphy, James F. O'Neill, Roger V. Pugh, Jr., Nelson A. Rockefeller, John A. Roosevelt, Albert C. Simmonds, Jr., L. Corrin Strong, Ralph W. Stultz, George M. Vetter, Jr., Russell Ziegler.

Subsidies for American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the issue of Parents magazine for September 1958 contains a most timely article by our colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], entitled "Subsidies for Children."

In this article Senator NEUBERGER points out that it seems to be easier to obtain a Federal subsidy for farm crops, for shipbuilding, for airports, than for the boys and girls of America.

I am pleased that our colleague from Oregon has emphasized the strong justification for Federal aid to education, which I have just been advocating on the Senate floor, Mr. President. In his article in Parents' magazine, Senator NEUBERGER writes:

Without a funneling of national wealth into school channels on a fair basis, children in States of low average incomes will be far less adequately educated than in those States with greater financial resources.

I understand that Parents' magazine has a circulation throughout the Nation of 1,785,000 copies. I trust the subscribers will come to a greater realization of the urgent need for Federal aid to schools through a reading of DICK NEUBERGER's article.

I am pleased to request, Mr. President, that the article by Senator NEUBERGER be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it appeared originally in Parents' magazine for September.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIES FOR CHILDREN

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

On an afternoon when welfare legislation was before the United States Senate, we were debating an amendment to increase Federal matching funds by about $6.25 a month to each needy recipient of old-age assistance. It was a worthy proposal which I was happy to cosponsor. Abruptly, a message was sent in to me from the gallery by a social worker long active in the field of child welfare. She called to my attention a major omission in the pending amendment. I rushed back to the Senate floor and asked the principal sponsor if he would be willing to add to the proposals equal increases for aid to dependent children. He replied, "I do not think the amendment would receive any more votes if it contained a provision for dependent children."

My colleague was frank and candid, and of him I make no criticism. Indeed, he is a person with a humanitarian outlook. Yet Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois ambled over to my desk and muttered, "Perhaps you and I ought to offer a constitutional amendment fixing the right to vote during infancy—at the age of 1 year, let us say. That might give dependent children more influence than they have at present in the Halls of Congress."

I cite this episode only as evidence of a glaring fact. When subsidies are under discussion on Capitol Hill, those which inevitably receive the shortest shrift and the least consideration are subsidies for the Nation's children.

This stems, to my way of thinking, from two principal causes: (1) Sponsors of children's legislation are frequently too modest and timid in their demands; and (2) political pressure in behalf of programs for children is not nearly so intensive or overpowering as that mustered for business, labor, veterans, farmers or some other group.

In the Senate much of my time has been allocated to legislation to expand children's benefits and programs. It has taken many forms: advocacy of pilot courses to train teachers specializing in classes for retarded children; bills to raise the authorization ceilings on grants-in-aid for maternal and child health and crippled children services; a resolution calling for a formal Senate study of Canada's 12-year experiment with family allowances; cosponsorship of the Murray bill (which would authorize $25 per student in Federal funds for either classroom construction or teachers' salaries during the first year of its operation, rising to $100 per student in every State by the end of the fourth year); and authorship of Federal matching grants to encourage courses teaching the basic physiological facts about the impact on health of tobacco, liquor, and drugs. In addition, largely as a result of personal association with the illustrious Dr. Sidney Farber, director of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, I am sponsoring a bill for $500 million grants for cancer research and study, in an effort to get at the origins of the disease which claims the lives of more children than any other cause except accidents.

Out of all this experience I have become thoroughly convinced that the devoted men and women promoting children's bills are not nearly aggressive enough in their requests. They use few postcard or telegraphic blitzkriegs, for example. I cannot help but believe that spokesmen for the next generation would seek wider benefits if they knew the scope and size of Federal subsidies to other groups in the population.

A subsidy is defined by Webster's New International Dictionary as "a grant of funds or property from a government * * * to a private person or company to assist in the establishment or support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public."

With most government subsidies I have scant quarrel although I would challenge an agricultural policy which pays price supports on peanuts and tobacco, but not on eggs and orchard fruits. Subsidies grew up with the United States, and they are now part of the warp and woof of our national fabric. The first transcontinental railroads were given every alternate section of land along their rights-of-way to induce them to build to the Pacific's shores. By President Abraham Lincoln's signature, the Homestead Act made the public domain of the West available for the taking to pioneering families who were unafraid of a hostile wilderness. Free locks and canals sent barges up the Mississippi and the Ohio and eventually up the surging Columbia River.

In our time, a $2,500 federally financed operation on a little girl born with a hole between her heart chambers is a subsidy, and so is a $20 million Government payment to a shipping corporation to enable it to cope with foreign competitors. These are the major subdivisions of Federal subsidies for the fiscal year 1957, as compiled by the Library of Congress:

[In millions of dollars]

Agriculture	$3,564
Business	1,011
Labor	333
War veterans	4,679
International (foreign aid, etc.)	3,998
Others	1,763

What do some of these subdivisions really mean? Under agriculture, for example, the Government spent $247 million in 1957 to maintain price supports on the corn crop. In the business category, the Federal budget set aside some $39 million for payments to private airline operations and $114 million to subsidize our shipping on the high seas. Virtually the entire labor classification was in the form of Federal support of and supervision over unemployment-compensation programs. The bulk of the veterans' program was made up of pensions and medical care. And, of course, the mutual-security system dominated Government disbursements in the realm of international aid.

All of these Government undertakings during fiscal year 1957, described as subsidies by the Legislative Reference Service, totaled $15.3 billion. Subsidies to children, such as they are, were lumped in the category containing some $1,763 million of this amount because it included many of the expenditures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Now, how much will really be spent on the children of the United States through the Federal budget in the fiscal year 1959? I would list these items:

[In millions of dollars]

School lunch program	110
Special milk program	75
Aid to dependent children	539
Crippled children services	15
Maternal and child health services	16½
Child welfare services	12
Salaries and expenses United States Children's Bureau	2
Aid to schools in federally impacted areas [1]	205½

[1] Estimated on basis of legislation passed by the House.

This total, representing the entire Federal subsidy to children, amounts to $975 million. Furthermore, the assistance to schools where Federal garrisons and construction projects are underway is actually not a child-aid program. Yet, even if we stretch a point and include the $205½ million allotted to schools in these realms of Federal defense activities, the whole expenditure for children in fiscal year 1959 is barely 5 percent of all Federal subsidies. According to the study prepared by the Library of Congress, it is much less than the subsidies disbursed to business, agriculture, veterans, or foreign countries. Is this fulfilling our obligation to our next generation of citizens?

Indeed, my own approach to Federal fiscal policy has been heavily conditioned by my profound conviction that our Government is far too penurious in its financial support of virtually all child-welfare programs. All existing children's programs should be greatly enlarged. This means funds for maternal and child health, for crippled children, for the school-lunch program, for aid to dependent children, and for children who are retarded through any kind of congenital defect. When we are spending some $45 billion for armaments, is it not a shameful disgrace when children with defective hearts no longer can obtain surgery because an appropriation of a mere $100,000 for the Government's open heart surgery project is exhausted? When these funds ran out, 70 children from 12 States were on the waiting list at the University of Minnesota Hospital, in urgent need of heart surgery. Sixty-nine more children had applied, but the requests had not even been processed. Bess Furman wrote in the New York Times that this plea had gone to the White House from the parents of a little girl born with a hole between the chambers of her heart: "We don't like to postpone this operation. We know the longer it is put off, the less chance she has."

Even as the heart surgery program for children came to a halt, my bill was pending in the Senate to raise the statutory limit on maternal and child health to $25 million annually, from the present $16.5 million and $15 million, respectively. The situation should have stirred a violent political eruption. Sad to relate, it was accepted passively. Only two Senators spoke to me about it. As I recollect, they were MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, in whose State the hospital is located where the surgical experiment had aided 400 children born with crippled hearts since 1955.

Not only are we lamentably hesitant about expanding current programs for the health and welfare of America's children, but our reluctance is equally inexplicable with respect to new undertakings. Canada's island province of Newfoundland, despite its limited resources and Spartan way of life, has operated for nearly 2 years under a law providing that every child who has not attained his 16th birthday is entitled free of

charge to medical services of all kinds, including hospitalization and dental and optical services.

Prof. James C. Vadakin of Miami University has written, "In the United States, Federal expenditures on child welfare amounted to only about eight-tenths of 1 percent of total Federal expenditures in 1956. This represented only about 60 cents out of every $100 of Federal moneys spent. In Canada, during the same year, family allowances payments alone accounted for almost 9 percent of total Dominion expenditures, or about $9 out of every $100 of Dominion moneys spent for all purposes." The least we could do is to study thoroughly the operation of this program in the country which shares with us the bulk of the land of the North American Continent.

In all five Scandinavian nations—Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Iceland—there are programs for the daytime care of children in nurseries or kindergartens. Because the rigors of the northern winter require maximum development of child health during the comparatively fleeting months of summer, most of these countries help to furnish zestful vacations for children in the vast outdoors. The railroads and other common carriers frequently provide free transportation to recreational centers. Adds a Danish Government commentary: "In Denmark it has been a custom for many years for farmers to extend invitations to poor children, particularly from the capital, to spend a free holiday in the country; transportation on the railways is, in these cases, provided free by the state."

The child, after all, is a citizen of the Nation. He may dwell in any 1 of the 48 States, but he will grow up to be a citizen of the United States of America. In an hour of emergency and crisis, the National Government can claim the child's services and perhaps even his life. Military duty is a national obligation to the United States Government, contributed in World War II by young women as well as by young men. Does the Government feel a commensurate obligation? The child, grown to young manhood, is regarded as a citizen of the Nation when an aggressor strikes at one of our military outposts, but evidently he is merely a citizen of his own particular State when he may be in need of nutrition, social guidance or medical care in his youth. High-income States like New York spend an average of $3.33 per child for child welfare services, but low-income States like Arkansas spend a mere $2 cents.

Wealth in the United States has been inequitably distributed. To begin with, most of the manufacturing takes place in a handful of great industrial States, such as Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, and New York. American families elsewhere pay tribute to these States whenever they finance their automobiles, electrical appliances, home furnishings, or other products of industry. The only avenue by which some of this wealth can be spread throughout the country for support of the schools is through the Federal taxing power. Obviously, Idaho and Mississippi cannot levy on incomes in Ohio or Connecticut to help sustain their educational systems. Yet, without such a funneling of national wealth into school channels on a fair basis, children in States of low average incomes will be far less adequately educated than those in States with greater financial resources.

I would estimate that nearly half our rollcall votes in the Senate involve one kind of subsidy or another. Many of these subsidies even furnish benefits beyond our own international borders. Some 25 percent of the subsidy payments studied by the Library of Congress were in the realm of foreign aid, economic as well as military. Since becoming a Member of the Senate, I have supported President Eisenhower's recommendations on virtually every such rollcall, despite the fact that I am not of his political faith. It has seemed to me that the great question of continuing the free-world alliance cannot be shaped by partisan differences.

Yet, when I look up to the Senate gallery, I often feel a twinge of guilt. Classes of schoolchildren from neighboring States are among our frequent visitors. They look down upon us Senators with a sense of awe. Occasionally they buttonhole us in the ornate Capitol corridors and eagerly ask for our autographs. I try to engage these students in conversation as often as possible, seeking their views and opinions. They seem so earnest and trusting, so grateful for a few moments of our time. But I become uncomfortable in their presence. I wish more fervently than ever that the big subsidies in the Federal budget were for aid to schools and for child welfare programs, because that is where I think they could contribute most to the enduring greatness of America as a free nation.

Opposing Views on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mood in Washington," written by James Reston and published in today's New York Times, which is an analysis of opposing views of United States' foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOD IN WASHINGTON—FULBRIGHT AND EISENHOWER SET FORTH OPPOSITE VIEWS OF UNITED STATES' FOREIGN POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 6.—Two events that occurred today in Washington illustrate and dramatize the strange and contradictory mood of the capital.

On Capitol Hill Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the second-ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee, delivered the most critical attack on the administration's foreign policy to be heard in the Senate this year.

Coincidentally, President Eisenhower ranged over the fundamentals of that foreign policy in his news conference this morning without conceding that any of the problems in the world today were in the least chargeable to the conduct of our affairs.

If this were mere partisanship, it could be dismissed as the beginning of election-campaign oratory, but it is much more than this. It represents a fundamental difference that has been steadily growing here in the estimates of where the United States stands in the world today.

The President followed the line today he has followed from the beginning. He saw a world full of complicated problems that could be resolved if the Nation continued patiently to follow the principles he and his associates had repeatedly defined and followed.

NO NEED FOR CHANGE SEEN

He agreed that policies must be under constant review but there was nothing in his words or manner to suggest any need for fundamental changes in the policies or personnel of the State Department.

In contrast, Senator FULBRIGHT characterized these policies as "inadequate, outmoded and misdirected." He attacked the administration's Middle East policy, and its "readiness to use the spectre of Soviet communism as a cloak for the failure of our own leadership."

Finally he called for a hard re-examination of these policies, and served notice on the administration that such an examination would take place, if not by the administration itself, then by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator FULBRIGHT'S outburst may very well mark the beginning of a campaign by the rising young Democrats on the Foreign Relations Committee to force a change in the policies and direction of the State Department.

The Arkansas Senator is the leader, in fact, if not in title, of the majority on that committee. He has lost all confidence in Secretary of State Dulles. He is convinced that two more years of the present leadership and policies of the State Department will be disastrous, and he has now embarked upon a campaign to do something about it.

This has been coming on for a long time, but without the support of the Democratic leadership of either the House or the Senate. Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House and LYNDON B. JOHNSON in the Senate share many of his worries about both the President and the Secretary of State, but so far they have hesitated to use their political power to try to force any major changes.

If no changes take place between now and the election, it can be taken for granted that a major effort will be made to change the Democratic strategy from one of bipartisan cooperation to one of stern opposition.

MEMBERS IN THE GROUP

A majority on the Democratic side of the Foreign Relations Committee is almost as concerned as Senator FULBRIGHT about the present trend of events. Included in this increasingly critical group are Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota; MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana; JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama; and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

For the last 2 years these members have been asked by the administration to go along with policies whose effectiveness they have increasingly come to doubt.

One the whole, they have cooperated, but every foreign policy reverse has added to their sense of frustration, and this is now beginning to spill over into talk of an organized effort to force major changes.

Those who favor such a move argue as follows:

The Democrats have acquiesced in policies that have weakened the alliance for the last 6 years. Scholarly speeches and political argument have not moved Mr. Dulles. The Democrats have thus been partners in policies and tactics they did not approve.

Therefore, if the Democrats increase their majorities in both Houses in the November election, as seems likely, the Democratic leadership will be confronted with 1 of 2 choices: To continue supporting a Secretary of State in policies and methods they regard as detrimental to the Nation, or to try to force changes in both the substance and administration of foreign policy. This is the theme.

CHOICE FOR THE PRESIDENT

It remains to be seen, of course, whether the Democrats can agree to confront the President with a choice between a rebellious Foreign Relations Committee or dismissing

Mr. Dulles. Even the dissidents on the Foreign Relations Committee differ in the degree of their opposition to the Secretary of State, and some, for political reasons, would rather see the Republicans take full responsibility for running the State Department than force the President to add Democrats to his Cabinet.

Nevertheless, the Fulbright speech today is significant of a growing opposition. The truce forced by the need for unity while the Marines were landing in the Middle East is coming to an end and at least some influential Democrats are now beginning to say in private that their duty in the future seems to lie, not in sullen cooperation, but in open opposition.

Action on Farm Bill Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Action on Farm Bill Urged This Session," published in the Dallas Times-Herald on August 10, 1958.

Mr. President, since this article was printed, 4 days ago, in the Dallas Times-Herald, one of the leading daily newspapers in the South, the West, and the Midwest, real and gratifying progress has been made on the farm bill. It has passed the House, and there is hope for a farm bill within the next few days.

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article which appeared in many newspapers on Sunday, August 10, 1958, and among others, in the Dallas Times-Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION ON FARM BILL URGED THIS SESSION

Leaders in the cotton and rice industries of Texas Saturday predicted disaster unless Congress passes a new farm bill.

They made their prediction after House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, said farm legislation appeared dead for this session.

RAYBURN'S estimate came shortly after Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson issued the dire prediction that cotton farmers will be forced to cut back acreage 22 percent and rice farmers 45 percent unless Congress acts to change present laws.

But a Texas and United States cotton leader said Saturday that he still has hopes a bill will be passed. And a farm expert in the State's rice belt predicted farmers will vote down rice controls if House inaction results in further acreage reductions.

Meanwhile, Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman of Anderson, Clayton & Co., worldwide cotton firm, said the threatened acreage cuts would be catastrophic to the entire South.

SAYS PROPS PERILED

"If this cutback holds, it will be so disastrous and the cost of the program so scandalous there will be an explosion," Fleming said. "It could well be the end of the price-support program."

R. H. Stansel, Harris County Rice Growers Association secretary, said such a cut "would put a whale of a lot of growers out of business. And they wouldn't be alone. Driers, mills, implement dealers, and farm laborers would be affected tremendously."

Burris Jackson, Hillsboro, chairman of the American Cotton Congress, said that "if present law is not changed, the American cotton industry faces disaster next year and it will be a major blow to the whole economy."

The House voted down a new farm bill Wednesday under procedure requiring a two-thirds majority for passage.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, said Friday it would be futile to give further consideration to farm legislation.

SEEK CONFERENCE

But Jackson and others hope to bring up the farm bill under regular procedure—whereby a bare majority will be sufficient to send it to a House-Senate conference committee.

Unless a farm bill is passed, cotton acreage is expected to be cut as much as 22 percent next year. Rice acreage would be cut 45 percent.

The reductions would come under present laws which set acreage on the basis of supplies and expected consumption.

The snag in the House was the price support level, which opponents of the farm bill feel is too high. Under Wednesday's procedure, no amendments were permitted. Under regular procedure the bill could be amended.

Tacticians of the bill hoped to get it through the House, with necessary revisions coming in the Senate-House conference committee.

Jackson said all Texas House Members, except BRUCE ALGER, the GOP member of the delegation, voted for the bill. The vote was 210 to 186.

RICE SITUATION

The prediction that rice growerr will vote down controls came from Marion C. Ulery, manager of the Federal Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Office at Orange.

He said rice acreage already had been cut 40 percent since controls went into effect in 1954.

Ulery said ricegrowers still are optimistic "that no big cut will be ordered and we are making preliminary plans for next year on this basis."

He added that "I feel sure that if there is a drastic reduction the ricegrowers will vote against controls when the annual referendum is held the next time."

Orange County rice acreage dropped from 10,250 in 1954 to 6,000 this year, and rice leaders in Orange said the reduction has been general along the gulf coast.

Jackson, who also is chairman of the Statewide Cotton Committee of Texas, commented:

"We simply must have more cotton acreage to survive. Texas has a big stake in the result. This is not just a cotton problem, but it is a public problem, and the public better wake up to it.

"I supported the House Agriculture Committee and Speaker RAYBURN in the effort to pass a farm bill which was voted down Wednesday because I felt that represented the only assurance of getting a much-needed bill. What we wanted to do was send that bill to conference believing that proper adjustments could be made acceptable to all.

"URGES AGREEMENT

"Since the bill failed, we all hope and urge that some agreement can be reached to get a rule (of House procedure) so a farm bill can pass before adjournment.

"We cannot stand the terrific cut in acreage that confronts us without legislation. The Department of Agriculture has announced that the maximum acreage we can hope to receive next year is 13,675,000 acres under the present law. And the cotton industry just cannot exist as a major industry under that kind of acreage allotment. We feel therefore, that it is essential that Congress act and increase the acreage allotment."

Visit of Cured Cancer Congress to Gallery of United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring and moving occasions in the recent history of the United States Senate was the presence in the Senate gallery on April 1, 1958, of some 40 delegates to the Cured Cancer Congress, which met in Washington, D. C. These brave and resourceful men and women were welcomed to the Senate gallery by the Senator who has done more for health and medical research than any other political figure of our time—the eminent senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

A number of us on both sides of the aisle had the privilege of participating in Senator HILL'S greetings to people who are symbols that the most dreaded disease of our time can sometimes be coped with successfully, if it is detected early enough, and provided effective medical treatment is available from skilled doctors.

This inspiring event was described in detail in the summer, 1958, issue of Cancer News, which is the official periodical of the American Cancer Society. I ask unanimous consent that this entire article appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, under its heading "The First Cured Cancer Congress," and also that there be printed with it the address entitled "Toward a Common Purpose," with which Senator LISTER HILL presented the delegates of the American Cancer Society Cured Cancer Congress to the United States Senate on April 1.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST CURED CANCER CONGRESS

(The place, United States Senate; the time, 3:30 p. m., April 1, 1958; the speaker, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama)

"Mr. President, it is my great privilege today to welcome to the Senate of the United States a group of men, women, and children who are living testimony of the great progress that has been made in the control of cancer during the past decade. These good people from all parts of the United States have survived the ordeal which has been fatal to so many others, and they visit us today as the Cured Cancer Congress of the American Cancer Society to enlist the American people in the cancer crusade."

As the Senator spoke, a vivacious 9-year-old gallery guest squeezed her mother's hand. A retired couple whose combined ages totaled 150 years exchanged happy glances. Senator HILL was talking about them and their fellow delegates to the 37-member Cured Cancer Congress. They were men, women, and children coming from all sections of the country; most had met for the first time the night before. But they were as old friends as they sat together in a spe-

cially reserved section of the Senate gallery. All listened closely to the remarks of Senator HILL and other Senators who spoke spontaneously from the Senate floor to help launch the Nation's annual Cancer Control Month, and the special guests had part of their reward when Senator HILL concluded on behalf of his colleagues and the Nation at large:

"We thank the Cured Cancer Congress for honoring us with their visit. They are an inspiration to those who sometimes despair at the magnitude of the cancer problem. They will inspire the American people to a greater participation than ever in the cancer crusade and I am confident that their example and their experience will give hope and confidence to millions of their fellow citizens."

Thus was keynoted the spirit of hope which the Cured Cancer Congress of the American Cancer Society, in first session convened, brought to the Nation's Capital to help open the 1958 crusade. They were 37 witnesses—living proof—that many types of cancer now are curable. They represented 800,000 other living Americans who have been saved from the disease. The delegates were selected by the divisions they represented, and afterward returned to their home States to help mobilize and spearhead local crusade activities.

The opening session of the Cured Cancer Congress had been called to order in the Federal Room of Washington's Statler Hotel at 8:30 that morning. Presiding was John Davis Larkins, Jr., of Trenton, N. C.—former State senator, political and civic leader, and longtime American Cancer Society volunteer who was successfully treated for skin cancer more than 5 years ago.

The Reverend Fritz O. Evers, of Baltimore, delegate from Maryland, led the invocation. In 1949, Pastor Evers saw his dentist for a routine checkup which led to a diagnosis of cancer of the left jaw, head, and neck. Surgery and radium saved his life. His inspiring prayer was heard by a hushed roomful of persons that included five youngsters all cured of cancer. Present also were newsmen and photographers from the local press and the wire services whose reports and special interviews would, within 24 hours, carry the story of this first Cured Cancer Congress across the Nation.

Members of the Congress itself were a varied group. They included a district judge, lawyers, doctors, housewives, a teacher, an engineer, a bricklayer and a former vaudeville team. Cheryl Lynn Cerjak, a starry-eyed 9-year-old from Beaver, Pa., was the youngest delegate. She told a reporter "I was sick * * * but I got well again." Mr. and Mrs. Frank Burt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., were the oldest delegates. He is 76, she 74. Mrs. Burt said: "Both of us had cancer and were cured. I was 59 when cancer struck. We are lucky to be here—together." Arthur Weidner, Jr., 34, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., felt the same way. So did his wife. He learned about his cancer just 7 weeks after their third child was born.

After a message of welcome from Calvin O. Klopp, M. D., president of the ACS District of Columbia Division, the delegates heard the society's president Lowell T. Coggeshall, M. D., report on progress in cancer control. Dr. Coggeshall noted that uterine cancer cures have helped cut the overall cancer death rate for women. "If every woman, once a year, would have a checkup, including the cell examination for uterine cancer—the Pap smear—we would come closer to eliminating uterine cancer as a cause of death." The society's president did not ignore the dark side of the picture either. Among men the cancer death rate has gone up, he said, mainly because of a 300 percent increase in deaths from lung cancer. He warned that if present rates continue some 50 million Americans will face cancer in their homes. He asked delegates to the Cured Congress to help save lives by bringing the facts about cancer to this "immense target audience that we must reach with a positive, hopeful message; we must educate them to sound health habits, to understanding attitudes toward illness and toward the medical profession; we must teach them cancer's seven danger signals and the value of checkups."

Dr. John R. Heller, director of the National Cancer Institute, told the group that "a milestone" had been reached on the long road to conquering cancer in that the first solid tumor apparently had been completely dissolved by a drug. Called methotrexate, the drug has been used in treating an extremely rare but almost invariably fatal type of cancer.

Maj. Gen. Edmond H. Leavey, the 1958 crusade chairman, called for "dedicated deeds and dollars" to help fight cancer. "Business may not be good in some parts of the country," he said, "but cancer is worse in any area of the country." General Leavey, president of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., urged corporations to double previous contributions.

During the talks a 10-year-old boy had been eagerly waiting his turn on the dais. It came at 10:05, when Marc Seamons, Cured Cancer delegate from Logan, Utah, walked up front, turned his back to the audience, sat down to the piano and played I Dreamed and Begin the Beguine, with the precision and fervor of a virtuoso. The youngster, blind in both eyes, had taught himself to play piano and organ from the age of four, after he had conquered cancer. Surgery saved his life.

Then, as its final act, the Cured Cancer Congress adopted a resolution urging the 800,000 Americans who have been saved from cancer to "mobilize in support of the 1958 Cancer Crusade; speak out about their personal victories; bring to the frightened the message of hope that early cancer can often be cured; urge all men and women to have an annual checkup; help raise the millions more needed for research, for service to help carry the burdens of patients and families, for spreading more life-saving facts through education." All delegates solemnly affixed their signatures and the first formal session of the first Cured Cancer Congress was adjourned.

The 37 delegates, led by a group of medical and lay leaders of the American Cancer Society, then went to the White House. Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary ACS crusade chairman for 5 years, received them in the rose garden. The 5 child delegates presented the First Lady with an 8-foot symbolic sword of hope. She flashed her famous smile, had a word for each of them, and to the group said: "It is such a pleasure and privilege to meet each and every one of you. * * * I wish I could do more. I avidly read everything I can get hold of on this." To the physicians in the group she said: "You have a wonderful cause."

At 12:15 the delegates were back at the Presidential Room of the Statler to attend the District of Columbia division's crusade kickoff luncheon. There they heard TV star Fran Allison in a dramatic narration, The Sword of Hope. Speaker was the division crusade chairman, Hugh McGowan, general traffic manager of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

Then came the visit to the Senate Chamber where the delegates were officially welcomed by Senator HILL. Most had already visited Senators and Representatives from their home States for a friendly chat. Some had also enjoyed an unexpected meeting with Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

Bricklayer George Koyne, of Chase, Md., visited with ex-bricklayer JOHN E. FOGARTY, Congressman from Rhode Island, and, like Senator HILL, a leader in health legislation. Mr. Koyne told Representative FOGARTY he was back laying bricks a month after his operation for cancer of the larynx. That was 8 years ago. Congressman FOGARTY showed his visitor a bricklayer's trowel which he keeps on his office desk. Mr. Koyne explained that the operation which saved his life removed his vocal cords but within 6 months he had learned how to speak again. "You can't stop an Irishman from talking," he told Representative FOGARTY.

Following Senator's HILL's introduction of the delegates and remarks to the Senate, eight other distinguished Members rose in turn to welcome the Cured Cancer Congress and to stress the urgency of support for more research. They were Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon; IRVING M. IVES, of New York; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama; CHARLES H. POTTER, of Michigan; EDWARD J. THYE, of MINNESOTA; and FREDERICK G. PAYNE, of Maine.

Senator NEUBERGER spoke of a relative who was stricken with cancer 20 years ago and made a complete recovery. He expressed admiration for the real valor of those who have faced the disease and conquered it. Describing a visit he and Mrs. Neuberger made to the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston last summer, where Dr. Sidney Farber has over 350 children under treatment for cancer, the Senator said: "How shocked we were to learn something we had never realized, namely, that cancer kills more children under the age of 14 than any other single disease; and how startled we were to learn that cancer killed 6 times as many children as polio in the last year before the discovey of polio vaccine." Noting recent discussions in the Senate on Soviet propaganda victories in the field of nuclear weapons, Senator NEUBERGER said that if our scientists find a cure for cancer they will earn for America the gratitude of all mankind.

Along similar lines, Senator POTTER told the Senate: "If we spent as much money on research in connection with cancer as we spend on research, for example, in the military field, or if we spent even one-hundredth as much, I am confident we would make many breakthroughs. So far as leadership in the world is concerned, I am sure that we would be making a greater contribution to the world by a breakthrough in cancer, which is the kind of development that will save mankind, than we could possibly make by the launching of a satellite."

Senator SPARKMAN expressed appreciation for the visit of the Cured Cancer Congress, saying: "They are a demonstration of the fact that cancer can be cured. In the past cancer has been largely thought of—and it is even today thought of generally throughout the country—as incurable. The group in the gallery are a living demonstration of the fact that cancer is curable."

Senator KNOWLAND termed the visitors "an inspiration to the country, as well as to Congress." He said: "As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I feel we are on the threshold of new horizons in this field, which will be a great help to mankind. It is of tremendous help to have in Washington persons who have been cured of cancer, as showing what progress has already been made and what our hopes are for the future."

Senator HUMPHREY expressed confidence that it will not be long before we have announcements of great discoveries such as we had in the field of polio research.

Senator IVES said that no family in America was immune from cancer, and that his own family has been hit several times.

Before the discussion ended, the Senators had recalled the names of honored and beloved colleagues lost to cancer: the late Senators Arthur Vandenberg, Brien McMahon, Robert A. Taft, Kenneth Wherry and, most recently, Matthew Neely. The recollection

cast a shadow over the session, but it also appeared to sharpen congressional determination to help wipe out cancer. It was late afternoon by the time the extraordinary Senate tribute ended.

Most of the Cured Cancer Congress delegates gathered afterward in the American Cancer Society staff room at the Statler Hotel, where national office personnel dispensed coffee and opportunity for reminiscence. "When I got home," and "starting tomorrow," were the pivotal points of many conversations going on in groups around the room. "Wonderful, inspiring," were the adjectives most frequently used to describe the day's events.

That evening members of the Cured Cancer Congress assembled at the Washington premier of South Pacific where a glittering first night audience watched Miss Allison push a button that lit the giant 30-foot sword of hope erected on Pennsylvania Avenue in the heart of the Nation's Capital. Within the hour following, delegates to the congress had started their homeward trek, by plane and train—37 ambassadors of hope who, in the words of their own resolution, were to "bring to the frightened the message of hope," and by their living example instill the hope that will lead to action.

A cancer victim says:

"I had cancer. I discovered its presence early. I was completely cured of it. And I have never made the slightest secret of it.

"This malady has been hedged about too long with the absurd belief that it is unmentionable. Let's break down the hedges. Let's discuss cancer as matter-of-factly as a broken leg.

"I don't know why this malady should be considered more disgraceful than whooping cough or stomach ulcers or heart disease. I do not know why any disease should be considered shocking. But if it is disgraceful to have cancer, then I am thoroughly disgraced in the eyes of my family and friends. And I have known more than a dozen other disgraceful cases. In my own family there have been three.

"The unmentionableness of cancer still claims too many victims. That's why I want to help the American Cancer Society's great educational message: You can have cancer—and live.

"To start where it all began: Cancer can so easily be an ending. When it isn't it is a brandnew beginning; you are born again.

"I was born for a second time in 1936.

"It was a warm, bright afternoon when cancer struck. Or rather when I discovered that it had struck, for the initial invasion of cancer is silent, painless, unwarning; that is the treachery and cruelty of this inscrutable disease. It hits anyone, anywhere, at any time. The fat and the slender; the strong and the sickly; the woman who overworks and the woman who doesn't work at all.

"No knowledge of hygiene can ward it off. I had been married for many years to a physician, and I was, myself, a graduate nurse. I had kept my weight reasonable and I had always been a strong woman, hardy enough to take long mountain hikes as well as to spend exhausting hours at my desk to meet an editor's deadline for a manuscript.

"If ever a woman seemed secure from illness that warm bright afternoon in 1936, it was I. I was enjoying the day and my favorite sport, fishing, when I felt a nagging pain. And then I discovered the lump in my breast.

"It was still tiny and that was lucky. But my recovery did not depend on luck; I acted without delay."

TOWARD A COMMON PURPOSE

(By the Honorable LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama, chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare)

(Following is the main body of the remarks of Senator HILL in presenting the American Cancer Society Cured Cancer Congress to the United States Senate on the opening of the 1958 crusade in Washington, D. C.)

The American Cancer Society has long been the partner of the Federal Government in the great and challenging problem of the cause and cure of cancer. Just as we in the Senate appropriate funds for cancer research each year, so, in a parallel effort, does the American Cancer Society raise funds from the general populace for the same purpose, and together the two efforts, well coordinated and complemented by private industry, move toward their common purpose.

The science of chemotherapy in cancer is the best example of how this three-pronged approach works. The Government, private industry, and the American Cancer Society are presently engaged in a coordinated crash program to test some 42,000 new chemicals each year in laboratories across the country. About 16 compounds are now in clinical use. They do not cure, but they do prolong life and relieve pain, often enabling thousands of cancer patients to lead useful, fairly normal lives. Only a few months ago came news of great importance. Massive doses of one of the new drugs have for the first time apparently succeeded in completely suppressing one rare type of cancer.

Virology and immunology are important new research fields. Nobel Prize winner Dr. Wendell Stanley holds that viruses provide the clue to cancer control. His work, and that of many other distinguished scientists, is based on the hypothesis that viruses cause most, if not all, types of cancer. Virology is one of the many research areas supported by the American Cancer Society.

Yes, research is moving ahead on many fronts. But there is another and not less important factor—people. Never has any population been so well informed about a disease and so active in the fight for conquering it as is true of the American people. A leader in all this is the American Cancer Society, which, through research, service, and education, wages an unrelenting battle against cancer. Two million Americans, men, and women in every walk of life—doctors, housewives, businessmen, professional workers, factory workers, industrialists—are banded together as dedicated volunteers of the American Cancer Society. They do the work. They will be satisfied with nothing less than total victory.

The goal of the American Cancer Society is threefold:

One, to save all the lives that can be saved within the limits of our present knowledge. This means the lives of 75,000 Americans who now die needlessly each year through fear, neglect, delay.

Two, to find cures for every type of cancer.

Three, and finally, to find cancer preventives, so that no man, woman, or child will ever have to know the fear and pain of cancer.

Cancer strikes in 2 out of 3 American families. It can strike in any home, at any time, and at any age. Few people realize that it is the No. 1 disease killer of our children. And it has, also, orphaned more children than we like to contemplate. There are today more than 300,000 children in the United States who have lost either a father or mother to cancer. In too many cases the parent they lost did not have to die. Early detection and treatment could have saved them.

We cannot have too much research, because we cannot get a cancer cure too soon. Each day gained means 700 lives saved. For this is the rate at which Americans are dying of cancer—700 a day, 365 days a year. This is why we need more and more research supported both by Government and by the American Cancer Society. And this is why we also need the society's life-saving service and education programs.

H. R. 13742, a Bill To Amend Title 28 of the United States Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. DENNISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill H. R. 13742 to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to confer original jurisdiction on the district courts of the United States in any civil action to enjoin, suspend, or restrain the assessment, levy, or collection of a tax of a local government of a State without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy. This jurisdiction is exercisable if two conditions are satisfied, first, that there is diversity of citizenship between parties to the action, and second, that the action arises under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. An added feature of the bill provides that the prevailing party in any such action may be awarded costs, including reasonable attorney's fees.

The need for this legislation has been indicated for some time. It has increasingly become the habit of municipal corporations and local political subdivisions to levy taxes on many different kinds of activities within their jurisdiction. As the need grows for greater community services, the imagination and perseverance of local taxing bodies is stimulated.

One device is levying license or privilege taxes for the conduct of a trade, vocation, profession, or business. Some of these are levied on a flat, annual rate, and others on a percentage of profits basis.

Often such taxes, although not large in dollar value, becomes a very real burden to a person or association outside the community and State, particularly when engaged in similar activities in many, many other communities.

Of course, it is axiomatic that when an out-of-State business concern is so taxed, any undue or discriminatory burden upon commerce is forbidden. A State, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, cannot put a barrier around its borders and may not interfere with the constitutional power of the Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States. Such a prohibition may not be accomplished in the guise of tax-

ation if it produces an excluding or discriminatory effect.

A recent case, *West Point Wholesale Grocery Co.* v. *City of Opelika, Ala.* (354 U. S. 390), is a case in point. Under an ordinance of the city of Opelika, an annual privilege tax of $250 was required to be paid by any firm engaged in the wholesale grocery business which delivered groceries at wholesale within the city from points outside the city. The West Point Wholesale Grocery Co. was a Georgia corporation, and except for the solicitation of orders and delivery of goods had no other contact with the city of Opelika, Ala. Notwithstanding the foregoing and the previous decisions of the Supreme Court in the cases of *Nippert* v. *City of Richmond* (327 U. S. 416), and *Memphis Steam Laundry Cleaner, Inc.* v. *Stone* (342 U. S. 389), holding such a tax to be unconstitutional, the city of Opelika proceeded to assess and collect the tax from West Point.

Under the law as it exists, the West Point Wholesale Grocery Co. could not file suit either in the State or Federal court to enjoin the assessment or collection of the tax. Its only recaurse was to pay the tax, which was obviously unconstitutionally levied, and sue in the State court to recover. In this case the amount was $250. Thus West Point Wholesale Grocery had to go through the State courts and ultimately appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States before it could invoke the jurisdiction of any Federal court, and this in a case in which a question involving the Constitution of the United States was the sole point in issue.

Now it is possible that the same or similar tax could be levied in the next year, again requiring the taxpayer to proceed in the same manner through the State courts to the Supreme Court. It is not the $250 in the West Point case that is important, but rather the cumulative effect of taxes upon such an out-of-State business over an extended period of time that causes the trouble. As was stated in *Nippert* v. *City of Richmond*, supra, pages 429–431:

> But the cumulative effect, practically speaking, of flat municipal taxes laid in succession upon the itinerant merchant as he passes from town to town is obviously greater than that of any tax of statewide application likely to be laid by the legislature itself. And it is almost as obvious that the cumulative burden will be felt more strongly by the out-of-State itinerant than by the one who confines his movement within the State or the salesman who operates within a single community or only a few. The drummer or salesman whose business requires him to move from place to place, exhausting his market at each periodic visit or conducting his business in more sporadic fashion with reference to particular localities, would find the cumulative burden of the Richmond type of tax eating away all possible return from his selling. A day here, a day there, 5 days now and 5 days a year or several months later, with a flat license tax annually imposed lacking any proportion to the number or length of visits or the volume of the business or return, can only mean the stoppage of a large amount of commerce which would be carried on either in the absence of the tax or under the incidence of one taking account of these variations.

To subject any out-of-State business to such a burden is a costly procedure and does not afford the taxpayer a permanent and adequate remedy. It should be pointed out that the delay caused by the necessity of suit in State courts and subsequent appeal from court to court and finally to the Supreme Court is in itself a burden on interstate commerce.

The only method by which the free flow of commerce can be maintained against the unconstitutional levy of local taxes is by according one so engaged in interstate commerce prompt and permanent relief without harassment and undue delay. Federal courts should be given jurisdiction over this Federal problem.

This is the purpose of the bill which I have introduced.

Librarians for Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution on the National Defense Education Act of 1958, adopted by the American Library Association on July 17, 1958, at Los Angeles.

Mr. President, these librarians work closely with the students and educators. They know their needs, and they know the necessity for the elevation of educational standards, sought in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. As a coauthor of this bill, I welcome this endorsement of it by American librarians.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958 ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, JULY 17, 1958

Whereas the American Library Association has an established policy in support of Federal aid to public education without Federal control in order to assist the States and their subdivisions to establish and maintain adequate educational facilities;

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958 aims to provide scholarship loans to individuals for study at institutions of higher education; grants to the States to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in schools; a substantial program of graduate fellowships to encourage individuals to train for a teaching career in our universities and colleges, and authorizes an annual appropriation for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes;

Whereas the broad program encompassed by this legislation has wide implications for the libraries whose interests it touches at every major point: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the American Library Association at their annual conference at San Francisco, Calif., on July 17, 1958, recommend to the 85th Congress, sitting in its 2d session, that it enact the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to all Members of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the United States Commissioner of Education.

Proceedings Against Bernard Goldfine

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, my interest in this resolution lies, not in Mr. Goldfine, nor the performance of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but in the powers of the House and their exercise.

I have often spoken on the investigative power of the Congress and the importance of the factfinding function of committees in forming a firm foundation for sound and intelligent legislation.

I shall vote for the resolution and uphold the power of the committee and the House to obtain the information Mr. Goldfine defiantly and contumaciously refused to give on a subject within the scope of the committee's inquiry.

I disapprove, however, the method employed by the committee to compel obedience. We are calling upon the executive—the United States district attorney—and the courts to do, under section 102 of the Revised Statutes, the task we ought to do ourselves.

The House has ample power to bring contumacious witnesses before it, interrogate them on the subjects deemed of importance to the legislative process and, if they defy the House, punish them for such defiance.

The considerations and reasoning in such an exercise of the investigative authority of the Congress—so necessary to enlightened lawmaking—are brilliantly set forth in a law review article by Gerald Morgan, presently the President's special counsel, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14, 1958, at pages 12521–12526.

Turning over our task of enforcing our powers to the executive and judiciary branches of the Government is simply one more indication of the weakness and low estate of the Congress today.

Actually, however, it is more than that. Section 102 of the Revised Statutes expressly makes pertinence "to the question under inquiry" an element of the crime. Thus it calls upon the courts to make a legislative decision, namely, what facts, or what opinions, have a bearing or influence upon the determination of legislative policy. That is our task, not one for the court.

Curiously, the resolution before us contains no phraseology reciting a legislative finding or judgment that the

information sought by the questions Mr. Goldfine refused to answer were pertinent, relevant or "germane" to the subject of the subcommittee's inquiry. The committee's report did assert relevancy, but the House merely received the report; it did not adopt it.

Regardless of the report or the absence of a finding of relevancy by the House, section 102 of the Revised Statutes by its terms imposes upon the prosecution the duty of proving "pertinency" of the questions, as all other elements of a crime, "beyond a reasonable doubt."

Thus, the executive branch is to undertake to present to a grand jury and a court a legislative proposition; namely, what circumstances or set of facts might induce the Congress to legislate or to refrain from legislating. That proposition is one peculiarly within the province of the legislative body—not the executive—not the judiciary.

Section 102 of the Revised Statutes was enacted in 1857. However, for almost 40 years thereafter the House and the Senate continued to try contempt charges themselves. In 1894 charges against Elisha Edwards and Elverton R. Chapman were certified to the United States attorney under section 102 of the Revised Statutes. The latter was the first indictment under this law.

Between 1894 and 1940 contempt charges were increasingly referred to the United States attorney and the courts. Some notable contempt cases, however, were tried in that interval by the House and by the Senate. Since 1940 all contempt charges have been certified under section 102 of the Revised Statutes, and the House and the Senate have failed to exercise their inherent powers to punish witnesses for contempt. This history of the punishment of contempt of Congress is a mute but eloquent index of the state to which the Congress has sunk—that we should send others to do our chores and be bound by their actions.

In the process the vigor of the investigative power of the Congress has been weakened. Witnesses have escaped punishment, and precedents have been established which seem to hinder and limit the factfinding power of the Congress.

I hope in future instances of defiance of committee inquiries the House will assert the powers it possesses and proceed to deal directly and effectively with those who flout its orders and seek to obstruct its processes.

In Memory of the Honorable Bill McVey

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 11, 1958

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed associate, WILLIAM E. MCVEY.

No more kindly and considerate Member ever served in this body. He was constant in his work both in committee and on the floor of the House. His was a useful life both as an educator and as a legislator.

I want to join others in expressing our sympathies to the McVey family.

Will Ike Permit Kremlin To Take Nuclear Lead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, has been commenting in a series of articles on America's woeful unpreparedness in the field of missiles, both offensive and defensive. One of the most frightening articles of the series was printed in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of Monday, August 4, 1958.

I think it is particularly important that the Congress and the American people should be aware of the situation as it now exists and will worsen in the future.

I hope all Members of Congress will read this splendid article and will become aware of the grave danger faced by the United States during the next few years:

WILL IKE PERMIT KREMLIN TO TAKE NUCLEAR LEAD?

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—It is now the Eisenhower administration's policy to permit the Kremlin to gain an overwhelming superiority of nuclear striking power in the next 5 years. This is the true, though unadmitted, response to the warning of the sputniks.

The terrible facts that support the foregoing terrible charge have already been printed. These facts in turn quite obviously pose a further question.

How can the administration possibly be pursuing such a policy, 8 months after the sputniks' clear warning?

All sorts of extraneous factors enter into the answer.

The most important, certainly, is the capture of the President's mind by former Secretary of the Treasury George Magoffin Humphrey. Humphrey taught Eisenhower to fear loose or burdensome fiscal measures more than he fears the armed might of the Kremlin.

But no President could cling to this system of priority—not even a President so protected from the terrible facts as Dwight D. Eisenhower—if he did not have some veil of military argument to cast over the hideous reality. The veil currently being used is the theory of overkill.

This theory has been put forward by the Army and Navy, in order to protect their own appropriations from the competition of the needed vast expenditures to strengthen our nuclear deterrent.

What, then, is this theory of overkill? In essence, it is the argument that you do not need the power to overkill, if you already have H-bombs and the means to deliver them in quantities sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union.

Being childishly simple, it sounds convincing. This is nonsense, all the same, because it slurs over the operational realities and altogether ignores the political-psychological realities. The operational realities may be summarized as follows:

First, the Kremlin is not deterred from attacking the United States by any simple computation of American nuclear striking power. What deters the Kremlin is a computation of the balance between their power and our power.

In particular, the Kremlin is continuously computing how much American nuclear striking power will probably survive a first blow by Soviet nuclear striking power. This part of our striking power that will survive the first blow is the true and only deterrent.

As the balance tilts toward unchallengeable Soviet superiority during the next 5 years, the part of our striking power that will survive a first blow must also diminish.

This rate by which our true and only deterrent will weaken is affected by many special factors.

Ever since the sputniks, for example, the Strategic Air Command has kept one-third of its aircraft either in the air or on 15-minute alerts, in order to make sure that at least a third of its strength will survive the first blow by the Soviets.

But this survival force cannot strike back without the complexly coordinated support of the air-tanker fleet. It will surely be disorganized by the effect of the first blow on SAC's nerve centers.

Picture the Kremlin with 1,000 to 2,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles; with 1,000 to 2,000 shorter range missiles neutralizing our overseas airbases; with a vast network of air defense to withstand our manned bombers that survive the first blow; and with a substantial manned bomber force of their own for the precision jobs.

What will the Kremlin then do?

And how shall we respond to Kremlin threat, when we have a proud total of 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles, against 2,000 Soviet ICBM's.

That will be one item in the dreadful balance sheet of 1962–63; so how will it affect our actions?

This administration ought to know the probable answers to these psychological-political questions, after the great Middle Eastern catastrophes.

Hon. William S. Hill

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate for the country that our colleague BILL HILL, of Colorado, is retiring from Congress at the end of the present session. After 18 years of distinguished service he has chosen to voluntarily retire from the Washington scene.

BILL HILL is one of the most amiable and sincere men I have known during the 16 years of my service here. He has served his district well, and he has served the Nation well. As a ranking member on the Agriculture Committee he has for many years been a leading voice in legislation affecting woolgrowers and livestock raisers. BILL HILL has always been found up on the front lines in every battle that has been waged in behalf of

the legitimate rights and interests of the American woolgrower.

Aside from his congressional work in the field of agriculture, BILL HILL has achieved an enviable record for economy in Government, and for maintaining the fundamentals of our American institutions. He has not been hoodwinked by the voice of the Socialists and do-gooders. He has held firm to his convictions and has always put the welfare of the country first.

I can hardly think of a man who is more respected by his colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, than is BILL HILL. And I can hardly think of one who is more deserving of that respect. As this session nears its end and the packing begins, I extend to my friend BILL HILL my own appreciation for the good fight he has made for better government, and my best wishes for a happy and pleasant future. He and his family deserve the best.

The Late Honorable Augustus Owsley Stanley

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Augustus Owsley Stanley will be mourned by all Kentuckians and all Americans.

Blessed with ability in many fields, his outstanding characteristic was his love of his fellow man. This trait predominated his actions throughout his political life. Etched upon the books of both the State of Kentucky and our National Government, are actions resulting from this great man's efforts from which we all have benefited.

Pioneer in the field of humanitarian legislation, the turn of events have proven his wisdom and foresight. His was the true philosophy of government for the people.

Prior to his coming to the Congress in 1903, Owsley Stanley's name had become linked with good government. His charitableness and his graciousness became so widespread that his fellow Kentuckians called upon him to represent them in the halls of the United States Congress in 1903. In this office he served until 1915. Throughout this service these principles predominated.

In the year 1915 the folks of Kentucky called him to serve as their chief executive. In this capacity he served faithfully and well through 1919. In this office he remained steadfast to these principles and objectives. Written on the books in old Kentucky history is the record that his was an administration for the people.

Following this service, Kentuckians demanded further of his time and his ability. They elected him to the United States Senate, in which office he served ably and faithfully through 1925. Because the administration in power was of opposite political faith, the voice of Owsley Stanley was in the minority. Nevertheless, here, too, he etched an enviable record, the course of which was charted upon the seas he so well knew—government for the people.

Governor Stanley, fortunately, lived to see many of the principles for which he stood—and oftentimes apparently stood alone—written upon the books. No one received greater joy and greater pleasure than Governor Stanley did when the Federal Government, through the Congress, recognized its obligation to the disabled, the lame and the blind, the poor and the suffering, and others in distress.

Governor Stanley's passing is truly a passing of an era. All will miss him because he was a friend to all. I extend to his widow and his family my sincere sympathy.

Why Ike Opposes Blatnik Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 5, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the House recently made an important contribution to the eventual solution of the problem of water supply when it passed a bill to direct the construction of plants to convert brackish water to fresh water. It would indeed be shortsighted not to work in the direction of real progress to eliminate water pollution. The efforts of our colleague, JOHN BLATNIK, and the difficulties that he has had in securing action on his bill to expand the water pollution control program are pointed out in an editorial from the August 16 edition of Labor. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY IKE OPPOSES BLATNIK BILL

Is the Eisenhower administration against cleaning up America's polluted rivers because that would adversely affect the selfish interests of some big industrialists? Facts strongly supporting an affirmative answer to that question are given in an article in the conservative Business Week magazine.

It points out that Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, is pushing for passage of a bill which would broaden Federal aid for sewage cleanup projects. In other words, it would continue and expand the water pollution control program BLATNIK put through Congress 2 years ago, despite, as the magazine says, "strong opposition" from the Eisenhower administration.

The present Blatnik bill, the article points out, is backed by city officials and wildlife protection societies, because the smaller program in the past 2 years has proved a great success. By having Uncle Sam contribute comparatively small amounts to local sewage treatment projects, it has stimulated $351 million in city spending on new or improved water treatment plants, a 40 percent increase over the spending average of the previous 5 years.

That part of the program, the Business magazine says, "has grabbed most of the headlines," but there is another part. The Blatnik law "gave the Government stronger powers to crack down on municipal and industrial polluters of interstate streams.

"This new enforcement authority," the articles continues, "has been used in a score of cases to prod State pollution control agencies into revitalizing their moribund programs against stream polluters." As a result, some big industrialists fear they will have to stop pouring their poisonous and filthy wastes into the Nation's streams.

If that isn't why the Eisenhower administration opposed the original Blatnik program, and now opposes its expansion, what is the reason?

Guy Harvey Cited for His 20 Years Service as State Chairman of March of Dimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable men I have been privileged to know is Mr. Guy Harvey, of Yankton, S. Dak. In addition to many crowded years of unusually active participation in the fraternal, civic, and political life of his community and State, Mr. Harvey has established a nationwide reputation for his work as a State March of Dimes chairman.

One of only three remaining State chairmen appointed personally by the late President Franklin Roosevelt, Mr. Harvey was recently honored with a special dinner and a plaque in recognition of his 20 years of service to the March of Dimes. It is difficult for one to imagine a more worthwhile investment of time and energy than the inspiring leadership that Mr. Harvey has given to the great work of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. It was my privilege to serve as director of the March of Dimes in Davison County for 2 years under the direction of State Chairman Harvey. As his colleague, admirer, and friend I salute Guy Harvey on the occasion of his 20th anniversary with the March of Dimes.

I include at this point a news account from the August 11, 1958, issue of the Yankton Press and Dakotan:

"One of the outstanding records of service to mankind," stated Basil O'Connor, president of the national foundation, in honoring Guy Harvey of Yankton upon completion of 20 years as State volunteer chairman for the March of Dimes.

Harvey's service as a volunteer leader in the State has been instrumental in raising nearly $2½ million as a weapon in the national foundation's fight against polio. For many years the only known relief against a devastating crippler was insignificant attempts to thwart the disease.

However, with the increased attack backed by the national foundation, treatment centers were set up, iron lungs were developed, professional education was advanced, and finally a successful prevention was discovered by Dr. Jonas Salk.

Through these milestones Harvey was instrumental in South Dakota in aiding the many struck down by polio. During epidemics his desk in Yankton was cascaded by the numerous requests for financial aid,

families whose plight was always answered by ceaseless hours of dedication to a cause.

Of the many State chairmen appointed personally by the late Franklin Roosevelt, founder of the national foundation, Harvey is 1 of 3 chairmen still presiding, the others having retired or are deceased.

In accepting the honor, Harvey announced that his activities on behalf of the expanded programs of the national foundation, which is entering the fields of arthritis, rheumatism and birth defects, "will continue so long as the good Lord wills."

Mrs. D. L. Corning of Sioux Falls has been reappointed volunteer South Dakota adviser on women's activities for the national foundation, it was announced today by O'Connor.

Volunteer advisers on women's activities face the challenging task of interpreting the comprehensive programs and coordinating efforts of local chapters to develop long-range patient-aid services. Simultaneously they will encourage completion of all-out all-ages polio vaccination programs in all communities. Working closely with women's clubs and organizations, advisers will seek leadership cooperation to increase public understanding of the enlarged health programs. They will also participate in early planning for the 1959 March of Dimes which will initiate and finance the national foundation's expanded attack on disease and disability.

Mrs. Corning, chairman of a PTA study group for 2 years, is a member of the Fighter Squadron Wives. She also serves with the staff and office committee for the Girl Scout area office.

Commissioner Henry J. Clay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, 4½ years ago an able, young lawyer offered his services to the Eisenhower administration. Today Henry J. Clay is resigning from the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

Commissioner Clay was highly suited for the task he has so well performed. He is a graduate of the Taft School in Middletown, Conn., a graduate of Union College and the University of Virginia Law School. After having made an outstanding record as a practicing attorney in New York City he volunteered his services to the Federal Government. He was a former Chairman of the International Claims Commission. When this Commission was merged with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States he became its most experienced member.

Many members of the bar of the various States who have appeared before Commissioner Clay have expressed themselves on not only his ability but his courtesy and fair treatment.

I speak for many Members of Congress in expressing the deepest regret that he has chosen to withdraw from Federal service. It is understandable, however, that his public service could not continue forever due to personal commitments and a large young family. We wish him well.

A Tribute to Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion no Representative has served his country and his constituency more devotedly or constantly than RALPH GWINN of the 27th District of New York. While I am not and have not been in agreement with his economic philosophy through the years of his distinguished service to his people, I never could question his deep sincerity or his complete dedication to the high responsibilities of his position as a Congressman.

A man of courage, of gentle mien, of soul searching spirituality, RALPH GWINN is beloved by all who know him and admired greatly even by those who are in disagreement with his views.

His retirement from Congress this year will take from the House a needed balance-wheel and stabilizing influence. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues, all of whom respect him for his dedicated service and kindly nature.

Following is an article by a distinguished columnist of the San Francisco Daily Chronicle News, which appeared in that newspaper recently and which sums up eloquently the many admirable virtues of Congressman GWINN:

AS I SEE IT
(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

There are few men I hold in greater regard than John Fischer, editor of Harpers.

He is, without question, editing the most brilliant magazine now published in America.

His versatility, his keenness of perception, his disciplined love of the truth, his enormous and exuberant curiousity—all expressed in his writing, and in his judgment of articles—can only be compared with that of the late Harold Ross, editor of the New Yorker.

He is doing a top job.

But John Fischer can, as I see it, be capable of something he would not want to be incapable of—namely, injustice.

In the current issue he has a blistering attack, under his own name, on Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Republican, of New York. In his perceptive way he all but demolishes the Congressman from Bronxville, and when John Fischer demolishes anybody, he usually stays demolished.

Therefore, it is with great deference to the distinguished district attorney that I rise as counsel for the defense.

I do so humbly, and with no little trembling, as I doubt if I can sway the jury.

Yet, as I arise I ask the indulgence of the court. For I defend a man whose political views I do not agree with, whose record may rightly be regarded, as John Fischer puts it, one of the 19th century and "the economics of John Stuart Mill."

Yet I must say this is only part of the story.

There is another side. There is something to be said for this 74-year-old man who, personally, is the soul of love, who honestly and humbly shares with T. Jefferson the moss-covered doctrine that "the best government is that which governs the least," and with whom you cannot converse 5 minutes without realizing that, from a standpoint of character, he is a better man than you are.

Or at least than I am.

Of how many Members of Congress can one say this? Or at least of one whose political views you do not share?

Indeed, the essential nobility of the man is such that during the many hours I have conversed with him, in his office, dining alone with him in the Republican Club, in his home, on the street, I have always been reminded of Emerson's famous dictum:

"What you are speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say."

Indeed, I am a better man for having known RALPH W. GWINN. But it is not on that ground I defend him. I defend him on the one outstanding part of his political philosophy I do agree with.

Namely, that unique plank in his platform on which he always ran for Congress: the reform of the United States Office of Education and the return of it to its lawful function.

Here he was on solid ground, because for over 30 years that function has been ignored.

I know. I used to be on the staff of the United States Office of Education. I saw the law being by-passed and treated with contempt every day. I resigned in protest against it.

I carried my protest to the House of Representatives and had Mr. GWINN's immediate cooperation.

It was Mr. GWINN who led the fight on former Commissioner of Education John W. Studebaker; it was Mr. GWINN who showed that Mr. Studebaker was publishing handsome and costly booklets on the status of education in Yugoslavia and Poland and Panama, but not one word on the status of American history in the secondary schools of the United States; it was Mr. GWINN who year in and year out demanded, and secured, an investigation of this gross and incredible fraud on the American people; it was Mr. GWINN who has successful each year in lopping off thousands of dollars that might otherwise have been appropriated for silly and ridiculous projects in bureaucratic office; it was Mr. GWINN, coming from Bronxville, which happens to have one of the best elementary and secondary school systems in the United States, who did his best to awaken his colleagues to the danger—indeed, the peril—of Federal interference in the local matter of education.

Mr. Fischer may not know it, and indeed I do not want to offend him, but as Mr. GWINN spoke on the floor of the House, I did not see anybody walk out. I saw something that—at least in my mind's eye—would have surprised Mr. Fischer.

One day, as he spoke, I saw Thomas Jefferson walk slowly down the center aisle and stand quietly behind him, listening with rapt attention as he talked in that voice of love and compassion, denouncing those who were defiling the Temple of Education.

Then, as he finished, I saw Patrick Henry come in suddenly, stride down the aisle, with a bow to Jefferson, take over the lectern and with that eloquence which only Patrick Henry knew how to give, start slowly and solemnly:

"Listen, all who are yet free, you have just heard the voice of the Founding Fathers. I say also * * *"

There was something spellbinding in the way Mr. Henry gestured with his arms. His voice rang out, and he electrified every man within range. And then the applause came. It was deafening. I remember standing up, the thrill of being an American pounding through me.

And, suddenly, Mr. Henry was gone. And there was standing there only the spare, gaunt figure of RALPH W. GWINN of New York.

Yet I am glad, because I knew Mr. GWINN. I did not know, in a personal way, those in whose behalf he spoke. But I knew he was not alone.

Mr. Fischer says that the Republican bosses of Westchester and Putnam Counties have retired Mr. GWINN.

Let us hope, if this is true, they have not also retired Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Henry.

Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan Devoted to the Polish Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, our colleague from the 11th District on the Northwest Side of the city of Chicago, is recognized as one of the outstanding fighters in behalf of Poland's struggle for freedom.

Ever since Congressman SHEEHAN came to Congress in January 1951, he has maintained an active interest in Poland's cause. Through the years, this interest and dedication has never diminished and I know that all citizens of Polish ancestry join with me in recognizing and lauding him for the time and effort he has given to Poland.

Soon after Congressman SHEEHAN came to Congress in 1951, he was the first Member of Congress to introduce a resolution in the 82d Congress to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. After the resolution was adopted, he served on the special Katyn Investigating Committee. The whole world knows of the accomplishments of this investigation.

For TIM SHEEHAN'S work on this Katyn Investigating Committee, our colleague received the Polonia Restituta Award from the Polish Government-in-exile and also is the recipient of a citation from the Polish Army Veterans of America.

During 1956, Congressman SHEEHAN introduced two resolutions in the Congress dealing with the Poznan uprising which caused President August Zaleski of the Polish Government-in-exile to write:

I wish to offer to you my heartfelt thanks for this generous gesture.

Since the initiative you have taken in the question of the Katyn Forest massacre, I have been following with great interest your activities on behalf of my country and I can assure you that I am expressing the opinion of all patriotic Poles when I express to you their gratitude.

I am, sir,

Yours very sincerely,

AUGUST ZALESKI.

Recently, in a speech in the House of Representatives, commenting on the 15th anniversary of the discovery of the Katyn graves, our colleague brought to the attention of the people of our country facts about the present Russian Ambassador to the United States, Mikhail Menshikov, who, when in charge of the distribution of allied food and supplies in Poland right after World War II, made this distribution not to needy Poles but to those card-carrying Communist members in strict solidarity with the party line.

The Polish daily, Dziennik Chicagoski, stated editorially that—

We cannot fight our friends—one of whom is Congressman TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN.

In another editorial, Dziennik Chicagoski stated that—

American Poles should not disregard Congressmen of non-Polish descent, who are favorably disposed toward our problems and objectives.

People of non-Polish descent, who honestly cooperate with us, are needed in the various public offices as much as our compatriots. Congressman TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, a Representative of the 11th District of Chicago, is one of those people who, although alien to us, is completely devoted to the Polish cause. He is a Republican, but, at the same time, a poised man who fully realized that, very often, in advocating a just cause, party lines must be crossed and one has to vote according to the conscience of an honest citizen.

Congressman SHEEHAN has gained the very best reputation among the American Poles of Chicago. We can state here that in every problem of general Polish or American-Polish character we can always count on Mr. SHEEHAN'S splendid suggestions or advice.

From the Katyn committee on, of which he was an active member from the beginning to the end, no Polish problem has ever been indifferent or alien to Congressman SHEEHAN.

On Congressman SHEEHAN'S record of supporting his constituency, and on the basis of his wholehearted support and aid for the Polish cause, all citizens of Polish descent should give earnest consideration to the interest which he has demonstrated through the years in the fight for Poland's freedom and for his close attention to the affairs of Polonia here in America.

Showdown in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of August 12, 1958:

SHOWDOWN IN POLAND

The battle has been joined again in Poland. Accepting the challenge of the Red regime in raiding the monastery of Jasna Gora in the holy city of Czestochowa, the Polish primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, has ordered special prayers daily for 3 months. Moreover, without any directive, thousands of Poles already are marching to Czestochowa to participate in a religious demonstration on Friday in connection with the observance of the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary who is regarded as the Queen of Poland.

On the other hand, the Communist government in Warsaw, under the lash of Moscow, is stepping up its attacks on the cardinal and the church, possibly setting the stage for a new showdown. It is a fateful step for the government because the Poles are a religious and patriotic people and they have demonstrated repeatedly they possess the courage of their convictions despite the power of the Red usurpers.

This is a dramatic moment in the history of Poland and the world, as the forces of good and evil face each other in this enslaved land with its proud traditions of freedom.

It would be difficult to think of anything more to arouse the Poles than the raid of Jasna Gora which is identified with some of the most stirring chapters in the history of Poland, combining religion and patriotism. It is a shrine that occupies a peculiar place in the life of the Polish people. It is here that the primate of Poland maintains his headquarters, symbolizing Polish fervor and, if need be, sacrifice.

It is coincidence that this test should come at a time when the August holy days, focusing attention on Czestochowa, are at hand. The Communists cannot be unaware of the risk they take.

There will be millions of Americans who will add their prayers to the supplications of the people of Poland to surmount the obstacles in the difficult days immediately ahead.

More on the Bang-Jensen Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend to the further attention of all another article from the Brooklyn Tablet under date of August 2, 1958, on the Bang-Jensen case. I assure you that this is worth reading:

UNITED STATES, WITHOUT PROOF, HITS BANG-JENSEN—UNITED STATES DEPUTY SECRETARY FINDS U. N. FULLY JUSTIFIED IN DISMISSING ANTI-RED—IGNORES FACTS, THOUGH—INACCURACIES AND OMISSIONS IN OFFICIAL UNITED STATES STAND ARE POINTED OUT

(By Don Zirkel)

The United States has officially (and without proof) announced that United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold was fully justified in dismissing Povl Bang-Jensen, Deputy Secretary of the U. N. Special Committee on Hungary.

That information is contained in a statement sent to American citizens who have protested the mishandling of the case. The statement, signed by James J. Wadsworth, Deputy United States representative to the U. N., does not answer Mr. Bang-Jensen's charges.

LODGE AID LAUDS LODGE

It says Ambassador to the United Nations Henry Cabot Lodge "left no stone unturned to see to it that the anonymity of the Hungarian witnesses should be preserved and that thereby they and their relatives could be protected against Communist reprisals.

"His efforts were completely successful," Mr. Wadsworth proudly announces, with this explanation:

"The Secretary General gave Mr. Lodge definite assurance that the secrecy of these documents would be kept totally inviolate in his possession. • • • Mr. Lodge was fully satisfied with this assurance."

Neither Mr. Hammarskjold, Mr. Lodge, nor Mr. Wadsworth have explained how the witnesses "could be protected against Commu-

nist reprisals" by turning their names over to Communist agents.

But the head of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, among whose duties is custodian of documents including names of witnesses and other top-secret information, was Dragoslav Protitch, a Yugoslav. He has since been demoted, possibly for his lack of full cooperation in the drive to get Mr. Bang-Jensen, and the documents in his safe turned over to his successor, Anatoly Drobynin, a Russian.

U. N.'S PERFECT RECORD EXPOSED

The Secretary-General pointed out, Mr. Wadsworth assures the United States citizens who have written to Mr. Lodge, "that during the 12 years the United Nations has been in existence, secret material has been kept absolutely secure under the jurisdiction of the Secretary General."

Of course there would be positively no way to prove that secret documents were never taken from the Secretary General's files, photographed and returned.

The Secretary-General's experiences with Mr. Bang-Jensen only serve to prove he does not have complete and continuous control of U. N. documents.

More specifically, apparently neither Mr. Hammarskjold, Mr. Lodge nor Mr. Wadsworth remember back to last December, when the same Mr. Hammarskjold announced the termination of employment of a Ceylonese U. N. worker for delivering verbatim testimony from the same Hungarian Special Committee to a member of the Soviet delegation.

At least the Secretary-General should have remembered because of the link between that case and Mr. Bang-Jensen's.

The Ceylonese employee's offense had been exposed many months before and then generally forgotten. It was recalled by a question in the first press conference after Mr. Bang-Jensen's case became public and Mr. Hammarskjold replied that the earlier case had been terminated.

MOST IMPORTANT CHARGE IGNORED

The press conference was on the morning of December 16. A check of the records indicates that the termination took place on that very day, either by a curious coincidence or, more presumably, after the press conference—to establish a precedent for the dismissal of Mr. Bang-Jensen.

The United States representatives have failed to discuss the most important charge against Mr. Bang-Jensen, that he gave assurance of anonymity to prospective witnesses which were in excess of his authority.

They also failed to discuss the sabotage of the Hungarian investigation which would have resulted from the refusal of the witnesses to testify because of the refusal to guarantee the United States objective, as stated by Mr. Wadsworth, "that the anonymity of the Hungarian witnesses should be preserved and that thereby they and their relatives could be protected against Communist reprisals."

Following is the complete text of the only paragraph in which Mr. Wadsworth discusses the charges against Mr. Bang-Jensen:

"Secretary General Hammarskjold has now made public the letter which he gave to Mr. Bang-Jensen specifying the reasons for his dismissal. I do not think this letter supports the idea which seems to exist in some places that Mr. Bang-Jensen was dismissed for opposing and denouncing communism. In fact, among the people whom he opposed were two of the main authors of the United Nation report on Hungary, one of the most powerful indictments of Soviet Communist behavior ever issued by the United Nations. I believe that Mr. Hammarskjold's letter shows that he was fully justified in dismissing Mr. Bang-Jensen."

It is agreed by both sides that Mr. Hammerskjold's letter does not support the idea "that Mr. Bang-Jensen was dismissed for opposing and denouncing communism." Did anyone seriously expect it to? But Mr. Bang-Jensen's letters support and document that idea and the United States representatives to the U. N. have failed to discuss his letters.

They have also failed to discuss his documentation that members of the secretariat tried to sabotage the report and that it is one of the most powerful indictments of Soviet Communist behavior despite, not because of, their activities.

MR. BANG-JENSEN'S DEFENSE

As for the charges that promises of anonymity were given in excess of his authority, Mr. Bang-Jensen told Mr. Hammarskjold:

"It is difficult to understand how anybody can determine whether this charge is true, without knowing what I was authorized to promise the witnesses who testified before the Special Committee on Hungary and what you claim in this respect.

"However, the various so-called reports of the Gross committee and the disciplinary committee do not give the slightest hint as to this. Nor have you and Dr. Protitch, in spite of many urgings since October 10, 1957, been willing to tell me what you maintain that I was authorized to promise the witnesses."

Mr. Bang-Jensen maintains that he received the authorization early in February 1957, from Dr. Protitch and that it was supported by a February 8 memorandum from Andrew Cordier, an American who is the Secretary General's executive assistant, and several additional memorandums.

He was promised copies of these memorandums for his defense but while waiting to receive them he was criticized for failing to reply, convicted and fired. The United States representatives to the U. N. have failed to discuss this angle of the case.

MORE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Since it is claimed Mr. Bang-Jensen acted without authorization, he has asked Mr. Hammarskjold:

"(a) Why, for 8 months, from February 8 to October 9, 1957, neither you, Mr. Cordier, Dr. Protitch, Mr. Jordan or anybody else in the Secretariat ever asked me:

"(i) To see the list of witnesses;

"(ii) Where and in what manner I kept and safeguarded this, perhaps the most secret document in the United Nations on the security of which human life depended;

"(b) Why I was not requested to hand over the list of witnesses to you, Dr. Protitch, or Mr. Jordan for safekeeping, at one of the following occasions:

"(i) After the Committee on Hungary had adopted its report on June 7, 1957, and it was generally thought that the Committee thereby had concluded its functions;

"(ii) Before I left on a 2 months' home leave on June 17, although the report of the committee was made public on that date, and one could well expect that questions might then be raised relating to the identity of the witnesses;

"(iii) When shortly after my return from Denmark, on August 26, I was told, without any explanation, that you and Mr. Cordier had agreed that I be dismissed as deputy secretary of the Committee on Hungary, shortly before the General Assembly's special session on Hungary was about to meet;

"(iv) When, on September 19, one of your Under Secretaries, in a memorandum to you, as I later discovered since it was included as evidence against me among the annexes of the final Gross 'report,' claimed that I had been 'mentally ill,' apparently since the end of May, and that he was 'not at all sure that he is very far from a state of mind which could lead to physical violence, either to himself or others.'"

Neither Mr. Hammarskjold, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Wadsworth, Mr. Cordier or anyone else has answered these questions or the many other serious charges raised in previous issues of the Tablet.

THE MORAL CONSIDERATION

Mr. Bang-Jensen further points out that if he acted without authorization, "which I do not for a moment admit," this does not change the fact that "a promise was given to the witnesses on behalf of the United Nations by an officer of the organization.

"Whether he actually was authorized or not is of no legal consequence. In the circumstances, all lawyers, I should think, will agree that the United Nations and I, legally as well as morally, are bound by this promise and that it cannot be modified without the consent of the witnesses themselves."

To this argument Mr. Hammarskjold made the amazing statement: "Any moral reservations which might have prevented you from obeying my instructions do not ameliorate the impropriety of your conduct."

When United States citizens protest this travesty of justice to the United States representatives to the U. N. they receive a gratuitous statement which ignores the charges and documentation but believes Mr. Hammarskjold was fully justified in dismissing Mr. Bang-Jensen.

Termination of Voice of America Broadcasts in Baltic Languages Blow to United States Prestige and Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in ELTA, Information Service of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, of August 10, 1958:

TERMINATION OF VOA BROADCASTS IN BALTIC LANGUAGES BLOW TO UNITED STATES PRESTIGE AND INTERESTS

The reorganization of the Voice of America radio center in Munich threatens to become a major blow to the United States interests and prestige among the people of the Baltic States.

On July 2, the United States Information Agency has announced that it was augmenting the Voice programs in English and Russian and, in connection with this, was reorganizing its radio center in Munich. In plain language it means that, under the cover of administrative changes, the only half-hour broadcasts by the free world from Europe in the Baltic languages are being abolished.

As of September 1 of this year, the free world's voice will not be heard from Europe in Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian any more. The listeners of Voice of America in the Baltic countries will be very painfully affected by this move, as they do not have, and never had, any special American programs broadcast to them from Europe (as, for instance, the Radio Liberation for Russians or the Radio Free Europe for Bulgarians, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles and Rumanians). Could this reorganization, therefore, be a conscious act designed to make the discrimination of the Baltic peoples in the field of the free world's information even worse?

The Baltic people will never be able to comprehend that at the same time, while

they are discriminated against, the Voice is increasing its programs in Russian. The inevitable question arises if by such actions the United States desires to promote the Russification process which the Baltic peoples are resisting with the same determination as ever in the past.

What is now being liquidated is not an instrument of the cold war, but the only moral ties of the United States, as the leader of the free world, with the captive Baltic peoples whose forcible annexation by the Soviets will, according to numerous solemn statements, never be recognized by the American Government.

For a number of years the Voice of America has been successfully proclaiming the word of hope, strength, and truth. No Communist obstructions have managed to prevent the Baltic peoples from listening to this word. This fact is borne out by letters, personal witnesses and, especially by the press and literature of the Communists themselves who have classified listening to the Voice as one of the major sins against the regime. Hence the transfer of Voice's programs to Washington is not only an unjustifiable retreat of the United States from Europe, bound to encourage the Soviet imperialists, but an offense to its listeners in the Baltic countries—they will interpret it as an inexcusable concession to the Soviets, as a step toward the recognition of Soviet occupation. The unhappy act in Munich will create bitter disappointment among the Baltic peoples in the free world's policy toward the captive nations; a policy which has been spineless enough even before this act.

It is astonishing that the people responsible for this reorganization have absolutely disregarded the specific character of the programs in the Baltic languages; that they have been oblivious about the unusual international status of these countries as well as about the fact that these programs are for the Baltic peoples the only access to American information from Europe—their own continent.

According to the new setup, as of September 1—why such a feverish haste to create an accomplished fact?—instead of the former free Baltic departments in Munich, there will remain only one American official with three native employees (one for each nationality). Anyone having a minimal knowledge of the propaganda broadcasting field knows perfectly well that such a service will in no way be able even to approximate the impact for which the Voice programs from Europe have been noted.

The search for new and more creative ways in disseminating United States information is not compatible with the rupture of existing contacts. The authors of the "reorganization" of the Voice Radio Center in Munich contradict themselves when, allegedly looking for better means to win new friends for America, they risk the alienation of true and tried friends—those in the Baltic countries. The temporary continuation of the Baltic programs from Washington, even if somewhat increased, cannot disguise the naked fact that an attempt has been made to extinguish the only channel of United States information in Europe in the Baltic languages. This is something that only the enemies of the United States will rejoice in.

The muzzling of the United States voice in Europe comes at the time when the Communists are strengthening their broadcasts beamed to the West. (Radio Prague, for example, has increased its broadcasts directed at West Germany to 5 half hours a day; Radio Budapest is propagandizing the West Germans by means of two daily half-hour broadcasts.) And the silencing of America's story coincides with a deluge of Communist propagandistic interpretations of the Middle Eastern events to the Baltic people.

In order to avoid irreparable harm, the "reorganization" of the Voice of America's Baltic programs in Munich must be immediately stopped. No dubious temporary motives can justify a major blow to the United States prestige in the Baltic countries.

In case it would not be possible to maintain the Voice of America broadcasts from Europe in the future, another way must be found before the closing date to guarantee at least a minimal United States radio program from Europe in the Baltic languages. All such possibilities must, of course, be thoroughly examined in order to insure as smooth as possible a transition from the present situation to another one. Only in this way can the severe problem of the personnel of the discontinued services be solved, because it is unthinkable that people who have faithfully worked for the United States would be just simply discarded and left exposed to the hand of Communist revenge which can easily reach them in Europe. Only such a reorganization and not a liquidation, can be compatible with genuine United States interests, its prestige, and its moral obligations toward the friendly Baltic nations.

Ike Spells It Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower made a forceful speech to the United Nations General Assembly yesterday. Because I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues, I include an editorial from the August 14, 1958, edition of the New York Daily News entitled "Ike Spells It Out."

The editorial follows:

IKE SPELLS IT OUT

In the course of his address to the United Nations General Assembly yesterday, President Eisenhower effectively answered those critics, both here and abroad, who have complained that the United States of America actually never does come up with a definite foreign policy.

This Eisenhower plan for the Middle East, as spelled out to the world, proved to be both bold and comprehensive.

It embraces four main items: (1) Fast, economic, and technical help for the Arab nations; (2) a sizable U. N. standing army to relieve our marines of their present unwelcome chore; (3) a firm pledge to small, threatened nations that the United States remains willing to back them militarily, within the U. N. framework; (4) the creation of a U. N. monitoring body to muzzle those flammatory propaganda broadcasts which have been creating trouble in the Mideast.

Above all, Ike emphasized, the Arabs themselves would have to contribute their own energies to a do-it-yourself program for their region. He stated emphatically that the United States had no desire at all to rule the Mideast roost—and added pointedly that the days when one nation (Red or otherwise) could dominate the map are ended.

To make that item even clearer, General Ike invited his listeners to examine the maps, both geographic and economic, of our globe. Nowhere, he noted acidly, could anyone find a spot where America, a victor in two world wars, had taken advantage of her strength to annex foreign territory or establish an economic dependency.

Ike conceded freely that we might have pulled some bloopers of our own in that region. Were any of our broadcasts, for instance, offensive to any Mideast states? We'd be willing to listen to reason, just as soon as Arab radio transmitters abandoned their incendiary songs.

So that was our United States bill of goods presented forcefully but temperately—and now what are the chances of making a sale?

We'd say that—except for the presence of the unpredictable Nasser and the always-out-for-trouble Kremlin—Ike's friendly and practical blueprint would meet ready Mideast acceptance.

IT'S UP TO THE ARABS

Of recent days, however, Nasser has been less belligerent than usual. Some usually authoritative sources say that he finally has grown worried about increasing Communist meddling in the affairs of his United Arab Republic. If so, the Eisenhower plan may give him an easy and face-saving way to get off the Red hook. Our President, significantly, didn't once bring the sensitive Nasser's name into his speech.

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko followed President Ike to the rostrum, and, though he wore out two U. N. interpreters with his lengthy harangue, to the surprise of nobody agreed with hardly one word Ike had said.

That dangerous situation in Lebanon and Jordan? That situation, Grommy insisted solemnly, was created only by the arrival of British and United States troops. In short, the burglars weren't doing a thing wrong—there wouldn't have been any trouble at all if the West's cops hadn't arrived.

Gromyko then repeated his standard demand that our troops get out of the Mideast pronto, snooting the facts that some already have departed and that we'd dearly love to withdraw the rest the minute the Mideast fire is declared out.

KREMLIN DISSENT

Andrei, the mouthpiece of a Government which has gobbled up the Baltic States, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, and Hungary within recent years, then proceeded to denounce the United States and England as dirty imperialists and colonialists. To the assembled U. N. diplomats' everlasting and resounding credit, not a soul laughed.

Wetbacks Almost as Rare as Condors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the excellent work in southern California of the border patrol in handling the problem of the illegal Mexican immigrants—the wetbacks—is well described in the following article by Lou Jobst which appeared in the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent-Press-Telegram on August 10, 1958. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and his fine staff on the border patrol deserve commendation for the effectiveness of the work done in Operation Wetback:

BORDER SNEAKS YIELD TO LEGAL TRANSIENTS

(By Lou Jobst)

TECATE GATE, MEXICO.—The border people talk about the wetback the way ornithologists discuss the California condor. Both are rarities.

The day when illegal Mexican immigrants trudged across the dust-filled river beds in droves to seek the Yankee dollar in California fields and orchards is past.

Credit disappearance of the unlawful dusky itinerant to an unheralded but unique task

force—Operation Wetback—a joint undertaking of the United States and Mexican Governments.

The big roundup started in the summer of 1954, a year in which more than 1 million illegal foreign entrants were repatriated.

United States Immigration Bureau and its troubleshooters, the border patrol, cooperating with the Mexican Servicio Migracion, clamped a "Tamale Curtain" on the international border.

The effect was marked and immediate.

Apprehension of Mexican citizens illegally in California for the fiscal year ending last June 30 totaled considerably less than 10,000. This is a far cry from the 330,000 picked up in 1953 and 291,000 taken into custody in the southwest region in 1954. Or the 32,000 captured in California in 1955.

But, the border hasn't been sealed by arms, desert-girdling jeeps, and airplanes alone.

Immigration authorities and Labor Department officials oiled the legal machinery to change the Mexican visitor from wetback to bracero, vernacular for Government-sponsored farm worker.

While illegal alien arrests dwindled the number of braceros hired spiraled.

Under the Mexican national program 213,000 were admitted in 1954, 416,000 in 1956, and 450,000 last year.

California-bound braceros zoomed from 55,000 in 1954 to 150,000 last season. More than 65,000 have been admitted thus far this year.

Experts believe this program has headed the wetback for oblivion.

Cheering signs—other than international goodwill—are seen in the operation.

Shortly after the dragnet operation was perfected, payment of unemployment benefits in southern California dropped by $325,000 a week. And public health officials reported drops in case loads of up to 50 percent.

Crime and communicable disease—the types associated with wetbacks—declined by 40 to 80 percent and epidemics such as dysentery virtually disappeared.

Border men are proud of the operation's humanitarianism and point out that the thousands of illegal entrants were rounded up without a single injury or violent incident.

Does this steady decline of wetbacks mean the border patrol has outlived is usefulness?

"Hardly," is the reply of the service, explaining that traffic on the border is steadily mounting.

Last year at district entry points more than 92 million border crossers (more than the combined populations of Mexico, Canada, and Great Britain) were counted.

By and large these are legal transients—tourists and tradesmen—but the criminal set is still among them, pulling some new razzle-dazzle. And immigration agents have leaped from the saddle to cockpit and other modern means in their vigilance against this unlawful trafficking.

This year 26 airplanes have been seized. The contraband cases ranged from dope peddlers to a man trying to land 8,200 parrots from central Mexico in Los Angeles. The birds communicate to humans a virulent, medication-resisting fever.

On the ground, border patrolmen captured 36 armed fugitives without losing a single officer in service. (The patrol has the Nation's top pistol team.)

On the subversive and criminal front 252 persons, many Communists, were excluded from entry into the States.

More than $171,356 in narcotics was confiscated.

The ocean borders of California are another scene of hectic operations for the Service. Officers this year have detained 1,135 aliens aboard ships while rounding up 23 stowaways.

These seaboard cases range from the bizarre (an attempt to smuggle 1,800 pounds of cooked lobster ashore in San Diego) to the more bizarre (the cracking of the Huey Clan, a fraudulent identity scheme that saw more than 225 illegal Chinese entries exposed).

And, all the while in Southern California the immigration people are keeping tab on 313,656 aliens (among them 3,890 Russians), not including the braceros.

One border veteran summed up the department's attitude.

"The border patrol is just like any other law enforcement agency—it was created not just for apprehension of the criminal but it provides a threat for the would-be law violator."

Loyalty Day Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Middle East have focused attention on the sinister effects of the skillfully contrived propaganda of international communism. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have for many years been combating this propaganda weapon through the observance of Loyalty Day and by other methods. One such method has been the sponsoring of essay contests for school children, that our younger generation may arm itself with a knowledge of our enemies.

Recently I received from the Honorable Charles A. Moran, Georgia State Loyalty Day chairman, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a prizewinning essay on the subject of Loyalty Day. This fine essay was written by an eighth grade student, James Denman of the Immaculate Conception School in Atlanta, Ga. Under unanimous consent I take pleasure in inserting this essay herewith:

LOYALTY DAY

(First prize essay by James Denman, eighth grade, Immaculate Conception School, Atlanta, Ga.)

The Veterans of Foreign Wars established a day which they called Loyalty Day. This is a day, set aside in May, that gives all citizens an opportunity to profess their loyalty to the flag, country, and God. We practice loyalty every day of the year, but on Loyalty Day we show, in an outward way, our loyalty, not only to the flag, country, and God, but to our neighbors and our employers and associates.

Loyalty to God comes first to a Christian. On this day he goes to his church, and gives special praise to God. Loyalty to our country comes next. We show our loyalty to our country by celebration and by praying to God for the good of our country on this day. We show our loyalty to our country at other times, in a more effective way. We go to the poles to vote, in order to keep our country in the hands of Christian men. We show our loyalty to the flag by saluting it daily, and keeping it from disgrace. We show loyalty to the flag because it represents the freedoms of our country. Freedom comes in many forms, and the flag represents them all.

We show loyalty to God because He gave us freedom to live our lives in the way we think we should. We show our loyalty to our country because it is the land where we practice our freedom.

Freedom did not come to us without cost. We gained it through great hardships and sacrifice. When our country was first founded, it was not a free independent country. Men with loyalty to their fellow men fought to gain freedom. Through the ages, more men, loyal to the country which their ancestors fought to gain, fought to keep this freedom. The men who fought in the wars, which preserved our freedom, showed their loyalty in a great way. These were men like the VFW. And many did not return to their homes as a result of their bravery.

We are lucky to live in a country which we have reason to be loyal to, and, we have God to thank for this. This is why we show loyalty to God.

There are some lands where the people do not have freedom, and are loyal only to the state. Russia is a great example of this, and the countries where Russian influence is strong. In these countries, the people are taught, from the moment they could speak, to be loyal to the state only, and to speak against the things that favor independence. They were taught that they must put all personal feelings aside to serve the state.

Only the strongest Christians have any idea of independence and God. The people of these countries have no idea what freedom is like. Many die each day trying to gain freedom, which is taken for granted in this and a few other countries.

Because God gave us this freedom, and our country is the place where this freedom is a daily practice, and the flag represents this great freedom, we show loyalty to these articles which signify freedom.

There are other reasons to be proud of, and this is the fact that we live in a State that did much in our fight to gain the freedom of our country. Georgia is one of the Original Thirteen Colonies, and was one of the leading colonies to fight the British for our freedom. So we should show a special loyalty to Georgians.

We also have another flag to be proud of, that of the stars and bars and the seal of Georgia. This flag represents the freedom and glory of our own State, Georgia. So it is great to be a Georgian, as the slogan says, "A Georgian can be specially proud of his heritage as a Georgian."

A Bill To Amend the Criminal Code With Regard to the Theft of Livestock Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would amend the Criminal Code to provide that the theft of cattle, sheep, swine, horses, mules, and goats shall be the same as the larceny of property of the value of $100 or more.

The purpose of this bill is to bring the Federal law in line with the State laws in western States.

In nearly all western States the theft of these livestock animals is grand larceny regardless of their value. The Federal law should be the same as State laws.

I have, therefore, introduced this bill today in hopes that a report will be available for early committee action when the Congress reconvenes following the first of the year.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed 87 measures on calendar call, passed military constructions appropriations, worked on supplemental appropriations, and rejected bill on Capitol front extension.

House passed farm bill and bill extending Mexican farm labor program.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 16125–16163

Bills Introduced: 8 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 4288–4295. Page 16131

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3268, proposing technical amendments to the National Science Foundation Act, with amendment (S. Rept. 2367);

H. R. 12670, additional payments to Indians of Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., with amendment (S. Rept. 2368);

H. R. 12663, additional payments to Indians of Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., with amendment (S. Rept. 2369);

S. 4273, to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community, with amendments (S. Rept. 2370);

H. R. 7860, relating to payments to members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Indians for damages resulting from establishment of Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, with amendment (S. Rept. 2371);

S. Con. Res. 116, to approve agreement between the U. S. and European Atomic Energy Community concerning cooperation to advance the peaceful application of atomic energy (S. Rept. 2372);

H. R. 11889, to permit articles imported for exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair to be admitted without payment of tariff, with amendment (S. Rept. 2373);

H. R. 12662, acquisition of lands for reservoir created by construction of Oahe Dam on Missouri River, and rehabilitation of Standing Rock Sioux Indians of North and South Dakota, with amendments (S. Rept. 2374);

H. R. 11630, to extend the unemployment insurance system to ex-servicemen (S. Rept. 2375);

H. R. 12489, to extend the time for making certain reports under the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (S. Rept. 2376);

S. 3571, providing equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the U. S. (S. Rept. 2377);

S. 3776, to extend the time for collection of tolls to amortize the cost of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo., with amendment (S. Rept. 2378);

S. 4179, to authorize the Tahchevah Creek flood-control project, Palm Springs, Calif., with amendments (S. Rept. 2379);

S. 4192, to authorize construction of the Bardwell Reservoir on Waxahachie Creek, Tex., with amendments (S. Rept. 2380);

H. R. 8160, to authorize a survey of the Tensaw River, Ala., in the interest of navigation and allied purposes (S. Rept. 2381);

H. R. 8652, to rescind the authorization for the Waldo Lake tunnel and regulating works, Willamette River, Oreg. (S. Rept. 2382);

H. R. 11697, relating to the prevention of obstructions and injurious deposits in the harbors of New York and Hampton Roads (S. Rept. 2383);

H. R. 12216, to designate the Carthage Dam and Reservoir (Tenn.) to be constructed on the Cumberland River as the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir (S. Rept. 2384);

H. R. 13342, to provide for a survey of the Parish Line Canal, La., to determine feasibility for navigation (S. Rept. 2385);

S. 4287, relating to the detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases (S. Rept. 2386);

S. 4266, to establish the U. S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas (S. Rept. 2387);

H. R. 13549, Social Security Amendments of 1958, with amendments (S. Rept. 2388); and

S. J. Res. 201, to authorize chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U. S. Navy (no written report). Page 16127

Appendix

Address by Dario Toffenetti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chicagoans are proud people, and justifiably so. We are proud to be known as midwesterners and we are proud of what made us. The heartbeat of our beautiful city is ever strong and steady.

Emerson, one of our truly great American writers, said:

The chief want of man in this life is someone to make him do what he can do.

There is a quality about Chicago which though inexplicable makes people who live there do many things for the growth, development, improvement and peace of the world. Not only have important contributions in the business and commercial world been made by Chicagoans but many wonderful things have been done in the cultural and scientific areas.

I recall that another learned middle westerner, Rev. John Francis Bannon, S. J., of St. Louis University has spoken of the midwesterner as the midcontinent man. He recorded well midcontinent man's achievements. Such a man we have in Dario L. Toffenetti, a noted restaurateur in Chicago. Recently Dario Toffenetti was given an honorary doctorate of law degree by the University of Idaho. I am happy for this recognition to be given to him because he has earned it.

Those of us who have the good fortune of being a Chicagoan and those who have visited Chicago know that this city is a melting pot. We have men who despite their being at opposite poles as to faith, nationality, and political party, are united in the conviction that God created all men in His image and likeness and assigned to man the quality of dignity and humanity so that we could live in peace and temper our deeds with mercy and justice. Dr. Toffenetti performs his original task well.

In May, Dario L. Toffenetti was host to an important dinner known as the international friendship dinner. Many distinguished ladies and gentlemen were there. Some timely remarks were made by a great lady of Chicago and a Republican friend of mine, Mrs. Bertha Baur. Mrs. Baur, who is 86 or 88, said:

There is no age. We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths; in feelings, not in figures on a dial. We should count time by hearthrobs. They live the most who think the most, do their best. There is no age.

The following is Dr. Toffenetti's inspiring address before the international friendship dinner in Chicago on May 6, 1958:

Mr. Goldstein, our toastmaster; Consul General Oldenburg and Mrs. Oldenburg; honorable consuls representing 49 nations of the world and their distinguished wives; Postmaster of Chicago and Mrs. Schroeder; Col. John Reilly, assistant to the mayor of Chicago, and Mrs. Reilly; Mr. Earl Eisenhower, the brother of our President, and Mrs. Eisenhower; Mrs. Bertha Bauer and Mrs. A. Henry Goldstein, wife of our distinguished toastmaster; General Woodward and Mrs. Woodward; Admiral Whitehead (retired) and Mrs. Whitehead; Mr. Robert Robinson, district director of immigration, and Mrs. Robinson; our distinguished Judge John Sbarbaro; Dr. Augusto Daro; Mr. Daniel D. Glasser, past commander of aviation post, American Legion; distinguished guests, friends, gentlemen of the press, the American Legion, and the Rotarians International, representatives of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to have you here tonight as guests of the Toffenetti organization. Myself, my family, and all our employees feel proud that you honored us with your presence.

We have been in the Loop for 44 years, and during this time we have had the pleasure of serving thousands of people originating from the various countries that you represent; we feel deeply grateful to you and your people.

Today, ham and sweets, strawberry shortcake, Idaho baked potatoes and Italian spaghetti (my wife's famous recipe), have become international symbols of good food, giving us greater determination for constant quality. (Excuse my plug.)

As restaurant men, we feel that our contribution and responsibility to our city, our Nation and the world goes further than purveyors of food. We are not only health builders but also morale builders; well fed bodies develop intelligence and creative minds and vitality. Good food served in a friendly, pleasing atmosphere creates contentment. Well fed people are tolerant, happy, generous and make better citizens. You can see that restaurants are the direct fortresses for better public relations among the nations of the world. Great national treaties, public functions, commercial deals all conclude with a wonderful dinner, a few cocktails, champagne, and a warm friendly spirit of fellowship.

Every hometown to us is the center of the world because the heart is centered in the town; small or big, it is still the hometown which gives us pride. We feel proud of our community because of the contributions that we make; our character, our integrity, our dreams, our creative work; cities, towns, villages, are the realization of the dreams of men.

Today, our towns and cities are getting closer and closer. Distance is not measured by miles or space. Around the world in 80 days was a big accomplishment 80 years ago. Today, one can go around the world in less than 36 hours with the supersonic speed and mighty planes of the present. As the march of progress goes on and the people of the world mingle more readily than ever, problems are bound to arise; personality clashes, opinions, complexities of the various nationalities, pose many problems which we must meet.

As I said before, food helps people's disposition and temperament. Yet, we need another important formula. Consideration for others is to raise every man and woman to our level, entitled to dignity and respect, to look at the other person's point of view with an open mind and calm judgment. We may have divergence of opinions and ideas, but we can always come to a meeting of the minds if we have respect and consideration for the others. Whether an individual is rich or poor, brilliant or mediocre, whether a nation is large or small, they should all respect what God has given us—the dignity of men. By having consideration for others, our minds are open so that we see their good qualities, enabling us to discuss problems in an intelligent manner. Consideration for others, whether practiced by individuals, employers, employees or nations brings about the understanding for the realization of the brotherhood of men.

Chicago is the melting pot of the world. Over the years people came from all your countries and brought with them a heritage of character, indomitable spirit, usefulness, integrity and good citizenship. They built this city stone by stone and today it is one of the greatest industrial, financial and cultural centers of the world. Regardless of nationality, color, creed or religion we work together, side by side in harmony and peace. What spurred our pioneers and sacrificing people to work and develop our wonderful city was only the fact that they knew that they were needed and important to build our great city and their Nation. They had pride; they had strength of character. Chicago is a great city, yet it could not live and endure if it would be isolated from the rest of the world.

Chicago needs all your people from your nations to come and integrate your efforts with ours, your brains with our brains, in the sciences, the professions, industry, agriculture, medicine, surgery and all the vast enterprises which we now enjoy.

The greatest achievements of this modern time were accomplished by men and women from many nations (the giant minds that do not seek glory). Louis Pasteur, of France, discovered bacteria. Professor Harvey, of England, discovered the mystery of the circulation of the blood. Madame Curie, of France, radium. Dr. Fermi, of Italy, atomic energy and radiation. Our own Dr. Jonas Salk, of the United States of America, vaccine to prevent polio. Dr. Koch, of Germany, discovered the bacteria causing tuberculosis. Dr. Minoto, Dr. Murphy, Dr. Cesedman, of England, discovered the use of liver to cure anemia. (The gain of the world; it cost us thousands of dollars, because everybody eats liver and we have to pay higher prices for liver, but we are happy to do it.) And again, Dr. Pavlaow, from Russia, made a great contribution to science. His discovery of the use of animals for experimentations. Professor Benti and Professor Best, from Canada, discovered insulin, and Professor Flemming, from England, discovered penicillin. Dr. Einstein, of Germany, whose reasearch and genius have benefited civilization in its quest of the natural and supernatural.

All these discoveries are passed on to the great laboratories of the world for the bene-

fit of all civilization and has greatly lessened pain, suffering, and poverty. It makes for a better world. It has been a selfless endeavor and all doctors should be elevated to the highest honor of all nations.

Chicago, we are proud to say, is constantly working for the improvement and betterment of the medical world. It is truly a wonderful medical center for all, and great credit should be given to our friend and leader, Dr. Carl Meyer, the guiding genius of the largest hospital in the world, the Cook County Hospital, which he directs.

The Chicago Fair of 1959 offers to you a great opportunity to show Chicago the products of your Nation and open to your people a greater prosperity and also cement lasting friendship.

The various nationalities here represented have been merged into the melting pot that is Chicago, to make the world a better place to live.

And now commerce. Commerce is a treasury to which nations make their contributions for the benefit of all mankind. All the riches of the world stored away by nature, such as oil, iron, gold, cobalt, and items precious to humanity, can be depleted, but the interdependence of nations is and ever will be necessary to preserve the wealth for all the world to share.

The St. Lawrence seaway, the Sag-Cal canal, the highways of the seven seas, the highways of the sky, railroads, buses, trucks, are open to your nations and to our Nation to send the products to your industry, agriculture, and imagination to us and ours to yours. Come to the 1959 Fair.

With the help of God, let us all join hands to do our best to create and exchange new opportunities so that all can prosper and share God's blessings. You are the ambassadors of the world, the salesmanagers of your countries and ours. You are the great force for bringing peace and brotherhood to a troubled humanity. God grant that peace and security may come to all men of good will, wherever justice and mercy is the guiding light.

Views of the National Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, H. R. 13247, known as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, was passed by the House. This legislation passed the Senate yesterday, and it now goes into conference.

While I give full credit to the Committee on Education and Labor for an earnest attempt to solve some of our educational problems, and to such of my colleagues who voted for this bill I still remain in disagreement with them. It seems to me that it is a mistake for the Federal Government to move too heavily into the field of education.

As passed by the House, this bill would have put the Federal Government into the business of education to the tune of about $1 billion. If I thought the $1 billion would achieve the purpose intended by this measure, I would be more favorably disposed. However, the entire educational experience of this country shows that the greatest progress has been made through the States and not by overall Federal controls. There is no question that he who pays the piper calls the tune, and Federal financing means an increasing Federal control of the school system everywhere.

It is noteworthy that this bill also does not get to the crux of what many educators think is our major problem—the fundamental primary and secondary school training. In passing also let me note that this measure, while it was designed to help students get through college, makes no provision for additional pay for schoolteachers. Our educators complain more bitterly about the lack of good teachers than anything else. The only help to teachers offered here is 4 years' training for foreign-language teachers, who presumably would be expected to teach at the same too low pay scales.

Editorials from Cleveland newspapers point out that although the House-passed measure provides for college scholarships for students there are literally thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. It seems to me a mistaken theory that the mere appropriation of large sums of money from Washington can force people to do what they are not disposed to do for themselves.

Our leading scientists seem to be in agreement that any program to stimulate scientific training should start in the elementary grades. This is where the child's initial interest in science or any other subject is first aroused. This measure starts from the top, in other words, at the college level and tries to take young people whose bents have already been formed and turn them into scientific channels. Neither educators nor scientists believe this feasible.

I want to point out that the Cleveland Plain Dealer also notes this measure certainly would result in drying up scores of private scholarship money. I think this would be disastrous. The Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, terms this measure—

A part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits, more power in Washington and less for the States and the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, believing my colleagues will be interested in the views of these two leading Cleveland newspapers in opposition to this bill, I ask to include editorials from the Cleveland Press of July 30, 1958, and from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 4, 1958.

[From the Cleveland Press of July 30, 1958]

MOVING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

In both Houses of Congress, committee approval has been given liberal bills to solve our educational problems by plunging the deficit-ridden Federal Treasury deeper into this field.

On top of the $1 billion or so the Government now feeds into public education via various routes, the bills before Congress propose to go directly into the production of scientists, scholars, and teachers.

Over the next several years, these bills propose to dole out up to $1,500,000,000 for scholarships, student loans, teacher training, etc.

Up to now, Congress has turned back the energetic effort to get the Government in the school-building business. But the scholarship bill is the opening. It heads the same way.

This all is based on the theories that too many gifted youngsters are not going to college simply because they lack the money, and that only the Government can remedy this—generalizations never substantiated.

There literally are thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. And the number of scholarships has been growing fast—the last survey indicated there were nearly 250,000. (The most liberal of the bills before Congress would provide an average of 23,000 a year.)

This is called a shot-in-the-arm program—a one-time deal designed merely to stimulate State, local, and private effort for better education. Such programs repress rather than stimulate because they tempt people to depend on others for things they can do better for themselves.

Whenever the Government administers a shot in the arm it normally follows with permanent cures from Washington.

This simply is a part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits, more power in Washington and less for the States and the people themselves.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 4, 1958]

NO TO UNITED STATES SCHOLARSHIPS

In their flurry of last-minute money-shoveling, some leaders in Congress are bent on appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for Federal scholarships for 23,000 college students.

We think their program is unwise and unnecessary. It was born of the hysteria that spread at the time Russia sent up its first sputnik and it was pumped up by the free-spenders in Congress and out.

The program is unwise because in some aspects it would be self-defeating. Individuals and corporations, for example, which have been donating scholarship money in increasing amounts in the last decade would be less likely to donate if the Government moved in.

There are more such scholarship grants than you might imagine—10 or 12 times as many as the 23,000 proposed by the free-spenders, according to the last count we saw.

You know what would happen if the private scholarship money began to dry up. More and more demands for Government aid, so that what is now termed a temporary experiment would become a permanent arrangement costing billions. That would just be added to the national debt as a larger millstone to be passed on to the coming generation which the scholarship gifts are supposed to help.

We also have reservations about the Federal scholarship accent on science. It may bring into that field young people who ought to be elsewhere. Once started, those interested in other fields would beat the drums for scholarships in academic subjects, the arts, athletics. And why not? We ought to beat the Russians in them, too, they could say.

We think a better system of helping the Nation and our young people to understand their responsibilities to our country would be to offer repayable scholarship loans with low interest to those who ordinarily are lost to college because of family circumstances. Another expedient might be to give income tax credits to fathers for tuition payments.

We don't see why Uncle Sam should jump into the business of giving scholarships to young people who might get them from private sources whose parents are able to put them through college or who have a college fund built up.

Corporations and individuals should be encouraged to give more to colleges and scholarship funds for the days in the 1960's

when the postwar baby boom will be seeking degrees. The Federal scholarship notion would discourage rather than encourage such giving as people surrendered to the theory of letting Uncle Sam do it.

Ad Expense Disallowed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me under date of August 6, 1958, by Mr. A. E. Cahlan, general manager of the Las Vegas Review Journal, together with an editorial which happened in Editor and Publisher, captioned "Ad Expense Disallowed."

This letter and editorial depict a very serious situation which is rapidly developing in this country today and which threatens the foundations of our democracy—freedom of the press. It is conceivable that unless something is done to curb the increasing self-assumed powers of our Internal Revenue Service that we will lose that right granted to us in the Bill of Rights, because there will be no press and, therefore, there can be no freedom of the press.

Advertising supports the cost of producing the newspapers of this country and is equally as vital to the consumer public. I wish to go on record as being unlaterably opposed to the Internal Revenue Service ruling referred to in the following editorial, and I feel this matter should be brought to the attention of all concerned, and especially to all Members of this Congress, in order that the disapproval registered by Mr. Cahlan and myself be noted, so that action can be initiated to get the ruling reversed at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Cahlan's letter follows:

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL,
Las Vegas, Nev., August 6, 1958.

HON. WALTER BARING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: I am enclosing an editorial from a recent issue of Editor and Publisher. This editorial very aptly sizes up a situation which in my opinion could prove disastrous to the newspapers of our State as well as those of the United States.

You will note that the Bureau is disallowing as deductible expense any institutional advertising run by public utilities and Government contractors.

In my opinion this is a roundabout way of obtaining control of the American press which was started in the days of NRA when the Government-suggested code for newspapers contained a paragraph which provided a fine of $10,000 and/or 2 years in prison for anyone who dared criticize the President of the United States or any members of the Federal Government. Of course this was never adopted. Subsequently, bills have appeared in Congress from time to time which would require newspapers to obtain a Federal license the same as radio and television stations. Then there have been the repeated efforts to place a special tax on advertising run in newspapers.

A free press is the backbone of any free people and to me this last ruling of the Bureau is simply for the purpose of eventually taking control in Washington.

Let me point out what happens in Nevada. Harolds Club advertising would not be run because it would not be deductible. Many small papers in the State have survived solely because of this campaign. Many of the papers carry regular advertising schedules from the Bell Telephone Co., from the power companies and gas companies. None of these could run because they are of an institutional nature. I could go on citing many other examples but I think these should suffice.

While the demise of any more Nevada papers would be most regrettable, this is not the most sinister part of the Bureau's ruling. Who determines whether advertising is institutional or not? The internal revenue agents who check your return. Here we have another twilight zone in which agents can lower the boom on those who criticize any program they may have in mind and reward those who keep quiet or support them. It is a very dangerous situation. It means that eventually all advertising will be rejected as a business expense. You certainly can appreciate what that can mean since most businesses operate today on the basis of deductible expenditures.

In short, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, without any act of Congress, has laid the groundwork for silencing or putting out of business the free American press we have known since the founding of the Republic.

I ask you just what you as Representative of the people of the State of Nevada and of the United States propose to do about it? I, for one, am getting increasingly tired of the continuing and ever-expanding dominance of the American business and the American people by the hired hands in Internal Revenue. You as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America are the only source of relief. At the risk of creating a bit of indignation on your part, I must ask this question: Are the Members of the Congress fearful of reprisals by the Internal Revenue department if they make anything more than a token effort to release the hand at the throat of the American people which is slowly but surely stifling the liberty and freedom we have cherished from 1776 down to the present day.

I will await with interest your comments.

Sincerely yours,

AL.

[Editorial in Editor & Publisher]

AD EXPENSES DISALLOWED

The official drive against institutional advertising as an allowable expense for income tax purposes has spread from the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Power Commission to the Renegotiation Board.

The FPC has struck down advertising expenses of private utilities as a factor in determining cost of operation for the purpose of ratemaking. The IRS has ruled that advertising placed by utilities to publicize the importance of privately operated taxpaying companies versus Government-controlled power companies is not deductible as business expense for tax purposes.

The IRS has also taken steps to disallow the plant city advertising of Timken Roller Bearing over a period of years.

The latest move in Washington is an order by the Renegotiation Board to strike out $300,000 in advertising expenses of Boeing Airplane Co. which had been charged to the cost of performing defense contracts. If previous procedures are followed IRS will probably act to disallow the same sum.

This three-pronged attack against institutional advertising may spell the doom of that important technique whereby business and industry have attempted to explain themselves to the general public to create favorable corporate images.

We think that institutional advertising is a valuable tool of public relations. It is vitally necessary to some companies like Boeing that do not sell anything directly to the public. It is just as important to others like private utilities to protect themselves against Government competition. It is important to companies like Timken to convey the thinking of management to employees and the community.

Leaders of organized advertising must carry this fight to Congress if Government agencies continue to lay down their antiadvertising rulings.

Great Future for the Panama Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Panama American of July 31, 1958:

George M. Smith, manager of the Panama Railroad for the past year, left the Isthmus today. And his parting words as he walked up the gangway of the Panama Line's *Cristobal* bound for New York were:

"Anyone who says the Panama Railroad is redundant and should be closed down is a chump. There is a great economic future for the railroad, both for expanding Panama and for the Canal Zone."

Smith was loaned to the Panama Railroad a year ago by the Pennsylvania Railroad to give a shot in the arm to an enterprise which former Gov. John S. Seybold, among others, had recommended be consigned to the scrap heap.

Congress did not go along with the recommendation, and in Smith's year the railroad has been put back on the track.

The operating loss has been reduced by more than half according to indications of the 1958 fiscal year figures, the railroad division announced today. The operating loss during fiscal 1957 was $252,912.

There was an increase in revenue with increased freight tonnage and passenger load during the past year and at the same time an improvement in the condition of the railroad's equipment, track, and right-of-way.

How has Railroader Smith achieved all this in the face of significant wage increases and higher cost of fuel and other items?

"There's no magic about it," he said today. "As far as I am concerned it is just a matter of railway practice properly applied, plus efficient organization and the fact that everyone has pulled together."

He added: "The morale of the staff is much better now. They feel they are running a worthwhile service. The railroad does not exist to make a profit. It should break even and it is coming much closer to doing that now."

Smith has been recalled by the Pennsylvania Railroad and has been appointed superintendent of transportation, Pittsburgh reach, in Pittsburgh. He is a native of Virginia and a graduate of Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

He will be succeeded as manager of the Railroad Division of the Transportation and Terminals Bureau in the Canal Zone by Rich-

ard E. Pinkham, formerly superintendent of equipment of the Pennsylvania Railroad at Baltimore.

He spent several days here in July familiarizing himself with the Panama Railroad, its equipment, and its operation.

The Oregon Trail Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly today about a unique undertaking of modern times.

For several months an energetic group of Oregonians has been ironing out the many problems which confront a reenactment of the crossing of the plains by Oregon pioneers 100 years ago.

On to Oregon Cavalcade is the official name selected for the wagon-train project which will follow as closely as possible the Oregon Trail. In many places it will retrace the actual path of the stalwart adventurers of a century earlier.

In mid-April of 1959 the wagon train will leave Independence, Mo., on its first leg across some 2,000 miles to Champoeg State Park in Oregon. Its arrival time is August 1. During the months on the trail the caravan will pass through parts of Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Idaho before arrival in Oregon.

On to Oregon Cavalcade, Inc., is a nonprofit corporation formed for the sole purpose of the organization, administration, and conduct of an authentic cross-country expedition.

Purpose for this trek is to properly, authentically, and colorfully celebrate and commemorate the cross-country emigration of settlers to the Oregon Territory and publicize the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union of the United States of America in coordination with the Oregon Centennial Commission.

According to information I have received concerning the upcoming journey, it is jointly sponsored by the Oregon State Junior Chamber of Commerce and the nonprofit corporation, On to Oregon Cavalcade, Inc.

Months of preparation have been devoted to this project. The South Lane Stamp Society, Inc., a nonprofit civic organization of Cottage Grove, Oreg., is participating in the adventure through the production of the Official Cachet Cover, a souvenir illustrated envelope, commemorating the crossing. The society has envelopes for distribution to the general public.

These envelopes will be carried in the covered wagon train. Special permission for this delivery has been given by the Post Office Department. As stamp society President Ivan C. Hoyer notes:

This mail will be the first official United States mail to be carried over the Oregon Trail by covered wagon in nearly 100 years.

Appearing on the official cover will be the reproduction of an original sketch by Oregon artist Robert S. Drenner. Fillers detailing the history of the wagon trek and highlighting Oregon history will be enclosed.

Wagons of the train will be drawn by two horses. The actual cavalcade will be in two parts—the horse-drawn and a motorized escort of trucks, field kitchens, jeeps, sanitary facilities, and manpower for taking care of the expedition.

The trek has been endorsed by State officials and the Centennial Commission. I have not received word that available wagon space has been reserved, but interest in the overland journey is mounting and the end of the trail will not mean the end of the individual wagons. Each may be displayed in a frontier town exhibit at the Oregon Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair in Portland.

It is impossible at this time to give credit to all the men and women who have worked to make the project possible. Enthusiastic Oregonians have handled the many problems confronting the trek. The trail ahead has not yet been completely cleared, but I want to commend the trail boosters and particularly a young Roseburg man, Mr. Alan B. Knudtson, for this project. Alan is chairman of the On to Oregon Cavalcade. His interest in history is well known.

Oregon's 100th birthday celebration next year grows bigger and better each day. I hope many Members of Congress will find it possible to participate.

Resolution Approving Title IV of Senate Bill 4035 as Passed by the United States Senate, 85th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under lease to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., approving title IV of Senate bill 4035:

Resolution No. 2572

Whereas on July 11, 1958, the United States Senate passed S. 4035 known as the Housing Act of 1958; and

Whereas the provisions of said act entitled Title IV—Low-Rent Housing, is of direct interest and concern to the administration and operation of this authority; and

Whereas the enactment of said title would provide substantial administrative savings to both the Public Housing Administration and this authority; and

Whereas the enactment of said title would clearly define and establish local responsibility for the administration and operation of the low-rent public housing program as originally intended by the Congress of the United States in enacting the Housing Act of 1937 as amended; and

Whereas said legislation, has, by experience, been demonstrated to be absolutely necessary if said low-rent public housing program is to be administered and operated in accordance with the needs and policies of the local communities in which said programs are located: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., as follows:

1. That the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., approves, in principle, the provisions of title IV, S. 4035, known as the Housing Act of 1958, as passed by the United States Senate and strongly recommends its adoption by the United States House of Representatives and its approval by the President of the United States.

2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mayor Norris Poulson, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Housing Administration, United States Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and all Members of the House of Representatives from the Los Angeles area.

3. That the executive director be, and hereby is, authorized and instructed to take such administrative action as is legal and proper to secure the enactment of this legislation.

Adopted: July 15, 1958.

Eulogy of Hon. A. O. Stanley

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, announcement has been made today of the death of Hon. A. O. Stanley, one of my eminent fellow Kentuckians and a former Member of the House of Representatives for a period of 12 years, he having served in this body from March 4, 1903, to March 3, 1915. This announcement has been received with real sorrow by his relatives and friends and those who were closely associated with him over a long period of years.

I remember Mr. Stanley as the wartime Governor of Kentucky during the days of World War I. Also, I remember him as one of the most gifted orators I have ever been privileged to hear on a speaker's platform. He was a master of rhetoric and eloquence and on many occasions was able to hold an audience spellbound for an hour or more with his speechmaking talents. Another characteristic of his was his ability to walk with common people and understand their outlook and problems.

He and my father were friends even though they belonged to different political parties and had different attitudes on various matters. But I suppose their friendship was probably based on the humble beginning of each of these two men, Mr. Stanley having been born and reared as the son of a humble minister of the gospel in Kentucky and my father

having been born and reared as the son of a humble mountain farmer of Kentucky.

Many outstanding and distinct honors were bestowed upon Mr. Stanley during his lifetime and he had the high privilege of serving, in addition to his years in the House of Representatives, as Governor of Kentucky, and as a United States Senator from Kentucky, and finally as an official in a quasi-judicial body here in Washington during the latter years of his life. And now that he has gone from us we would express the fervant hope that he may have gone to join that choir invisible of those immortal dead who will live forever in a life planned by the Lord for all the just and the redeemed of God's family. As Christians, we know that life everlasting comes through the love, grace, and redemptive power of God Almighty. As one writer has well said:

The love of God is greater far
Than tongue or pen can tell;
It goes beyond the highest star
And reaches to the lowest hell.

When we think of our friends that we have loved long since and lost for awhile, we can always remember the omnipotence of the Creator of this world and the unchanging character of His grace toward all those who belong to Him through faith. This thought has been eloquently expressed in the words of one of our great hymns:

Oh love that will not let me go
I rest my weary soul in thee.
I give thee back the life I owe
That in thy ocean depths its flow
May richer, fuller be.

Oh light that followest all my way,
I yield my flickering torch to thee.
My heart restores its borrowed ray
That in thy sunshine's glow its day
May brighter, fairer be.

Oh joy that seekest me through pain,
I cannot close my heart to thee.
I trace the rainbow through the rain
And feel the promise is not vain
That morn shall tearless be.

Oh cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee.
I lay in dust life's glory dead
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend to the surviving members of Mr. Stanley's family my sincere sympathy on the occasion of the passing of this eminent Kentuckian who held various positions of great honor in my native State during the years of this past generation.

Hon. Augustus Owsley Stanley

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1958

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the great loss of former Congressman, Governor, and Senator, Augustus Owsley Stanley, who passed away at age 91 at his home here night before last.

Senator Stanley's career was a long and distinguished one. He was born in Shelbyville, Ky., which is located in the great Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent here. He graduated from Centre College, Danville, Ky., which is also my alma mater, and later was a member of the faculty of Christian College in Kentucky. In his spare time he studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1894.

His political career began in 1900, when he was a Presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of William Jennings Bryan and Adlai E. Stevenson. Two years later, he was elected to Congress from Kentucky's Second District and was returned in the five succeeding elections. During his 12 years as a Congressman, he came most into public notice during his investigation of the United States Steel Corp. In 1915, he was elected Governor of Kentucky, served through World War I, and was elected to the Senate at the war's end. When he ran for a second term as Senator in 1924, he was defeated under the Republican avalanche in which Kentucky, for the first time, voted for a Republican President.

Senator Stanley remained in Washington where he established a law practice. He was appointed by Herbert Hoover to serve as head of the International Joint Commission, created to settle disputes arising along the United States-Canadian boundary, from 1930 until 1954. He retired at the age of 86.

Senator Stanley was not only one of the most colorful individuals ever to pass across the stage of Kentucky politics but what is more, he was known to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest, silver-tongued, golden-throated orators of his generation.

As an example of his raw courage, honesty, convictions, and his great oratorical ability, he saved the life of a colored man about to be hanged by a mob. When the Governor heard of the mob and the fact that they were about to storm the jail and hang him, without benefit of State militia, guards, or personal aids, he dashed alone into the town, mounted a platform, and spoke to the crowd. At first, he could hardly be heard above the roar and din but he literally outshouted the seething group which was so overwrought. When his voice finally carried over the noise and "yack yack" of the mob, his first words were:

As your Governor, I have sworn to uphold the laws of Kentucky—that I shall do and if you are going to hang this Negro, then you will have to hang your Governor first.

He then proceeded, after the crowd quieted down, to give them a lesson in government, decency, and morals. Fact of the matter is, the leader and the ringleaders of the mob were actually in tears—with this, the crowd quietly and ashamedly dispersed and order was restored.

The Nation has truly lost an able legislator, one who served with great honor and ability, not only in the House of Representatives, in the United States Senate, but in addition thereto, served his native and beloved Commonwealth of Kentucky as Governor extremely well. If the life of A. O. Stanley could be emulated, even in a small sense, by those of us here today and by those who will follow in years to come, what a wonderful world this would be. He was a Christian, a great lawyer, an outstanding statesman, a fearless leader, a fine husband, a devoted father, and one of our greatest citizens. He was an all American.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, two sons, and the other members of his wonderful family.

Flight From the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress rolls toward its merry close, appropriating more and more dollars and adding deficit on top of deficit, it might be well to stop, look, and listen.

There are signs and portents that are not good. There are increasing reasons to believe that our own people are losing confidence in their dollars and their dollar's value.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal gives us plenty of food for thought. Our thoughts are not very cheerful, but there is yet time to heed the warnings and prevent the runaway inflation that has wrecked so many economies already, and can even wreck our own:

FLIGHT FROM THE DOLLAR

One of the more puzzling things around Wall Street these days has been the sharp, upward march of the stock market in the face of lower earnings, reduced and sometimes omitted dividends. And as brokers, economists and other commentators seek an explanation, we hear more and more often a very ominous phrase.

A few examples will illustrate many. The E. F. Hutton Co. thinks the rising stock market and declining bond market "underscores the flight from the dollar." Reynolds & Co. comments that last week "the flight from the dollar, which has been gathering momentum in recent weeks, turned into a stampede."

The same note is struck across the country. Wayne Hummer & Co. of Chicago observes that the "answer can be that investors have more confidence in the future value of stocks than they have in the dollar's stability." And the market comment of Daniel Reeves & Co. of Beverly Hills, is both pointed and poignant: "It is sad but true that few people any longer believe that our currency can ever be worth more in terms of buying power and most likely will ultimately be worth considerably less."

Now admittedly many market comments are not necessarily compendiums of wisdom. Still, brokerage houses are by the nature of their business close to people who are concerned about how to manage their savings for an uncertain future. And when they

note, with so much unanimity, such a strong feeling of fear about the dollar then it is surely time to pay attention.

In this instance, too, the feeling is confirmed by the figures on what people are doing. The bond market, including the market for obligations of the United States Government, has been depressed. Plainly the generality of people do not want to lend money to their Government. They know the Government will pay them back dollar for dollar with interest. What they fear is that they will be paid back with eroded dollars.

Moreover, the economic figures from Washington suggest that the people's fears are not unfounded.

The already huge Government debt is again being lifted; the deficit this year alone will be $12 billion or more. Getting the money for this deficit would be a terrible problem anytime. With a country already inflation-conscious, it is almost an insurmountable problem. The Treasury is very likely to find that it can borrow little, or nothing, from the public savings; it may well have to turn to the Federal Reserve to create all the necessary credit dollars in the banking system. And almost everyone knows nowadays that this is just a fancy way of printing money.

Finally—and this is the saddest part of all—the political facts of Washington suggest that nobody is going to do anything about it. The President warns sternly about the dangers of inflation, and approves a budget that can only make more inflation. Congressmen talk sorrowfully about the terrible thinks that inflation does to people, particularly the little people, and casually build the budget bigger.

The basic problem of inflation is not new. But what is suggested by these scattered and independent market reports is that the people may be developing a new attitude toward it. There is a strong suggestion that people generally are beginning to abandon hope that those appointed to manage their Government will halt inflation, an implication that the country may come to accept the rotting of the dollar as being as inevitable as death and taxes.

And that is why we think Washington had better heed the ominous tone in these reports. For though this country has suffered from its past inflations, all those troubles will be as nothing to what we shall have to bear if the people, privately and quietly, once get it into their minds that they can no longer put any trust for the future in the dollars of the United States.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

ROBERT D. HARRISON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Farm Bureau cannot support legislation (1) giving any Secretary of Agriculture the breadth of discretion for setting supports that is contained in the proposed House farm bill; and (2) providing for artificial minimum price-support levels. This latter provision is particularly indefensible when applied to noncontrolled crops like corn and feed grains while other crops with the same minimum price-support levels are subject to marketing quota controls.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President American Farm Bureau Federation.

Let's Look at Al Ullman's Part of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we Oregonians are proud of our State and its infinite variety of natural beauty spots. The long and scenic coastline is dotted with public beaches. Oregon's mountains provide an endless challenge to those who seek climbing adventures or who merely like to hike.

Recently four of my able colleagues were appointed members of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. They will serve on a bipartisan commission established to study the recreation potentialities of the Nation's forests, parks, and other public lands.

The work before these men grows bigger each year. National interest in outdoor recreation facilities is growing rapidly. The need for development and expansion of today's facilities is clear. The job of commission members will be arduous and time-consuming.

The Commission members from this House come from Oregon, AL ULLMAN; Arizona, JOHN J. RHODES; Idaho, MRS. GRACIE PFOST; and Pennsylvania, JOHN P. SAYLOR.

These Members are certainly aware of the value of planned resource development.

We of Oregon who have seen AL ULLMAN's dedication to work know he is well qualified to make concrete recommendations to the President and Congress as to how present and future recreation needs can best be met. Any recreation time he finds centers on hunting, fishing, and camping.

Most recently his tireless efforts to help produce an effective and acceptable Klamath Indian termination conference report resulted in the saving of priceless timber, wildlife, and watershed resources of a major portion of southeastern Oregon.

The natural beauty of Oregon abounds in all sectors. One such area in AL ULLMAN's Second Congressional District is the Wallowas. Last month the editor of a weekly newspaper in western Oregon told his readers of exploring a part of Oregon new to him. Mr. Hal Schiltz' comments appear in his editorial, A Beautiful Part of Oregon, which appeared in the Myrtle Creek (Oreg.) Mail of August 3, 1958:

A BEAUTIFUL PART OF OREGON

For the first time in 10 years, the publisher and his wife have had the pleasure of 2 weeks vacation together thanks to confidence in a present hard-working and worthy staff. And this important event was celebrated by seeing a new part of Oregon for us, the Wallowa Mountains of northeast Oregon. From conversations since, we know many other friends and neighbors have never visited this Alpine fastness, and we commend it to your attention.

The Wallowas have been underpublicized to date, and remain primitive, for exploration, but in this lies their great attraction. For our money, they far outglamor the much publicized Grand Tetons, much of the Cascades, and Sierra Nevada vistas. Cut off from normal highway travel by rugged mountains and the Grand Canyon of the Snake River on the Idaho side. And a remote area from the wheat fields and ranch lands of the Baker-La Grande-Walla Walla crescent, they remain removed from most tourist visiting. We saw only one California car in our tour among the mountains and only a few from Washington. The most visitors were Oregonians, like us, visiting just another beautiful part of the State, of which we have a grand diversification about which we are prone to remain too silent.

This situation is really fine with us. We think that maybe it would be a good idea to sort of "fence in" the Wallowas and keep them for Oregonians and their guests. Where else in the State is the daily trout bag limit 30 fish? Hunting lodges of that area boast 100 percent kill for deer and elk.

Large and beautiful Wallowa Lake itself remains relatively clear of personal home and tourist facility encroachments. Interestingly formed by glacial age lateral and terminal moraines of the Pleistocene geological period, it remains more than normally unsullied by human encroachment its greatest service still the provision of needed water to semi-arid agricultural lands nearby.

To really get around in this area, you need to employ pack horses, unless you want to do it the hard way and back-pack, but we found both ways worthwhile as we delved its mountain fastness depths along three of its main rivers—the Minam, the Lostine, and the Imnaha.

If you are vacation bound and wondering where to go, we feel that we can unhesitatingly recommend the Wallowas to fellow Oregonians. But be prepared to camp and rough it. That's the way the Wallowas are at their best.

Those who are interested in our personal trials and travails and experiences and comments on same will find them in "Chips."

Lieutenant General Quesada, War Hero, Helps Airlines in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report of August 15, 1958, on Lt. Gen. Elwood R. (Pete) Quesada, USAF (retired), special assistant to the President for aviation matters and head of the Airways Modernization Board:

WARTIME AIR HERO HELPS AIRLINES IN PEACE

A military flier spoke up for the commercial airlines in Washington last week. Lt. Gen. Elwood R. (Pete) Quesada, USAF (retired), special assistant to the President for aviation matters and head of the Airways

Modernization Board, told the President that airlines must make more money if they are to stay modern. The general made his statement in the form of a report, and President Eisenhower has passed it along to Congress.

The 54-year-old general, a combat flier in World War II, an explorer and soldier-diplomat, has a reputation for daring. In transmitting his report to the President, General Quesada sustained the reputation by tackling some delicate problems head on.

One touchy problem the general dealt with was the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Board. General Quesada wrote, "The Civil Aeronautics Board must examine the carriers' proposals [for rate changes] promptly. * * * A pending CAB proceeding relating to domestic passenger-fare levels is not due for decision until March 1959. By that time, the success or failure of major segments of the equipment program may well have been determined."

Another of aviation's hot potatoes, the growth of the Military Air Transport Service into a worldwide passenger service, got this treatment in General Quesada's report: "The Air Force unjustifiably discounts the national-defense potential for immediate readiness of the airline industry."

General Quesada is known as an officer who liked to lead his forces into combat himself in wartime. In peacetime he seems to retain the trait.

Sixteenth Annual Report to Constituents of Fourth Congressional District, Nebraska, by A. L. Miller, Member of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, during the 16 years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, it has been my custom to render a report to the people I represent at the end of each session.

I believe that every Member of Congress should do just that. If we are to continue to have good government we need an informed public.

I have tried to keep the voters of the Fourth District of Nebraska acquainted with my activities in Congress. I do this through a weekly newsletter to some 80 papers and a weekly radio broadcast. When Congress is not in session, I drive about 9,000 miles in the district seeing as many groups as is humanly possible.

In off-election years I hold a "youth wants to know" clinic for the public in all the county seat towns. These are question-and-answer periods in which I try to give information as to my stand on many questions before the Congress. I can tell you the youth and adults of America asked some keen, penetrating questions.

I have never dodged a vote in Congress or an answer to a question. It is not possible, Mr. Speaker, for everyone to agree. People who disagree with me may be right and I may be wrong but they are entitled to know how I voted and how I feel on all public questions. You and I live in a world where honest and sincere men and women can and do differ in their conclusions on public questions. We would not have it any other way in America.

There are many times when the proposed legislation seems to be of a doubtful nature. Some appears to be 51 percent good and 49 percent bad and vice versa. Legislation must be examined carefully and then I try to vote according to my conscience. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am in the upper 5 percent of those answering the most rollcalls. I am not a rubber stamp. Any mistake I have made has been of the head and not of the heart.

COMMITTEE WORK AND SENIORITY

I am the ranking member on a committee important to Nebraska, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This committee handles about 22 percent of all the bills the President signs. Bills are perfected in committees. The committee meets every day. I am always in attendance. I am also a member of the policy committee that meets every week and several times a year with the President and his Cabinet.

Seniority means a good deal and pays dividends. Because the southern Members seldom have opposition they return year after year and get positions of authority and chairmanships when their party is in power.

I was the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 83d Congress. I am now ranking member on that committee and a Republican victory would make me chairman again.

The record shows that of the 435 Members in the House of Representatives there are only 20 Republicans and 37 Democrats who have served longer than I have served. Seniority is always recognized in both parties.

TWO STRONG PARTIES

This has been a difficult session partly because of the fact that American politics are formed upon the basis of two strong political parties. There are nations where there is only one party. There is no choice for the people. Then we have nations like France that have 17 or 18 splinter parties in which no one party has the majority. Here in America and in the Congress you are either a Democrat or a Republican. There are no Independents. We have all shades of opinion among those who represent the Democrat and Republican parties. This administration has been a Republican administration. The Congress which is Democrat has control of all committee chairmen and all legislation. The Rules Committee, made up of 8 Democrats and 4 Republicans, certainly controls legislation that comes to the floor of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

More than 13,000 bills have been introduced in the 85th Congress. I was successful in getting for Nebraska flood control approval of the Gering-Mitchell area, money for the Ainsworth and Farwell Irrigation Districts and for Glendo Dam and Fremont Canyon. The mid-State reclamation bill was reported from the subcommittee and several watershed bills were reported. There are some people who criticize putting money into reclamation and flood-control projects like the mid-State, Farwell and Ainsworth projects. To me they represent an investment in the resources of this country. The money is all paid back over a period of years. The construction of the Gering-Mitchell flood-control projects would save thousands of acres of good land from destruction of continuing floods. Actually the crops raised do not add to the surplus. Wheat for instance is not an irrigated crop.

On a national basis, I introduced legislation which has passed to control chemicals in the food we eat, to give our parks a wider use for recreation and, as this is written, I believe my bill on the use of surplus farm products for industrial use will be passed. There were a number of minor bills and resolutions of a private nature introduced by request of the Secretary of Interior.

VETOES

The President has found it necessary to veto a number of bills. I think he was right in vetoing the huge pork barrel public works bill. He was right in vetoing the bill which would provide for a ship known as the atomic ice breaker. He may veto a military bill which has money for 142 armories not asked for and calls for $1 billion of additional spending which the military say they do not need. I believe he will veto the huge public housing bill and the community facilities bill which together would call for several billion dollars of additional spending. To date more than $3 billion has been added to bills reported by the Rules Committee and passed by the Congress that the President did not want.

Mr. Speaker, there are a dozen bills waiting for a rule which if passed would raise deficit spending about $8 billion. There are powerful groups like the ADA, the liberal Democrats and a few Republicans who are insisting on more and more spending. It is my opinion that a number of these high spending, inflationary bills will and should be vetoed by the President if they are passed by the Congress.

I voted against all of this unnecessary and unwanted spending. I voted against raising the debt limit. There are several departments of Government with some many billions of unexpended balances. It seems that instead of borrowing more they should use these unneeded funds to pay off the debt and not increase it. The way to balance the budget and to halt inflation is to stop this unnecessary spending.

INFLATION

With increased appropriations that the administration did not ask for, this country is confronted with a big dose of inflation. I believe it is the most serious thing Americans face. It can destroy just as much as a military defeat. The erosion of the dollar eats at all pensions and savings accounts. The President has warned repeatedly that the spending he has not asked for would lead us down the road of inflation. That is another reason I voted against new un-

necessary spending and the raising of the debt limit.

AGRICULTURE—FARM BILL

It has been almost impossible to get a satisfactory agricultural bill adopted. This comes about partly because the 3 or 4 farm organizations are not in agreement upon any legislation. It comes about because the membership of the Agriculture Committee have been somewhat at loggerheads, arguing what commodity should get a preferred position in the bill. It should be remembered that of the 19 committees in the House, 13 of the chairmen come from the South or border States. There are 14 Democrats with the most seniority and they are all from States below the Mason-Dixon line. The House Agriculture Committee has 8 ranking Democrats who are from the South.

I voted for both farm bills as they came from the Senate and House hoping they could be improved in conference. Most legislation is a matter of compromise that comes out of conference. The agriculture program must provide the farm folks with their fair share of the national income. They must have opportunity and freedom with as little Government control as is possible.

I have not always agreed with the administration on some of their legislation. I could not go along with the huge foreign aid bill or the Federal aid to education, or upping the pay and time to 39 weeks for unemployment compensation insurance. I have not always agreed with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. I thought he was wrong in opposing legislation to make alcohol and industrial products out of our surplus crops. I thought he was wrong when he took entire farms out of production without consulting anyone from Nebraska, and then quickly reversed himself. I thought he was wrong when he rolled back the price of wheat about 22 cents a bushel and kept cutting the acreage that raises high gluten and protein wheat.

I have said all the time that there is no man in the Cabinet that has a higher integrity, honesty, sincerity, and strong character than Secretary Benson. I might add he is also stubborn. I have supported the administration and the Secretary in about 85 percent of their program. While I am a Republican, I believe I am on the conservative side. I could never be a rubberstamp for any one or any group.

Fortunately in Nebraska and the Midwest farm income is rising. It may be 25 percent higher than 1957. The price paid for crops may be lower but there is greater abundance which brings smiles to farmers and to businessmen who must sell to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who are trying to make political capital out of the farm situation, out of depression and out of the Russian sputniks. They use the sputnik and this phony depression to force through unwise legislation and unneeded spending. In Nebraska there is no depression. People grin at you when you talk about a recession. While the acres and the price have been cut on basic farm crops, Mother Nature has smiled upon the farmer and more bushels have been grown. This means more dollars in the farmers' pockets, more prosperity for the community. This is so much different than the desperate drought of 1956 and 1957.

I introduced legislation for the conversion of grain into industrial alcohol and for industrial uses. I believe that research is one method that will help us solve our huge surpluses. This country has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to learn how to produce more on less land and with fewer farmers. We have not completed sufficient research work to know how to use our surpluses wisely.

The stockgrowers have their problem solved. They do not need or want Government subsidies. Proper utilization of the grain surpluses will place the corn and wheat farmer on the same basis as the livestock raisers.

FOREIGN-AID PROBLEMS

I am glad to see a partial meeting of foreign diplomats at the summit. I do not believe there will be another major war. I believe in talking our problems over around the conference table. When they are talking they are not fighting. It does seem that Russia and the Communists will continue the cold war. Russia cannot be trusted. She has made 37 agreements with this Nation and the world and has kept only 2 of those agreements. This Nation must have a defense that is strong enough to discourage any aggressor. I am hopeful that we can proceed properly with the fuller use of the atomic reactors for peaceful uses.

Our foreign aid for the past 10 years has been largely a waste of money. We cannot buy friendship. I will continue to follow the procedure I have always followed to vote against foreign aid except for food, medicine, and clothing for needy people. I believe we need an immediate reevaluation of our foreign aid giveaway program. Perhaps loans instead of gifts will be the answer.

TAX RELIEF

It had been my fond hope when this current year started that we could have a tax reduction, pay a moderate amount on the public debt, and still balance our budget.

My hopes were soon overturned. Demands of the Defense Department were higher than anticipated. A restless world made it imperative that our Nation stand prepared for a war which we hope will never come. The unbalanced budget comes about because of increased military spending and spending not asked for by the President. Some relief from taxes was given to small business and on certain excise taxes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

I am disappointed in the type of labor legislation passed thus far by the Congress. I had hoped for approval of these points:

Legislation to assure honest elections in labor unions.

Legislation to protect union welfare and trust funds.

Legislation to eliminate the secondary boycott and sympathy strike.

Legislation to place the larger unions under antitrust and antimonopoly laws and protect the workingman.

Passage of a right-to-work law.

The Senate Rockets Committee has uncovered many unsavory practices by union racketeers to which the honest laboring man has little defense. Laboring men need help to clean up their unions. He is forced to make political contributions often against his will. Labor has helped elect, by contributions and endorsement, 175 Members of Congress. Only two are Republicans. Labor leaders have been rather brazen in their demands on those they have helped. The Hoffa-Reuther labor leaders openly boast about controlling in the next Congress more than 200 Members. This is not good for America.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

It remains my conviction that education belongs at the local and State levels. I believe that communities can build, maintain, and operate their own schools cheaper and better than under the Federal Government.

VISIT HOME

As usual, I will be in Nebraska after the Congress adjourns. I go home every fall, election or not, so that I may chat with people about their problems, visit the county fairs, speak to service clubs and other organizations. There is no substitute for face-to-face talks with the people whom you represent in Congress. I look forward to seeing many of you this summer. In the meantime, please feel free to write me anytime at 1025 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Matter of Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Tom Cawley which appeared in the Sunday Press of Binghamton, N. Y., on August 10, 1958.

MATTER OF FACT
(By Tom Cawley)

A little of the old Jim Farley flashed through the political cliches during the week, and it seemed like old times. Farley, running for the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate, never was what you'd call a firebreather, even at the peak of his political career (1932–40), but his talent for needling is vast.

He called Ed Dickinson the "mosquito candidate" of the Harriman administration. With deadly kindliness, he suggested Tom Murray, another candidate, couldn't write a class composition on How To Run for Office.

He applied the ancient and honorable technique of not throwing a needle at Governor Harriman directly, but accused him by implication of walling himself off from his old friends by having an ambitious clique guarding the outer portals of the Governor's chamber.

Farley isn't coming out swinging in his grab for the nomination, but he's warming up his old political muscles for a bit of Indian wrestling before the delegates' votes are counted.

Farley's technique is composed of behind-the-scenes strategy in getting a nomination for anybody. In elections, his strategy is plain and simple. He shakes everybody's hand and remembers everybody's name. It's a formula nobody can improve on.

In contending that some of his old political friends want to endorse him publicly, but are afraid of reprisals from the current ruling Democrats at Albany, Farley is giving voice to one of the firm tenets that has guided him in politics.

"Many people," he said recently, "proceed on the theory that they got into positions they occupy on their own power, forgetting the fact that as they went up the stairs, there were people helping them along the way and making sacrifices for them."

Farley believed that Franklin Roosevelt had violated this tenet when he ran for a third term. In a wracking decision, Farley, who got F. D. R. to be President, broke with the old champ. It was a nerve-shattering decision for him, but he had to do what he believed was right.

The liberal Democrats—who up to that point had loved good old Jim—jumped all over him for what they called his fatal defection.

The old-line Democrats stayed with him. Whether there are enough to put him over at Buffalo is a big question.

But the old Farley magic still is evident. Even today, name-droppers love dropping Jim Farley's name more than any other name in politics. A telephone call from Farley is something that you've got to mention to your friends. A postcard is a small compliment sent by one of the master politicians of his time.

Big, smart, well known, well informed, with a pair of eyes that have seen every conceivable type of political doublecross and chicanery, Farley is making his final attempt for political laurels.

The sentimentalists will be with him. You've got to be with a guy—if you're a sentimentalist—who murmured in 1936, "As Maine goes, so goes Vermont."

Wilderness System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by W. D. Hagenstein before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 23, 1958. Mr. Hagenstein, who is executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association, is well qualified to present his views on a bill which would have a great effect on my district in the State of Washington.

His statement concerns S. 4028, which would establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. I agree with him that hearings on this proposed legislation should be held throughout the West to acquaint people with its provisions and to get their views, especially in my district and the State of Washington where forestry is so important to our economy. I know from the many letters I have received many persons are deeply interested in this subject.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF W. D. HAGENSTEIN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF INDUSTRIAL FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, ON S. 4028, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, ON JULY 23, 1958

My name is W. D. Hagenstein and I reside in Portland, Oreg. I am a professional forester and a registered professional engineer in the States of Washington and Oregon. I am executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association which has been promoting constructive forest management throughout the Douglas fir region of western Oregon and western Washington for 25 years.

The Industrial Forestry Association consists of 58 companies engaged in the business of growing and harvesting timber and manufacturing lumber, pulp and paper, plywood, shingles, hard- and soft-boards, and other forest products. Our members own and manage more than 7 million acres of forest land. They operate nearly 250 wood-using plants which employ more than 63,000 people and have an annual payroll of more than $300 million.

The Industrial Forestry Association founded the now nationwide tree farm program in 1941 and to date has certified more than 5½ million acres of privately owned forests as tree farms in our region. We operate one of the West's largest forest tree nurseries as a nonprofit enterprise to provide seedling trees for keeping forest land productive on our members' tree farms. Our nursery has shipped more than 93 million trees since it was established and has 25 million trees growing in it at present. We are also developing better trees through application of the principles of genetics in a substantial research program financed entirely by our membership.

We come before you today to make the plea that before any action is taken on S. 4028, this committee hold hearings throughout the West to acquaint westerners with the provisions of the measure and to get their views. Because the proposal was only introduced in June of this year, it has had little circulation as yet and its provisions are not known nor understood by the people most affected. As you all realize, more than 90 percent of the lands involved are in the West.

In the West, where we have lots of it, land is our basic resource. Without it, man couldn't exist, for with the exception of the relatively small proportion of our total diet which comes from the sea, everything we eat, wear, and consume is a product of the land.

When I speak of the West, I refer to the 11 Western States. In this great area, we have three-quarters of a billion acres of land or two-fifths of the total area of the United States. We have only 23 million people, or 14 percent of our country's total. More than half our people are in California. In only three other States do we have more than a million.

A third of our land is forest, less than half of which is now considered to have commercial timber-growing possibilities. We have 59 million acres of cropland, 400 million acres of grazing land and nearly 50 million acres occupied by cities and towns and rights-of-way for highways, railroads, powerlines, pipelines, canals, aqueducts, and other means of transporting products of the land to the consumer.

Obviously, land is the basis of our Western economy. The annual value of all farm products is nearly $5 billion. Minerals produce $3.3 billion, forest products $3¼ billion and our tourists are reckoned to spend $2 billion. These land-based industries produce the basic income for all westerners. People who live in our cities and towns are apt to overlook this if they work in supermarkets, department stores, drug stores, service stations, banks, hospitals, garages, insurance offices, theaters, or any of the thousands of other service establishments. And this goes for public officials too, because county, State, and Federal taxes all originate in the land. It's a fact that farmers, miners, loggers, sawmill hands, construction workers, sheepherders, and cowboys are the ones whose activities start the dollars rolling toward our cash registers. All of these basic economy producers are so engaged to satisfy the needs and wants of everyone. Take away any part of them in any community and the economy suffers. This is particularly true in the West, with the exception of our few big urban centers where people seem to make their living by trading goods and services with one another, but if the thousands of small communities close to the land weren't funneling their products and payrolls into the cities, the latter would not exist.

Fortunately for the wage earners of the West, every single member of this committee is a westerner and all 11 Western States are represented. I don't know how often this has been true of your committee, but it may be an act of Divine Providence rather than a fortunate coincidence to prevent hasty enactment of legislation like S. 4028 without giving the people of the West an opportunity to understand it and be heard on its proposals.

To give you an example of some of the expressions of opinion on the previous bills to create a national wilderness preservation system, let me cite from the Portland Oregonian for November 23, 1957, when the Association of Oregon Counties, made up of the county judges and commissioners from all the State's 36 counties, was reported to have received a report from its public lands committee which declared, "that the single use concept of Senate bill 1176, the so-called wilderness bill, is contrary to the public interest and asked for its defeat."

This is the kind of grassroots opinion which the hearings held by this committee and its counterpart in the House in the last session of Congress didn't get into the record because hearings were held only in Washington, D. C.

Another example of western sentiment on this legislation is evident in the resolution approved by the Washington State Association of Soil Conservation Districts' meeting at Seattle, Wash., in December 1956 when the following action was taken:

"Whereas the economic development of our States and Nation depends on the maximum ability of national forest lands to produce fiber, water, minerals, game and fish habitat, and recreation for all of the people; and

"Whereas the establishment of excessive acreages of limited use, without adequate consideration of all natural resource values, could have serious effects on local economies and overall public benefits: Now therefore be it

"Resolved by the Washington State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, That before any national forest area is dedicated to a single purpose use a thorough analysis and land management plan be made for the area to assure that the long term benefits of all natural resources are adequately protected; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Washington State Association of Soil Conservation Districts opposes singling out portions of national forest areas for limited use through any proposed act of Congress."

These examples which reflect western thinking, by the people whose livelihood is directly affected by the proposals contained in S. 4028, indicate the necessity of taking this legislation to the West for full public

hearings in every State so that their economy may be adequately represented in the record from which you gentlemen must decide what course of action to take.

Further argument for the necessity of holding hearings in the West on S. 4028, if you will pardon the personal reference, Mr. Chairman, is your statement to the members of this committee in the committe print entitled "Full Development of Public Resources," dated June 16, 1958. You very kindly sent me a copy of this with your letter to Conservationists under date of June 30, 1958. In your letter of transmittal to the members of this committee, you said, "The policies that are pursued in the development of these lands and resources in large measure guide the economic destiny of the West." You were, of course, referring to the Federal lands.

Quoting further from your letter of transmittal to the members of this committee, Mr. Chairman, you said, "The authority placed in our committee for matters affecting public lands requires that we keep informed, and that we keep the public informed, on matters which affect these lands. The growing need to develop our public lands resources requires more adequate information. We need to acquaint the people of our Nation with the tremendous value of the Federal assets belonging to them so amounts budgeted to protecting resources, and amounts of investment made to expand use of the public lands can be related to the value of the assets with which we are dealing and potential revenues and benefits.

We wholly endorse your statement of the need to acquaint the people of our Nation with the tremendous value of the Federal lands belonging to them and what needs to be made in the way of investment to protect and expand the use of their resources. We hope that, as part of your program of acquainting the people of our Nation, you won't forget the people of the West who depend upon the good judgment of this committee in all matters to do with the protection, management, and use of the Federal lands.

Another reason for delaying action on S. 4028 is the recent creation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which is charged with examining the outdoor recreational needs of the country and making specific recommendations as to how they are to be met. Consideration of the present proposal in light of the study which will shortly be underway by the Recreation Review Commission is certainly premature.

I would now like to cite a few facts pertinent in the consideration of S. 4028.

In the West our No. 1 landowner is Uncle Sam. The Government owns more than 400 million acres, or 53 percent of our total area. This means that Federal land policies in a big measure control our economy. How important that makes full consideration of westerners' views on any proposal to modify the management of Federal lands is abundantly clear. Without western hearings, how can our views be adequately transmitted to you gentlemen whose actions on the pending bill may determine the future of westerners yet unborn.

I want to mention a few other pertinent considerations.

Our increasing population, predicted to be 100 million more in 40 years, means increasing pressure on the land. Every acre must contribute all it can to our needs for food, wood, water, wildlife, and recreation. Practical land management emphasizes highest use for each acre but doesn't exclude other uses. There is no question but that in some areas there are paramount uses such as the growing of food crops on agricultural soils, the extraction of ores from mineral deposits, the management of certain areas exclusively for water, and other areas exclusively for recreation because of their scenic wonders and historic values. But most of our land in the West is capable of contributing two or more of these uses simultaneously. For example, a forest, which can be managed for a never-ending crop of wood, provides a permanent crop of water for domestic, agricultural, and industrial use, a continuing habitat for fish and game, in many areas can be used for grazing livestock, and always has many opportunities for picnicking, hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, and noise-free solitude for those who want to get away from it all.

In the West we have 140 million acres of national forests managed under the principle of multiple use. We have 13½ million acres of national parks, monuments and recreation areas, 6.8 million acres of wildlife refuges, and 725,000 acres of State parks. All of these areas are dedicated to recreation in its many forms. Many of them are so developed with roads, campgrounds, trails, and shelters that they are available for all of our citizens for most every outdoor pursuit.

Some of the areas in the national forests are dedicated to exclusive use of wilderness recreationists. Called wilderness, wild, primitive, and limited areas, they are roadless and generally include vast areas of forests, waters and open lands above timberline. They are generally remote and hence accessible to relatively few. Young families with small children can't very well walk 15 or 20 miles into a wilderness, if they want to take the youngsters along. Older people, on the average, haven't the stamina to invade these areas very far. Working men and women don't often have the time or money to explore these areas whose vastness requires either considerable time by foot or an expensive pack trip which few can afford.

These areas also provide a real worry to the Federal forest managers who must protect them against fire and, in some instances, have been up against it when serious insect epidemics have broken out. Not only is it difficult to control fire and insects in these inaccessible areas, but there is a serious question as to the advisability of investing great sums in protection of forests managed under multiple use in Federal or other ownership adjacent to wilderness areas and running the risk of having fires or insect epidemics spill out of the wilderness into the managed areas.

Having been one of the charter members of the Northwest Forest Pest Action Council and, currently, as chairman of the Western Forest Pest Committee which covers the 11 Western States, I know firsthand of the tremendous problems which confront us in saving timber from death over millions of acres from such pests as the spruce budworm. We have been spraying to control it for a decade in the Pacific Northwest and, in the last few years, Idaho and Montana have had to do a lot of it also. Those of you from Colorado and Montana are well aware of the problem of the Engelmann spruce beetle and all of you know of the pine beetles which have been taking their destructive toll for many years in every western State. In many parts of the West today there is more timber being destroyed each year by insects than all that consumed by fire or used by man.

I know from my boyhood experiences in fighting fire in Idaho that we often walked for 20 hours or more from the end of a road to the fireline. Because we were so exhausted after that long a hike with bedroll and tools to pack, we were of little use until we'd had a long rest. And by the time we were able to combat the flames, the fires were no longer small, so we often couldn't control them until either a major change occurred in the weather or the fire consumed all the fuel.

One of the fires I was on, almost 25 years ago, completely destroyed more than 200,000 acres of a national forest which no longer exists, the Selway. Had these areas been accessible, we probably could have minimized the damage and saved great quantities of timber, soil, wildlife, and just plain outdoors for recreation.

I am sure that all of you, flying as you do frequently over your States, know what I am talking about when I suggest that inaccessible areas are extremely difficult, if not impossible, to protect against the natural ravages of lightning-caused fires and the great hordes of insect pests which abound in nature.

No one is opposed to setting aside areas for wilderness solitude. The only question is, can we do it without adversely affecting the multiple-use area adjacent or losing resources necessary for the maintenance of our western economy? Naturally, most of the areas now set aside as wilderness and those proposed are in the West because that's where the Federal lands are. This also limits their use mostly to people in the West because the average citizen from far away neither has the time nor money to explore them by foot or pack train.

May I conclude by again urging that you listen to the many voices in the West, not just those from the wilderness, but to everyone who wants to be heard on this and every proposal which will influence Federal land management. The only way you can do this is to take this committee into the West and hold hearings on S. 4028 in every single State whose jobs and payrolls it will affect.

A Bill To Amend Section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act With Respect to Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a draft of a bill dealing with the administration of Public Law 518 passed in the 83d Congress.

It is my considered judgment that legislation of this type should be given serious consideration in the 86th Congress:

A bill to amend section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to fees

Be it enacted, etc., That section 408 (o) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulation condition referrals to advisory committees pursuant to this section upon the payment, by the person requesting the referral, of fees to defray the costs arising by reason of such referrals. Such fees, including advance deposits to cover such fees, shall be available, until expended, for paying (directly or by way of reimbursement of the applicable appropriation) the expenses of advisory committees under this section and other expenses arising by reason of referrals to such committees, and for refunds of excess payments. Such regulations may further provide for waiver or refund of fees in whole or in part when in the judgment of the Secretary such waiver or refund is equitable and not contrary to the purposes of this subsection."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to correct an undesirable and inequitable provision in the Federal Food, Drug, and

Cosmetic Act which has placed discriminatory financial burdens and restrictions upon those involved in the manufacture, recommendation, sale, and use of agricultural pesticide chemicals. It would delete certain fee provisions from section 408 (o) of that act.

In 1954, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7125, which was enacted and became Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress. It amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by adding a new section 408, which provides for the control of pesticide residues in or on raw agricultural commodities intended for food or feed purposes. It is commonly referred to as the Miller pesticide residue amendment. All parties directly concerned, the Government agencies, the growers, and the pesticide manufacturers are in accord that the law is operating well and effectively and that consumers are receiving an unparalleled degree of protection as a result of it.

At the time the bill was pending before the Congress, it was the announced administration policy that, to the extent practicable, all services rendered by Government agencies were to be put on a self-supporting basis; fees were to be charged wherever possible.

In accordance with that policy, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare requested that H. R. 7125 be amended to provide for a fee system which would bring in sufficient revenue to cover the costs of the operations of the bill, if it were to be enacted.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee rejected the proposed amendment and the bill as passed by the House did not contain a fee provision. The Senate did adopt the amendment, and the House later concurred. The bill as enacted provided that "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall by regulation require the payment of such fees as will in the aggregate, in the judgment of the Secretary, be sufficient over a reasonable term to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for the performance of the Secretary's functions under this section."

Under the authority of these provisions, the Food and Drug Administration in February 1955, promulgated a regulation which specified a series of fees for the various steps involved in the tolerance setting and review procedure. Without going into all the details of that fee schedule, a few examples will serve to illustrate what has developed since that time. The original fee schedule, announced by the Food and Drug Administration in February 1955, required the payment of $500 for the filing of a petition for the establishment of the initial residue tolerances for any given pesticide chemical and a $50 filing fee plus $50 for each additional tolerance requested later on the same chemical. In September 1955, these fees were doubled to $1,000 and $100 respectively. Last Thursday—August 7—the Food and Drug Administration published in the Federal Register a notice that effective on September 6, 1958, these fees would be raised to $2,500 and $250 respectively. This amounts to a fivefold increase since February 1955.

Under this new fee schedule, if a manufacturer develops a new pesticide chemical and seeks a tolerance for it on a certain crop, he will have to pay $2,500 before the Food and Drug Administration will accept his petition and consider his data. Each time that he comes back for an additional tolerance on another crop, he will have to pay another $500. Some pesticide chemicals find use on a great number of crops. Thus, a considerable amount of money can be involved in getting these important pest control chemicals approved by the Food and Drug Administration so that they may be used by our farmers and growers for the protection of their crops. These fees for FDA approval are ultimately reflected in the prices which our growers must pay for these essential pesticides.

Since approval of a pesticide chemical by the Food and Drug Administration through the establishment of a tolerance or exemption is usually a prerequisite to the sale of that product for use on food crops, the fees charged in connection with such approval, in effect, constitute a tax to do business. It imposes additional and unnecessary burdens on small companies.

The previously mentioned policy of charging fees wherever possible, which led to the inclusion of the fee provision in H. R. 7125, apparently was not implemented to any significant extent and, in fact, appears to have been abandoned as far as this type of food legislation is concerned.

The Poultry Products Inspection Act, Public Law 85–172, passed last year, contains no provision for the charging of fees for the approval of chemicals proposed for use on poultry or in poultry plants.

In 1957, the Food and Drug Administration sponsored a chemical or food additives bill which was introduced by Mr. HARRIS as H. R. 6747. That bill is quite similar in many respects to the pesticide-residue amendment of 1954. It contains no fee provisions except for those instances where petitions for the approval of a food additive are to be referred to an advisory committee. The manufacturer or user of a chemical intended for use in food would not have to pay a fee in order to file a petition and have the Food and Drug Administraton examine the data to establish its safety. This is proper, since the purpose of the Food and Drug Administration's review of the data is the protection of the public health and not the conferring of some benefit upon a particular chemical or food company. After lengthy hearings on H. R. 6747 and other food additive bills, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last month reported a new bill, H. R. 13254, which represents that committee's views as to the type of regulation which should be imposed upon food additives.

This chemical additive bill was passed by the House August 13. It had no provision for the charging of fees such as is now being carried out in Public Law 518.

The above facts relative to the Poultry Products Inspection Act and the pending food additive legislation would indicate that it is not the policy of this Congress or of the present administration to require the payment of fees in legislation regulating the use of chemicals in or on food.

It is an injustice to require those who must obtain approval of their chemicals under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—the pesticide residue amendment—to pay fees to obtain such approval while those who would obtain similar approval under the proposed section 409—the food additive amendment—would not have to pay such fees. The two sections are similar in requirement and in operation. The Food and Drug Administration has essentially the same responsibility under both sections. It would be concerned with essentially the same considerations and types of data under both sections. It would take as much, if not more, time and effort on the part of the Food and Drug Administration to consider and approve a chemical under the proposed section 409 as it now does under existing section 408 as regards pesticide chemicals. Hence, there would appear to be no sound reason why the Food and Drug Administration should charge fees for its operations under section 408 while not charging them under proposed section 409.

This bill is intended to correct this inequity. It would eliminate the fee provisions of section 408 with one exception. That is the provision relating to the appointment of an advisory committee to study a petition to establish a tolerance on a pesticide chemical. It appears reasonable to expect that, if a company requests the Government to appoint a group of experts to serve as an advisory committee on its petition for a tolerance, it should be willing to pay the actual costs incurred by the operations of that committee.

While the fees levied against the person requesting a tolerance have been discussed at some length, there are other important fee provisions in the Regulations which warrant careful consideration. For example, if a person wishes to file objections to a tolerance order and request a hearing on it, he must pay a filing fee of $250. This appears at variance with the American system to require that a person must pay a fee to a Federal administrative agency in order to register his objections and request a hearing on one of its orders which he things is contrary to the public welfare, or which might put him out of business as a grower or manufacturer. The regulations also require that if a person files a petition for judicial review of the order he must pay the costs of preparing a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which the order is based.

Legislation is necessary to correct this situation created by the fee provisions of section 408 (o) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder. As the Food and Drug Administration stated in its order which appeared in the Federal Register for August 7, 1958, and which announced the latest increase "the collection of such fees is required by law." This has reference to the fact that section 408 (o) provides "the Sec-

retary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall by regulation require the payment of such fees as will in the aggregate, in the judgment of the Secretary, be sufficient over a reasonable term to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for the performance of the Secretary's functions under this section." Thus, it would appear that the Food and Drug Administration has no discretion in the matter of the fees to be levied. Since the fee requirement was imposed by law, it must be repealed by law. Hence, the introduction of this bill and the need for congressional approval of it.

Essence of Reutherism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, most Members regularly read Raymond Moley's penetrating analyses of current political trends. I know of no one whose judgment is keener.

His column in the current issue of Newsweek is entitled "Essence of Reutherism." It is based on Mr. Reuther's own statements made to Washington correspondent for the Sunday Times of London, Mr. Henry Brandon. While Mr. Reuther states that he rejects a separate labor party, he clearly shows that he intends to capture the Democratic Party so completely that it will become a labor party in every sense of the word.

Mr. Moley's comments are of great significance, as we approach a national election. I believe they should be brought to the attention of every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; hence I am including them as an extension of my remarks.

ESSENCE OF REUTHERISM

(By Raymond Moley)

A remarkable interview with Walter Reuther was recently tape-recorded for the Sunday Times of London and was reprinted in the New Republic of July 21. Either in speeches, or in demands upon employer companies, or in his actions, the strands of Reuther's philosophy have appeared before. But here they are, tied together in a neat package—ominous, comprehensive, and revolutionary. The proof of his intentions lies in what he has already accomplished.

"The American labor movement," he assures the British, "is as radical as the European labor movement." But he refrains from using their labels, such as socialism, planned economy, Marxism, or fascism, although in essence his program is practically identical with the last. He maintains that reforms would be within the four corners of a free economy and our constitutional system. Indeed, the late Justice Frank Murphy, in 1942, in the Schneiderman case, said that the objectives of any ism, even communism, could be accomplished within the American Constitution. No original thinker himself, Murphy, while Governor of Michigan, probably learned this during his close collaboration with Reuther.

It has been clear that Reuther's efforts to secure first a pension plan and then supplementary unemployment compensation were to bring industrial management to his side in efforts to get the Government to give more. He says that within 48 hours after Ford succumbed to his pension plan "we got action out of Congress that we were unable to get in 12 years."

A PLANNED ECONOMY

The objective in all Reuther strategy is to make private decisions more publicly responsible. To do this, "we want" a "government clearinghouse, a place where you can have a top group periodically sit down and evaluate, and based upon their evaluation and their recommendation, have the private decisions then attempt to translate and implement these broad policies." This is precisely what Socialists call national planning. It is government imposing its will upon all economic life.

On many occasions Reuther has made clear that this supergroup should be composed of one-third management, one-third labor union, and one-third government. This means that to gain control of all planning, the unions must control the third member-government. "The solution," says Reuther, "has got to be economic and political."

He rejects a labor party because "a political party to succeed has to have groups that go way beyond labor as a group." In short, the bulk of workers would be too conservative, since so many have moved into the middle-income brackets. The groups he has in mind that go beyond labor toward collectivism would be leftist farm organizaitons, public-power pressure people, the ADA (in which he is already a principal figure), certain teachers' organizations, and generally the pink intellectuals (who include a good many individuals of wealth).

POLITICAL CONTROL

There is no better example of the sort of coalition he has in mind than the Democrats of Texas—DOT—directed and largely financed by CIO units, which has just reelected RALPH YARBOROUGH to the Senate with almost twice his 1957 vote.

Reuther's ridiculous claim is that the aim is to work with but not capture the Democratic Party. This is a subtle trap for those conservative Democrats who are prisoners of their party, either by habit or tradition or by the one-party system in the South. But he notes that the Democratic Party "is coming to reflect the kind of programs and policies that the American labor movement can support." Thus the Democrats can have the name if their policies are agreeable to Reuther. He will reward the party by bearing a large part of the expense of their campaigns.

Reuther says in conclusion that "the great tragedy is not that the Russians are better than we are—they're doing better because they're trying and we aren't." But the education which he says should be copiously supported should, he says, be directed toward "constructive and creative leisure." If we follow that policy, we may win the next Olympics but lose the cold war. Khrushchev would settle for that.

Post Office Department Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon August 6, 1958, the Department of the Army and the Military District of Washington honored the Post Office Department with a parade on the Mall staged by the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry (The Old Guard). A plaque was presented by Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker to the Postmaster General of the United States and the members of the United States Post Office Department for outstanding contributions to the accomplishment of the vital mission of the United States Army.

This citation reads:

Through the wholehearted and dynamic cooperation of the officials and employees of the United States Post Office Department with the United States Army in assuring the prompt and efficient processing and dispatch of mail destined for our troops at overseas stations throughout the world, the morale and well-being of the American soldier in war and peace, and hence the effectiveness of the United States Army as a major instrument of national defense, has been immeasurably enhanced.

With the deployment of American troops to France in World War I, and the global deployments of World War II, the close and harmonious working relationship existing between the Army and the Post Office Department made possible the maintenance of a strong and durable link between our service men and women and their homes and loved ones which has been and continues to be of immense significance in helping to preserve even under the most difficult and hazardous conditions the essential solidarity of the American family, the foundation of our American heritage.

For such capable and devoted assistance to the United States Army in carrying out its worldwide responsibilities for the security of America, and such distinguished service to the dedicated men and women of the Army, the officials and employees of the United States Post Office Department merit in the highest degree this expression of appreciation.

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield responding for the Post Office Department said:

It is indeed a privilege to accept this tribute paid the Post Office Department by the Army in this magnificent review here today.

As your Postmaster General it gives me a sense of great accomplishment that you have seen fit to honor the 530,000 dedicated men and women of the Post Office Department.

The most satisfying of the many services which the Post Office Department renders is the carrying of messages and packages from home to our American young men and women who are serving in the defense of our liberties in every corner of the free world.

To efficiently cement these ties between home and our Armed Forces abroad, the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department maintain a daily continuous liaison to assure the regular and certain exchange of the mails.

There is, furthermore, an extraordinary significance to this occasion for the freedom which our sons and daughters are defending is especially symbolized and typified by the uncensored exchange of messages through our Postal Service.

The Postal Service which you have honored today is not only essential to human liberty, it is capable of existence only where liberty is a very special thing, something deep in the blood of men, imbedded in the soil, immovable as mountains.

Thank you again, Mr. Secretary, for the high honor the Army pays us today.

The Miller Pesticide Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Miller amendment to the pesticide bill was signed into law July 22, 1954. Those who use the pesticides must follow closely the instructions as to their use. This law gives to the Food and Drug Administration sufficient authority to assure the public that they are adequately protected at all times against the hazard of the use of these chemicals in food production.

Pesticides play an important role in providing the Nation's food supply and protecting the public health. The law required thorough pretesting of the pesticide chemicals and the protection of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be possible to produce as much food as is now produced without the proper use of pesticide chemicals on food crops. If they were not used, I doubt if it would be possible to produce apples, peaches, potatoes, citrus, and tomatoes, and many other crops would be drastically reduced. I doubt if the American people would be fed adequately unless crops and livestock are protected from insects and other pests.

The American public can be congratulated that they have had a food industry that has been most careful in the past in protecting the public health. They have worked in harmony with the Food and Drug Administration.

In publishing a few highlights on the editorial entitled "My Push-Button Garden," it is my opinion that the scientists have just scratched the surface of what may happen in the future.

It is my considered opinion that before long we will have new chemicals and pesticides that will be selective in their uses. They will be selective for different pests. They will be selective in the treatment of the food we consume. Future generations will be benefited by the proper application of science in the production of food for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, all of us at one time or another have either farmed or tinkered around our garden, so I am quite certain my colleagues will be quite interested in the article, My Push-Button Garden, which appeared in the July 26 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. It was written by the well-known author, Mr. Frank Taylor.

The article is quite long and tells of the author's experiences in lazy gardening, telling how the unorthodox has worked for him.

Of major interest to the Congress, however, is the information he gives pointing out the wonders and benefits of the new insecticides. He calls them new, but they have been in use since the mid forties. We have heard varying reports on the effectiveness and safety of these chemicals and even now legislation is pending before the Congress which would regulate the use of these modern tools even further. I say "even further" because now they are regulated by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the State counterpart as well as the Miller amendment to our Federal Food and Drug Act.

Mr. Taylor tells how his garden gradually became "a bug cafeteria. Snails came loping over the hills to feast on our vegetables. Butterflies came fluttering and laid eggs, which hatched out into caterpillars that defoliated the trees. Ants moved by the gillion, bringing aphis and mealy bugs, which are, so I am told, the ants' cows, milked for honeydew. While the ants milked the aphis and the mealies, the latter sucked the juices out of our rosebuds and lilies and iris and sweet peas. Lawn moths laid eggs in the grass, and the weevils that hatched out chewed off the roots, turning great patches of lawn a dead brown no matter how much we sprinkled."

He goes on to tell of his introduction to chemicals designed and developed to aid the farmer and home gardener. "My eyes were opened to their potential one day when two men drove up in a truck equipped with a tank and a power spray rig and what seemed like a mile of hose.

" 'We're looking for a place with a lot of ants,' one of them said.

" 'Brother, you've found it,' I replied.

" 'How'd you like to get rid of every ant on the place?' he asked.

" 'I'd sure like it. What's the plot?'

"They wanted to demonstrate how chlordane would rid a home garden of ants and offered me a special deal. I bought it. They sprayed the place in an hour and drove off. I didn't see an ant around for the rest of the summer. And the aphis and mealy-bug population took a drop too."

Mr. Speaker, the same can be said for many other insects and weeds which annually do billions of dollars in damage. Some of these insects play havoc in the home garden. Others denude forests, strip croplands, destroy pastures and attack meat and milk animals.

The Federal Government, through the United States Department of Agriculture, has declared war on many of these pests which can be eradicated. Perhaps one of the greatest contributions these chemicals have made is the complete eradication of malaria from within the confines of the United States.

Literally millions of lives have been saved by successfully eradicating the anopheles mosquito—carrier of malaria—from the United States.

At present the Department of Agriculture is carrying on eradication programs to rid our land of the gypsy moth which is destroying forests in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and the New England States and the fire ant and the Mediterranean fruitfly in the South.

These programs have been under attack by certain groups. Charges have been made—many of them half-truths and warped by personal prejudices—and USDA has been taken into court on injunction proceedings to stop the spraying for gypsy moth. Based on shotgun charges one cannot help but question their motives.

The case was heard, and when all the facts were presented, the injunction was denied. In rendering his opinion, Judge Walter Bruchhausen, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York pointed out that the adverse testimony presented was not warranted by the facts. He also stated, "Coupled with these elements is the fact that some are so strongly in favor of organic farming, without the use of chemicals, or emphasize their preference for biological control that their judgment may be influenced by their leanings."

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most important that certain facts be presented at this time. First, Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress provides for the establishment of safe tolerances for pesticide residues in or on raw agricultural commodities. The Food and Drug Administration, together with the Department of Agriculture, are charged with the responsibility of setting these safe tolerances and, I might add, they are doing an excellent job.

These tolerances are established on years of research necessitating expenditures of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Toxicity studies based on generations of test animals must be completed to satisfy the demanding requirements of Food and Drug. The public health is always given major consideration.

I have checked with Dr. W. L. Popham, assistant administrator of Agriculture Research Service, as to the safeguards employed by the Department of Agriculture in their spray programs. I am satisfied they are doing the best possible job.

Their fire ant eradication program in the South is the latest target for the food fadists. Cries of "They are killing all the wildlife" have reached the Congress. These reports have not been confirmed. In fact, in one area in Alabama which was treated it was reported that all the quail had been killed by the insecticide used. A check with the landowners showed that quail still abound in the treated area.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that we should act slowly before we do anything drastic to curtail these eradication programs. We should carefully weigh all the facts, giving prime consideration to the health and economic benefits derived. I am convinced that when this is done, the Congress will seek to expedite these programs.

Civil Aviation and the Weather Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed the supplemental appropriation bill without giving favorable attention to the section relating to steps needed to put the Weather Bureau in a

position to provide adequate service to aviation. This serious and tragic omission will someday have dramatic consequences.

The Weather Bureau is required to supply what weather service is needed for the public safety and national interest. The Bureau concerns itself with weather observing, forecasting, warning, recording, hydrology, and flood warning, climatology, research, and atmospheric physics. And in addition to their observational duties, collateral requirements are numerous and varied, including the furnishing of weather information to motorists, housewives, farmers, TV stations, boat operators, organized sports, and political aspirants.

The overall number of forecasters available for writing forecasts, for advising CAA on weather conditions affecting air traffic control procedures, and for the issuance of warnings is down more than 20 percent from the staff of 10 years ago. Greatly increased aviation activity during this period, coupled with the sharp reduction in staff has resulted in far less time being available for the preparation of forecasts. Under such circumstances there naturally has been a decline in the quality of forecasts and in service to aviation generally.

Without fanfare but with quiet determination, the National Business Aircraft Association has focused attention to this critical congressional omission.

Generally speaking, I am opposed to unchecked spending and bigness in Government, for together they draw our Nation into the quicksand of smothering destruction. Certain departments, however, require sufficient funds to adequately serve the Nation as they are charged. Our Weather Bureau, like our military, should be strong, alert, mobile, and technically modern. I urge the other body to recover and restore the necessary five points points outlined in the National Business Aircraft Association letter.

Indeed the restoration cost is modest compared to the staggering sums which our Congress pours into Poland and Yugoslavia to subsidize communism and strengthen the grasp and control over their captive peoples. The National Business Aircraft Association communication follows:

CIVIL AVIATION AND THE WEATHER BUREAU

Congressmen agitated by midair collisions are berating both CAA and CAB over air safety matters. Yet, these same Members in the past 10 years have done little to help air safety as it relates to weather. The unpleasant picture unfolds when we examine the happenings of the past 10 years.

The Weather Bureau offers less aviation service today than it did 10 years ago. During this period there has been a loss of 85 weather stations, with a corresponding loss of 279 highly skilled weather service employees. During this same period aircraft operations have more than tripled. CAA fix postings (instrument flights) have quadrupled. Instrument approaches have increased a whopping sixfold.

Today a fleet of more than 88,000 civil aircraft are solely dependent upon the forecasting and disseminating abilities and services of the United States Weather Bureau. These aircraft (not including the 1,800 scheduled air carriers) are widely used in business, industry, training, and general transportation. The type vary from large pressurized four-engine airplanes to helicopters, jets, and even turboprops. Most of the larger airplanes are readily convertible to military carriers in times of national emergency.

This vast aviation fleet is faced with a grim problem that Congress refuses to recognize: (1) The deplorable state of aviation weather services rendered by the Weather Bureau to this immense force; and (2) the air traffic control and safety problems which are compounded by lack of weather information.

The results of this decline in Weather Bureau service to the safety of civil aviation is characterized by the announcement that in 2 years civil aviation suffered 1,931 accidents in which the CAA cites weather as a casual factor. In the same period, the air carriers suffered 37 accidents attributable to weather. Thus the obvious need for greater weather facilities available to civil aviation.

The air carriers, like the military, have their own weather forecasters. All carriers have flight dispatchers to advise their pilots while en route of changing weather conditions, and they have their own radio network by which this weather information can be quickly transmitted to them. This forgotten and ignored 88,000 aircraft have none of these facilities which are considered basic for the safe conduct of instrument flights.

Realizing this deplorable situation, the Commerce Department and the Weather Bureau have repeatedly sought to remedy this deteriorating condition by outlining detailed plans for correcting the deficiency. Of the 8 requirements to bring the Bureau's forecasting and weather disseminating service up to the essentials required by civil aviation, only 1 item—high altitude forecasts for international flights—was acted upon by the House subcommittee. The items not recommended by the subcommittee are of direct and vital concern to the 88,000 general aviation fleet. The NBAA carefully considered all proposed items considered essential and urgent, and accordingly place particular emphasis on the adoption of five items:

1. Restoration of aviation forecast briefing services: During the past year services to aviation have been curtailed at 72 airport weather stations due to dropping of positions. These reductions were necessary for the Bureau to function within the narrowing orbit of budget operations.

2. Restoration to provide 24-hour-a-day weather observations at high-activity airports: In keeping within the reduced budget of last year 57 airport Weather Bureau stations now operate on a part-time basis (less than 24 hours each day). Lack of weather reports during the hours the station is closed and the unavailability of aviation weather briefing services poses a severe handicap to pilots and other interested users.

3. Continuous weather warning broadcasts for pilots. This program will provide continuous radio broadcasts to pilots of existing weather conditions plus information as to hazardous weather conditions which are expected to develop during the ensuing 6 to 12 hours. The 88 CAA L/MF ranges will be utilized to transmit the weather information. In this way pilots will be able to obtain required aviation weather briefing service without recourse to crowded telephone channels.

4. Establishment of 10 new weather reporting stations at airports which meet certain criteria for establishment of new aviation weather reporting stations.

5. Automatic aviation telephone forecasts: An automatic answering aviation telephone device has been in operation at Washington National Airport for several years and has proved to be of immense help in getting aviation weather forecast information to pilots. An aviation weather forecast, up to 1 minute in length, is recorded by the forecaster on equipment located in the weather office. This forecast describes current local conditions, changes expected for the next 6 to 12 hours and weather on air routes to cities 200 and 300 miles distant. Two unlisted telephone lines hook into the recording equipment so that two pilots may obtain weather briefing simultaneously. This service is planned at the 50 airports in the United States with the most aviation activity.

The Weather Bureau has managed to continue its operation with essentially the same basic appropriation only at the cost of closing stations and reducing service. In order to meet the continuous and pressing demands of progress and science, the Bureau needs to modernize, and this is possible only through the restoration, not expansion, of units heretofore removed, or curtailed, through wrongly placed budget reductions.

We need to bring the Weather Bureau services into phase with present aviation requirements.

As a great nation we are spending enormous sums of money to develop a system of airways, a system of airway traffic control, and a complete radar network to control traffic, all in the name of flying safety. Yet we have ignored one of the basic causes of air accidents—those caused by weather.

We completely surround our soldier with the the finest of weapons and features to protect his life. Our military pilots are wrapped in the latest of safety innovations to protect him. Money is no object. And our air carriers, foreign and domestic, are likewise placed under the protective canopy of modern facilities. But the 88,000 civil aircraft, the very bedrock of our country's aviation interest, is being denied the essentials, or luxuries, of aviation safety.

Dr. L. R. Mellin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, a real veteran leader died on Wednesday, August 6. Dr. Robert Mellin was well known throughout the American Legion for his service work among veterans. He was in the thick of the fighting to improve the services of the veteran facilities.

As a leader in the medical profession, his advice and suggestions carried great weight in the legislature of the State of Illinois, the Congress, as well as in the national councils of the American Legion. His passing marks another great loss to the servicemen of World War I. The days grow shorter and the ranks grow thinner.

To his talented widow—a renowned educator—Winifred, 4 brothers, and 3 sisters we extend our heartfelt and sincere condolences. Dr. Mellin was a proud and kindly man with many friends. They mourn his death.

The Chicago Daily Tribune and Sun-Times articles are as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 7, 1958]

DR. L. R. MELLIN IS DEAD AT 65—RITES FRIDAY

Dr. L. Robert Mellin, 65, of 840 Castlewood Terrace, an eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist with offices at 185 North Wabash Avenue, died Wednesday in Billings Hospital. He was graduated in 1914 from Loyola University medical school. Dr. Mellin was past commander of Advertising Men's Post, American Legion, and the Military Order of World Wars. He leaves his widow, Winifred Holmes Mellin, former member of the Chicago Board of Education; 4 brothers and 3 sisters. Mass will be said at 10 a. m., Friday, in St. Thomas of Canterbury Catholic Church, 4827 Kenmore Avenue.

[From the Sun Times of August 7, 1958]

DR. L. R. MELLIN DIES; PHYSICIAN, LEADER OF VETS

Dr. L. Robert Mellin, 65, physician and veterans' leader, died Wednesday in Billings Hospital.

Dr. Mellin, of 840 West Castlewood, began his practice upon graduation from Loyola University School of Medicine in 1914. In World War I he served as a lieutenant in the Navy. He maintained offices at 185 North Wabash and for many years was on the staff of Alexian Brothers Hospital and Columbus Memorial Hospital.

Dr. Mellin was a past commander of Advertising Men's Post, No. 38 of the American Legion and a past commander of the Chicago chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars. He was also a former medical officer of the Cook County Council of the American Legion and a former member of the National Veterans' Rehabilitation Committee.

Requiem mass will be offered at 10 a. m. Friday in St. Thomas of Canterbury Church, Kenmore and Lawrence. Burial will be in Delavin, Wis., the birthplace of the widow, Winifred.

Survivors also include the parents, Joseph and Hannah Mellin, and a nephew, Robert Holmes Lindstrom.

Television, an Effective Instrument of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, television has grown tremendously during the past number of years. It is a source of entertainment and a medium of knowledge. The educators have not utilized this medium to its full extent and the airways should be employed in the great task of education. One facet of the problem is the teaching of the English language to nationality groups who do not speak English. In our town, especially in my congressional district, there are many groups speaking two languages and a large percentage of the population speaks only the foreign language. The influx of Puerto Ricans to America has accentuated the problem. A summary of the facts on New York City Spanish-speaking people will prove illuminating and interesting.

There are an estimated 900,000 Spanish-speaking people in New York—about half the population of Madrid, Spain. Some 700,000 of these are Puerto Rican. Cubans, estimated at 100,000, comprise the second largest group. Of the 725,235 pupils enrolled in elementary and junior high schools in New York last September, 101,671 were Puerto Ricans. Of the 45,000 attending adult education classes in the evening last March, 11,000 were Puerto Ricans.

A total of 80,563 pupils in New York schools (including high schools) as of last October, were classified as non-English speaking. These ranged from pupils unable to spak any English to those who could speak English well enough for most situations, but still had to make a conscious effort to avoid the forms of some foreign language. School officials said Spanish-speaking pupils were preponderant in the total.

Spanish is spoken in almost all Puerto Rican homes, but over 50 percent of these are reported to be bilingual. There is an average of 5.1 persons per Puerto Rican family. The Puerto Rican population is a young population; about one-third of the Puerto Ricans are under 10 years, over half are under 24 years, and two-thirds are under 35 years. The Puerto Rican labor force is estimated at 260,000. About 50,000 are employed in the garment industry, 25,000 in the restaurant and hotel business, and about 15,000 in the laundry business. About 73 percent of Spanish-speaking families read a Spanish newspaper exclusively and 14 percent read English and Spanish newspapers. Approximately 79 percent of Spanish-speaking families own television sets, and virtually 100 percent own radios.

One of the television channels has initiated a program to help New York's Spanish-speaking population to learn English through a new daily morning series called Aqui Se Habla Ingles.

I commend the television station WRCA-TV, which has initiated its program on channel 4.

New York's vast Spanish-speaking population—including an estimated 700,000 Puerto Ricans alone—will be aided by television in the task of breaking the language barrier. Next week station WRCA-TV, flagship station of the National Broadcasting Co., will launch a new daily program which, by teaching English and encouraging its regular use among Spanish-speaking New Yorkers, is designed to speed the assimilation of these citizens into the community.

Titled "Aquí Se Habla Inglés"—English spoken here—and presented in cooperation with Harvard University's language research center and the Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the new program will be seen on channel 4 Monday through Friday from 6:30 to 7 a. m., beginning Monday, August 11.

In announcing the series, William N. Davidson, general manager of WRCA-TV said: "The early time period enables us to put this program on the air without disrupting our present schedule, which, of course, is geared to the majority of viewers. Happily, however, our research indicates that this period will accommodate a great segment of the specialized audience we are trying to help. The majority of Spanish-speaking residents perform labor that requires them to rise very early or retire very late, and in both cases they will be able to fit the new program conveniently into their daily routine.

Aquí Se Habla Inglés will be hosted by Jose Roman, a native of Puerto Rico who came to New York 5 years ago and is now labor editor of the Spanish-language newspaper El Diario de Nueva York. Mr. Roman, who is well-known to Spanish-speaking New Yorkers for his Spanish language program, What's Your Problem, on radio station WHOM, will open the program each morning with a brief bilingual roundup of news of particular interest to Spanish-speaking persons. Then he will introduce the program's English instructor, Clara Barbeito.

Miss Barbeito, a teacher, author, and editor with the McGraw-Hill Book Co. foreign department, will begin instruction with the day's vocabulary—a list of English words, many of which relate to a specific topic to be discussed by Jose Roman later in the program. After vocabulary, viewers will watch an English-language training film produced by the Harvard University Language Research Center. Combining animated cartoons and real-life sequences, the films are designed to teach phrases and short sentences while also increasing basic vocabulary.

As added incentive for viewers to build a greater working English vocabulary, and to provide a greater sense of participation, the program will feature a daily word game. To play the game, viewers must identify in English a number of household objects shown each morning on the program. When listed correctly, and in the sequence shown, the first letters of each object will spell out a Spanish word. The viewer submits his list of words, plus the English translation of the key Spanish word, and if correct, will receive a prize.

At the conclusion of the word game, program host Jose Roman will speak in English only, on a topic of special interest to Spanish-speaking New Yorkers. These daily topics will cover such subjects as the New York City rent clinics, where they are, what they do, and how they operate; job opportunities in New York, how to apply and requirements necessary; educational opportunities for adults, where and how to register for them, as well as mainland American customs and culture.

Aquí Se Habla Inglés will be produced by Miss Pat Farrar of the WRCA-TV Public Affairs Department, and will be directed by Mike Garguilo.

The Sherman Adams Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Lexington Herald, Lexing-

ton, Ky., relating to the Sherman Adams case:

[From the Lexington Herald of Thursday, June 26, 1958]

AS ACTOR, ADAMS WAS NO NIXON

Vice President NIXON has advised his fellow Republicans not to panic because of the Sherman Adams case. And in advising his party's leaders to wait out the storm, occasioned by disclosures of Adams' acceptance of gifts, NIXON was speaking as a politician who has weathered such a storm, and with flying colors.

In 1952, NIXON admitted the acceptance of gifts of money amounting to more than $18,000 while he served as a Member of the United States Senate. The money was given to him after he was elected to the Senate and before he was nominated as a candidate for Vice President in 1952. NIXON apologists, including the Lexington Leader, sometimes explain away the NIXON acceptance of money by saying that it was for campaign purposes. They forget, of course, that NIXON wasn't running for any kind of office during the time that he received the money.

Supposedly, the money paid to NIXON by a group of Californians engaged in the real estate, oil, banking, and allied interests was to help pay his office expenses. An audit showed that a good part of the money went to pay travel, hotel, and communication expenses incurred by NIXON as a United States Senator. More than $5,000 was spent by NIXON for other expenses, which he ordinarily would have had to pay for himself. Thus the money served to supplement NIXON'S salary as a Senator, and it was paid by a group of persons who could have had some vested interest in Federal legislation at the time.

When a New York newspaper uncovered the NIXON fund in 1952, the then vice presidential candidate put on a melodramatic television performance in which he referred to Democratic mink coats and almost everything except the $18,000 gift. He certainly did hint that the gift made it a little easier perhaps for him to make the downpayment on a $45,000 house which he bought after being elected Senator.

GOP leaders no doubt wish that Sherman Adams could have been as adroit as NIXON in explaining away the Goldfine gifts. Adams was a cold performer in his appearance before the Harris subcommittee, and his confession act didn't click as the producers had hoped. His histrionic ineptitude no doubt means that President Eisenhower eventually will have to get a new "chief of staff" and that the country will, to some extent, get a new President.

[The Lexington Herald of Monday, June 30, 1958]

PART OF YOUR CONGRESSMAN'S JOB

Congressmen, since the meeting of the first session after formation of the Union, have been called upon for favors by the folk "back home." It is just part of their job and has been so accepted through the years. Therefore, it is somewhat surprising to read where some of the defenders of Sherman Adams try to cast doubt as to the wisdom or propriety of such congressional acts, and seek to place these congressional contacts with Federal agencies on an equal footing with those made by the Presidential assistant in behalf of his friend, Bernard Goldfine.

These columnists, among whom David Lawrence is the most outspoken, endeavor to make it appear that Congressmen who take up matters with Federal agencies in behalf of constituents are violating some code or regulation. Again we say, this is part of the Congressmen's job and they soon will find that the folk back home are not interested in returning them to Washington if they don't heed their inquiries. The point the writers seem to miss—if they are not purposely trying to evade the issue in order to protect Mr. Adams—is that these requests from the home district are not accompanied by lavish gifts.

Congressmen exert influence and there is no denying the fact that when they call upon a Federal agency for a report that the agency responds promptly—perhaps a little more readily than it would if the request came direct from the voter back home. Requests from Senators probably merit a little speedier action than those from Representatives. Requests from high officials, especially those in the executive branch, undoubtedly get speedier action than those from Senators. The "weight" implied in such requests varies according to the rank of the official making the request.

A Congressman handles hundreds, many of them thousands, of such calls in the course of a year. If he decides he isn't interested in returning to Washington all he has to do is to begin ignoring these calls. Few expect or receive anything other than pledges of support for such services. Few, if any receive vicuna overcoats (even $200 ones, the price to which David Lawrence now ascribes the $700 Adams gift) $2,500 hotel bills or $2,500 oriental rugs, on loan. If you want to ask your Congressman for some favor don't be frightened by all this talk. Just don't send him anything for this service. You may embarrass him.

Report on the 2d Session of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report to the people of Tennessee on the activities of Congress during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. It has been a most active session during which we have considered extremely important legislation. In my estimation, the Congress has fulfilled its responsibility to act in the public interest in almost every instance. Many of the bills considered here have been of direct concern to the people of my State and I want them to know of our efforts.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: Now that Congress is approaching adjournment, I want to write you about some of my impressions of this second session. And I also want to take this opportunity to thank you for the comments, observations and recommendations many of you submitted which have been so helpful to me in these past months.

TO MEET NEEDS OF NEW SPACE AGE

The 85th Congress was the first to be faced with the challenges of the space age, heralded by the launching of the satellites now circling above the earth. To meet the demands of this new era we are entering the Congress has responded by passing considerable major legislation which I feel was vitally necessary to guarantee our security and enable us to prepare adequately for our ever-enlarging responsibilities.

For example, I strongly supported the passage of the defense reorganization plan, so clearly called for by the new needs of the space age in military and strategic planning. This act clarifies the chain of command, especially as it relates to the authority of the Secretary of Defense over the military departments, and it increases the size of the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to facilitate strategic planning. A new position of Director of Defense Research and Engineering was created by the act, which also contains many other provisions designed to define powers and functions within the Department of Defense. As a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I took an active role in the passage of this act, which should eliminate much of the wasteful competition between the services and make the entire defense organization and readiness of the Nation more adequate.

Another move to meet the challenge of this era was made by Congress in creating a new agency to deal specifically with the development of a comprehensive program of research and operations in aeronautical and space sciences. The newly created National Aeronautics and Space Administration is to be a civilian controlled body dealing with the problems of space flight and the development of aircraft, missiles, and other space vehicles. This is indeed a dramatic step into the future.

DEFENSE PROGRAM

Congress further responded to the critical military problems by appropriating a record amount during peacetime for our defense. It became apparent to most of us that we were woefully weak in many areas of defense. As a member of the Special Defense Preparedness Subcommittee which investigated our military posture early in this session I became aware of a serious need for stepped-up defense activity. The budget for military affairs was designed to accomplish that task.

We also followed the recommendations of the Cordiner Commission by raising the pay rates a minimum of 6 percent for almost all military personnel with over 2 years of service—a measure which should serve to attract and retain the capable men needed to staff our Armed Forces.

Meanwhile, I have been encouraging passage of the national defense education bill, which provides for a Federal scholarship and loan program to aid talented students to continue their education. This bill would also grant money to State agencies to facilitate the improvement of science, mathematics, and language teaching. I feel that this is a very much-needed program, but I want to assure you that it involves no Federal infringement on local control of education. A modified form of this bill has passed the House and I am hopeful that the Senate will act favorably on it before this session adjourns.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND MUTUAL SECURITY

In the field of foreign affairs, we passed two extremely important bills to which I gave my full support. The troubles in Latin America and the crisis in the Middle East underlined the vital need for full authorization of the mutual security program. The military and economic support provided under this act is one part of our attempt to meet the challenge of Russia's determination to wage wars of economic aggression combined with political subversion. This challenge also pointed out the need for an effective program for reducing barriers to trade. It is to the credit of Congress, I think, that a reciprocal trade program was renewed in the national interest. Expanding international trade promotes the best interests of our own country and advances the welfare and security of the free nations of the world. To achieve this end I gave my support and

vote to the bill which successfully extended the Trade Agreements Act.

Another steppingstone to international peace and security was the passage by the Senate of a resolution supporting the creation of an expanded and more effective United Nations police force. In supporting this resolution it was my feeling that we must do everything possible to strengthen this vital agency which has done so much to promote the peaceful solution of our international problems.

COMBATING THE RECESSION

On the domestic scene, too, the second session of the 85th Congress faced important issues. Foremost among these was the recession. I proposed or supported several measures designed to stimulate business, restore consumer confidence and inject new stimuli into the economy. One bill which I cosponsored is known as the Community Facilities Act. This act would expand the eligibility of projects for public facility loans under the Housing Act. It is designed to accelerate local public works programs, not by the old PWA approach, but through expanding the capacity of local agencies of government to undertake projects through Federal loans. Such a program would be much faster than a Federal public works program and would not run up the huge Federal debt. This bill passed the Senate but unfortunately did not receive the approval of the House of Representatives. It is my sincere hope that this bill will receive the earliest possible reconsideration and passage in the next session of Congress.

Another important antirecession measure was the law which authorizes loans to States that wish to extend their unemployment benefit programs to persons who have exhausted their jobless pay. I sponsored a bill which would have enlarged the benefits considerably and extended them over a longer period of time, but unfortunately it was not accepted. I of course supported and voted for the bill that did pass.

Other proposals met with more complete success. These included the passage of a major housing bill—which the President reluctantly signed—to put new life into the construction industry. We felt that the stimulation of housing was especially important because it does not take that industry long to tool up and get started, and furthermore, it touches almost every community in the country and stimulates many related businesses as well. An emergency housing bill was the first antirecession measure passed in 1958 and was followed by passage in the Senate of an omnibus housing bill. This latter measure, I fear, may never get through the House of Representatives owing to the lateness of the session.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

During this session we also passed a bill stepping up the great Federal-aid highway program. By accelerating the road construction of this 41,000-mile system it is hoped that resultant demands for both men and materials will boost the economy. Under the same principle we have urged the various Government departments, especially the Department of Defense to which most of the money goes, to step up purchases and contracts for which money had previously been appropriated.

ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

Much of my work this session has involved the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. Along with the problem of the recession, our chief domestic problem has continued to be inflation. I have continued to conduct hearings designed to determine monopoly influence on the inflationary spiral, especially with respect to administered prices. For a long time, by speeches on the floor of the Senate and by writing the President, I have urged a voluntary labor-management wage-price control program to avert the increase in steel prices, which will probably cause another round of inflation, depress the economy, further lower production, and add to unemployment. Since the recent steel-price increase, the committee has recommended again that the President exert strong leadership to maintain the price line. As yet he has done very little. This problem is extremely serious for both the public and the Government, and you may be assured that I will continue to work toward its solution, for what I consider to be the best interests of the Nation.

I have also sponsored a bill to restrict unlawful price discriminations. The heart of this bill states that in effect a company cannot sell to retailers in the same market area at two different prices if the end result is a lessening of competition. The passage of this bill is considered a matter of economic life or death by thousands of small-business men.

As the best anti-inflationary measure at this point, I advocated a straight across-the-board price cut at all levels—manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing. If business were sufficiently stimulated by such a reduction, increased production would more than make up for the reduction in prices, and there would be no marked reduction in business profits.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Other major legislation of interest includes our activities in the labor field. We have responded to the disclosures of corruption and abused trust and power in some unions by enacting measures which are in the interest of both labor and the public. No one is completely satisfied with these bills since opinions differ widely on the remedies required, but these bills have gone a long way in meeting the recommendations of the McClellan committee which has been digging into these abuses. Both Houses have approved a bill which requires managers of employee welfare funds to register these funds with the Department of Labor. In addition, they would be required to make annual financial reports and disclose the funds' financial transactions to the public. The Senate has also passed a bill providing for the regulation of union elections and requiring union officers to file financial, organizational and trusteeship information with the Secretary of Labor. This bill contains provisions for greater protection of the rights of individual workers, the public, management and unions in their labor-management relations. We are hopeful that this may receive House action this session.

RAILROADS

As you know, our railroads have been suffering severe economic reverses in recent years. Many are on the verge of bankruptcy. The Congress recognized the importance of a strong communication and transportation system by passing a Transportation Act which provides some tax relief and financial and operational assistance to the railroads. I strongly supported these measures and feel that the railroads will be restored to sound financial condition.

THE 49TH STATE ADMITTED

I am sure that all of you are happy with me to welcome into our Union the 49th State of Alaska. For many years I have sponsored and actively supported the admission of Alaska, which is truly deserving of statehood. You may be interested to note that Alaska followed what is known as the Tennessee plan in electing two Senators who then petitioned Congress for admission. Tennessee had done the same thing just prior to its admission in 1796.

Also approved this session was another overdue measure which provided an average 10.1 percent increase in pay for all classified Government workers: white-collar workers in TVA, AEC, DIA, and other nonclassified agencies, including postal employees.

OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO TENNESSEANS

One of the most important pieces of legislation, especially for Tennesseans, was the farm bill. Three attempts have been made in 1958 to write either basic or emergency farm legislation. The latest bill, which passed the Senate last month, provided farmers the choice of reductions in price supports and eased production controls on cotton, or the present price-support program. It also contained provisions relating to corn, feed grains, and rice. I was certainly not fully satisfied with this bill, but I supported it chiefly because of the emergency situation in cotton, and in consideration of the President's vetoes of previous farm bills. It is still not clear whether the House will act on farm legislation this session, but I am hopeful that it will.

On the brighter side, I am glad to report that 25 counties in west and middle Tennessee were declared eligible to receive Farmers Home Administration emergency loans under a law passed this year. This law authorizes credit measures to meet emergency needs of farmers and small business due to excessive rainfall.

In the last session of Congress the Senate passed a good and workable self-financing law for the TVA—a piece of must legislation. We are still anticipating House approval of this bill which would relieve TVA of the annual fight for appropriations, and will permit the planning of its power expansion on a much sounder basis. Incidentally specific appropriations of interest to Tennesseans included almost a million dollars for Cheatham lock and dam, over $10 million for Barkley Dam, and planning money for an important project at Melton Dam, just to mention some highlights. The Memphis Harbor project, for which $550,000 was allocated, has now received funds for its completion.

Last the President vetoed the important appropriations bill which included the Memphis Federal Building and other matters of interest to our State. These were not among the provisions to which he objected, however, and I am confident that these appropriations will be approved this session.

Other construction authorized included 13 new armories and other military installations in various localities throughout the State. There was also authorized a new metals and ceramics building at Oak Ridge which will greatly facilitate our research in atomic energy. I am very hopeful that funds will be forthcoming for the construction of that building as well as for a permanent research building at Oak Ridge which was authorized in 1957.

For some time I have tried to prevent the closing of Mallory Air Force Base at Memphis. The Air Force, however, has decided to close that installation. I am endeavoring, and I am confident that I will be successful, to obtain funds for the modification of the Memphis General Depot in order that the Air Force motor vehicle function can be relocated there. The Air Force is supporting my efforts and they agree that it would be detrimental to the Air Force operations to have this very efficient management team broken up by relocation.

The omnibus judgeship bill, which authorizes three new Federal judges for Tennessee, has not yet been reported from the Judiciary Committee. A bill authorizing 1 new judgeship each for the 3 grand divisions of Tennessee passed the Senate last year but failed in the House. Owing to the lateness of the session, it is doubtful that it will be enacted this year although I have stressed the need for additional judges over and over again.

This has been a most sketchy outline, indeed, but perhaps from these highlights it may be seen that this 2d session of the 85th Congress has been exceptionally busy one, despite its several disappointments. This

has been my 20th year as a Member of Congress and never in my experience have the challenges been greater than now, as we dramatically enter this new era, beset by the serious domestic and crucial foreign problems which call for responsibility, vision, and imagination.

If you desire more detailed information write to me in Washington.

I want to again express my appreciation for all the letters and suggestions I have received during the course of this session. Be assured that I will welcome your continuing interest and recommendations for the new legislative session beginning next January.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator.

The United States Helped Arab Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Near East Report, a Washington letter on American policy in the Near East, in its August 1, 1958, issue contained an article headed: "The United States Helped Arab Nationalism." This article appears to me to portray the United States as the one country which has aided Arab nationalism instead of the United States being portrayed as the villain or enemy of Arab nationalism. It seems singularly appropriate at this time, when there is so much ferment in the Near East, that the historical background of the area be presented to the Members of the House; and I therefore request that it be printed in the RECORD:

ANALYSIS: THE UNITED STATES HELPED ARAB NATIONALISM

It is difficult for the United States to come to terms with Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser because he does not really want to come to terms with the West. He profits by his anti-westernism. He gains popular acclaim by portraying America as the villain, the enemy of nationalism, the ally of the conservative past, and the exploiter of the fellahin.

To this indictment, America owes neither assent nor apology.

The truth is that Arab nationalism is indebted to the United States. For if our country had not entered World War I in 1917, thus insuring the victory of the Allies, and if President Wilson had not insisted on self-determination for all peoples, the Ottoman Empire would have survived and the eight independent Arab states would not have come into existence.

Few Arab nationalists today will acknowledge the decisive United States role in restoring Arab independence, and if they are reminded of it they will insist that the United States then forfeited Arab friendship by supporting the creation of the State of Israel. Since the great majority of the nations of the world, including the U. S. S. R. as well as the United States, joined at the U. N. in recommending the establishment of Israel, it is always a mystery why the United States should be singled out by Arabs for special responsibility.

Conversely, since the United Kingdom alone among the great powers refused to support and implement the U. N. decision, it is a mystery why this pro-Arab attitude did not endear the British to the Arab world.

But the fraudulent character of this propaganda is best exposed by the forgotten fact that the pioneer Arab nationalists who led the desert revolt were so eager for independence and so grateful to the West for assistance in driving out the Turks that they did not begrudge Palestine to the Jews.

THEY ACCEPTED ZIONISM

The romantic leader of the Arab awakening, Lawrence of Arabia, accepted Zionism and believed it would benefit the Arabs.

The diplomatic literature of the period documents Arab acquiescence.

On January 3, 1919, with Lawrence as intermediary, the Emir Feisal, grandfather of the youthful king who was murdered in the Baghdad coup last July 14, signed an agreement with Dr. Chaim Weizmann by the terms of which the Arab Kingdom of the Hejaz accepted the Balfour Declaration. Two months later, Feisal wrote to Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was then representing the Zionist organization:

"We Arabs, especially the educated among us, look with sympathy on the Zionist movement. * * * We will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home."

Thus, the British Royal Commission, in the historic 1937 report declared:

"If King Hussein and the Emir Feisal secured their big Arab State, they would concede little Palestine to the Jews."

Indeed, there was every reason for the Arabs to accept the Balfour Declaration which promised Palestine fully to the Jews because that declaration helped win World War I and helped the Arabs themselves to liberation. It may sound odd to today's Arab nationalists, but Arab nationalism literally owed a debt to Zionism.

Thus, the British Royal Commission wrote in 1937:

"The fact that the Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917 in order to enlist Jewish support for the Allies and the fact that this support was forthcoming are not sufficiently appreciated in Palestine. The Arabs do not appear to realize in the first place that the present position of the Arab world as a whole is mainly due to the great sacrifices made by the Allied and Associated Powers in the war, and, secondly, that insofar as the Balfour Declaration helped to bring about the Allies' victory, it helped to bring about the emancipation of all the Arab countries from Turkish rule. If the Turks and their German allies had won the war, it is improbable that all the Arab countries except Palestine, would now have become or be about to become independent states."

ARAB RESISTANCE

Arab hopes for complete and swift independence were frustrated by both the British and the French. Feisal himself was ejected from the Syrian throne. Inside Palestine, Arab extremists resisted the implementation of the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations mandate with riots and strikes. With this, there began a long and tragic period of vacillation and appeasement, during which Jewish rights to Palestine were whittled down by the mandatory power.

The first partition in 1922 severed Transjordan from Palestine to provide a throne for Abdullah, as a consolation to wounded Arab pride. (One wonders whether Churchill would do it today.) Finally, by 1939, the promise to the Jews was virtually nullified by the Palestine white paper, which all but closed Palestine's doors to Jewish immigration and doomed uncounted numbers of Jews to death in Hitler's gas chambers and concentration camps.

(History has a curious way of repeating itself. In a first reaction to the anti-western coup in Baghdad, Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, offered a 1958 white paper. He took the Senate floor to urge cutting down Jewish immigration into Israel by striking at American Jewish philanthropic support for refugee resettlement. How does Senator FLANDERS reconcile his argument that American Jewish aid to Israel has caused Arab resentment with the impressive fact that West Germany has never suffered any setback in its growing relations with the Arab States, even though it is pouring almost a billion dollars into Israel for reparations?)

Despite its early disappointments, Arab nationalism overcame obstacles as the French and British withdrew and Arabs won independence in nine separate Arab States. But one must draw a distinction between the historic nationalism of the Hashemites and the form it takes under Nasser's banner.

Nasser wants to unite—and dominate—the entire Arab world. It is a bizarre twist of history that the great-grandson of Hussein, the leader of the Hejaz revolt, has fallen to assassins who struck him down in the name of Nasser's nationalism.

A true nationalism respects the rights of all people to self-determination, Jews as well as Arabs, Iraqis as well as Egyptians, Lebanese as well as Saudi Arabians. This is consistent with the Wilsonian concept, but the imperialist would erase boundaries he impeaches as artificial and obliterate sovereignties he derides as synthetic.

Those who want to deal with Nasser must ask whether they accept the proposition that all Near East states are his rightful legacy and that none are entitled to assistance in defense of their integrity. How can they be sure that the Syrians are resigned to their annexation? Or that Iraq must be written off? Is Arab "unity" an instrument for subjugation?

To embrace Nasserism because we are the friend of Arab nationalism is to say that we must put up with juvenile delinquency because we love our children.

PRESSURE ON ISRAEL

Although Israel is now one of the few Near East states firmly committed to the West and, despite its size, a redoubtable source of strength for the free world, Arab propagandists have now opened an all-out campaign to make her the scapegoat for western reverses. This is an obvious prelude to pressure on Israel to make concessions to the Arabs and thus placate Nasser, a tactic reminiscent of the craven responses of European statesmen to the rise of nazism in the 1930's.

Responsible western statesmen are not likely to collaborate in any such disreputable and perverse program. Yet the mood of panic, engendered by a train of adversity, can lead to suicide pacts.

NURI AS-SAID'S TESTAMENT

This propaganda will gather impetus from an article in Life magazine written by Nuri as-Said before his death. In this "testament," the late Iraq Prime Minister damns Israel for western setbacks and complains that "Americans seem incapable of comprehending the profoundly bitter, even pathological attitude of the Arabs toward the Jews of Israel." He concedes that this is perhaps "an ugly thing but it is basic to the seeming Arab compulsion to flirt with suicide."

Yet neither the creation of Israel nor its policies figured in the pro-Nasser coup in Iraq or the siege of Lebanon. Neither Israel nor Zionism was an issue. The pro-Nasser campaigns in both countries are assaults—not on Zionism or Israel—but on Western imperialism, military moves in the overall struggle of totalitarianism against democracy.

In his youth Nuri as-Said, like his fellow nationalists, Lawrence and Feisal, was ready at Paris in 1919 to accept a Jewish Palestine. But that has generally been forgotten, and is

later years no Arab leader was more implacable in his persistent demands for concessions to appease the Arabs. Alone among the Arab States, Iraq refused to sign an armistice agreement with Israel. All last year he campaigned in London and Washington demanding slices of Israel to prove that he was a true Arab patriot—not so much because he hated Israel but because he was under attack for his prowestern policies, and he needed anti-Zionism as a shield against the frenetic Cairo radio.

It is the West—not Israel—that is the primary target of Nasser.

WHERE DOES HISTORY BEGIN?

Nevertheless, there are some pundits who are obsessed with the view that if there were no Israel the Near East would be a vast oasis of peace. Invariably these historians begin their chronicle of current developments in 1948 with the establishment of Israel.

One might reply with equal force that Western difficulties in the area began, not with the establishment of Israel, but with the demonstration of the weakness and infirmity of the West when it failed to defend Israel from Arab aggression and subsequently tolerated and condoned the Arabs' refusal to make peace.

Typical of the propagandists who seek to blame Israel is Dorothy Thompson, former head of AFME, who syndicated a bitter attack in her newspaper column on July 26. That column distorts the record and impugns the integrity of former President Harry S. Truman and former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey who, Miss Thompson charges, supported Israel in 1948 because they were vying for votes. One might enter a point-by-point rebuttal but perhaps the best answer to her (and Senator FLANDERS) is written in the passionate words Miss Thompson herself uttered to a huge gathering in Madison Square Garden on March 21, 1944. These are some of the statements Miss Thompson made:

"A people without a homeland of their own is doomed. * * *

"From one end of Europe to another, Jews sit down and weep, aye they weep, because they remember Zion. And I say: Their word should go out through all the earth and their cry to the end of the world. And there should be no speech and language where their voice is not heard.

"The opponents of Zionism are hypocrites. They oppose the Jewish homeland on behalf of the Arabs. Very well, then. What Christian country, however underpopulated, is prepared to receive all who come?

"The brutal truth is that the only spot * * * where * * * Jewish refugees were received * * * as assets and not liabilities—is Palestine. * * * And have they a right to be there?

"To whom anyhow does this earth belong? * * * I have no patience with the argument that Palestine 'belongs' to the Arabs, because they are the original settlers there, which by the way, is very dubious.

"The Near East was once a great center of civilization. * * * Only in our own times could this land be redeemed. * * * But in the whole Near East only one people have done it—and that is the Jews of Zion. * * * They are taking nothing from the Arabs. They are giving the most essential thing there is. * * * For they are saving and recreating the land.

"If all the Jews of Europe should settle in Palestine and its surroundings and do what the original stonebreakers and builders of the soil have done, there would not be fewer and poorer Arabs but more and richer Arabs in the Near East. * * * The earth belongs to its lovers and creators."

Perhaps Governor Dewey listened to her words that night. Perhaps Harry Truman, then a Senator, heard their echoes in Washington. They agreed with her then—as did most Americans who favored the restoration of Israel. Why does she now attempt to discredit their good faith—the sincerity of many other great American leaders—merely because she changed her mind?

WHERE DO WE GO?

But post mortems serve little purpose unless they help answer the question: Where do we go from here? One fact emerges from the foregoing recital. For 40 years the weak thread of appeasement runs unevenly through the fabric of our policy and the slightest stress or strain rips it apart.

The West has never confronted the Arabs of the Near East with the fundamental fact that those who claim rights must discharge their correlative obligations.

The West has tended to excuse and indulge Arab aggression, whether it is directed against Jew or brother Arab, whether it is direct attack or indirect subversion. The Arabs have never been presented with an open challenge which summons them to comply with the U. N. Charter and to make peace.

Little wonder that the Arabs have convinced themselves that Israel can and will be destroyed. This attitude is one of the basic causes of instability in the region.

Nor is there doubt that Israel's danger will grow when the time comes for western forces to withdraw from Lebanon and Jordan. The existing security shield will be gone. Arab hostility will be fanned, for Israel, a symbol of western civilization in the region, will be a special target. It will be the residuary legatee of all the hatred that has been incited against the United States and the United Kingdom in connection with recent troop movements.

It would be logical under the circumstances to fortify Israel both by firm guaranties as well as by material assistance to enable her to strengthen her economy and her defense capacity. Someday the great powers may produce an arms embargo for the Near East, but we are a long way from it, and until that day comes every democratic friend of the West should be equipped to defend itself.

Finally, the United States commitment to Israel should be spelled out in language that is understandable to everyone, including Nasser. We have just extended new commitments to the Baghdad Pact powers. There is no reason why we should hesitate to offer a firm guaranty to Israel. While the United States intervention in Lebanon was obviously reassuring, for it demonstrated that our country is ready to honor its commitments, an explicit guaranty to Israel is needed not merely to reassure the Israelis but to deter Nasser and every other Arab leader. Collective security relies on deterrence as well as intervention. It is the road to peace.

H. R. 9020

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee has brought up H. R. 9020 under suspension of the rules to prevent the amendments which would convert an unsatisfactory and inadequate bill into a bill worthy to be passed by this distinguished body.

If it were not in the closing days of the session, I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Agriculture Committee in this instance. But to vote against it now would undoubtedly kill the bill this year. H. R. 9020 was granted an open rule months ago and could have been properly amended to make it correspond to S. 1356 which was passed by the Senate.

H. R. 9020 will continue a mistake made in 1921 when the Congress was persuaded by the lobbyists for the Big Five meatpackers to allow the packers to escape the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission.

No other segment of the food industry has ever been able to remove itself from FTC control. This has been a tremendous advantage to a few large packers which dominate the meat industry.

The Department of Agriculture has never carried out its responsibility to prevent unfair competition or monopolistic acts in the merchandising of products sold by meatpackers. As a result the two largest companies have been permitted to retain most of the monopoly powers they had established prior to 1920.

In 1947 the Securities Exchange Commission reported that Armour & Co. had more assets than all the independent packers in the United States combined. This was also true for Swift & Co.

Last year Swift sales exceeded $2,500,000,000 and Armour sales amounted to approximately $2 billion. These giant concerns, without effective FTC regulation to prevent unfair competition have been able to injure their small competitors.

This high degree of economic concentration without regulation of trade practices has also worked against the best interests of livestock producers and consumers of meat.

The Department of Agriculture lacks the enforcement staff and the incentive to prevent unfair competition in meat merchandising. The Department works closely with the meatpackers and depends on their cooperation to provide market news information and other important data essential to the Department's programs. Enforcement action against the packers would apparently jeopardize to some extent the friendly relationship that now exists and has always existed between the big packers and the Department of Agriculture.

This relationship undoubtedly explains why the Secretary of Agriculture has not issued a cease-and-desist order against a meatpacker to prevent unfair trade practices in the merchandising of packer products since 1938.

The Senate considered H. R. 9020 as a substitute for the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill, S. 1356. That body properly rejected H. R. 9020 by an overwhelming nonpartisan vote because H. R. 9020 seeks to retain exclusive jurisdiction and control over the wholesaling of meat in the Department of Agriculture.

The Senate bill, on the other hand, would share jurisdiction between the Agriculture Department and the Federal Trade Commission.

I will vote for H. R. 9020 only because legislation is necessary this year and because all logic points to an agreement in the House-Senate conference that would

include concurrent jurisdiction. Any agreement in conference which falls short of concurrent jurisdiction should be emphatically rejected by the House.

Venture for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in these materialistic times, it is heartening to have evidence that other and more lasting values are being considered. On a previous occasion, I inserted in the RECORD an article describing the venture for victory program being conducted by Taylor University, Upland, Ind.

Recently, I received a newsletter reporting on this Christian venture of a group of devoted young men. Under unanimous consent, I include this newsletter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

VENTURE FOR VICTORY NEWSLETTER JULY 24, 1958, SINGAPORE

We had just finished a basketball game in Saigon, the southernmost city of the China Seas and the key and gateway to much of Red China's expansion program, when the news came: "American Marines have landed in Turkey to aid in the Lebanon crisis." Radios and newspapers blared stories, "Is this the beginning of the end?" Tenseness and fear reigned among the people of this Oriental nerve center. There was no peace and security in Saigon—except—in the hearts and lives of those few Christians who knew the peace that passeth understanding through faith in Christ our Lord. Yes, even that night there were some new believers in this war-torn area who knew that what they had experienced within was greater than that about them—even war. Vietnam offered us the challenge to make Christ known in a country that had the least number of Christians of any place we have ever visited. But those that we met, ministered unto our lives even though we had come to bring the good news of salvation to those who had not yet heard or believed. Highlight of the work here was with the Army of Vietnam and a special game against the American Army team with an opportunity to preach to the officers and men stationed in Saigon. The attendance and decisions were not impressive in numbers, but each member left feeling God's blessing upon those few precious days in Vietnam.

Singapore has a Communist mayor. Over half the population is under 25 years of age. It is the most cosmopolitan city we have ever visited. Tonight in the service we had Chinese, Malayan, Dutch, Germans, Syrians, Jews, Indians, British, Eurasians, Indonesians, and Americans. What is there about this man Christ that could be such a common denominator for this group as well as their Savior? This answer can only be found in His love, His power, and His concern for us. Two young Buddhists came to the Lord; also a Chinese scholar, a clerk, a public accountant, etc. This has all come to pass because you have prayed for a group of basketball players and the Lord has guided and blessed their testimonies. One rule we saw displayed for young Communists was this: "Be untiring in your exhortations." The team members have had a combined total of 50 meetings plus 14 ball games in 10 days. When we prayed with one young man at 12:30 a. m., we saw the blessings of untiring exhortation of His word.

Here in Singapore we are playing in the Happy World. It is a big amusement park and adjoining the stadium is a huge taxi dance where hoodlums and prostitutes hang out. Many of the Christians will not come to this area. We have not refused to play here because this is the area where the Gospel is needed. These people would never go to a church * * * this is definitely reaching the unreached. I cannot imagine Christ not talking to the woman at the well. When we saw many of these youth at the decision meeting following the game * * * His words "neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more," were real again.

Now we are on our way to Kuala Lumper in the Malaya Federation. It is positively against the law here to witness or preach to a Moslem. For the first time in history they have waived this law in the stadium when the basketball team presents its halftime program. Unusual opportunities, challenging people—again a great and effectual door has been opened. We believe that His word will not return void but will accomplish the purpose wherefore it is sent.

The team has played 52 games and last night beat the best in Singapore 100–55. The total attendance is approaching 200,000 and every boy is well and busy with his responsibilities. Today at noon I addressed the Singapore Rotary Club with 200 men (including two Ambassadors) present representing 24 countries. One was from Japan and the other from East Germany. One stated to me, "The sincerity of your message assures me that there is still hope." This hope is not in bombs, not in education, but in Him who said, "My peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." This is the message being given forth by the Venture for Victory basketball team * * * we are your ambassadors of peace here in the Orient—playing, preaching, praying for His peace to reign in the hearts of men. * * *

For the cause of causes.

DON J. ODLE,
Director, Venture for Victory.

Psychopolitics, the Basic Communist Tactic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include two additional articles by that great patriot, George Todt, of the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times. These articles outline the basic Communist tactic, psychopolitics, and should awaken all America to this grave threat.

[From the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times of Wednesday, July 30, 1958]

HOW COMMUNISTS EXPANDED

"There is treachery, O Ahaziah."—II Kings IX: 23.

The balance of an infamous address made by Beria to American traitors at Lenin University in 1936, as reported by ex-Communist Kenneth Goff in his book Brainwashing which was commenced in this column yesterday, concludes as follows:

"Psychopolitics is a solemn charge. With it you can erase our enemies as insects. You can cripple the efficiency of leaders by striking insanity into their families through the use of drugs. You can wipe them away with testimony as to their insanity. By our technologies you can even bring about insanity itself when they seem too resistive.

"You can change their loyalties by psychopolitics. Given a short time with a psychopolitician you can alter forever the loyalty of a soldier in our hands or a statesman or a leader in his own country, or you can destroy his mind.

"However, you labor under certain dangers. It may happen that remedies for our treatments may be discovered. It may happen that a public hue and cry may arise against mental healing. It may thus occur that all mental healing might be placed in the hands of ministers and be taken out of the hands of our psychologists and psychiatrists. But the capitalistic thirst for control, capitalistic inhumanity and a general public terror of insanity can be brought to guard against these things.

"But should they occur, should independent researchers actually discover means to undo psychopolitical procedures, you must not rest, you must not eat or sleep, you must not stint one tinest bit of available money to campaign against it, discredit it, strike it down, and render it void. For by an effective means all our actions and researches could be undone.

"In a capitalistic state you are aided on all sides by the corruption of the philosophy of man and the times. You will discover that everything will aid you in your campaign to seize, control, and use all mental healing to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their own borders.

"Use the courts, use the judges, use the Constitution of the country, use its medical societies and its laws to further our ends. Do not stint in your labor in this direction. And when you have succeeded you will discover that you can now effect your own legislation at will and you can, by careful organization of healing societies, by constant campaign about the terrors of society, by pretense as to your effectiveness make your capitalist himself, by his own appropriations, finance a large portion of the quiet Communist conquest of the Nation.

"By psychopolitics create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies. And bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known. Thank you."

That's what the man said. I will leave it to my readers to determine how prophetic some of his words may have turned out to be by this time. Incredible, isn't it?

However, students of contemporary history need look no further back into the pages turned by old father time than the military debacles of such erstwhile strong nations as France in 1940 and China in 1948 to see the fatal effects of quisling penetration in modern and machiavellian Trojan horse operations by 20th century exponents of the art of total war.

Never before has any alien philosophy of human mistreatment gained so much land and population for itself at such a low price as has the imperialistic Soviet Empire—almost without firing a shot as it were. How have the barbaric and inhuman Communists managed to succeed beyond their wildest dreams in the beginning? Who would ever have dreamed that the nondescript band of human scavengers, which took over mother Russia in 1917 would dominate nearly half the world just 40 years later? And hold the balance of mankind in terror at the same moment?

What has happened to us?

The only honest answer to this pertinent question must lie in the persistent methods of infiltration used against us by the atheistic and amoral Communist hordes. They have not beaten us to any large extent upon

the field of battle, so the answer has to lie elsewhere. We might as well face it: they have somehow very cunningly managed to infiltrate themselves, to our vast detriment, within the highest levels of Government and internal affairs.

That this happened to the United States in World War II is documented in Elizabeth Churchill Brown's famous book, The Enemy at His Back, a Bookmailer publication. Like Goff, Mrs. Brown—who is the writer-wife of columnist Constantine Brown, incidentally—evinces no naive surprise that our Government and most-prized institutions are the serious objects of Communist espionage and infiltration. Just the contrary. What is truly amazing is the typical American reaction that such things can't happen here. Cloak-and-dagger stuff, you know.

What do you think your reaction might be after reading these two eye-opening books for yourself? Why not try it and find out?

[From the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times of July 30, 1958]

'PSYCHOPOLITICS' OF THE COMMUNISTS

"As saith the proverb of the Ancients, Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked."—I Samuel, XXIV. 13.

"The stupidity and narrowness of nations not blessed with Russian reasoning," says the official U. S. S. R. textbook on psychopolitics, "has caused them to rely upon practices which are, today, too ancient and outmoded for the heroic pace of our time. And in view of the tremendous advance of Russian culture in the field of mental technologies, begun with the glorious work of Pavlov and carried forward so ably by later Russians, it would be strange that an art and science would not evolve totally devoted to the alining of loyalties and extracting the obedience of individuals and multitudes.

"Thus we see that psychopolitical procedures are a natural outgrowth of practices as old as man, practices which are current in every group of men throughout the world. Thus, in psychological procedures, there is no ethical problem, since it is obvious and evident that man is always coerced against his will to the greater good of the State, whether by economic means or indoctrination into the wishes and desires of the State.

"Basically, man is an animal. He is an animal which has been given a civilized veneer. Man is a collective animal, grouped together for his own protection before the threat of the environment. Those who so group and control him must then have in their possession specialized techniques to direct the vagaries and energies of the animal man toward greater efficiency in the accomplishment of the goals of the State.

"Psychopolitics, in one form or another, has long been used in Russia, but the subject is all but unknown outside the borders of our Nation, save only where we have carefully transplanted our information and where it is used for the greater good of the Nation.

"The definition of psychopolitics follows:

"Psychopolitics is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the conquest of enemy nations through mental healing. • • •

"The strength and power of psychopolitics cannot be overestimated, particularly when used in a nation decayed by pseudointellectualism, where exploitation of the masses combines readily with psychopolitical actions, and particularly where the greed of capitalistic or monarchial regimes has already brought about an overwhelming incidence of neurosis which can be employed as the groundwork for psychopolitical action and a psychopolitical corps.

"It is part of your mission, student, to prevent psychopolitical activity to the detriment of the Russian state, just as it is your mission to carry forward in our Nation and outside it, if you are so assigned, the missions and goals of psychopolitics."

Elsewhere in this arresting book, I found such quotations from Bolshevik sources as the following:

"In this time of unlimited weapons, and in national antagonisms, where atomic war with capitalistic powers is possible, psychopolitics must act efficiently as never before.

"Any and all programs of psychopolitics must be increased to aid and abet the activities of other Communist agents throughout the nation in question.

"The failure of psychopolitics might well bring about the atomic bombing of the motherland.

"If psychopolitics succeeds in its mission throughout the capitalistic nations of the world, there will never be an atomic war, for Russia will have subjugated all her enemies.

"Communism has already spread across one-sixth of the inhabited world. Marxist doctrines have already penetrated the remainder. An extension of the Communist social order is everywhere victorious. The spread of communism has never been by force of battle, but by conquest of the mind. In psychopolitics we have refined this conquest to its last degree.

"The psychopolitical operative must succeed for his success means a world of peace. His failure might well mean the destruction of the civilized portions of Earth by atomic power in the hands of capitalistic madmen.

"The end thoroughly justifies the means. The degradation of populaces is less inhuman than their destruction by atomic fission, for to an animal who lives only once, any life is sweeter than death.

"The end of war is the control of a conquered people. If a people can be conquered in the absence of war, the end of war will have been achieved without the destruction of war. A worthy goal.

"The psychopolitician has his reward in the nearly unlimited control of populaces, in the uninhibited exercise of passion, and the glory of the Communist conquest over the stupidity of the enemies of the people."

I have quoted the above at length because I believe that no American citizen can reveal more effectively to his countrymen as to the nature of their enemy and just what they are facing presently on the world stage—and perhaps here at home as well—than the words which have emanated from the Russians themselves in this case.

This revealing insight comes at an appropriate moment—just as we are about to be hurled into a new summit conference with the masters of psychopolitics. Can we trust them?

News of the "Nautilus" Is Needed Sedation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, coming at a time when the nerves of this Nation are frayed from the harangue of those who are so committed to the belief that all is wrong with the United States, that we are outdistanced and outclassed by our potential enemies; the news, I should say the greatest news in these cold war years, of the *Nautilus* opens a new era, should give great confidence and hope to all Americans. Greater than the Russian sputnik, yes; militarily much greater; possibilities unlimited, yes; perhaps, these and other similar superlatives fill the air in Washington and throughout the Nation. This, truly is good news. It is music to our tired and tender ears. This great news causes us to even hope that our critical friends, those "wavering Willies," those who are so bent on taking the administration to task about our lack of positive leadership today, and then to praising Soviet Russia tomorrow, may even quiet for a spell. It has puzzled many of us just how intelligent people could pose as opposing communism with one hand, and praising Soviet Russia with the other, could hope to make friends and influence people. Yet, for days, months, yes, and weary years this seems to be what has been happening. Boldly declaiming against communism, then following through by belittling everything that is American, and showing up the greatness of Soviet Russia, and expecting that our people, the products of our decadent capitalism and our outmoded American school system are falling so rapidly and so disastrously behind Russia; and apparently feeling that they would be accepted as true advocates of freedom and the rights of little people.

I am thinking today how early in the administration of President Eisenhower they insisted on what we then termed a "One hundred and thirty wing Air Force." That was when we used the old conventional World War II type planes. This same criticism of falling behind in our defenses was used. Suppose we had followed their thinking and stockpiled planes of that vintage. What value would they be today? Then later they pressured for us to try to match Russia sub-for-sub in the old-type submarine. Had we done this, what value would those old, clumsy, slow, only able to submerge for a few hours and limited mileage be worth to us today? Now we are told, as of this time, perhaps 20 vessels like the *Nautilus*, ready and waiting under the ice cap, would enable us to keep the peace of the world, with only such other defenses as we have in being today. Hail, *Nautilus*, and our highest compliments to those who have made her possible. Hail, also to the administration that has not been panicked by our "wavering Willies," who ostensibly oppose communism while praising Russia; who pose as patriots and at the same time try to discredit and change everything that is traditionally American.

The column, The *Nautilus* Opens a New Era, by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 11, is timely and I believe of interest, and I am pleased to include it herewith:

THE NAUTILUS OPENS A NEW ERA—POLAR FEAT, BARING RUSSIAN HEARTLAND TO MISSILES, SEEN MAJOR UNITED STATES BLOW

(By David Lawrence)

The United States Navy has done it again. It has revolutionized strategic warfare in the world today, as it has done several times in past history.

For while the sputniks whirl around in far-off space, their military value in relation to a precise target still much in doubt, it has been demonstrated that the atom-powered submarine, with its capacity to fire missiles, can become a major deterrent to war itself.

Most people who since school days have become accustomed to remember maps that sparate the hemispheres do not realize that the borders of Soviet Russia lie across the top of the world and are bounded by a stretch of nearly 3,000 miles of the Arctic Ocean which in turn is accessible from both the Atlantic and Pacific sides of North America. This geographical circumstance means that Soviet Russia is now vulnerable to attack by missile-carrying submarines which can fire into her heartland and reach almost any city therein with atomic weapons.

The North Pole, pivotal point for the plane-carrying bombs of the United States Strategic Air Force that can go across the Arctic directly to Soviet Russia, now becomes also the rendezvous of American submarines hiding under the big ice cap in the polar seas.

The latest exploit by the *Nautilus*—which cruised submerged from Hawaii by way of the Bering Sea along the coast of Alaska, then traversed the Arctic under the ice to a point beyond Greenland and, still submerged, headed this week for Great Britain—is startling in its military implications.

Perhaps the best way to understand the tremendous significance militarily of what has just happened is to quote from a copyrighted interview published recently in U. S. News & World Report—cleared by the Navy Department—in which Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, sometimes called the "father of the atomic submarine," said:

"A large number of these missile-carrying nuclear submarines should be kept continuously at sea, submerged anywhere we want—many of them hiding under the Polar ice cap. They would constitute a fleet-in-being ready for immediate use at any time.

"That means that, if anyone declares war on us and actually fires missiles into our country—even if he should manage to destroy the United States—he knows that inevitably he himself will also be destroyed, because we will have these submerged missile-launching bases where he cannot prevent them from firing on him. So this missile-carrying submarine may turn out to be a real deterrent to war."

Admiral Rickover then went on to say:

"Consider the problem from the enemy's point of view. He can do something about missile bases which we or our Allies may have on land. He can sabotage them or overrun them, or he can fire missiles at them. But suppose these bases are somewhere in the ocean? Or hidden under the Polar icecap? How is he going to find them under millions of square miles of polar icecap?"

The Admiral pointed out that the United States has a total of 22 nuclear-powered submarines that either have been built or have been authorized and that the last 3 authorized by Congress will carry Polaris-type 1,500-mile missiles. This is a nonair-breathing rocket which has not yet been fully developed. But the Regulus-type rocket—which is air-breathing and can be fired from submarines surfacing at night—the Admiral said, are operational right now.

Thus seapower—long the bulwark of our offense and defense—joins airpower in the development of strategic concepts which, while designed primarily for use in war, can really serve to maintain world peace. For the history of international behavior has shown that, where one major power or alliance of powers has a military advantage, it can use its potential to secure respect for its words of diplomacy and thereby preserve peace.

America today, by reason of what the *Nautilus* has accomplished, is in a position once more to talk from strength. This deterrent power, emerging in an era of irresponsible dictatorships—which overnight might have pushed the world to the brink of war—can be hailed as an epochal occurrence.

The Untold Story Behind Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the issues of life where many men act and react on the basis of emotion, fear, or hatred, those who urge the counsels of reason, understanding, justice, and law and order frequently find themselves attacked and reviled by the extremists. But their wisdom, integrity, and raw courage in speaking up for those basic processes of a democratic society and of representative government are a part of the cement that holds the American structure of freedom together despite the pressures and strains that assault it.

Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette, which was this year awarded a Pultizer prize for meritorious public service, and who personally received another Pulitzer award for his editorial writing, clearly merits recognition for such service, not only from his journalistic peers, but also from many others. Mr. Ashmore has contributed to the June issue of Harper's magazine another thought-provoking article, entitled "The Untold Story Behind Little Rock." In it he calls attention to the failures of the press and other means of communication to bring to the American people the full picture of the significant developments leading up to and following the highly publicized events of last fall in Little Rock.

Because following this June there will be another September, and because what Mr. Ashmore has said in this article to his news colleagues also has an urgent meaning for public officials—who have an even greater duty to inform the people and preserve justice, law, and order—I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Ashmore be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript will run to approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $243.

I ask that the article be printed, the cost notwithstanding.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EASY CHAIR—THE UNTOLD STORY BEHIND LITTLE ROCK

(By Harry S. Ashmore, 1958 Pulitzer prize-winner)

The executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette and author of Epitaph for Dixie—widely acclaimed as the best of recent books about the South—examines the failure of our press, TV, and radio to report what really happened in his city. His paper won a Pulitzer prize this year for meritorious public service and Mr. Ashmore himself received another for his editorials during the Little Rock crisis.

For some months now I have served, in addition to my other duties, as something of a public monument, a sight to be seen by distinguished visitors on safari to darkest Arkansas. They still come in a seemingly endless stream to view the scene of the battle of Little Rock—small, brown men from the Orient, lady parliament members from Norway, earnest students from eastern universities, pipe-smoking professors of sociology, ecclesiastics of every rank and denomination, and journalists without number. They go, usually, to look upon the site of Faubus' charge and Eisenhower's envelopment, visit the Governor in his marble sanctuary, and come finally to what a friend of mine has termed, inaccurately, I hope, Ashmore's tomb.

These visitations often provide unique intellectual exercise. It is stimulating, at least, to discuss, through a French interpreter, the States rights doctrine of John C. Calhoun with a Japanese professor of European literature. But I encounter a besetting frustration, too. With only rare exceptions the visitors—domestic no less than foreign—come with an image of Little Rock firmly fixed in their minds, an image fashioned by the millions of words sprayed through the communications mediums since the balloon went up last September. And I doubt that the image is perceptibly altered even when they gaze upon a quiet, attractive city built upon tree-clad hills where civilized people still go about their ordinary business without visible trepidation.

There is, of course, good reason why Little Rock has become a symbol that arouses strong emotions among people everywhere in the world. Events have made the very name of the city a battle cry for those on both sides of the great moral issue that has divided this Nation through most of its history, and still divides it. "Remember Little Rock" proclaims the great seal that adorns propaganda-bearing envelopes going out from the headquarters of the southern citizens' councils. The same words have been sounded by Negro hoodlums moving with drawn knives against whites in the slum streets of northern cities.

It follows that there has been considerable deliberate tinkering with the image at home and abroad. Little Rock was about as handy a package as the Russians have had handed them since they set out to woo the colored peoples of the earth. In the South (and among some of the copperhead columnists who espouse States rights above Mason and Dixon's line) a whole new mythology has evolved to fit extant prejudices against the central Government. Westbrook Pegler, for example, has solemnly contended that Old Applehead sent his stormtroopers into Little Rock to assault innocent citizens not only without legal sanction but without cause, and John Temple Graves maintains on several southern editorial pages that the mob which overran the Little Rock police force was Harry Ashmore's imaginary lion in the streets. The effort is far advanced to expunge from pliant southern memories the salient fact that Orval Faubus moved first with force of arms when he sent his State militia to seize Central High School in naked defiance of a Federal court.

WHAT THE REPORTERS DIDN'T SEE

But this I regard as incidental, a natural hazard of my trade and my time. What gives me professional pause is the odd, distorted, and grossly incomplete image of Little Rock carried around by those who got their facts straight, and in great abundance. Among my present afflictions is the gloomy suspicion that somehow as we improve the mechanical means of communication we are losing the fundamental ability to commu-

nicate; we are talking more, that is, and saying less.

In my time I have seen the mass mediums expand to include the formidable newcomer, television, and add a new dimension to the raw stuff of history. In the same span, newspapers, although financially weakened by the additional competition for attention and the advertising dollar, have improved their techniques; we get the news faster and dish it up in prettier packages. We are as free as we have ever been—which means that we are as free as our proprietors have the heart and the will to be.

Yet with all of this, we seem to be no nearer a solution to the fundamental problem that has beset us since Gutenberg perfected movable type—how to present the day's events in meaningful perspective. Indeed, in some important ways, we seem to be moving in the opposite direction. The concentration on technique can, and often has, become a sort of refuge from this more complex problem. One of the major wire services is still bemused by Dr. Rudolph Flesch's formula which seeks salvation through syntax, and holds that public understanding can be improved through shorter sentences and more frequent paragraphs. It seems to me it doesn't really matter what tools we use so long as we are prone to wake up each morning and discover a whole new world and write about it as though nothing relevant had gone before.

The Little Rock story is a case in point. It was, by universal judgment, the second biggest news story of the year—topped only by sputnik. It attracted a concentration of correspondents, photographers, and radio and television technicians comparable to that which assembles for a national political convention. The newspapers, wire services, and networks sent their best men, too—seasoned hands to handle the fast-breaking spot news and think-piece experts to back them up. For many days the story had top priority on every news desk in this country and abroad—which meant the men on the ground could count on whatever space or time it took to report their findings in full. It is fair to say that contemporary journalism's best effort went into the Little Rock story.

Let Harold C. Fleming, the perceptive executive director of the Southern Regional Council, whose business it is to chart the shifting pattern of race relations in the South, has written of the result:

"What do the millions of words and television images add up to? Have they given Americans—to say nothing of foreigners—a clearer understanding of the South's malaise? As a result of them, will the national shock be less or the insight greater if a similar eruption accompanies desegregation in Dallas or Charlottesville or Knoxville? We can hope so, but not with much optimism. Only a few major newspapers, like the New York Times, a few thoughtful television and radio commentators, and a few good magazines sought to give a meaningful perspective to their reports from Little Rock.

"Conspicuously lacking in most interpretations is any sense of continuity. The upheavals in Tuscaloosa, Clinton, and Little Rock were not isolated events, but episodes in an unfolding drama of social change."

I can file no dissent from Fleming's verdict. I was there when the cowboy reporters rode in to the scent of blood. They did not have to seek for drama; it was thrust upon them, with a complete set of heroes and villains—and these readily interchangeable, depending upon your point of view. I do not charge that the press sensationalized the Little Rock story; the facts themselves were sensational enough to answer any circulation manager's dream. Moreover, I believe that—with rare exceptions—the men and women who reported the Little Rock story were competent and conscientious. Similarly, I have no reason to believe that any but a tiny handful were bound by home-office policy or blinded by their personal prejudices.

They performed their traditional function, within the traditional limits. They braved the mob that formed for some days around the high school, they interviewed the principals on both sides and many of the minor characters, they sketched in personalities and filled in color, and some at least tried hard to define the feeling of the community. Over a period of weeks they did a reasonably accurate job of reporting what happened at Little Rock—but as Fleming has said, they have failed to tell why it happened.

THE UNFINISHED STORY

And the reason, I think, is that to American journalism the Little Rock story had an arbitrary beginning and end. It began the day Governor Faubus surrounded Central High School with his State guard. It continued so long as there was a naked edge of violence. It ended when Federal troops restored a surface order to the troubled city. It has had subsequent footnotes only when the edge of violence reemerged in clashes between white and Negro children inside the school. It survives in the press today largely in the sort of occasional oblique reference that passes for background of more immediate news.

Yet, it is quite obvious that the Little Rock story did not begin in September. It is equally obvious that it has not ended yet. For Little Rock was simply the temporary focus of a great, continuing, and unresolved American dilemma which touches upon fundamental concepts of morality, of social change, and of law. Journalism has concentrated on only the exposed portion of the iceberg; the great, submerged mass remains uncharted.

It was, admittedly, an extraordinarily difficult story to handle. A journalist is trained to seek out spokesmen for both sides in any controversy. They were readily and anxiously available in Little Rock. The case for resistance to the Federal court's desegregation order was made at length by Governor Faubus, and bolstered by the more flamboyant utterances of the unabashed racists in the citizens' councils. The case for compliance was made by the local school officials, the mayor of the city, and—belatedly—by the President of the United States, with somewhat more passionate arguments freely offered by spokesmen for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

But this was a controversy that had three sides. Caught between the committed and dedicated partisans was a substantial and silent mass of plain citizens—confused and deeply disturbed. They were people who deplored desegregation and also deplored violence. They felt, many of them, a deep compassion for the nine Negro children exposed to the anger and contempt of a white mob. But they also felt that the Negro children should not be attending the white school in the first place. They had been, most of them, willing to undertake what they considered the unpleasant duty that had been required by the courts.

But then, at the last moment, their governor had stepped forward and proclaimed that what they had accepted as the law was without substance—and that their failure to resist desegregation amounted to treason to their own traditions and to their own people.

It is true that most of those who accepted this thesis (and the majority have, to some degree) did so with conscious rationalization. But it is also true that when emotion triumphed over reason they did not actively join the crusade of the governor and the citizens' councils; rather they simply subsided into troubled silence and by so doing withdrew their support from those few who attempted to stand against the tide. And because they were silent, their attitude went largely unreported. The press took due note of the fact that in fairly short order Governor Faubus was in command of the field; but here again it did not explain why—which is the heart of the story.

It can be argued that these matters are too subtle for the proper practice of journalism—that those who rode to Little Rock as though it were a four-alarm fire could not be expected to plumb the hidden attitudes of the populace, and indeed that the effort to do so would represent a dangerous departure from proper standards of objectivity. Perhaps so. But there were other aspects of the Little Rock story that were equally vital and by no means so elusive. There was, conspicuously, the failure of leadership in Washington which matched the default of southern leadership, and made the ultimate showdown between State and Federal force inevitable.

NEWS THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN

Before pursuing this thesis I should, perhaps, note that I am (to borrow SAM RAYBURN's description of himself) a Democrat without suffix, prefix, or apology. It should be noted too that I spent 10 months in the wilderness with Adlai Stevenson in 1956, when the Democratic candidate's cries on this subject, along with all others, were largely unheeded. But, making all due allowance for my prejudice, I submit that the record shows that from May 1954, when the United States Supreme Court reversed the old Plessy doctrine, until September 1957, when the chickens finally fluttered in to roost in Little Rock, the Eisenhower administration took no affirmative action to pave the way for the sweeping legal change the Court required or to temper the inevitable dislocations it would occasion. Indeed, the incredible fact is that the administration, without preliminary, moved directly to the ultimate resort of armed force, and then was confounded by its own belated audacity.

It required no delicate fingering of the public pulse to chart the course of growing defiance in the South. It was evident in violent utterances by some of the South's public men and in the silence of others. It was made a matter of record in the passage of a variety of restrictive laws in the southern legislatures. A conspicuous public monument was erected in Washington when 100 southern Members of the Senate and House signed their breast-beating manifesto in the spring of 1956.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower's only reaction to all this was an occasional bemused press conference statement about the difficulties of changing the minds and hearts of men. His administration, it is true, made token efforts to pass stringent civil-rights legislation—which only served to lacerate the southerners in Congress and certainly had an adverse effect upon their minds, hearts, and spleens. And, of course, Vice President NIXON, in the days before he sheathed his hatchet, joined other administration spokesmen in making proper obeisance to their party's Abolitionist tradition when campaigning in those areas where the Negro vote is heavy.

But at no time did Mr. Eisenhower attempt to use the moral force of his office to persuade southerners of the justice of the course the Supreme Court required of them, or his great personal prestige in the region to allay their fears that they were being forced into a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary course. Nor did he employ the vast political powers of his office to negotiate with the recalcitrant southern political leaders from a position of strength.

I am not one who supports without reservation the thesis that the Republican allegiance of most of the proprietors of the press has been translated into a conspiracy to wrap Mr. Eisenhower in bunting and protect him against criticism. I do not believe

that this was a primary cause of the conspicuous failure of the press to take due note of the troubles that were shaping up in the South, and of the administration's apparent unawareness. I suspect that it stems rather from the limiting journalistic axiom that what happens is news, and what doesn't isn't.

Thus the reporters rode into the region only when there was action—when a couple of red-necked hoodlums in backwoods Mississippi dropped Emmett Till into a river, or a mob ruled that Autherine Lucy couldn't attend the University of Alabama, or John Kasper incited the citizens of Clinton to wrath. In between, an occasional reporter, usually from one of the magazines, toured the region—but these too often caught only the sound and the fury on the surface. A notable example was the series in the Saturday Evening Post last summer, The Deep South Says "Never." The author, John Bartlow Martin, is a competent and conscientious practitioner, but his pieces were largely distilled from the utterances of the extremists without qualifying balance. The certainly unintentional result was to give national credence to the contention of the councilmen that they spoke for the whole of the southern people, and the council leaders themselves regarded the Post series as invaluable propaganda in their campaign to enforce the doctrine of brute resistance upon the silent majority. But the other and equally essential part of the story—the drift in Washington—went largely unnoticed except by a few peripheral critics who address a limited audience.

THE POLITICAL DEAL

If the reporting of the prelude to Little Rock was conspicuously inadequate, it seems to me that the postlude provides an even more distressing example. The stirring martial events of September were, it is true, somewhat confusing—particularly when President Eisenhower and Governor Faubus held their historic peace conference at Newport and there remained some doubt as to who emerged with whose sword. Out of the communiques issued by the White House on this occasion, however, and the later meeting with envoys from the Southern Governors' Conference, there emerged an assumption that the executive department of the Federal Government was prepared to back to the utmost the orders of the Federal judiciary.

This notion was reinforced by the arrival of the 101st Airborne Infantry, and by the presence in Little Rock of so many FBI agents they created a problem of hotel accommodations. Indeed, there was public and official talk of a vast document compiled by the FBI, at the direction of the United States Attorney General, presumably in preparation for court action against those who were clearly defying the injunctions of a Federal judge. During those fall days the embattled Little Rock School Board—under fire from the State government for carrying out the judge's order and deserted by a city administration intimidated by a show of political strength by the citizens' council—waited for the Federals to ride to their aid. All they got, as it turned out, was withdrawal of the regulars of the 101st and a perfunctory detail of federalized National Guardsmen, under orders to observe but not to arrest any malefactors within the school.

It soon became apparent that this was far from enough to preserve any semblance of order. The mob which once came close to forcing entry into the school did not reform, it is true, but it didn't need to. A far safer course was to inspire a small group of white students to undertake a campaign of harassment against the isolated Negroes. And as it became apparent that Washington had done all it was going to do, the citizens' councils became bolder and bolder in their campaign of intimidation, coercion, and boycott directed against any who dared dissent from the defiant course they had charted. The campaign bore tangible fruit in the expulsion of 1 of the 9 Negro children who had responded in kind to calculated mistreatment—an event greeted by the appearance of cards on the lapels of the student activists bearing the cogent notice: "One down—eight to go."

Here again, in spasmodic, uncoordinated fashion the surface of these events has been recorded by the press. But the other and more significant portion of the story has attracted little attention. In Washington, the decision to leave to the Little Rock School Board the entire burden of carrying out the Court order against impossible odds has never been officially announced, but has been clearly acknowledged by the Department of Justice. The new Attorney General, William P. Rogers, said that there were no present plans for further legal action in Little Rock. He further noted that the administration would not press for additional civil-rights legislation at this session of Congress—a matter of some moment since the Justice Department had previously used as an excuse for inaction at Little Rock the failure of the enforcement provisions in the last civil-rights bill.

These pronouncements were followed by one of the most remarkable scenes enacted on Capitol Hill since the passage of the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Rogers appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee to be interrogated as to his fitness as Attorney General, received cordial greetings, and was recommended for confirmation without a single question being addressed to him regarding his past or future course in the Little Rock case—and this before a committee that counts among its members Senators JAMES EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. This singular occurrence was accorded no more than passing mention in the press and no one of consequence speculated in print or on a television tube as to the dimensions of what must have been one of the most singular political deals in recent years.

TIME FOR WHAT?

Just as the Little Rock story did not begin in Little Rock, it will not end there—whatever the ultimate fate of the eight children still remaining in the beleaguered high school at this writing. These events have already had tragic consequences in Arkansas and the South; those who were disposed to support an orderly adjustment to the new public policy have been discredited and disarmed—not alone by the extremists who are now in control, but by a national administration which deserted them in the first collision between Federal and State force and declared in effect that the rule of law propounded by its own courts is not enforcible. And so, by default, what began as a local issue has been built into a national constitutional crisis.

And it is no less than that—perhaps the most critical the Nation has faced since 1860. I do not suggest that civil war is imminent, because, of course, it isn't. I do say that the drift in Washington has gravely compounded the dislocations that were made inevitable by the historical developments affirmed by the Supreme Court in 1954, and has left the country sharply divided on a complex moral and social issue at a time when national unity could be the price of national survival.

There are many who share the blame. There is reason to wonder if our system of education has served us adequately when in its ultimate flowering it has produced a generation, North and South, that appears not only unable to grasp the implications of the race problem but unwilling to face it squarely. I have said of the South that its besetting problem is not the accommodation of the rising aspirations of its Negro people, difficult as that may be, but its inability to reduce the issue to rational terms. In slightly different context, the same thing is true of the non-South—called upon now to translate its pious principles into action and blinking painfully over the mote in its own eye.

But my concern is with journalism. No one can say with certainty that the course of events in the South could have been altered had the President exercised firm leadership—or that Mr. Eisenhower would have been disposed to act even if the alarm had been sounded by those who are supposed to man the watchtowers of public affairs. And now, after the fact, this is perhaps not of consuming importance. But the watchtowers remain largely silent still, and I suggest that this is a matter of pressing concern.

For it seems to me that the American people are still not aware of what Little Rock really demonstrated—the shocking fact that not only did the administration have no plan to meet the crisis at Little Rock when it came, but even now, with all the bitter lessons before it, still has charted no effective course of action nor displayed any disposition to do so.

I am the first to argue that time is of the essence in any resolution of the problem. In so delicate an area of human relations change must be evolutionary. Yet time is of value only if it is put to some practical use; perhaps the most cogent single question yet raised was that put by Francis Pickens Miller of Virginia to a group of Southerners who at a national conference were pleading for a breathing spell.

What, he asked, did they propose to do with it?

It is clear that the southern leadership has no program and no policy except the negative one of delay at any price—and part of that price will be a steady deterioration of race relations across the whole of the Nation, with a corollary impact of great significance on our sagging foreign policy. In the face of this, the administration has offered nothing except the politician's usual device for postponing unpleasant decisions—the creation of a study commission, which, if it does not founder on its partisan division, at some distant date presumably will come up with the facts the press should have been setting forth all along.

These then are some of the aspects of the Little Rock story which seem to me to be largely unrecognized or generally misunderstood despite the millions of words that have adorned the front pages and boomed through the loudspeakers. I suppose that a patient man with endless time on his hands might have put together the lurid fragments that were hurled at him and divined their meaning—but readers and listeners are usually both impatient and busy. It remains, then, journalism's unfulfilled responsibility to somehow provide perspective and continuity—to add the why to the what.

How can it be done, in the face of the real and in many ways growing, limitations of time and space that beset all of us who live by the clock? I will confess that I have no ready answers. But I do know the task is urgent and steadily becoming more so.

And I think perhaps it begins with recognition that this is so—and that, valid as they may be, the excuses we newspapermen have made to our selves in private, and the proud boasts of rectitude our promotion managers commonly make in public, are no longer good enough. I think we have got to get over the notion that objective is achieved by giving a sinner equal space with a saint—and above all of paying the greatest attention to those who shout the loudest. We've got to learn that a set of indisputable facts does not necessarily add up to the whole truth.

Perhaps what we need most of all is simply the courage of our own convictions—to recognize that news is not merely a record of ascertainable facts and attributable opinions, but a chronical of the world we live in cast in terms of moral values. We will err, certainly, and we will be abused—but we will at least be in position in the watchtowers, trying to tell the story in all its dimension.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in regard to our foreign policy and the attitude of some of us on that subject. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

From time to time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have utilized the Senate as a forum to discuss the foreign policy of the United States. For the most part their remarks have been fair and they have avoided injecting partisan considerations into their discussions.

They are to be commended not only for the light which they have shed on many of the problems we face in this precarious world, but for the support which they have given to the programs of the President.

In recent weeks, however, my Democratic colleagues have begun to harp on the theme that the administration has failed in leadership; that somehow the administration is to be held responsible for the fact that the world of 1958 is a precarious place in which to live.

I have searched these recent speeches for the positive suggestions which are allegedly lacking in the present leadership. I have sought to separate the wheat from the chaff. I am frank to say that I have found remarkably few kernels of wheat amongst all of the words that have been launched on this floor.

It is always easier, to demand an idea, than to develop one.

I do not deny that from time to time we read in the press or find in the remarks of my colleagues the germ of a new idea. But many, many times those ideas which are supposed to be positive in character are nothing more than glittering generalities or procedural gimmicks.

Among the generalities we hear such suggestions as:

NATO should be strengthened; or

NATO must concentrate on economic problems; or

The Algerian problem should be settled by giving Algeria commonwealth status; or

We should concentrate on economic aid instead of military aid; or

We must pay more attention to Latin America, or Canada, or Southeast Asia, or the Middle East.

I must say if I were the Secretary of State I would certainly not know what to do with advice of this kind. The Secretary of State must live in a world of reality.

There may be some things he can do and some actions he may take which will induce change in the current of events. But I suggest that much of what happens in this world is outside the control of the United States.

It is unrealistic to expect that a note from Washington will force nationalism into constructive channels; or that a word from the President will settle a constitutional crisis in France, or Lebanon; or, for that matter, even in a neighboring Latin American country.

It is a wise man—it is a wise nation—that realizes its own limitations.

It seems to me that one of the first steps toward international responsibility would be for the American people and their representatives in Congress to realize our limitations. This is the first step toward wisdom.

We cannot legislate peace and security throughout the world.

We cannot extend a little aid here and there and expect automatically that our troubles will be over.

Certainly, this Nation is not without influence throughout the world. But at the same time we must realize that our influence is in many instances of a marginal character.

I can illustrate this fact by referring to the situation in India and in China.

During recent floor debate it was suggested that massive doses of economic assistance to India would somehow be decisive in preserving her independence from Soviet control. It was argued that India should not be lost to freedom, as was China—a loss attributed to a failure to give Generalissimo Chiang timely help.

My point is that the loss of China to the side of freedom and the preservation of Indian independence are events of such magnitude and complexity that what the United States does or fails to do is not necessarily decisive. In short, our sights must be geared to reality. Unless the United States imposes a Pax Americana on the world—which I do not think we could or should do—what this Nation may do in the world is important, but not by any means of controlling significance.

I labor this point in order to inject some reality in our thinking about problems of international relations. It is time for us to realize that Dwight Eisenhower is President of the United States, and not omnipotent in the world. It is as unrealistic to give him credit for all that is right about the world as it is to hold him responsible for all that is wrong with the world.

The same may be said of Mr. Dulles. He handles the foreign relations for the United States, and, despite our undoubted power and influence, Mr. Dulles cannot snap his fingers and bring peace to the Middle East, or restore the satellites to freedom.

If India is to preserve its independence, it will be largely because of what the Indian people and their leaders do for themselves. And the same is true with respect to many of the other problems with which nations are burdened.

The United States, with the most admirable foreign policy we could dream up, can only be of marginal influence on the future of the Middle East, of Africa, of South Asia, and of the Far East. This is not to say that we should throw up our hands in hopelessness. It is only to emphasize that good intentions may pave some roads, but that the hard work of salvation, the building of the trails and the heaviest work must come from the peoples who are principally concerned.

We are doomed to continuing disappointment in our foreign policy if we do not learn to keep our feet on the ground and to base our policies on reality instead of fancy.

I would warn also, against allowing ourselves to be taken in by what I would call procedural gimmicks.

We cannot expect to solve our problems in Africa by creating an Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs—even though I support that proposition.

We are not going to solve problems of our relationships with Latin America by rushing headlong into an all-American summit meeting.

We are not going to bring peace to the world by grasping blindly at summit conferences with the Russians.

Procedural gimmicks are not without use, but let us not condemn the President or Mr. Dulles because they have not grasped at the procedural gimmicks put forth on the floor of the Senate or because they have not dreamed up a few such gimmicks of their own.

There have been many times over the years I have served in the Senate when I have seen my colleagues on both sides of the center aisle in moods of frustration. Many times this frustration had risen out of events in the field of foreign relations.

I recall the years when Members on this side of the aisle were frustrated with the foreign policies of members of the other party who controlled the executive branch of the Government. I detect in some of the remarks that I have heard in recent months here that my Democratic friends have felt some frustration with the foreign policies of 1958.

Now, frustration is a normal, human, emotion. It has its place in life. But let us remember that frustration is an emotion and as such it does not provide a solid basis upon which to build a foreign policy.

I do not propose to stand on this floor today, or any other day, to try to tell the President of the United States how to conduct the foreign policy of the Nation. Although it is the purpose of our forign policy to promote peace and freedom in this world so that the values we cherish and nurture may forever be preserved, that purpose may best be achieved if we leave its day-to-day direction to our President.

One of the popular topics for students of foreign affairs is the role of Congress in the formulation of foreign policy. This topic is more popular than simple. Indeed, it is perhaps easier to describe what the foreign policy role of Congress should not be than it is to describe what that role should be.

Certainly, it is not the role of Congress to quarterback every move which the President and the Secretary of State undertake. If 531 Members of Congress were to undertake that duty, the main effect would be to telegraph our punches to every nation in the world, friend and foe alike.

Clearly, it is not the role of Congress to second guess every act of the Executive, telling him how something should have been done. It is easy to be smart after the event—but this kind of smartness is not very helpful.

The Congress cannot expect to substitute for the executive departments in the gathering of information upon which our foreign policy must be based. We cannot substitute for the thousands of able, devoted, members of our Foreign Service who are stationed throughout the world.

Finally, it is not the role of Congress to "bird dog" the Secretary of State as he wends his way through the jungles of international relations.

Yet Congress has a positive role to play in the formulation of foreign policy. I would stress that in discharging this role, however, Congress proceed on the basis of a little bit of faith. We should certainly assume that the President and the Secretary of State are conscientiously working to promote the interests of the United States.

Mr. Dulles is one of the hardest working Secretaries of State this Nation has ever had. He may make mistakes, even as Members of the Senate do on occasion, but no one can deny that his actions spring from the highest motives and his labors have been far and above the calls of duty.

It seems to me that the principal role for Congress in the field of foreign policy is to try to keep the people and the executive in

tune. In other words, Congress is exercising its proper role when it serves as go between. In some instances, this means that we must go to our constituents to explain to them and help them understand the reasons why certain foreign-policy actions may be necessary. In other instances, it is our duty to go to the executive and pass on to it the views of the American people.

We must help to link the commonsense of the American people with the facts and the expert advice we receive from those Americans who are engaged in the day to day strategy of foreign policy.

A good example of the need for explaining certain policies to our constituents can be found in the mutual security legislation upon which we act each year. Of course, the President can, as we say, "go to the people," but I have never been convinced that he can do the carefully tailored job of explaining and answering the many questions which Americans have about the need of this program. That is our job.

It has been my experience that my Wisconsin constituents are quick to grasp the importance of the mutual-security program to our own security when I can sit with them and describe in detail the consequences of failure to keep that program going.

A good example of the influence of the people in getting the executive branch to tailor its programs to the felt needs of the American people was found in the wartime resolutions expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should help to create and should join a postwar international organization devoted to the maintenance of peace. And in more recent years, I am convinced that it has been the constant pressure of the American people which has kept the executive hard at work in seeking reliable means to suspend nuclear tests, despite the difficulties of negotiating with the Russians in this important field.

Our Government is a Government of separation of powers. It works best if the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches tend to their own knitting. Yet we see many instances in which individuals in these branches of the Government are tempted to tell other branches how to do their work while they neglect their own responsibilities. This tendency must always be resisted.

Fortunate indeed are we that our Founding Fathers devised constitutional safeguards to keep our branches of Government separate in the discharge of their duties, and unfortunate indeed are we that the American people can sit in ultimate judgment of our faithful discharge of our constitutional duties.

Tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, statements by John J. Halloran and Frank L. Orfanello, representing the Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. I ask also that letters to Mr. Halloran from a number of prominent citizens in Boston be printed as well.

The subject of these statements and letters is of great concern to the ports of northeastern United States. The statements and letters express very well the point of view of the port of Boston with respect to the tolls which are now to be established on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Congress was very clear, Mr. President, in authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway, in providing that it should be self-liquidating over a period of 50 years. Congress recognized full well the injustice of supporting with tax revenues the operation of the St. Lawrence seaway, since much of the tax revenue would be derived from ports in direct competition with the seaway.

I think the statements of these gentlemen, Mr. President, are worthy of our attention, inasmuch as they are in affirmation of the objective which Congress made so clear in authorizing the seaway project.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE AND VIEWS FOR RULES OF MEASUREMENT AND TOLLS HEARING

My name is Frank L. Orfanello, director of the Port of Boston Commission. Our business address is 14 Court Square, Boston, Mass.

The Port of Boston Commission is an agency of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, created to promote the waterborne commerce through the port of Boston.

It is our considered judgment that the tolls, as recommended by the United States Tolls Committee, are inadequate.

We realize that the proposed tolls have been recommended after considerable study and deliberation. We are of the opinion, however, that the income realized from said tolls will be insufficient to amortize the cost of the seaway pursuant to legislative mandate.

Public Law No. 358, 83d Congress, May 13, 1954, authorizing expenditures for the seaway is very explicit that moneys expended pursuant to said act shall be repaid over a period of 50 years.

The Port of Boston Commission, therefore, is unalterably opposed to any subsidy from the United States to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

STATEMENT OF MARITIME ASSOCIATION OF THE GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN CONNECTION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF TOLL COMMITTEE TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Chairman, my name is John J. Halloran, and I appear as the representative of the Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. Our business address is 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

The Maritime Association is a voluntary organization with approximately 200 corporate and individual members, all of whom are interested in the development of waterborne commerce of the port of Boston. The members are engaged in various forms of maritime business: Steamship owners, agents, importers and exporters, customs brokers, terminal operators, warehousemen, towboat owners, truckmen, stevedores, and other types of maritime endeavor. Collectively, all are substantial employers of labor and all depend for their economic welfare upon marine activities.

Our prime concern in the present proceeding is the hope and desire that the statutory requirements for the St. Lawrence seaway development shall be effectuated. This is particularly important in the matter of tolls for the very basic reason that any deficiency would be made up by Federal revenues derived from citizens and operations in a competitive situation with the seaway.

We fully believe that the tolls committees of Canada and the United States have every intention of complying with the mandate of Congress that the seaway shall be self-sustaining and, in particular, we have every confidence that the United States Tolls Committee has no intention of creating a Government-subsidized facility.

However, we do not agree that their tolls structure will meet the statutory requirements of a self-supporting operation. We may further state that we consider their proposed substantial deferment of capital payments is not a businesslike concept of a project of this nature.

We agree to the tolls committee estimate of total tonnage movement at the outset but there remain many unknown and uncertain factors. Just a slight percentage change in a revenue and in an expense item would or could create havoc and jeopardize the whole tolls structure.

Even though we accept the committee's tonnage figure, which we consider very optimistic, our analysis does not bring about revenue approaching that of the committee.

In opening its report on the tolls structure the United States tolls committee states that it has had the benefit of views advanced by interested public authorities and others. The most outstanding public authority appearing in favor of the seaway was probably the United States Department of Commerce. Its staff devoted much time in a study of potential traffic and toll structure. Secretary W. A. Harriman, in 1947, and Secretary Charles Sawyer, in 1951, testified that the Department of Commerce believed that basic tolls should be 50 cents a short ton on iron ore, $1.25 a short ton on general cargo, and a ballast rate of 15 cents per deadweight ton. Considering that a deadweight ton is at least 60 percent more than a gross ton this ballast rate suggestion becomes 24 cents a gross ton, just four times the rate recommended by your toll committee. These toll charge estimates by the Department of Commerce were generally agreed to by advocates of the seaway at the time.

In a comparison of the proposed rates by proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway in 1947 and 1951 with the suggested schedule submitted by your tolls committee we call attention to the cost rise during the period between 1947 and 1958 and we should invite your consideration to the following standard cost indexes:

Consumer Price Index: United States Department of Labor (1947–49 equals 100), April 1958, 124.5.

Construction Cost Indexes: Department of Commerce (composite) (1947–49 equals 100), April 1958, 138. Engineering News Record (1) building (1947–49 equals 100), April 1958, 153.3, May 154.1; (2) construction (1947–49 equals 100), April 1958, 165.9, May 167.2.

These price trends clearly show that rates should be higher than proposals of 11 years ago; certainly there is no justification for lower schedules.

We submit that you should be particularly concerned at the extremely low rates recommended for bulk iron ore and ballast voyages. Your tolls committee states that 90 percent of the seaway traffic will be bulk cargoes which bulk cargoes will in the main call for ballasting one way. To propose special bargain rates on the most important segment of the traffic seems entirely in violation of good business judgment.

The basic philosophy of your tolls committee appears to be shown by the following sentence on page 7 of their report:

"This means that the estimated traffic during the initial years of a development

period is not expected to produce revenues sufficient to meet total annual charges."

Now turn to page 5 of their report from which we quote the following:

"The traffic through the seaway will be of the same general character as that now transiting the St. Lawrence Canals and the Welland Canal."

This is not a new business or new development. It does not call for price inducements or loss items to attract the uninitiated. The St. Lawrence has been a going concern in the domestic and foreign transportation system for many years. The so-called seaway is merely an enlargement or improvement of an old well-known waterway.

Furthermore, it was the clear intent of Congress to require that tolls should produce revenue to meet total annual charges. An examination of Public Law No. 358, 83d Congress, May 13, 1954, section 12 (b) and the paragraphs following will show that no authority is given the St. Lawrence Development Corporation to defer any of the specific expenses named.

On the contrary, it provides that toll charges shall be calculated to cover all costs of operating and maintaining the works under the adminitsration of the Corporation including depreciation, payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, payment in lieu of taxes and amortization of the principal of the debts and obligations over a period not to exceed 50 years. Clearly, all these items of expense are to be met from revenue and nowhere do we find any authority is vested in the Corporation to defer any of these payments. We have further noted that your tolls committee has made no provision for any reserve to compensate for increasing costs, periods of reduced business, accidents, or casualties causing partial or complete stoppage of traffic. To provide a uniform, average annual cost figure over a period of 50 years into the future, does not seem to conform with good sound economic or business practices.

We urge your careful consideration of all these conditions, as we are confident you will find it necessary to substantially increase the rates proposed by your tolls committee in order to meet the mandate of Congress for a self-supporting St. Lawrence seaway.

BOSTON AND MAINE RAILROAD,
Boston, Mass., July 29, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLORAN: We have read and endorse the statement you are to make at the hearing in Washington on August 6, 1958, before the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and we authorize you to so record us.

We believe the seaway should be self-sustaining, and that to make it so, compensatory tolls should be levied in accordance with the law.

Sincerely,

P. J. MULLANEY.

FOREIGN COMMERCE CLUB OF BOSTON, INC.,
Boston, Mass., July 31, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Maritime Association, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLORAN: I have read your prepared statement to be made at the St. Lawrence seaway hearing in Washington on August 6, 1958.

As a member of the port advisory council representing the Foreign Commerce Club of Boston, I subscribe heartily to your position and statement and you may accept this as authority to state that we concur fully in your presentation.

Very truly yours,
FOREIGN COMMERCE CLUB OF BOSTON,
T. R. WELCH.

MASSACHUSETTS WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., July 30, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLARAN: At a meeting of this association's executive committee held yesterday, I was instructed to place the Massachusetts Warehousemen's Association on record with you as being in complete accord with the statement of the Maritime Association prepared for presentation at the hearing by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation in Washington on August 6, 1958.

We strongly endorse your position on the tolls proposed by the Tolls Committee and you may use our name as being one of the organizations that supports your statement.

Sincerely,

L. F. FOSTER,
Executive Director.

THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF BOSTON, INC.,
Boston, Mass., July 29, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLORAN: As chairman of the legislative committee of the Propeller Club of the Port of Boston I am authorized to write to you and endorse statement of Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce in connection with recommendations of Toll Committee to St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., which you intend to present on August 6, 1958, at Washington, D. C.

We feel that the material appearing in this statement is a realistic analysis of the general economics of the situation on a national basis.

Very truly yours,

JOHN O. PARKER.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON,
Boston, Mass., July 30, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLORAN: As representative of the Boston Clearing House Banks on the advisory council to the Port of Boston Commission, I want to endorse the statement which you propose to make before the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., at the hearing in Washington on August 6, 1958, in connection with the recommendations of their Toll Committee.

The rates now being proposed by the joint toll committee are considerably lower than original schedule of tolls that were suggested when this project was in promotion and legislative stages and we do not see how anyone can accurately estimate potential traffic through the seaway at the present time. It is our feeling, therefore, that the original schedule of rates should be adopted until such time as actual experience over a period of 3 to 5 years proves what the exact cost of operation and the tonnage are going to be. We feel that there is no proper way to arrive at fair and accurate toll figures except by actual experience and the rates can be adjusted at a later date, if necessary. At the present time it is extremely important that the toll rates be established at a figure which is adequate to cover all costs of operating and maintaining the seaway, including depreciation, interest on the outstanding debt of the corporation, and amortization of the principal over a period not to exceed 50 years so that the taxpayers of the United States will not be called upon to subsidize this project.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. BINNEY.

BOSTON SHIPPING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boston, July 24, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALLORAN: Now that the St. Lawrence seaway is becoming a reality, the members of our association are very much concerned. They feel very strongly that proper tolls should be levied, and that the seaway must be self-sustaining. They do not want taxpayers in this area to subsidize the seaway in the event the tolls or revenue are not sufficient.

Our association is comprised of 32 members engaged in maritime activities in the port of Boston and vicinity, and provides a payroll for labor in excess of $10 million annually. In addition, accessorial services expend additional moneys. Members of this association are steamship owners and agents, contracting stevedores, contracting watching agencies, contracting linehandlers, contracting ship cleaners, and terminal operators and warehousemen. We attach a list of the individual members.

The Boston Shipping Association, Inc., heartily endorses your statement to be made at the St. Lawrence seaway hearing on August 6 in Washington, D. C.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR LANE, *President.*

PLYMOUTH CORDAGE CO.,
Plymouth, Mass., August 1, 1958.

Mr. JOHN J. HALLORAN,
Manager, Maritime Association of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: I received in the mail the statement you are to present at Washington in connection with the Toll Committee of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

You have the endorsement of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts. Hope this will add some support to the presentation.

Thanking you, I remain,
Sincerely,

E. N. MAYER.

United States Proposals for the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, August 14, 1958, entitled "United States Proposals for Near East."

I commend this article to the reading of every Member of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PROPOSALS FOR NEAR EAST—EISENHOWER TALK HELD SIGN OF STAND FOR INDEPENDENCE OF SMALL NATIONS

There have been great addresses in the past by Presidents of the United States in the periods preceding big wars, but none

that has been the equal of the speech delivered by President Eisenhower to the United Nations General Assembly with the aim of preventing a world war from breaking out over the Near East situation.

It was an impressive message because it reiterated the traditional principles for which the United States has consistently stood throughout its history. It will be effective throughout the free world, primarily because the address reflects bipartisan support here. This is but another way of saying it is a true expression of the purposes and intentions of the people of the United States.

For the speech means that America has not yielded in her firm insistence that the independence of small nations must be protected against any aggression by a major power, even if measures of protection bring on a crisis of major proportions.

The President at the very outset spoke of "the danger that nations under aggressive leadership will seek to exploit man's horror of war by confronting the nations, particularly the small nations, with an apparent choice between supine surrender or war." He added: "This tactic reappeared during the recent Near East crisis. Some might call it 'ballistic blackmail'."

Mr. Eisenhower in those few sentences served notice that the American people would not be terrorized, would not appease dictatorships and would not compromise on basic principles of national sovereignty. He denounced the cry of aggression which the Soviets have raised against the military aid given by the United States at the request of the Government of Lebanon. He said that, "If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited."

Here, therefore, is the great cause to which the President says America is dedicated—a cause that champions the rights of small nations to work out their own destinies without external interference. This is reminiscent of President Wilson's plea just 40 years ago for the self-determination of peoples and of President Roosevelt's similar point in the Atlantic Charter of 1941.

But, while conceding that each nation has a right to make any change—in fact, he said that "change is indeed the law of life and of progress"—Mr. Eisenhower declared that this carries with it an obligation to bring about change in peaceful ways. The President insisted that, above all else, there must be "an end to external interference in the internal affairs of the Arab states of the Near East."

Mr. Eisenhower realized that merely to set forth the requirements of the U. N. Charter that members refrain from interfering through indirect aggression or otherwise with the independence of other member states was not enough. He called for the setting up of U. N. machinery to police troubled areas, and he offered a program of economic cooperation based not alone on American support but on the contributions in the internal affairs of the Arab States themselves.

The speech was carefully designed to express agreement with the legitimate aspirations of Arab nationalism, but at the same time it was unmistakably directed at the major threat to world peace today—the dictatorship in the Soviet Union which seeks to dominate smaller nations and stir up trouble between them. The President's pointed reference to the damage done by inflammatory broadcasts was an example of what realistically is causing crisis after crisis in the Near East.

Obviously, the plan for economic development of the Near East by means of a regional arrangement is a response to those who have all along insisted that money is needed to assist the peoples of the Arab world to develop their resources and improve their standard of living. America's promise to help is significant. If taken only on its face value, it would aid immeasurably in relaxing tension and bringing peace to the Near East. Implemented further by international conferences, it could prove to be of transcendent importance in world history.

But when Mr. Eisenhower sat down amid the applause of the free world's representatives, Soviet intransigence came back into the picture at once. The Soviet Union's Foreign Minister was almost immediately on his feet to repeat the same familiar cries about aggression and exploitation by the West.

The Eisenhower address is bound eventually to bring second thoughts to all the Arab politicians who have echoed the Kremlin's cries against the presence of American troops in the Near East. Those troops will be withdrawn the moment there is a real basis for peace. The big question now is whether the mischiefmakers in the Kremlin will be content to let the Near East settle down or whether they will continue to keep it stirred up.

President Eisenhower has put on the record America's willingness to go all out to maintain the peace of the Near East. The burden now is on the Arab world and on the strategists in the Kremlin. For public opinion—thinking people everywhere—will endorse what President Eisenhower has said so eloquently and will hope that his plan for peace in the Near East will be supported by the United Nations General Assembly.

Your Congressman Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Representative USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN COMMENTS ON SECRET TREATIES

(By USHER L. BURDICK)

WILLISTON, N. DAK.—The following item has been carried in the daily press of the country, and there is no doubt it is true:

"UNITED STATES STRENGTHENS BAGHDAD PACT TIES UNDER NEW COMMITMENTS

"LONDON.—Secretary of State Dulles Monday night committed the United States to defense of Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan as a virtual partner in the Baghdad Pact.

"The pact is being realined to take into account the apparent loss of Iraq.

"Dulles signed up after twice talking with President Eisenhower in Washington by telephone. American backing was thus pledged for security of western-allied Moslem nations on or near the Soviet southern frontiers. Automatically, the United States became more deeply involved in the Middle East than ever before.

"Without technically joining the pact, the United States virtually became a member through the new obligations undertaken in declaration that Dulles signed with leaders of the four active members—Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, and Britain.

"With this dramatic stroke, the United States immensely increased the strength and power of the alliance weakened so badly after the violent overthrow of the prowestern Royal Government of Iraq, the fifth member.

"Iraq was not represented at the Baghdad Pact council meeting. The late King Faisal's government had been the lone Arab keystone of the pact designed, among other things, to bar communism from the Middle East. His capital city of Baghdad originally gave the alliance its name.

"A spokesman for Britain said: 'We greatly welcome the strengthening of American ties with members of the Baghdad Pact organization.' The declaration provides that the United States will promptly enter into two-way agreements with Iran, Pakistan, Turkey, and Britain. The document expressed determination of the signers 'to maintain their collective security and to resist aggression—direct or indirect'.

"Some Western statesmen have accused the Soviet Union of indirectly bringing about unrest and revolution in the Middle East and threatening other nations in adjacent areas.

"The countries signing the declaration took under consideration whether substantial alterations should be made in the Baghdad pact and its organization. This means that they are not completely sure what the new Iraq Government is going to do. They feel there may be a bare chance that Iraq will continue its membership."

Regardless of whether or not we should have signed up the name of this Government binding us further into the Baghdad Pact, the dangerous thing is that we allow the Secretary of State to sign such documents. No one in the United States knows about what is to be signed except the executive department, and to allow one department to bind this country to a contract that may, or possibly will, involve us in war is not protecting this Government through the representatives of the people. Congress has nothing to say, and doesn't even know what is in the mind of the executive department.

The result of executive action like this might well amount to a declaration of war without the consent or knowledge of the Congress, for if we have pledged this Government to go to the assistance of any country, then if that country is attacked, we are in a war.

During the Democratic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman, many commitments were made without the consent of Congress, and now the Republican administration is following the same course. No Congressman, nor anybody else outside the executive department, knows how many contracts we have signed and propose to sign. These contracts or treaties have the force of law, and it appears to me that Congress is not needed in dealing with foreign government, according to the ideas of those who make the agreements. The only safe way to handle matters of this kind is to submit the treaty to Congress before it is signed. Any other course may involve us in war without the people knowing a thing about it. If there is a good reason for us to enter into such a contract a patriotic Congress will know it, and we can envision that many of these treaties would not be made.

The executive department handles these matters in a secret way and gets away with it because any information about a treaty before it is signed is marked "secret information," and that is as far as we can go in finding out what is in the wind. It would be interesting to the people of this country to know how many of these secret treaties are in existence today, and to what extent they bind the United States to support them.

Dealing with foreign countries is a live issue today, and the Congress of the United States should have at least some slight information about making contracts that may involve us in a war. This last contract with

the Baghdad Pact countries has all the earmarks of danger to this Nation, but the Secretary of State signs them as easily as a debtor renews a note.

The Problem of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, an excellent editorial was published recently in the Salt Lake City Deseret News and Telegram, dated dated August 5. That paper urged the Government to "turn the corner now away from business-stimulating, inflationary devices." Because of the urgency of the message, and since it relates so directly to my recent speeches on the inflation problem, and to other speeches during the past week by my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The paper's suggestion that margin requirements be raised was very timely. The editorial was published the day the Federal Reserve announced the increase to 70 percent.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "More Inflation Ahead?" written by Henry Hazlitt and published in Newsweek of August 18, 1958; and an editorial entitled "Flight From the Dollar," published in the Wall Street Journal of August 13, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News and Telegram of August 5, 1958]

ACT NOW TO SLOW INFLATION'S SWING

Kennecott Copper's swing back to a 5-day week this week is, of course, good news to tens of thousands of workers and their families and the businessmen who depend on their patronage. It is also one of many encouraging signs of a significant business upturn this fall.

But these signs also represent something else. They should sound a warning to Government to turn the corner now away from business-stimulating, inflationary devices.

Unless we do, we may be in for another inflationary spiral that will dwarf any of the others since World War II. And inflation, in the long run, is a deadlier threat to this country than business slowdowns.

Signs of an upturn can be seen on almost every hand.

The Kennecott work step-up is one. The company had been on a 4-day week since April. In addition, nearly 1,500 employees had been laid off entirely. The news that sales have risen sufficiently to justify a swing back toward normal operations is tremendously heartening.

Even more encouraging are the signs in the construction industry. Total dollar volume of new construction for the first 7 months of this year is even higher than the booming first half of 1957. July 1957, was the highest month on record up to that time, July 1958, was 3 percent higher. But one note of caution: The boom has stemmed largely from vast Government spending for highways, public housing, and armed services construction.

The stock market is another indication. It has now regained more than four-fifths of the ground it lost in the sharp declines of late last summer. But here again, danger signals are in order. The major pressure boosting the stock market seems to come unquestionably from the expectation of inflation. Present selling prices for stocks are 30 to 40 times their current annual earnings, which is far out of line. Some of the customer confidence is due, of course, to the expectation of good, solid future earnings, but more of it seems mainly a hedge against further inflation.

And then there are other signs. Industrial production has begun to rise. So has steel production. Farm income continues to rise. Personal income is higher than ever. So are Federal expenditures. All tend to boost and stimulate the economy.

But what will be the result? Inflation seems a certainty; the only question is how much. Last week the major steel companies boosted their prices $4.25–$4.50 a ton. Aluminum went up 7/10ths of a cent a pound. Costs in industries using these products—and, it might almost be asked, what industries do not?—are certain to rise accordingly.

Meanwhile, Government spending will be running around $12 billion in the red next year, the greatest peacetime deficit, by far, in the Nation's history. The deficit will be almost wholly inflationary.

So what does all this mean? For one thing, that President Eisenhower was fully justified in vetoing a $6.5 billion appropriations bill full of otherwise sound projects, because Congress had added to it $500 million for the civil service retirement fund. "No sound justification" can be found, he said, "for adding unnecessarily over half a billion dollars to a deficit which may reach $12 billion this year."

This veto kills the $11.7 million appropriation for Salt Lake City's new Federal building, which is unfortunate. But good government and economy are not just for the other fellow. We applaud the veto, for now if ever is the time for the most stringent efforts to squeeze out every ounce of fat from every budget in the interest of minimizing inflation. If the appropriations bill can be pushed through these closing days of Congress without the objectionable feature, well and good. If not, it is still better to delay a bit rather than to accept unbridled spending at this critical time.

Moreover, now is the time for the administration to consider carefully reinstating some of the inflation-control measures that were removed to stimulate the economy. Margin requirements on stock purchases might be a good place to start. Credit restrictions might be considered next.

We do not suggest that the economic brakes be put on full just now. But what we must do is to stop the long swings of the pendulum from boom to recession, and the best way to do that is to act before the swing gets fully into motion.

[From Newsweek of August 18, 1958]

MORE INFLATION AHEAD?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The signs are becoming unmistakable that the recent rise in the stock market is more a reflection of the belief in further inflation (i. e., in a further shrinkage in the dollar) than a reflection of business recovery.

Certainly stock prices are not reflecting current earnings reports. The First National City Bank of New York reports that net profits after taxes of 809 corporations in the first half of this year were 30 percent under those for the corresponding period last year. The automobile industry suffered a 56-percent drop in profits; the railroads, a 61-percent drop.

No one would suspect anything about this by looking at the recent stock market. The Dow-Jones industrial average went up from 420 on October 22 last year to 513 on August 8. This has created some surprising relationships between prices of stocks and the earnings and dividends of the companies. Barron's, the financial weekly, has pointed out that the stocks in the Dow-Jones industrial average as of August 1, were selling at a rate of about 17.3 percent of net earnings. This is higher than any earnings multiplier rate in the entire 1949–1957 upswing. And the New York Times has called attention to some extraordinary examples, such as Universal Cyclops Steel selling at 100 times its current annual earnings rate, and Crucible Steel at 110 times.

STOCK AGAINST BOND YIELDS

No less significant is the relationship recently established between the dividend yield of stocks and the interest yield of bonds. Normally the yield on common stocks, because of higher risk and uncertainty, is substantially above the yield on high-grade bonds. But as of July 30 the yield on Standard & Poor's index of 500 common stocks was 3.87 percent, or only 0.13 percentage point above the 3.742 percent yield on its A1-plus bond average. This is the closest the two yields have come together since July 1957, when for a short time stocks were actually yielding less than A1-plus bonds. It was the first time this had happened in more than 20 years.

This situation is usually thought to be paradoxical. In fact, the near-approach of the yields on common shares and bonds is often followed either by a fall in the price of common shares or a rise in the price of bonds. But there is one situation in which the convergence or crossing of stock yields and bond yields is a logical response. This is when investors and speculators believe that still further monetary inflation is threatened. In that case stocks are valued abnormally high in relation to current earnings or dividends. Bonds, on the other hand, are valued abnormally low, because the purchasing power of the principal is expected to decline, and lenders insist on a higher interest rate as an insurance premium against this.

EVER-MOUNTING DEBT

If there is a fear of further depreciation of the dollar, the blame rests squarely in Washington. Congress and the administration, between them, are responsible for the prospect of a $12 billion deficit in the current fiscal year. Even if we admit that the Federal Reserve authorities either can or should try to stabilize the economy, they made an extravagant overresponse to a mild recession, slashing the rediscount rate from 3½ to 1¾ percent, reducing required reserves of member banks, and engaging in massive support-buying of Government securities. Whatever the immediate effects may be of the restoration of stock-margin requirements from 50 percent to 70 percent, it is unsound and ultimately futile to encourage a general inflationary flood and then try to dam off its effects in 1 or 2 directions.

And now the Treasury wants a further $8 billion boost in the national-debt ceiling to $288 billion. It is time to ask some blunt questions of Congress and the administration. Do you ever expect the debt to be paid off? Do you ever intend even to reduce it? If so, at what rate? Under what conditions? Are the conditions likely to be realized? Do you intend to pay off either principal or interest in dollars of even present (48 cent) purchasing power, or do you mean to keep short-changing the Government's creditors by further depreciation?

President Eisenhower has expressed great concern which, however, must still be translated into policy.

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 13, 1958]

FLIGHT FROM THE DOLLAR

One of the more puzzling things around Wall Street these days has been the sharp upward march of the stock market in the face of lower earnings, reduced and sometimes omitted dividends. And as brokers, economists and other commentators seek an explanation, we hear more and more often a very ominous phrase.

A few examples will illustrate many. The E. F. Hutton Co., thinks the rising stock market and declining bond market underscore the flight from the dollar. Reynolds & Co comments that last week the flight from the dollar, which has been gathering momentum in recent weeks, turned into a stampede."

The same note is struck across the country. Wayne Hummer & Co., of Chicago, observes that the answer can be that investors have more confidence in the future value of stocks than they have in the dollar's stability. And the market comment of Daniel Reeves & Co., of Beverly Hills is both pointed and poignant: "It is sad but true that few people any longer believe that our currency can ever be worth more in terms of buying power and most likely will ultimately be worth considerably less."

Now admittedly many market comments are not necessarily compendiums of wisdom. Still, brokerage houses are by the nature of their business close to people who are concerned about how to manage their savings for an uncertain future. And when they note, with so much unanimity, such a strong feeling of fear about the dollar then it is surely time to pay attention.

In this instance, too, the feeling is confirmed by the figures on what people are doing. The bond market, including the market for obligations of the United States Government, has been depressed. Plainly the generality of people do not want to lend money to their government. They know the government will pay them back dollar for dollar with interest. What they fear is that they will be paid back with eroded dollars.

Moreover, the economic figures from Washington suggest that the people's fears are not unfounded.

The already huge Government debt is again being lifted; the deficit this year alone will be $12 billion or more. Getting the money for this deficit would be a terrible problem anytime. With a country already inflation conscious, it is almost an insurmountable problem. The Treasury is very likely to find that it can borrow little, or nothing, from the public savings; it may well have to turn to the Federal Reserve to create all the necessary credit dollars in the banking system. And almost everyone knows nowadays that this is just a fancy way of printing money.

Finally—and this is the saddest part of all—the political facts of Washington suggest that nobody is going to do anything about it. The President warns sternly about the dangers of inflation, and approves a budget that can only make more inflation. Congressmen talk sorrowfully about the terrible things that inflation does to people, particularly the little people, and casually build the budget bigger.

The basic problem of inflation is not new. But what is suggested by these scattered and independent market reports is that the people may be developing a new attitude toward it. There is a strong suggestion that people generally are beginning to abandon hope that those appointed to manage their Government will halt inflation, an implication that the country may come to accept the rotting of the dollar as being as inevitable as death and taxes.

And that is why we think Washington had better heed the ominous tone in these reports. For though this country has suffered from its past inflations, all those troubles will be as nothing to what we shall have to bear if the people, privately and quietly, once get it into their minds that they can no longer put any trust for the future in the dollars of the United States.

The Voice of Radio Cairo: What It Means to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have repeatedly pointed out that what President Nasser says, and what Radio Cairo says, are often two entirely different things.

The head of the United Arab Republic may, for purposes of expediency, issue sirupy words to the West in order that he can consolidate his gains.

Meanwhile, Radio Cairo beams, night and day, in 23 languages, and uninterrupted stream of hatred against the United States and other western powers.

Moreover, the most powerful single propaganda transmitters of the Middle East continue to demand the assassination of prowestern leaders in Arab countries.

I ask my colleagues: What can we expect of a government which speaks with one voice to us, through diplomatic channels, and with another voice against us through propaganda attacks?

And what do we expect will happen in the Middle East if these appeals for assassinations continue? How much stability can we expect there?

If United States troops leave Lebanon, and British troops leave Jordan, what is to prevent Radio Cairo from redoubling its appeals for the immediate murdering of prowestern leaders?

These are questions whose answers we had better think over very carefully.

Mr. President, during the last few days there has been a great deal of comment about the message the President of the United States delivered before the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was a wonderful message, and was wonderfully delivered. However, we must realize that an agreement or treaty with a nation which does not keep agreements or treaties would be worthless. The Kaiser said an international treaty was but a scrap of paper. Today, the philosophy found in the Mideast and in the Kremlin demonstrates that that attitude still exists in the world, at least in those areas. So we must not permit ourselves to be lulled into a state of complacency by syrupy words of either the Kremlin, Nasser, or anyone else. The stake involved is so great that we must not subject ourselves to that danger. If the United States were to step out of that picture and if the Kremlin were to be successful in egging Nasser to step in, what would the situation be? Then there would be a fire which would have to be put out. Would it lead into a third world war?

So, Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot permit our eyes to be blinded to what will occur tomorrow if today we act like children.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cairo Radio: It Promotes Nasserism With Lies, Hate, and Obscenity," which was published yesterday in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 14, 1958]

CAIRO RADIO: IT PROMOTES NASSERISM WITH LIES, HATE, AND OBSCENITY

(By Ray Vicker)

CAIRO.—"Hypocrites. Vice lords. Degenerates."

These are only a few of the milder epithets being used to describe Americans by Cairo Radio, the most potent propaganda tool now operating in the Middle East.

President Eisenhower yesterday put the spotlight on the Egyptian station in his address before the United Nations. He didn't call it by name—but none listening to him doubted what he was talking about when he declared inflammatory "radio broadcasts directed across national frontiers in the troubled Near East" were a form of "indirect aggression."

A few weeks ago Cairo Radio's strident voice called for uprisings in Iraq and Lebanon. Today it cries for a revolution in Jordan.

"Kill the dwarf King Hussein"—that is the theme of program after program beamed to the troubled Kingdom of Jordan. The assassin would be a hero acclaimed by the entire Arab world, station announcers declare with fervor.

FACTOR IN TROUBLES

And from its powerful Czech-built transmitters in the Nile Delta, this station is beaming a steady stream of anti-American, antiwestern propaganda in 23 languages to most of the world. Diplomats and government officials in the Middle East rate its virulent stream of abuse as a prime factor in recent disturbances in this area. Nationalist Arabs in a dozen countries listen to its voice for cues to new action.

Cairo Radio's 600,000- to 1,000,000-kilowatt capacity transmitters override every other station in the area. America's Voice of America, broadcasting its Congress-muted weak signal from a penny-pinched ship anchored in Rhodes harbor, is drowned out by the din of Cairo Radio and its Voice of the Arabs programs.

And the station presents America to the Arab world as a venal nation of colonialists. Mohammad Sahaf, commentator on a recent afternoon broadcast, said, "Since the end of World War II the policy of the American Government turned against all liberation movements in all parts of the world, fighting against the free leaders of oppressed nations and killing those who showed a tendency of being a headache to the plans of American imperialism."

Mohammad Abdel Kader described the United States as being "made of the refuse of all nations of the world molded together into a solid mass of crime and graft and corruption."

He describes United States Middle Eastern policy as "the policy of political prostitution and vagrancy of those gathered in America from the scum of the earth."

WARPED MENTALITY

Earthy obscenities flavor the rest of the broadcast. Secretary of State Dulles is described by another announcer thusly: "The man is crazy and has a warped mentality."

The announcer ended his broadcast by saying: "We warn you, Mr. Dulles, to lay off Arab nationalism before it proves to be the death of you and your like, you hypocrite."

Most broadcasts involving America contain so many obscenities that squeamish monitors won't repeat exact phraseology.

Headquarters of Cairo Radio is in the heart of this hot, sunny city at 4 Sharia El Cherifeen, a narrow lane between a canyon of buildings. Policy for the station is decided by President Nasser and his top lieutenants.

A policeman in a white uniform stands with a rifle before the entrance of the block, six-story, gray stone building which resembles a medieval Italian castle. The policeman steps forward, then hesitates as you nod nonchalantly to him.

Inside the drab halls people scurry back and forth between high vaulted offices. You remember the comment of one western intelligence officer:

"The station employs hundreds of people, literally hundreds, and it must cost a small fortune to operate."

A stair leads upward. On one floor the landing opens into a hall where a group of radio supervisors are drafting a program. Each has a script and each has some suggestion to make in Arabic. The chorus of voices seems to make little sense.

A youth thaws somewhat and explains that the radio supervisors are mapping a program to be beamed later that day to Lebanon.

What should the tone be? Violent? Friendly? Who should the program try to reach? What should be the theme? These questions are threshed out at "brainstorming sessions." After agreement, the outline is given to a team of writers and a script is written. Officials clear the script and it is then given to the production team with the scheduling.

There is nothing haphazard about the abuse which flows through this station. Economists, folksong writers, politicians, historians, anthropologists, and radio technicians all join hands in carefully planning each part of the program for maximum effect.

Each program is preceded by long studies. Included are studies of the customs of each people to whom a broadcast will be beamed. Attention is paid to the time they sleep and awake, the time they start and end work and the average time-distance between work and home. This helps decide the time the program will be beamed.

Other studies delve into the political position of the country, its economy, the type of government and major problems occupying the attention of the people. This information decides the content of the program.

More studies go into the literacy rate of the people involved, their method of expressing themselves, their idioms, and their intonations. This helps set the tone of the presentation.

Cairo Radio not only broadcasts news bulletins and commentaries, it also presents to each people their popular songs and music. The lonely Kurd in northern Iraq hears Cairo Radio's messages interlarded with wild tunes of the Upper Tigris Valley. The Sudanese hears the savage drum beat of his native dances along with the political pitch to join Egypt.

Each program is presented by a native of the country to which the message is beamed, assuring that all idioms and methods of presentation will be authentic to listeners.

SOMALI, SWAHILI

Programs last from 15 minutes to 2 hours as a rule. Languages include: Indonesian, Malayan, Bengali, English, Kurdi, Turkish, Iranian, Sudanese dialects, Swahili, Amheric, Somali, French, German, Portuguese, Spanish, and Hebrew. As many as seven programs broadcast simultaneously over different bands. A total of 62 hours of propaganda daily is now being fed to people in the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, and Africa.

Of the 7 programs identified with Cairo Radio, 4 are especially important. These are the general program, Voice of the Arabs, which specifically aims at promoting Arab nationalism, the Sudanese program which tries to sell Sudan on the idea of unifying itself with Egypt, and the beamed broadcasts. The latter may be directed at any country where Egypt thinks it has something to gain by spreading its messages.

Not content with carrying the torch of Arab nationalism, the station also beams broadcasts to the Belgian Congo lashing at Belgian paternalism in its native policy; at Kenya urging natives to rise again against British colonialism; at French West Africa selling natives the idea of working together with their Moslem brothers in Egypt.

Especially virulent messages to Africa are reserved for the Voice of Free Africa. This is a station operated from an unidentified location in southern Egypt by Egyptian intelligence. The government maintains a myth about this being a clandestine station but it is an open secret who runs it.

WESTERN COUNTER MEASURE

Egyptian officials claim that Cairo Radio is being operated merely as a counter measure against anti-Egyptian propaganda. The government claims that eight clandestine radio stations are now beaming anti-Nasser propaganda into the Middle East each day. There were nine such stations until last month when the Voice of Iraq was stilled by the revolution. Says an Egyptian Government official: "We have reasons to believe one or more of those stations are on Cyprus, another in France, one in Israel, and at least one in Turkey. They are constantly subjecting us to vilification and abuse."

No doubt Western powers would be only too happy to silence their clandestine stations if Cairo Radio could also be silenced. Their stations seem to be running poor seconds behind Egypt's when it comes to effectiveness of propaganda.

"The only way a small country can attack a big one is to yell like hell," says one European diplomat. "Egypt is not going to quit yelling through Cairo Radio unless forced to do so, for when you come right down to it this is her best weapon."

Twentieth Anniversary of the Southwest Rural Electric Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, one of the greatest movements on behalf of the farmers and rural people of the United States was the rural electrification program which was inaugurated in the 1930's. I know that the rural electrification program in North Dakota has been a blessing to the farmers, their wives and their children and the rural people of my great State of North Dakota.

I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate of the great strides made by our people because of REA.

I notice the Tipton Tribune, Tipton, Okla., August 7, 1958, issue, there is an item which states:

Economists who have made exhaustive studies of the matter say that for each dollar spent by a rural electric cooperative to build its distribution system, more than $4 is spent by co-op members for wiring and appliances. Some economists place the figure at $5.

The article says that rural electric cooperatives bolster United States economy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two clippings from the Tipton Tribune of August 7, 1958, which deal with the 20th anniversary of growth of the Southwest Rural Electric Association which services southwestern Oklahoma and northern section of Texas. I am happy to note that the rural electrification program progresses in all parts of the United States where it has been instituted.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHWEST RURAL ELECTRIC MARKS 20-YEAR GROWTH

Celebrating 20 years of progress in bringing electricity to the rural areas of nine counties in Oklahoma and Texas, the Southwest Rural Electric Association will hold its 21st annual membership meeting in the Tipton city park Tuesday, August 12.

With more than 2,000 members and visitors expected to be on hand for the annual event, an interesting program will feature the Willie Wirehand Serenaders of KOCO–TV, at Enid; short talks by Roscoe Keiffer, widely known rural electrification leader, and E. E. Karns, manager of Western Farmers Electric Cooperative of Anadarko.

Keiffer, a long-time farmer of Helena, Okla., is now serving his fourth term as president of the State Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives. He has a broad understanding of the problems facing rural people today.

Karns, an authority on power generation and transmission, held a responsible position with the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington, D. C., before coming to the cooperative at Anadarko.

A brief talk will also be given by Betty Fern McGee, 16, a Southside 4–H Club youth with one of the most outstanding records of achievement in the State. She was the State winner in the cooperative speech contests in 1957 and was also the winner in the county speech contests, 1954 to 1958.

The Willie Wirehand Serenaders, sponsored on television Monday through Friday of each week by a number of rural electric cooperatives of the State, are one of the Southwest's most popular musical groups. They will present their wide repertoire of western, popular, novelty, and religious music.

As usual, a feature of the annual parley will be the drawing for attendance prizes, all of which are useful electrical appliances. Winner of the grand prize will have his choice of a television set, home freezer, refrigerator, 1-ton air conditioner, or electric range.

Also, a brief business session will offer reports on the condition of the cooperative as a financial and business enterprise.

There will be free swimming in the Tipton pool for children of all visitors. The pool will be supervised.

The Southwest Rural Electric Association provides electric service to all or part of 4 counties in Oklahoma and 5 Texas counties. The vast network of the co-op's lines reach into Tillman, Jackson, Grees, and Kiowa Counties in Oklahoma, and Wichita, Wilbarger, Hardeman, Foard, and Archer Counties in Texas.

The annual payroll of the cooperative, over $100,000, helps bolster the economy of the community in which it is headquartered. Twenty-five employees of the cooperative live in Tipton and 21 of these own their own homes here.

"The bulk of the cooperative's payroll is spent right here in Tipton," J. M. Maddox, manager, says. "In addition, the cooperative spent $23,511 with Tipton merchants last year for supplies, materials, and services."

Reviewing the progress Southwest Rural Electric Association has made since its inception 20 years ago, Maddox points out that when the first line was energized December 13, 1938, slightly more than 300 rural families in Jackson and Tillman Counties began receiving electric service for the first time.

This event marked the beginning of the rural electrification program in the area now served by the consumer-owned REA-sponsored electric cooperative.

It was just a small par.—that first line of only 162 miles—of the vast network of distribution lines now totaling more than 2,400 miles and serving more than 5,400 residential, farm, and industrial customers and organizations.

"The rural electrification program was just slightly over 2 years of age at that time," Maddox points out. "It was just starting to bring the luxury of city living to the rural areas in the form of electricity at prices which the farmers and rural people could afford to pay."

To the more than 300 rural families of Tillman and Jackson Counties, getting electricity meant getting electric lights. But as the years passed, and they learned of the many other conveniences and labor-saving devices which electricity could provide for them, a great many expanded their use of electric service.

Today, a large number of the rural and farm homes served by the Southwest Rural Electric Association have acquired electric refrigerators, home freezers, electric washing machines, electric ranges, attic fans, electric water systems, irons, radios, television sets, roasters, and many others. Many have installed all-electric kitchens, air conditioning, electric milkers, electric-powereed farm machine shops, incubators, brooders, and other types of electrically powered farm equipment.

At the present time it is estimated that there are more than 400 ways to put electricity to practical use on the farm and in the home.

All these things have contributed to the steady rate of growth of Southwest Rural Electric Association.

As to the future outlook for the cooperative's growth, J. M. Maddox has this to say: "We hope to continue our steady progress by adding new members from time to time, and to educate our membership to a greater use of electricity in their everyday work and living. At this time we are preparing to launch a campaign to promote a better understanding of the advantages of electric heating in the home, its safety features, its cleanliness, and its numerous other conveniences. Today's rural family can have all the modern conveniences of the city and still enjoy the advantages which the open country provides."

RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS BOLSTER UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Economists who have made exhaustive studies of the matter say that for each dollar spent by a rural electric cooperative to build its distribution system, more than $4 is spent by co-op members for wiring and appliances. Some economists place the figure at $5.

Conservatively, this means that more than $14 million has been channeled into the economy of Southwest Rural Electric Association's service area during the co-op's 20 years of operation that would not otherwise have been put there.

The cooperative has spent $3,483,000 building its distribution system and for system improvements.

TWO EMPLOYEES OF SOUTHWEST REA ARE LANDMARKS HERE

Two employees of Southwest Rural Electric Association of Tipton are virtual landmarks of the history of progress of the organization. They are Homer Shotts, line superintendent, and C. M. Shelton, work order clerk and dispatcher.

The work these two men did in launching the cooperative project predates the cooperative itself for they were engaged in taking member application and securing easements for the construction of the initial lines.

Recalling those early days of the program, the men say that most farm people they called on were willing enough to pay the $5 application fee but they did not believe anything would ever come of it. Shelton and Shotts say that practically all rural people would not believe that they would ever get electricity for their farms and farm homes.

They point out that in that day people thought of electricity only in terms of getting lights for the home. They didn't realize at that time the many uses electricity could be put to on the farm to take the drudgery out of rural living.

"These men are excellent employees," J. M. Maddox, manager, says. "It is worth a great deal to have employees with the background knowledge of the system that these two men have. It makes them very valuable."

The World's Political Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article by Constantine Brown entitled "The World's Political Illness," which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, August 14, 1958.

I think this article calls for the attention of the public in general and my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD'S POLITICAL ILLNESS—POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST RED VIRUS SEEN ONLY CURE IN DULLES' VIEW

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary John Foster Dulles and a few realists in the State Department are diagnosing the ills of the world as "political." The virus which besets every nation is produced by international communism; the only possible cure suggested for some years by our Secretary of State is a strong political offensive against direct and indirect aggressions prompted by the Kremlin. Most of the "consultants," particularly from congressional ranks, are taking issue and declare the ailment is "economic." They recommend large doses of American dollars and substance as the only possible treatment.

Mr. Dulles, in his discussions with the congressional "consultants," pointed out that whenever this country and her associates adopted what used to be called in medicine "heroic remedies," the pernicious high fever subsided and the patient improved. There are many examples of this treatment: The Truman doctrine, which stopped the Soviet advances in the Middle East in 1947 in their tracks; the Berlin blockade; the aggression against the Republic of Korea and, very recently, the response to the requests of the heads of governments of Lebanon and Jordan to land troops and thus stem the Communist tide.

It is unfortunate that the last three operations have not been pushed to their logical conclusion: Complete success. In Korea, we bowed before the fear of our allies that pushing ahead with our military forces would involve us in another world war. Under the impact of some of the allies who had sent small forces to the Korean battlefields we accepted first a ceasefire and later actually signed an armistice at a time when our commanders in the field felt certain that they could push the enemy across the Yalu with fewer losses than we had suffered during the ceasefire period.

The military promenade in Lebanon appears to have been of little assistance. It was a mere shot in the arm, with only very temporary effect, because the free world decided to let the illness run its course in Iraq. There are many here and in London who maintain that had the Turks, for instance, been asked (and provided with the much-needed gasoline for their tanks and airplanes) to move into Iraq, the rest of the still loyal army would have rallied around the legitimate successor of the murdered King Faisal. The coup so cleverly engineered by Moscow by way of Cairo could have boomeranged.

As things stand now, politically, it is only a question of time before the King of Jordan is either ousted or assassinated, while the real ruler of Saudi Arabia, Crown Prince Faisal, is expected to accept Nasser domination. The other Arab princelings who control vast resources without which the NATO and particularly Britain claim they cannot survive, unquestionably will join Colonel Nasser.

The inevitable nationalization of the oil resources is unimportant. Few people bother about the fact that the oil companies may make smaller profits. What is important is that once the Arab empire is established under the president of the UAR, the oil resources will be controlled politically by the Soviet Union. Only those countries which accept the Moscow standard of coexistence will be supplied.

This is the analysis of the political X-ray pictures which Mr. Dulles has carefully examined ever since he took office. There is no question that economic aid is necessary in certain areas to lessen the fever. But economic help alone as advocated by the many consultants inside and outside the government has proved of little or no help.

The belief that communism thrives in countries where poverty is rampant is belied by the facts. Those who have traveled, like this reporter, in areas where people lead a substandard way of life realize that hardship does not produce communism or a desire to join the Communist system. People

in South Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, and Turkey—to mention only those I have visited recently—have barely enough to eat, and live, if they are lucky, in hovels. Yet they are all determined to fight and defeat communism.

The same thing can be said about the Chinese in Taiwan and the Turks, who in recent years have suffered economically more than ever in their history. Economic assistance and relief are sought by all, but not at the price of surrender to the Red conspiracy.

Crippling of Labor Called Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, writing in the August 11 issue of the Chicago Daily News, Columnist Harry Barnard points out that the blackening of the American labor movement because of the actions of a few is not only unjust but dangerous to our democracy.

Mr. Barnard, by the way, is author of the book Independent Man, a biography of the late Senator James Couzens, a former distinguished Member of this body from the State of Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIPPLING OF LABOR CALLED DANGEROUS

(By Harry Barnard)

So much ink has been used lately for blackening the public image of labor unions that using a little here to bring this matter into better focus seems highly desirable.

Labor unions are good. They are necessary for achieving democratic aims for a fair shake for everybody and for as much freedom as orderly society can tolerate. Some of their leaders act hard boiled. But so do many employers.

So long as we operate an economic system on the principle that the profits should go to individuals or private corporations, not to the state, workers need the protections of organization. There is no getting around this fact, unless we want Government to fix wages.

Many businessmen, perhaps most, do keep in mind the welfare of their employees. But so long as any do not, employees must band together to get decent wages and conditions.

Otherwise, the individual worker, usually having no reserves for bargaining power cannot refuse any offer. Otherwise also, even social-minded employers, because of competition, are inevitably forced to lower their wage rates.

These are old truths. But they ought to be kept in mind to offset the anger produced by recent reminders that some unscrupulous men are in labor unions or organizations they call unions, but in fact are extortion schemes.

Anger over this is certainly justified, though none of this is really new. Corrupt men have always operated in the labor movement—just as such persons have always operated in business and in professions.

But they are in the minority.

Some new laws may be desirable. This may be so to the extent that bigger unions, like bigger business, result in new relationships.

Also, the time has come, I think, for unions themselves to drop certain vestigal practices—featherbedding by railroaders, "bogus" typesetting by printers, and the like—which had justification in earlier eras but not today. This along with their own housecleaning of illegal practices.

But I am not unhappy that Congress will not pass new labor legislation this session. It is all to the good that there be a breather for everybody for digesting better the McClellan committee activity, some of it nothing more than sensationalism.

More Government regulation of labor practices means less freedom, not only for labor, but also for industry. This may be unavoidable. But we should not rush along this road.

John L. Lewis, of course, is not unbiased here. However, when this really great labor figure appeared before a Senate committee last year, he made a comment worth emphasizing. "One of our proudest boasts abroad," he said, "is that our unions are free, unlike those of Russia."

This is important.

Neither Mr. Lewis nor I argues that freedom means that racketeers should not be punished—a responsibility, by the way, of local and United States prosecutors.

The racketeers should be run out, but the method should be carefully weighed, with the balance, I think, in favor of the most freedom possible for our unions.

We do not hamstring the entire medical profession because of a few quacks. By the same token, we should be sure we do not cripple the now free American labor movement out of indignation over a few bad eggs in it.

By any test, throughout history, the labor movement has been a major bulwark of democracy. It is that now. This should not be forgotten.

Nor should we forget that extending Federal regulation into this field, even for good purposes, can be the first of several fatal steps toward statism where it would hurt democracy most.

United States Cattle in Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great forces in settling the West was the cattleman, and though his importance has been recognized in books and television, opportunities are now present for this country to extend the impact of his achievement to the other parts of the world.

The July issue of the Cattleman has a very informative article on the Latin American cattle industry and the possibilities for American assistance through sharing of our knowledge and the sale of our cattle to these countries. The author of this article, Mr. W. W. Callan, points out that conditions in the Latin American countries vary greatly from those in the United States, but that with study, mutual benefit will result.

The economic challenge in world power is becoming increasingly serious, and adds greatly to the difficulties of our political and military struggle. Mr. Callan suggests one way in which steps may be taken to strengthen our ties with our sister republics in the Latin American States.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE'S A MARKET FOR OUR CATTLE IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

(By W. W. Callan)

So often when we hear someone speak of one of the many countries south of the border, we have only a vague idea of the geography, climate, terrain, or the people involved. Few of us realize that Brazil is 1 of the 4 countries of the world larger than the United States. It is difficult for us sometimes to realize that the Mayan culture of Guatemala is older than anything we know in the United States, or that the lush tropical growths along the coast lines of many of these countries give way to high, cold mountain areas within less than an hour's airplane flight.

So to understand the conditions surrounding the market for cattle in Latin America, we have to understand that any general statements that we make will not apply in many spots.

There are, however, a few general conditions that prevail in most of the Latin American countries, including Mexico, Central America, and in South America that need to be recognized at this point.

COMPLETE ABSENCE OF SELECTIVE BREEDING

The custom of the cattlemen is to allow the bull to grow up without castration, and that 4- to 6-year-old bull meat is quite common and perhaps constitutes the majority of the meat in Latin America. These animals often run with the cow herds indiscriminately. There is complete absence of any plan for selective breeding for better animal production as we know it in the cattle areas of the United States.

It is not uncommon for a 5-year-old bull to be moved from the place where he was born to one of the better coastal plain fattening areas weighing 600 pounds and after 6 months to be sent to market weighing 800 pounds and have the meat from this animal to represent the average or perhaps a little above the average of the meat that is available in many of the Latin American countries.

At this point I hasten to say that there are a few countries where there are a few fine cattlemen who are just as progressive and who take advantage of all the techniques we know for beef production in the United States. These men who are the exception to the rule have fine cattle. They market 3-year-old steers weighing 1,100 pounds, fat off grass with a very desirable quality of meat. Many of these people have cow herds that could go into some of our best cattle areas in the United States and compare favorably with the cow herds now found in those areas.

We should also recognize that the meat in most Latin American countries is cooked and consumed the same day the animal is killed. There is almost a complete absence of refrigeration. Of course, in the major cities again we have an exception and there are refrigeration plants for the meat sold to the elite and some of this meat is of very fine quality and quite flavorful and sometimes very tender.

LITTLE GRAIN FOR LIVESTOCK

There is almost a complete absence of any grain for the cattle throughout Latin America. There is hardly enough corn,

wheat or other grains to feed the human population with a little bit used for poultry farms, leaving nothing in the way of grain for the livestock. So we are talking about animals that have to grow up and build their entire life subsistency on grass and other vegetation, and go to market at a much older age and at a much lower weight than any we are accustomed to thinking of in the cattle areas of the United States.

In many areas there is a rainy season when an average of 10 inches of rain each month for 6 months will occur. At this time there is a lush growth of grass and other vegetation; growth where the nutrients have been washed out of the soil. Little food value is found in the grass of many areas. Cattle may be up to their backs in green grass but be in poor condition and failing to make growth or put on fat except at an extremely slow rate.

As a result in many of the areas, exclusive of the few modern ranches of these countries, the cattle have a tendency to be light framed and of small bone. Animals imported from the United States or other areas are not likely to grow out to the same scale, weight or bone structure animals developed in the better cattle areas of this country. Experience has shown the necessity of recognizing the soil and mineral deficiencies when cattle are selected from importation into most areas or perhaps all of the Latin American countries.

It has been perhaps 50 years that most of the United States has been relatively free of internal and external parasites. Our animals do not have many of the immunities of the native animals to tick fever of one kind or another that is quite common in most of the Latin American countries. There are a few areas where the cattlemen, veterinarians and other advisers have been quite progressive in the treatment of the animals to condition them to withstand the ravages of the parasites.

In the case of the tick fever, a system has been developed to preimmunize the animals before they are turned loose in an area infested with ticks. This treatment has been especially successful in the case of young animals not over 10 months of age in a few of the countries.

I have tried to give a little of the background that is necessary for those who wish to successfully introduce cattle from the United States to Latin America. These problems, while serious, are not insurmountable. If recognized and approached with commonsense and all the knowledge gained by those who have studied the problems in recent years, these problems can be overcome and the animal successfully introduced into Latin America with beneficial results to the cattle now being used.

Also on the positive side of cattle raised in Latin America, there are some interesting situations,

Land in many cases, good land, is readily available to cattlemen of almost all Latin American countries. Foreigners who desire to acquire this land may have either difficulty in acquiring or keeping it.

The manpower to perform the necessary ranching work and the costs of operation are both readily available and low in cost. The cost of bringing a 6-year-old steer from time of birth to sale at the ranch for market is a negligible item as compared with the cost we know in the United States.

There is always a demand for all the beef or other meat products that can be grown in most Latin American countries. Many of the citizens of these countries only rarely secure any meat. The cause of health and nutrition would be greatly assisted if more meat was available for more of the people.

NO PREMIUM ON QUALITY OF MEAT

In many of the countries the governments have rather strict controls over the prices of the live animals and the resale price of the meat. These government regulations, in general, do not recognize any difference between animals in good flesh with some fat and the run-of-the-mill animals that may be in poor flesh and of inferior quality. In other words, a kilo of beef is a stated maximum price regardless of whether the animal from which it was cut would grade by our standards—Choice, Good, or Utility.

In Mexico, the Central American countries, and throughout South America, there are individuals, ranching corporations, Government agricultural and livestock department and others who are aware of all the problems listed here and many more that exist in their own areas, who are successfully importing and exporting breeding livestock; introducing them into their herds and showing real improvement in the resulting animals. These people are practicing the best animal husbandry known to us. They are working toward the marketing of 2- and 3-year-old animals weighing more than those marketed by their neighbors at 6 years of age.

In spite of the governing regulations in many of these countries, the high cost of export and import expenses, money exchange rates and transportation costs, they are continuing year after year to bring in more and better animals and finding it both possible and profitable to do so.

The experiences of many of these people indicate less difficulty when young animals with good growth characteristics and large bones are introduced and carefully managed until they reach maturity. The young animals respond to preimmunization and other adjustments more readily than the older animals in many cases. These young animals, however, require greater nutritional care to reach their maximum growth than would be necessary for us here.

There is a real need for many kinds of livestock, especially cattle to be carefully selected, well prepared, and taken care of in the herds in the various Latin-American countries.

The introduction of inferior animals, failure to properly recognize the health and nutritional problems is certain to result in unsatisfactory experiences and is to be avoided wherever possible.

The Soviet Union's Economic Offensive in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a series of 6 articles and 1 editorial which appeared in the Miami News, prepared by its Latin American editor, Mr. Hal Hendrix and his staff, concerning the success of the Soviet Union's economic offensive in Latin America.

They pointedly describe the scope of the Communist offensive, and the grave threat it poses to the United States. As the Soviets strengthen their toehold in Latin America through a greatly expanded trade program, they will follow it up with massive attempts at political penetration of the entire Western Hemisphere.

For many years I have urged the establishment of a stable, long-range, effective, workable trade program between the United States and Latin America. These articles call for the same action and give new evidence that we must act soon in bringing our Latin American trade policies in line with the demands of the times.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) News]

SMALL, BUT GROWING—SOVIET TRADE HITTING LATIN SOFT SPOTS

(Throughout the world the Soviet Union has launched an economic offensive which is considered an entering wedge for later political penetration. The economic campaign has touched parts of Latin America. Several weeks ago, the Miami News has asked its correspondents in Latin America to report on this Soviet offensive and its shape and size. Their reports on this extremely dangerous development follows.)

(By Hal Hendrix)

In the last year, several informed Americans have expressed increasing concern regarding the rising tide of Communist economic influence in the free world.

There is evidence at every turn that the much-heralded Soviet economic offensive has reached into Latin America.

The penetration has been in varying degrees in the 20 Latin republics. Some of the nations have nibbled at the Red bait, some have taken a fairly good-sized bite, some have turned away.

The dollar value of all the Soviet transactions is relatively small. Soviet business in Latin America, for instance, amounted to $131 million in 1956. United States sales in the same year were nearly $4 billion.

UNDERLYING SIGNIFICANCE

Roughly 2 percent of Latin American trade was with the Soviet bloc. Although this is not a large figure, there are at least two reasons for not assuming that it is completely insignificant.

First, Soviet bloc trade with Latin America has been growing about 40 percent a year since 1952.

Considering the very low level from which it started, the net gain still is small. But it points up an intensified economic drive in Latin America.

Second, the Soviet Union is directing its trade offensive primarily to soft spots in Latin America—countries that, because of various economic problems, have experienced difficulty in disposing of their exports at declining world prices.

FRIEND IN NEED

The Soviets are thereby able to make an effective show of helping out nations in trouble. There is no doubt that behind the trade screen the chief purpose is political penetration.

Latin America has been increasingly anxious to find new markets, and the anxiety has grown in recent months due to the depressed free world market in most commodities.

The Latin nations possess some of the raw materials in short supply in the Soviet bloc. They have a large demand for some of the products the bloc has in surplus.

All reports indicate that trade between Russia and its satellites and Latin America will show another gain this year. Red trade missions have been extremely busy in soliciting Latin purchasers and offering to buy Latin products.

TOO LARGE TO IGNORE

If Red trade in the Latin area should increase at the possible rate of 20 percent a year, in 10 years it would amount to about $1 billion. This still would be considerably below the United States volume in Latin

America, but too large for the United States to ignore.

A strong and growing Soviet trade offensive in Latin America presents a serious challenge to the West in general and the United States in particular.

For as the Soviet Union's trade grows in the Western Hemisphere, so does its political penetration and influence.

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 2—RIO WOULD DEAL FOR RUSSIAN OIL

(By Herbert Zschech)

RIO DE JANEIRO, August 5.—The Soviet Union's trade offensive has been underway in Brazil several months.

It has been more intense here than in many other Latin nations, and last month obtained its first success when Brazilians said "Yes" in principle to a barter-trade offer.

However, the deal depends on conditions spelled out by Brazil. There has been no indication the Soviets will agree.

Russia offered to supply Brazil with 200,000 tons of crude oil—worth about $9 million—in exchange for coffee, cocoa, and cotton.

NO GATE FOR INFILTRATION

According to reports which have not been denied, Brazil accepted the offer with these two provisions:

1. It should be strictly trade, not involving currency.

2. It should not be a pretext for Russian trade missions, technical missions or similar groups to be sent to Brazil.

Alexander Volkov, a member of Russia's Supreme Soviet, said in Rio yesterday that the time was ripe for Brazil and Russia to renew diplomatic relations, which were severed in 1947.

The Soviet delegate said Russia was in a position to supply Brazil with large quantities of machinery, including oil drilling equipment and nuclear plants with technical assistants.

The recent Russian offer was made through the Soviet Trade Bureau in Montevideo, which is the hub of Soviet South American activities, to the Brazilian Government's oil monopoly, Petrobras. Brazil now imports about $400 million worth of oil annually, mainly from United States firms.

Russian trade specialists earlier submitted a proposal to supply ships in exchange for Brazilian coffee. Brazil rejected the offer, but then accepted a similar deal with Communist Poland for 12 merchant ships.

ALSO WANTS MANGANESE

The Soviets also have expressed interest in buying Brazilian manganese.

Red attempts to extend trade relations lately have been meeting with increasingly favorable reception by Brazilian nationalist groups, including some quarters close to President Juscelino Kubitschek.

The Brazilian Foreign Ministry has been the principal center of defense against these tendencies. It remains to be seen whether the recent resignation of Foreign Minister Macedo Soares will change this attitude.

Opposition deputies in the Brazilian Congress have frequently accused the Government of attempting to blackmail the United States with the Russian trade offers in order to gain financial and commercial advantages in Washington.

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 3—MEXICANS COOL TO RUSSIAN BAIT

(By Marion Wilhelm)

MEXICO CITY, August 6.—If Russian officials in Mexico have any trade tricks up their sleeves, and there have been recent indications they do, Mexico is not likely to fall for them.

The Russians broached the trade subject here recently when Deputy Foreign Minister V. V. Kuznetsov, ending a South American tour, made overtures regarding all kinds of heavy industrial machinery, including petroleum rigs—just what the nationalized oil industry needs to speed up exploration and development.

But Petroleos Mexicanos, or Pemex, told the Miami News the Soviets have made no direct offer. If they do, it is known that Pemex would say, "No."

The industry's equipment is almost totally from United States manufacturers and it would not be feasible to switch at this point.

FRIENDLIEST WITH UNITED STATES

Further, the Mexican Government maintains friendliest official relations with Washington and this administration has been outspokenly anti-Communist.

President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines didn't bother to answer a letter received last April from Russia's Khrushchev asking Mexico's support of his unilateral suspension of nuclear tests.

Ruiz Cortines' successor, President-elect Adolfo Lopez Mateos, is expected to continue warm relations with the United States Government and United States businessmen when he takes office in December.

Kuznetsov's statements here nevertheless indicated that there would be some concrete offers made to Mexico's rapidly industrializing economy, presently bounding ahead with the help of United States capital and machinery.

"For example," he said, "the U. S. S. R. could sell petroleum machinery, lathes, highway construction machines, transport equipment. The Soviet, for its part, could be a constant buyer of the traditional export products of Mexico."

PARTY SNUBBED

He added:

"We are disposed to develop economic, cultural, scientific, sports, and other relations with Mexico."

It was interesting that Mexico's Minister of Economy Hilberto Loyo, who bosses foreign commerce, didn't attend the chummy party thrown in the Russian Embassy by Kuznetsov and the Ambassador. He sent an assistant.

Propagandawise the Russian minister's visit was more significant, since he had followed pretty much the betroubled trail taken by the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON.

"We didn't plan our trip to coincide with Mr. NIXON's," Kuznetsov told the Mexico City press conference, smiling broadly and reminiscent of the jocular Khrushchev.

While Mexico's Government is not likely to promote any trade with Russia, Iron Curtain manufacturers have been silently moving in some products for Mexican sale.

Cameras from Iron Curtain countries, including East Germany, have been on sale here for some time.

The most noticeable stepup in Russia's Mexican offensive has been in magazines and periodicals—some published here, but most brought in from Russia—and books, now on sale at numerous bookstores around Mexico City.

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 4—RUSSIA THREAT IN ARGENTINA STILL MOSTLY PALABRAS

(By Herbert M. Clark)

BUENOS AIRES, August 7.—Russia's vaunted trade offensive has been more a matter of propaganda than product recently in Argentina, although it is stealing headlines and building into a potential threat.

Briefly, this is what has happened in recent months:

The Soviet Union has sold a million tons of crude oil and a sizable quantity of rails to Argentina at prices below United States rates.

An Argentine purchasing mission visited Communist bloc countries in January and February and bought $27 million worth of goods, mostly machinery and steel.

ARGUMENTS OVER OIL VALUE

Czechoslovakia has sold Argentina a coal-washing plant for its Rio Turbio deposits.

The most recent fanfare centered on the deal in which Russia agreed to supply Argentina with a million tons of petroleum over the next year. It was front-page news in papers, which did not bother to point out that the agreement would meet barely 10 percent of Argentina's needs for imported fuel.

The Government announced that the Soviet quotation of $2.32 a barrel was less than has been paid in the world market recently, but the pro-Frondizi weekly El Intransigente contended that actually Argentina has been paying only $2.28 and that actually the government has been driven to overspending in an effort to use up commercial credits.

SOVIETS OFFER MACHINERY

The first 400,000 tons of Soviet oil will actually be credited against an existing balance to Argentina's favor in Russia, one which the trade mission sent behind the Iron Curtain was not able to liquidate. The balance will be imported on a barter basis against low-grade wools from the clip which starts next October 1.

Russia has offered road-building machinery and railway and oilfield equipment in a series of negotiations, but none has yet borne fruit as President Frondizi attempts to juggle overwhelming needs against nonexistent means of payment. The president has forecast a $360 million trade deficit for 1958, even with an import freeze applied on May 2 and not yet relaxed.

Iron Curtain trade with Argentina actually has slumped over the past 3 years. In 1955, Russia and its satellites sold $64,170,000 of the total of $1,172,590,000 worth of goods which Argentina bought and took $47,510,000 worth of total Argentine exports of $928,595,000, absorbing 5.2 percent of the country's total foreign trade.

The percentage slipped to 3.6 percent for 1956, and for the first 4 months of 1958—latest figures available—fell to 2.8 percent of the total.

Of total exports of $321,859,000, barely $8,846,000 went behind the Iron Curtain, and only $11,638,000 of total imports of $405,943,000 came from the Soviet bloc.

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 5—PERU-RED TRADE LIGHT, BUT SOVIET TRIES TO NIBBLE

(By Donald I. Griffis)

LIMA, August 8.—Peru has not yet really felt the Soviet Union's trade offensive in Latin America.

Trade between Russia and Peru is virtually nonexistent. Imports from Soviet bloc countries, chiefly Czechoslovakia, amounted to only about $1 million last year. The figure is expected to be about the same this year. Exports to all Communist bloc countries amounted to less than $3,000 last year.

SUSCEPTIBLE TO RED TRADE OFFERS

Observers here note, however, that Peru is susceptible to Soviet trade overtures since its foreign-exchange income this year is expected to drop at least $40 million because of the plunge in world prices of the nation's principal exports—lead, zinc, cotton, wool, and sugar.

Left-wing and anti-American elements here have suggested recently that Peru attempt to trade with Russia and its satellite countries. The demands became loud at the time the United States Government was considering increasing duties on lead and zinc imports.

However, little serious thought has been given to Soviet nibbles. The country's governing class is strongly anti-Communist.

At present, Peru's principal imports, with the exception of wheat and beef, are manufactured goods that can be obtained more cheaply and easily from the United States or Western Europe.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA NONEXISTENT

Peru never has maintained diplomatic or economic relations with the Soviet Union, despite intense efforts by the Soviets for recognition during World War II.

For a time a Czechoslovakian legation existed in Lima, but the Peruvian Government ordered it closed last year. The Government charged that the legation was serving as an outlet for Communist propaganda.

Three years ago a Yugoslav trade mission visited Peru. But its members never got farther than their hotel. A hooting mob surrounded the place until the mission left.

REDS IN LATIN AMERICA, NO. 7—RUSSIANS RANK FIFTH IN BUYING OF CUBAN SUGAR

(This concluding article on the Soviet economic offensive in Latin America is a roundup of reports from Miami News correspondents—Julio Vielman in Guatemala, Jay Mallin in Cuba, and Victor Hugo Villegas in Bolivia—on the situations in their respective countries.)

(By Hal Hendrix)

In Guatemala, the overthrow of the Communist administration of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in mid-1954 established the tone of any relationship between Guatemala and the Soviet Union or any of the Communist-bloc nations.

Any diplomatic, commercial or cultural associations that existed between the Soviets and Guatemala before the 1954 revolution were cut off and have remained severed.

A decree signed June 6, 1954, by the late President Carlos Castillo Armas, forbids all trade between Guatemala and the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Communist China, North Korea, and all the other Soviet satellites.

Inquiries among Guatemalan Government officials, businessmen, and foreign-investment promoters disclose no real effort by the Soviets or their puppet nations to aid or trade with Guatemala.

FIFTH AS CUBAN SUGAR BUYER

In Cuba, the world's largest single sugar bowl, trade with the Soviet Union is limited largely to sugar sales. Russia ranks fifth as a purchaser of Cuban sugar.

The United States usually buys slightly more than half of the total Cuban sugar crop. Other big buyers, with purchases ranging between 300,000 and 500,000 tons, are Great Britain, West Germany, and Japan.

As of last May 1, Russia had purchased 187,000 tons of Cuban sugar this year. Total for 1958 is expected to be about 260,000 tons. Last year, purchases amounted to 347,673 tons. This year, for the first time, Red China bought sugar from Cuba—50,000 tons of it.

(The total Cuban crop this year was 5,600,000 tons, worth about $600 million.)

BOLIVIAN REDS MIDDLE MEN

In Bolivia, the Government maintains no commercial relations with the Soviet Union. It has not yet received any formal propositions, either for an exchange of products or for tin and oil exploitation.

However, the Bolivian Communist Party—with the backing of several leftist political parties—recently suggested to President Hernan Siles Zuazo that it would be advisable for Bolivia to enter into trade agreements with the Soviets.

The Bolivian Communists said the Soviet Union might be able to purchase "almost any amount" of Bolivian lead and copper. They also said the Soviets were anxious to offer technical and economic assistance to intensify the country's mining production, on terms more advantageous than those extended by the United States.

OIL AGREEMENT CAUSES ALARM

The recent barter agreement of Russian petroleum for other Argentine products has caused alarm in Bolivia, since Bolivia has been supplying oil to Argentina at the rate of about 120,000 barrels a month. Bolivia has been counting on increased oil exports to help rehabilitate its economy and relieve some of its heavy dependency on tin exports.

To counteract the Soviet economic offensive Bolivia seems likely to increase its tin and oil production and seek to place it in a more favorable and less restricted international market.

This will require increased technical and economic injections. And since Bolivia revolves in the democratic western orbit, attainment of its goals of better quotations and increased demands for its products, depends largely on its neighbors in this sphere of influence.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of August 12, 1958]

ROUGH STORM ON HORIZON

The continuing threat of the Soviet Union's economic offensive in Latin America, which is in reality the front yard of the United States, should be a matter of serious concern for every citizen of this country. The effort of the Soviet bloc is like the little black cloud on the horizon, with a falling barometer and increasing winds. A rough storm could move in on us.

Last week, correspondents of the Miami News unfolded a series of accounts of just what the Soviets and their satellites are up to on the economic front in Latin America. Their reports, ranging from Mexico southward to Argentina and Chile, all noted that the Communists are aiming at the soft spots in this hemisphere with sugar-coated trade proposals that mask a long-range political penetration program.

The Soviet trade in Latin America still is relatively small in volume compared to the United States-Latin commerce. On the basis of figures alone an unwary observer might well ask: What is all this fuss about? The answer is easy and disturbing. It lies in the intentions and capabilities of the Soviet bloc now and its potentialities in the years immediately ahead.

The Soviet Union and its satellites have reached a point where they can extend long-term credits at interest rates more attractive than those from the United States, buy large quantities of raw materials and export manufactured goods and machinery. They have moved into Latin America at a time of galloping inflation and tumbling commodity prices.

The degree of economic penetration has varied in the Latin nations. Some have resisted stoutly; some have weakened. The danger is clear. It should be clear to this Government that it is foolhardy to keep threatening higher tariffs, and to continue sidestepping the issue of establishing more stable trade policies with our Latin neighbors.

Now that Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles have had recent on-the-spot views of conditions in Latin America, it is hoped that Washington officialdom will take constructive steps to stem the brewing Soviet storm blowing toward our front yard. The United States has certainly had sufficient forewarning.

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to hear a very fine address delivered by Emmet O'Neill, who spoke about the contemplated Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. I believe his speech can be read with profit, because of its bearing upon our foreign policy, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

(Address by Emmet O'Neill)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Philippines became a sovereign nation on July 7, 1946. On October 12, 1947, the United States, at a formal ceremony returned to the Philippines the last bit of Philippine soil which had been under its control—the island of Corregidor. At the ceremony on Corregidor, when the American flag was lowered and the Philippine flag raised, the American Ambassador (the present Chairman of this Commission) said in part:

"Today the United States of America conveys to the Republic of the Philippines the last tangible bit of America, the island of Corregidor. It is right that this be done. But in a deeper sense, Bataan and Corregidor do not belong solely to any one country, even to the heroic Philippines. * * * There is more to this hallowed spot than what we here convey, and it is that which belongs to the ages and to all men who believe in human liberty. Nations yet unborn will strive for freedom and receive strength and courage from nearby Bataan. Men now living and yet to be born will carry on inspired by the true meaning of Corregidor. They are now enshrined in the temple of hope for mankind with Runnymede, Valley Forge, and other places where the fires of freedom were lighted and kept burning.

"* * * The blood of Americans and Filipinos mingled, indissolubly in the soil of Battan and Corregidor, each defying the forces of autocracy and slavery. The blood shed by your sons and our sons cannot be separated in the hallowed earth of Bataan and Corregidor. * * * This spot will tell the story to oppressed and groping people how they, too, can attain liberty by devotion to the democratic way of life.

"Bataan and Corregidor will ever be beams to guide liberty-loving people of Asia and of the world to a way of life which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number. May they light the way to freedom for millions who are seeking that which Bataan and Corregidor so sublimely represent."

This was the inception of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial effort.

Mr. Chairman, some have inquired as to the support of the idea of placing a memorial on Corregidor. Its deep meaning and importance has brought approval and widespread support both in the Philippines and the United States.

President Quezon, during the tragic days of the war stated that Corregidor should be preserved as a memorial.

Every other Philippine President, Rojas, Quirino, Magsaysay, and Garcia have been deeply interested in our efforts to place a memorial on Corregidor and have given it their support. The Government of the Philippines set aside Corregidor to be preserved as a shrine, and created the Philippine National Shrines Commission. It was directed to work with the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission and has done so enthusiastically. It has officially and unanimously expressed its full endorsement of the concept and plans for the construction of the memorial. The members have individually and collectively expressed their unqualified appreciation of the winning design and officially approved it. They have stressed the great desire of the

Filipino public to see the proposed memorial erected soon.

The Honorable Eulogio Balao, when Secretary of Defense, stated: "I hope very soon, we shall see standing on Corregidor a living symbol of the gallant struggle."

The Honorable Carlos Romulo said: "It is for this reason that we in the Philippines are happy to know that the United States Government has created a Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission and that plans are underway—and we sincerely hope they can be carried out soon—to build a memorial with Corregidor as its pedestal. Done with proper sensitivity, this memorial will be a perpetual beacon light to show the world the road to peace." On July 17, 1958, he said: "You are rendering an incalculable service to the cause of Philippine-American friendship."

The defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, the representative veterans' group in the Philippines has written in part as follows:

"The veterans' organization in the Philippines will be eternally grateful for the magnificent plans you have for the monument—I can only say that they are with me 100 percent behind the idea."

The Corregidor-Bataan Veterans' Association in the United States has discussed plans to hold its annual reunion on Corregidor when the dedication occurs.

General MacArthur said in a letter to the chairman:

"It is indeed a most worthy purpose. For no soil on earth is more deeply consecrated to the cause of human liberty than is that of the island of Corregidor and adjacent Bataan Peninsula. There, American and Filipino blood is intermingled to immortalize that gallant stand taken to resist against desperately overwhelming odds the onrush of the forces of despotism which sought to blot the concept of freedom from the face of the earth.

"I am quite confident that you will find among our countrymen few who will hesitate to support the erection upon that hallowed ground of so suitable a memorial to those who there fought and bled and died in desperate resolve that liberty should live."

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz has endorsed wholeheartedly the proposal and served on the jury of award which selected the winning design for the memorial.

Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright wrote as follows: "Even while the fighting was going on, I visualized such a thing in the future, and of course, I am more than interested in seeing the project go through."

Major General Moore, who surrendered the Corregidor forces, said: "I feel that such a symbol erected on that hallowed ground would exert a deep influence throughout the Far East and impress upon all who see it the unselfish ideals of American democracy."

I could quote similar statements from Gen. A. M. Jones, one of the commanding generals on Bataan; General Krueger who commanded the Army ground forces and General Kenny who commanded the Army Air Corps, both served on the jury of award and are giving their support to the cause.

No effort has been made to collect endorsements and these are but a few of many statements agreeing with the goal of the Commission.

Since this is our first appearance before this committee, may I take a few moments to outline briefly the basic concepts of the Corregidor memorial.

It will be a symbol to every participant in the Pacific war both in the United States and the Philippines of the months and years of his service and sacrifices in the preservation of liberty against an aggressor bent on conquest, tyranny, and enslavement. To such a veteran, and there are over 4 million of them in every part of the United States, it will be deserved recognition of each one's service to his country. Primarily it will be a reminder and record of those who gave their lives to preserve freedom in the world, and with the use of the memorial as a living memorial, which I will mention later, it will continue to serve so that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

It will be a sensitive and appropriate recognition of the most remarkable feat of arms in the world's history, America's participation in World War II, undertaken with no thought of conquest or material gain. In the Pacific, the front was 8,000 miles from our shores, and the battleline extended almost half the way around the earth.

The Philippines were a part of the United States until July 4, 1946, almost one-third of our national existence up to that time. It will be a symbol to every Filipino who sees it, and they will be numbered by countless thousands, of our understanding and appreciation of that long association unique in the annals of history. It will be a permanent and deserved tribute to the Philippines, which cooperated with us and remained faithful for 50 years.

It will cause our ties to remain close when we place on their soil this impressive testimonial of our recognition of the price the Filipinos paid through 4 frightful years for remaining true to the United States and the cause of democracy. It was no light decision, to defy an all-powerful conqueror, and to resist the plausible promises as to co-Asian prosperity, hemispheric solidarity, sovereignty, and freedom. That deliberate choice caused them to suffer more loss of life than the combined losses of the American forces in both the European and Pacific areas combined. The memorial on Corregidor will continue to impress upon the minds of men why an oriental nation, the Philippines, weighed the cost and decided to stand with an occidental nation. It will bear testimony to the Philippine confidence in the integrity of the United States, and its belief in democracy after 50 years of trial. It will stand as the best argument for democracy of which I have any knowledge.

This memorial will be placed by the United States not in Washington or some other American city for the edification of ourselves, but on Asiatic soil which will mean a great deal to all Asiatics. Such a tribute on foreign soil is somewhat unique, and cannot fail to explain better to the world, especially Asia, what is the truth as to the real America, so little understood at the present time in the world, especially Asia, in spite of our largesses running into the billions.

All of Corregidor will actually be a memorial. The Philippine Government has set it aside and, as I have said, created a Commission similar to ours to cooperate with us. They are quite importunate as to the immediate start of the erection of the memorial. They are even now taking visitors to Corregidor and showing them the future site.

Their Congress has appropriated funds for the development and beautification of Corregidor. They are planning through various organizations to make it available and inspiring to all.

They have begun to restore Malinta tunnel. There, was enacted the greatest drama of modern times. In the early days of 1942, it was the Capitol of the Philippines and their great President Quezon was there carrying on for the future of the Philippines. It was the headquarters of General MacArthur and all that was left of the high command of the American forces. It was there that the Treasury of the Philippines was located. It was the hospital for the sick, wounded, and dying, as well as the only real shelter for our intrepid, starving troops from the vicious bombings by land and air.

General MacArthur said he could never forget their gaunt faces, unafraid.

A major goal of the Commission is to use the memorial as a living memorial. We believe that with this design as a symbol, and the memorial as a base of operations, it can appreciably affect the thinking of Asia. These are activities that we expect to carry on without any financial help from the Government but with its guidance.

The Commission has had the cooperation of a number of experts on the Far East in laying the groundwork for practical programs to be developed as a part of the living memorial. Studies have been made by Far Eastern experts in the Library of Congress, the International Cooperation Administration, Cornell University, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as well as by selected Philippine authorities. The ideas have ranged from child education, common tongue, exchange students to and from the Philippines and other Asiatic countries, etc., means of better thought interchange between the Philippines and the rest of the Far East and a forum from which the doctrines of democracy can be proclaimed.

The specific programs and projects to be selected for the living memorial must of necessity be delayed until the memorial is an actuality.

If our great country has an inherent weakness, it is that our way of life is so dynamic that our leadership and our people have little time for constructive thinking on a long-range basis. Our high scale of living makes it difficult to understand the desires and the psychology of the millions who live in a different world from us both physically and mentally. I appreciate the emergency situations which must be met elsewhere and it is understandable that 80 percent of our foreign news deals with the European and Near East situations, yet Russia and Chinese communism are quietly performing in subtle ways in the Far East where half of the people of the world now live and where millions have little information and few fixed opinions as to ideologies. Informed authorities on the Far East seem to agree that the Communist effort there is much more effective than the Democratic, and they freely predict, that unless the situation changes Russian communism will be stronger and stronger throughout that area and among the millions living there, because, as we believe, it has an Asiatic China to front for it.

According to experts it now seems probable that communism will dominate a great number of the nations in the Far East. It is quite shortsighted on our part not to solidify and make use of the great asset that the United States has had and now has in the understanding friendship of the Philippines. The Philippines, an Asiatic nation, has proven its dedication to the democratic way of life. It has stamped out effective communism in the Philippines and openly alined itself with the United States and democracy. It is worthy of note that the Philippines stand at the most exposed frontier, within 1 hour's time from China by a flight of rocket planes.

No other foreign country, with the possible exception of Russia, has such an important asset as we have in the Far East. The Filipinos are largely of the same racial stock as many, many millions in Asia—Indonesians, Malayans, Siamese, etc. There are hundreds of thousands of Chinese in the Philippines and very many of the people of the Philippines have close ties of blood, friendship, and business with those living in other Asiatic countries, even behind the Bamboo Curtain.

The Philippines, with its understanding of Asiatic psychology, in cooperation with the United States can help to do much to combat communism in the Far East. The Philippines can explain democracy to their fellow Asiatics, in a way that they will understand, and they can put the United States in the proper light in so doing. Under the aegis of the Corregidor-Bataan symbol, which repre-

sents what the Philippines sacrificed to preserve the democratic way of life, they can intelligently influence the oriental mind. We know that very often the service or generosity of the United States is misunderstood and mistrusted.

It is very difficult to sell the American way of life, when America is doing the selling.

Of course, a comprehensive effort on the part of the Philippines would have to be well thought out, financed and cooperatively controlled.

A basic task of the Commission of the greateset importance was to create and select a design that would be inspiring and worthy of the things commemorated. We felt that thought should be given to oriental forms and tastes as well as occidental. We realized that artistic forms in painting, sculpture, etc., impress people differently due to variations in human nature. Realizing this the Commission felt that it is highly desirable to enlist the interest and participation of the best experts in the field of architectural art.

The Commission sought competent advice and direction in this field for our own staff. They secured the part-time service of Mr. John F. Harbeson of Philadelphia. He has been recognized for years as one of the leading men in his profession. Under his direction the Commission conducted a nationwide competition among the architects of the United States, in which 43 men or firms participated. All designs were submitted anonymously and among the competitors were many of the outstanding firms in the United States. After several months the competition in two stages was completed, and the winning design was chosen. It was created by a splendid but lesser-known firm from Seattle, Wash., Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson. The jury of award had as its chairman Mr. Pietro Belluschi, dean of the School of Architecture and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. There were seven other outstanding men in the field of architecture and sculpture and three from other professions, Admiral Nimitz, Gen. Walter Krueger, and Gen. George C. Kenny. The design chosen was cordially approved by our Commission. The Philippine Shrines Commission acting for the Philippine Government accepted and approved the selection. Incidentally, the members of the Philippine Shrines Commission were highly pleased and individually expressed their great satisfaction with the design. The jury of award in its report said in part, "The final selection was made through gradual elimination. The majority found the winning design to possess sculptural qualities of a high order, to be a simple form easy to remember, to admire and to love; it compared well with the shape of the island, and it had the right scale. The jury in the end believed that it had spiritual power and its meaning did not need to be explained any more than the Washington Monument needs to be explained."

All Corregidor is virtually the base of the memorial. It will stand at the top of Corregidor which is at that point 500 feet above the surrounding sea. The memorial will rise approximately 250 feet higher or 750 feet above the nearby ocean and bay. Between its two uplifted arms there will be a beam of light reaching to the sky and it will throw its rays far out across the China Sea. All incoming and outgoing vessels will pass within 1 or 2 miles of the memorial and all air travel from the east and west through Manila will see it vividly.

The architect gives his interpretation of the structure in part as follows:

"In the design of the monument for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial we have tried to express in concrete form an abstract symbol of hope and aspiration. It was intended that this form be abstract enough to permit the individual viewing it to read into it values from his own experience. We felt this to be very important inasmuch as the monument should have equal, if not similar, or identical, meaning to peoples of East and West.

"Some of our thoughts were as follows:

"We searched for a form that was not static, but one that would be dynamic, feeling that a static form such as the vertical shaft expressed the memorial concept of a finished past. We felt that here was the need for a form that somehow would express a future, not a past; a hope, and not a sorrow.

"The double form of parabolic concrete shells is essentially the shape of outstretched arms, or of simple outstretched hands, an inherent form of hope and supplication universally understood.

"The double form can also symbolize the East and the West, each a separate and distinct entity, yet each equally striving to the highest point; each held to the other by an encircling bond without which the structure of their civilization would collapse, even as the structure of the monument would collapse without the tie between the two.

"The opening, or eye, between the two portions of the monument, with its single vertical unwavering beam, protected by the encircling monument, symbolizes the singleness of purpose, shared by both East and West. The shaft of light also symbolizes the brilliance of mutually shared ideals and hopes, and also by its transitory quality emphasizes the need for constant care and nurture of these ideals and hopes.

"Other thoughts perhaps less abstract:

"The monument should be visible in silhouette from Manila, therefore it was placed on the very top of the island. By day the silhouette would be dark against the light sky. By night, the underside of the monument would be brightly lighted to effect a white silhouette in a dark sky.

"The monument will also be visibly important from the airlanes into Manila. With this in mind our design calls for the top surface of the monument to be surfaced in brilliant-colored mosaic. This design might depict symbols of East and West."

We have been extremely gratified at the approval of the design by most of those who have seen it and studied it. Particularly pleasing has been the attitude of the Filipinos, who recognize that it gives consideration to artistic forms other than the simple classic style which had been traditional in this country.

My father used to quote a Latin phrase to me "De gustibus non disputandum"—"You can not debate taste." But we are highly gratified at the enthusiasm of nearly all of those who have studied the design.

The outline I have just given to you was for your information and does not directly appertain to the bill before you. By previous bills which have heretofore passed Congress, the Commission was empowered to erect the memorial. The Commission has the authority now under previous acts of Congress to do all the things which have been mentioned so far.

Japanese High-Seas Fishing Is Destroying Alaska Red Salmon Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope one of the priority items on the agenda of the 86th Congress will be legislation to protect the Alaska red salmon fishery. We have regulated ourselves by allowing only 2 days fishing a week during the season and cutting down on the amount of gear in the interest of conservation—all to little or no purpose—because the Japanese refuse to cooperate as shown by the following recent editorial from the Seattle Times:

FEARS FOR BRISTOL BAY FISHERY BORNE OUT

Forebodings of a disastrous run of red salmon in the Alaska fishing industry's principal area of operations in Bristol Bay have been fully borne out by events.

After one of the shortest seasons in history the catch and pack of red salmon in the Bristol Bay fishery were the poorest and smallest on record.

The total pack is tentatively estimated at 232,000 cases in round numbers. The pack last year was 463,491 cases. But the years more suitable for comparison, according to salmon-industry spokesmen, are 1952 and 1953 when the salmon of the 1948 run were spawned. The pack in 1952 was 712,503 cases, in 1953, 443,057.

The collapse of this valuable fishery is attributed almost entirely to the operations of the Japanese fishing fleet which for several years has been taking huge numbers of Alaska salmon on the high seas.

There was a "flukish," unexpectedly large run of pink salmon in some Alaska waters this season which helped to produce substantial increases in the total Alaskan salmon pack, but this has no bearing on the Bristol Bay red-salmon problem.

In anticipation of a record drop in the red-salmon run, the Fish and Wildlife Service had cut the 1958 season virtually in half and issued regulations severely restricting fishing to protect the year's spawn in Alaska streams.

Unsuccessful efforts purportedly had been made by the American State Department to persuade Japan to restrict its fishing activities to an area farther west of the line established by the tripartite Pacific fisheries treaty of 1952 as the eastern limit of the Japanese ocean operations.

The Japanese Government declined to comply with this request. There were news reports also that Japanese commercial fishermen themselves had agreed to limit their high seas fishing to an area farther west.

While there is no evidence that the Japanese fishing ships crossed the treaty line or otherwise violated the treaty, there is no evidence, either, that the Japanese fishermen heeded this supposed private agreement.

The factor that has decimated the Alaska red-salmon run is that the Japanese fishing fleet has been taking great numbers of immature as well as mature salmon as the fish circle far to the west in their ocean cycle. These salmon obviously never return to their spawning streams in Alaska to reproduce their stock. The Bristol Bay run in future years cannot, therefore, be expected to be any better than this year's.

This intolerable situation, ruinous to one of the world's valuable food resources cannot be permitted to persist.

Extraordinary measures must be resorted to by the State Department and all other appropriate agencies to convince the Japanese Government that the Alaska red-salmon fishery must be saved.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, next week, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to provide a great cultural beacon for the people of the United States and of the world.

The House will be acting on S. 3335, the Fulbright-Anderson-Wiley bill, as amended by its Public Works Committee, to provide a National Cultural Center in the District of Columbia.

I have frequently brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the importance of this center, as sponsored on the House side by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, and others.

Although I am not a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, I feel very keenly the responsibility which all of the Members of the Congress have to the people in the greater Washington area.

WISCONSIN, OTHER STATES WELCOME THIS PROJECT

But, as a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin, I feel, in this instance the responsibility which I have, as well, to the people of the 48 States to help provide for them a great National Cultural Center which would be a showplace of the performing arts.

Alone among the great powers of the world, Washington, unfortunately, lacks a major center for this purpose.

In 1955, we of the Congress authorized formation of an Auditorium Commission, giving that group the responsibility for designing a structure and determining a site.

Next week, the House will have the opportunity to move ahead one great step toward such a center. Let us not turn back.

In favorably reporting S. 3335, the House Public Works Committee responded to the enthusiastic support from the Capital area. It responded, as well, to the messages of many private citizens, who indicated that they are ready, willing, and able to help launch the drive for the collection of private funds to bring this center into being.

NO SO-CALLED ECONOMY ISSUE INVOLVED

All that remains now is for the House of Representatives to "flash the green light" next week.

I earnestly hope that this will be done. Let not any misguided so-called economy drive sidetrack this action. There is no economy issue involved in this legislation. The funds will be raised privately—and within 5 years.

THE INSPIRING LINCOLN CENTER IN NEW YORK

As an illustration of what private enterprise can do, I send to the desk excerpts from an article which appeared in the July 19, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Colossus on Broadway."

This article describes the progress toward a splendid project which I have previously cited to my colleagues, the new Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, in New York.

Under the inspired leadership of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, III, president, some of the most famous names in the arts in America; together with top executive talent in American business and other areas of our national life, are teaming together to raise $75 million to pay for the center.

They hope, moreover, to provide a fund of perhaps $20 million that will be used in a long-term program to present contemporary works, encouraged experimentation in the arts, and achieve related objectives.

AN ANSWER TO DOUBTERS AS TO FUND-RAISING

I present this article because it depicts the high caliber of private voluntary effort, such as will not only see the Lincoln Center project through to success, but which will see the Nationtal Cultural Center through to success.

Some of the critics of the District of Columbia project have questioned whether private leadership will come forth. The answer is that leadership has already come forth; notably in the person of Mr. Robert Dowling, who has worked so tirelessly as chairmap of the American National Theater and Academy and in other artistic efforts and civic causes.

New York's project provides an excellent model of voluntary action, which, I am sure, we can count on, as regards counterpart work here.

I cannot too highly commend men like Mr. Rockefeller; Mr. Clarence Francis, who is heading up the fund-raising campaign; Mr. Richmond R. Gardner, cochairman; Messrs. Arthur A. Houghton, Jr. Devereux C. Josephs, and Charles M. Spofford, vice presidents; Mr. Robert E. Blum, treasurer; Mr. Edgar B. Young, secretary; Mrs. Robert L. Hoguet, Jr., chairman of the woman's committee; Mr. Lander Greenway, chairman of special gifts; and others too numerous to mention. They are taking time out from their busy lives in order not only to raise a great edifice, but a living organism for cultural presentations for and by the American people and for and by friends of the performing arts everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, preceded by a list of distinguished officers and campaign committee members of the Lincoln Center.

There being no objection, the excepts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS, INC.

Officers: John D. Rockefeller 3d, president; Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., vice president; Devereux C. Josephs, vice president; Charles M. Spofford, vice president, Robert E. Blum, treasurer; Edgar B. Young, secretary; Reginald Allen, executive director operation; Otto L. Nelson, Jr., executive director, construction.

Campaign committee: Clarence Francis, chairman; Richmond P. Gardner, cochairman; Mrs. August Belmont, John E. Bierwirth, Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, Christopher T. Chenery, Harold W. Comfort, Mrs. Lewis W. Douglas, John W. Drye, Jr., James A. Farley, G. Keith Funston, Lauder Greenway, Harold H. Helm, Mrs. Robert L. Hoguet, Jr., Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., C. D. Jackson, David M. Keiser, Robert Lehman, John J. McCloy, Thomas A. Morgan, Charles S. Munson, Franz Schneider, Howard C. Sheperd, Lansing P. Shield, Winthrop H. Smith, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., Sidney J. Weinberg, Mrs. Frederick K. Weyerhaeuser.

COLOSSUS ON BROADWAY

(By Joe Alex Morris)

A sentimental saying along Broadway is that "there's no business like show business"—meaning that any guy or any doll with a song or a dance can dream of success on the street of bright lights and slightly broken hearts. It may seem preposterous, therefore, that the newest and most promising recruit to Broadway is John D. Rockefeller 3d, who can't carry a tune, doesn't dance the rumba, and was once suspected of suppressing a yawn while seated in the Golden Horseshoe of the Metropolitan Opera House. But Rockefeller does have a dream—a multimillion-dollar dream that may prove more exciting than anything that has happened in show business since Good Queen Bess split her gloves applauding the premiere of Romeo and Juliet.

A lanky, retiring man, Rockefeller got into the entertainment world at the age of 50 as president of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc., a nonprofit corporation dedicated to establishing in the United States a unique focal point for the finest talent in music, dancing, and drama. To achieve this immodest goal, the corporation expects—with the help of philanthropic organizations, of labor, business and civic groups, and of the public generally—to raise approximately $75 million for an American cultural center without parallel in history.

The realization of any ambitious civic plan obviously requires an organization dedicated to overcoming formidable and complicated difficulties, and Lincoln Center's brief corporate history already is studded with trials and tribulations. Lincoln Center, for example, is one phase of a much larger $205 million New York City slum-clear-

ance-and-redevelopment project which will include new parks and apartment buildings and probably educational buildings. A group of property owners opposed to certain parts of the larger project—but not to Lincoln Center—unsuccessfully challenged it in the lower courts. After repeated appeals, the United States Supreme Court finally declined to interfere with the lower-court decision on June 9 of this year. Since then, other litigation has been instigated but Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts has proceeded in the belief that its plans will not be seriously delayed regardless of the length or outcome of such legal controversy. The fund-raising campaign, under direction of Clarence Francis, former chairman of General Foods Corp., has gained momentum steadily this year and the center has formally acquired title to an 11-acre site near New York City's famous Central Park and negotiations are currently under way for nearly 3 acres more. In the next few years, it is confidently hoped to establish there:

1. A spectacularly modern opera house with 3,800 good seats, all the newest stage improvements, an orchestra pit that can be raised or lowered by elevator, and a television studio for special performances. The balconies will be hung away from the walls to improve acoustics and the building will be double-shelled to prevent the audience from hearing the shriek of a taxicab in the street or the rumble of an airplane overhead.

2. A 2,800-seat symphonic concert hall that will take full advantage of all proved innovations to achieve acoustical perfection. It will also be possible to convert the hall for pop concerts by installing tables at which refreshments can be served.

3. A 2,500-seat theater for ballet, operetta, and other dance groups, which, for the first time in America, will be provided with a home comparable to state-supported organizations in other countries.

4. A theater seating about 1,400 persons for repertory dramatic presentations, for recitals, and for small or intimate operas that lose some of their effectiveness when presented in large auditoriums.

5. An unprecedented educational center for advanced students in the performing arts. The school will be designed to foster development of recognized talent and creative ability, to encourage experimentation and to establish a unique laboratory in which student and professional musicians, dancers, actors, playwrights, conductors, composers, and technicians will mutually benefit by close association and collaboration.

6. A library and museum for research and study of everything in the performing arts from ancient musical instruments to recordings of modern productions.

"Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts is the most exciting vision as well as the largest civic project ever undertaken anywhere on a private philanthropic basis," one distinguished authority said recently. "There are always plenty of troubles between planning and achievement. But success of this project could make America the recognized cultural capital of the world and be a major factor in destroying the myth that this is a land devoted only to crass commercialism. More important, it can assume leadership in making the best in the performing arts available to the many instead of the few."

These are high-sounding and perhaps highbrow words. Neither Rockefeller nor his associates in Lincoln Center speak so extravagantly of their objectives. Yet, some such aim lies behind the many months of hard work and down-to-earth planning that more than a score of distinguished professional and businessmen have put into the project. There are, sponsors of the center believe, millions of Americans with more leisure than ever before and with greater interest in opera, ballet, drama and symphonic concerts. These entertainment groups are not and probably will not be clearly profitable fields for commercial enterprise, but audiences are steadily increasing, and Lincoln Center is based on the theory that, in the future, grand opera must be for the masses and not merely for the carriage trade.

The "performing arts" is a stilted name that might cover almost any living performance—except possibly a singing-dog act—but at Lincoln Center it will mean entertainment only on a high level by the best artists. The opera house, for example, will be the new home of the Metropolitan Opera Association, and the concert hall will house the New York Philharmonic-Symphony. Similarly distinguished groups—not yet selected—will be based in the repertory and ballet theaters, and still other recognized American and foreign companies will be invited for limited engagements to keep the great complex of air-conditioned auditoriums operating the year around.

But this concentration of famous companies in a handsome and modern Manhattan setting is only part of the vision behind Lincoln Center.

"There isn't much point in merely repotting the Met or the Philharmonic," Rockefeller once pointed out. "There must be an entirely new concept that will provide a creative stimulus."

To encourage creative work, the center contemplates a 10-year program costing about $1 million a year to facilitate experimentation in new forms, presentation of contemporary works and revival of significant but less popular classics. Such activities are essential to cultural progress although they are normally beyond the means of established organizations such as the Metropolitan Opera Association. But the most revolutionary feature of the long-range planning of sponsors—and of Rockefeller, in particular—is educational. The school for advanced students in all of the performing arts will be created by reorganization of the Juilliard School of Music under direction of William Schuman, a leading symphonic composer and an experienced administrator.

The several hundred students in the school will be selected by the faculty strictly on the basis of talent. Most of them presumably will be graduates of other schools in the United States or abroad, and will range in age from about 18 to 28 years. The purpose of their studies at the center will be to bridge the gap between academic training and the beginning of a professional career. There will be no definite period of attendance and no graduation, but there will be a specialized course of study and work under leading instructors that might be compared to the internship of a medical-school graduate before he becomes a practicing physician. The school will have its own small theater and concert hall, so that students will have opportunity to create, produce, and perform.

A still greater stimulus to creative work is expected to come from the close association of students or young "interns" with famous professionals appearing at the center. The students will attend rehearsals of the professional companies in order to become familiar with all stages of producing an opera or a play. They will be able to study different techniques and to consult with top professionals in their fields. But this collaboration between the school and professional groups will not be a one-way street. The professionals are confidently expected to profit, too, by their proximity to the most promising young artists in their fields and by exposure to the creativeness of youth. Out of such a cross-fertilization of ideas among the performing arts and among students and professionals will develop, it is believed, the creative atmosphere so essential to great cultural progress.

And, in Rockefeller's mind, the bringing in of young people and young ideas may well be the center's most important contribution to the future.

This rather dazzling concept of Lincoln Center represents a remarkable break with the past, but it is by no means a one-man idea or a Rockefeller project. On the contrary, it is a civic undertaking—the product of many minds and of a strange series of circumstances dating back more than a quarter of a century. * * *

* * * * *

"I enjoy music, but I have no special background for it," Rockefeller remarked later, "unless you count a few years in which my parents unsuccessfully encouraged me to become familiar with a violin. But I believe there is a steadily increasing interest in this country in good music, opera, ballet, and theater, perhaps because people are better educated, have greater leisure and enjoy vastly improved methods of communication. Children today are exposed to music from a very early age and they know and understand it far better than when I was a boy. Encouragement of this trend can contribute to the welfare of America.

"In addition, it can be of great importance in our relations with other nations. In travel abroad, I have often observed the interest of ordinary peoples in artistic and cultural achievement. Even the poorest homes in Japan, for example, always have some artistic feature—perhaps only a flower arrangement or a vase—that emphasizes their aspiration to cultural progress. They respect nations that encourage such progress. The disturbing thing is that many foreigners mistakenly believe Americans are concerned only with material achievement. They admire our technology, but look elsewhere for cultural leadership, despite the fact that New York is perhaps the greatest cultural center in the world today. This has been a handicap in our relations with other peoples and, for that reason, it is my hope that Lincoln Center may become a symbol before the world of America's cultural development."

The joint committee of which Rockefeller became a member held only one meeting, but it was an important one. Rockefeller had already begun to toy with the idea of expanding the music-center proposal to include other performing arts, and educational facilities. He knew, for example, that it would be more likely to attract financial aid from big foundations if training of students was included. He believed the broadest feasible approach was likely to be the most successful. After a few hours' discussion, the joint committee agreed to dissolve itself and set up a larger exploratory committee to establish a definite objective. Rockefeller was elected chairman of the exploratory committee.

The next 18 months may have been the busiest and most exciting of Rockefeller's career. It was typical of his methods that almost the first thing he did was go up to 65th Street and Broadway and pace off the site that Moses had allotted to the opera and symphony. He knew immediately that it wasn't large enough, and later, he persuaded Moses to expand it to three city blocks. He knew virtually nothing about show business, but he began learning in a hurry by cramming like a schoolboy facing final examinations. His tutors were tops in their fields, and they kept him busy from early morning until late at night. He might consult Elia Kazan or Joshua Logan on problems of the drama at breakfast; discuss the ballet with Lincoln Kirstein or Choreographer George Balanchine at luncheon; go into the trials and tribuations of composers with Aaron Copland in the afternoon; learn about the headaches of repertory from Cheryl Crawford; and spend an evening talking grand opera with Rudolf Bing.

With Wallace K. Harrison, one of the architects of the United Nations building

and Anthony A. Bliss, president of the Metropolitan Opera Association, he toured the famous musical and theatrical centers of Europe, studying the methods and facilities of La Scala Opera House in Milan, the Comédie Française in Paris, Sadler's Wells in London, and a half dozen postwar German opera houses that have attracted wide attention for their technical improvements. A group of European architects and acoustical experts—Alvar Aalto, of Finland; Sven Markelius, of Sweden; Walther Unruh, of Germany—also were brought to New York to confer with American designers.

Rockefeller and his committee wanted to take advantage of the latest technical developments abroad, but the basic concept of Lincoln Center was American and their most important consultations were with men and women who had had experience in similar projects in the United States. Many of the basic policies to be pursued were discussed at a 2-day seminar attended by educators, composers, architects, critics, producers, labor leaders, and patrons of the arts from widely scattered parts of the country. James D. Zellerbach discussed the problems of the San Francisco Arts Center; Samuel R. Rosenbaum related experiences of the Philadelphia Orchestra board; Charles R. P. Farnsley told of the development of a cultural center at Louisville, Ky.; Mrs. Helen M. Thompson, of Charleston, W. Va., who is executive secretary of the American Symphony Orchestra League, emphasized the need for a center at which trainee conductors could get professional experience. A second similar seminar in the summer of 1956 was devoted to the need for developing educational facilities to carry young artists across the gap between technical training and professional performance.

As a further contribution to planning, the entire staff of the Metropolitan Opera company was asked to make suggestions for what would be needed in an ideal opera house. The result was a 40-page memorandum covering everything from convenient storage space for sets to a heated swimming pool for exercise between rehearsals. All thought of an ideal house was quickly dropped when architects estimated that it would cost almost $50 million to carry out the suggested plans.

After a few months in his new job, Rockefeller still couldn't carry a tune, but his skull was crammed with an amazing collection of statistical information on the performing arts. Once every 2 weeks, he sat down with the exploratory committee to discuss progress and plan the next steps. These meetings could have been exceedingly difficult. In the past, it had often proved impossible to achieve a meeting of minds among representatives of a single group such as the opera. The meetings of the exploratory committee, however, brought together a score of distinguished men long accustomed to individual leadership—Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., president of Steuben Glass, Inc.; Devereux C. Josephs, chairman of the board of New York Life Insurance Co.; David M. Keiser, chairman of the board of Guantanamo Sugar Co.; Robert E. Blum, president of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences; Irving S. Olds, lawyer; George D. Stoddard, dean of education at New York University; C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc. Furthermore, in their relations with Lincoln Center each of these men represented a different immediate interest. It would not have been surprising if their discussions had covered everything and got nowhere.

Yet, from the beginning, the sessions set some kind of record for speed and collaboration and hard work. There were, of course, many differences of opinion, but these usually melted rapidly before the general enthusiasm of the group for the broad concept of Lincoln Center. Some of the busiest men in New York accepted and eagerly executed assignments that required them to devote a large part of their time to the project. They attended meetings faithfully, and there were comparatively few flares of temperament.

* * * * * * *

The exploratory committee went out of existence and Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc., was born in June of 1956, with Rockefeller as president.

The next stage of work—carrying out the plan—plunged Rockefeller into complicated negotiations with Federal and city officials, particularly planning commissioner Moses. Nobody has ever accused Moses of being a patient or conciliatory negotiator. He has probably done more for New York planning, and enjoyed more rough-and-ready controversies in doing it, than any other figure in the city's history. He wanted to get the plans for Lincoln Center "frozen" as soon as possible, and his approach was one of "Let's get going; you can't wait or the whole thing will die on its feet."

To a certain extent, the directors of Lincoln Center welcomed the emphasis on speed, because the new concert hall must be completed by 1960 or the Philharmonic Symphony will be homeless. But there also were many reasons for moving cautiously on the overall plan until the countless details of architecture and financing could be worked out. It took a great deal of Rockefeller's "soft persuasion" to keep them on an even keel during the winter of 1956–57, but, over the long run, his quiet, painstaking persistence seemed to complement the efforts of the fast-moving, fast-talking, and temperamental Moses. They worked together with a minimum of friction, which was essential to success of the project.

The detailed blueprint for building and operating Lincoln Center for the performing arts probably will not be completed until after the site has been cleared. But basically Lincoln Center, Inc., will act as a kind of management company for technical operation and policy making in the center as a whole. Each participating group, such as the Metropolitan Opera Association, will collaborate, but will remain completely autonomous in handling its own affairs, and will be responsible for its own deficits.

In a campaign within the next year, the sponsors hope to raise about $75 million to pay for the center and to provide a fund of perhaps $20 million that would be used in a long-term program to assist the school to present contemporary works and to encourage experimentation in the performing arts. About half the total sum has already been raised. If these hopes are fully realized, the center will be debt free, and rents paid by nonprofit organizations using the auditoriums presumably will be comparatively modest. It is also believed that by combining maintenance and other services—ticket sales for all auditoriums at a big central box office, for example—there will be considerable savings in the cost of operation of various units in the center. In addition to the Metropolitan Opera Association and the New York Philharmonic-Symphony, the center expects eventually to have a resident ballet company and repertory company. All these groups will make their auditoriums available to guest companies selected by the center's management during months outside of their own regular seasons, thus keeping the stages busy throughout the year.

The half dozen buildings in the center will be clustered around a large central plaza and flanked by city parks. An underground garage, with facilities for parking 700 automobiles, will have moving stairs running to the lobbies of the auditoriums and there will be an underground connection with the subway system.

A great deal of hard work remains to be done before Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts can become a reality, but progress has been surprisingly rapid since the day in 1955 when it was only a dream. Three years does not necessarily make anybody an expert in the entertainment field, and nobody has yet reported seeing Rockefeller strolling down Broadway, singing "Show business is my business." But when, on behalf of the board of directors, he put his signature to the agreement to buy and develop 11 acres touching on Broadway at West 65th Street, Rockefeller became one of the top figures in the world of the performing arts.

"It's a great challenge," he summed up recently with a slow smile: "But it's a lot of fun too."

Lt. Comdr. Frank M. Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are proud of the heroic achievements of the submarine *Nautilus* and its crew in making its historic voyage under the Arctic ice cap.

The people of Tunica, Miss., are especially proud of the event, however, because the executive officer aboard the *Nautilus* was Lt. Comdr. Frank M. Adams, a native of Tunica who was appointed to the United States Naval Academy by my predecessor, the Honorable Will M. Whittington.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Tunica Times-Democrat concerning Commander Adams' role in the historic voyage of the *Nautilus*:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ADAMS, "NAUTILUS' " SECOND IN COMMAND, ON HISTORY-MAKING VOYAGE UNDER ARCTIC ICECAP—IN CHARGE OF ATOMIC SUBMARINE'S CRUISE FROM ICELAND TO PORTLAND, ENGLAND, AFTER SAILING FROM HAWAII UNDER ARCTIC SEA AND ACROSS THE NORTH POLE

Tunica's celebrity is a native son, Lt. Comdr. Frank M. Adams, executive officer aboard the *Nautilus*, whose history-making voyage under the Arctic icecap was announced Friday at special ceremonies at the White House when President Eisenhower presented the Legion of Merit to the *Nautilus'* skipper, Comdr. William R. Anderson, of Waverly, Tenn., and a Presidential unit citation for the submarine's crew of 13 officers and 98 men.

The Times-Democrat's news release from the Navy Department is dated August 5, en route Honolulu to Europe, is titled: "Transpolar News Release," and is quoted:

"Lt. Comdr. Frank M. Adams was a member of the crew of the U. S. S. *Nautilus* when the world's first atomic-powered submarine steamed under the vast Arctic icepack to make a record-shattering voyage from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the North Pole.

"The *Nautilus* left Honolulu on July 23 and after a rapid submerged voyage through the Bering Strait went under ice off Point Barrow, Alaska, and proceeded due north to become at 11:15 p. m., eastern daylight saving time, on August 3, the first ship in history to reach the North Pole. After steaming over 1,700 miles under the polar pack the remarkable submarine on August 5 entered the open waters of the Greenland Sea west of Spitsbergen and continued south to the Atlantic to become the first ship to

make the Northwest Passage via the polar route."

The release didn't report that after Commander Anderson left the submarine to go to Washington to receive Presidential honors and the Nation's acclaim, Lieutenant Commander Adams assumed command of the atomic submarine in Iceland for the remainder of the voyage across the Atlantic to Portland, England. The cruise from Honolulu to England, via the Arctic, was completed Tuesday, when the submarine reached Portland. Commander Anderson rejoined his ship in England.

The son of Mrs. Ione Montgomery Adams and the late Harry E. Adams, Lieutenant Commander Adams attended Tunica schools and was graduaed from Marion Institute, Marion, Ala. He received his appointment to the United States Naval Academy from former Congressman Will M. Whittington of Greenwood.

He was commissioned in the Navy in June 1946 after graduating from the Naval Academy. Before becoming executive officer aboard the *Nautilus* on January 10, Lieutenant Commander Adams was on duty aboard the battleship *Missouri* from 1946 to 1948.

Since then, except a 2-year period, 1954–56, when he was assigned to the executive department of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Lieutenant Commander Adams has been on submarine duty.

Since boyhood, Lieutenant Commander Adams planned for a cereer in the Navy and after graduating from the Naval Academy, became a submarine man, selecting this branch of the Navy for duty.

His mother is in Denver, Colo., visiting her niece, Mrs. Houston Putney, Mr. Putney and family before going to Lindsay, Mont., to visit her son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Magalsky, and family.

Lieutenant Commander and Mrs. Adams, the former Novie Capps of Farmville, N. C., and their children, Clint, Monty and Harriette, live at Gales Ferry, Conn., near New London, were the *Nautilus* is based.

MOTHER, FRIENDS RECEIVE LETTERS FROM NORTH POLE

The letters which have been received locally from Lt. Comdr. Frank M. Adams, postmarked 11: 15 p. m., August 5, 1958, U. S. S. *Nautilus*, North Pole, are already collectors' items, but will be carefully treasured by the recipients.

On the left side of the envelope is a drawing with a map of the northern tip of the world and a fish drawn like a human holding an American flag which is about to be placed at the North Pole. Wording on the cachet or drawing includes: U. S. S. *Nautilus* (SSN57) and the First Time in History.

Among those receiving these important and exciting letters are Mrs. Harry E. Adams, mother of Lieutenant Commander Adams; John W. Dulaney, Sr., cousin; John W. Dulaney III, cousin and godson of the *Nautilus'* executive officer, and M. Gerald Burrow, president of Planters Bank.

Lieutenant Commander Adams wrote to his godson, 3-year-old John III:

"DEAR JOHN: As you will notice from my address I am writing to you from the top of the world—the North Pole. *Nautilus* brought us up here under the ice on a history-making voyage—the first transpolar crossing of a ship from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean through the Arctic Ocean via the North Pole.

"Old Santa Claus in his bright red suit just left the ship after a short visit with us.

"I hope that your mother and dad will save this letter and envelope for your future Boy Scout scrapbook.

"Best of everything to you. Love from your godfather."

Mr. Dulaney's letter reads:

"I am writing you this letter as a memento of the first history-making first transpolar voyage by a ship through the Arctic Ocean from the Pacific to the Atlantic via the North Pole.

"*Nautilus* has traveled submerged from Point Barrow, Alaska, and she will emerge in the Atlantic Ocean on August 5, having traveled over 1,700 miles under the Arctic ice pack.

"Please give Irene my love, and I hope to see you all soon."

Lieutenant Commander Adams' letter to Mr. Burrow says:

"I am writing you this letter as a memento of the history-making first transpolar voyage by a ship through the Arctic Ocean from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean via the North Pole.

"*Nautilus* submerged north of Point Barrow, Alaska, on August 1 in the Chuckhi Sea and will emerge in the Atlantic Ocean between Spitsbergen and Greenland on August 5.

"Please give my regards to your wife, and to the Holmes."

You're Not Needed, Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I commend my colleagues attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Palo Alto Times under date of June 5, 1958:

Palo Alto is a city which is served by a well-operated municipal power distribution system. Nevertheless its citizens do not give their blanket endorsement to all public-power projects and insist that Government money be spent only in situations where good business sense prevails.

The following editorial by Miss Elinor V. Cogswell clearly reflects the sound thinking of the citizens of Palo Alto:

YOU'RE NOT NEEDED, UNCLE

(By Elinor V. Cogswell)

Water is backing up from 1 of the 3 dams being privately built in Hells Canyon. Power will start flowing in September through a region that would otherwise face a serious shortage.

Yet it was not until Monday that rock-ribbed advocates of public power at all costs gave up the fight to halt the three-dam project and substitute a federally built high dam on the Snake River—a project that couldn't have been finished for years. A House subcommittee mercifully killed off legislation that would have authorized Uncle Sam to start to begin to get ready to build a dam to meet—after awhile—an urgent need that private enterprise can meet this year.

While the talk went on in Washington, the Idaho Power Co. built dams. The dams will start creating wealth for the Snake River Valley this fall. Taxes will begin pouring into Federal, State, and local treasuries at the rate of nearly $10 million a year.

The fight was silly enough when it started. There are many situations in which public-power projects are desirable; Hells Canyon is not one of them. At the end, the original absurdity of the high-dam plan was compounded, for the Government would have had to repay the power company for work already done, and delay for years the power and flood-control benefits of the project. In addition to calling on taxpayers for some $400 million.

Under a license legally issued by the Federal Power Commission in 1955, the Idaho Power Co. has completed Brownlee Dam, Oxbow Dam, just downstream, is well under way. A third dam in Hells Canyon will complete the system.

The high dam was to hold back some 3,880,000 acre-feet of water—more than it would ordinarily get and more than could be efficiently used. Increasing amounts of water are being drawn off for use upstream, steadily reducing the need for storage capacity.

Use of the term "high dam" for the Federal project has implied that the Idaho Power Co. dams are inadequate midgets by comparison. The fact is that the Brownlee Dam, just being completed, is the second highest rockfill dam in the world—400 feet high and 1,380 feet wide. It will generate 360,000 kilowatts of power as soon as its gets going, and can be expanded to generate 540,000 kilowatts.

The 57-mile reservoir behind it will hold 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, providing for flood control, reserve supply, and recreation.

Oxbow will generate 200,000 kilowatts to start with, and the third dam will add 272,000 kilowatts. That adds up to 832,000 kilowatts initially, with a potential of 1,012,000. The Federal dam was expected to produce 924,000 kilowatts.

It is hard to imagine that power users could get juice cheaper from a $400 million project generating 924,000 kilowatts than from a $138 million job producing more.

Rates charged by the Idaho Power Co. in the Pacific Northwest are 35 percent below the national average. Even if they were not, the potential users would gladly pay more in order to get the power now and put it to work earning for them.

They need it for irrigation pumping, to develop their phosphate resources, and to meet a variety of domestic and commercial needs that stem from expansion of the basic agricultural economy.

If the people who will use the power favored the privately built three-dam project and opposed the Federal plan, who was it wanted the latter? The question has more than casual interest for Californians.

Practically all the agitation for the "high dam" has come from public power proponents in Oregon and Washington who want a Federal agency handling the project so that public power distributors in those States will have first claim on the power—a preferential right ahead of that of private customers in Idaho, where most of the waters of the Snake River originate.

Here we have a familiar issue. Who has the rights to profits from the oil originating in our tidelands—the area of origin, California, or the Federal Government, which claimed paramount rights? Who has first claims on our water, the north in which it originates, or the south, which needs it for uses that are part of the entire State's economy and welfare?

No single formula will serve. In the Hells Canyon case, the claim of the area of origin is strengthened by the comparative costs and efficiency of the rival projects.

Trade Makes Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

TRADE MAKES FRIENDS

Fighting communism has been such a costly business that it has come to be accepted as always being expensive.

Yet some of the best campaigning for friends and against communism costs virtually nothing, as Dr. Yale Brozen, economics professor at the University of Chicago School of Business, reminds in the current issue of Freeman, published by the Foundation for Economic Education. His remarks were originally before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee earlier this year.

In a day when we woo other nations by sundry devices—foreign aid, military assistance and treaties of many sorts—look around and see some of our best friends. On them we have exercised few of these means.

Brazil is first mentioned by Dr. Brozen. One of our finest friends year in and year out, she feels close to us in important part because we are her best customer. In turn, she is one of the better customers for United States-produced goods.

To the north is stanch friend Canada of whom we are the best customer. And Canada likewise is one of our major customers, not an aid client. Trade ties us closely to Britain as well.

Communists' efforts show they, too, realize the influence which accrues to them through buying, such as Egypt's cotton, India's hemp and various products from other nations hungering for markets and expanded commerce.

"The purchase of a country's goods," says Dr. Brozen, "is a mightier weapon than many appreciate. This has exceedingly important implications for our trade policy."

Flying in the face of this are those who would needlessly limit and hamstring our trade although it makes solid friends while imposing no additional burdens on the taxpayer.

Salute to Folsom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, of the many outstanding tributes to the recently retired Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion B. Folsom, one of the most inspiring has been made not by a fellow Republican, but by my very good friend on the other side of the aisle, the Honorable STEWART L. UDALL. In a statement to which I heartily asseverate, Mr. UDALL cites Secretary Folsom's common touch, tenacity, and fairness in the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of August 8, 1958]

SALUTE TO FOLSOM

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion B. Folsom has gone into retirement and perhaps it would not be inappropriate for a Democrat to have the last say on his performance in the Eisenhower Cabinet.

Unlike his predecessor, he believed in the mission of his department, and his positive attitudes vouchsafed a constructive role for his office in formulating and presenting legislation to Congress.

He was cognizant that most worthwhile legislative objectives are achieved through the bipartisan approach. One of his winning qualities was that he gave attention to the particular task at hand, and was quite willing to let the political consequences of his acts come to public notice after office hours and without hyperbole. Even those who generally thought his goals were too low (as with the school-aid bills) respected the tenacity and fairness with which he pursued them.

Secretary Folsom also had a common touch: At times he dropped in at the offices of junior House Members (of both parties) to explain proposals he favored. If he was the quietest member of the Eisenhower Cabinet, it would be a pleasant irony if it turned out he was also one of its most effective advocates as well.

In my opinion, Secretary Folsom well deserved your accolade for a job well done.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Representative of Second District, Arizona.

Time for the Big Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include a newspaper article I wish to insert an editorial entitled "Time for the Big Stick. It recently appeared in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal. The editorial follows:

TIME FOR THE BIG STICK

Another round of talk about the national debt and the need for giving the legal limit of that debt another boost has an all too familiar ring. We're told, in effect, that it's a case of "raise it or else.". Again, it is to be only temporary, but, like every instance in which Government spending or taxation are involved, "temporary" soon becomes permanent.

Officials, from the President on down, direfully bring up the ogre of a fiscal year ahead in which the Federal deficit will soar to $11 or $12 billion. Another increase in the legal debt limit and continued burdensome taxation seem to be the only suggestions they have to offer in a situation which would threaten receivership if it were an individual or a private business matter, instead of involving the United States Government.

Whether the administration has been that of Eisenhower, Truman, or Roosevelt, the approach to the national debt and Federal deficit has been the same for years. Any talk of approaching the problem from the other direction—the direction which anyone other than the government would have to take—has been seldom and brief. That is, cut the cloth to fit the pattern and bring government spending into line with income to balance the budget and pay off the debt.

The discouraging thing about it, however, is the apathy which the American people have displayed toward government debt. Fat paychecks and easy money have blinded the average individual to the serious aspect of the situation, even though he is being paid today in dollars worth half, or less, of those received only a few years ago.

To them "government" is something intangible and too remote to be of individual concern. The belief persists that government can continue on its merry spending way, unrestrained, along a road which ultimately will spell national ruin just as surely as it would ruin the individual pursuing a like course with respect to personal finances.

Small wonder, then, that most Congressmen and Senators show little concern for the Nation's financial future and subscribe to a spend-and-tax, tax-and-spend political platform. If the folks back home are content with 40-cent dollars, why aim higher? If they don't care what effect present fiscal policies will have on their children, why should Congress concern itself with posterity?

Until a sufficient number of voters awakens to the seriousness of it all, and demands in no uncertain terms that Congress pass laws to curb such reckless spending and going deeper and deeper into debt, it is rather naive to hope for a change which would force less, not more, Government spending until it is not only brought into line with Federal income, but allows a steady reduction of the public debt.

There is a need for more thinking such as that reflected by Senators BRIDGES (Republican of New Hampshire); BYRD (Democrat of Virginia); and CURTICE (Republican of Nebraska); who have stepped over party lines to back a Senate bill which would not only prohibit the Federal Government from spending more money than it takes in from taxes and other revenues during a given fiscal year, but would further provide that a certain amount be set aside each year to pay off the Federal debt on a systematic basis.

If the people of this country really want to save it from a financial collapse, which could come much sooner than they think and even with tragic suddenness, it's time for them to go after Congress with the big stick and tell that body that, for a change, "or else" means check the Government spending spree regardless of any arguments to the contrary, and get the Government back on its financial feet, or step out and make room for a Congress that will do it.

It might be well to recall again the Soviet boast that its people would force the United States to spend itself into destruction, and that socialism would take over here without the firing of a shot. Could it be that they are already well along the road to attaining that goal?

Improved Methods of Stating Budget Estimates

SPEECH
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I was a member of the committee that held hearings on it. I believe it is worthwhile legislation and that if adopted it will create more efficiency and more economy in government. I hope the House will adopt this resolution.

Its adoption will represent a long step forward in the effort by the Hoover Commission to improve the functioning of the Federal Government.

The bill has had the warm support of thousands of Americans interested in simplifying Federal budgeting and accounting procedures. I have had a great deal of mail on it myself, from good citizens of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District. They see in H. R. 8002 an opportunity of cutting down on Govern-

ment spending, and I think the bill will eventually have that effect.

I have been a member of the House Committee on Government Operations for 8 years and I consider this proposal among the most important ones our committee has handled during that period. I recommend the adoption of the resolution.

Major Breakthrough Under Arctic Icecap by "Nautilus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 4, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely article on the cruise just made by the atomic submarine *Nautilus* under the Arctic icecap. This is also a great achievement for the skipper of the cruise, Comdr. W. R. Anderson.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of August 15, 1958]

NEW WORRY FOR RUSSIA—MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH BY UNITED STATES AT SEA

(A silent, invisible cruise just made by an atomic submarine under the Arctic icecap now promises this for the United States:

(Major military advantage, with American missile-carrying subs able to hide under the icecap, hit much of Russia at will.

(A peacetime short cut for the future, with cargo submarines saving thousands of miles from Atlantic to Pacific ports.)

An atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, has just given a graphic demonstration of this country's growing atomic power at sea.

The *Nautilus* left Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands and cruised up the Pacific, along the Aleutians. It surfaced just once, near Alaska, then sailed under the polar icecap, across the North Pole and into the Atlantic, emerging just off Greenland.

Man for the first time had moved across the top of the world under water. On the surface, Rear Adm. Robert E. Peary had pushed to the pole in 1909. In the air, Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd was the first to fly over the pole, in 1926. It was just last week that Comdr. W. R. Anderson, captain of the *Nautilus*, cruised to the pole under a layer of ice.

The cruise of the *Nautilus* carries with it great significance, both military and commercial. Officially, stress is placed upon the possibility that atomic submarines of the future may achieve commercial value by carrying cargoes across the pole, cutting ocean-travel distances between Atlantic and Pacific ports on an underwater polar route. Unofficially, all attention is centered on the military meaning of the achievement of the *Nautilus*.

HIDDEN WEAPON

The submarine is seen more and more as the great missile-launching platform of the future. Submerged, lying under the vast icecap of the north, a submarine is regarded as almost completely freed from danger of detection and destruction. It can rise under cover of darkness, surfacing in open stretches of water in the ice, to launch the long-range and intermediate-range missiles of the future with their hydrogen-bomb warheads.

Soviet Russia, of all nations, is least protected from this type of sea approach. For 3,000 miles, her nothern coastline is facing the polar icecap. Vital Soviet cities are within range of missiles now developed, from a launching platform within that icecap. Coming within sight are longer-range missiles, which could reach deep into Russia's heartland from launching sites near the North Pole.

Speed and maneuverability of nuclear submarines operating under the polar icecap were demonstrated, too, by the *Nautilus*. Traveling completely submerged, Commander Anderson's submarine averaged a speed of 16 knots, covering 384 nautical miles—or 442 land miles—a day. It traveled about 6,000 miles, surfacing only once.

The voyage showed conclusively, as well, that the crew of a nuclear submarine can exist for prolonged periods under thick ice without ill effects.

AN EXPERT SPEAKS

Just how valuable this ability to cross the top of the world under the polar icecap may be in wartime is explained by this country's top authority on nuclear submarines, Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover. In a recent interview with U. S. News & World Report, Admiral Rickover said this:

"A large number of these (missile-carrying nuclear submarines) should be kept continuously at sea, submerged anywhere we want—many of them hiding under the polar icecap. They would constitute a fleet-in-being, ready for immediate use at any time.

"That means that, if anyone declares war on us and actually fires missiles into our country—even if he should manage to destroy the United States—he knows that inevitably he himself will also be destroyed, because we will have these submerged missile-launching bases where he cannot prevent them from firing on him. So this missile-carrying submarine may turn out to be a real deterrent to war."

Admiral Rickover then went on to say: "Consider the problem from the enemy's point of view. He can do something about missile bases which we or our allies may have on land. He can sabotage them, or overrun them, or he can fire missiles at them. But suppose these bases are somewhere in the ocean? Or hidden under the polar icecap? How is he going to find them under millions of square miles of polar icecap?"

Actually, the advantage of hiding under the polar icecap was demonstrated by German submarines which escaped under its edge in World War II.

Russia is highly vulnerable to attack from missile-launching submarines operating in the vicinity of the North Pole, the admiral contends. In the interview, the questions and answers went like this:

Question. Is not the polar icecap a long way from the heart of Russia?

Answer. No, it is not. With a 1,500-mile missile, you can, if you have freedom to use the oceans, knock out almost any part of the world.

Such a submarine can hide under the polar icecap and then go directly anywhere it wants.

Then there is another point. It offers the possibility for other countries to become powerful, to change the international political setup. It would permit England, for example, to increase its importance as a naval power. She would not have to do much more.

Question. What are we doing about getting some of these submarines?

Answer. We have a total of 22 nuclear-powered submarines that either have been built, are building, or have been authorized.

Question. Can all of them carry missiles?

Answer. No. The last 3 of these 22 that were authorized in legislation Congress has just passed will carry Polaris-type 1,500-mile missiles—and the Polaris, which is a non-air-breathing rocket, is still being developed. There are several others that carry Regulus-type missiles—and although these are air breathers, they are operational right now.

PROOF OF POWER

Now the polar cruise of the *Nautilus* demonstrates that Admiral Rickover's idea of using the big icecap is feasible. It promises to have a major impace on the power race between United States and Russia, giving this country a powerful new technique in use of weapons at a time when long-range missiles for launching by submarines are reaching an advanced stage of development.

Militarily, in other words, the submarine's arctic trip opens up new vistas for the United States, gives it an edge in an area where geography makes Russia most vulnerable.

AID TO TRADE

Peacetime uses of the Arctic route are being eyed as well, although the prospects here are more long-range.

There are great savings in distance for cargo-carrying submarines able to use that route. For example, the normal sea route now from Honolulu to London is 9,500 nautical miles long, while a route under the arctic icecap is only 6,700 miles in length. From London to Tokyo, the voyage is cut in half, from 12,200 miles by present sea lanes to 6,300 miles via the North Pole.

Even from ports on this continent, the potential savings in distance are sizable. From Seattle to Oslo, for instance, the distance by present shipping lanes is 9,300 miles, while it is only 6,000 miles by way of the Pole. From Quebec and United States cities along the St. Lawrence seaway to Tokyo, the distance is cut from 10,700 to 8,700 miles.

For both peace and war, thus, the latest cruise of the *Nautilus* promises a major edge for the United States at a time of growing international competition.

The credit for building the *Nautilus* goes to Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who is an expert in the nuclear power field. I thought the readers of the RECORD would be interested in his reasons for the success of the *Nautilus* project, which follow:

THE ADMIRAL SPEAKS HIS MIND

(Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the man who built the atomic submarine *Nautilus*, went before the Senate Armed Services Committee last week and revealed some of the things he had learned while breaking trail in the nuclear power field. Here are some excerpts from his testimony that are pertinent to the current national determination to meet the challenge presented by Russia's progress in military technology.)

The military organization is not set up to do development work. It is set up mostly to do routine work. So if anyone comes in with a new idea, the people in the organization naturally tend to make him conform to the organization because conformity is prized.

There is still too much conformity rather than performance—conformance rather than performance.

So the first thing that a man has to do is to make up his mind he is going to get his head chopped off ultimtaely and if he does not have that feeling he will never get things accomplished in the military.

So when I took this job I knew that if I were going to do it in a proper manner I would naturally displease many people and cause them to be angry with me. My anticipation proved to be quite correct.

The reason my organization is efficient is not because I can find good people. There are no good people to be found. The good people already have good jobs.

All you can ever do is to find potentially good people and then you must train them yourself.

The most depressing thing that comes out of the interviews with job candidates is the fact that, whether they are civilians or officers, they do not read, they do not study, once they leave school. The ability to make money, the ease of making money for anyone who has been through college is so great in the United States that we have an expression: We say they are becoming "nest builders" or "egg hatchers." They are just spending much of their time working around the house. They are not improving themselves enough professionally.

There can be no division between responsibility and authority and really get a job done effectively and rapidly.

Now, the ordinary Government agencies are geared to the concept of the division of powers, checks, and balances, just as is the Federal Government. This system is perfectly all right for more or less static or routine things, but it surely does not work today when weapons are so powerful and so fast. * * * Its primary purpose is to see that everyone does his job by the rules. But there are no rules for development. If there were rules, it wouldnt be development.

If we lose a war, it will make no difference whether all of the rules of bureaucracy were carried out or not.

I would like to amplify this point, because I think right here you have what is wrong with some of the large-scale research and development work. It is not money. It isn't money altogether. To some slight extent, yes; it is money, but it also takes time to spend money. In fact, if you give a man too much money, he can waste time.

And I surely would like to disabuse any of the Senators here that all you have got to do is appropriate a lot of more money and you are going to get things done. It is time we must buy, and time today is our measure of survival.

It is more the getting qualified people to do a job, make sure they train their people and make sure, and I think—I wouldn't be surprised that there may not be over 10 or 15 people in the whole United States who are capable of handling large-scale research and development work.

Make sure when you get one of those guys that you don't let everybody hound him to death and tie him up with trivia.

For instance, my time and the time of most of my leading people, is spent on things which have no real relation to our job. We are at the beck and call of every staff, every staff member there is in Washington. And a good deal of our time is spent in protecting ourselves—in preventing bad things from happening.

"Well," you could say, "Why do you pay attention to them? Why don't you disregard them?" You can't do that. You can't live in an organization and just disregard people. You can't, because you will get everybody down on you, and it will become difficult to get things done.

I think we are kidding ourselves. I think most of our people cannot understand that we are actually at war. They don't understand it. They need to hear shells. They are not psychologically prepared for the concept that you can have a war where you don't have actual literal fighting, and this is the trouble.

Most people say they see it, but they do not really act that way. I think everybody today in the military should be acting, should be doing things as if we were really at war. We have got to learn ways of doing things faster. I think it is almost too late. This is what I worry about.

The easiest thing to do in Washington when something goes wrong is to reorganize and from what I have seen in many years all that usually gets reorganized are the telephone numbers.

One of the main reasons for the success of the *Nautilus* project was that there were so many people who were certain the project would fail, and they did not want to be associated with it. * * * That was one of the most wonderful and fortuitous things that happened in our program.

Mississippi Native Next Tennessee Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we in Mississippi are proud of the fact that Buford Ellington, recently nominated as Democratic candidate for Governor of Tennessee, is a native of Mississippi. The people of Holmes County, Miss., are especially interested in Buford Ellington's career. They are confident that he will make a great Governor of our great neighboring State, because of the confidence they have in Governor Ellington's fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Ellington.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article about Mr. and Mrs. Ellington from the Four County News:

BUFORD ELLINGTON'S HOLMES COUNTY PARENTS HAPPY OVER HIS GUBERNATORIAL VICTORY

Since Buford Ellington was elected Governor of Tennessee Thursday, life at his old homeplace in the Bethesda community in Holmes County has been busy and exciting for his happy parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Ellington.

At the attractive white frame house, located on a high point with a commanding view of the surrounding country, phone calls and visitors have been constant.

Things were so happily hectic that when this reporter asked them Monday how long they had been married, they looked at each other and burst out laughing—this was their 54th wedding anniversary and in the excitement they had forgotten it.

The Ellingtons have lived in the Bethesda community, 8 miles northeast of Lexington and 8 miles northwest of Durant, their whole lives, and have been on this farm most of the 54 years of their married life.

Their son Buford, the oldest boy, finished Bethesda school, says his mother, and then on the advice of Millsaps school officials went on to Holmes at Goodman. Back in the old record book at the school, Buford Ellington is listed as having graduated from Holmes Agricultural High School in 1926. He then went on to finish at Millsaps.

UP ALL NIGHT

"We sat up all Thursday night listening to the returns," said Mr. Ellington, and Mrs. Ellington said that it wouldn't have done any good to go to bed, since they couldn't have slept anyhow.

"We've been swamped to death," laughed Mr. Ellington. "I'm supposed to be in the field cutting hay right now." Mr. Ellington is 74. He had already been out working the garden that morning.

He's still active on the farm, as the foregoing illustrates, which he operates in partnership with his middle son, Irby, of Lexington. "Irby has breakfast with us every morning except Saturday and Sunday and works here until noon and then goes into town to his gas station," explain the Ellingtons.

THREE SONS

The third son is Leonard, 43, who is with the Clewiston Motor Co., Caterpillar dealer in West Palm Beach, Fla.

Irby attended Durant High School 1 year and attended Holmes for a short while. Mr. A. E. Ellington and Irby have 125 cows on their place.

Getting back to the big topic of the moment, Buford's election as Governor, Mr. Ellington was asked if he was ever in politics.

"No, man." was his emphatic reply.

How did Buford become such a successful politician?

"He was a natural born politician, from the time he was a baby," recalled his parents, remembering his taking part in all activities and fitting in well. Asked about any sports he played, his mother said that he played basketball but he wasn't a real basketball player. "Now Irby was the basketball player," she said. That brought another thought to her mind.

PROUD OF ALL BOYS

"The two other boys are just as good boys as Buford—all three of them have made us very happy. I'm proud of Buford, and I'm proud of Irby and Leonard, too. We have the finest daughters-in-law a person could ask for, too," she said. "Leonard is the best church worker," she said.

The Ellingtons have both lived in the Bethesda neighborhood all their lives, and have belonged to the Bowling Green Methodist Church for 54 years. Dr. A. I. McIwain, of Jackson, is the pastor there now, and they say he is the best in Holmes County.

They live at the extreme western end of district 2, and get their mail on route 2 out of Durant. They have electricity and a telephone and all modern conveniences in their pretty home.

PRETTY COUNTRY

On the road up to their house, rock outcroppings form the base of the good gravel roads in places, and crystal clear streams in deep beds flow over sandy bottoms. The country is very hilly, and is similar to mountain foothill country. From his favorite sitting place under a tree in the front yard, Mr. Ellington has a wonderful view of the country in all directions.

In the past, Mr. Ellington said that he has done some truck farming, but now is concerned mostly with cattle and timber.

A fact that makes their son's Buford election more unusual than ever is the fact that he has been in Tennessee only about 20 years.

Some Tennessee papers had just come in Monday. One showed a picture of a crowd of 40,000 at a Memphis rally, called one of the largest crowds ever. Another was the Nashville Banner of Friday with the big headlines, "Ellington Wins It" in huge letters across the front, and several pictures of Buford sweating out the election returns.

"We don't feel like we deserve all this publicity," Mrs. Ellington said modestly, but friends in Holmes County feel differently, they feel that they do.

Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, for some time our office has ben receiving propa-

ganda from the U. S. S. R. Embasy. It is quite different from informative material that comes from other embassies but we felt that freedom of speech and freedom of the press are two cardinal principles in this country. For this reason, we made no particular comment in our office and made an attempt to read this material as it came from that source.

I now have received a leter from one of the newspapers in the Fifth Indiana District advising me that they too have been receiving the press releases from the Soviet Embassy. They complain bitterly at the type of propaganda that this embassy has been circulating and, furthermore, that they are permitted to pay only 3 cents per piece of mailing matter which costs the postal department many times that much to handle.

The newspaper editor in returning this particular piece to me said that it cost him 8 cents to send it first class and the Russian Embassy apparently was paying only 3 cents.

Thus, it seems that a subsidy is being given to those who would attempt to undermine us or who at least are not hesitating to be severely critical of our President, our Congress, and our people in these press releases.

Does it not seem that this is going far beyond freedom of speech and freedom of the press? They would not tolerate even this much propaganda coming out of our embassy in Moscow, and I am wondering why it is necessary to permit it in our free land.

A Hoosier Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the last half century a rapidly increasing belief in the powers of governments—at all levels—as being the best medium for settling all of the conflicts and differences in our lives. Many of us—and this is particularly true of Hoosiers—have felt that this attitude demands too much of government, and is bought at too great a price. I doubt that all-powerful governments are the best means of solving all of the problems of day-to-day living, and I am sure that such endeavors would necesarily be accompanied by severe restraints of those liberties we cherish.

Without denying the rightful duties and responsibilities of governments, it is worthwhile to remind ourselves that many problems can and should be solved without recourse to legislation or sovereign decree. In this light I was particularly impressed by recent remarks of Mr. Dallas Sells, president of the Indiana State AFL–CIO. His comments, as they appeared in the July 25, 1958 issue of the Leader, weekly publication of the Indiana State AFL–CIO, follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN
(By Dallas Sells)

Aldon C. Palmer, insurance commissioner for the State of Indiana, in a statement prepared for the Indiana Hospital Association, recommended State regulations of hospital rates. While we agree that hospital rates are too high because of some added costs that should not be borne by the patient, we question State interference in this field just as we oppose State interference in the free and democratic collective bargaining processes of labor-management relations.

One thing is certain, if the administrators of hospitals that are service social institutions and not business enterprises, do not assume their full responsibilities in this area, some other group will assume the authority.

In Pennsylvania recently, the insurance commissioner gave the authority to the Blue Cross. We think the hospital association should, in cooperation with the proper medical groups, work with citizen groups to resolve this issue. The health and welfare of the citizens of Indiana are at stake.

National Education Association Studies of Local Property Taxes and Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most convincing arguments in favor of Federal aid to schools is the way the local property tax is breaking down as an adequate and fair means of financing school construction and operation.

A most thorough and exhaustive study of this development has been published by the National Education Association, as prepared by Dr. R. L. Johns, head of the department of educational administration at the University of Florida.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Johns' informative study, entitled "The Property Tax and Public School Financing," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPERTY TAX AND PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCING
(R. L. Johns)

There is evidence all around us that we face a major financing problem in providing for an adequate program of public education in the decade ahead. The attainment of the American ideal of equality of opportunity—even national survival—may well depend upon a major policy change in educational expenditures.

At present our school financing policies show several major defects:

1. The Federal Government has followed the laissez faire policy of let the States do it.

2. Some of the States have followed the policy of let the local districts do it including those districts which do not have the wealth to do the job.

3. Many districts have followed the policy of keeping tax rates low while many others are prevented from financing their schools either by poverty or by State restriction on the property tax.

The net effect of these policies and conditions in many districts has been to spend as little as we can rather than what it takes to finance an adequate program of public education. Furthermore these policies have resulted in placing 54 percent of the financial burden of supporting schools on the property tax. The purpose of this pamphlet is to analyze the effect on school financing of using the property tax as the principal source of school revenue.

THE YEARS AHEAD

Let us first take a look at the problem of school financing in the next 10 years. The Committee for the White House Conference on Education studied this problem in 1955 using data for 1953–54. At that time educational expenditures totaled approximately $9 billion. After studying the status of education and educational needs, the Committee estimated that educational expenditures would need to be doubled and increased to $18 billion during the succeeding 10 years.

Events during the intervening years now make it evident that this estimate was much too low. The educational program envisioned by the Committee cannot possibly be achieved without at least doubling the per pupil expenditures for education. This is quite different from doubling the total expenditures because of the rapid increase in school population.

In 1956–57, the revenue receipts available to the public schools totaled approximately $10,220,000,000, or $316 per pupil enrolled. School enrollment is increasing approximately 1,200,000 per year. Assuming that the school enrollment will be 44,338,688 in 1966–67, it would require $26 billion to provide $632 per pupil in revenue receipts for 1966–67. The doubling of per pupil expenditures would provide an average teacher salary of $8,440. Many authorities believe that it would require an average salary of this amount to provide the type of teacher needed in the public schools. Further decreases in the purchasing power of the dollar and other events by 1966–67 may subsequently prove even this estimate to be conservative.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

With this financial picture before us, can we possibly expect the property tax to provide 54 percent of the school revenue in 1966–67? The schools received approximately $5.5 billion from the property tax in 1956–57. Can we expect the property tax to provide more than $15 billion or 54 percent of the school revenue needed in 1966–67? In considering this problem it is advisable that we examine the types of taxes levied by all levels of Government, the sources of the income of the people, and the equity of the property tax as compared with other sources of revenue.

Taxes are levied by the Federal Government, State governments, and local governments other than schools and school districts. Table I presents some very interesting evidence concerning these taxes. (Table I shows only taxes levied by various levels of government, not expenditures.) There are many intergovernmental transfers of funds through grants in aid not shown in this table. But this table presents some pertinent information concerning the tax levying possibilities of the various levels of government.

Tax collections totalled approximately $93,570,000,000 in 1953 and the Federal Government collected more than $70 billion of this total.

DIFFERENT TAX SOURCES

The property tax raised 10 percent of all governmental taxes; 59 percent came from individual and corporation income taxes; 17 percent from various types of sales taxes; 8 percent from payroll taxes, and 6 percent

from all other taxes. Total taxes have increased considerably since 1953 but the percent derived from each source has changed very little. Therefore the percent derived from each source is of great significance.

The Federal Government derives none of its tax income from the property tax. The last time the Federal Government even attempted to levy a property tax was during Civil War days. State governments derive only 3 percent of their tax income from the property tax, local governments other than schools, 72 percent, and school districts 98 percent. Table I shows clearly that the tax levying possibilities of school districts, despite their heavy financial responsibilities, are far more limited than any other level of government. School districts are limited almost exclusively to the property tax and most states place severe restrictions on the amount of property taxes which can be levied by school districts.

TABLE 1.—*Tax collections of different levels of government 1953*

[In millions]

Type of tax	Total all governments		Federal Government		State governments		Local governments (excluding schools)		School districts	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Personal income	$32,870	35	$31,800	45	$970	8	$100	2+		
Corporation income	22,410	24	21,600	31	810	7				
Other business	1,390	2			990	8	400	6		
General sales	2,730	3			2,430	20	300	5		
Liquor sales	3,520	4	2,780	4	540	4	200	3		
Tobacco sales	2,320	2	1,650	2	470	4	200	3		
Gasoline sales	3,060	3	890	1	2,020	17	150	2		
Other sales	4,970	5	4,620	7	250	2	100	2		
Auto license	1,040	1			1,010	8				
Customs	610	1	610	1						
Property	9,370	10			370	3	4,520	72	$4,480	98
Payroll	7,150	8	5,650	8	1,500	12				
Death and gift	1,110	1	890	1	220	2				
Miscellaneous and unallocated	1,020	1			620	5	340	5	90	2
Total	93,570	100	70,490	100	12,200	100	6,310	100	4,570	100

Adapted from data given in American Public Finance, by William Schultz and C. Lowell Harris, Prentice Hall, p. 252, and Trends in Significant Facts in School Finance by Clayton Hutchins, Albert R. Munse, and Edna D. Booher, U. S. Office of Education, p. 21.

The property tax is one of the most unpopular. In most districts, property tax levies for schools must be approved by a vote of the people. School bond issues which are retired by property tax levies are also usually submitted for the approval of the people.

The Federal Government and State governments have access to the most popular types of taxes; none of these must be approved by popular vote. On the other hand, school boards must obtain most of their local revenue from an unpopular tax approved by popular vote. This situation is of great significance in appraising the practical possibility of school boards obtaining a significant portion of the additional funds needed in the next 10 years from the property tax. The reasons for public resistance to the property tax will become apparent in the following paragraphs.

SOURCES OF INCOME

All taxes must be paid from income of some kind. Therefore the taxing system should have some rational relationship to the sources of income of taxpayers. The sources of income have been changing substantially during recent years. Table II presents an analysis of the national income in 1929 and 1956: Although the national income has quadrupled during this period and although the amount derived from each source has increased, the relative amounts derived from different sources have changed greatly.

Compensation of employees in the form of salaries and wages comprised 58.2 percent of the national income in 1929 and it had increased to 70.2 percent in 1956. Corporate profits provided 11.5 percent of the national income in 1929 and 11.8 percent in 1956. All other sources of income declined between 1929 and 1956 in terms of percent of total income. Farm income declined from 6.8 percent of the total in 1929 to only 3.4 percent of the total in 1956. This is of particular significance to rural districts which rely heavily on the property tax on farms.

In 1956, compensation of employees, corporate profits, and the income of unincorporated businesses and the professions comprised 90.1 percent of the national income. These three major sources of income can be taxed much more readily and equitably by income taxes and sales taxes than by property taxes.

It is possible to tax other sources of income—farms, rental properties, and evidences of loans—by the property tax, but some authorities on taxation believe that even these sources of income can be taxed more equitably by nonproperty types of taxes. These last three sources comprised only 9.9 percent of the total national income in 1956 and 20.3 percent in 1929. Therefore the only components of the national income which bear any rational resemblance to the property tax are rapidly declining as a percent of the total income. Although the typical taxpayer may not be fully aware of these economic changes, he senses that the property tax is not a rational tax and, therefore he resists it.

TABLE II.—*Sources of national income,* [1] *1929 and 1956*

[In millions]

Source	1929		1956	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Compensation of employees	$51,085	58.2	$241,372	70.2
Corporate profits	10,100	11.5	40,449	11.8
Unincorporated business and professional income	8,791	10.0	28,017	8.1
Farm income	5,968	6.8	11,600	3.4
Rental income of persons	5,425	6.2	10,322	3.0
Net interest	6,445	7.3	11,860	3.5
Total	87,814	100.0	343,620	100.0

[1] Source of data: Survey of Current Business, U. S. Dept. of Commerce, July 1957.

PRINCIPLES OF TAX EQUITY

Different types of taxes can be analyzed in terms of certain generally accepted principles of tax justice or equity.

Ability to pay: The most commonly accepted principle of taxation is ability to pay. The ethical justification of this principle is that the proportional sacrifice of one person for supporting government should not be greater than another. The progressive income tax best satisfies this principle because the greater a person's or corporation's income the higher the rate of taxation. It is the opposite of a regressive tax which weighs more heavily, proportionately, on those of least wealth.

The property tax rates very low according to this principle because the taxpaying ability of people is but poorly reflected by property. One example is sufficient to establish this point: When a man goes into debt to buy a home, he immediately increases his tax liability although there is no increase in his income.

Benefit: Also used to evaluate types of taxes is the benefit principle. This means that taxes on person and property should be scaled in proportion to benefits received from government. Schools, of course, increase the value of property but persons benefit more from schools than property. People can be taxed more equitably by income and sales taxes than by property taxes.

Various criteria: Many other principles of taxation and several criteria have been advocated, including adequacy of yield, flexibility of yield, adapability, ease of administration, cost of administration, ease of payment, and stability. The only one of these criteria on which the property tax rates high is stability. All of the major sources of tax revenue listed in table I, rate higher on most of these criteria than the property tax. The typical taxpayer may not know the canons of tax equity but his sense of justice is offended by excessive property taxes. Therefore he resists large increases in property taxes.

ADVANTAGES OF PROPERTY TAX

In should not be inferred from this line of reasoning that the property tax should be abolished as a means of school support. There are many reasons why the property tax should continue to be one of the important sources of school revenue. The most important of these is to provide a degree of freedom in decisionmaking for local school administrative units, a vital factor in preserving experimentation and innovation in the public schools of America.

A local school administrative unit cannot carry out many important decisions affecting educational programs unless it has the power to obtain local revenue in addition to the amounts provided from other levels of government. The property tax is about the only substantial source of local revenue available to local school administrative units. Therefore, the provision of local home rule necessary for innovation and experimentation is sufficient reason to continue the ad valorem tax as an important source of local school revenue.

Much can be done to improve the yield of property taxes levied for school support. Assessment practices should be improved. Constitutional and statutory restrictions should not limit property taxes which can be levied for schools. There are unnecessary restrictions in the qualifications of electors voting for property taxes. And in some cases, the majorities required to vote for a tax or a bond issue are excessive.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In conclusion, it might be feared by some that the national economy could not stand the expenditure of $28 billion for the public schools in 1966–67. At present, only 3 percent of the national income is spent for the public schools. To double educational expenditures with no increase in national

income per capita would require 6 percent of that income. But the per capita national income is rising and by 1966–67 it would not require 6 percent of the national income to provide $38 billion for the public schools.

The U. S. S. R. reportedly spends 6 percent of its national income on public education. Within 40 years, the Soviet Union has lifted itself from a nation largely illiterate with a medieval culture to a highly literate, productive, and powerful nation. Education has been the principal means by which that accomplishment has been made possible.

GREATER FINANCIAL EFFORT

Unless the United States of America chooses to become a second or third class nation, it must make as great or greater financial effort to support public education as that proposed in this booklet. In order to do so, our school-financing policies must undergo a major change both in the amount of revenue provided and the sources of that revenue.

The property tax can no longer be the principal source of school revenue. The Federal Government and State governments are in a much better strategic position than school districts to tax the major sources of national income.

Therefore the Federal Government should abandon its present policy of stopgap, trivial appropriations for public education. The national interest demands that the Federal Government adopt a policy of providing substantial financial assistance for the public schools.

The States should make further expansion and further improvements in their programs of State support.

Local governments should improve the administration of the property tax and in many districts increase the yield from that source.

But the major increases in school revenue during the next 10 years should be provided by the Federal Government and the State governments.

Cleaning Up Veterans' Fund Raising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the text of an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of August 15, 1958, concerning the activities of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House in regard to its investigation of fund raising by veterans and veterans' organizations.

I believe the Members of the House, including those who had some doubt as to the wisdom of this investigation, will find the editorial pertinent and invaluable. The report of the committee has been designated House Report No. 2546 and the legislation to correct the abuses which we found is H. R. 13689:

CLEANING UP VETERANS' FUND RAISING

One observation by the House Veterans Affairs Committee, which has been investigating all sorts of fund-raising activities, good and bad, by veterans' organizations, will hit the spot with a lot of people:

"No good reason is seen why the general public should be annoyed and burdened by the receipt of unordered merchandise for which they are expected to make payment or go to the trouble of returning."

As regards this practice, the committee urges a law which would require that at least half of the gross receipts must be devoted to stated charitable purposes.

Furthermore, the lawmakers feel that people wouldn't be quite so generous with some of the money-seeking programs if they knew what a small percentage funneled down to charity.

Hence all-inclusive legislation for stricter controls is recommended. Funds collected would be regarded as trust funds. Groups with congressional charter would have to make annual reports to Congress on their finances.

Certainly these are requirements to which no genuinely public-spirited organization can reasonably object.

Survey on Current Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, recently the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center conducted a survey on current unemployment. The survey was devised and carried out largely by Prof. William Haber and Prof. Wilbur Cohen of the University of Michigan.

The survey is of such importance that I am asking unanimous consent to have it placed in the RECORD where all Senators may read it.

Mr. President, surveys such as this are of great importance. Too often we act without sufficient knowledge in areas such as unemployment. Too little information is available concerning the facts and attitudes of the unemployed. I can only hope that the University of Michigan will find it possible to continue this particular study, or studies relating to it, and I only wish that it had been available sooner than it was.

Mr. President, I commend this report of the study to my colleagues. The two men who were principally involved in setting it up and carrying it through—Professors Haber and Cohen—are men of great intelligence and judgment. The University of Michigan should be proud to have them as members of its staff. Both have worked long and diligently in this general field. Further, Mr. Cohen, whom many here know, is probably the most knowledgeable man in the country on the subject of social security. An expert in the field of social security may be defined as someone who knows Wilbur Cohen's phone number.

I therefore commend this report of the Haber-Cohen study to Members of the Senate and I hope that it will be just the beginning for further studies in this field. I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One in every four American families felt the recession's impact through unemployment or shortened workweeks. But surprising optimism about individual economic prospects and business conditions generally prevails even among those still unemployed.

These findings of a nationwide study on unemployment were reported Sunday, August 10, by Profs. William Haber and Wilbur J. Cohen of the University of Michigan. Their conclusions are based on interviews with a random sample of 1,456 adults conducted by the University of Michigan survey research center during May and June.

Data obtained from the survey indicate that 12½ million families felt the recession's impact directly. In 8½ million families, the head or one other member was unemployed at some time between mid-1957 and mid-1958. Shorter workweeks affected an additional 4 million families. (See table 1.)

In 700,000 families, two or more members experienced unemployment.

Other highlights, in brief:

Length of unemployment: Those unemployed at the time of the survey averaged 21 weeks unemployment; those previously unemployed who had found jobs again by June averaged 11 weeks unemployment. (See table 2.)

Unemployment insurance coverage: Sixty percent of those unemployed at any time during the past 12 months received some unemployment benefits. Thirty percent received benefits during the entire period they were out of work.

Roughly a third of those who did not receive unemployment compensation never applied for their benefits, because the family head either felt he would not be unemployed long enough to make it worthwhile or that benefits were not enough to make it worthwhile to apply.

Income losses: After counting unemployment insurance benefits as income, unemployed families estimated their income losses as follows: Under $500, 38 percent; from $500 to $1,000, 25 percent; from $1,000 to $2,000, 25 percent; $2,000 and over, 12 percent. (See table 3.)

Impact by income groups: Unemployment was most widespread among families with 1957 incomes of $5,000 or less. Shorter work hours were most frequently experienced by those in the $5,000 to $7,500 income bracket. Taken together, these two factors had their greatest impact on families with 1957 income of $3,000 to $5,000. (See table 4.)

Impact by age: Unemployment during the past year was concentrated among younger members of the labor force. About 1 in 4 family heads under 30 were unemployed at some time during this period and nearly 1 in 10 were unemployed at the time of the survey. Only 13 percent of family heads aged 40 to 50 were unemployed at any time during the same 12 months. (See table 5.)

Measures taken by unemployed: Most families experiencing unemployment reported they piled up bills (26 percent), borrowed money (22 percent), or got help from relatives (21 percent). Some moved to cheaper quarters (11 percent) and 4 percent were on relief.

In addition, some people said they withdrew savings and cut down on buying. A few reported that another member of the family went to work, or that they sold their car or other durable goods. About 1 in 5 families reported they took no steps to adjust to their income loss, but many families took more than 1 measure. Two-thirds of those employed less than 8 weeks took some measure to make ends meet; for those unemployed 9 weeks or more, this proportion was 84 percent.

Job expectations of unemployed: Many of those unemployed at the time of the survey had optimistic hopes for the future. One-third felt confident they would get their old job back soon or they could find another job with equal pay. Slightly more than a third felt their chances of getting another job with

equal pay was bad. The remainder were uncertain.

Economics attitudes of unemployed: Unemployed persons are only slightly more pessimistic about the economic outlook than those who have jobs. Although 25 percent of the heads of families unemployed at the time of the survey felt that another major depression like the thirties could happen, 55 percent felt a major depression unlikely.

Sixty percent of those currently unemployed believe business conditions will not be any worse a year from now than they are at present. On the other hand, only 27 percent felt there will be good times during the next 12 months.

Heads of families who found new employment and were no longer unemployed were even more optimistic. Eighteen percent felt that a major depression could happen, while 67 percent felt that it was unlikely. Nearly half thought there will be good times during the next 12 months.

Those who are unemployed now, or who have been unemployed during the past 12 months, express a desire to buy some new appliances, to make repairs on their home, or some other major expenditure, as frequently as employed people. Ten percent of those who are now unemployed say that they expect to buy a car in the next year. Of those people who were not affected by the recession, only a few percent more indicated that they planned to buy a car in the coming year.

Unemployment in Detroit: A special series of interviews with unemployed Detroit workers showed interesting differences from national patterns.

Out of all those in Detroit who were unemployed during the year from June 1957 to June 1958, a much larger proportion were still unemployed at the time of the survey than were still unemployed in the rest of the Nation.

The duration of unemployment in Detroit also has been appreciably longer than in the rest of the Nation. As a result, income losses due to unemployment and shorter work weeks appear more severe in Detroit than the rest of the United States. These losses occurred even though a larger proportion of Detroit's unemployed were covered by unemployment insurance than was true for the country as a whole.

Even though their economic losses were above average, more of Detroit's unemployed felt they had a good chance of getting back their old job or finding a new one with equal pay than was true for the rest of the country.

Unemployed Detroiters also felt slightly more optimistic about business conditions than unemployed elsewhere—almost half those interviewed felt there would be good times in the coming year.

Commenting on the findings, Professors Haber and Cohen said:

"While a larger proportion of American workers have been affected by this recession than at any time since World War II, the amazing thing is that a generally optimistic attitude continued to prevail, in spite of large economic losses.

"We believe this is due in part to the more significant role of unemployment insurance than in previous recessions.

"It is, undoubtedly, also due to the fact that most people, including the unemployed, felt there was little likelihood of a severe depression and the belief of many that their chances of obtaining another job were good, should they become unemployed.

"To a large extent, the built-in stabilizers of our economy, developed during the past 25 years, gave assurance that the recession would not develop into a depression.

"While unemployment insurance during this period made up a larger proportion of the national wage loss than in any previous period, it is still clear that, unless further permanent improvements in unemployment insurance are made, both in terms of amount and duration of benefits, unemployed workers are still subjected to severe economic losses during layoffs."

Commenting on the study itself, they said:

"This is an important new area of research for the university. Survey research has been extended into three new areas with this study: (1) Rather than obtaining a series of static pictures of unemployment, experience with unemployment over a period of 12 months has been studied; (2) unemployment in families has been measured, in addition to individual unemployment; and (3) data have been collected on how greatly hurt the unemployed feel and how their attitudes and expectations were affected.

"This data will be a useful supplement to information currently available from the Government, which records only the number of persons currently unemployed and does not measure the dynamic impact of unemployment over longer periods of time.

"Data obtained in the University survey on current unemployment corresponds closely with data from the Bureau of the Census on unemployment at the time of our interviews. This adds reliability to the new data obtained in our study."

Questions for the Haber-Cohen study were included as part of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's survey of consumer attitudes and intentions to buy. George Katona, Eva Mueller, James Morgan, and Vivian Kleinman of the survey research center staff assisted in the project.

The study was made possible through the cooperation of the coordinating committee on social welfare research of the university, of which Dean Fedele F. Fauri of the school of social work is chairman, and its committee on income maintenance and social security, headed by Professor Cohen.

The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, Wayne State University-University of Michigan, and the University of Michigan Department of Economics assisted the project through Professor Haber and Ford Foundation faculty research funds. Martin David served as research assistant.

Professor Cohen was director of research and statistics for the Social Security Administration prior to his University of Michigan appointment in 1956. Professor Haber is a member of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security.

Complete findings of their study are expected to be available this fall.

TABLE 1.—*Extent of unemployment, shorter working hours*

	Percent
Head of family unemployed at time of survey	5.5
Head of family unemployed during past 12 months, but employed at time of survey	7.9
Family member other than head unemployed during past 12 months	3.0
Total families affected by unemployment	16.4
Head of family working shorter hours	8.1
Total families affected by unemployment, shorter hours	24.5
Head of family employed	40.9
Head of family self-employed	15.2
Head of family not in labor force	14.9
Unemployment, shorter hours not ascertained	4.5
Total families not affected by unemployment, shorter hours	75.5

NOTE.—Since it was not possible to obtain information which would indicate the losses which self-employed persons suffered from business conditions during the recession, these figures underestimate the full impact of the recession on United States families.

TABLE 2.—*Duration of unemployment for heads of families*

Number of weeks unemployed	Currently unemployed	Currently employed, but unemployed during past 12 months	Either
1 to 4 percent	8	23	17
5 to 13 do	23	46	37
14 to 26 do	37	27	31
27 to 39 do	21	4	11
40 to 51 do	5	0	2
52 or over do	5	0	2
Total	100	100	100
Average duration of unemployment weeks	21	11	15

NOTE.—The period for which heads of families actually will remain unemployed are understated by this table. Those who are now back at work are the more fortunate and more able whose period of unemployment would be less than average under any circumstances. Many of those who were still unemployed in June undoubtedly remained unemployed for some time after the survey; hence, the average duration of unemployment of those who were unemployed at the time of the survey will continue to rise. As a result, this table presents minimum estimates of duration of unemployment.

TABLE 3.—*Income losses after unemployment insurance benefits, estimated by unemployed families*

	Percent
Under $500	38
$500–$999	25
$1,000–$1,499	17
$1,500–$1,979	8
$2,000–$2,499	4
$2,500–$3,499	5
$3,500 and over	3
Total	100

NOTE.—This table excludes those who were not able to give a numerical estimate of their income loss.

TABLE 4.—*Unemployment by 1957 family income groups*

[Percent]

Head of family	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $7,499	$7,500 and over	All incomes
Is currently unemployed	8	7	3	3	5.5
Was unemployed during year	9	11	8	4	7.9
Total unemployed	18	18	11	7	13.4
Is or has been working shorter hours	4	11	10	7	8.1
Total affected	22	29	21	14	21.5
Not affected by unemployment or shorter hours	78	71	79	86	78.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100.0

NOTE.—1957 income may have been affected by unemployment or shorter hours in the last quarters of 1957.

TABLE 5.—*Unemployment by age groups*

[Percent]

Head of family	Under 30	30 to 40	40 to 50	50 to 65	Over 65	All ages
Is currently unemployed	9	6	5	6	3	5.5
Is currently employed, was unemployed earlier in the year	15	10	8	6	1	7.9
Total unemployed	24	16	13	12	4	13.4
Was or is working shorter hours	14	10	9	9	(1)	8.1
Total affected	38	26	22	21	4	21.5

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

His Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner on Thursday, August 14.

The President of the United States in his address before the General Assembly of the United Nations was at his best. His six-point program to bring peace to the Arab world should receive the close study of the General Assembly and certainly the free world should understand our position and desire for peace everywhere.

The President's speech could, indeed, have been his finest hour.

The editorial follows:

HIS FINEST HOUR

Nothing could be clearer than America's position on peace, security, and progress in the Middle East, as President Eisenhower yesterday defined it. And if U. N. does not move to implement it in full consciousness of duty and opportunity it will be defaulting on an obligation which no member land of conscience can deny.

Only the blind could fail to see the line sharply drawn between this presentation of fact and principle—assertive of security guarantees for the small nations—and the wild mouthings of Gromyko to the effect that this constitutes "aggression." That Mr. Eisenhower in paragraph after paragraph scored a direct hit is evident from the source of the yelps.

As he said, "If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited. We will have nullified the provisions of our (U. N.) charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defense. We will have let loose forces that could generate great disasters. The United Nations has, of course, a primary responsibility to maintain not only international peace, but also security."

To that fact, bearing directly on the call to this assembly, the President's message was addressed. Along with it the corollary principle of self-determination by the peoples—in this case the Arab nations—whose survival as independent, national entities, is at stake.

That is not a revised position of the United States. A common principle has guided this policy; notably, that "aggression, direct or indirect, must be checked before it gathered sufficient momentum to destroy us all—aggressor and defender alike."

In redefining this concept, the Chief Executive minced no words. "I would be less than candid," he said, "if I did not tell you that the United States reserves, within the spirit of the charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation—particularly small nations."

That occurred in the case of Lebanon, immediately at hand. Simultaneously, however, the United States appealed to the U. N. to assume the patrol task for which these troops were sent. That was blocked by a Soviet veto.

The Arab countries assuredly know America's concern for the sovereignty for which they are striving—the consideration, that is, for legitimate undertakings to that end, and the respect for aspirations that do them credit. No leader among them, or alliance of leaders, could have read into this message a sinister design. On the contrary, it was a declaration of concern for their freedom, and with that a formula for joint action to help build, under their auspices, an economic structure meeting their primary human needs.

Again it is pertinent to quote the President: "A true Arab renaissance can only develop in a healthy human setting. Material progress should not be an overriding objective in itself; but it is an important condition for achieving higher human, cultural, and spiritual objectives."

That is adequate answer to the Soviet allegation that along the Communist road lies progress from want and misery. It is the assurance of deeds, along with words. For Mr. Eisenhower not only introduced it as a topic; he presented the means to that end.

A peace program indeed; a framework of policy and action by which both clouds and tension could be lifted from an apprehensive world in the knowledge that mankind collectively was striving to banish the conditions that make for war. When development and human progress are the objectives, and strength exists to combat mutually the inroads of conspiratorial assault, it would be a gain for the very purpose for which the U. N. exists.

There are six major elements in the program yesterday laid down: (1) United Nations concern for Lebanon; (2) United Nations measures to preserve peace in Jordan; (3) an end to the fomenting from without of civil strife; (4) a United Nations Peace Force; (5) a regional economic development plan to assist and accelerate improvement in the living standards of the Arab peoples; (6) steps to avoid a new arms race spiral in the area.

They are points belonging together—to be considered as a whole, understanding that as a U. N. responsibility one objective cannot wholly succeed without the other.

It needs to be stated again and again, that this world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one power or group of powers. It is not going to be committed to any one ideology. We must be, by the very nature of the case, a world community of sovereign powers, and of open societies.

That solemn note concluded the President's speech: "We must then seek with new vigor, new initiative, the path to a peace based on the effective control of armaments, on economic advancements and on the freedom of all peoples to be ruled by governments of their choice. Only thus can we exercise the full capacity God has given us to enrich the lives of the individual human beings who are our ultimate concern, our responsibility, and our strength."

The President excelled himself in what probably was the greatest speech of his career. The depth of his convictions, the breadth of his appeal to conscience, realism, and courage, the vigor of his presentation—no wonder he stands as the personal symbol of his Nation and the figure of leadership in the free world.

It was his finest hour.

Judge Eugene McGarry, of the Old School, Not Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Judge Lou Eugene McGarry died the other day, February 24, 1958, at 4:30 p. m., just like a real lawyer would wish it. In a profound sleep, in the place he loved, in his law office.

He started out as a lad around his father's boiler works, in the early nineties, and did well. Then, as a young man, he went off to the Spanish-American War. He came back, got married. Studied law at night school and became a lawyer. He specialized in the criminal practice. Judge McGarry had 10 children and he reared them well. Lou was a real father and proud of his family. One boy, Joe, now a colonel in the Air Corps, served in World War II; with honor, and all the children married. He had 32 grandchildren and 8 great-grandchildren. His lovely mate died 15 years ago.

All in all, he was versatile and clever. He knew every trick and kept the prosecution in trouble all the time. We all learned things from Lou.

Congressmen EMMET BYRNE and BARRATT O'HARA were numbered among his good friends. The camaraderie around the criminal court building was something to talk about in the old days. Great prosecutors and the best of the criminal defense matched wits and maneuvered about on the legal field of battle, as knights of old.

The fellows were around the criminal court one day and talking of days gone by. How men thought of things a little differently than they do now. And then one perked up, it was an old courtroom fan, a curbstone bard, and strictly between the two of us, he mentioned a lawyer whose name was Lou.

Said he:

This fellow was fast on the lip and words flowed like a Texas well. He splintered the air with his vibrant talk and the juries were under his spell. He breezed right through a murder trial and gave the State just 'ell. He knew how to talk to juries, the kind that

had only heard the school bell. (The hifalutin' guys were too busy to serve a spell.)

Those days are over now; people got smarter with the newspapers, radio, and television giving the straight information. Schooling, too, is more to the reading and writing side. People have better training. But in the old days, Lou was the best.

He was a popular person and the people elected him to a judgeship. He was crossed up in a big political fight and the party did not reslate him. He ran as an independent and lost—but nearly 300,000 voters said Lou was a good judge—but the party beat him.

After leaving the bench he was placed by Democratic Party Leader Joseph Gill in the recorder's office as a lawyer in the title section, retiring after 10 years.

He returned to his old love, the criminal court. He was one of the best brief writers of appeals to the Supreme Court, and one of his briefs so impressed the Supreme Court that his contentions as to the archaic nature of its operation resulted in a complete rewriting of the Habitual Criminal Act of the State of Illinois. I know, because I introduced and passed the law, together with Representative Burhans of Peoria, he in the house and I in the State senate, under the advisory guidance of Chief Justices Daley and Schaefer of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

He practiced law for a while—and everybody was glad to help him. He came into my office. He died there the other day, and the legal fraternity gave him a good sendoff to his Maker.

In attendance were members of the criminal court press, George Wright, Chicago Daily Tribune; Art Summerfield, Chicago Daily News; and others; together with the distinguished lawyers of the civil and criminal bar, Crane, McDonald, Bieber, Brodkin, Bellows, Petrone, Stewart, Nicosia, Love, Bulger, Brody, Mallerdino, Busch, Meyers, the Devine brothers, Schultz, Barbaro, Scalise, the Stillo brothers, and Altieri.

Among the outstanding members of the bench attending were O'Connell, Dougherty, Butler, Crowley, Hartigan, Lupe, Sbarbaro, Pope, Cilella, Barth, Geroulies, Cornelius Harrington, Morrissey, Quilici, Green, Dunne, McDermott, Chelos, Drucker, McSweeney, Kula, McCormick, Covelli, Austin, Weiss, Padden, Casey, Normoyle, Wells, Dempsey, Barry, Robson, Holmgren, Roberts, Kluczynski, Ward, Burke, Bicek, Tucker, Leonard, Kiley, Touhy, Lyons, Adesko.

Do not worry about Lou—he did more than his share to make men a happier lot. He fought all the way, and strictly among these lawyers they said that goodhearted Lou was one of the greatest lawyers of his time. So we who knew him say "Ditto". And the Good Lord will see to it that he makes the Gate to the Promised Land. We all are proud that we knew Lou, and his good friends just ask in their prayers that he travels the road to Kingdom Come a little light.

God is good and sees in man His likeness. And Lou was a real servant to the end.

Indian Education Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1958, I asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs what progress had been made during the past 2 years in the implementation of Public Law 702, 84th Congress.

Public Law 702, sponsored by Representatives RHODES and UDALL, of Arizona, and Senator GOLDWATER, authorized and directed the Secretary of Interior to conduct a study and investigation on Indian education in the United States and Alaska. I am disappointed to learn that although preliminary steps have been taken the program has not yet gotten underway. Thirty years have elapsed since the last comprehensive study of Indian education was made and another is sorely needed. I sincerely hope sufficient funds will be made available during the 86th Congress to permit this study to be made. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the able direction of Commissioner Emmons, has an outstanding record of performance and service. I believe the Bureau should be given the necessary appropriation to enable it to make this important study.

Commissioner Emmons' letter dated August 8, 1958, follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1958.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: We are pleased to comply with your request of July 28, for a progress report and information with respect to the survey of Indian education authorized by Public Law 702, 84th Congress. Although the intent of the Congress to have such a survey made is clear, the act has never been implemented because we have been unable to secure the necessary appropriations to do so. Funds to carry out the survey were included in our 1958 budget request, but since other projects in the judgment of the Congress had a higher priority, moneys were not appropriated for this survey.

The purpose of Public Law 702 was to have a survey made to study Indian education in the United States, including an investigation of the education problems of Indian children from non-English-speaking homes, and the possibility of establishing a more orderly, equitable, and acceptable program for transferring Indian children to public schools. The Bureau developed preliminary materials for the planning and managing of the survey. However, lacking adequate funds, this was the extent of our participation.

The last comprehensive study of Indian education was made in 1928 in connection with the Meriam survey made by the Institute for Government Research. Although there have been several surveys and studies made since that time, there is nothing of a comprehensive nature that can be compared to the Meriam study of 1928. A comprehensive survey such as that authorized by Public Law 702 would be helpful, and with that legislative authority we hope it may be possible, when funds become available, to carry out such a study sometime in the not distant future.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN L. EMMONS,
Commissioner.

Indian Adult Vocational Training Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, when Public Law 959 was enacted during the closing days of the 84th Congress, I stated that it was perhaps the most important and far-reaching piece of Indian legislation processed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 84th Congress. Introduced in the House by Representatives EDMONDSON, UDALL, and BERRY, and in the other body by Senators YOUNG THYE, CHAVEZ, MUNDT, and GOLDWATER, legislation culminating in Public Law 959 authorizing the Secretary of Interior to undertake by contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, vocational training school, corporation or association, a program of vocational training for Indians to help them obtain employment.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Ernst which presents a progress report on the implementation of Public Law 959. The letter follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 12, 1958.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: Your letter of July 28, 1958, requested information about the Bureau of Indian Affairs' adult vocational training services program authorized under Public Law 959. The following is a brief summary of progress made in the program to date.

Full-time institutional vocational training is now available in the 10 area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in 8 field relocation offices at Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati and Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Los Angeles and Oakland, Calif.; and St. Louis, Mo. Applications are being taken for adult vocational training services at agency and other similar Bureau offices.

Since January 1958, there have been 165 various occupational courses approved, involving approximately 65 different schools. As of June 30 of this year, 376 Indians had entered vocational training under the act, either at the field relocation office destination or at the area office location. Of this number, 37 trainees have discontinued training for various reasons. As the program has been underway only a short time, just four have completed the training. Beginning July 1 of this fiscal year, a total of 325 ap-

plications were on file for processing. Of this number, 115 have been primarily selected and 137 have been finally selected. Of this latter number, 118 have already departed for their training destination.

The Bureau has staffed each of the offices where training is available with qualified training officers who are assisting the applicants with the necessary counseling relative to the appropriate training objective they should pursue. Grants of financial assistance covering tuition and related costs, and other necessary items, are being furnished to the participants in the program as their needs require.

To carry out this work, $1,500,000 was appropriated for fiscal year 1958 and, as stated above, at the close of the fiscal year, 376 heads of families and single individuals were enrolled in approved courses of adult vocational training. Most of these persons entered training during the months of April, May, and June 1958. The courses of training being pursued range from 6 to 24 months in length, with an average duration of about 12 months.

For fiscal year 1959, $2,830,000 was appropriated to carry on and expand the program. With these funds, we will be able to continue in training the persons who entered late in fiscal year 1958, and we expect to provide services to 670 additional trainees.

We believe the interest in the program expressed by the number of Indians participating and the inquiries that have been made about it is exceedingly good and indications are that the program is gaining momentum as knowledge of the opportunities afforded by it are known. We are pleased with the reception this program has obtained from the Indians and with the progress that is being made.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Ike's Good Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of August 7, 1958:

IKE'S GOOD PRESS

Although President Eisenhower might be the first to deny it, he has received what any public relations consultant would call a "good press." To be sure, he has been criticized. All Presidents are criticized. And where Mr. Truman caught his lumps only from the conservative right, Mr. Eisenhower often has caught it from both sides—liberal and conservative, white and black, North and South.

But if there are times when it may seem that Mr. Eisenhower can't win for losing, more frequently it appears that he can't lose for winning.

We have in mind the astonishing fashion in which Mr. Eisenhower's defeat on his defense reorganization bill has wound up as Mr. Eisenhower's victory. Both the administration and the Congress were agreed on about 90 percent of the original bill; so far as these provisions were concerned, there scarcely could have been an "Eisenhower victory" because there was no contest.

On two points, however, there was great controversy. The House insisted upon a provision specifically allowing both the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the individual service secretaries to take their dissenting views on major problems to the Congress. Mr. Eisenhower demanded that the provision be eliminated. It was, he said, "a bad concept, bad practice, bad influence," and an invitation to insubordination. What happened? The Congress coldly kept this provision intact.

Back on April 3, in a special message, Mr. Eisenhower said: "We must remove all doubts as to the full authority of the Secretary of Defense." He called "fundamental" the Secretary's need for greater flexibility in transferring appropriations. Within limits, he declared, such authority should be "complete and unchallengeable." Dozens of Congressmen, however, were unkind enough immediately to challenge that which the President regarded as unchallengeable. He quickly retreated, and the provisions he once described as "fundamental" never were sought at all.

On these two major areas of controversy, representing just about all the controversy there was, Mr. Eisenhower was roundly licked. Yet he smilingly assured reporters last week that "except in relatively minor respects, the bill adequately meets every recommendation I submitted to Congress." And the headlines dutifully read, "Eisenhower Scores Victory in Defense Fight."

If Mr. Eisenhower could just enchant the Russians the way he seems to enchant everyone here at home, the United States would have it made abroad.

Your Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, two significant events have taken place in the 2d session of the 85th Congress. On August 8, 1958, the House of Representatives adopted three civil-rights amendments by a voice vote. This is the first time that the Powell amendment has ever been adopted by a voice vote and on that date the science aid bill passed the House, providing that there would be no discrimination on account of race, religion, national origin, or sex.

The other significant event occurred when the House and Senate approved the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The brilliant columnist for the New York Post, Sylvia F. Porter, has summarized this important legislation in her column of August 7, which I am including in my remarks:

YOUR DOLLAR

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The banks of this Nation are not designed or organized to provide risk capital or long-term loans for small business firms. This, the American Bankers Association, organization of the country's bankers, readily admits in black and white.

The capital markets of this Nation also are not set up to provide growth capital at tolerable cost for small firms. This, the Investment Bankers Association, organization of the country's investment banking houses, readily admits in black and white, too.

Nor are the existing business-loan programs of the Federal Government and some of the States geared to doing an adequate job of meeting small-business needs for capital with which to expand and grow. Lending activities of Government agencies are comparatively meager; restrictions on their operations just about prohibit the agencies from making the type of loans small-business men so desperately seek.

For years a dangerous vacuum has existed in the financing system of this country, and because of the vacuum the position of the small-business man in America has steadily deteriorated.

For years, a force toward busness giantism in the United States has been the money squeeze on small firms and because small firms have simply had no place to go for adequate long-term financing, increasing numbers of them have shriveled and died.

Now, though, a move is being made to fill this vacuum—as a result of the long efforts of Senator SPARKMAN, (Democrat, of Alabama) and the devoted work during this congressional session of Senator JOHNSON, (Democrat, of Texas) and Representative PATMAN.

A turningpoint for small business in our land will be reached when "The Small Business Investment Act of 1958" goes on the books—as is anticipated any day.

You should know about this act. For your own welfare, you should help make the program and experiment a roaring success. Here, therefore, are vital details.

Question. What does the act provide?

Answer. It provides that Congress will appropriate $250 million for the Small Business Administration for use in promoting the formation of local sball business investment companies the Nation over. These companies are to help small firms get risk capital and long-term loans.

Question. How will the local investment companies be set up and financed?

Answer. A group of as few as 10 local businessmen can voluntarily form an investment company with the approval of the SBA. To start, the company must have a minimum of $300,000 of capital, but half of this it can get from the SBA. The other half must be raised from private sources and the company can obtain additional capital from private sources as well.

In short, these are to be private investment companies. Although they will be kicked off with Government assistance, the idea is that eventually, they will be owned almost entirely by private capital.

Question. What will the investment companies do for small firms?

Answer. A local investment company may invest risk capital directly in a small firm—actually arrange to buy stock in the firm; or

It may make a long-term loan running up to 20 years at an interest rate determined by the SBA to the firm.

The only key limitation is that the investment company can't lend an individual small business more than 20 percent of its total capital.

Again, the emphasis is on investment decisions by private, local businessmen backing their decisions with money of their own and seeking a profit on worthwhile risk loans. "Washington" won't be doing the job.

Question. Why is this so revolutionary?

Answer. It is revolutionary because the bill is creating a new system of financing small business. It is a most constructive step because it will give the small firm a more equal opportunity to obtain long-term growth capital and thus will help it compete more effectively with big companies. It is a positive antimonopoly move.

Of course, much depends on how vigorously the SBA administers the program and on how enthusiastically local investors cooperate.

But as the law goes on the books, all of us who feel deeply that the survival of small

business is imperative to the survival of our system have high hopes. This will be recorded as one of the great deeds of the 85th Congress.

On Saturday afternoon, September 20, 1958, at 4 p. m. I am calling together a leadership conference of Negro businessmen in my district at my New York headquarters, 132 West 138th Street, to formulate plans for the establishment of a small business investment company in my area, as I am certain that this law will prove beneficial to the small business men in Harlem.

A Letter by Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo of the Dominican Republic to the Apostolic Nuncio to the Dominican Republic. The program suggested by Generalissimo Trujillo is affirmative and constructive in its purpose and appeal. It should commend itself to all people who desire to combat communism.

[Translation]
CIUDAD TRUJILLO,
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC,
July 22, 1958.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Monsignor SALVATORE SIINO,
Apostolic Nuncio of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, City.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: As we find ourselves relatively near the 2,000th anniversary of the Christian era and more than four and a half centuries since the discovery of America, an act symbolized by the raising of the Christian cross by Columbus on the first land that he trod; at a time, too, of deadly and persistent expansion by internationtal communism in nearly all parts of the Americas, in anticipation of which I hastened to save this Republic from such an evil influx as early as 1936 when I was the nation's president, it has occurred to me to submit to the high consideration of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, through the distinguished mediation of Your Excellency, an idea which I believe to be of considerable importance, so that, should the Holy Father deem it appropriate, he would consent to sponsor its translation into reality.

The idea is the following: The desirability, both from the historic and religious points of view, that the Holy See should arrange for the dispatch of a high pontifical mission to the capitals of all the countries of the New World, entrusted with the lofty mission of realizing in those countries what we might call a ratification of the Catholic faith and a defense of that civilization which was born with Christianity. Its mission of reaffirmation of the human principles of peace and concord cannot at this time be but one of the gravest concern in the face of the disastrous events which we are witnessing. This would come to be, let us say, an intensive campaign for spiritual strengthening against communism, which, incidentally, does not exist in this country thanks to the foresighted measures I erected as a barrier against it. Undeniable is the ever-alert zeal with which not only the church of this country but also that of the other Catholic American countries carries out its ministry. But inasmuch as the enemies of the freedom and equality upheld by Christianity are increasing their efforts, an action such as I herein suggest would seem desirable, an action to fortify the spirit of the great family of Christian peoples of this hemisphere with the far-reaching impact that a pilgrimage of this magnitude, sponsored by the spiritual father of all the faithful, would have.

His Holiness Pope Pius XII advises from his exalted position as Christ's representative on earth that Christian peoples everywhere make the greatest efforts to halt the advance of communism.

Such concern by the holy father would have at this time, in the advancement of my proposal, a far-reaching significance, should his holiness so deem it, I think that his high decision in this regard would reinforce the very action he has been advising for the attainment of world peace.

If the suggested idea is acceptable to his holiness, the high pontifical mission which would be set up for this purpose, would commence its work in Ciudad Trujillo, the capital of this country in which, as is well known, the first mass was held in America, the first cathedral built, the first university founded, the first government set up, and the work of colonization and civilization of the New World commenced—a few among the many other works which will not have escaped the privileged knowledge and perception of the holy father and of Your Excellency, in connection with the rare historic fact that the Dominican nation is the cornerstone of the Gospel in the New World.

Such a campaign, in which the reaffirmation of the spiritual seed of Christianity in the hearts of all American countries would be sufficient in itself to bring about, indirectly but surely, the required end, would in my opinion, constitute a most forceful onslaught against communism, and one of far greater value than all those violent and bitter diatribes against that doctrine, its founders and its exponents, ever launched by newspapers and anti-Communist groups with the use of invectives, always susceptible of bringing about violent and impetuous reactions.

Apart from the European cardinals and bishops comprising the mission which would attend the initial act in Ciudad Trujillo, all the cardinals and Bishops of America would be invited, and their expenses would be paid by our Government, as was the case with the International Catholic Culture and World Peace Congress held in this city. Generally speaking, the plan to be followed in developing the proposal and in financing this crusade would be agreed upon between our Government and the Vatican, should the idea meet with the approval of his holiness. In the remaining American capitals, the expenses could be covered by the various religious bodies pertaining thereto, together with official aid wherever this were possible.

Your Excellency, being aware of the Christian feelings of the Dominican people, and of their deep-rooted respect for the religious traditions which form an essential part in their double faith in God and in the country, is also well aware with what joy and enthusiasm a mission of such quality and purpose would be welcomed here.

Hoping that this suggestion, inspired as it is by the same high ideals as those of the vicar of Christ, may receive, in these critical hours of the world, the benediction and backing of Your Excellency, and Your Excellency's agreement to my request that it may be made known to his holiness so that he may give it his consideration, I have pleasure in conveying to Your Excellency my profound gatitude together with my best wishes for a safe journey, good health, and comfort on the occasion of your forthcoming visit to the eternal city.

I remain, Your Excellency's sincere and devoted,

RAFAEL L. TRUJILLO.

Moon Dust and a Rocket Around the Moon—Will They Unfold a Mystery of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, not since Pope Gregory, the Great, has there been so much speculation, it seems, about time, speed, space, and the moon, and their effect on the activities of man.

It is said that the Gregorian calendar under which we live was devised to free man from the comings and goings of the moon and the tricks it played. Man plowed by the moon and soon found himself plowing in the snow. So an adjustment was made for every 100 years and leap year was taken care of. Man now plows by the Gregorian calendar free of snow.

But has the calendar freed man from the tricks, if any, that the moon might still be playing on him during its 27.3 days visibility 13 times a year?

Like the ebb and flow of the tides, is there a repetitive pattern of conduct, of creative thought and feeling, of negative thought and feeling that man experiences in the coming and going of the moon? Is a calendar on thought and feeling in order? And knowing it, can we parry destructive tendencies and enhance creative ones? Lacking such calendar, do we think and feel, in the snow, as it were?

Man has lived through 4,000 years of recorded history. This means through 52,000 moons covering 200 generations. Is there a repetitive pattern of man's conduct in any of the quadrants of the moon through time?

Edison said that his ideas came from space. Are thought waves thrown by the handfuls, as it were, through space, with each of us absorbing as much of them as we can take?

These and other questions come readily to mind when one reads in today's press of moon dust and of our contaminating it with a direct shot at the moon. Some say that we should fire a rocket around the moon to avoid contaminating the moon dust. Moon dust, it is said, holds a mystery of life that could add greater glory to the divine in it all.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an item on moon dust and a rocket around the moon as related in the August issue of the Saturday Review:

(By John Lear, science editor)

The Washington rumor factory once again is circulating the report that an American

rocket will head for the moon this month. If the story is true this time, we hope the rocket will be sent around the moon rather than at it, because the story of life from the moment of its beginning in the cosmos may be written in the dust on the face of the moon just as clearly as the later phases of evolution appear in the fossil-bearing sediments of the crust of the earth.

The moondust scrolls were discussed in the issue of Science which members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science read during the July week that marked the 100th anniversary of the theory of evolution through natural selection.

The moondust is assumed by astronomers to be of great antiquity. Prof. Joshua Lederberg, chairman of the department of medical genetics at the University of Wisconsin, and Dean B. Cowie, a member of the staff of the department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington, D. C., reported. They explained: "This dust is cosmic material captured by the moon's gravitational field and presumably left undisturbed by atmospheric and biological alteration.

"For the biologist, the dust may furnish two striking opportunities," the two scientists declared, making public what they had said at a secret symposium in Washington in May on possible uses of earth satellites in life science experiments. The first possibility is "to assess the prebiotic synthesis of organic compounds"; the second is "to make an empirical test of cosmic dissemination of biospores."

To put the problem in its true perspective, it must be recalled that analysis of light from the stars indicates that the chemical elements existing on earth are here in different proportions of abundance than they are elsewhere in the cosmos. Whereas carbon, nitrogen, and oxygen make up three-fourths of all the matter in the universe apart from hydrogen and helium, there is no nitrogen in earth's crust and very little in the atmosphere, a relatively tiny amount of carbon, and a small amount of oxygen. In brief, "the richness of organic complexity on our own planet was formed out of the mere dregs of cosmic distillation."

If man could get his hands on some of the dust that moves among the stars, he might put it in a test tube and work backward along the chain of life to find his own beginnings. Interplanetary dust is the next best bet, but as soon as it nears earth by way of asteroids and comets it is likely to mix with what we already know is in earth's atmosphere and confuse the record. The dust on the moon can tell us the story if we can sample it without contaminating it. Even a minor degree of pollution could ruin the account.

Angry Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the National House of Representatives the present Governor of Connecticut, Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, made an outstanding name for himself. As Governor of Connecticut, he has given outstanding service with ability and courage to the people of his State.

As he served the people of his district in the Halls of Congress with credit, so now Governor Ribicoff is serving the people of his State with credit, already establishing a reputation thoughout our country as an outstanding Governor.

As evidence of this fact, I include in my remarks, a highly complimentary editorial appearing in the Washington Star of August 14, 1957:

ANGRY VOTERS

Connecticut's Governor Ribicoff is a highly respected public official wherever his good works are known. And not the least of these, by any means, is his success in drastically reducing the slaughter on his State's highways.

This has been done by cracking down hard on the speeders, the drunks, and the reckless drivers. Some 14,000 motorists have been fined or had their licenses revoked, and some of these are reported to be planning to take it out on the Governor when he comes up for reelection this year. Since he won by only 3,200 votes in 1954, this could be a serious threat should it really materialize.

The Governor's safety campaign has reduced traffic fatalities in Connecticut by about two-thirds—a truly impressive record. There ought to be enough people in the State who appreciate this safety record, and whose votes will offset the malcontents who have been punished for traffic violations. It would also be a great help, of course, if Governor Ribicoff's Republican opponent were to announce that, if elected, he will continue the all-out drive against the bad actors on the highways. Politics being politics, however, this probably is too much to hope for.

Basis of Congressional Quarterly Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 1, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that on Monday next it is possible that the House of Representatives will consider labor legislation similar to that which was recently considered in the other body. The magazine Congressional Quarterly, Inc., in its issue for the week ending August 1, 1958, has an interesting summary of the amendments offered in the other body and a tabulation of the rollcalls thereon. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the summary and tabulation, as follows:

BASIS OF CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY STUDY

For its vote study, Congressional Quarterly chose the 12 key amendments to S. 2888 and the 10 key amendments to S. 3974, all opposed by both the Democratic leadership and the AFL–CIO and all defeated. (Congressional Quarterly rollcall Nos. 49–59, 61, 89, 91, 93–96, 102, 103, 105, 106. Weekly report, pp. 555–557; 808–814.)

S. 2888: The following were the 12 amendments to S. 2888:

ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado: Exempt level of benefits type plans from S. 2888; rejected 28–59 (Democrats, 2–43; Republicans, 26–16).

KNOWLAND, Republican, of California: Require election of union officers once every 4 years by popular ballot; rejected 37–53 (Democrats, 1–43; Republicans, 36–10).

KNOWLAND: Establish conditions for trusteeship over locals; rejected 35–53 (Democrats, 1–42; Republicans, 34–11).

KNOWLAND: Make payments to union representatives by employer agents illegal; rejected, 35–52 (Democrats, 1–41; Republicans, 34–11).

KNOWLAND: Authorize the Secretary of Labor to publish union reports and to notify the Attorney General if he believes false information has been filed; rejected 33–53 (Democrats, 1–40; Republicans, 32–13).

KNOWLAND: Bar as exclusive bargaining agent any union refusing to grant equal rights and privileges to members; rejected 28–58 (Democrats, 0–40; Republicans, 28–13).

SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey: Permit strikers permanently replaced during a strike to vote in representation elections; rejected 33–50 (Democrats, 0–41; Republicans, 33–9).

SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey: Permit the National Labor Relations Board to certify building and construction trades unions without prior certification elections; rejected 34–52 (Democrats, 0–42; Republicans, 34–10).

MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota: Direct the Secretary of Labor to publish reports on violations of S. 2888 on mishandling of union funds; rejected 22–67 (Democrats, 0–43; Republicans, 22–24).

WATKINS, Republican, of Utah: Permit States to assume jurisdiction in labor disputes the NLRB declines to handle; rejected 35–51 (Democrats, 0–41; Republicans, 35–10).

CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska: Tighten the Taft-Hartley Act ban on secondary boycotts; rejected 26–60 (Democrats, 0–41; Republicans, 26–19).

KNOWLAND: Permit the NLRB to invalidate a union election in which a member has been deprived of his vote contrary to union rules, provided the vote might have changed the outcome; rejected 35–53 (Democrats, 0–42; Republicans, 35–11).

Some of the amendments to S. 2888 were obviously pro-union in substance; Democrats, arguing they were merely an attempt to crack the antiamendment bloc and open the bill for wide-ranging changes, opposed them.

S. 3974: The following were the 10 amendments offered to S. 3974:

GOLDWATER (Republican, Arizona): Strike from the bill language narrowing the Taft-Hartley Act definition of "supervisor"; rejected 38–47 (Democrats, 11–33; Republicans, 27–14).

HOLLAND (Democrat, Florida): Permit States and Territories to regulate or ban strikes in public utilities; rejected 27–60 (Democrats, 9–37; Republicans, 18–23).

WATKINS (Republican, Utah): Permit States to assume jurisdiction in labor disputes the NLRB declines to handle; rejected 37–53 (Democrats, 7–40; Republicans, 30–13).

SMITH (Republican, New Jersey): Impose fiduciary responsibility on persons handling union money and permit members to sue against misuse; rejected 42–47 (Democrats, 5–42; Republicans, 37–5).

SMITH (Republican, New Jersey): Bar NLRB access to any union not complying with the reporting and disclosure provisions of the bill; rejected 30–53 (Democrats, 2–43; Republicans, 28–10).

KNOWLAND: Require unions, on petition of 20 percent of the members, to hold secret-ballot referenda on recall of officers; rejected 31–52 (Democrats, 6–40; Republicans, 25–12).

CURTIS: Bar "hot cargo" contracts and strengthen existing laws against secondary boycotts; rejected 32–51 (Democrats 8–38; Republicans 24–13).

POTTER (Republican, Michigan): Permit suit for recovery of union members' dues if

they are not being used exclusively for collective bargaining or related activities; rejected 30–51 (Democrats, 5–39; Republicans, 25–12).

MUNDT: Require union elections to be supervised by a membership board of representatives of all candidates; rejected 44–45 (Democrats 9–37; Republicans 35–8).

MCCLELLAN (Democrat, Arkansas): Strike from the bill a provision permitting building trades and construction employers to conclude exclusive bargaining contracts with unions that have not won a certification election; rejected 29–60 (Democrats 18–28; Republicans 11–32)

INDIVIDUAL VOTES ON SENATE LABOR BILL AMENDMENTS

The table below shows how Senators stood on the two labor bills (S. 2888, 3974) of the 1958 session. Numbers under "F" indicate how many times a Senator voted, paired or announced for amendments to make the bills tougher; under "A" the number of times he voted, paired or announced against. The breakdown is based on Congressional Quarterly roll calls 49–59, 61, 89, 91, 93–96, 102, 103, 105, 106. (Weekly Report, pp. 555–557, 806–814). An asterisk (*) indicates candidate for reelection.

Senator	S. 2888		S. 3974		Total	
	F	A	F	A	F	A
DEMOCRATS						
Lausche	10	1	7	3	17	4
Byrd*	1	3	9	1	10	4
Robertson	1	11	9	1	10	12
Thurmond	0	12	10	0	10	12
Russell	0	12	8	2	8	14
Eastland	0	12	7	3	7	15
Frear	0	12	5	5	5	17
Holland*	0	12	5	5	5	17
Stennis*	0	12	5	5	5	17
McClellan	0	12	4	6	4	18
Talmadge	0	12	3	7	3	19
Smathers	0	11	2	6	2	17
Jordan*	(1)	----	1	9	1	9
Fulbright	0	12	1	8	1	20
Anderson	0	12	1	9	1	21
Ervin	0	12	1	9	1	21
Hayden	0	12	1	9	1	21
Monroney	0	12	1	9	1	21
Gore*	0	12	(2)	----	0	12
O'Mahoney	0	12	0	7	0	19
Chavez*	0	12	0	8	0	20
Bible	0	12	0	9	0	21
Carroll	0	12	0	10	0	22
Church	0	12	0	10	0	22
Clark	0	12	0	10	0	22
Douglas	0	12	0	10	0	22
Ellender	0	12	0	10	0	22
Green	0	12	0	10	0	22
Hennings	0	12	0	10	0	22
Hill	0	12	0	10	0	22
Humphrey	0	12	0	10	0	22
Jackson*	0	12	0	10	0	22
Johnson (Texas)	0	12	0	10	0	22
Johnston (South Carolina)	0	12	0	10	0	22
Kefauver	0	12	0	10	0	22
Kennedy*	0	12	0	10	0	22
Kerr	0	12	0	10	0	22
Long	0	12	0	10	0	22
Magnuson	0	12	0	10	0	22
Mansfield*	0	12	0	10	0	22
McNamara	0	12	0	10	0	22
Morse	0	12	0	10	0	22
Murray	0	12	0	10	0	22
Neubeger	0	12	0	10	0	22
Pastore*	0	12	0	10	0	22
Proxmire*	0	12	0	10	0	22
Sparkman	0	12	0	10	0	22
Symington*	0	12	0	10	0	22
Yarborough*	0	12	0	10	0	22
REPUBLICANS						
Bricker*	12	0	10	0	22	0
Curtis	12	0	10	0	22	0
Hickenlooper	12	0	10	0	22	0
Jenner	12	0	10	0	22	0
Martin (Iowa)	12	0	10	0	22	0
Martin (Pennsylvania)	12	0	10	0	22	0
Schoeppel	12	0	10	0	22	0
Williams*	12	0	8	0	20	0
Goldwater*	11	0	8	0	19	0
Allott	12	0	9	1	21	1
Bennett	12	0	9	1	21	1
Bridges	12	0	9	1	21	1
Capehart	12	0	9	1	21	1
Cotton	12	0	9	1	21	1
Hruska*	12	0	9	1	21	1
Senator	S. 2888		S. 3974		Total	
	F	A	F	A	F	A
REPUBLICANS—continued						
Mundt	11	1	10	0	21	1
Case (South Dakota)	11	1	9	1	20	2
Dirksen	12	0	8	2	20	2
Hoblitzell*	12	0	8	2	20	2
Knowland	11	1	9	1	20	2
Watkins*	11	1	9	1	20	2
Butler	10	1	9	1	19	2
Barrett*	11	1	8	2	19	3
Carlson	12	0	7	3	19	3
Dworshak	11	1	8	2	19	3
Wiley	12	0	7	3	19	3
Bush	10	2	5	1	15	3
Saltonstall	10	2	4	1	14	3
Purtell*	9	3	5	1	14	4
Flanders	10	2	7	3	17	5
Morton	11	1	5	4	16	5
Smith (New Jersey)	10	2	6	3	16	5
Potter*	8	4	8	2	16	6
Revercomb*	7	4	5	3	12	7
Thye*	7	4	2	8	9	12
Young	7	5	2	8	9	13
Kuchel	8	4	1	9	9	13
Beall*	0	12	2	8	2	20
Case (New Jersey)	0	12	2	8	2	20
Cooper	0	12	2	8	2	20
Smith (Maine)	0	12	2	8	2	20
Aiken	0	12	1	9	1	21
Payne*	0	12	1	9	1	21
Malone*	0	12	1	9	1	21
Javits	0	11	0	10	0	21
Ives	0	12	0	10	0	22
Langer*	0	12	0	10	0	22

[1] Jordan had not yet been appointed to the Senate when S. 2888 was debated.
[2] Gore was absent on all 10 votes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Price Fixing Conspiracy Indictment Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have written the below quoted letter to the Attorney General because of my hope that the small-business people of this country will not feel that justice is such a cumbersome and slow matter that it cannot afford them any adequate relief.

The case illustrated below is of importance, and I hope that Members having small gasoline dealers in their districts will take an interest in this matter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 15, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM PIERCE ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It surprised me greatly when I recently learned that the price-fixing conspiracy indictment, in the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Company, et al.*, was dismissed by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division, because it was returned by an illegally drawn grand jury. The defendants in this case are 14 major oil companies who were charged with an unlawful combination and conspiracy in unlawful restraint of gasoline traffic in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

It was entirely through the efforts of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee that facts were uncovered which appeared to present a clear case of price fixing in the South Bend, Ind., area. This came to light during one of the subcommittee's hearings on distribution practices in the petroleum industry last year.

I immediately sent a telegram to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice advising him of the situation and requesting that immediate action be taken to determine the existence of possible violations of the antitrust laws on the part of the petroleum companies involved. Transcripts of the hearings were promptly forwarded to the Department of Justice for evaluation as soon as they became available. The information contained in these transcripts was deemed by the Antitrust Division to be sufficiently complete to enable action to be undertaken by way of grand jury proceedings which culminated in the indictment of these 14 major oil companies for alleged violations of the Sherman Act.

I deeply regret that this indictment was dismissed, not so much because the subcommittee had announced that it desired to make it a "test case" in regard to the length of time that would elapse in the proceedings, but because of the importance of this case to the small business segment of the petroleum industry.

The price fixing in this case arose in connection with a gasoline price war. The hearings of the subcommittee have shown that price wars often reduce the retail dealers to a desperate financial plight from which they are usually unable to extricate themselves. Price fixing associated with such situations frequently serves to narrow the retailer's normal margin of profit. This particular situation also clearly indicates that any tampering with retail gasoline prices may take the ultimate form of antitrust violations.

In this case it was reported that the Jury Commissioner did not draw the jurors' names in public from a box containing names of at least 300 qualified persons as required by law, but that the names were picked from slips placed on a desk in the office of the Jury Commissioner. The indictment was dismissed because certain officials charged with the administration and enforcement of Federal laws did not perform their respective duties in a proper manner.

The fact that the Jury Commissioner and the clerk of the court were derelict in their obligations to follow the mandatory provisions of the Statute dealing with the method of selecting a grand jury does not, I submit, absolve the Department of Justice of its responsibility. Actually the Attorney General, as the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, is vested with complete control over all criminal prosecutions through the United States attorneys and other subordinates.

The duties of all officers of the Department of Justice and all functions of the agencies and employees of such Department were, with few exceptions, transferred to the Attorney General by the 1950 Reorganization Plan No. 2.

It is strange indeed that the United States attorney for that district was not more careful, especially in this case which appears to be one of national importance. The United States attorney as Federal prosecutor acts also in an administrative capacity and has wide discretion to be exercised for the general public welfare. Since he is the legal advisor of the grand jury and has the duty to present evidence to such body, it is, I think, not unreasonable to require that he make sure that the grand jury is properly selected and legally qualified to act, otherwise all criminal charges presented by it would be vulnerable to attack and all prosecutive efforts go for naught.

The Department of Justice has promised to seek a new and valid indictment this coming autumn. Frankly, I do not understand why this matter must be delayed until

a later date. It is a known fact that the longer any case, particularly one involving charges of criminal violations, is delayed, the more difficult it becomes to obtain a conviction.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee has been vitally interested in the welfare of the small-business man in the petroleum industry. During the hearings held by the Subcommittee during 1955, and again in 1957, the records were replete with allegations of coercive practices, price fixing and other undesirable methods of operations, to the detriment of small business.

Here, we have an indictment involving some of the biggest corporations in the country which was thrown out of court, due to what appears to be the obvious incompetence of important officials of the Department of Justice in failing to see that court officials comply fully with the express requirements of statutory law.

I shall follow this matter with a great deal of interest in observing what action is taken in its prosecution and what the ultimate outcome will be, and will appreciate your keeping me fully informed.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Euratom—A Symbol for the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has given its unanimous approval to legislation providing for cooperation between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community to advance the peaceful use of atomic power.

I, for one, firmly believe that it is imperative that this legislation be enacted before the adjournment of the 85th Congress. It represents a big step forward in the carrying out of the atoms-for-peace program which President Eisenhower gave to the world almost 5 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial on Euratom which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 15.

The editorial follows:

EURATOM—A SYMBOL FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

It is fitting, and perhaps symbolic, that on the same day President Eisenhower made his dramatic appearance before the General Assembly, the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee unanimously approved the legislation to set Euratom in motion.

For it was on this same rostrum, almost 5 years ago, that President Eisenhower made his "atoms for peace" proposal out of which Euratom grew, and which fired the whole world's imagination and dream of peace, through beneficial uses of the atom.

At first, the Soviet Union tried to block this idea, just as they are opposing the President's plan for the Middle East. But it caught up such worldwide support that in the end they joined it. Out of it came the International Atomic Energy Agency, now functioning in Vienna, and out of it also came Euratom, on which the five nations of the common market, particularly France, place great hopes for a rapid increase in the supply of electrical energy.

One can only hope that the history of "atoms for peace" will be repeated in equal worldwide support for a United Nations peace plan for the Middle East. Actually, the two are by no means unrelated. For once Europe develops fully the electrical energy potentials of the atom, it will no longer be as dependent on Middle East oil for its energy sources.

And by the same token, as the President suggested in his speech yesterday, the development of atomic power may eventually make possible the solution of the Middle East's own paramount dependency—on water. With cheap, and virtually inexhaustible, sources of power, it should eventually be possible to reclaim the vast deserts of Africa and Asia, and make them green again, as once they were.

Thus it becomes increasingly clear that not only peace is indivisible, but so is the progress and orderly development of man. The same irrefutable logic of "atoms for peace" lies in the President's plan for defusing the Middle East time bomb.

The Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleading for a bill that should have been passed many years ago.

I am happy that during my first term here I have been helpful in introducing this bill and having it released from committee.

The hopes of the coal industry, its workers, and the allied trades are riding on this vote. The need for research and chances for the survival of this important segment of our economy are one and the same. Without one, the other is lost.

For a full account of these aspirations and hopes, kindly refer to my address on page A7005 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 5, 1958, entitled "The Coal Research Program."

At this point, I wish to put into the RECORD the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Financial Post, of Toronto, Canada. In this article, the coal producers of Canada are calling for long-range planning and for the survival of their coal industry.

Can we do any less at this late date? I sincerely believe we can make this industry the pillar of American prosperity and economic welfare once again, if given help.

HELP COAL INDUSTRY NOW—NOVA SCOTIA WARNS COMMISSION

Nova Scotia's views on the hardpressed coal industry:

Short-term prospects are not particularly bright. Long-term prospects are for increased use of coal.

Appearing before the Borden Energy Commission recently, Hon. E. A. Manson, Nova Scotia Minister of Mines, viewed the next decade as crucial, warned against the long-range consequences of mine shutdowns.

"Unless the province's coal industry can be maintained in the next 10 years, either by government assistance of legislation, the industry will not be able to take its place in the supply of energy by 1980," he said.

Manson observed that by 1980 Canada likely will have to produce twice as much coal as it does now.

Nova Scotia also suggested some form of assistance to submarine mines to maintain coal in a competitive position with natural gas. Urged sufficient freight subventions to make coal competitive with imported residual oils. This includes residual oils made from imported crudes. Recommended the Dominion Coal Board be maintained, even if a national energy authority is established.

"Absorption of the board into a larger organization with responsibility in the whole energy field would lessen the effectiveness of its work on coal," Manson claimed.

In line with our efforts here in Congress for action on a research law for the United States coal industry, I want to submit the following items from one of our wide-awake daily newspapers in my district.

The publishers of the New Kensington Daily Dispatch are aware of the urgent need for this important legislation:

NATIONAL COAL RESEARCH EFFORT SOUGHT BY DENT

(By Robert E. Hennessee)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman JOHN H. DENT Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is urging Congress to establish a Coal Research Commission and assures his colleagues that coal can have a bright future.

"There is no limit," he told the House this week, "what science and engineering may do for coal, for everyone connected with the industry, and for the millions everywhere who stand to benefit by what coal and its products may bring to them."

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recently reported out a bill to set up a coal research commission, which DENT said could do for the coal industry what the Agriculture Department has done for American farming, in improving efficiency, production and new uses.

DENT traced the history of American coal from that day back in 1673 when the French-Canadian explorer Louis Joliet recorded on a map a deposit of "carbon de terre" along the banks of the Mississippi River in northern Illinois, up to the present, which, he said, finds is with the most efficient coal industry in the world.

Then the Congressman turned to the future:

"Energy demands will continue to spiral upward at a progressively greater rate as population increases and standards of living improve. The coming decades will require such an enormous amount of energy that coal industry production will of necessity tend ever upward."

DENT concluded:

"What is in store for us in the way of utilization (of coal) is too wondrous for conjecture.

"Besides carrying out its primary functions to provide heat and power, coal has become the source of a wide variety of chemical products including sulfa drugs, nylon, plastics, explosives, perfumes, and fertilizers. Tests (to develop new products) must be encouraged."

Dent said that while the bill reported out of committee was not in the precise form he would have liked, he nevertheless thought it would "go a long way toward reaching the objective we all hope to obtain."

COAL QUANDARY

Congressman JOHN DENT'S efforts to keep the coal industry alive through a proposed National Coal Research Commission is certainly commendable.

Like the railroad industry, the coal industry has virtually been engulfed by the atomic and nuclear age of this decade. But Congressman DENT, as well as many others close to the scene, realize that this industry, which has meant so much to Westmoreland County and the Nation, still can play an important role if given the right direction in Washington.

DENT, who was raised in the aroma of coal dust in the Allegheny-Kiski Valley, last week had an opportunity to express his views before the House and as reported by Dispatch Washington correspondent Robert E. Hennessee, it looks like something might come out of this bill which is now out of committee and could be passed before this session adjourns.

It would behoove interested parties in this area to lend their moral support to Congressman DENT in this much-needed effort to keep the coal pits of the Nation a lasting American tradition.

Those of us from the depleted and economically ill coalfields recognize the opposition of other fuels to this legislation. We also feel that it is the kind of blind opposition that in the end hurts the coal industry and the people of the country in general and at the same time does no good for the oil and gas industries.

These industires fail to recognize the common good as the basic ingredient of American welfare and prosperity.

If this Congress fails to pass this legislation it will only signal a harder fight next session.

Speaking for the group of Congressmen from the coal-producing States, I can assure the Congress that we cannot give up the fight until we have reached our goal.

Increased Judge Power: A Congressional Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of August 14 contains another strong editorial urging congressional action on the Federal judgeship bill The Post along with other newspapers all across the country has for some time been pressing for enactment of this vital measure. In its latest editorial, it presents further convincing arguments of the need for more judge power in the Federal judiciary.

Passage of the judgeship bill is one of the great unfinished tasks before this Congress. I do not believe we should go home—in fact can go home, in good conscience—without acting on this bill.

I hope the leadership will accept its responsibility in this crucial area before it is too late.

Under leave previously granted, I insert the Washington Post editorial at this point in the RECORD:

TWO DOWN, ONE TO GO

Two bills passed by Congress should contribute much to relief of the overburdened Federal courts. One limits the cases that may be filed in the Federal courts by reason of diversity of citizenship to controversies involving $10,000 or more. The previous minimum fixed in 1911 was $3,000. Moreover, a corporation suing persons living in the State where it has its principal place of business can no longer get the case into the Federal courts on the ground that it is incorporated in another State. The result should be a substantial relaxation of pressure on Federal judges.

The second measure which has passed both Houses requires the chief judges of the district and circuit courts, with some exceptions, to relinquish their administrative duties after reaching the age of 70, although they can still function as regular members of their courts. This should bring more vigorous leadership into 7 circuit courts and 19 district courts within the next year.

An acute need still exists, however, for enactment of the bill creating 46 new judgeships which has now been approved by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. The compulsion behind the bill is to be found in the fact that cases in the Federal courts have increased 62 percent since 1941 and judge power only 26 percent. The result is increasing delay in the disposition of cases. In Brooklyn it takes about 3½ years for a civil suit to come to trial, and in many other areas the delays are almost as serious. This shocking denial of justice has brought cries of alarm from Chief Justice Warren, the judicial conference, bar associations, and many other groups. It is making a mockery of the United States' professed concern for justice to the individual.

If some of the Democratic leaders in Congress are reluctant to create 46 new judgeships for a Republican President to fill, they may well recall that Mr. Eisenhower has indicated a distaste for overloading the bench with lawyers chosen from only one party. Spokesmen for the administration have indicated that when something approaching a balance between the number of judges selected from the two major parties has been achieved, the President would try to maintain that balance by naming judges from both parties. A positive statement of this policy by the President now would give an obvious boost to the judgeship bill.

But Congress has a responsibility to authorize more judgeships in any event. The need to bring the courts abreast of the ever increasing flow of Federal cases is sufficiently great to justify Majority Leader JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN in launching special drives to get the judgeship bill enacted before adjournment.

The Housing Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we progress toward the conclusion of this session, I most earnestly hope that the so-called omnibus housing bill of 1958, recently acted upon in the Senate, will not be overlooked in the logjam that so often accompanies the rush toward adjournment. Failure to act on this bill, in my opinion, would be placing an unhappy and unnecessary blemish upon an otherwise commonly admitted constructive record of this 85th Congress.

One basic reason, among many, why action on this measure is vitally important is the admitted effect it would have as a further antirecession bulwark and production and employment stimulus.

The emergency housing bill that was earlier passed has demonstrated that a stimulation of the building industry, with the associated trades affected, is one of the wisest and most economical methods through which any further deterioration of our overall economy can be restrained.

It is universally recognized that our economy has been in a recessionary trend for a year or more and, although current indicators have shown some improvement, most authorities agree that we are far from being on safe ground. The unemployment situation, as revealed by the most recent figures, is still deeply disturbing. These figures unquestionably establish that approximately 5 million Americans are yet out of work and more than 1½ million persons have been reduced to part-time work. The most optimistic interpretation of these statistics demonstrate that more than 7 million families in this country are directly experiencing the hardship results of the economic recession. We have at hand an economical way and instrument to substantially relieve their distress.

This housing bill would undoubtedly assist in the revival of our lagging economy by encouraging investment activity in the construction field, with an accompanying increase in production and employment.

Embodied also in this housing bill is the foundation purpose of promoting better housing throughout the country, giving further impetus to operating programs designed to combat slum areas, and providing needed assistance to the continuation and expansion of the veterans home loan program.

Another primary objective of the measure is to further the advancement of scientific and academic knowledge, by helping our hard-pressed institutions of higher learning to provide the vitally needed dormitories, classrooms, and scientific laboratories which are pitifully inadequate to meet the ever-increasing enrollment. Obviously, one of our essential national goals is to compete with, and surpass, the scientific achievements and progress of Soviet Russia, and we cannot hope to do it unless the fullest facilities are made available to students through our colleges and universities.

In this most blessed country in the world, we have only begun to attack the problems of providing decent housing for our elderly citizens, expanding FHA insurance, encouraging wider recognition of the necessity of urban renewal, and relocating families displaced by wholesome and healthy slum clearance.

The foundation unit of any nation is the family. The best guaranty of wholesome family life is a home of their own in decent surroundings. Reasonable encouragement of better housing for American families and American citizens, is one of the wisest investments we can make toward the future safety and progress of this great country. In order to make this wise investment, I hope that the housing bill will be presented to us for debate and action at the earliest possible date.

SOS for a Dying Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress in January of 1955, I have been fighting to save a vital industry in America. I refer to the fluorspar industry. Due to foreign imports our domestic industry has been strangled. Congress inaugurated a program to stockpile this strategic material and it has been of great help. I am more than disturbed, however, that the President this week vetoed a 1-year extension of that program. I am indeed hopeful that Congress can pass the minerals stabilization bill now awaiting House action, in order that this and other industries can survive. Under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing a letter to the editor from one of my constituents outlining the true circumstances of this small but vital industry.

The letter follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat of July 12, 1958]

SOS FOR A DYING INDUSTRY

To the EDITOR:

While we hear "recession-depression" on all sides, I would like to bring to your kind attention a dying American industry problem. I refer to the slow squelching of our fluorspar mining industry because of foreign imports and lack of proper Government protection. Because I believe the future will make unprecedented demands upon the fluorspar industry with new needs, because this future could be a great boost to economy in your area as well as ours, and because I am personally acquainted with the heartache and struggle for survival, I feel that somehow, someway, something must be done in its behalf.

Of the 660,000 tons of fluorspar consumed in the United States in 1957, foreign imports totaled 620,000. Southern Illinois and Kentucky produce most of the United States fluorspar. There is plenty of it. The industry could expand overnight. In 1957, 120,000 tons of foreign imports went into Government stockpile under Department of Agriculture barter contracts, 500,000 tons poured into America's commercial consuming market, despite fluorspar ore reserves and milling capacity substantially capable of supplying all our consumption needs.

Here is a good, rich American resource with a growing demand that cannot move forward and develop fully because of foreign imports. Our Government in this instance is failing to protect an industry of its own blood and country, nor even giving it an even chance. Employment in this area is critical. Man does not want charity and state aid, but the rightful dignity of working for his daily bread.

Fluorspar through its usage in steel, aluminum, uranium, atomic energy, and fluorocarbon chemicals is becoming more and more an integral part of America's future. Reasonable estimates for 1960 suggests a fluorspar consumption of over 1 million tons. Fluorspar is at present the only commercial source of fluorine. New uses for this mineral are developing all the time. The use of fluorine as an oxidizing agent in high energy fuels for missiles and rockets, expansion of fluorocarbon producers (these chemicals being used for propellants in pressurized containers, refrigerants in cooling systems, and fluoroplastics), hydrofluoric acid consumption used in atomic energy program, fluoridation of community drinking water systems directly instead of with a fluorine compound, etc.

With countless other experiments underway for the use of fluorspar, which will create new demands from time to time, here is an industry with a great future. But this future will not belong to the American people unless our Government takes measures to protect them.

Mrs. BILL D. JOHNSON.

HARRISBURG, ILL.

Senator Smith of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate of the United States last week, our colleagues in that other body suspended their legislative proceedings for several hours in order to pay tribute to the senior Senator from New Jersey who is leaving the Senate at the end of the present term.

The demonstration of the respect and affection which his colleagues feel for Senator SMITH was unusually impressive. The Newark Evening News and the Elizabeth Daily Journal have both commented editorially on this display of deep warmth toward Senator SMITH. The editorials should be of interest to the great many Members of the House who have known and worked with Senator SMITH over the years, and I ask that they be considered as part of my remarks.

My own friendship with Senator SMITH goes back many years. I have cherished every element of that friendship and every occasion on which it has been renewed. As the News and the Journal have pointed out, ALEXANDER SMITH was a man of great talent, broad experience, and deep devotion to his country. But to me, the qualities that most endeared him were his warm, human kindness and understanding, his unfailing generosity and consideration for others. There are altogether too few people like ALEXANDER SMITH in this world, and the Congress of the United States will be the poorer for his absence.

The editorials follow:

[From the Newark Evening News of August 10, 1958]

TO SENATOR SMITH

Beginning in 1944 when he was elected for the unexpired term of W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey has three times sent H. ALEXANDER SMITH to the United States Senate. Now, as Congress nears adjournment, he is preparing to relinquish a legislative career that over the years has enhanced his stature and that of his State and party.

Senator SMITH is not taking leave of the Senate until the expiration of his term next January. But last week his colleagues took occasion to make abundantly clear what they think of him as a friend and as a Senator. Led by CLIFFORD P. CASE, soon to be New Jersey's senior Senator, Member after Member arose to praise Mr. SMITH's service to the Nation and Senate in a tribute that continued for several hours.

It was a warming demonstration of personal esteem that in Senator SMITH's case was the more impressive because it was so richly deserved.

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal of August 11, 1958]

FAREWELL TO SENATOR SMITH

In the conventional pellmell rush for an illusive adjournment hour, Capitol Hill has little moment for personal sentiments, but the Senate paused for 2 hours in a tribute to New Jersey's H. ALEXANDER SMITH. He is in the final months of his third term, and last spring declared against another election campaign.

The junior Senator from the Garden State, Union County's Mr. CASE, summarized the congressional concept of his colleague with the simple statement that "I wish the world were full of men like ALEX SMITH."

Senator SMITH took to the Senate one of the broadest and most absorbing backgrounds to be found in all the Congress. He has talents far above the run-of-mine legislator and experience and broadness of field rarely encountered, even at the congressional level, where ability is a hallmark.

Both sides of the aisle joined in the tribute to Senator SMITH. For 2 hours partisan labels were laid aside as the men who have worked with him in committee sessions and debated him on the floor spoke their praise.

The prospects are that the Nation will not lose Senator SMITH's skills. Instead of the traditional shelving as an elder statesman of his party, he probably will be commandeered for advisory or diplomatic service in the administration, where he is held in the highest esteem.

From his work on the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee and his prior experience he has attained stature as an expert in United States dealings with other nations. This is the sphere in which the Nation needs its finest and shrewdest. It is a logical locale for Senator SMITH.

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD excerpts from a speech on the Middle East crisis that I made recently:

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

(Excerpts from an address by Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, Los Angeles, July 20, 1958)

The decision by the President to send the Marines to Lebanon was a tragic choice between two evils—the evil of the collapse of Lebanon, Jordan, and the Persian Gulf States in the wake of the Iraqi revolution, and the evil of unilateral military intervention unsupported by the United Nations with the risk of world war in the atomic age.

The President has made the choice. The country has been committed. We are now in the midst of a graver international crisis than we faced in Korea. We must see this crisis through.

Therefore, this is not the time to carp and criticize, to seek political capital out of our national peril, however regrettable we may

find it is that this administration's foreign policy has brought us face to face with these awful alternatives.

But the time will come for a full review of our Middle East foreign policy, and when it does, it will be fully explored. I cannot refrain from pointing out that spokesmen for the Democratic Party in the United States Senate have foreseen the gathering storm in the Middle East and issued warning after warning that our policy was inadequate and inept. Those warnings have been ignored.

A fuller discussion of the past is for the future. Today, I wish to deal with some constructive proposals as to how we may extricate ourselves from the prospect of indefinite military involvement in the Middle East. For we are now in the position of the man with the bear by the tail—it only takes one man to get hold, and a dozen to let loose.

What should we do now?

First, I think we should do everything in our power to substitute military forces acting in the name of the United Nations for forces acting in the name of the United States alone. We should pursue this objective with all the vigor at our command, and we should not be deterred by the Soviet veto of our resolution in the Security Council, which was anticipated. I am glad to see that we are calling for an emergency session of the General Assembly. The going will not be easy there, with a two-thirds vote required.

Second, while these deliberations are in progress, every effort should be made through adequate supplies and training to prepare Lebanon—and in the case of Great Britain, to prepare Jordan—to maintain law and order, and to resist subversion from the outside in the event we lose the resolution in the General Assembly. If that happens, we can't stay in Lebanon forever, and there is the possibility that after the upcoming election there, a new government in Lebanon may ask us to get out.

Third, I believe we must seek an arrangement through the United Nations for a U. N. Force to guarantee the peace, and to protect legal governments of Middle East states from subversion from without, coupled with a worldwide embargo on the shipment of arms to that area, while we get at the more basic causes of the unrest and ferment which are sweeping through the whole of the Middle East.

So far, our Middle East foreign policy has not done so. The premise of the Eisenhower doctrine is that the chief cause of the trouble in that area is the threat of armed Soviet intervention. And the Bagdad Pact is based on the assumption that Soviet economic, political, and military influences can by a military alliance be prevented from operating in an area adjacent to the Soviet border.

The Eisenhower doctrine is limited by its terms to resisting aggression from a country controlled by international communism. Can we apply that doctrine to President Nasser, even if it is proved that he had a hand in the current Middle East troubles, which the team of U. N. observers in Lebanon has been unwilling to certify? The fact is that the Eisenhower doctrine doesn't touch top, side, or bottom of the basic issues in the area, and isn't even invoked as the ground for our military intervention in Lebanon. The Bagdad Pact is also essentially negative in character, and futilely seeks a containment of Nasser as well as the Soviet Union. Both the doctrine and the pact ignore the basic realities of what is going on in the Middle East.

In that area—marked by one of the heaviest concentrations in all the world of stagnating poverty, hunger, fear, and disease, corrosive superstition and human subjugation—tens of millions of people are struggling to emerge almost overnight, into the mainstream of international life. And they are struggling to find for themselves the basic decencies of human existence, which they now lack, but which modern technology makes possible.

One manifestation of this vast struggle is nationalism. We, of all peoples, cannot quarrel with that. And we cannot stop it if we would. We must recognize that fact, just as we also recognize the difficulties and dangers inherent in the great surge of nationalism in the Middle East at a moment when the peace of the whole world is in precarious balance.

What we can do, and what we must do, is to distinguish between the constructive and destructive tendencies in Middle East nationalism, and encourage the former and oppose the latter.

A constructive nationalism will seek not war, not conquest, but peaceful solutions to the problems of borders, of refugees, of an orderly liquidation of the last vestiges of colonialism, of wiping out hunger, disease, ignorance, poverty, and fear.

Now specifically, as I mentioned previously, an essential precondition for progress in the Middle East is a U. N. emergency force to be made available to keep the peace and block aggression from any source. At the same time, we should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East through an embargo on the shipment of arms to that area from any other source than the U. N. itself.

We should take the lead in the United Nations, working toward reestablishment of the principle of free navigation on international waters and unfettered access to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal for ships of all nations.

We must make it clear, again acting through the United Nations, that the dream of some Arab leaders of pushing Israel into the sea is nothing but a fantasy and will not be permitted to materialize.

Finally, we should direct our influence toward the establishment of a United Nations organization charged with developing, financing and implementing programs of technical aid to all nations of the Middle East.

Toward this end, we should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle East Development Authority as an administering agency for the mutual pooling of capital and technical aid for this entire region. Americans should offer to participate in supplying capital and technical aid.

In this way, nationalism will be put to work in constructive channels, the ground work laid for ending the poverty of these peoples and the solution of their many vexing problems.

We should move to do what we can to alleviate starvation and crippling malnutrition in the Middle East by making available to the peoples of that area at least a portion of the farm surpluses of this Nation which now cost us $1 million a day just to keep in storage.

An area so vital economically to us—and an area which is the key to world peace itself—requires a program with this vigor and imagination. We must prepare to sustain such a program for many years to come.

For we must recognize that we are in for many years of turmoil and difficulty in the Middle East. There are no simple, quick, easy solutions to the many complex problems of that turbulent area.

But we have an interest in the Middle East of such overriding importance that it cannot be ignored. That interest is the creation of a peace in the Middle East which is both stable and vital.

If we do not recognize the urgency of that interest, and our inescapable responsibility for action to achieve that peace, the present crisis will seem mild compared with the others that must surely follow.

Conservation of Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no more important challenge confronts the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas which I have the honor to represent, than the conservation of our water resources. Realizing this situation, the members of the Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3 at White Deer, Tex., instituted a competition and opened it to all high school seniors in the district who submitted essays under title of "The Importance of Water Conservation." First place winner in this contest was Mr. John Davis, of Pantex Village, Panhandle, Tex., who received $150 as first prize. The larger prize was, of course, the recognition of the necessary stewardship of our natural resources. I request unanimous consent to insert herein the text of Mr. Davis's excellent first-place essay.

The essay follows:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION?

(By John Davis)

One could write the story of man's growth in terms of his epic concerns with water.

Through the ages people have elected or have been compelled to settle in regions where water was deficient in amount, inferior in quality, or erratic in behavior. Only when supplies failed or were made useless by unbearable silt or pollution or when floods swept everything before them, were centers of habitation abandoned. But often the causes lay as much in the acts or failures of men themselves as in the caprices of nature.

There's a lot to know about water. We see and feel rain, snow, fog, and dew. We use water for drinking and washing, we irrigate our fields and lawns. We talk about the weather, complain that it is too wet or too dry. Most of us are conscious nearly all the time of the importance of water in our lives, but actually our knowledge of it is rather skimpy.

We know the symbol of water, but little about its properties, which can make us comfortable, rich or poor, secure or insecure. We cannot live without water, but we could live better if we knew more about it.

Ordinarily water, which most people take for granted, is on the way to becoming a national problem of great, even dangerous size. Farmers complain that wells and springs, which they have depended on, are going dry as the level of water in the ground gets lower.

The problem of water supply already is critical in many areas. Consumptions and other uses of water are phenomenal yet only a fraction of what they will become. In the Southwest the problem of water shortage is an old one. There are parts of the East and Middle West where the supply of water threatens to run below demand. In some areas ground water is being withdrawn 30 times as fast as it is being replaced.

In 1955 the United States used 200 billion gallons of water a day. It is estimated by 1957 we will use 490 billion gallons of water a day. That is enough to supply 145 cities the size of New York with water.

More and more Texas farmland is being irrigated with underground water every year.

In the Panhandle, High South Plains, the winter garden area, and in other sections of the State, more wells are being drilled, and more water is being pumped from the underground for irrigation, industrial, and municipal supplies.

There are two great formations of water under Texas. These are the Ogallala formation in the Panhandle and South Plains, and the Lissie Sandstone formation along the gulf coast.

When circumstances that govern the water yielding performance of these two Texas ground water sources are reviewed, one conclusion seems inescapable. The demands placed upon these two water bodies exceed their capacity to match the withdrawals on a sustained basis. The fact remains that we have superimposed upon these aquifers, demands of such tremendous quantity that steady water table declines seems inevitable.

In 40 years our Texas population is expected to reach about 17 million people, and most sources are in agreement that in the same period the national population will approach 300 million.

These oncoming millions will place a heavy strain upon our physical capacity to provide enough food and fiber.

In reviewing these facts, we know that expansion, industrial expansion, and the expansion of irrigation all tend to steadily deplete the amount of our ground waters.

The outlook for the future ground-water supplies presents a problem that is important to the economy and well-being of almost every citizen in the United States. It is of particular importance to municipalities using ground water as a sole source of water supply, to many thousands in rural areas who are dependent on ground water for domestic supply, and a large number of the bigger industries.

In some of our larger cities water has been rationed. People were not allowed to water their lawns. In some instances bathing was even limited.

The city without a water problem has been the exception rather than the rule, and it shares this dilemma with farmers, ranchers, industrialists in the rapid expansion and increasing demand for water.

To meet the water demands that will be placed upon us in the future, we must do our best to conserve our underground water.

Water falling on the surface either enters the ground or runs off into streams. A part of the water that enters the ground evaporates or is transpired by plants. Water in excess of these soil requirements percolates downward to zones of saturated rocks and thus reaches ground-water aquifers.

By conservation practices we can decrease the amount of water entering the stream and increase the amount of water entering the soil.

By building dams on our rivers we can increase the amount of ground water. Also, we can supply cities with water and reduce the amount they are taking from the ground.

Sewage water from large cities can be purified, and a large portion of it may be reused for industrial purposes.

Intelligent development of ground water must be based on clear, accurate evaluations and appraisals. Although much has been accomplished in the past 20 years from investigations of our major ground-water reservoirs, there still remains a need for detailed study of the geology and occurrence of ground water.

The intelligent use of water has always been a road to wealth and to a better way of life.

Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the second-place winner in the Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3 was Miss Mary Lou Miller, of Panhandle, Tex., whose prize was $100. Her treatise on the importance of water conservation is outstanding, and I request unanimous consent to insert the essay herein that all the Members may have the benefit of Miss Miller's excellent views. Her fine contribution toward the solution of a major national problem will be long remembered.

The essay follows:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Mary Lou Miller)

A series of blows to the Nation's water supply since 1940 has sent experts scurrying out for ways to conserve this diminishing vital resource as well as to open up new water supplies. Unexpected increases in population, shifts in industry, droughts, and pollution of streams and lakes have accelerated the need for water, while decreasing the ready supply.

Next to the air they breathe, water is probably the most important thing in human lives. Water is so easy for most people to get that they seldom think how necessary it is for man, animal, and plants. Without it man and his animals would die. The bodies of living animals and plants contain more water than any other substance.

The pioneers of Daniel Boone's day had to hunt for a never-failing spring or brook before deciding upon a spot for a cabin. Bitter battles have been fought for the possession of some muddy waterhole or tiny stream that would furnish this liquid.

One of the most important uses of water is for human and animal consumption; however man uses water in a variety of ways necessary to his way of life. One of the chief concerns of a farmer's life today is that the season will bring enough rain to supply the necessary water for his thirsty plants. Almost every modern factory uses great quantities of water in its many operations and in the disposal of its wastes. The modern home, with its facilities for bathing, cooking, and washing dishes, uses a great many thousands of gallons of water during a year. Often the least expensive way of moving freight is to carry it in boats on rivers, lakes, or oceans. Running water is used for the generation of waterpower and electricity. Civilization has arrived at the stage when the people demand that many of the stores, hotels, and office buildings be air conditioned. This again calls for water to cool or moisten the air. Water is used in refrigeration and for fire protection. It is a home for fish and aquatic life. Man uses oceans, lakes, rivers, streams, and ponds for recreational purposes. Life would be very drab and uninteresting if there were no brooks, rivers, ponds, lakes, or oceans to break the monotony of the landscape.

Man obtains his water from two main sources, ground supplies and surface supplies. Surface supplies consist of all the water that is above the ground, such as in rivers and lakes. Ground supplies come from springs and wells.

A certain amount of the water that falls on the earth's surface passes underground, the percentage varying with the porosity of the surface materials. This absorption of water is due to the fact that all rocks are somewhat porous and considerably fissured. Sand and gravel deposits are very porous and can store from 15 to 35 percent of their bulk of water.

Even though ground water is unimportant as a direct source for power, navigation, and recreation, it is of considerable importance because the minimum flow of streams is sustained chiefly by ground water and because it yields water suitable for most of the other uses of water.

Water passes underground in various ways. The following are the most prominent: Direct inhibition of rainfall, the sinking of surface flows in passing over zones of porous rock, the spreading of streams laterally into the porous deposits of their valleys, and the percolation of water laterally from the ocean or lakes into materials of the shore. Falling raindrops strike trees, bushes, and grass that cover the soil. The humus acts like a blotter which holds the water for a time, during which the roots of growing plants absorb some of the moisture. The plants use water in their life processes, and then return it to the air. The rest of the water trickles down through the topsoil. Some of it usually penetrates deeper layers of soil and rock where it forms useful stores of ground water.

Ground water has several advantages over surface water. It is usually more accessible; it may be reached within a few hundred feet of the place where it is to be used, whereas surface water may require pipelines and rights-of-way over stretches of several miles. Ground water may be available for use in areas where the supply from streams and lakes is very limited or has already been appropriated by other uses. Yield from wells and springs is generally a more dependable source because it fluctuates less than stream flow in alternating wet and dry climatic cycles. Ground water is more uniform in temperature and soluble mineral load than surface water, and it is generally free of turbidity and bacterial pollution. Thus ground water is also an important source of water and must be conserved as well as the surface water.

The utilization of ground water might be increased significantly above the limits set by natural replenishment if flood waters or other surplus water could be used to increase the replenishment artificially. Thus a coordinated program of flood control and artificial recharge might serve the double purpose of preventing damage from too much water and storing it until it can be used beneficially.

Nature has many ways of conserving water and of controlling it to prevent too-rapid evaporation or runoff from the land. Trees, grasses, and other plant life play an important part in the natural circulation of water and thus in its conservation. Without plant life the water would run off as rapidly as it falls, taking away valuable topsoil, causing erosion and floods, and leaving little water for man or vegetation.

Nature's process allows waters to move in an endless cycle from the atmosphere to the land or oceans and back again. This cycle, however, is interrupted by the storage of the water in plant life, in natural or artificial lakes, in the soil, or stored in the porous rocks or cavities of the earth.

Man often upsets the water balance in his desire to grow more crops. He drains ponds, swamps, and other lands. He plows under the natural sods, cuts timber, and dredges, and straightens streams. These changes lessen the natural storage of water and spread its movement off the land. As a result much of the water falling as rain or snow finds its way to the oceans without having given its full service to growing things. This hurrying away of water results in soil erosion and floods.

When water shortages occur, it is not necessarily the fault of nature; but it is rather the lack of foresight and bad usage of this valuable resource by man. Man often neglects to return water to the earth to replace that which he has used. When man disturbs the balance of nature, he must establish a new balance. If he returns nothing to nature, he finally destroys both nature and himself.

In many places the water supply has been exhausted or lessened by the lack of conservation practices or waste. Towns and cities often get their water supply from lakes and rivers, and they sometimes dump sewage and garbage into them. This makes the water unfit to drink. Water pollution is a serious problem. Even ground wells can become polluted through wastes seeping into the soil around the water supply.

Since man uses so much water in so many different ways, it is indeed an absolute essential to his life. Although water seems to be inexhaustible, there is not enough of it in some places and too much in others. Thus man must conserve water if he is to have it for his many needs when it is necessary.

Conservation simply means using the natural resources of the world wisely. Man must remember that the world's gifts are not his alone. He only borrows them for a lifetime. The conservation of water not only is an essential thing for the present generations but also is a moral obligation to the future generations of man.

America Doesn't Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very timely editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner on August 14 and I am including it in my extension of remarks as I believe each Member of Congress will be interested in reading what this newspaper has to say about the rumor that the United States is studying "the possibility of surrender in a nuclear war."

The very thought of surrender in any war is repugnant to every American and this rumor should certainly be dispelled once and for all.

The editorial follows:

AMERICA DOESN'T SURRENDER

Of the planting of rumors and the moronic speculation of defeatist theorizers, apparently there is no end. But President Eisenhower has moved swiftly to check and demolish, a-borning, one that could only have hatched in the incubator of idiocy. It is the report that "officials" are studying the "possibility of surrender by the United States in a nuclear war."

Granting that such is purely academic, it would violate every premise of fact and conscience on which principle, courage, and conviction rest. It angers not only the President, but every American who has fought for liberty.

The Chief Executive did not stand before the world yesterday as an exponent of appeasement, or as one thinking in terms of compromise with the forces of murderous destruction. Neither he nor his Nation has subscribed to any surrender theory, and does not now. Nor does defeatism, even as a theory, figure in the contemplation of any task ahead—even if the time should ever come that as the defender of human liberty America stands alone.

It is not surprising that the very mention of such defeatist speculation, however theoretical, incensed the President to the boiling point. The overwhelming majority of 170 million Americans share his anger. Anyone giving credence to this poison of heart and spirit, calculated to beget premonitions and doubt, is a candidate for the booby-hatch and overripe for it.

The Importance of Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the third place essay entitled "The Importance of Water Conservation," sponsored by the Panhandle Underground Water Conservation District No. 3. This fine treatise was submitted by Mr. Cloyd M. Bender, Jr., of Panhandle, Tex., who was awarded $50. His laudable treatment of the subject matter is commendable as is the vision evidenced by Mr. Felix Ryals, manager of the water conservation district, and the members for undertaking this competition.

The essay follows:

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Cloyd M. Bender, Jr.)

The farmer is endowed with God's most precious gift which is our soil. Productive soil is God's most priceless gift to man. It is the one thing that all living things must depend upon for their livelihood. It is the farmer that has always been responsible for the caretaking of this soil. When God created the earth he also made a balanced cycle which would supply the necessary water to keep the soil fertile. The cycle has been badly hampered due to men's frequent misuse of the soil with his sharpened sticks, axes, plows, and fires; he has unintentionally aided the process of erosion. This erosion, which is connected so closely to water conservation, has furnished the pathway for much of our precious water to flow down. A great deal or perhaps all of this water could have been used to aid in God's cycle of supplying water to our soil, had it only been conserved.

It has only been in recent years that man has learned to conserve this water and put it to good use. This has been accomplished in many ways and on all scales, from the Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams, to the small reservoirs on the individual farms. Regardless of the size of these projects they all have one thing in common; they all have been a step in the right direction in conserving our water.

Because our modern society has brought heavy demands upon the Nation's war resources, the need to conserve them is now generally recognized. This recognition has been a step in the right direction.

But clearly much more is required for the sound development, wise use, and protection of these resources. We require, for one thing, much more technical and common knowledge.

Because we are still lacking in this knowledge, the effective use and conservation of our water has been hampered. We do not yet know enough in exact terms about the water resources available to us, the use currently made of water throughout our Nation, and specifically our farmlands, or the effect on our water supply. One thing that we are sure of is that a tremendous amount of water could be conserved if we only had a Canadian River Dam.

Of all our water resources, least is known about those which are underground. This lack of knowledge has hampered their effective development, as well as use and conservation. In some areas demands for ground water have increased even faster than for surface water; ours, of course, is one of those areas. Because of this tremendous growth in the use of ground water, many startling news reports have appeared in the papers and on the airwaves about the situation in certain cities and other areas. One of those cities is Amarillo and one of those areas is the Panhandle of Texas. In our area the water-level trend in most wells has been steadily downward for several years. There are several areas across the Nation facing the same problem that we are. This problem is that our ground supply is being generally depleted and may be exhausted within the lifetime of the present generation. This is a startling fact, but it is one that we must not overlook.

The serious problems of ground-water shortage are in areas, like ours, where water is pumped out faster than the entire ground-water reservoir is replenished. Under these conditions the reservoir is being emptied of water that may have taken decades or even centuries to accumulate, and there is no possible way of replenishing this supply unless conditions change. All of these problems result in what is known as an overdeveloped area. An overdeveloped area is, of course, an area where too much of the water is taken from the ground such as ours. A few ground-water reservoirs receive very little natural replenishment. Some are in deserts where replenishment occurs only after exceptional rainstorms that may be several years apart; others are almost completely sealed off by clay or other material that impedes entry of water from precipitation or from other sources. The water in these reservoirs can hardly be classed as a renewable resource. Where the quantity stored in them is large, there is a real problem involved in development: should the water be extracted for maximum benefit of our generation, as minerals and other nonrenewable resources are mined, or should the pumping be limited to the places where the supply can be replenished rapidly. These are a few of the many problems before us; there are also a few answers but they are not simple.

Corrective measures, already applied in certain areas include prevention of waste, prorata reduction of pumping from all wells, prohibition of further development, reclaiming of used water, and importation of water from other areas. Some of these practices could never be used in our area but those that are feasible must be utilized. It seems to me that the best answer to water conservation would be this: use what you need, and make sure that you have a need for what you use.

TVA a Costly Burden on Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD a statement which I made before the House Committee on Public Works on July 30, in opposition to the TVA revenue bond bill S. 1869.

As I indicated on that occasion, this legislation if enacted could prove to be one of the most costly mistakes ever made by the Congress, and would impose further burdens on the taxpayers in addition to the billions of dollars which TVA has already cost this country.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR., FIRST DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 30, 1958

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appear in opposition to Senate bill 1869. My opposition to this bill is based primarily on the unfair competitive situation in which others parts of the United States find themselves when competing for the location of new industry with the TVA. My position is so clearly stated by a news story appearing in the Wheeling News-Register of February 20, 1956, that I would like to quote this story in is entirety:

"VALLEY TAXPAYERS GIVE INDUSTRY TO ALABAMA—$75 MILLION PLANT LOST BY WEST VIRGINIA TO TVA REGION

"(By Haze Cochran, News-Register staff writer)

"Ohio Valley residents helped pay to keep a new $75 million aluminum industry from locating in West Virginia.

"They didn't realize it—but even if they had, they couldn't have done anything about it.

"The decision was made in Washington.

"It's the age-old story of government subsidy versus free enterprise and fair competition.

"The News-Register learned today that the Reynolds Metal Co., the second largest aluminum company in the United States decided to locate a huge aluminum plant in TVA territory rather than along the Ohio River, south of Point Pleasant, probably because of the cheaper, Government-subsidized power available at Lister Hill, Ala.

"Philip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Service Corp., told the News-Register his firm was 'working on' locating the new industry in West Virginia.

" 'We were not successful. Reynolds told us that our power rate was too high. I can't say that is the real basis, but it was one given.'

"Sporn said the American Gas & Electric gave Reynolds a 'good rate, the same rate we offered to Kaiser Aluminum and Olin-Mathieson.' But, he added, there was a large tax component in the American Gas & Electric rate.

" 'They (the Reynolds officials) told me the TVA rate was lower.'

"Further evidence of the manner in which the Reynolds plant was lost to West Virginia because of a Government-subsidized power project is found in a letter sent West Virginia Senators Matthew M. Neely and HARLEY M. KILGORE by M. C. Funk, vice president of the Appalachian Electric Power Co., a member firm of American Gas & Electric.

"In his letter, Funk points out that 'I feel sure you will be interested in knowing about the latest instance of the pulling of industries into TVA territory. This one greatly concerns West Virginia.'

"According to Funk, the 'Appalachian Co. had been approached by Reynolds Metals Co., now the second largest aluminum company in the United States, with regard to a proposed aluminum plant in the Ohio Valley.

" 'The required 225,000 kilowatts of electric power was to be furnished by our company. Of course, power is a principal element in aluminum cost.'

"Funk pointed out that the site of the Reynolds aluminum plant was to be at Apple Grove, W. Va., some 10 miles below Point Pleasant.

" 'In the meantime, however,' Funk told the Senators, 'the Reynolds Co. was negotiating with TVA. We knew this and did our utmost to land the business for our system and West Virginia.

" 'In fact,' he stated, 'our quoted price for power exceeded the TVA price by only one-third of the difference between the taxes which we have to pay and the scant tax contribution which TVA makes.

" 'Nevertheless,' Funk's letters to Neely and KILGORE continue, 'the Reynolds Co. has announced that it will locate in Alabama, with power to be supplied by TVA. It is reported that this new Reynolds plant will cost about $75 million.'

"In concluding his letters to the Senators, the power firm official notes that 'as a consequence, TVA will now somehow have to get the money for and to build more steam electric power—which, of course, will enable it to do more of this same sort of thing.'

"And the same sort of thing will mean that tax dollars, from residents of the Ohio Valley, West Virginia, and Ohio as well as the rest of the Nation, will aid the TVA cause.

" 'Competition in which a substantial protion of the tax component is eliminated can be very deadly,' Sporn commented.

"The American Gas & Electric president pointed out that 20 cents of every dollar private electric firms receive for power service goes to the Government.

" 'Excluding the tax component, we can give them (industry) a better rate than TVA or any of the public power installations. The people are being asked to develop the power in TVA.'

" 'When it comes right to the point,' the head of American Gas & Electric stated, 'West Virginia is going to have to fight for industry.'

" 'But the State shouldn't have to fight an agency which has the weapons.'

"He explained that the TVA, through Government subsidy has the weapons to attract industry in the area around such installations.

" 'Why should the Government so equip other States?' he asked.

"Sporn pointed out that West Virginians should naturally be against Government power projects. 'They're in the disinterest of the State.'

"The power official pointed out that West Virginia today is in wonderful shape to attract new industry with its abundant availability of coal and manpower, but it's going to have a tough time meeting Government subsidy.

"There have been other instances of new industry being lost to the Ohio Valley and West Virginia because of Government-subsidized power projects. The Reynolds plant is merely most recent.

"In an address delivered as part of the Cooper Foundation Series at Swarthmore College in 1954—but which is as 'valid today as on the day it was made'—Sporn pointed out that 'a basic difficulty with public power is that it is subsidized power and that cannot be in the public interest.'

" 'The most common form of subsidy of public power is the tax route. Interestingly enough, it is now being claimed that public power operation is more desirable because it can be carried out without paying taxes.'

" 'It is quite clear that tax savings as such do not exist.'

" 'So-called savings, by going to a governmental setup, merely result in the general taxpayers, rather than those benefiting from the project, paying in additional taxes the subsidy granted the tax-free power project. A general application of the tax-free subsidy principle would result in complete disorganization of all government.'

"Sporn labeled the tax differential an irresistible magnet which draws industries requiring particularly heavy quantities of electric energy 'from other locations that but for taxes are equally as well situated and might perhaps otherwise be even more favorably situated'."

Representative William E. McVey

SPEECH
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the very high respect and esteem in which our late colleague from Illinois, Representative WILLIAM E. MCVEY, was held, is probably best evidenced by the editorials in the Chicago Daily Tribune and the Chicago Daily News.

The Chicago Daily News of August 12 featured the following editorial:

REPRESENTATIVE W. E. MCVEY

The sudden death of Representative WILLIAM E. MCVEY has deprived Congress of one of the stanchest advocates of Government economy and sound money.

His career illustrates the fact that a well-educated man is capable of holding conservative economic views and fighting for them effectively.

He was the valedictorian of his class at Ohio University, and a Phi Beta Kappa. He was a master of arts and a doctor of philosophy at the University of Chicago.

He was himself a distinguished educator. As a young man, he was a school superintendent in the Philippines. For many years he was superintendent of the Thornton Township High School and Junior College, and once served as president of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

For a few years before he entered Congress, he was professor of education at De Paul University. He was the author of several books and magazine articles in the fields of education and economics.

A year ago, Mr. MCVEY announced that he would not seek reelection in 1958, when he would have completed four terms. He was, however, persuaded to change his mind. He was renominated in the primary and would probably have been reelected.

The Republican Party should make a diligent search for a man of equal qualifications and stature to take his place.

The Chicago Daily Tribune of August 13 editorialized as follows:

WILLIAM E. MCVEY

The death of Representative WILLIAM E. MCVEY is as great a loss to honest Republicanism as it is to his constituents. Mr. MCVEY represented the Fourth District of Illinois, comprising part of Chicago and its

southern suburbs. He was a Member of Congress for nearly 8 years.

His constituents had learned to love and respect him during the 28 years he was superintendent of Thornton Township High School and Junior College in Harvey. He was chosen by a caucus to challenge the Democratic incumbent in 1950, and won easily with the support of Democrats as well as Republicans. He wished to retire in 1956 and again this year, but both times he was persuaded to run again.

In Congress, he devoted himself in his own words "to the perpetuation of those freedoms which have made this country great." He fought the socialistic tendencies of the New Dealers and their disciples. As a lifelong educator, he saw the dangers of Federal aid to education; as a former tax assessor, he opposed ever-mounting taxes, which he described as "like icebergs. We see only a small part of them." The country can ill spare men of his courage and sense.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 15, 1958, which is a very well reasoned editorial on the subject of Federal Aid to Education. I believe that it should receive wide circulation:

OUR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

America's answer to the Soviet school system is now being given its finishing touches on Capitol Hill. This is the bill to provide about $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000 to improve the teaching of language, science, and math in our high schools, to provide thousands of Federal college scholarships, and to seek out the able high-school students and try to persuade them to set their course for a college degree.

If this proposal is approved, it will be the nearest thing to a general education aid measure to come out of Washington since 1862. That was the year when the Morrill Land Grant College Act made the State colleges possible.

In its final form, it is expected that the bill would provide for 10,000 Federal scholarships a compromise between the Senate figure of 23,000 and the House figure of none. These would be based on need, White House insists.

In the past, proposals for Federal aid to help build public schools failed because Congress refused to open the door to Federal invasion of the field of education. By a wise tradition, the building and support of the public schools have been a State and community responsibility.

The 1958 bill has a better chance of passing because it is aimed at encouraging more high-school students to go to college and to take more science and math courses. This idea has an immense, popular appeal since the United States Office of Education published a report last November that said the Soviet Union is outstripping us in every scientific phase of education and some other phases as well.

One of the most unhappy aspects of this Federal education bill is the easy, but dangerous assumption that all problems in the United States can be solved simply by spending a little more money.

There is no doubt that education in the United States, at the high-school level especially, is badly in need of an overhaul. There are too many snap courses, not enough incentive to take the more difficult subjects and a failure to exploit fully a revolutionary new educational tool—TV. The question is, Will spending $1 billion to $1.5 billion of Federal money bring about reform? Or will it simply postpone the day when economic necessity might otherwise compel educators to make the reforms.

Russia, it should be pointed out, was spending 68.4 billion rubles a year on its educational-cultural activities in 1955, when the Americans were spending $15.5 billion on all forms of education, from grade school to the college or university level, the United States Office of Education report stated.

Since the Russian ruble is worth anywhere from about 6 to 10 cents American, the Russians were spending only about $4.5 billion to $6,840 million a year on education—or about a third of what we were.

It isn't just how much we spend, but how well we spend it that will determine whether or not we can bring about the needed revolution in our classrooms.

In Defense of the VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, my good constituent, Mr. Jack Kluger, Nassau County commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has asked that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter which he recently addressed to one of our local newspapers and which appeared in its August 11 issue:

IN DEFENSE OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

ELMONT.—The Veterans of Foreign Wars of Nassau County take sharp issue with your editorial of June 30, entitled "The Privileged Veteran." The reliable American veterans organizations have been the one voice consistently promoting legislation to assist veterans ever since the unfortunate conditions which developed after the First World War.

The VFW has never asked for, nor received, as a point of fact, privileged treatment for veterans. All that ever was asked of a grateful Nation was an opportunity for the returning serviceman to rehabilitate and reestablish himself in civilian life. This was done through hospitalization, subsidized college training, veteran guaranteed mortgages, etc. These measures were part of a planned program to put the ex-GI back, at least in part, on an even plane with his civilian counterpart. This goes for the veteran who spent his time on the front line, as well as those "10 veterans who served far behind the line."

We further recognize that there are those who would abuse the benefits given to veterans. We neither condone this action nor expect to be held responsible for it. It should be remembered that although veterans organizations pioneered the whole program of veterans benefits, membership in a veterans organization is not a prerequisite to participate in all veterans benefits.

Contrast this sharply to the 30 days a worker has to join a union or be barred from all benefits of employment in that industry. We certainly would never want this restriction, however, it should be borne in mind before so many free swings are taken at veterans organizations. Actually, veterans benefits are only one phase of the program of the VFW. The principles and objectives upon which the VFW is founded are both patriotic and fraternal. However, first and foremost, the VFW epitomizes "Love of Country and Devotion thereto," and that is why your editorial was so distasteful. The editorial not only showed a complete lack of understanding of the functions of a veterans organization, but the editorial itself, contained at least a half dozen distortions. This the VFW considers unpardonable by a vehicle representing itself as a responsible segment of the press.

JACK KLUGER,
Nassau County Commander,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

State Department Blunders Hurt Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, with each passing week, I become more and more concerned with the inefficiency, ineptitude and indifference of the State Department in deals which ultimately affect the domestic economy of our Nation. It is quite apparent that many of the persons employed in the State Department either have never taken a course in basic economics, or else they have become so enmeshed in nebulous webs of foreign intrigue that they have no time to concern themselves with the effect which their activities or inactivities may have upon the United States of America.

Several weeks ago, I called attention of the House to the fact that France has been using foreign-aid dollars to purchase coal produced by the Soviet Union. This fact was called to the attention of the State Department which turned a deaf ear to the complaints of thousands of coal workers in West Virginia and throughout the Nation, whose jobs have been usurped as a result of these foreign giveaway policies. I have protested against these policies in the best manner I know how by voting against the foreign-aid authorization and appropriation bills, and I will continue to fight any program which will sacrifice the jobs of American workers and destroy our industries simply for the purpose of pursuing a course which has failed to either win us friends or improve the security of our Nation.

At this time I would like to call attention of my colleagues to a letter sent on August 12, 1958, to the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, by that stanch defender of the mining industry in America, Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers Association. Mr. Moody, in his inimitable manner excoriates the State Department for its continued inactivity in dealing with the matters of foreign policy

which vitally affect the economy of our country and the coal industry in particular. I wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Moody's letter and urge all Members of the House to read and subscribe to the philosophy espoused therein.

The letter follows:

SOUTHERN COAL PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., August 12, 1958.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Deputy Under Secretary of State, United States State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DILLON: I am writing you with reference to certain actions and policies of the Department which have had a most detrimental effect on the maintenance and growth of overseas markets for American coal. No segment of the domestic coal industry depends so greatly on exports for its economic health as do the southern fields, located in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama, which supply approximately 85 percent of these shipments. The great majority of producers in these fields are members of this association.

Where coal is concerned, the Department seems to have abandoned its traditional role of fostering United States interests abroad. Last year, for example, it raised no question when some $4 million was advanced to the U. S. S. R.'s Polish satellite for purchase of coal-mining machinery, equipment patently destined to improve productive capacity so that Polish coal could compete even more successfully with our coals in the world market. Obviously, and rightly so, if United States coal producers were to go to the Government for aid in purchasing coal machinery, they would have their requests rejected. Yet the funds for Poland came from the President's special fund, which, with the Department's guidance, Congress made available to him to use to further this country's interests abroad.

In Argentina, the United States recently authorized a $60 million loan for a steel plant, and is considering an additional loan request of $40 million. Nowhere in the loan agreement, negotiated or pending, is there a stipulation that the plant should obtain even a part of the coal for its operating requirements from the United States. Not only that, but Argentina now has a 4-year barter agreement to import 2 million tons of Polish coal and it is not improbable that Argentina, which we supplied with over 1½ million tons in 1956, will now turn entirely to the Communist bloc for its coal.

These examples of how the State Department's policies are curtailing our foreign trade in coal are evident. Not so obvious are those instances where countries which we are aiding fail to reciprocate our friendship and, directly or indirectly, use these funds for coal purchases outside the United States or even in the Communist bloc.

We give substantial aid to Japan and yet I understand that recently 12 cargoes of coal were purchased by the General Services Administration for Japan—financed, of course, by American dollars. Eight of the 12 cargoes were awarded to Australian producers, and only 4 to the United States. This, despite the fact that the coal industry in our country has had a production decrease this year of approximately 25 percent—with resulting idle time for coal miners and a general recession of all business in coal mining areas.

A bill to end, or at least moderate, such activity was proposed during the current session of Congress in the form of the so-called Payne amendment to the Mutual Security Act. This would insure that at least 50 percent of United States aid funds for procurement of commodities, including coal, for foreign use would be spent in the United States. The State Department strongly opposed this measure and the amendment failed of passage.

On June 19 of this year in Brussels, the Department and the Atomic Energy Commission signed jointly the so-called Euratom agreement, which, if implemented, would provide many millions of taxpayers' funds to subsidize a gigantic reactor-construction program for Europe.

Since reactor construction and operating costs are many times those of conventional fuels and electric power station equipment—about 10 times those of coal-burning plants in this country where reactor techniques are probably most advanced—we would not only be casting away part of an annual market for 40 million tons of American coal, but simultaneously levying upon the pockets of every taxpayer in the United States to make up the losses on this astounding investment.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees detailing the consequences of such an irrational course.

The Department's lax attitude where this country's basic and most plentiful fuel is concerned, does not end here. In the case of residual oil, which is dumped at east coast ports, imports now displace more than 41 million tons of coal annually. These imports are being dumped by a cartel which has been charged by the Justice Department with conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws. The case still is pending after 5 years.

The actions which I have mentioned unfortunately lead to the conclusion that the Department of State—wittingly or unwittingly—pursues a calculated policy of indifference and neglect where the health of the coal industry and the hundreds of thousands of workers and their families dependent upon it are concerned. Partly as a consequence, production is down, exports are down, and thousands in the industry are jobless. This constitutes neglect of these vital national resources when Soviet coal production has for the first time exceeded our own and the U. S. S. R. is embarked on an energetic campaign to increase its coal production 10 percent a year for the next 5 years.

From all indications, the State Department has been extremely solicitous of the welfare of our oil industry. It would be helpful, indeed, if the Department also would review its coal policies in the light of these representations.

Specifically again, it can:

1. Reevalute, in the light of their impact at home, its policies respecting: (a) Unrestricted loans and grants; (b) residual oil imports.

2. Carefully determine where American aid funds are spent, and, whenever possible, encourage a spirit of reciprocity through coal purchases in the United States.

3. Recognizing that Europe is basically a coal economy, reevaluate the need for an extravagant and self-defeating program such as Euratom.

4. Encourage and be alert to opportunities for mutually beneficial barter arrangements involving United States coal.

I am sure members of the industry would be happy to discuss personally, in detail, these recommendations.

This letter is sent to you on the instructions and with the unanimous approval of the board of directors of Southern Coal Producers' Association in regular meeting, August 11, 1958.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

The Advantage of Lath and Plaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, safer, better homes are a continuing national objective. Many believe that lath and plaster offer advantages in safety, appearance and wear for interior walls and ceilings over so-called dry-wall construction.

Recently I received a letter on this subject from Joe M. Baker, executive director of the National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Inc., whose organization is making a sincere effort to educate the American people regarding the need for and desirability of better quality homes through the use of permanent and fireproof materials. Because of the wide interest in the subject, I include his letter in full in the Appendix of the RECORD, where his thoughts will be available to all of the Members:

NATIONAL BUREAU FOR LATHING AND PLASTERING, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1958.

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I personally want to take this opportunity to thank you for your telegram addressed to us at our annual convention in Minneapolis, Minn., congratulating us on our program to educate the public to build better homes—homes for the future, instead of slums for the future.

Not only do we have to educate the public but it is going to be necessary to educate the Congress and all the Federal agencies that handle construction that there is no substitute for any type of building materials, especially for genuine lath and plaster. Our Government agencies have established a minimum specification for interior walls and ceilings consisting of one-fourth inch plywood, three-eights inch and/or one-half inch drywall, whereas if genuine lath and plaster is used it requires three-eights inch gypsum lath plus one-half inch of plaster, resulting in a wall and ceiling thickness of seven-eights inches, which is permanent construction and is fireproof. Compare seven-eights inch of lath and plaster with other materials ranging in thickness from one-fourth inch to one-half inch and from measurements alone, lath and plaster is far out in front.

Our Government agencies gave no consideration whatsoever to fire protection in private homes on which the mortgage is guaranteed by the FHA, the VA, nor on the Capehart housing projects.

The appalling waste in many human lives and general productivity which results from substandard housing is the greatest single strain upon our national economy.

No economy of materials can justify exposure of a child to the terrible hazards of fire. No flexibility of building use can explain the use of inflammable material to a parent suffering the anguish of knowing that a loved youngster has suddenly and agonizingly been forever stilled by searing, spreading flames, that might have been avoided. We call your attention to the fire that occurred in a Navy housing project in San Diego, Calif. Three children lost their lives

in this fire. There was another fire at Columbus, Ohio, where three children died as a result. There was a slight saving in the original building cost by using substitute materials for walls and ceilings. But, how could this saving be compared with the lives of these loved ones?

Plastered walls and ceilings are a tried and tested building material which have earned 1- to 4-hour fire-resistant ratings from the underwriters laboratories, which can be employed with economy to protect the lives and health of all occupants—not only of homes but also of schools.

The last Congress appropriated an extra $3,000 per unit to be used in construction of Capehart housing to make these projects more livable.

In several instances where there have been sufficient funds to accept the alternate of lath and plaster the agencies have failed to do so stating that they could not justify spending the money just because it was appropriated. We contend that the most important consideration to be given in the construction of these projects first should be the protection of those who occupy same; and second, the maintenance costs should be taken into consideration.

We have in our files a letter from the Air Force written to one of the United States Senators in which he states:

"Over a period of years experience indicates less maintenance and repair costs by the use of lath and plaster. Initial hair and similar cracks are expected but these are easily and inexpensively patched up by painters at the time the house is redecorated. It should be noted that although the use of drywall has many advantages it is not completely trouble free. Settlement of exterior walls and partitions, or shrinkage of lumber, may cause popping of nails at ends of panels with resultant cracks at taped joints. Hard usage may also result in panel damage requiring complete replacement. Repairs of these types of damage require expert mechanics whose wages, combined with material costs, are more expensive than the repair of plaster damage."

Sincerely yours,

JOE M. BAKER,
Executive Director.

H. R. 8002

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. The enactment of H. R. 8002 as revised by the Senate will furnish a needed implement for Federal auditing. There has been a tremendous demand for a more meticulous check on the Federal system of expenditures, motivated in large part by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. The attitude of this group is understandable in the light of the huge reserves of unobligated funds in the pipelines each year.

The other body amended the original piece of proposed legislation in such a way as to bring about these modest revisions: They inserted permissive language so that where Congress sees fit it may authorize the transfer of expenditures from one category to another insofar as it is deemed feasible. It—the amendment of the other body—clarifies the intended wish of the House legislators that contractors be paid promptly for services rendered within a fiscal year even if the payment is not made technically before the close of that fiscal year. Lastly, the other body deleted two lines of the bill which would have permitted in an appropriation bill a recision, or reappropriation, on a transfer.

In effect the bill as returned from the other body is substantially the same as previously approved by the House by a tremendous majority.

Everything considered, this bill is simply permissive legislation and it is entitled to a trial. If it proves too costly or ineffective it can be dispensed with by the Congress. If it works it will improve expenditure limitations so that the House may control not only obligating authority, but continue expenditures as it did before it departed from the contract authority principle. When it did that it left the rate and time of expenditure in the hands of departments and agencies, and gave up its control in any given year to a balanced budget.

With the debt ceiling having to be lifted to a new high of $288 billion, it looks as though a balanced budget is out of the question for some years to come. But it is a goal devoutly to be wished for and eventually attained.

The passage of H. R. 8002 will have a good effect on many citizens who will at least realize that Congress is trying to be judicious in its bookkeeping.

Transportation Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, often when legislation is being considered by the House, dire predictions are made by individual Members as to the impact of the legislation under discussion. Sometimes the House is persuaded by these predictions and sometimes not. A few weeks ago the House had under consideration the Transportation Act of 1958, the so-called railroad assistance bill. Just prior to passage I specifically warned the Members from the New York metropolitan area and a few other commuting localities that the bill would produce disastrous results. Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and some others, scoffed at my warnings. The bill passed, however, and was signed into law by the President on August 12.

Only one Member of the House, in addition to myself, saw fit to vote against the bill.

Unfortunately, confirmation of my worst fears was not long in coming. Practically at dawn, on August 13, the day following the President's signing of the bill, the New York Central Railroad posted abandonment notices announcing the termination in 30 days of its West Shore ferry service between Weehawken, N. J., and New York City. These notices had obviously been prepared long in advance.

Unless the ICC should intervene, on September 13, this century-old vital transportation link will be entirely abandoned under the new section 13A of the Transportation Act of 1958. This section grants the railroads the power of abandonment, after posting notice, and at the same time takes away from the public and the community any specific rights to intervene which may have existed prior to the passage of the act. The same situation exists with respect to Erie Railroad ferry service between New York and New Jersey.

There are a few loosely organized commuter groups which are working in conjunction with several municipalities; the Bergen County, N. J., governing body; and the attorney general of New Jersey in an effort to prevent the catastrophe which will befall thousands of innocent people should these facilities be abandoned. With what limited resources are available to them, I am sure that every effort will be made to have the ICC suspend these abandonments while the unfairness and unconstitutionality of these provisions in the Transportation Act can be established in the courts.

In its haste to bail out the railroads, Congress has ridden rough-shod over the future of many of our people. The economic disturbance, possible loss of employment, and the major congestion of highways, bridges, and tunnels that will be caused, is impossible to estimate at this time. In the future, it might be well for Congress to consider, in this connection, individual rights as well as the financial needs of the railroads. I favor helping the railroads, but it should not be done unless those affected are given the right to protect themselves.

The underlying value of every home and business in northern New Jersey is threatened by these abandonments. Every person, community, and county in that area should immediately give full support to those leading the fight for continued rail and ferry service.

If justice cannot be obtained from the ICC or the courts, then Congress must amend the act and fully protect these innocent citizens.

Tenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we note today the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Korea.

A fateful and eventual 10 years have passed in the life of the Asian republic which has been our close friend, and our

ally in combat. Starting from truly humble beginnings among the destruction left by war and long foreign occupation, this ancient land of honorable people hardly had established their goals and objectives before they were invaded and forced to defend at great cost and sacrifice their homes and their liberties. They were assisted by many free nations, and greatly by the United States, for the sinister force which threatened their independence was the same one that threatens the liberties of freemen everywhere.

After the end of the fighting, the Korean people again turned to the tasks of developing a country which, although without great wealth, does have many resources. Not the least of these resources is the spirit of the people and a determination to find their own way and be accountable only to their own national conscience.

My interest in the progress of Korea is more than casual. I served in military government in Korea from October 1945 to July 1946 when this brave country was attempting to formulate an economic and governmental stability that would represent their needs and would permit them to take their place as a free nation among other free nations of the world. I have returned to Korea several times since then so that I am able to attest to the steady progress that they are making. In this country I am one of the directors of the American-Korean Foundation.

They are making progress. They live still in the shadow of the evil which almost engulfed them. We may find it difficult to fully understand them at times, for our Nation, even in its struggling years, did not know the kind of hazards which have beset Korea in the last decade.

We can take pride in their accomplishments, for they have demonstrated the type of national feeling which turns people to the moral dedication and objectives which free people share. Their ultimate victory will be, in part, our victory for we both seek honorable peace based on the freedom and dignity of man.

Money Grows on Our Hardwood Trees, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., which points out the growth of industries relating to our forest resources.

I am particularly delighted that as pointed out in this article we are having a furniture factory move to Live Oak, Fla., which is one of the splendid communities in my Eighth Congressional District. The editorial follows:

MONEY GROWS ON OUR HARDWOOD TREES, TOO

The forthcoming opening of a furniture factory in Live Oak directs our attention to another aspect of our forest resources—hardwoods.

Because of the work of the Georgian, Dr. Charles Herty, and others, regional prosperity has been advanced through utilization of southern pines. The burgeoning paper and pulp industry here in Jacksonville, the State and South attests to the economic activity this development has brought.

But softwoods represent only part of the potential that the South has in its woodlands. More and more there are signs that we are waking up to the value of our neglected hardwoods. The experts have been emphasizing the value of hardwoods for some time, and the sugestion has been made that Florida again investigate the feasibility of growing one of the most valuable hardwoods of all, mahogany.

The migration of the furniture industry to the South has been a spur to hardwood culture. By the reverse token, development of hardwoods will help to expand furniture making in the region.

The national center of furniture manufacturing has long since shifted from Grand Rapids, Mich., to North Carolina, and from there, it is fanning out over the South. It has been a boon to the economy, for in many instances small operations have continued to grow, while spawning satellite industries in surrounding areas.

Location of a furniture plant at Live Oak is welcome on many counts. It helps to pioneer the way in the State for another industry. Furniture making is not done on any sizable scale in the State, but there is no reason why it should be that way.

This sign of diversificatiton of the economy in north Florida bodes well too for the increased job opportunity it represents to the people of our area. Portions of the northern section of our State are deficit areas from the standpoint of population. One of the ways to check this condition is to offer new employment.

Work requiring skilled labor is always desirable, for the future of the State and South does not lie in the direction of cheap exploited labor, but in an intelligent and industrious working force.

The Live Oak venture bears watching and following up, for it symbolizes a new horizon for the area and State.

Conversion of Sea Water to Potable Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, water experts have pointed out repeatedly over the last few years that many areas of our country face a critical, even perilous situation if the water table continues to decline. Already water in certain places in the great State of California is being transported from a source hundreds of miles away, at considerable expense to the consumers. Were it not for the Colorado River, for example, large cities in California would be in a most trying situation.

The development of a mechanism to transform sea water into potable water has long since been successfully achieved. Fighting ships of large size, certain island possessions of the United States, and hotels on such islands as Bermuda are already equipped with devices which are successfully converting sea water into drinking water.

The writer recently witnessed a demonstration in the State of Connecticut where thousands of gallons of drinking water were made from salt water successfully and economically. A Bermuda hotel is now being equipped with a similar installation at a cost not prohibitive to its management.

The major problem today is to devise a method of producing large quantities of potable water from sea water or brackish water—as found in certain parts of the Southwest in natural underground storage—at a cost in keeping with a community's ability to pay for it.

Most processes—and there are a number of them—resort to heat as the motivating factor in conversion, and heat, whether generated electrically or by coal or oil, is expensive. The introduction of atomic energy into the process of conversion may soon come about. Another possibility is that the powerplants of littorally situated cities will be transformed for the dual purpose of supplying not only electric power for the community but even for the transformation of sea water or brackish water into potable water in vast quantities. This, of course, will be an answer to the problem facing many communities.

Whether the sea water or brackish water is converted into drinking water by means of radiation, membrane filter—osmosis—distillation, or any other way, the problem of cost is the paramount one. But success in the effort is necessary if hundreds of thriving communities are not to be changed into tombstone cities. People will have to remove themselves to areas where water is plentiful.

The chances of success have been multiplied many times by the passage by the House of Senate Joint Resolution 135 on August 12—passed Senate June 10. This joint resolution provides for the establishment of no less than five water demonstration plants designed to discover the most feasible and economic means of attaining the aforementioned objective. Once we find a means of supplying unlimited quantities of drinking water from the sea or from underground brackish deposits, man the world over will sleep better content in the knowledge that one of the basic neeessities of life is always within his reach.

The House, as well as the other body, is to be commended for the swift enactment of a most important piece of legislation.

Thoughts as Adjournment Nears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all of us are feeling the pressure of these crucial days of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. We have suffered many losses,

physically, and a number of our able colleagues are withdrawing to pursue other activities. Adjournment for some can be considered as graduation and for others of us, only a change until a new curriculum begins.

I would like to express my sincere good wishes to all of my colleagues and in particular to my colleagues from Illinois. I hope that between now and the time Congress reconvenes in January 1959, you will each enjoy good health, strength, and success. I extend this wish regardless of party and may each of us who desires to be returned to Congress be successful on November 4.

The purpose of our being here in this great legislative body is to serve the interests and the well-being of our Nation and more specifically, the people whom we represent, to the very best and fullest of our ability. We sought the office and we must assume the responsibility willingly. I consider it a privilege to represent the Third District of Illinois.

Many of us disagree as to what is best for our country and our constituents. We may differ as to what is the best way to accomplish our purpose. The important element is not our differences as men or as parties but our unity in desiring that, as our loyal and able minority leader, JOE MARTIN, says, "America should come first."

As long as the House of Representatives and the Senate lend themselves to the privilege of free speech, only found so abundantly in the Halls of Congress, I believe our Nation may well earn the distinction as being the only nation governed by men able to survive the myriad attacks against her, both from without but more lamentably, the attacks from within. To our children and grandchildren, let us bequeath not a spectral America but a vibrant America.

I am deeply appreciative of the following letter which our minority leader sent me:

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1958.

Hon. EMMET F. BYRNE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EMMET: Congress is about to adjourn, and I cannot let you go home without expressing my appreciation of your personal loyalty as well as your support of a legislative program that is full of outstanding achievements.

Although we Republicans were in a minority of 30, we were the driving force that brought about most of the program of President Eisenhower. We were stalwart supporters of his splendid efforts to maintain peace, and we vigorously supported his measures to stimulate the business recovery which is now apparent. We were able to defeat some fantastic spending schemes. If we had not been successful, the country would now be headed toward disastrous inflation and possible bankruptcy. The country has profited from your judgment and courageous service.

I do hope you will be successful in your fall campaign and with additional recruits return to help solve these momentous problems that are ahead. As a capable, tested legislator you deserve the support of your district regardless of party affiliation. America should come first.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

Slums Are a Luxury We Cannot Afford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the greater Cleveland community, Mr. Oscar H. Steiner, one of the most vigorous and enthusiastic builders of private low-cost housing, has made the clearing of Cleveland slums an almost personal crusade. His devotion and his untiring energy in this cause have made him an authority on this subject.

I want to submit to the consideration of my colleagues an article which he submitted in the Reporter magazine for November 14, 1957, entitled "Slums Are a Luxury We Cannot Afford":

CLEVELAND.—Fred and Mildred Hurns were very special sidewalk superintendents when they stood at the corner of East 35th Street and Scovill Avenue here not long ago and watched bricklayers at work on a 283-apartment development. Along with hundreds of other Negro families, the Hurnses were displaced 2 years ago from this same area by a slum-clearance project. But their visit had not been prompted by any nostalgia for their old neighborhood. They had come, with their four children, to check on the new apartment they will soon be moving into. Furthermore, they will take up residence in one of the modern fireproof apartments not as renters but as owners.

Because I am the head of the building firm that is putting up the Longwood development into which the Hurns family will move, what follows may sound presumptuous. But I honestly believe that the project, small as it is, has real significance for all communities that want to do something about their slums.

All too often slums are cleared with public funds and then the former residents are forced into other slum areas by the excessive rents of the new development. It hurts me every time I hear of a huge apartment development with rents of $25 to $40 and more per room going up in a former slum section. Unless something is done to help people like the Hurnses, the troubles that afflict the heart of almost all of our large cities will increase rather than diminish.

The Hurns family has been making monthly deposits during construction toward the downpayment for their new home. When their two-bedroom apartment is ready and they move in, they will have paid $500 down. (Sure, they'll be cramped for space by ideal standards, but they'll be less crowded than they were before or than they would be in another slum.) Their monthly payments covering interest, amortization, taxes, insurance, and all exterior repairs and services, including lawnmowing and snow removal, will be $81.50. Other families are saving toward or have made downpayments of $750 for three-bedroom units in Longwood on which their total monthly payments will be anywhere from $85.50 to $91.50, depending on the size of the rooms. These are bargain-basement prices in Cleveland, where construction costs are high. Two other firms are working in Longwood on more conventional rental projects, and this is progress too. But I think it is interesting that those who are paying for their own apartments will be paying substantially less than those who rent.

We learned from an earlier project that the average family income of a purchaser is $4,100 a year, only about $700 below the national median and a thousand dollars under the median for city dwellers. And yet after years of living in deteriorated, jampacked slums most of the purchasers had almost given up hope of ever renting, let alone owning a decent home of their own. We have experienced practically no turnover; even more, there are no delinquencies.

Two years ago the city of Cleveland, with the help of a Federal grant of more than $2 million, bought for demolition the tattered tenement the Hurnses had lived in on East 35th Street. The houses in the neighborhood were predominantly frame, and most of them hadn't been painted in years. Maintenance consisted of patches on patches. Originally single- and double-occupancy houses, they had practically all been converted to multifamily occupancy—some with families of 6 or 8 persons living in a single room and sharing bath and kitchen facilities. The Hurnses paid $15 a week for 3 rooms. Some families paid more, some slightly less, but the rates were almost uniformly exorbitant, although not at all shocking to anyone who is in any way familiar with the economics of Negro slum property.

HOW TO MAKE SLUMS

Along with a sizable number of the 1,200 families who once lived in the section, the Hurnses were relocated into the Cleveland Hough neighborhood. There they had to double up again in a house in an area that is already caught in a familiar pattern: overcrowding, heavy wear and tear on already neglected buildings, climbing rents, growing crime and delinquency, an increasing tax burden on the entire city—in short, new slums while the old were being cleared. The police call this area the Jungle.

The rapid growth of new slums means that Cleveland and cities like it are getting nowhere fast in a desperate race that will exhaust the earnest dreams of the planners and the bright hopes of the city administration.

Of the $1.5 billion industrial expansion enjoyed by the Cleveland metropolitan area in the postwar years, $1 billion worth has been located in the suburban municipalities. Most of the new houses have also been built outside the city limits.

As the tax base in the center of the city levels off in relation to that in the rising suburbs, Cleveland's housekeeping problems—health, police, and welfare—show no corresponding reduction.

No one can say that we Clevelanders haven't had plenty of warning about how expensive slums can be for a city to go on tolerating. Back in 1934, Father Robert B. Navin, now Monsignor Navin, president of St. John College in Cleveland, completed a study of a 333-acre section of the city that included the present Longwood project site. Father Navin discovered that direct cost of maintaining the section—in city, county, and school services, in private and public health and welfare spending—was $2 million, against a potential real estate tax revenue of $225,000. He observed that the inclusion of a few items of administrative overhead would have made the deficit 10 times the tax return.

The social deficit, which also costs money, was found to be even more disproportionate. A section comprising 2.5 percent of the city's population and 0.73 percent of the land area boasted 21 percent of the murders, 8 percent of the juvenile delinquency, 26 percent of the vice resorts, 10 percent of the illegitimate births, and 12 percent of the tuberculosis deaths.

The years since Father Navin made his survey have increased the costs of municipal services without solving any of the social problems, so that even in a period of relatively full employment and prosperity, slum areas constitute a severe drain on the city's resources. When the city administration

went to Cleveland's voters with a $7-million urban-redevelopment bond issue in 1953, it could argue accurately that the Longwood section represented an annual loss of more than $200,000.

Some simple arithmetic shows how good an investment Longwood will be. It cost $3 million to buy and clear the project area. Resale of the land to builders brought $450,000, leaving a net cost of slightly over $2.5 million to the city and Federal Government. But the new apartments and shopping center will so enhance the tax returns from the section that the city will get its share of the costs back in 9 years. Hard figures like these as well as humanitarian motives convinced the business and industrial leaders of Cleveland that they should support the city's renewal efforts. This they are doing through the nationally recognized Cleveland Development Foundation.

Nearly 100 Cleveland companies subscribed $2 million to provide the foundation with a revolving fund to expedite almost every phase of Cleveland's redevelopment. Part of the money has been or is being used now as loans to the city and private builders to get specific projects underway. The list of officers and trustees of this organization includes many of Cleveland's industrial and commercial leaders. Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze and Renewal Director James M. Lister have repeatedly paid tribute to the foundation's help in getting programs started.

THE NEGRO PROBLEM

Whenever I begin to feel complacent about what we are accomplishing for the Hurnses and families like them, I have only to climb into my car and drive up and down the broken streets of the neighborhoods adjoining the Longwood building sites. In half an hour, the proper—and bitter—perspective is restored. What we have done, what we are doing, is only a pinprick compared to the major surgery needed.

The majority of inhabitants of Cleveland's slum areas are Negroes. The Cleveland Community Relations Board issued a report a few years ago showing that only 500 of the 140,000 private dwelling units built in the Greater Cleveland area since the war had been available for rent or purchase by Negro families. What this has meant, of course, is that colored families, regardless of economic status, have been for the most part confined to the oldest and most rundown sections of the city. The Negro "problem," which helps create slums in the first place by overcrowding open neighborhoods, makes slum elimination all the more difficult.

Restrictive real-estate practices of builders, brokers, and lenders, echoing the sentiments of white neighbors, have made it almost impossible to obtain tracts of vacant land in the outlying sections of Cleveland or across municipal boundaries into the suburbs on which to build single home or apartment developments with open occupancy. Wider realization of the economic consequences of prejudice—the cost of maintaining slums, for instance—may help hasten the day when integrated housing is more than a church-sponsored social experiment.

Cleveland and other industrial cities should certainly review their extensive landholdings with an eye to making some vacant sites available for open housing. When the city of Cleveland was eager to attract the 1959 Pan-American Games it quickly produced land for a stadium, parking fields, and temporary housing facilities for the athletes. Why couldn't the same areas be made available for housing the slum DP's?

The need everywhere is for low-cost houses. The spectacular boom in the postwar years produced a tremendous amount of housing for families who could afford to pay $15,000 or more—families, in other words, with an annual income of $7,000 or more. It is safer and more profitable for a contractor to build and sell a $35,000 home than one selling for $8,000 or $10,000. But the supply of homes in the upper bracket has come within hailing distance of the demand. In fact, you can say now that the prospective buyer has a very good choice.

But the building boom didn't help the average industrial worker. Accurate figures for the income of Cleveland families show that 60 percent of the families are in the $3,600 to $5,000 per year range—too high for public housing under Ohio's income limitations, and too low for the private units that have been built.

This income group, which includes so many of the slum DP's, cannot afford to pay more than $65 to $95 a month in rent or monthly payments on a mortgage. Some of them, in desperation, are paying more than 1 week's take-home pay in rent, but in the long run they are bound to find they have been led up a blind alley. The old rule of thumb that no more than 20 to 25 percent of income should go for shelter still holds true.

In building apartments to rent or sell in the $65 to $95 range there are all sorts of problems, not the least of which is tight money. If mortgage-interest rates climb 1 percent, as they did between our first and second redevelopment projects, the purchaser's monthly payment jumps nearly $5—more than 8 percent—on an $8,500 mortgage. In addition, costs of material and labor keep increasing, and the average industrial worker's pay shows no sign of catching up.

One place where relief would seem entirely possible—and logical—is in land costs. Instead of charging $14,000 per acre for the Longwood site, why couldn't the city of Cleveland have deeded the land for $1, making sure that the savings would be passed on to the purchasers of the new units? It would have meant an immediate reduction in monthly payments of more than $3. As in the case of interest rates, the amount can be substantial for the family budgets we're talking about.

The increased writeoff on the land would help bridge the wide gap between public housing, which must be almost completely subsidized, and conventional private housing, which only those with incomes of $7,000 or more can afford. It's not as if the city would simply be giving away money it could never hope to see again; the time required for it to recover its capital outlay in tax returns would merely be slightly lengthened.

There's nothing radical about such a proposal. In many parts of the country, communities are providing free factory sites and sometimes even building free factories to promote industrial developments. The same philosophy of enlightened self-interest could well be applied to the housing crisis.

Slums are not only the shame of our cities in aesthetic and moral terms; they are also outrageously expensive.

Ninety-three percent of the shabby dwelling units in the razed slums of the Longwood section were owned by absentee landlords. When the Hurnses and the other families move into the new apartments, a large degree of homeownership will be restored to the neighborhood.

I feel very strongly that resident ownership is the best possible guaranty against community deterioration.

The Townsend Plan for National Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a speech and statement by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder of the Townsend Club movement and great champion for decent and adequate pensions for our elderly citizens.

Whatever one may think about the so-called Townsend Plan, there may be no doubt that Dr. Francis Townsend has been a constructive force in American economic life. He speaks out day after day for social justice for our elderly citizens. This statement is particularly timely as the Senate considers improvements in our social security system.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND SPEAKS

I have just read an article in which the author expresses his belief that the findings of science will eventually bring about great revolutionary changes that will transform the world's social structure into a virtual heaven on earth.

I doubt very much that scientists acting alone can ever master the illnesses of the world. They can tell the world how to act, but they still have the apathy to overcome that afflicts the great masses of people who are ignorant and unable to think for themselves. These people, who need help most, cannot be reached with scientific advice. They are afflicted with a malady that is too deep-seated and too longstanding to be reached by scientific facts alone.

There is a worldwide sickness afflicting the human race today which is epidemic in character and which has been cursing the world since the dawn of civilization. Like all other men who have had medical training, I no sooner see a case of sickness that I do not want to make a diagnosis and, if possible, suggest the needed remedy. Having observed this world sickness, and having seen it in every part of the globe that I have visited, I have done a great deal of thinking about how to combat it and check its vicious spread throughout the world. This, I have concluded, can never be done through the discoveries of new medicines. I believe here is a case of such urgency and need that the world dare not wait for the slow and tedious experimentation that scientists require before curative agencies can be depended upon. This world sickness is spreading so rapidly, and its ravages upon humanity have become so terrifying, that nothing but the application of sound commonsense and immediate action will be able to slow it down.

Yes, you have guessed it; the malady I refer to is poverty. It would seem that a sickness so widespread would attract the at-

tention of the world's greatest thinkers, but it seems that familiarity with poverty creates an indifference toward it, and little or nothing has been done.

What a strange and fearful indictment is hurled at our cherished institutions, our schools, our churches, our colleges, and even our national Government itself, for their apathetic attitude toward this greatest curse that has ever afflicted the human race.

This indifferent attitude toward a rapidly-growing, worldwide affliction is carrying with it the threat of a revolution that is so dreadful that those of us who cherish our present social achievements are becoming truly alarmed they may all have to be thrown into the discard. This danger comes home to us when we stop to think of the magnitude of the impending disaster.

Probably two-thirds of the world's population can be classified as desperately poor. Until recently it has been accepted as an act of Providence that poverty was ordained as the lot of most mortals; only since the dawn of a spirit of democracy, growing out of oppression, has it been possible for mankind to break away from tradition and strike out for self-improvement in an independent way.

Here in the new world where men first found freedom to use their brains independently and increase their ability to produce new ways of creating wealth, the greatest revolution in all the world's history has been brought about. The tremendous discovery that there was no limit to our ability to create wealth has brought with it many new problems which clamor for solution. In these United States alone the problem of what to do with our new-found wealth is a problem of worldwide import.

Wealth that has been created but cannot be sold is almost as dangerous and baffling as poverty itself. Man's ingenuity and inventiveness have run ahead of the Nation's ability to buy and consume. At first glance it seems so simple a problem could easily be solved—just give away our excesses of such goods as we cannot use, through our home market. But we find there are markets abroad as well as here at home, and the people who run those markets object to our dumping our surpluses on them; it shuts down on their profits and disrupts their markets, and they say: "Keep your stuff at home; we cannot buy it and we will not have it dumped at our doorstep."

So here we are, we Americans, with a world of wealth-creating ability, doomed to restrict our production of wealth to the minimum and let factories and farms lie idle and unemployment increase and plague us.

Does it not seem strange that our national thinkers have not given consideration to the matter of increasing our home consuming ability by making us all better customers of our fast-growing volume of wealth?

In our national population there are at present some 20 millions of adult citizens who can be classed as paupers or semi-paupers. Their consuming ability is restricted to a bare livelihood because of one thing—lack of ability to buy. Their money supply has dried up.

Who are these people? The old, the sick, the crippled, the blind and all others who have met with afflictions that have incapacitated them for making a living. How foolish of us who are blessed with strength and good health to impose a burden upon ourselves by condemning these afflicted ones to a life of deprivation. It entails a tremendous cost upon the producers of our Nation to maintain 20 millions of human derelicts on a bare subsistence plane of living.

Why in the world do we not devise a way whereby these unproductive ones can be, come, at least, good customers? Customers are just as important to industry as working producers; all we would have to do to convert these burdened and burdensome people into useful citizens would be to see that they were liberally supplied with money; they would put that money to work purchasing great quantities of the wealth of things that are now surpluses.

If these deprived millions were to receive regular monthly annuities in sufficient amounts to permit them to live comfortably, and without anxiety and worry, they would soon establish a dependable flow of money throughout the channels of trade, and no such thing as a depression, or recession could become possible. Thus we could insure our Nation a constantly growing prosperity that would be proof against hard times.

Well, if we had for our Nation proof against hard times and depressions, that would constitute insurance for the free enterprise, capitalistic system of ours, would it not? And that brings us to the important theme of why we so badly need a national insurance system of money circulation that cannot be disrupted under any national or international conditions: If that kind of insurance can be made available to our Nation, it can shortly be made available to all others, when we make it clear to them how we have done it.

How to insure the nonexistence of poverty throughout the world is the most important and pressing problem facing the modern world; it is the biggest, most humane and benevolent undertaking that humanity can be called upon to undertake. It must be accomplished within the next few years or the possibility of its accomplishment will have been lost forever. A great revolution of the underprivileged people of the world is forming, and it is being fanned into flames by the advocates of communism.

Communist leaders are to be found in every country today preaching to the poor and helpless that their deliverance is at hand; that if they embrace communism their days of suffering will be over. The chronically poor are swallowing this doctrine through their ears; they are saying to themselves: "These promises sound good to us, even though they are only half true. Anything—any change, is better than what we have to endure now."

So, here in the United States, let us set up a system of insurance that will cover all American citizens and forever eliminate poverty from our country and demonstrate to other nations that we stand ready to help them do likewise.

A way of establishing and maintaining such an insurance has been before our Nation's lawmaking body for more than 20 years; unfortunately there are none so blind as those who will not see.

But extreme pressure is being put upon our lawmaking body from many directions. Our burden of poverty is growing very rapidly. It is causing a rapid increase of crime; it fosters ignorance and neglects disease; it creates a fertile field for the growth of that odious thing we call communism. All these enemies of progress and prosperity can be mastered here in the United States. We know there is no limit to our ability to create wealth. A just distribution of our wealth has become a must if we are to avert national and international disaster.

Let us not despair. There is great promise that in the very near future our legislative bill for the establishment of national insurance will win. Social forces all over the world are putting pressure upon our lawmakers, and the whole world is looking to the United States for a way out of its difficulties.

Let us remember that God helps those who help themselves. Let us all become individual missionaries for our country and for ourselves, and see that our neighbors are made acquainted with the importance of insuring that poverty shall no longer curse our Nation with its bitter blight.

Commendation of Senator Fulbright of Arkansas by Milwaukee Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have in my hand an excellent editorial from one of the Nation's great newspapers, the Milwaukee Journal. It is a commendation of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the superb speech he made the other day. I wish to read merely the last paragraph:

Mostly, FULBRIGHT'S was an honest picture of where we are, and a cogent, fervent plea to Americans of both parties to break away from our present "inadequate, outmoded, and misdirected" foreign policy and try to develop "a set of coherent, realistic, well-thought-out objectives and feasible policies to attain them."

Mr. President, approval by the Milwaukee Journal is given only after the greatest consideration. It is a commendation which is something to be proud of. I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas on the commendation of this great newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Apendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

One of the most searching comments on American foreign policy was made in the Senate the other day by FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. It was grim, but so are the facts.

Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"Only the blindest of optimism would interpret our international position as a secure one. The fact is that we are in trouble, very deep trouble, regardless of what happens next in the Middle East.

"Time and again we have drifted until circumstances reached an intolerable state, and then we have rushed to the brink. This time we have even put one foot over the brink.

"This Nation has wallowed in a kind of fool's paradise in jolly and supercilious complacency while elsewhere others of more serious bent of mind have worked.

"Are we to admit that we are, as men, less capable, less astute than the Russians? If that is the case, we had better will the world to them without further ado—and ourselves along with it. But if we are their equals as men, and if the ideologies for which we bear witness are superior to theirs, then in heaven's name when are we going to stop taking refuge in this excuse that they are responsible for our difficulties?

"We have cast ourselves indiscriminately in the role of defender of the status quo. * * * We have found ourselves alined against those who would strike at tyranny or corruption. We have found ourselves alined with landlords who have exploited tillers of the soil and with militarists who have kept the people in line.

"We have on a grandiose scale provided peoples of the underdeveloped nations with the weapons of destructive warfare, and have been miserly in providing them weapons to wage war on their own poverty, economic ills, and internal weaknesses.

"What, really, is our policy in the Middle East? Can we live with Arab unity, or can we not? Where are we going in the Far East? What is our policy? We cannot forever ignore 600 million people on the mainland of China."

FULBRIGHT is second-ranking Democratic member of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. His statement was not overly partisan, although he did charge bitterly that "present leadership of this country, when it is not weak and desultory, tends to be impetuous and arbitrary." He blamed Congress for emphasizing military over economic aid. He traced Chinese policy back to the Truman administration.

Mostly, FULBRIGHT'S was an honest picture of where we are, and a cogent, fervent plea to Americans of both parties to break away from our present "inadequate, outmoded, and misdirected" foreign policy, and try to develop "a set of coherent, realistic, well-thought-out objectives and feasible policies to attain them."

Tribute to Admiral Rickover and Commander Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from M. Leitzsey, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

The letter, Mr. President, has to do with Admiral Rickover, in connection with the development of the *Nautilus* and other submarines. The letter points out the great achievement of Comdr. William R. Anderson in taking the *Nautilus* under the polar icecap.

Mr. President, Commander Anderson is a native of Waverly, Tenn. We are very proud of Commander Anderson. A great celebration will be held in his hometown in the latter part of this month in recognition of what he has done. But the people of Tennessee are also very proud of Admiral Rickover. Admiral Rickover first worked on the motor which went into the *Nautilus* at Oak Ridge, Tenn. After that was developed, Commander Anderson was under Admiral Rickover's direction for more than a year.

I agree with the conclusion of the letter that Admiral Rickover certainly should have been included as one of the guests at the White House, and I am glad Commander Anderson, when he saw the slight which had been visited upon Admiral Rickover, immediately went to call upon the admiral to pay his respects.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL RICKOVER

It is altogether fitting and proper to accord every honor possible to the handsome and heroic Comdr. William R. Anderson, of the *Nautilus*, and certainly he deserves all the fanfare he so promptly received. However, it is difficult to comprehend the apparent neglect shown Admiral Rickover, the so-called father of the nuclear Navy, whose brilliant research and development—and pushing his project to completion—made possible Commander Anderson's wonderful achievement.

The commander immediately noticed and regretted the absence of Admiral Rickover and promptly hurried over to his office as soon as the ceremonies were over. The flimsy explanation that "there had not been room enough to crowd everyone in" was more than inadequate; it was ridiculous.

However, the little man who wasn't there was more than conspicuous by his absence, and instead of diminishing his fame, it will probably bring him greater recognition and appreciation by the whole world.

Surely the White House contains a room large enough to include one small, wiry admiral, although his brainpower couldn't be contained in a building larger than the Pentagon. He deserves the very highest accolade our country can bestow, and no doubt the first to agree would be Commander Anderson.

M. LEITZSEY.

WASHINGTON.

The U. N. Radiation Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, August 13, Minneapolis Tribune, entitled "The U. N. Radiation Report."

The concluding paragraph of the editorial supports the request that I made in the Senate on the date of Tuesday, August 12, when I urged that our Government make a basic policy decision on the question of banning further nuclear tests if proper safeguards and inspection can be agreed upon.

The editorial gets right to the heart of the issue.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U. N. RADIATION REPORT

There's nothing fundamentally new in the U. N. report on radiation. It concurs in the widely held view that, genetically speaking, any radiation is bad radiation and is scrupulously scientific in noting that while fallout from weapons testing can cause leukemia and bone cancer, we don't yet have firm evidence as to how many cases of these diseases stem from testing and how many from natural causes.

It calls attention once more to the large amount of natural radiation (cosmic rays, etc.) which is harmful but which cannot be reduced and against which we have no present protection. And it notes that good radioactivity—i. e., medical X-rays—also has bad side effects.

The U. N. committee concludes that all steps designated to minimize the irradiation of human populations will act to the benefit of human health. Such steps include the avoidance of unnecessary exposure resulting from medical, industrial, and other procedures for peaceful uses on the one hand and the cessation of contamination of the environment by explosions of nuclear weapons on the other. The reference to nuclear explosions will almost certainly be cited by those who oppose weapons tests as support for their position.

Generally, the U. N. study repeats the findings of the excellent report made by this country's National Academy of Science in 1956. In that document, in the present U. N. report and in future studies, scientists can sum up their factual findings as to the effects of manmade and natural radioactivity. The decision that the manmade has exceeded or is about to exceed justifiable bounds must be a political decision.

That decision will not be made simply by saying that man's use of atomic energy—whether for weapons, medicine, or peaceful atomic power—has some bad effects and therefore must be immediately stopped. For almost every advance in human progress has been paid for with human suffering and even death. The western industrial revolution, for example, exacted such a toll in its time, and the human costs of contemporary industrialization in underdeveloped nations have only been reduced, not eliminated.

The value of reports like those of the U. N. and the National Academy is that they make it possible for the ultimate political decisions—such as to test or not to test—to be made on the most reliable factual information.

Broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on July 21, this year, there was a broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting network by Fulton Lewis, Jr., that is so apropos with reference to events of the past few weeks, and, for that matter, the last few days, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR., JULY 21, 1958

The Middle East spotlight is beginning to switch to the United Nations, tonight, as the actual happening of events at the scene of the crisis begins to quiet down. There have been a few minor skirmishes between loyal Lebanese troops and rebels in Beirut, but none involving Marines, and some 92 Americans who were caught in Baghdad by the overthrow of the government of King Faisal 1 week ago this morning were flown out of the country to Ankara, Turkey, in a Pan American Airways DC-6-B which the State Department chartered for that express purpose.

Despite the fact that they were all instructed not to talk with newsmen or anyone else except State Department personnel, several are reported to have done so, and they said that everything is quiet in Baghdad and they didn't know anything had happened till they got aboard the plane.

That coincides, generally, with scattered pickups from other escaping travelers to other points, one of whom said that among the group of individuals massacred by tommy-gun fire along with the King, the Crown Prince, and the Premier in the palace courtyard were three foreign show girls,

who were staying in the palace. How they happened to be there was not explained, but this was a rather expensive weekend in Baghdad. One was Canadian, one was French, and one was Israeli.

Troop movements in the area have pretty much stopped. The United States and Britain both seem to have moved in all the forces they consider necessary to do the job, and the entire picture seems to be poised to await whatever the next events are that may take place, if any.

To the diplomatic analyst, probably the most significant event over the weekend was the release by the East German Government of the nine Army helicopter prisoners, who have been held for weeks in Dresden, after being captured by the Russians, when their plane ran out of gas and had to land in a thunderstorm in East German territory.

It seems to be generally agreed that this release was the dirct result of the American-British move-in of Armed Forces into the Lebanon-Jordan area, and that it betrays a massive apprehension on the part of the Soviets.

For weeks, Moscow has been toying with that issue—the nine helicopter prisoners—amusing itself with a cryptic game of tease, so far as we are concerned, cooperating with the East German Government—if such it could be called—in a pitch to win de facto recognition for that government, as the cost of freedom for the prisoners.

It's an old Russian trick, and it seems to amuse the Kremlin leaders to needle Western powers in such situations, like a cat toying with a mouse.

But came this break in the Middle East, the Moscow bosses decided the picture was too serious to be taking time out to play, and that this might have been one of the things that had been played too far, and had triggered action on the part of the United States and Britain—and decided to forget it and turn the men back. Those who know the Russian ways say unquestionably they intended to do so all along, sooner or later, but were enjoying the pantomime as long as it seemed harmless.

That coupled with a generally bewildered reaction from Moscow so far as diplomatic moves are concerned, suggest that the Soviet leaders never expected the move-in that suddenly took place, and are floundering around trying to figure out what to do about it.

The one thing they have come up with—the demand for an immediate summit conference to discuss the crisis in the Middle East—is not doing very well, thus far. They wanted the conference to begin tomorrow morning, and the White House announced late this afternoon that the President will not even have an answer for the note until tomorrow at the earliest, and perhaps not then.

A tentative draft of it was turned over to the British and the French for study today, but nobody seems to be very thyroidal about getting it decided and delivered and the general picture is that we are letting Mr. Khrushchev cool his heels in the outer office while we take our time.

This is a beautiful picture for study, incidentally, because it is a very dramatic setting of the international chess board.

Mr. Khrushchev, alcoholic that he is, has baited and badgered and ridiculed and challenged like the bully from the gashouse gang, and the longer the decent law-abiding citizens of the neighborhood put up with it, the more he began to believe his own propaganda about how strong and tough he is, and how big his gang is.

But finally, out of a clear sky when he is just in the middle of one of his housebreakings, the lights go on and he is surrounded by the cops—it all catches up with him at once, and when he begins to take stock of his real situation, he begins to realize that that huge gang of his consists of victims he and his top pals have bullied into submission, and then comes the showdown, they not only will not come to his rescue and support; they would like nothing better than to see him clobbered and thrashed within an inch of his life. It was all a lot of fun, the boasting and the bragging and the stealing and the waylaying of smaller boys, as long as he was enjoying the immunity that was extended to him because of the code of the society on which he was preying. They believe in orderly procedures of accepted law and human behavior, and they declined therefore, to resort to the methods that he was using against them.

But now, all that's over. The camel's back is broken, and they're on the same level with him, and the situation is bad, bad, bad. And that is the picture that Mr. Khrushchev finds in the magic mirror of the Kremlin tonight, make no mistake about it.

Put yourself in his shoes. His only reliable allies are two: Mr. Nasser down in Cairo, who hasn't got a thing when it comes to force; as weak as a newborn kitten, and wouldn't last 36 hours, if the British and Americans—even leaving out the Israelis—were to turn on him. And military experts agree that the Israelis could do it by themselves, and would like nothing better, and it wouldn't take them more than 36 hours. That's ally No. 1.

Ally No. 2 is Communist China, with two sabre-toothed tigers just waiting for the opportunity to pounce, from Formosa on the one side and from South Korean on the other. And while Mao Tse Tung has lots of men, and men who hold life very cheaply, they aren't any good in modern warfare, unless they have the materials with which to fight, and if Mr. Khrushchev is threatened from other quarters, he cannot afford to be sending any considerable quantity of his war materials to Mao Tse Tung.

And all this while, on his southwest front, is a snarling, murderous pack of caged wolves, who for 13 bitter years have been suppressed under his dictatorship and who have demonstrated their determination to be free of him, even when they had nothing to fight with. What happens when they are unleased, and supplied with arms and air support and all that goes with it?

They almost succeeded in Hungary, as Mr. Khrushchev well remembers, and likewise in Poland, and we, the stupid Western world, following the milktoast counsels of the diplomats sold them short on those former occasions and gave them not the first iota of help.

That would not be so this next time. Come another outbreak, we would give them supplies and guns and tanks and the protection of our combined air forces, and this would be bad in the extreme.

Mr. Khrushchev just cannot spread it that thin. He is extended, and, through half the distance of his lines, he is operating through enemy country which hates him and everything he stands for, and that is tough operating.

Oh, it has been all very easy to put up this great front about the family of the proletariat nations and the glorious people's republics of East Germany and Poland and Bulgaria and Rumania and Czechoslovakia and the rest. While the tanks were in the background and his Russian soldiers were standing around the periphery of the crowds, he could make those statements and nobody would challenge them, because nobody dared. It was suicide to do so.

But Mr. Khrushchev and his predecessor, Mr. Stalin, weren't fooling anybody with that line—unless it was themselves. Feeding it to the Russians is one thing. They have never known anything but dictatorship and degradation, and they are in their homelands, at least, and the Russian troops that are everywhere present are their troops.

That is not so in Poland and Hungary and the rest of these subjugated countries. In the first place, they are a people who have a culture of their own, in each case; they are a people who have known freedom and are willing to fight for it again when the opportunity arises. They are being occupied by a foreign conqueror, and the talk about the people's republics is so much hogwash. Gomulka? Kadar? Gottwald? These are self-serving pigs, the puppets of a hated foreign government, as much hated and despised as were the huns of old.

This is what Mr. Khrushchev sees in the mirror tonight, and it is an ominous picture, indeed. He dares not move, this way or that, for fear the slightest misstep will trigger his destruction.

He turns now to the United Nations—the very United Nations he has violated and defied and kicked in the teeth and helped to render impotent—and hopes that somehow there will be some solution in that direction.

He wants a summit conference—which he will not get, not on his terms. He wants to discuss the Middle East. There will be no summit conference, I am able to inform you at this moment, unless everything is discussed, as part of the whole evil picture—and it will be held, even then, only as a very last resort.

Unhappy man—and let the world gloat over that fact. He has had it coming a long time.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Nation has, I think, only one reasonably large daily newspaper which is a personal, crusading newspaper, and it is the Capital Times of my own home city of Madison, Wis. In the great tradition of American journalism, it is a militant campaigner for liberal democracy in every sense of the word. There has recently been published a typical liberal editorial, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, entitled, "If Federal Aid is O. K. for Business, Why not Business?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF FEDERAL AID IS O. K. FOR BUSINESS, WHY NOT EDUCATION?

The Wisconsin Statee Chamber of Commerce continues to drone away on the dreary theme that Federal aid to education will mean Federal control of education.

Actually, as Philleo Nash, candidate for the Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor, recently reminded us "Federal aid to education is older than the Constitution of the United States."

Nash pointed out that 2 years before the adoption of the Constitution the Continental Congress, at the instigation of Thomas Jefferson, wrote an ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory providing for free public education and setting aside from the public domain sufficient land to provide free schools.

Federal aid is an old and honorable principle, which has been continued in various forms through the years. Many of our colleges have made permanent improvements

from the funds received under the GI bill of rights.

It has always seemed strange to us, as it must to many overburdened property taxpayers who are shouldering the increasing costs of education, that such groups as the chamber of commerce continue to discriminate against education and agriculture. They have no compunctions about accepting Federal aid to highways. Indeed, they are among the most passionate lobbyists for more Federal highway funds.

Is the cement that goes into a highway any more tainted than that which goes into a school?

Nor do we hear them object to Federal aid to the shipping lines, the airlines, the newspapers and all the other private businesses that are subsidized with Federal money. Why aren't they concerned about Federal control of these recipients of Federal aid?

Why is it that only Federal aid to education and Federal aid to agriculture alarm these business groups?

Centennial of the Conflict of 1861–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the approach of the centennial of the War Between the States quickens interest in the type of observance which is planned. An editorial published in one of the great newspapers of the South and Southwest very ably discusses the trend of the planning to this date. There is great interest in my home State of Texas in the type of observance to be held in the years of the commemoration of the event.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nation Will Conduct Centennial Observance of 1861–65 Conflict," published in the Houston Post of July 28, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION WILL CONDUCT CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF 1861–65 CONFLICT

America is preparing to conduct its most lavish historical observance. The years 1961–65 will mark the 100th anniversary of the great Civil War by which this country was torn asunder and then welded back together more strongly than ever before.

The national observance will be headed by a distinguished American, Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, grandson of the man who took Richmond. And it is worthy of note that when it came time to select the chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission, an agency created by Congress, a Virginian nominated General Grant and there was unanimous approval, both North and South.

General Grant has called on all States, regardless of their status during those fateful years, to form State commissions to cooperate in the planning and coordination of the forthcoming centennial observance. General Grant said the objective of the commission is to make it the greatest pageant in our history. He added that the participation of all States, whether at the time they were States, Territories, or embraced in the borders of another State, is wanted.

On most of the major battlefields of the Civil War, such as Gettysburg in Pennsylvania and Vicksburg in Mississippi, there are markers and monuments erected by the people of both North and South in honor of their sons who fought there. The Lincoln Memorial in Washington, probably our most beautiful national monument, is encircled by the names of all of the States. In short, the war is over and very few scars remain. The war's centennial observance is something in which all States can take part with pride.

A major objective of the observance is the collection and safe storage of letters, diaries, journals, and other documents of historic value concerning the war. People will be asked to go through old trunks and storage closets to search for such material.

Texas, a member State of the Confederacy, contributed much to the South's cause. On the battlefield of Gettysburg, for instance, there are markers which tell the story of the heroism of Hood's Texas Brigade. Visitors to Gettysburg find it difficult to understand how they had the courage to race down a steep hill to the bottom of a ravine and up on the other side, constantly under Yankee fire, to drive the Union force out of a natural fort, called, appropriately enough, Devil's Dam. But they did.

Texans fought valiantly in other battles and the war came to the State in the battles of Galveston and Sabine Pass. Indeed, there is abundant reason for Texas participation in the observance.

American Foreign Policy in the African Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Governor of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, traveled into parts of Africa, particularly Liberia and Ghana. He has conveyed some of his impressions to the Secretary of State, a copy of which letter he has shared with me.

He also has prepared a statement on United States policy in Africa which was issued upon his return.

I ask unanimous consent that these two documents be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. They represent an important contribution to the development of American foreign policy in the African area.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 5, 1958.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Permit me to express my appreciation for the many courtesies extended to me by yourself and by the members of your department at home and abroad in connection with my recent trip to Liberia and Ghana. In everything and on every occasion, the department served me and my purposes well.

Specifically, let me say that in Liberia I met Richard Jones and his wife. He is a most genial person and is working hard to fulfill his duties. While I had a very full schedule prepared by the Liberians, Mr. Jones had a reception for me and performed other incidental services for me. He also met me and saw me off and paid other kind attentions and courtesies which I much appreciated.

In Ghana I was met by Ambassador Flake, who impressed me very favorably as an experienced career official who was doing an effective job. He was particularly ably assisted by Peter Rutter, who with his wife not only performed services for us beyond the call of duty, but who, I had the feeling, had a good grasp of African affairs. The Ambassador in his summing up for me made some very interesting points, some of which I found difficult to believe, but which on independent review I found to be absolutely correct. In connection with esome passport and travel, the Embassy moved mountains and I commend them most highly on their efficacy.

Mr. Secretary, I do not pretend to be a foreign affairs expert, certainly not an expert on Africa, but as you may know, I have an interest in the field and have studied and traveled somewhat.

My own official business in the oncoming campaign make it impossible for me to spend much time in putting together the kind of report I would like to prepare for you. Therefore, not to wait until the time when I could do it properly, I would like to substitute as an addendum hereto a press release I issued on my return to the United States.

In addition to this I would like to say that I did hear several businessmen and government officials say that the Soviet operations are perhaps more vigorous than my press release indicated. This leaves me to believe that action on our part is imperative at this time.

It was impossible for me to accurately gage the importance or prestige of the Pan African racist extremists. However, I strongly suspect there is more of this than some of our good friends let on. The very convincing and esudite Ghana Minister of Education, Mr. C. T. Nylander, made an independence day speech which showed influences, which may have been only political license or which may have had deeper significance. While it sounds strange for me to say this to you, in describing the push for African independence, he stated that the African lamb was fiercer than its opposition and that the African elephant never forgets. There were other occasions when this kind of language came out. Again, I can't say that I could give you a sound judgment in this area except to say that I think much and careful consideration should be given to this kind of thing.

Finally, it seems to me that real thought should be given, if it is not being given, to the idea of where America should stand with respect to Pan Africanism. It may well be to our interest to prevent the volcanization of Africa, where the Soviet Union might sow confusion and discord.

Again, Mr. Secretary, I wish to thank you for your many kindnesses and apologize for the incomplete kind of report this is, but I trust you will understand the circumstances.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

STATEMENT ON UNITED STATES POLICY IN AFRICA, BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, OF MICHIGAN

Governor Williams, arriving at Idlewild Airport, N. Y., made the following statement based on a 10-day trip to Liberia and Ghana, independent countries of Africa. Primary purpose of the governor's trip was to attend ceremonies marking the 111th anniversary of Liberian independence, at which he was guest of honor.

Governor Williams said he found both countries very friendly to the United States and making democratic progress.

"But," he continued, "you don't have to be an African expert, which I am not, to see that things are getting ready to pop in Africa and that the United States has neither a workable comprehensive all-African policy nor a particularly effective policy for Liberia and Ghana.

"The proposed action for Ghana resulting from Nkrumah's visit is a step in the right direction, but this is only a very feeble beginning. Now is the time to act, when the iron is hot and malleable and before it either melts and spills over who knows where or becomes cold and rigid. Now is the time to act, when our friendly relations are at their best, and when our action will be most helpful and appreciated.

"With regard to Liberia, it is to the self-interest of the United States to vigorously support and help develop this friendly country. Africa is more than restless with the desire for self-rule. But this legitimate ambition can be distorted into ugly results by overexuberance, or by rampant Nasserism and/or latent Communist subversion. President Tubman, of Liberia, in this maelstrom has consistently supported the free West, and as senior statesman of the independent African states, particularly those south of the Sahara, he has provided progressive and sensible leadership in the direction of free self-determination and world cooperation.

"Furthermore, whether the United States likes it or not, it is a fact that Liberia is regarded as a showcase of American democracy in Africa, and we're not showing at our best. The Communists are pointing to the lag in Liberia with its close association with the United States in comparison with some of its neighbors who were or are European colonies in an effort to discredit both the United States and our free way of life. This certainly is an added reason why the United States should support the development and growth of Liberia."

By way of explaining the last statement, the Governor pointed out that all Africa knows that the United States sent our freed slaves to Liberia, beginning in 1820, encouraged her independence in 1847, kept other nations from exploiting her, used her as a staging base for American planes in World War II, and now has important business interests there. Liberia adopted a constitution and system of government based on our own, and is generally regarded as following the American line.

While colonial powers were developing Africa for their own profit and collaterally providing some education and economic advantages for a number of African people, the United States more or less left Liberia to shift for itself. Without capital and other resources, the Liberians skillfully maintained and developed their liberties, but were unable until comparatively recently to exploit their economic resources or to bring education to the native peoples. The result of this was that in some ways Liberia lags behind the economic and educational development of some of her neighbors.

The Governor then continued: "Liberia with some support from the United States Government and with the help of American business enterprise is hard at work trying to pull itself up by its own bootstraps. It has made commendable strides in establishing a system of education not only for its civilized population but also for the indigenous people, some of whom are almost ready to live in a modern society but some are not. Liberia has built some roads, experimented with improved agriculture, encouraged business enterprise, and has built up a cultured and intelligent leadership that is able but too few.

"Incidentally, there are many attractive opportunities for American businessmen in Liberia. Liberia welcomes free enterprise, pursues an open-door policy, gives new business tax concessions, and permits the free export of profits from the country. The country is rapidly developing not only its tree crops but such minerals as iron, gold, and diamonds.

"President Tubman has said time and again that Liberia seeks no gifts, and Liberia has sought to pay its loans. Liberia urgently needs loans for internal development such as roads, power, and communications. Presently, the United States has a $23 million loan under consideration. I recommend that it be authorized in full.

"Liberia also needs technical assistance. The United States is doing some good work in this area but it requires considerable expansion. For example, the Booker T. Washington Institute is doing a magnificent job in practical vocational education. But there should be three such institutions at least.

"In some places American assistance is not appreciated. That certainly will not be the case in Liberia. Liberia regards the United States, some will be surprised to know, as her mother country. President Tubman has unabashedly taken our side time and again in international matters. It is important that this be generously recognized, because it has been suggested to him that Liberia would do better by sitting on the fence between the East and West. It certainly would not be in the best interests of the United States to create the illusion that we are more concerned with buying the allegiance of waverers than in helping our friends and allies."

The Cherry Growers' Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an editorial from the Oregonian of August 13, 1958, has taken a stand in favor of the position which I assumed in the Senate in opposition to the so-called cherry growers' amendment, that would have weakened the Trade Agreements Act.

The editorial, entitled "Victory for Broad View," shares my belief that the Senate-House conferees acted wisely in dropping this amendment, which was neither necessary for the welfare of the cherry growers nor beneficial to a successful trade program with our allies overseas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Oregonian of Portland be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR BROAD VIEW

The reciprocal trade bill, which was passed by the Senate Monday and which now goes to the President for his signature, does not contain the so-called cherry growers' amendment which Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, put into the Senate bill as originally passed. The amendment was dropped from the final bill last week by the Senate-House conferees.

Deletion of the amendment was a victory both for the Eisenhower Administration and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon. Senator NEUBERGER not only opposed his fellow Democratic Senator from this State, but all other Pacific Northwest Senators, in his stand against the amendment. He expressed the view that he could not, in good conscience, oppose similar demands to weaken the act from other States if he succumbed to local pressure from his own State.

The amendment was designed to include cherry growers among those who may appeal to the Tariff Commission against imports of glace and candied cherries. But the amendment had to be wider than that. So the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products which may appeal to the Commission was redefined to include any group of producers of raw or processed agricultural or horticultural products from which any import-affected products or articles are produced.

A memorandum from the Department of Commerce said the amendment would substantially widen the area of domestic operations which might be considered threatened with serious injury by any imported article. Cotton growers could claim injury if imports of men's shirts increased, or, to take an extreme case, cattle raisers might claim to be affected by imports of gloves.

Commerce Department spokesmen also pointed out that growers' cooperatives produce a large part of the United States output of brined cherries and thus they already are entitled to bring action under the escape clause in regard to imports of such cherries. To the extent that cooperatives produce glace cherries, the growers also have the right of appeal on imports of that nature.

Therefore, there was no need for the amendment in order to give Pacific Northwest cherry growers standing as applicants for escape action. On the other hand, adoption of the amendment would have opened a wide area for action to weaken the vital reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and other countries. In standing with the administration against the amendment, Senator NEUBERGER took the broad view of foreign trade which is essential to its success.

Haven't They Heard of Hoffa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this afternoon's Washington Daily News.

I agree completely that the revelations of the McClellan committee over the past months, and particularly within recent weeks, are more than sufficient argument for affirmative action by the House on the labor reform bill passed by this body recently. That bill, I understand, will come up for a vote in the other body next Monday and I know that the Members of the House will have in the forefront of their minds the effect which enactment of this bill will have on a cleanup of labor rackets.

If this law were on the books today, it would be impossible for the Hoffa-dominated teamsters union to have criminals as officers. It would be impossible for the funds of the union to be drawn off for the personal profit of a few officers without the knowledge of the union members.

These and many other aberrations in a few unions would be cleared up promptly by enactment of S. 3974 by the Congress this year, and I can see no reasonable justification for not supporting this measure under present circumstances.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVEN'T THEY HEARD OF HOFFA?

Congress has been acting like it never heard of Jimmy Hoffa—even though the Senate's McClellan committee for 18 months has been spreading on the record a massive volume of evidence showing Hoffa is a consort of criminals.

All the other evidence poured into the McClellan committee records—misuse of Teamster Union funds, sellouts to employers, hooliganism—has failed to arouse indignation in Congress.

Only now, at the tag end of the session, have House leaders been able to bring up the Kennedy-Ives bill, a gingerly approach toward a law to curb the likes of Hoffa. An effort will be made Monday to get this measure a House vote. But a stronger bill, although backed by the Eisenhower administration, has no chance at all.

Even a bill to clean up union pension and welfare funds—which ought to be sacred in anybody's book—has been diluted to the point of futility.

You would think laws to combat the abuses, arrogance, and outright thievery of union-raiding racketeers would be the easiest thing in the world to get through Congress—out of pure decency if no other reason. The laws which have been proposed, however feebly written, are aimed at protecting the rights and dues of the workers who made up the unions.

When Hoffa was hauled up before the McClellan committee last year he promised to do something about the hoodlums in the Teamster Union. When he was hauled back the other day he testified he had asked all the boys and they all said they were pure. So:

"What more could I do?"

That one line ought to be enough to goad every Member of Congress into a furious effort to get the stiffest kind of law to protect the victims of these racketeers posing as union leaders. What are they afraid of?

Impartial and Nonpunitive Legislation Is Always in the Best National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to sit in this, and other legislative assemblies, long enough to know that there will never be any such thing as a perfect bill composed by human minds, without divine assistance. May I further say that within my experience I have never seen a measure of purely punitive intent accomplish any real or lasting good.

In the enactment of legislation under our democratic processes we have come to expect the efforts of special groups to interject their passions, prejudices and particular interests. As conscientious legislators it is our duty to closely examine these pressures and concentrate our attention upon the enactment of a reasonable compromise designed primarily to inspire observance of the law with good will because of its essentially impartial nature.

In this respect there is pending before us a so-called labor-management reform bill which was approved in the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 88 to 1. No one with good sense claims that this measure is perfect but, even according to a great many members of the Industrial Relations Research Association, it unquestionably, if adopted, would contribute to union reform and sound industrial relations. However many contentious provisions the measure may be said to contain, it undoubtedly occupies a middle and compromise ground between the extreme demands of employer and union groups. Its enactment would tend to restrain a great many of the worst abuses plaguing some of the country's largest unions and it would provide more control by union members over the affairs of their organizations. Certainly it would discourage the unbridled ambitions of those few unscrupulous individuals whose main objective appears to be personal use of big union trust funds for their own interest.

There are also provisions in this bill placing additional restrictions upon unwarranted management practices; provisions designed to prevent scheming employers from entering into collusive arrangement with any tempted union official for the purpose of perverting real collective bargaining.

The revelations of the McClellan committee have demonstrated the need for reasonable legislation to encourage labor-management, internal activity reform. The general public expects a responsive impartial reaction of the Congress to that need. The great majority of labor unions have taken the first and biggest step in the best method of correction, from within, by their adoption of strict ethical codes of practice. With a temperate measure of impartial and reasonable, which is always the wisest, legislative encouragement we can entertain good hope for increasing good will and cooperation between labor and management for the national benefit. In pursuit of that wholesome objective, I most earnestly hope that this labor-management reform bill will be presented to the House before adjournment, so that it may be discussed, debated, and acted upon in accord with our democratic legislative traditions.

George Todt's Opinion on Senator William F. Knowland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles entitled, "George Todt's Opinion," published by the Valley Times of North Hollywood, Calif., on various dates.

These are particularly good articles and very complimentary to our distinguished minority leader, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—KNOWLAND'S SOUND PHILOSOPHIES

("Ideas must work through the brains and the arms of good and brave men, or they are no better than dreams"—EMERSON.)

It is always hard to write a column when Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND speaks to the American people nowadays. For the simple reason that he says so many good things that one must be perplexed as to what to emphasize and what to leave out. The trouble is that it is all so solid and worthwhile. Certainly his hard-hitting and dynamic address at the Hollywood Palladium last Monday night, when he was the principal speaker for the United Republican Finance Committee dinner, was no exception. Here are some highlights:

"We must, as a nation and a political party, build on principles rather than personalities. Individuals come and go, but fundamental principles endure. What are some of these basic principles our party should stand for? I suggest the following:

"1. Constitutional government with the division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and the reservation of all power not granted to the Federal Government, under the Constitution, to the States and to the people. The longer I have been in politics, the stronger I have leaned as an advocate of States rights.

"2. Maintenance of our free enterprise system under which we have grown from a small colony of 3 million people to a great world power of 170 million with the most productive economic system the world has ever known.

"3. Protection by the Federal Government and the States of the people from the concentrated and arbitrary use of power by business or labor organizations against individuals and small-business enterprises. The right to earn a living is a civil right of the first magnitude.

"4. Maintenance of a sound and growing economy based on free enterprise and full employment. No business or labor organization should have the power to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans, and by so doing endanger freemen everywhere.

"5. Support a sound fiscal structure for our Federal, State, and local governments. This requires all of them to live within their means and to stop trespassing on the tax resources of the others. Without a sound dollar and a solvent government our whole structure of local, State, and national governments, of public and private educational facilities, of wage earners, of public social security and private pensions and retirement systems will be jeopardized. Without a sound dollar every employee, every housewife, and our people living on retirement income or social security payments will be penalized. Inflation and debt repudiation is another form of confiscatory taxation in the Marxist Socialist pattern.

"It is time for us to rededicate ourselves to a renewed faith in our free way of life."

Those who may glorify the social welfare state philosophy of government might feel that Senator KNOWLAND is desirous of taking us back to 1890 with his principles thus enunciated. The rest of us who prefer commonsense instead of the more lofty reaches of the stratosphere will welcome his timely suggestions for the future—and this includes both the sensible segment of the Republican

Party as well as their counterparts who are to be found among moderate Democrats.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—KNOWLAND'S LABOR BILL OF RIGHTS

("If principle is good for anything, it is worth living up to."—Benjamin Franklin.)

It now becomes increasingly clear that what Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the Republican party's man of principle, is actually doing with reference to organized labor is simply this: he is ignoring the haughty, entrenched union bosses and going over their heads to the rank and file union membership with what might well be called a labor Bill of Rights.

He will not be applauded by the Hoffas, Becks, Reuthers, Dios, and other dictatorial bosses of that ilk—on National, State or local levels. But he will become increasingly the champion of Union Joe Doakes as he learns what the Senator is talking about. What Mr. KNOWLAND is seeking to end, no less, is the brutal victimization of Union Joe by certain labor tyrants who have ridden roughshod over him in the past.

I listened to the Senator in his tremendous address before the California Republican assembly in Long Beach last Saturday—and he dealt in specifics. He was never more serious or in greater earnestness than when he demanded seven items in behalf of dues-paying members:

1. The right of the membership to select their officers by secret ballot.

2. The right to recall incompetent or dishonest officials by secret ballot.

3. The right to vote by secret ballot on the question of taking the membership out on strikes.

4. The right of the membership to be protected in the administration of their welfare funds in the same manner as are insurance policyholders or bank depositors.

5. The right of union members to have their dues and initiation fees handled with integrity and strict accountability.

6. The right of the union membership to correct arbitrary and unlawful action of union officials.

7. The right of union members to be protected from reprisals and job discrimination in cases where they challenge union leadership.

Here, then, is the labor bill of rights which Senator KNOWLAND has proposed for Union Joe Doakes.

More items may be added later at the suggestion of union members themselves.

Who can say that anything Mr. KNOWLAND has proposed is against the best interests of organized labor? Labor, it says here—not the selfish overlords of the rank and file of union membership whose personal greed sometimes seems to beggar description.

The greatest wonder of all this—from the moral point of view—is why it hasn't been enacted in terms of appropriate legislation before.

Are labor-union members second-class citizens?

Aren't they entitled to the same protection as other investors in tangible and intangible matters of monetary consideration and value?

Who has the effrontery to negate the basic and fundamental rights any American citizen may be expected to possess—whether that organization be a labor union or any other relationship based on trust?

Senator KNOWLAND with his customary integrity and forthrightness is not only asking such needed questions in behalf of the American people—but he is also proposing a positive remedy.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

("See! There is Jackson standing like a stone wall."—Bernard Bee—Battle of Manassas.)

It must seem well-nigh incredible to any thoughtful American that practically all unions in the State of California have either raised their dues substantially or levied special assessments or right-to-work funds from their members in order to battle against a man who has stood up to be counted for working men and women today as has Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Let me tell you what they are fighting against—the reason why they are taking the workers' money to do battle with the champion of Joe Doakes. The authoritarian labor bosses, entrenched in wealth and spoils obtained through compulsion in all too many cases, hate the libertarian labor stand of BILL KNOWLAND. They are forcing their wards to contribute money to destroy his his stand. What is it?

Here is Senator KNOWLAND'S labor policy in full. This is what union men and women are being compelled to contribute money for—the defeat of the very stand which they want and desire themselves.

"I stand for free and democratic unions," state Senator KNOWLAND. "I believe in and unqualifiedly support the right of every American worker to join a union. Any attempt to restrict the opportunity of an employee to participate voluntarily in a union, or to prevent a duly elected union organization from representing such employees in collective bargaining, will be vigorously opposed by me.

"I believe in the right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union, and if the union does not act in their best interests I believe in the right to withdraw from the union without losing employment.

"I have introduced legislation in the Senate, and support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and activities of their respective unions. This legislation does the following:

"1. Guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot.

"2. Provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

"3. Prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members.

"4. Protects union members' welfare and pension programs.

"5. Requires that where unions are permitted, under law, to represent all employees in an industry or plant, all employees must be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership.

"6. Provides that union members shall have a voice in the conditions, terms, and duration of a strike.

"7. Prevents arbitrary control over local unions of trustees appointed by national or international unions.

"8. Provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, assessments or arbitrary actions.

"I believe that unions, in order to grow, prosper, and function effectively, must induce employees to become members of their organizations voluntarily and not by compulsion.

"No permanent progress has been achieved in our society, or in any other civilized nation, where people are compelled to belong to particular organizations in order to exist. The strength and contribution of our churches, parent-teacher associations, and fraternal, charitable and civic organizations has been due to the free and willing participation of our citizens.

"I believe in the right of an individual to decide, without coercion, his intention to become a member of a union. I also believe that if an individual decides not to support a responsible union which is working for his benefit, that union would continue to advance without his membership.

"In voluntary organizations, there will always be some individuals who will not participate in the activities of institutions working in their behalf. But that is the price we must willingly pay for liberty. Its alternative is compulsion without cooperation.

I therefore support the initiative proposal which will permit the people of California to vote on voluntary versus compulsory unionism.

"I believe it is necessary to raise the issue of undemocratic and compulsory unionism at this time in our Nation's history. This is not a partisan issue.

"If we are to continue to make progress through our free enterprise system, with its benefits flowing to all, responsible management and responsible unions are necessary to achieve this objective. We are all, in a real sense, each one our brother's keeper.

"I have great faith in the ability of the citizens of California to independently see the difference between truth and falsehood. I am convinced that the recommendations and policies that I propose will be supported by the members of organized unions when they are fully and fairly informed.

"Freedom and democracy must prevail in organized labor, for responsible union organizations operate in the best interests of our society."

AFL–CIO Opposition to Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Miss Alma Lutz, which was published in the July 13, 1958, issue of the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITS AFL–CIO OPPOSITION TO EQUAL RIGHTS

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Who sets the standard for American women? National women's organizations, such as the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Federation of Soroptomist Clubs, the National Woman's Party, and so on, or the AFL–CIO?

The equal-rights amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 80, now on the Senate Calendar, reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The AFL–CIO would annul it by means of the so-called Hayden rider which would provide that the amendment should not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred upon persons of the female sex."

The equal-rights amendment would give women what men long have enjoyed, equal protection of the laws under the Federal Constitution. Why a progressive organization, such as the AFL–CIO should wish to withhold this basic American heritage from women is hard to understand unless they fear the equal competition of women, as more and more automatic machinery displaces workers, and wish to continue and increase the handicap of special labor legislation for women.

In other words, is opposition to the equal rights amendment and insistence on the

Hayden rider a seemingly altruistic means of shutting off the competition of women?

Obviously women, shackled by protective and health legislation based on sex, which would be upheld and encouraged by a Hayden rider, would find their employment opportunities hampered especially in the better-paid jobs.

Men have always feared the competition of women and in the early days of labor organization refused to admit them to their unions. Only as a last resort did they encourage separate women's unions. Today women are a minority in the AFL–CIO.

The arguments used by the AFL–CIO against the equal rights amendment do not hold up when analyzed. The protective labor legislation for women which they fear it will endanger is out of date, for it was adopted when women were inexperienced in business and industry and were exploited as a source of cheap labor. Women, today, are essential to our economic system, and it is time the AFL–CIO retooled their thinking.

Whatever protective labor legislation is necessary can under the equal rights amendment be extended to men. This has already been the trend in minimum-wage legislation. It should be the trend in safety regulations, hour legislation, and healthful working conditions. Legislation for certain groups, such as mothers, veterans, minors, the blind, and so on, will be possible under the equal rights amendment. Since insurance statistics show that women outlive men and resist disease more readily, we must begin to think in terms of protecting men.

The AFL–CIO protests the equalization of the retirement age under social security benefits which the equal rights amendment would bring. A differential in the retirement age of men and women is mistaken chivalry which may make a few happy, but definitely depreciates the value of women employees and tends to keep them in the low-wage class.

This is the time for women to let their Senators know that they expect them to vote for the equal rights amendment, Senate joint resolution 80, and against the Hayden rider or any other qualifying rider.

ALMA LUTZ.

BOSTON.

Tribute to Robert D. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to pay tribute to Mr. Robert Murphy, Deputy Undersecretary of State and the No. 1 United States troubleshooter, for the splendid work he has done in the Middle East. The Nation, I believe, again owes him a debt of gratitude.

We in Wisconsin are particularly proud of the record of Bob Murphy, an outstanding Badger, of which Wisconsin has contributed many, to serve our country in war and peace.

The Middle East crisis, of course, was no new experience to him. In recent years he has served with distinction in many critical situations, including: The North African campaign in 1942; securing Japanese cooperation during the Korean conflict; conciliating Tito's dispute with Italy over Trieste in 1954; working for solution of the Suez crisis in 1956.

Now, as a master diplomat, Bob Murphy has earned another plaudit of "job well done."

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal and the Washington Daily News carried some fine articles recognizing the merits of the work done by this top-ranking troubleshooter. I request unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

BOB MURPHY: ONE-MAN TASK FORCE—CAREER AMBASSADOR FROM MILWAUKEE IS TOP TROUBLESHOOTER, WHOSE WORK IN LEBANON IS BUT ONE OF MANY DELICATE AND DANGEROUS ASSIGNMENTS HE HAS HANDLED

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—"The Lawrence of North Africa," as Robert Daniel Murphy was called when he was paving the way for the Allied invasion of enemy-held Algeria in 1942, is up to his old tricks again. The big, genial Irishman from Milwaukee is right in the thick of behind the scenes negotiation and camel trading designed to calm the Middle East trouble spots. Last week he was flying about from Lebanon to Jordan to Israel, one jump ahead of new political and diplomatic developments.

His cloak and dagger work as the State Department's No. 1 trouble shooter has won Murphy a number of other titles—not all complimentary. He has been called a "diplomatic Kilroy" because his face always shows up wherever American interests are at stake.

Last week Pravda, the Communist party organ, called him "Mr. Morpheus," who, "with the help of American guns, was trying to put the Lebanese to sleep through his false, 'pacifying' activity."

MOSCOW RADIO CALLS HIM FASCIST

Pravda said a "comedy" was being staged by Murphy for the election of a new president, and Soviet Premier Khrushchev accused him of interfering in the domestic affairs of Lebanon. Moscow radio beamed at Latin America screamed about Murphy's "fascist" background.

A Moscow broadcast in Arabic called Murphy the "hero of a bribery case" in which, said the broadcast, 17 million dollars was given to "leading Japanese statesmen in order to safeguard a pro-American majority in the Japanese parliament."

In the Middle East now, as in north Africa during the war, Murphy was working under personal instructions from a President of the United States. He has had to endure criticism not only from the enemy but from persons in his own Government who did not understand exactly what he was doing.

While Murphy, as the No. 3 man in the State Department, carries the title of Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, he is actually a sort of combination of secret agent, skilled technician, shrewd negotiator, and charming diplomat.

After 40 years in our Foreign Service, Murphy, now 63, knows his way around as no other American diplomat. He speaks French and German fluently and his knowledge of French is being put to good use in his current negotiations.

One of Murphy's associates described him as "the most successful American diplomat since Benjamin Franklin."

BRIEFED BY PRESIDENT

For his present assignment, that of calming things down in Lebanon, Murphy was summoned hastily to the White House while in the midst of testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That was the day after the marines had landed in Lebanon.

His entire career in the Foreign Service, of course, prepared him for such a delicate mission.

Dispatches relating to the Middle East as well as the rest of the world flow constantly over his desk at the State Department.

This was a mission, however, that required intensive briefing by State Secretary Dulles, CIA Director Allen Dulles, and experts on the Middle East desk at the Department. He has a quick mind and readily grasps the gist of a situation.

Within hours, Murphy, leaving his wife behind in Washington, was being flown in a Government plane to Westover Field in Massachusetts, where he boarded a jet tanker for the first nonstop jet flight ever made from the United States to Beirut. The tanker hustled him to the world's newest trouble spot in 11 hours.

The lanky, soft talking Murphy's greatest asset is his ability to deal with all kinds of people, and that's what he has been doing in Lebanon—with President Chamoun, General Chehab, rebel leaders and religious dignitaries. He has a fantastic memory and remembers people's names. His conferences start early and run late into the night. He likes people and his warm, infectious, outgoing personality makes people like him.

Murphy, who weighs a lean, hard 160 pounds and stands 6 feet 2, has an uncanny knack of adapting himself to any situation. In north Africa he accompanied French Gen. Maxime Weygand, with whom he was negotiating, to mass every morning, an easy chore for him since he comes from a devout Catholic family which used to live at 605 North 25th Street, Milwaukee.

HIS MISSION: GET MARINES OUT

Murphy is a devoted family man. He met his wife, the former Mildred Taylor of Kansas City, Mo., who was a Red Cross worker, when he was stationed in Switzerland. Their daughter, Mildred, covers New York State politics for the New York Times. Another daughter, Rosemary, an actress, is currently playing on Broadway in "Look Homeward, Angel."

If a situation calls for the kind of poker that is played with cards as well as the diplomatic kind, Murphy is also adept at that, and likes to play for high stakes. He is also a weekend golfer and does rather well at the sport at the Chevy Chase Club here.

In Lebanon Murphy spent much of his time talking to both government and rebel leaders, trying to get them to agree on General Chehab as a compromise candidate for president. With a suitable new president installed in office there may be no further need in Lebanon for our marines, so in a sense it is Murphy's mission to get them out of there.

The last time this ace troubleshooter was sent out of the country to try to put out a fire was in February, when he was ordered to represent the United States in exercising this Government's "good offices" in Tunis and Paris in seeking to settle the hot dispute between Tunisia and France.

The French Government fell, and the immediate reaction was that Murphy's good offices mission had failed. To use the language of the State Department, some of his suggestions were not implemented, but there is reason to believe his missionary work is now bearing fruit as French-Tunisian hostility subsides.

HELPED SETTLE TRIESTE

Murphy himself believes that the fact that France and Tunisia were able to reach agreement on the problem of French troops in Tunisia, largely in accordance with the proposals of the good offices mission, made it a rewarding project.

In July and August of 1956 Murphy met with officials of Great Britain and France in London to discuss matters relating to the Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal, and helped untangle the perilous situation that developed.

His troubleshooting has even extended to doing something about the demoralization of the State Department produced by the McCarthy era. In 1954 he was called back to Washington to serve as a member of the Secretary's Committee on Personnel and partly as the result of his work the Department's morale has improved greatly the last 4 years, to a point where promising young people are again seeking careers in the Foreign Service.

In 1954 Murphy successfully mediated Yugoslav President Tito's dispute with Italy over Trieste.

As Ambassador to Japan he moved quickly to insure full cooperation with the United Nations' military commanders and to obtain Japanese understanding of U. N. military requirements. He assisted in winding up the tortuous negotiations for a Korean armistice, making several trips to the battlefronts with Gen. Mark Clark to confer with President Syngman Rhee.

As political adviser to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Murphy went to London to plan the big invasion of the European Continent in World War II. It was the first time in American military history that a civilian had sat with the General Staff, privy to all its secrets, in planning a campaign.

HELPED ARRANGE BERLIN AIRLIFT

He stayed with Eisenhower's staff until the conquest of Europe was complete, then became political adviser to the United States occupation staff in Germany. Gen. Lucius Clay said his skilled negotiations with officials in the dozen governments contributed largely to the success of the Berlin airlift.

Murphy helped lay the foundation for the healthy growth of West Germany as a democratic nation and partner of the United States.

This was particularly gratifying to the man who had lived across the street from Hitler in Munich in the early 1920's, when Murphy was vice consul there. The Milwaukeean had been screamed at by the budding Nazi leader, who finally had him chased out of Germany. The trouble came to a head in 1925 when Mrs. Murphy talked back angrily to a Munich shopkeeper who had called her a stupid American, and the incident was blown up by the Nazis into an international dispute.

One of Murphy's bad guesses was about Hitler, he recalls with amusement. As vice consul, Murphy wrote a report in which he dismissed the future fuehrer as a fanatic who would never amount to much. Before sending in his report, however, the young diplomat consulted the papal nuncio in Munich, a young Italian named Pacelli. Pacelli agreed with Murphy's estimate of Hitler and sent a similar report to the Vatican.

More than 20 years later, accompanying Allied troops into Rome in 1944, Murphy sought out his old friend Pacelli, who had become Pope Pius XII. Murphy joshed him about papal infallibility as regarded Hitler, and the pontiff smilingly answered that he had not been Pope in Munich days.

Concerning Murphy's earlier work in north Africa, General Eisenhower wrote in Crusade in Europe that "unquestionably his missionary work had much to do with eventual success."

It was in north Africa that Murphy assembled a staff of 20 assistants which has been called the ablest group of intelligence agents ever assembled by Americans.

MACHINEGUN IN BACK

Among the more dramatic incidents in his north African cloak and dagger work was the meeting he arranged near Algiers between Gen. Mark Clark, who came ashore from a submarine in a rubber boat, and certain French officers friendly to the allied cause, some weeks before the American invasion.

Perhaps the closest call during this north African intrigue occurred in November 1942, at the villa of Admiral Darlan, Vichy French supreme commander in Algiers. Expecting the Americans to land almost immediately, Murphy and a handful of his undercover men had arrested Darlan and Gen. Alphonse Juin, commander of the French Army in Algeria. The American landing was delayed and 12 miles off course, however, and Murphy and his men were outnumbered and marched off with machineguns in their backs. Six hours later the Americans came, and Murphy's little army was liberated.

In 1949 Murphy was given one of the State Department's first distinguished service awards for acts of national or international significance.

Murphy 2 years ago was named a career ambassador, the highest career job in the Government, paying $20,000 a year, and on at least two occasions in recent years he has been Acting Secretary of State.

WORKED IN ROUNDHOUSE

Military men traditionally have been suspicious of diplomats—sometimes called "those cooky pushers in striped pants"—and have been inclined to shy away from them. But the generals and admirals have had no trouble getting along with the tough-minded Murphy. He came up the hard way. As a boy attending Gesu parochal school he sold Milwaukee Journals at North Third and West State Streets and he worked in the Milwaukee road roundhouse while going to the old Marquette Academy. Fists were used often in his neighborhood, and he was a boxer in his college days at Marquette.

In his present job Murphy is the liaison between the State Department and the Pentagon. He meets regularly with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he took part in the discussions that led to the decision to send marines to Lebanon.

[From the Washington Daily News]

BOB MURPHY

The Deputy Under Secretary of State, Robert Murphy, is home again, and he deserves all the plaudits that can be rung up from an appreciative nation.

He was President Eisenhower's special envoy to the Middle East in this great crisis. Maybe Bob Murphy's accomplishments can't be mapped with the exactitude of the *Nautilus'* spectacular feat, but certainly this able diplomat navigated an amazing course under the most challenging ice cap of the cold war.

The fact that the Middle East, with all the immense pressures and counterpressures, isn't at war today may be due in no small part to Mr. Murphy's skill and persuasiveness. In his own terse estimate, his mission turned out very satisfactory. Coming from the modest Mr. Murphy, it speaks a lot.

The Bizarre Conduct of Justice Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Saturday, August 2, 1958, entitled "The Bizarre Conduct of Justice Douglas."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIZARRE CONDUCT OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

The strange immunity to prosecution enjoyed for many years by Frank Costello, the New York gambler, and his recent efforts to avoid serving a prison sentence for income tax evasion were reviewed in a Senate speech by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware. The Senator rebuked Supreme Court Justice William Douglas for granting a stay of sentence to Costello after the full Court had refused to grant a review of his conviction, and remarked:

"I think the courts of our country should stop pussy-footing around with this racketeer and remember that 170 million law-abiding Americans have some rights as well as do these gangsters."

Senator WILLIAMS' indignation will be shared by many of his fellow citizens who recall previous bizarre behavior by Mr. Justice Douglas. In 1953 Douglas issued a last minute stay of execution to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the atomic spies. The full Court was called into special session and the Douglas order was set aside, after which the Rosenbergs were put to death.

Representative WHEELER, Democrat of Georgia, soon afterward introduced a resolution calling for impeachment of Justice Douglas, charging that he was unfit to dispense justice.

Traitors like the Rosenbergs and racketeers like Costello are entitled to, and have received, the protections which the Constitution provides for all persons. There is no reason for a Supreme Court Justice to go to bat for such people after their cases have been thoroughly reviewed. It is ridiculous to give Costello the benefit of the doubt after the trial court and two appellate courts found against him. Surely after all that study of his case, he is no longer entitled to the presumption of innocence.

Death of Representative William E. McVey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent editorials with reference to the late Representative William E. McVey. The first is entitled "William E. McVey" and was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 13, 1958; the second is entitled "Representative W. E. McVey," and was published in the Chicago Daily News for August 12, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 13, 1958]

WILLIAM E. MCVEY

The death of Representative WILLIAM E. MCVEY is as great a loss to honest Republicanism as it is to his constituents. Mr. MCVEY represented the 4th District of Illinois, comprising part of Chicago and its

southern suburbs. He was a member of Congress for nearly 8 years.

His constituents had learned to love and respect him during the 28 years he was superintendent of Thornton Township High School and Junior College in Harvey. He was chosen by a caucus to challenge the Democratic incumbent in 1950, and won easily with the support of Democrats as well as Republicans. He wished to retire in 1956 and again this year, but both times he was persuaded to run again.

In Congress, he devoted himself in his own words "to the perpetuation of those freedoms which have made this country great." He fought the socialistic tendencies of the new dealers and their disciples. As a lifelong educator, he saw the dangers of Federal aid to education; as a former tax assessor, he opposed ever-mounting taxes, which he described as "like iceberg, we see only a small part of them." The country can ill spare men of his courage and sense.

[From the Chicago Daily News of August 13, 1958]

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM E. MCVEY

The sudden death of Representative WILLIAM E. MCVEY has deprived Congress of one of the staunchest advocates of government economy and sound money.

His career illustrates the fact that a well-educated man is capable of holding conservative economic views and fighting for them effectively.

He was the valedictorian of his class at Ohio University, and a Phi Beta Kappa. He was a master of arts and a doctor of philosophy at the University of Chicago.

He was himself a distinguished educator. As a young man, he was a school superintendent in the Philippines. For many years he was superintendent of the Thornton Township High School and Junior College, and once served as president of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

For a few years before he entered Congress, he was professor of education at De Paul University. He was the author of several books and magazine articles in the fields of education and economics.

A year ago, Mr. McVey announced that he would not seek reelection in 1958, when he would have completed 4 terms. He was, however, persuaded to change his mind. He was renominated in the primary and would probably have been reelected.

The Republican party should make a diligent search for a man of equal qualifications and stature to take his place.

Senator Gore's Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 16, 1958

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, one of the outstanding Members of this body is the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. We all know of his fine record and of his ability.

It is gratifying that the people of Tennessee are also well aware of his record and ability, as his overwhelming victory in his State's recent primary election so conclusively shows.

An editorial in the August 18 issue of the magazine, New Republic, pays tribute to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the way he conducted himself during that campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORE STANDS PAT

There still is a moderate southern opinion to mobilize—at least when a man who has ability and energy and the confidence of his constituents places racial issues in some perspective—at least in Tennessee.

On television screens, through radio loudspeakers, on billboards lining the highways from the Great Smoky Mountains to the Mississippi River, during recent weeks Tennesseans were exposed to a saturation campaign of accusation and invective by 62-year-old former Governor Prentice Cooper as he sought to unseat the 50-year-old incumbent, Senator ALBERT GORE. Cooper charged that GORE by refusing to sign the southern manifesto, by voting for the final version of the civil rights bill, and by advocating reciprocal trade agreements, had betrayed the southern way of life and turned his back on his native State. GORE accepted the challenge and broadened the arena. Cooper appeared at rallies waving a copy of the southern manifesto. "Tennessee is a southern State, my first official act will be to sign this manifesto which my opponent refused to sign." He added that he would introduce a bill to reverse the Supreme Court decision of 1954. He also charged that the record showed that Senator GORE had "said 'aye' to the civil rights bill—after which bayoneted troops were sent to Little Rock to force integration at Central High School."

GORE ignored the manifesto—it never had any real meaning beyond that of a high-flown political gimmick, anyway—and the complete misrepresentation of the civil-rights bill he patiently explained away by the truth, terming the bill right-to-vote legislation. "I believe in the right to vote regardless of economic status, religion, or race." He also stated that he believed a mild bill would forestall passage of a severe bill for some time to come.

Seeking to take advantage of the recession and the admitted injury to a few Tennessee industries—textiles, pottery, zinc, aluminum—from foreign competition—COOPER struck hard at GORE's leadership in extending America's reciprocal-trade agreements. "His record proves him to be a global one world do-gooder, advocating a program that is sapping the life out of this Nation."

In a State whose two major crops are cotton and tobacco, GORE, long a disciple of Cordell Hull, pointed out: "Last year west Tennessee produced $73 million worth of cotton and $47 million of it was sold in foreign markets" and in east Tennessee he read from a telegram sent him by the Tobacco Leaf Exporters Association: "If this trade agreements act is not extended we certainly will lose a major part of tobacco exports totalling $300 million per year." And he reminded all Tennesseans that their State's share of industrial and agricultural exports last year was more than $230 million.

GORE assumed no labels. He gave the voters his record and stood by it, and on August 7 they gave him 6 more years to implement it. The people of Tennessee proved that agitators in Clinton and violence in Nashville were not their only frames of reference in selecting their political leaders. TVA and Oak Ridge are also in Tennessee.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 156, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

On Texan Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an article in the New York Times has brought back many warm memories. It concerns what has happened in the hill country of Texas because the people of that area had the courage and the imagination to battle against great odds to tame the Colorado River.

When I was a small boy in the Texas hill country, the Colorado River was wild, strange, and unpredictable. There were times when its waters would be reduced to the merest trickle. There were times when it would become a turbulent, raging torrent, capable of inflicting millions of dollars in property losses and taking lives.

The taming of the Colorado was not something that happened overnight. It required a long struggle by the people of imagination against the people who were timid and hesitant and who did not wish to take the first tentative step.

There should be a roll of honor for the men who led the struggle that harnessed the waters of the Colorado. High in that roll would be the name of the late Alvin Wirtz, a man of daring vision and bold imagination, who had the foresight to realize the tremendous potentialities of the Lower Colorado River Authority.

High on the list should be the names of Congressman Buchanan, Congressman Mansfield and Congressman Homer Thornberry, Senator Connally, the late Senator Morris Sheppard, our junior Senator [Mr. YARBOROUGH], a former member of the Lower Colorado River Authority Board, and former Gov. James Allred were men without whom many of the dams could not have been built.

Because of their work, the face of the land has been changed—changed in a form which represents progress for our people. The Lower Colorado River Authority is an inspiring demonstration of what happens when men unite for achievement.

The history of the area can well be divided into two periods—what happened before and after the dams of the Lower Colorado River Authority were built.

Today, the highland lake country of Texas is one of the most beautiful stretches of land in America. Death and devastation have been replaced by irrigation and reclamation. Floodwaters which once meant destruction now mean power to help the people with their tasks.

The highland lake country is a paradise for fishermen and hunters. It affords vast expanses of water for boating and for swimming.

There is probably no river in America that has been better developed than the lower Colorado.

The article in the New York Times was written by Hugh Williamson, with whom I went to school at San Marcos. It may appear to some people to be too lyrical. But to those of us who knew the hill country and who knew Austin in the days before the Lower Colorado River Authority, it is, if anything, an understatement of the case.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 17, 1958]

ON TEXAN WATERS—TAMING OF COLORADO RIVER HAS CREATED A VAST VACATION LAND NEAR AUSTIN

(By Hugh Williamson)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Time was, within the memory of many Texans now of middle age, when the Colorado River of Texas dwindled to a trickle in dry years and then, when the rains came, surged gulfward in roaring, damage-and-death-dealing fury. When we went up into the hills for hunting and fishing, we traveled terrible roads, choking on dust one day and bogging down in mud the next. But all that is changed now.

The Lower Colorado River Authority built a series of 6 dams to provide flood protection and water for irrigation and electric power, and more spectacularly, thereby created a stairway of lakes that reaches 150 miles northwest from Austin, the State capital.

To tourists in these parts, the city itself, as well as its chain of lakes, is worth a visit. First know as Waterloo, it was a mere cluster of shacks, huddled along the river, when the site was chosen to be the capital and renamed for Stephen F. Austin, the colonizer. Today Austin sprawls over both sides of the river and stretches out into cedar-covered hills. The capitol building and the University of Texas tower dominate the skyline.

The Highland Lakes have made Austin very outdoors conscious. The river valley and its surrounding hills—once wild and inhabited only by a few scattered sheep and goat ranchers—is a vacation center of formidable proportions and fast growing in fame and popularity. All of the standard water sports, plus a few novelties, thrive in, on, and around the lakes' 76,000 acres, enfolded by more shoreline than the Texas gulf coast.

FISHING IN COMFORT

On Lake Buchanan, farthest upstream of the chain, an entrepreneur has constructed an enclosed, air-conditioned fishing dock with all the comforts of home. Another operator, at Marble Falls, has built a cable car that takes fishermen down a steep cliffside to some of the best white bass fishing anywhere. On Lake Austin, within the city limits of the capital, a sternwheeler, capable of carrying 200, sails up and down with tourist parties.

All of these attractions, and many others, are accessible by good paved roads that wind through the hills where, from an occasional peak, there is a view of glistening blue water dotted with fishing craft and sailboats. Through the trees a side road leads to vacation homes that may be a fisherman's modest shack or a millionaire's country showplace. Travel these ways in the starry dawn and chances are you will see swift-running deer. Now and then a sign indicates where to turn off and reach a commercial camp offering supplies, rent boats, bait, and cabins.

Some of these accommodations are plush, some inexpensive, and some rudimentary, ranging down to $1 per day for a camping site. There are 11 public parks throughout the chain of lakes. Streams of traffic, especially on weekends and holidays, indicate that these establishments are well patronized, and the vacation homes, rapidly increasing in number, are in constant use. Of all the diversified activities that the vacationists pursue, fishing is the biggest draw.

FORMIDABLE CATFISH

Take Marble Falls, for example, the site of quarries from which came the stone of the magnificent Texas capitol. This small town today is famous as a center for white-bass fishermen. The sporty black bass abounds there, too, as it does in all the lakes. The crappie is a source of fun and good eating for thousands, and catfish come in sizes up to 80 pounds. Carp fishing is a growing fad, and any youngster can take a string of fat bream.

Fishing is a fine and happy occupation on the lakes generally, though you can hear some picturesque language when a speedboat, hauling a water skier, whizzes too close to an angler's skiff. There is also a hunting season, when hundreds of nimrods invade the rugged hills—among the best deer-hunting areas in the Nation.

Some of the gunners will make it a combination hunting and fishing trip, some will bring their families for an outing and a visit to Longhorn Cavern, third largest in the world. At one time or another, this underground curiosity was a home for Indians and a retreat for Confederate soldiers. Legend says that Sam Bass, a colorful Texas bank robber, once hid there. The cave contians brilliantly encrusted formations, a giant icicle, and other marvels.

All told, it is a lot different along the Colorado, now that the dams and the good roads have been built. An autumn ride here is itself a rewarding experience as the sumac and oak trees flaunt their red and gold leaves in the crisp sunshine. The cedars provide a background of dark green and the lakes reflect the vast, immaculate blue of a Texas sky, adorned with white clouds drifting gently in a breeze fresh from the Gulf of Mexico.

The Housing Challenge of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, somewhat condensed, an address by James H. Scheuer, a recognized authority in the field of housing, in which he outlines the housing predicament which faces our Nation and makes a number of thoughtful suggestions for dealing with it.

Mr. Scheuer is president of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York and serves as chairman of the Housing Advisory Council of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. He is also a private enterprise sponsor of title I redevelopment projects in Washington, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Sacramento, Calif. He has written and lectured widely on many aspects of housing and planning.

The address was given at a housing and urban renewal conference in Berkeley, Calif., sponsored by the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods—Action.

I invite the attention of my colleagues particularly to Mr. Scheuer's comments on middle-income housing. The Senate passed several weeks ago an admirable housing bill which I believe to be one of the best approved by this body in several years, yet the bill does not tackle directly the greatest obstacle which stands between the American people and the high standard of housing which we should and must achieve. As Mr. Scheuer remarks:

> The single greatest unserved market is that for inexpensive middle income rental housing.

I commend Mr. Scheuer's remarks on this problem to the attention of Members of the Senate, because we must, I am convinced, approach this problem of middle-income housing boldly and directly in housing acts which we must write in future Congresses.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSING CHALLENGE OF AMERICA

Among the domestic problems most in need of our immediate and serious attention is our nationwide housing predicament, which grows more costly and more painful to remedy with every year of apathy and neglect.

We are about to be inundated by demands for shelter and community services for which we are wholly unprepared. One-fifth of our present population lives in shamefully substandard housing. While we pride ourselves on having corrected the situation which existed 25 years ago, when one-third of our people were underfed and ill-clothed, we have utterly failed in that quarter century and are now continuing to fail to provide housing which will adequately meet minimum present, let alone future, needs.

Future needs will be even more pressing than those we have thus far neglected. The national population in the next two decades will leap from the present 165 million to 230 million people.

Virtually the whole of this extraordinary growth will occur in our metropolitan areas, chiefly in our suburbs. * * * The population of our 168 major metropolitan centers will be increased by no less than 50 percent.

* * * * *

We must face the fact that our metropolitan ares, in which more than 90 percent of our population will soon be living, are today in an acutely dangerous financial position. The exodus from our urban centers of the upper middle-income and professional groups have resulted in a loss, for the cities, of taxable income. The urban trek of great numbers of large-sized, low-income families has, at the same time, resulted in the social as well as dollar costs of overcrowding, undermaintenance, and inadequate city services. These long-term population trends pose problems of city and suburban finance with which we have made only the most tentative and halting efforts to come to grips.

Surely the existence of this extraordinary debit balance in an age of abundance and prosperity indicates that our national housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal programs need a complete review. We must now develop an inventory of presently needed municipal facilities of all kinds, and make plans to deal with the almost frightening growth in metropolitan requirements which will occur in the next two decades. We must shape a program of broad scope and continuity, and characterize it as one of fundamental urgency at every level of government.

* * * * *

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Federal officials must take a fresh, long look at the vast current shortages in housing, and in essential municipal facilities and services, which plague our urban centers across the country. They must also make themselves freshly aware of the unbelievable new demands which will be engendered by our future population expansion.

Our top Federal housing officials are experts at the complicated business of community development. I am profoundly convinced that, without exception, they are men with deep convictions making a vigorous fight for a broadly conceived housing and urban renewal program.

But their convictions frequently do not prevail in top administration circles. It seems apparent that theirs is not necessarily the viewpoint of the Bureau of the Budget, of the United States Treasury, of the Federal Reserve Board, of the Council of Economic Advisers, and, indeed, of the White House itself.

There is much evidence to indicate that the highest administration echelons still look upon the entire urban renewal and housing program as a device for stabilizing the economy—as a thermostat to be raised or lowered as economic and fiscal forces run their meteorological course. This point of view, if continued, will surely be recorded as one of the tragic blunders in domestic policy in modern times.

We have heard some talk in months gone by that it would be well to turn back responsibility for the provision of needed housing and community facilities to the cities and States. A few unalterable facts in this connection might be pertinent.

Consider, first, the total volume of needs for community facilities of all kinds. In 1954 the Department of Commerce estimated that our cities and States would be required to spend during the decade ending in 1964 approximately $200 billion to bring municipal facilities and services up to the minimum acceptable level. This would include expenditures for roads, schools, sewer and water facilities, hospital plants, and so forth. Against the target of $20 billion a year for 10 years, city and State governments are now spending approximately $10 billion annually.

But even with this inadequate rate of expenditure, cities and States have been forced to increase their bonded indebtedness threefold since 1946—from about $15 billion to about $50 billion. In order to meet the Commerce Department's estimate of community needs, they would have to treble their present level of bonded indebtedness in the decade to come.

Second, consider the immensity of our housing needs. By 1975 we will have to produce about $300 billion of new housing for 20 million additional new families in our expanding metropolitan areas. The Twentieth Century Fund's comprehensive study, America's Needs and Resources, advises us that we must spend, in addition, almost $100 billion to bring our present housing inventory up to a satisfactory minimum standard, by rehabilitation where feasible, and by demolition and renewal where the bulldozer is the only indicated treatment for the cancer of blight.

Last, the various public improvement programs for slum clearance, highways, schools and other municipal facilities are currently displacing each year several hundred thousand predominantly low income minority families. This is creating a demand for at least one million units of moderate price relocation housing over the next decade which will cost well over $10 billion. As a result, the most conservative and workmanlike estimates of our future housing needs by 1975 range toward $500 billion—one half a trillion dollars.

Which categories of housing are in the shortest supply? The single greatest unserved market is that for inexpensive middle income rental housing. The title I, section 220 slum clearance program fills the need for upper middle income rental accommodations. But it does not fill the vast need for lower midde income housing ranging in price somewhere between public housing and the luxury rentals which the title I program all too often produces.

The annual cost of servicing a 90 percent mortgage is the main determinant of rent levels in a title I project. And the financing charges for title I redevelopment housing are designed to attract private capital by paying the going private rate or long term loans. These relatively high charges make it impossible to produce redevelopment housing in the garden apartment category for less than $25 to $30 per room per month, or high rise housing, even of minimum deisgn standards, for much less than about $45 per room per month. It is a mathematical and physical impossibility to close the gap between these rentals and public-housing rentals by any possible combination of construction savings. The only way rent levels can be produced between public housing and upper income title I redevelopment housing is by making mortgage funds available at lower annual financing charges. Private enterprise can and must build this housing on a mass scale. Private mortgage funds cannot, however, be expected to finance housing at middle income rent level, since the interest and amortization rates paid on such funds must be lower than the going free market rate. These funds can only come from direct government or public-authority loans.

There is ample precedent for such a direct loan program on Federal, State, and city levels. The Federal college housing program, the direct State loan program in Connecticut, New York's Mitchell-Lama legislation, all point the way toward an effective Federal program of direct loans to stimulate privately built housing which would be available at middle income rent levels.

The second most urgent need is for a considerably expanded federally assisted public-housing program to build relocation housing, using vacant or nearly vacant land on the outskirts of our cities. To insure the basic political acceptability of the national highway and slum clearance programs, it is absolutely imperative that we provide adequate relocation housing.

It is clear, I believe, that there are urgent housing and community facility needs to be filled in our cities, and that to fill them even minimally, our expenditures must be vastly increased. Now let us review the comparable resources of our Federal, State, and local governments. Since 1939 the Federal tax take has increased about thirteen-fold, whereas the combined tax revenues of cities and States have increased only three times.

With Federal Government revenues rising four times as rapidly as the combined revenues of cities and States, it is clear that Federal authorities will have to make a substantial contribution to the enormous job of creating the cities and suburbs of tomorrow. By making minor and inconsequential tax concessions, the Federal Government is simply relegating responsibility for financing tremendous community projects to the cities and States.

Something seems terribly wrong when the annual subsidy to potato growers alone is larger than all current Federal contributions to urban renewal. It is high time that top administration policymakers undertake to support State and city urban renewal programs over at least a 10-year period. May I emphasize that in my lexicon, "support" means scope and continuity—a large and continuing effort. It may well cost the Federal Government $5 billion a year for the next 10 years to support a total program for developing and renewing our cities, towns, and surburbs. If so, this will still amount to less than 7 percent of the total budget. It will be no more than the cost of current aids and subsidies to agriculture, which benefit directly about one-tenth of our population.

Five billion dollars annually is a great deal of money. But our cities and suburbs, with their limited tax resources, simply cannot do the staggering job unassisted. The Federal Government, with its vast sources of income, must help, little as we may like to go to Washington for aid in solving local problems.

It should be understood that by far the greater part of the $500 billion of needed housing will—or should—be built privately, and will require little or no subsidy or out-of-pocket cost by the Federal Government once the stage is set.

I hope deeply and profoundly that our free-enterprise system will produce the great mass of our needed housing, and that public housing will play a useful but distinctly minor role in meeting the total housing demand. But in order for the great building industry to do the job, the Federal Government must make the requisite financial tools available both to the builder for rental housing, and to the purchaser for sales housing.

The Federal Government must expend enough "seed money" to assist cities in their basic planning and land acquisition. For these must come first before private interests can be harnessed to a crash program of urban redevelopment housing. In relation to total community needs for redevelopment and renewal, there should be a minimum authorization for Federal capital grant commitments of $500 million a year for a period of 10 years, with machinery for annual review of this amount.

THE ROLE OF THE STATES

State administrations can make a significant contribution to the urban renewal program.

First, they can press county and city authorities to realine and recast their lines of administration and planning. This means either modernization or abandonment of archaic governmental jurisdictions which hamper intelligent efforts at metropolitan and regional planning from coast to coast. We all know that overlapping and competing political subdivisions, and ancient and outdated planning, zoning and building laws can frustrate the most broadly-conceived plans for urban renewal.

Secondly, States can share with the cities the financial burden involved in meeting their required local share of total "seed money costs." At present, the Federal Government pays two-thirds of the net pump priming cost, and the local community is required to pay one-third. Until the Federal Government accepts a higher proportion—perhaps three-quarters of the total cost—the burden of paying one-third will be a difficult one for cities. The assistance of the States in sharing this burden will greatly stimulate the program.

THE ROLE OF THE CITIES

But in the final analysis decisions concerning community development must be community decisions and cannot be imposed upon a reluctant citizenry by any higher authority.

Our elected officials, both mayors and city legislators, must effect the necessary governmental reforms to enable our cities to get on with the job of intelligent planning. We as citizens must have the moral courage to accept the sacrifices and insist upon the hard decisions which are required to build American cities and suburbs of which we will be proud.

Furthermore, articulate support of an urban renewal program by industrial, business, labor, civic, and religious leaders will serve to spark more broadly-gaged Federal and State programs in support of city redevelopment.

Of one thing we can be sure. Ultimately we will have to pay for this immense population growth. The only question is how much do we pay and how do we pay it. We can continue to pay in terms of urban blight and urban sprawl; in terms of unnecessarily high police, fire, health, and delinquency costs produced by slums; in terms of a nationwide traffic snarl which is gradually choking the suburbs as well as the cities. Or we can maturely recognize that coping with our problems now is in the long run the cheapest and least painful way of paying for the future society of which we all dream.

Surely the job is not hopeless. Indeed, many cities have broad and well-advanced plans for urban renewal. Cleveland's urban renewal program is an excellent example of how a partnership between the Federal Government and an alert, responsible, local community can function. On April 3, 1957, sponsors were chosen for one portion of the promgram. Four months later construction was under way. By Thanksgiving, less than 8 months after sponsor selection, the first families moved into the completed project.

How did they do it? Cleveland Mayor Anthony Celebreeze did a remarkable job of organizing and galvanizing into action the city departments concerned.

Mayor Celebreeze was successful in stimulating Cleveland's industrial and financial leaders to band together in total support of Cleveland's urban renewal program. The Cleveland Development Foundation, headed by John Green, chairman of the board of the Ohio Bell Telephone Co., made available on a short term revolving loan basis several million dollars of "seed money" to assist the city and the private sponsors in getting the program into high gear. * * *

Significantly, the Cleveland office of the FHA was determined to prove that the FHA financing formula for title I redevelopment housing would work. The requisite mortgage insurance commitment was issued in the astonishing time of 25 days after an application was submitted.

And perhaps most important of all, the deadening hand of administrative bureaucracy was notably absent at all leveles of officialdom in Cleveland. In fact, as a sponsor of a portion of the Cleveland program I was encouraged and supported in my efforts to make this middle-income worker project an attractive and eminently livable one. I was given great freedom to strive for sparkling building design and landscaping, as well as to provide a comprehensive planning package of tenant facilities including outdoor sitting, recreation, and dining areas for adults and children; a splendid community building; and an intimate and neighborly family store in the center of the project. I emphasize this freedom to inject some style and gaiety into the project because frequently redevelopment sponsors are hedged about with frustrating limitations which doom a project to mediocrity from the very start.

* * * * *

To humanize our projects, a larger variety of physical building types should be used within each project—a pleasing and interesting admixture of high rise elevator apartments of varying heights with several types of row houses and garden apartment units.

Let us fortify this variety of structure with some variety of design. Why not use the marvelous variety of color and texture available in surface materials, fenestration, facade and landscaping to add some glamor and spirit to our projects? Architecture need not be a dismal science. No country in the world more nearly bursts with architectural excitement and creativity than ours. But one would never know it from the gray, drab, institutional pall which hangs, like a deadly smog, over many of our large projects.

We must plan both our central city projects and our new suburban communities for the many different population components which make up our rich American society. Federal statisticians may tell us that the average American family unit is composed of 2 parrents, 1.34 children, and three-quarters of a mongrel pup. Happily, we are not a nation of averages. We are a nation of differences and diversity. This is our strength, our resilience, and our hope.

So far, we have not produced housing to serve this great variety of Americans, for aging couples or single individuals, for couples with large numbers of children, certainly not at a price which the truly middle-income family can afford. We have shamefully negelected to meet the housing needs of 15 million American minority citizens.

Surely, in our efforts to rebuild our cities and create new suburbs we can, above all, make certain that these programs serve the total American community * * *

This is a time of excitement. We cannot permit this excitement to dissipate itself and end in frustration and defeatism. Let us work with pride and purpose today to shape the America we want to live in tomorrow. Never was the advice more timely. "Make no small plans—they have no magic to stir the minds of men."

The Critical Gap in United States Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "The Critical Gap," which contains some interesting and valid comments with respect to the outstanding speech made by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] last week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRITICAL GAP

New American achievements with nuclear-powered submarines are being hailed by

some as this country's answer to the Soviet sputniks. Nothing could be more misleading than such a comparison. It detracts not one bit from the significant and spectacular accomplishments of the Arctic navigators, or from the no less significant and spectacular American efforts in outer space, to say that assumptions that we have thereby offset the military lag represent the height of complacency.

Senator KENNEDY has performed a useful service in pointing to the critical period ahead—1960 to 1964—in which Soviet superiority in missiles may substantially reduce the value of this country's deterrent power. "Let no one think," he warns, "that a Soviet attack, inadvertent or otherwise, is impossible because of the H-bomb damage we would still hope to rain upon them." An even more likely, though probably less starkly dangerous, threat is that of limited war, under the shield of what President Eisenhower called Soviet ballistic blackmail. Mr. KENNEDY cites pertinently the inadequacies of sea and air lift illustrated in the expedition to Lebanon.

But the material shortcomings, unquestionably serious, are no more serious than many of the false assumptions that still seem to prevail. Among these, of course, are the magical protections attached to brinkmanship and boasts of massive retaliation, and the seeming conviction that virtue inevitably will trumph over evil because morality is on our side. Mr. KENNEDY properly insists that more than a military answer is needed, though his prescription for use of remaining American economic, ideological and geographic advantages is more than a little vague. But his comments about the exaggerated emphasis on military economizing, on the deference to the dangerous notion that the country can afford only so much defense, are altogether to the point. Unfortunately, such emphasis remains the rule.

The focus of military and economic effort is virtually important as the magnitude. All the evidence is, however, that the Soviet union is outstripping us not only in preparation for hot war, but also in the cold war—and this may have some bearing on Soviet willingness to discuss realistic arms control. The lamentable fact is that this is possible, not because of any innate Soviet superiority, but because the Soviet Union is devoting a far larger proportion of its resources to these efforts, is working harder than we are, and has a degree of direction and coordination which we and our partners have yet to achieve.

Spirit of the Bluestem Grass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week there was a formal dedication of an historical marker citing the glories of the Kansas bluestem pasture region at Matfield Green.

The Flint Hills of Kansas are known nationally for their bluestem grass and their beauty. It was most fitting that at this dedication Walter A. Jones of Emporia should conclude his remarks by stating:

We here dictate a humble spot, not to the glory of God or man, but to the glory of the great spirit of the bluestem grass.

In view of the millions of people who have witnessed the beauty of the Flint Hill section, I ask unanimous consent that Rolla Clymer's editorial which appeared in the El Dorado Times on August 14 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRIT OF THE BLUESTEM GRASS

The formal dedication of the historical marker citing the glories of the Kansas bluestem pasture region, at the Matfield Green service area on the Kansas turnpike Tuesday, was done in excellent taste.

All the elements of the true Flint Hills spirit were present—deep pride in the hills and their utilitarian mission in the world of today, lofty sentiment for the glory that shines all around as a brooding benediction over the lives of the hills' people. All speakers were serious and down to earth, the program was invested with divine blessing, and the crowd of about 150 of the hills' faithful responded cordially to all phases of expression. The ceremonies lasted a brief half-hour, and were capped when Miss Ginger Countryman—true daughter of the hills—unveiled the marker for present and future generations of wayfarers to read.

What was said on this occasion may not be soon forgotten by those who listened. Particularly is this remark true of the words of Walter A. Jones, of Emporia, who with accustomed feeling and brilliance, paid a solemn tribute to bluestem grass. The winged words of his classic utterance are herewith reproduced in order that they may be properly preserved:

"The history of grass is as long as the record of time. Grass has clothed the framework of the ages and is the master work of God's maturity.

"Man that is born is of few days, but the bluestem grass lives on in the heart of the hills, never weary, always alert—for its rooted crown makes an eternal bond between the dead earth and the living mental and physical triumph, man himself.

"Man is born of the genes of the grass, is nourished in the red corpuscle of that which is all grass, and matured in the flower garden of the spirit. The spirit flows in a steady stream through the mammary vessels of incipient man to old age. Receding, but ever faithful even to the dearth of drouth and winter's solstice, it leaves its remnants to nourish until it returns with the robin. When grass ceases to nourish man, man returns to earth.

"Millions of years ago the place where we now stand was the heart of a great sea, where calcium and minerals were ground by the laving waters and mixed with the phosphates of mammals, then bound with grass. The pressure and heat of weight and motion bedded down the limestone breaks and crusted the residue in the mills of the ages.

"There was in the mind of the great spirit a home for man. When he had sealed and bound the book of time, he brought forth from the bowels of the earth the great rocky chain of mountains to the west of us and knocked down a greater chain into the underbelly of our continent to fill its place. He drained the waters of this great sea into the crevices of the earth, leaving to us the hills arrayed in whiteness, but nourished in grass.

"These are our bluestem hills, bounded on the west and north by the short grass, on the east by fields of grain, flowing south into the grass of the Osage Country.

"These bluestem hills turn the increase of nearly a million head of cattle into 100 million pounds of beef in one season, where once only buffalo and antelope roamed. This is the kingdom of the whiteface steer, the greatest industrial miracle of all time. God's cattle on a thousand hills!

"Grass is the peace of the south wind. Grass is the music of the west wind that glides in and out of season with the ease and beauty of the homeward curve of swallows. Grass is the beauty of the blob that is a March creeper, or the soft glint in a mallard's crest, the white blackness of a crow's wing, or the flash of a redbird's coat.

"Although we displace grass to bury our sorrows, it always returns as a certainty of immortality. From grass alone does God create out of the dead earth by the warmth and softness of His breath all that is beauty and peace and music. For there is no thing but which proceedeth out of grass.

"We here dedicate a humble spot, not to the glory of God or man, but to the glory of the great spirit of the bluestem grass."

Excessive Oil Imports Threaten Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the world crisis has once again proved the dangers to our own security if we become too dependent on foreign oil. I have continuously urged that we adopt legislation which will limit imports in order that our own oil industry will be able to properly develop and meet our needs during uncertain times.

Recently, Mr. Eugene M. Locke, of Dallas, president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, pointed out other problems which confront the Texas oil producers.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have the article which was published in the Houston Post on July 23, 1958, under the heading "End of Oil Imports To Texas Urged by Locke," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF OIL IMPORTS TO TEXAS URGED BY LOCKE

AUSTIN.—An early end to imports of oil from other States into Texas was called for Tuesday by Eugene M. Locke of Dallas, president of the Texas Independent and Royalty Owners Association.

"Texas is and has always been fully capable of meeting all requirements made on it for both crude and products," he said. "and the action of the Texas Railroad Commission in increasing Texas production should remove any contention that out-of-State oil will be needed here."

Locke said several large Texas companies recently have built a pipeline from the Four Corners area which could be used to "pour up to 170,000 barrels of crude daily through west Texas into the Houston area."

Crude oil production at the far end of the new pipeline is unprorated and not subject to a ratable take, he said.

"The companies thus can use their own oil and produce at maximum levels in direct competition with Texas producers who are regulated by ratable takings and market demand requirements," the TIPRO chief continued.

"This pipeline could be used to rip apart the entire fabric of Texas conservation law, as companies owning the pipeline also own

the out-of-State wells supplying the line. It is clear they could favor their own production by cutting off 170,000 barrels daily of Texas production."

Locke estimated a loss of that amount of Texas production would cost the State's economy $100 million annually.

The shipment of Venezuelan oil into Texas and its movement through Texas pipelines to other States also was assailed by the TIPRO president.

He said the organization will seek "effective supervision of such crude movements into Texas either through legal, administrative or legislative remedies."

"It was bad enough that for years Texas had to hold the umbrella over other States which refused to cut back their production to demand," he said, "but now these companies with that unprorated oil are bringing it into Texas, raiding our own diminished market."

Locke said Texas has an unused production capacity of over 2 million barrels daily at this time.

"But not all of this can be moved immediately in an emergency," he said, "because domestic pipeline construction has been allowed to lag as a result of excessive imports."

Tenth Anniversary of SAC Headquarters at Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Strategic Air Command was created and began operations in 1946. Two years later the headquarters was removed to the city of Omaha, with the new headquarters building some 8 miles distant from the city.

A week ago last Saturday there was celebrated the 10th anniversary of the location of headquarters of SAC, by ceremonies at Offutt Air Force Base, as well as a dinner and program in the evening.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article giving the account of the celebration, published in the Omaha World-Herald, as well as an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald, both of August 10, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAC, WORLD'S PEACE FORCE, SALUTED ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY—THREE GENERALS GIVEN PRAISE BY SPEAKER—CITY CALLED AIRPOWER CENTER OF WORLD

Omaha paid tribute to the Strategic Air Command Saturday night.

SAC was saluted by representatives of the entire community—the people, the businesses, the Government.

They gathered in the ballroom of the Sheraton-Fontenelle Hotel with leaders of SAC—past, present, and future—the Air Force and aviation in general.

FRIENDLY NEIGHBOR

The formal dinner marked the 10th anniversary of the establishment of SAC headquarters in Omaha which made the city the world's most important command post.

SAC was hailed by Omaha as a warm and friendly neighbor and as the organization which has employed cold efficiency to contain the threat of Russian aggression.

Arthur C. Storz, Sr., chairman of the observance, put the tribute into words.

PRAISE THREE

Much of his praise was directed to three generals—George C. Kenney, who organized SAC; Curtis E. LeMay, who brought SAC to Omaha and led it into the jet age; and Thomas S. Power, who is guiding SAC's advance into the world of missiles and space travel.

Mr. Storz recalled that when General LeMay and his staff moved to Omaha 10 years ago, headquarters was set up in the Martin bomber plant and that he brought with him a skeleton organization.

HUNDRED MILLION INVESTED

Said Mr. Storz:

"Today we have an establishment in which there is invested $100 million. These figures, of course, do not include the aircraft at the base.

"Step by step, over the last 10 years, a lot of difficulties presented themselves, but our citizens of Omaha, plus General LeMay and his wonderful staff of executive officers, cooperated until one by one we whipped all these troublesome situations into line.

PRAISES SENATORS

"We always had the complete cooperation of our Senators, Wherry, Griswold, Hruska, and Curtis, and they always did a wonderful job in getting things done for us in Washington whenever possible.

"Today we can truly say that here in Omaha at the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command we have the air-power center of the world."

Mr. Storz quoted Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, as saying he has "unmitigated confidence in our airpower."

FEW CHANGES LIKELY

General Norstad, said Mr. Storz, states "he believes war in Europe is highly improbable as long as NATO keeps its shield up and SAC's sword is on the alert. General Norstad does not foresee any technical changes or weapons system advances by the enemy that would make SAC ineffective in the next 5 to 10 years."

CITY URGED TO MODERNIZE

Lt. Gen. Elwood R. (Pete) Quesada, World War II hero who now is President Eisenhower's assistant for aviation, urged Omaha to modernize its air transport facilities.

"Omaha, if it is to retain its position as the hub of industry and the hub of transportation in the Midwest, must provide modern facilities for commercial aviation," he declared.

"If Omaha is able to foresee the needs of the future, then it will reap the rewards of the future," he told the gathering.

Mayor John Rosenblatt presented General Power and SAC a scroll expressing the appreciation of Omaha and Nebraska to the Strategic Air Command:

"On this, the 10th anniversary of the coming of Strategic Air Command headquarters to our community, the grateful citizenry of Omaha and of Nebraska expresses its profound respect, admiration, and thanks to the officers and men who safeguard our security.

"Omaha and Nebraska pride themselves on being the home of the strength of the free world, the Strategic Air Command, whose indomitable vigilance, resolute diligence and courageous gallantry are making so historic a contribution to the twentieth century."

The scroll was signed by the mayor, Gov. Victor E. Anderson, who also was present, and Mr. Storz.

TEN NEIGHBORLY YEARS

When SAC came to Offutt Air Base in 1948 it was not a new experience for Omahans to have men in uniform living among them in peacetime. Omaha had been a military headquarters city since the days of the Indian uprisings.

But the coming of SAC was different. Many Omahans were surprised to find that their new neighbors were a spit-and-polish outfit, wholly devoted to what they were doing. Such dedication to duty seemed almost unnatural in peacetime. Didn't these SAC people know the war was over? Weren't they overdoing things with their perpetual vigilance?

It didn't take the people of Omaha and the surrounding area long to understand. They learned that the Strategic Air Command is not just a collection of control centers, bombers, tankers, and missiles, impressive as these tools are, SAC is people. Warm and friendly people. Neighbors who take an active part in community life. But they are people who have a special job to do and who, day and night, must live in the belief war may be only a few minutes away.

The rest of us now understand well, and share the pride that SAC people have in their job—which is nothing less than to guarantee the peace of a fretful world. So when we congratulate the men and women of SAC on their 10th anniversary among us we cannot help but bask just a little in the reflected glow. We're proud to be the home of the Strategic Air Command, and proud to be the neighbors of the men and women who make it what it is.

Awareness of Freedom Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Awareness of Freedom Needed," written by Jayne Ellison, and published in Camerica of August 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARENESS OF FREEDOM NEEDED

(By Jayne Ellison)

There's an unreasonable man working as a technical consultant at Wright Air Development Center.

George Bernard Shaw once said: "The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on unreasonable men."

Dieter H. Schwebs, who became an American citizen in June, says there is no achievement in conformity whether in human relationships, education, or technological advances.

"We are living in a state of total war from the point of view of spirit, economics, and technology," Schwebs reflected.

"I have a nightmare concept of the future, unless the citizenry rouses from its apathy and takes the initiative against communism and its ideas."

Schwebs foresees the United States as an isolated island, doomed by economic blockades. Driving force in the drama would be Russia, which would implement its nonshoot-

ing war by delivering ultimatums to all countries in Europe and elsewhere.

Russia's race for "accumulation of knowledge" will be the catalyst in implementing economic disaster for the free world, the last stronghold for individualism. Readiness in Russia's timing will be marked "not by ability to produce the most weapons, but by superior technological knowledge."

Soviet scientists are spurred by political ideas, working climate and environment conducive to concentrated experimentation and conditioned thinking, according to Schwebs. He met many of them in Barcelona, Spain, while attending international scientific meetings.

What line of counterattack is needed to offset the Russian offensive?

First. The scientist points out, there is a need for prointellectualism, compounded by full awareness of individual freedom as guaranteed in the Constitution.

Second. Establishment of institutes for mathematics, chemistry, and physics to provide young Americans with facilities for specializing and concentrated study.

Third. Accelerate basic research programs in natural sciences to increase understanding and provide a basis for new concepts.

Fourth. Jolt complacency into its proper illumination by examination of history and the fate of societies where high standards of living were believed protection against all forces.

Fifth. Approach education as an adjustment to thinking, rather than an instrument hoping to achieve adjustment to life.

"The future of my two small daughters and all the children coming along in this country depends on the challenge offered to gifted prospects," Schwebs said.

"School need teachers with knowledge, lots of it, and less gimmicks. Creative thinking is stimulated by well-educated teachers and it is stifled by extras, thus wasting talent.

"Complacency and materialism are diabolical partners in the struggle to preserve individual freedoms. History shows ancient Greece and the Roman Empire as outstanding examples of belief that barbarians wouldn't concern themselves with societies having such high standards of living. Smugness and a false sense of security, coupled with complacency, spelled the doom of dictators from the time of Alexander the Great, down the line through Hitler and Peron.

"A German proverb, with a counterpart in other languages of the world, is a key to the demises: Arrogance comes shortly before the downfall."

Survival, despite being bombed out six times in his native Germany, sharpened Schweb's focus on materialism. The final rout was easy, since his total possessions less than filled a suitcase. Paris was to be his destination, before coming to the United States.

Reflective evaluation placed human relationships and intellectual stimulation, along with individual freedom, as the only real reason for living. Secret meetings with friends in Berlin, spiked with conversation and music, carried him through the Nazi era and its threats to individual thinking.

"There must be a new awareness of how priceless individual freedoms are * * * which mark true security * * * instead of materialism and the false hope that money will buy anything," Schwebs said.

"It isn't enough to be against communism or sin, but we must all know what we are for.

"We are obligated to articulate on what we advocate and to present ideas and ideals to the world.

"Selling ideas, rather than possessions, is one of the prime responsibilities of the future."

What brought Schwebs to the United States and his recently acquired citizenship?

He believes his adopted country is the sole bulwark of freedom in the world and that technological developments, no longer stock-in-trade in Europe, must generate from here. His goal: Contributing to prevention of a hot war or the alternative economic isolation.

This Congress Has Made a Formidable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "This Congress Has Made a Formidable Record," written by Robert C. Albright, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 17, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CONGRESS HAS MADE A FORMIDABLE RECORD

(By Robert C. Albright)

A Congress that faced up to the dazzling new world of tomorrow while grappling with the problems of today is now concluding a really remarkable session.

Not perhaps since the historic 73d Congress and Franklin Roosevelt's first 100 days has a Congress turned in such a formidable record of work done.

More than that, the 85th Congress, 2d session, prodded, probed, and fretted its way into a completely new era of manmade moons, intercontinental missiles, polar-probing submarines. It even set up a new Government agency to cope with the problems of space. On top of all this, it created a new star and a new State—out of the Territory of Alaska.

This hard-working Congress, whatever its shortcomings, ground out legislation like a box factory, most of it keyed to the urgent problems of our day and to the needs of another day just over the horizon.

In a way, it was really three sessions of Congress rolled into one: a sputnik-inspired January session which searched out 17 ways to improve our research and defenses; a midterm pre-Easter drive to halt the recession with an imposing parade of job-producing bills, and now a stemwinding finale charting foreign trade-aid history and underwriting a new social security structure.

DID WELL BY IKE

Overall, it was a bipartisan Congress which gave President Eisenhower most of the things he wanted, however, dismayed the administration may have been at some of the Democratic embroidery.

One of the President's imperatives was a complete Defense Department reorganization to place more power at the top. This ran into such a congressional buzz saw that it seemed unattainable. But in the end the President got a bill he could accept.

In seeking parallels to this productive Congress, old timers could find no session in the last quarter of a century which turned out more legislative grist. Oddly, however, many regarded the Republican 80th Congress, attacked by former President Truman at the time as the "second worst" Congress in history, as a runner-up to this one in significant performance.

Despite Mr. Truman's wrath at some of its legislative failures, it was the Republican 80th which passed the Marshall plan and later laid the groundwork for the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance through the "Vandenberg resolution." It was the Truman-lambasted 80th Congress also which passed the Taft-Hartley Act and overrode a Truman veto to pass a tax cut.

STATESMANLIKE FORMULA

The Democratic Congress now dying, much like the Republican 80th, was faced with the problem of how to work with a President of the other political faith during a period of great domestic and international stress.

At the outset of this session, a basic leadership decision was reached. The decision was not to risk, under any circumstances, a head-on legislative-executive clash. It was decided to mimiumize politics as much as possible and try to pass a substantial program on a bipartisan basis. The formula worked.

Chief architect of 85th Congress strategy was Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, a skilled legislative craftsman and an old hand at getting things done with a minimum of controversy. Across the Capitol, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat JOHNSON's onetime political mentor, gave the program his blessing and helped carry it out.

Throughout most of the session, JOHNSON worked with a bare 49-to-47 Senate Democratic majority, obviously too narrow a party edge to bull through any partisan program. So in many of the big tests JOHNSON led in double-harness with Senate Republican Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California, or Senate GOP policy chief STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire. His close working relationship with the White House and key Cabinet officials helped round out the bipartisan performance.

A CABINET CATALYST

Speaker RAYBURN and another "old pro," House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, directed the House end of the strategy, working in harness on many a bipartisan vote with House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. Massachusetts.

A recent addition to the Eisenhower administration, Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson, helped bridge the gulf between the two parties on the politically explosive tax issue. Anderson, a former Texan, is an old friend of JOHNSON and RAYBURN. Following a round of informal conferences, RAYBURN and Anderson agreed not to press for tax reductions at this session.

When this 7½-month-old session convened, the possibility of substantial achievement of any sort seemed extremely remote. With the 1958 congressional elections in the offing, both parties were maneuvering for political advantage, each determined to land a haymaker on the other. Russia's Sputnik I had just handed the Democrats a wonderful chance to challenge administration "lack of urgency."

In addition, the first twinges of the business recession were being felt in the land. It looked like Democratic weather, but the Democrats differed on what to do about it.

JOHNSON argued that the best politics in these circumstances was no politics. In his opening speech to the January 7 Senate Democratic caucus, widely described as "the Democratic state of the Union message," he cautioned against "dissension" or "narrow partisanship."

"We must work as though no other Congress would ever have an opportunity to meet this (space) challenege, for, in fact, none will have an opportunity comparable," he said.

At the same time, he said Congress could not afford to ignore the soft spots in the economy or forget pressing farm, school, housing and resource problems.

Six weeks later, at the February 23 Democratic dinner honoring Harry Truman, JOHNSON outlined a 10-point program which was to become sort of work-sheet for the session.

He called for a "mature" outer space policy and American use of United Nations machinery for peace. In addition, he proposed that Congress pass education, farm, housing, small business, aid and trade, union reforms, natural resources, and public works measures to meet problems "crying aloud" for action.

When he had finished, Speaker RAYBURN stepped up to the microphone and told the Democratic celebrants:

"LYNDON JOHNSON has laid down a program here tonight, and we are going to put it through Congress."

Practically all of JOHNSON's points, plus a number of antidepression late starters and a liberalization of social security benefits, passed Congress in one form or another. There were important detours, of course, like the original farm and river and harbors bills, which bumped into Presidential vetoes, and the union reform and housing bills, which ran into House trouble.

This leadership record is cited because the 85th Congress, 2d session, didn't just happen to turn out all that work. It had no more, no less self-propulsion than any other Congress. Fact is, it had to be led.

In this instance the Texas leadership team of JOHNSON and RAYBURN, working with important Republican assists, provided just the right pull.

Another important attribute of the Johnson-Rayburn leadership was its follow-through. Again and again bills and programs that appeared to be dead were suddenly back on their feet after inhaling deep draughts from the oxygen pump. The farm program, for example, underwent one such resuscitation after another.

Senate leaders followed up personally on each of the 17 recommendations made by JOHNSON's Senate Preparedness Subcommittee after its missile-satellite probe. That is why Congress voted some $815 million more than the President requested in defense funds, including extra money for long-range missiles and missile-firing submarines as well as big bombers.

Eventually, the productive 85th got around to passing bills in practically every legislative field. Some bills which had been buffeted around in committees for years came out of the crush and were suddenly in the money.

Unfortunately, this didn't work in every case. Bills with exceptional merit often die like flies when the adjournment bell rings because of influential opposition or a hostile House Rules Committee. This Congress will prove no exception.

But by and large, this session came up with a record the President will find it hard to reject, and one which most incumbent Republicans (and Democrats) can run on. In a word, the record has something in it for everybody.

If the current election trend appears to run heavily with the Democrats, chances are you can lay it to factors far removed from this bipartisan Congress.

The voters still have a way of voting Republican in good times and Democratic in bad, regardless of what bills Congress passed or rejected. Another factor apparently favoring the Democrats is the current Middle East crisis. The Democrats attest, from sad pre-1952 experience, that cold wars have a way of reacting against the party in power.

That may or may not explain why the administration's handling of the Middle East crisis is the most absorbing topic on and off the floor of the dying Congress, and the subject most likely to influence the November turn of the clock.

When the new (86th) Congress comes back in January, it is likely, therefore, to be with considerably enhanced House and Senate Democratic majorities. Senate Democratic estimates of pickups range all the way from 4 to 10. House Democratic expectations run around 30 to 40.

All of this would make for a much more liberal Congress than the one now expiring. So if you are tempted to label this one "New Dealish," hold up a bit. The next could be a throwback to the thirties.

Whatever happens in November, all things being equal, the present congressional leadership isn't likely to change. Speaker RAYBURN and LYNDON JOHNSON, although moderates by instinct, know how to work equally well with a liberal majority or a conservative minority. In any event, neither is likely to be successfully challenged.

One of the holes in the record of the present Congress is the failure to make any change in Senate Rule 22, the Senate's virtually unlimited debate rule, requiring the votes of 64 Senators, two-thirds of the full membership, to force a bill to a vote.

Next January liberal Democrats, teaming up for the second time in 2 years with Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and his following of Senate Republicans, could change this. They expect to strike at the start of the session on the theory that the Senate, like the House, must adopt its rules at the start of a session—by majority vote.

One possible compromise is a plan jointly put forward last year by leaders JOHNSON and KNOWLAND, permitting two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to cut off debate, with no other strings attached.

A statistical fact to remember: The Senate next year will have 98 Members, instead of 96, as Alaska comes into her own as a State. Unless observers miss their guess, admission of Alaska means two more votes for the almost inevitable change in the Senate debate rules. It's just one more symbol of the slow but steady decline of Old South influence in the Senate.

The Eisenhower Doctrine II—The U. N. and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the attention of the world is focused upon the special session of the United Nations General Assembly. The President of the United States laid down a program for peace in the Middle East. It is appropriately termed by the New York Times "The Eisenhower Doctrine II."

The President's program is the subject of considerable debate and discussion in the United Nations. Actually, it places before the U. N. a real challenge—a test of the U. N.'s ability to create and establish long-range economic policies and to induce political settlements in troubled areas.

Two excellent editorials of the New York Times of recent date focused attention upon United States Middle East-ern policy and the problems that the policy faces in the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials "The Eisenhower Doctrine II" and "The U. N. and Democracy" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE II

The plan for Middle Eastern peace, security and economic development outlined by President Eisenhower before the United Nations General Assembly has been welcomed throughout the free world. At the same time it is recognized that the practical problems involved are enormous and that one of the first conditions must be the restoration of security and stability in that region.

To make arrangements for such restoration is the primary responsibility of the United Nations and the paramount business of this Assembly session which has been called not to obtain the western troop withdrawals, as Mr. Gromyko insists, but, as Mr. Lloyd emphasizes, to consider the complaints of Lebanon and Jordan of outside interference in their affairs. These complaints and the American and British responses to them raise a problem which, as President Eisenhower emphasized, involves the right of small nations to call for assistance against direct or indirect aggression. The President rightly warned that "if it is made an international crime to help a small nation to maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited."

The right to call for assistance, as even Mr. Gromyko concedes, is guaranteed in article 51 of the United Nations Charter in case of direct aggression through armed attack. But he rules out such a right in case of indirect aggression, although the United Nations has long been trying to deal with this new tactic.

The very Assembly now considering the matter condemned inflammatory propaganda in 1947. It adopted an "Essentials of Peace" resolution in 1949, condemning any acts, direct or indirect, aimed at subversion or fomenting of civil war. It passed a "Peace Through Deeds" resolution in 1950, outlawing as the gravest crime the fomenting of civil strife in the interest of a foreign power or intervening in the affairs of another state for the purpose of changing its legally established government by the threat or use of force. Finally it adopted the "Uniting for Peace" resolution which empowers the Assembly to act when the Security Council is paralyzed by the usual Soviet veto.

This is legal and practical background against which the Assembly must now act. But President Eisenhower also made a point regarding American policy which applies when the United Nations cannot act and which, in effect, is an expansion of both the original Truman and Eisenhower doctrines. The Truman doctrine pledged aid to Greece and Turkey against direct and indirect aggression, but primarily by economic means. The original Eisenhower doctrine pledged both economic and military aid to nations against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism. In the United Nations message President Eisenhower now declares that "the United States reserves, within the spirt of the Charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation, particularly a small nation," to resist any aggression, direct or indirect, from whatever source it may come.

It is up to the United Nations to provide help to small nations calling for it, as the President proposes. But the expansion of the Eisenhower doctrine marks a milestone

in the development of American foreign policy which further commits us to the cause of peace and freedom.

THE U. N. AND DEMOCRACY

In its latest effort to wrestle with the Middle Eastern problem, the United Nations General Assembly is again confronted with an issue that reaches far beyond the Middle East and involves the basic character and possibly the very existence of the United Nations itself. The issue, always in the background ever since its foundation, is whether the United Nations shall function as an international democracy based on the sovereign equality of all its members, as provided in the Charter, or whether it is to be dominated by a dictatorship of big powers making their own deals in a game of power politics.

The first concept of an international democracy has always been espoused by the West, in particular by the United States, which has made the United Nations the fulcrum of its foreign policy. It is espoused again in the present instance, as eloquently demonstrated by President Eisenhower's address, in which he reaffirmed our faith in the United Nations as the world body primarily responsible for both international peace and security, invoked the United Nations' own resolutions against any kind of aggression and repudiated the very idea of any one power or group of powers dominating the world. In keeping with this concept the United States, while presenting its own proposals, gladly backs the efforts of smaller nations to find solutions for the Middle East through the United Nations and its Secretary General.

In contrast, the second concept of big power dictatorship always has been and is still propagated by the Soviets. It was expressed by Mr. Gromyko as early as the San Francisco Conference of 1945, when he demanded that the smaller nations should trust the big powers and for the rest observe discipline. It has been expressed by the deluge of Soviet vetoes which has paralyzed the Security Council, by the Soviet attempt to take important problems, such as disarmament, out of the United Nations and, most pointedly, by the Soviet drive for a summit meeting to decide world issues by a few big power heads of government whom the Soviet must view as dictators akin to their own, which the western statesmen are not.

In line with that concept Mr. Gromyko again calls for a big power agreement on the Middle East as an essential precondition for a settlement. But the ultimate Soviet goal, as bluntly proclaimed by the Kremlin and backed by ballistic blackmail, is, of course, not dictatorship by several but by only one big power in a final world triumph of communism.

There are those who criticize the American concept of the United Nations as too idealistic and back the Soviet concept of big power rule as closer to the realities. The big powers cannot, of course, abdicate their responsibilities, and the United States has specifically reserved the right of individual and collective self-defense within the spirit of the charter whenever the United Nations is unable to act. But when the United Nations is able to act, as in Korea, or is at least able to take a stand, as on Hungary and Suez, the United States has supported it and will do so again in the Middle East. It is, however, up to the smaller nations, constituting the great majority in the United Nations, to make international democracy work, and do so without penalizing those who bow to United Nations decisions or rewarding those who systematically defy them.

Support in Oregon for Two-Price Plan for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the East Oregonian of Pendleton, Oreg., reflects in its editorial interests the paramount importance of wheat in the economy of its area of circulation. Consequently, the editor studies closely the direct or indirect impact of all agricultural bills on the one basic commodity grown in quantity in the Northwest. Umatilla County, of which Pendleton is the county seat, is one of the great wheat counties found in the Columbia River watershed. The States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington produce the bulk of the soft white wheat grown in this country. So it is understandable that the newspapers of the Northwest wheat belt report to their readers every word or action, coming from Washington, which in any way influences the price of their principal crop.

In a similar vein, the newspapers of the Midwest, where corn is king, follow avidly the measures which concern this basic crop. In the South, in like manner, no word touching on cotton fails to be studied and reported by the region's press.

In preparing the Monday, August 11, 1958, issue of the Pendleton East Oregonian, the editor went to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where his practiced eye discovered references to the domestic parity program—a subject of profound interest to every wheat grower. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial thus inspired.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian of August 11, 1958]

IT'S STILL VERY MUCH ALIVE

Men who understand the problems of agricultural have long recognized that there is no pat solution that can encompass all the basic crops, those crops that are provided Government price support. That has been evident in recent weeks with the introduction to and passage by the Senate of legislation that would determine price supports for corn, rice and feed grains according to market prices of the previous 3 years. Wheat was excluded for the reason that wheat has special problems.

The best special program for wheat, according to our thinking, is the domestic parity plan which would provide Government support for that wheat which was consumed domestically and would permit free marketing without price guaranty of all wheat that went into the export market and all that went into the feeding of livestock and poultry.

Among early exponents of the domestic parity plan were members of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. They have spread the gospel far and wide, have gained much support in wheat producing States, and among Senators and Representatives from those States.

The domestic parity plan has had rough going in the Congress because of opposition by Representatives of corn-producing States. They have not wanted wheat to become a feed for livestock at prices that would be competitive with corn. There are some favorable signs that that opposition is weakening.

A leader in the Senate for the domestic parity plan has been Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas; a State that produces one-fourth of all the winter wheat grown in the United States. Senator CARLSON introduced in 1956 and again in 1957 legislation which would establish the domestic parity plan for marketing of wheat.

In an exchange of remarks on the floor of the Senate late in July with Oregon's Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE, Senator CARLSON revealed that he plans to introduce domestic parity plan legislation again early in 1959.

During the discussion, Senator CARLSON made statements which will, we are sure, be of interest to wheat producers here as well as whose economy and that of the wheatgrowers is inseparable. We quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 25:

"Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] comes from a good State so far as dealing with domestic parity is concerned, because, historically, the McNary-Haugen bill was sponsored by a very able Senator from the State of Oregon many years ago. I knew him quite well personally. The Senator from Oregon, therefore, has a very good background for this type of program.

"Frankly, I cannot see any future for the wheatgrowers of the Nation except through a domestic parity program. I believe that has been proved this year. We are operating under a limitation of 55 million acres, in accordance with Federal statute. Yet, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated last night—and he expressed it very well—based on 1938 production figures, we are today, on 55 million acres, producing the equivalent of 82 million acres in 1938. We are doing that because we have improved our methods and increased our soil fertility, and so forth. Therefore, I cannot see any future for the wheatgrower except through a program of this type.

"Mr. CARLSON. If it could be put into effect without the great burdensome surpluses we have at the present time it would be a good program. It would provide 100-percent parity for the portion consumed in this country; the remaining portion would be exported or fed on the farm, without supports and without subsidy.

"We must be frank in a discussion of this situation. We have and we will have next July more than 1,200,000,000 bushels of wheat in surplus. Therefore I would be less than frank if I did not state that we must have some acreage controls until we dispose of some of the surplus.

"Second, we are having difficulty in the foreign markets. We are being criticized by our neighbor to the north, Canada, and by some other countries, for dumping our wheat by subsidizing it as high as 95 cents a bushel. I would like to say that the people who contend that the proposed program is a dumping program had best look at our present program. The argument against the proposed program, that it is a dumping program and would endanger us internationally, is not a sound one, because we are already doing that, although I do not agree it is justified.

"Mr. NEUBERGER. I can understand that. I shall ask the Senator from Kansas about one crucial agricultural problem which is particularly vexing in the Pacific Northwest. Along the seaboard in Oregon and Washington we have a very fine, cool climate, suitable for the raising of poultry, such as turkeys and chickens. The wheat grown in eastern Oregon and in eastern Washington is the logical feed for that poultry.

"However, under the existing situation, the wheat is supported at too high a price for the poultry raisers to buy it as feed for their turkeys and chickens. Is it not true that if the domestic parity or two-price plan were in effect, that particular dilemma might be solved, and the portion of the wheat crop available for feed could then be sold to the poultry raisers at prices which they could afford to pay and still make a profit on their operations?

"Mr. CARLSON. One of the complaints we receive from the corn-growing sections and the feed-producing areas of the Nation is that if quantities of those products are grown substantially in excess of the needs for human consumption, they will disrupt or wreck the feed program.

"I contend that that is a real fallacy, because if the wheat growers of Kansas were allowed to grow wheat on some of their acres, instead of planting milo and sorghum crops, they would grow from 15 to 25 bushels of wheat an acre, while at the same time, on the same ground, substituting sorghum grains, they would grow from 50 to 75 bushels to the acre, which would increase the feed tonnage.

"So I think the corn growers will see the advantage of such a plan. They are beginning to see it now. It will be the greatest thing which could happen to them. If 12 million acres were planted to wheat to be consumed in that way, the producers themselves would have a great advantage as compared to the present situation.

"Mr. CARLSON. The domestic parity plan for wheat, which was authorized in S. 3183 and S. 774 was a plan whereby wheat producers are assured of getting a return for wheat used for domestic food which is in line with other United States prices and costs while allowing all wheat produced to be sold competitively both in domestic and foreign markets.

"As compared with a continuation of the present program, it would maintain or increase wheat producers' incomes while reducing Government expenditures to negligible amounts. It also will permit eventual removal of acreage allotments, eliminate export subsidies, take the Government out of the wheat-export business, and permit all wheat to move through private-trade channels. I know of no other proposal which would accomplish all of these results."

True Status of Political Affairs in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since the large metropolitan daily papers in Texas which have printed so many untruths about me during the past 6 years have not ceased their attacks with my recent nomination, I call attention to a recent column in the Tulia (Tex.) Herald, by Mr. H. M. Baggarly, one of the outstanding editorial writers of America. Mr. Baggarly's editorials have placed first in State competition in Texas, and first in national competition as the best editorials appearing in weekly papers in Texas and America, for most particular years.

Mr. Baggarly, with his usual perception, has put his pen to the Texas political situation, and has accurately described it in his well known column the Country Editor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column, the Country Editor, from the Tulia Herald of August 7, 1958 written by Mr. Baggarly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulia (Tex.) Herald of August 7, 1958]

THE COUNTRY EDITOR

(By H. M. Baggarly)

Although the press was unsuccessful in defeating RALPH YARBOROUGH at the polls, it has not given up its fight. By taking his pronouncements out of context, by misplacing the emphasis on what he has to say, his enemies attempt to make him appear what he isn't.

Recent headlines make it appear that YARBOROUGH plans to go to the State Democratic Convention and raise a rough house, perhaps unbecoming to a United States Senator.

Here is his statement released when he arrived in Austin Saturday morning from Washington:

"I have proposed a free State Democratic Convention of freely selected Democrats. The governor has announced that he is the 'titular head of the Democratic Party in Texas,' and as such is entitled to control the State Democratic Convention. He has denounced me as vicious because I have said that Democrats should control their own convention.

"If it is truly a Democratic State Convention, it should be run by uncontrolled Democrats. If it is a Price Daniel convention, to be run for the benefit of him and his cronies, then he should control it. If it is a Democratic Party Convention, it shouldn't be in the vest pocket of any one man. We've had too much experience in Texas in recent years with conventions held in the palm of one man's hand.

"I do not call people vicious because they do not agree with me. Hundreds of thousands of people have disagreed with me on political questions in the past, but that does not make them vicious and deny them a voice in the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is truly a national party, broad enough in its doctrine and faith to include people of all religions, all races, all conditions from rich to poor, and all shades of economic thought from liberalism to conservatism.

"It will be a tragic blow to the Democratic Party if its convention in the greatest State in the Union becomes a mere Cronies Club for any politician temporarily in office.

"A person who really believes in democracy won't try to turn its delegates representing 9 million people into mere puppets of his political machine. A lover of democracy would want to see freely elected delegates freely assembled to represent the people's will, not one politician's will.

"I believe in democracy as the best form of government yet instituted among men, and in the Democratic Party as the best voice of democracy in America. Whatever force makes that Democratic Party the tool or property of one man, weakens the forces of democracy in the whole and leaves all of us the poorer for its happening. The welfare of the people will best be served by a free convention and not by a controlled convention.

"I view the Democratic Party as the party of spirit, not the party of spite. To me, the Democratic Party is an organization with the love of humanity in its heart. There is no room in it for personal vengeance. It is too great to be controlled as the mouthpiece of any one man. The people will rise in their majesty to claim their own."

That is the spirit and attitude of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. Now compare his spirit with that of Gov. Price Daniel who has been billed by the daily press as one devoted to restoring harmony to the Democratic Party. Yet instead of promoting harmony, he never misses an opportunity to promote discord. For instance, Swisher County is predominantly Loyalist and in sympathy with the principles of the DOT. We Swisherites are not labor racketeers, we do not belong to the NAACP or to the AFL–CIO. We are not Latin American radicals.

Yet the Governor calls us all these names because we do not approve of his brand of democracy which contends that to be a good Democrat one must vote Republican and perhaps cross-file every now and then; because we adhere to the Jeffersonian philosophy that government should be by and for the people instead of the chosen few; because we believe in majority rule at all conventions.

Just yesterday Daniel said, "By the time it (the State convention) is over, they'll be crying, 'me no DOT'." It is easy to grasp the sneering contempt in that expression.

If Price Daniel was either honest or dedicated to party harmony, he would try to find a middle ground on which all of us could meet. He would recognize the fact that at least half the Democrats in Texas are what he calls splinters. When Price Daniel alleges that he wants or is working for harmony, he lies—and that is the only word Webster has that accurately describes his action. He is devoted to 1 cause—kicking everyone that isn't 1 of the original Shivercrats out of places of leadership in the Democratic Party if not out of the party.

If we are to judge RALPH YARBOROUGH and Price Daniel according to their announced purposes and ambitions, which is the moderate? Which seems to want party unity? Which is the big man?

Read their direct quotations in the daily newspapers, not the headlines written by the papers or the slants given by writers who speak in third person—then decide which one is vindictive and spiteful.

We daresay there will be many delegates to the State convention who may even be pledged to Price Daniel but who love harmony, unity and their fellow man sufficiently to demand that the convention be conducted according to the principles advocated by RALPH YARBOROUGH rather than those of Price Daniel and Jake Pickle.

The New Graduate School of Public and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of Pennsylvania's great and progressive institutions of higher learning, the University of Pittsburgh, is opening its newest graduate school this fall, the Grad-

uate School of Public and International Affairs. It is headed by Dean Donald C. Stone, who brings to the position an outstanding background of educational, administrative, and public service.

We of Pennsylvania expect this school to make a notable contribution to higher education in the field of public affairs and particularly to the interchange of ideas and experience between American and foreign administrators and students.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article on the school entitled "A New Window on the World," from the magazine Pitt of the University of Pittsburgh in its 1957–58 winter issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW WINDOW ON THE WORLD

This year, when the fall semester begins, the university will open another window on the world—a wide and exciting view through its newest graduate school, the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

In increasing numbers, visitors, teachers, and exchange students from abroad have brought to the university each year culture and knowledge from many lands. And the exchange of ideas and personal contacts between students and teachers has further enriched the traditional environment already established at the university, as symbolized in its nationality rooms. But in the past, for the most part, many of these activities have been on an individual basis, and restricted to classroom activities. Now, on the graduate level, this new school provides a new structure and permanent dimension directed into specific areas with definite aims.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The objective of this new Graduate School of Public and International Affairs is to focus its research and teaching programs on the pressing worldwide administrative and public-affairs problems which face men and nations, preparing its graduates with the tools of leadership and knowledge to attack and successfully solve them. Only when public and community responsibilities on national and international levels are discharged effectively and democratically can the universal desire of mankind to live in peace be fulfilled.

Accordingly, the school will deal primarily with administrative affairs, whether governmental, community, or international. Programs will be concerned with the administration of change, with providing the leadership capable of improving society and advancing civilization.

This new graduate school will provide a center for professional education, research, and advisory services needed by all levels of government and many voluntary and international agencies in this era of rapid technological and social change. The school will present several unusual features:

It will provide an integrated approach to education in the affairs of local, State, National, and international organizations.

It will serve the leadership requirements of voluntary and community organizations at all levels.

It will engage in a balanced program of research, advisory, and consulting services, and formal and informal professional education in these interrelated fields.

It will provide an intercultural and international setting in which American and foreign administrators and students may share experiences and ideas and gain insight and perspective as they prepare for policy, operational, political, and research responsibilities.

It will stress the functions of leadership in the advancement of social ethics and responsible freedom.

The programs of the school are professional in character and planned at the graduate level. The method of teaching embraces both conceptual and empirical approaches to the problems of administration. A fundamental knowledge of the currently recognized theories and principles of administration plus an awareness of the need for their further testing and refinement are viewed as necessary background for the school's emphasis on administrative problem solving in program development and execution. Such an objective is made possible by a faculty which combines academic achievement with a wide and varied practical experience in both national and international administration.

The main fields of concentration are:

1. General public administration: Foundation work in administrative theory and science with special emphasis on program development and operational management, executive leadership and supervisory techniques of solving administrative problems, and human relations.

2. Municipal metropolitan administration: The social, economic, geographic, and political aspects of urban life and growth, administration of local public services, municipal organization and finance, intergovernmental relations, and personnel management.

3. Planning and urban development: A joint program, with the Carnegie Institute of Technology to provide training for potential city planners and urban development experts.

4. Community affairs administration: It is planned to offer two courses in 1958–59 in this new field which is concerned with the development of administrative leadership for community, civic, and other voluntary self-help organizations.

5. The administration of international affairs: While this curriculum is designed to develop a wide range of skills in handling international, intercultural, and indigenous economic and social development programs, it will also provide a solid grounding in major international problems and issues.

Especial emphasis is being given to cooperative arrangements between the graduate school of public and international affairs and other professional schools of the university, including business administration, education, engineering, law, public health, and social work, as well as the social science disciplines. The new school will have particularly close working relationships with the departments of economics, geography, history, political science, and sociology.

Another unique feature is the benefit the new school will derive from the university's administrative science center, a recently created research agency of behavioral scientists organized to do research in administrative processes as they occur in all types of large organizations. In addition, the Institute of Local Government, established in 1944, will be an integral part of the school.

Seminars, workshops, visiting speakers on international affairs, and the many international resources already available in the university will enrich the curriculum. Arrangements for study, research, and practical experience are flexible so that special programs may be provided to meet particular needs and interests of overseas students.

THE STUDY PROGRAM

For both young men and women and senior officials from abroad, the school offers a unique opportunity. In developing a curriculum, the aim has been to select courses and points of view which experience has shown to be of a maximum utility in dealing with specific situations and conditions found in many countries, especially those most often encountered in the newly independent and the less industrialized parts of the world.

The aim will be to enroll students, on both junior and senior levels, with the kind of personal qualities, leadership capabilities, and moral stamina which will enable them to carry broader responsibilities in important and significant fields of government, business, labor, education, and human relations.

The current academic year is being devoted to planning and development, recruitment of staff, special seminars and conferences, and initial advisory and research projects. A limited number of full-time students will be admitted to the degree programs in September, 1958.

Fellowships: A fellowship program has been established. Awards will be granted on the basis of ability and relative needs. Most students and officials from abroad who attend for short periods for degree purposes, however, will normally be financed under educational exchange programs of their own government, the United States Government, international agencies, or private foundations or associations.

Degrees: The program leading to a master's degree will require 1 to 2 years, depending on the previous education and experience of the candidate. Programs for doctoral work can be carried out jointly with certain other schools and departments of the university.

Especially designed nondegreee programs will often best serve particular interests of some students, however, and, for these, a certificate of study will be granted.

Direction: The school has been established by the board of trustees under the initiative and leadership of Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield, who himself has had a distinguished career in the fields of public and international affairs in government, higher education and business. The school is one of the professional schools under the coordination of Vice Chancellor Elvis J. Stahr.

The pioneering and experimental character of the school is matched by the diversity of experience of its first dean. Dean Donald C. Stone brings to the university varied administrative, research, consulting, and teaching experience dealing with all levels of government, public affairs, private education, and community service. He has served as Executive Director of the Public Administration Service, as Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Officer of the President, Director of Administration of the Economic Cooperation Administration (now International Cooperation Administration), and, most recently, as president of Springfield College. He has participated in numerous international conferences and helped in the establishment of the United Nations and UNESCO.

The University of Pittsburgh, with its fresh and progressive approach in many fields of education and research, provides a natural setting for this professional school. For many years a need for this kind of training has existed in the Upper Ohio Valley region. With the shifting pattern of world events, trade, economics, and politics, graduates from this new school will find many areas of challenge and service, locally, nationally, and internationally.

In the next quarter of a century man seems destined to conquer space and reach the stars. The trip to the moon already is assured. But in contrast to his fantastic progress in the physical world, advancement in the social, economic, and spiritual worlds appear insignificant and these problems insurmountable. Yet, here is the area of man's greatest challenge. For in the solutions of today's complex cultural, economic, and political problems are the keys to freedom from fear and want, oppression, and war.

Fifty-ninth Annual Reunion, 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry Last Man Association

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry Last Man Association met on August 2, 1958. The recorder-treasurer, Dan A. Dooley, has made a very fine report, which I think will be of great interest to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTH PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY LAST MAN ASSOCIATION
LIGONIER, PA., *August 14, 1958.*

To the 113 Survivors of 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry:

The 59th annual reunion of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry Last Man Association was held Saturday, August 2, 1958, at Brentwood Post 1810, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located on Route 51, in the Brentwood section of Pittsburgh, Pa., with President John H. Turley (C), First Vice President William E. DeBolt (D), Second Vice President G. Fred Anderson (C), and Recorder-Treasurer Dan A. Dooley (I) in their respective places.

Of the 113 surviving members of the 10th Regiment, as of the reunion date, 33 members were present. Also in attendance were 42 guests, including the widows of Pvt. Frank P. Trainor, of Company C, and Pvt. James Hudson, of Company I.

Rollcall of deceased members—with members at attention, Recorder Dooley called the roll of the following 21 veterans whose deaths had been reported since our last reunion:

Company A: Sgt. Charles P. Keller, Pvt. George A. Rowe, Pvt. William T. Van Voorhis.

Company B: Corp. William M. Cleckner, Pvt. Theodore G. Bauman, Pvt. Harry Wilmet Miller.

Company C: Pvt. John R. Barnes, Pvt. William E. Little, Pvt. Frank W. Shanaberger.

Company D: No deaths reported.

Company E: Pvt. Walter J. Devlin, and Pvt. Joseph Dempsey Roadman.

Company H: Sgt. Samuel K. Weirich, Jr.; Corp. Eli H. Wherry; Pvt. William E. Reed.

Company I: Pvt. John D. Fenton, Pvt. Burt H. Leonard, Pvt. Alfred F. (Snap) Rugh.

Company K: Pvt. Joseph K. Bush, Pvt. John H. Chambers, Pvt. Charles William Pfinder, Pvt. Charles B. Wood.

Taps was sounded in their honor.

Hon. William Rahauser, judge of the orphans' court of Allegheny County, delivered the address of welcome on behalf of the city of Pittsburgh, which was very much appreciated by members of the 10th Regiment.

Report of the historian: Recorder Dooley reported: That a card signed by Joseph D. Roadman (E), dated August 20, 1947, gave his address as Redondo Beach, Calif., and the date of birth as August 13, 1877; that information received between 1954 and 1958 showed that both Joe Roadman and his wife had died in a sanitarium, and was buried, under the name of Joseph D. Rodman; that the records in the police department at Pasadena, Calif., where Joe worked as a motorcycle officer for more than 20 years before he retired, shows over his fingerprints on the application blank the name of Joseph Dempsey Rodman.

That through correspondence it was learned that M. C. Lilley & Co., manufacturers of the sabre engraved, "To Colonel A. L. Hawkins from citizens of Greensburg, Pa., and members of Co. 'I', 10th Regiment, National Guard Pennsylvania" was absorbed by Bill Kay, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, who does not have the old Lilley records and was unable to contact any of the old employees.

That no information has been received concerning the 10th Regiment bass drum, which disappeared in Washington, Pa., and a letter from Mrs. Charles H. Delaney states that the drum used by her husband, of Company H, is in the museum, in Harrisburg.

That the contents of our July 15, 1958 roster was placed in the Monday, July 28, 1958, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Company K.

That of the 258 rosters mailed to widows or next of kin of our deceased members, 15 have been returned, several of them marked "deceased."

Reports from companies: According to the registration cards, the following members were present: Company A (3), Frank E. Yohe, R. Dale Jolliffe and Joseph Phillips; Company B (2), William A. Ketterer and William E. Smith; Company C (6), Charles O. Collins, John H. Turley, G. Fred Anderson, Homer J. Daugherty, Abraham De Gardeyn, Jr., and Leroy Underwood; Company D (6) George E. Mills, James H. Cope, Richard T. Cunningham, William E. DeBolt, Charles J. Rosenecker and Harry C. Wilson; Company E (4), James McShane, Harry R. Hummer, Harry M. Kinkead and Bert Mason; Company H (3), Harry E. Cope, Edward M. Power, Jr., and Thomas M. Reese; Company I (3), Judge Richard D. Laird, Daniel A. Dooley and Kennett W. Saam, and Company K (6), Samuel L. John, Albert Cathers, Benjamin F. Hamilton, Lowye Keys, Joseph W. McCullough and Donald C. Scott. Total, 33.

Remarks by guests or members: President Turley called on Judge Richard D. Laird, of Company I, who said in his remarks that because of pressing official business he had been unable to attend recent reunions and that in the future he hoped to be a regular at our reunions. Other speakers were R. Dale Jolliffe for Company A, President Turley for Company C, Harry C. Wilson for Company D, Bert Mason for Company E, Harry E. Cope for Company H, and F. G. G. Conley, son of the late Rollo J. Conley, of Company D.

Reading of communications: The following telegram was read: "R. Dale Jolliffe, 316 Bracken Avenue, Pittsburgh. Wish you would extend to my comrades my sincere regrets in not being with them at the 59th reunion. My work here is so piled up I cannot get away. That God may grant you all health and happiness is my prayer. EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator for Pennsylvania."

The following letter, addressed to the recorder, was also read: "My colleague and good personal friend, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, has informed me that the 10th Pennsylvania Infantry United States Volunteers of the Spanish-American War, is holding its 59th annual reunion on August 2, 1958, in Pittsburgh.

"As one who has long been aware of the services performed by the volunteers in the Spanish-American War, I would like to convey my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the only unit in the United States that has continually held an annual reunion since the war in which the volunteers served.

"Again, good wishes to the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and with my best wishes for a very successful reunion, I am cordially yours, KARL E. MUNDT, United States Senator." A thank you letter was mailed to Senator MUNDT.

Unfinished business—Relics Committee: A letter has been received from Miss Julia Bierer, daughter of Maj. Everhart Bierer, stating that the Spanish canon presented years ago by her father to Fayette County (now gathering dust in the basement of the courthouse at Uniontown), and other relics in her possession and in the family of Capt. Dan Bierer, will be turned over to the 10th Regiment when and if the association decides on a place to keep them.

A motion was made at the meeting to place the baseball trophy in the Baseball Hall of Fame, at Cooperstown, N. Y. It was defeated.

Good and welfare: A motion was made by Thomas M. Reese of Company H, that a standing vote of thanks be tendered Senator EDWARD MARTIN and Recorder Dan A. Dooley for the work they have done for the 10th Regiment.

Election of officers: The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Harry R. Hummer, Company E, Latrobe, Pa.; first vice president, Bert Mason, Company E, Mount Pleasant, Pa.; second vice president, Thomas M. Reese, Company H, Cannonsburg, Pa., and recorder-treasurer, Dan A. Dooley, Company I, Ligonier, Pa.

Korean Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Republic of Korea celebrated its 10th bitrhday this past week. An interesting editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "Korean Decade."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN DECADE

It was 10 years ago today that the free and independent Republic of Korea was proclaimed. They have been turbulent years in which disaster was narrowly averted. They have also been fruitful years in which the Korean people have shown their great courage, resilience and imagination.

This free government was instituted by the consent of the governed as expressed in an election that was sponsored and observed by the United Nations. It was necessarily the government of only a part of the peninsula, since the Communists would not permit either a free election or United Nations observation. Freedom could survive in only part of the troubled land. Its survival has seemed almost miraculous.

This part of the country was obliged to fight off a vicious onslaught from the Communist North, to accommodate literally millions of refugees who fled the Red terror and to undertake a gigantic rebuilding under conditions that would have tried the stoutest of hearts.

Fortunately, the United Nations was able to discharge some of the responsibilities that it had assumed. It was able to come to the defense of the free Koreans militarily. It has been able to give assistance, since the invader was halted, in this program of rebuilding. The United States may well be proud of its leading part in these operations.

The total obligation, however, has not yet been met. The United Nations has recognized the government in Seoul as the only lawful government among the Koreans. It is pledged to work for the unification of the peninsula under a free government. The case of Korea is still upon the agenda of the United Nations. It must be still upon the conscience of the world. The free Koreans have shown themselves worthy of our admiration. They deserve more than that. They can honorably claim our continued support.

Solar Radiation—Wisconsin "Sunshine" Satellite No. 4 in Vanguard Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pelased, from time to time, to invite attention to the splendid contributions made by our scientists and technologists at the University of Wisconsin to our national science program.

Today, I would like to make special comments on a current project, the development of a "sunshine satellite"—scheduled to be number 4 in the Vanguard series. The satellite is designed to provide important data on the radiation of the sun. For example, we need more answers to such questions as: How much heat comes to the earth from the sun? How much heat is reflected by clouds, snow, and water and radiate into space by the earth? How is sunshine, or lack of it, related to general weather conditions? To help answer these, and other questions, the information radioed back to earth from the orbiting satellite is expected to be extremely valuable.

The project is being developed by a team of scientists, headed by Dr. Verner Suomi, meteorologist. Other members of the team include: Prof. Robert J. Parent, Prof. Wayne Swift, Harry Miller, Peter Schoffer, Charles R. Stearns, E. J. Romare, William Hauser, and Andrew Grondahl.

Yesterday's New York Times carried a fine article on this splendid project.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNSHINE STUDIES BY SATELLITE SET—VANGUARD IS MADE READY TO MEASURE RADIATION IN WEATHER STUDIES

MADISON, WIS., August 16.—Where does all the sunshine go?

The answer could bring much more accurate weather forecasts, and perhaps one day help produce control over weather.

To get the answer, a team of scientists headed by Dr. Verner Suomi, University of Wisconsin meteorologist, is putting finishing touches to a Vanguard satellite that could solve the problem. It probably will be launched late this year.

Sunshine brings tremendous amounts of heat to the earth every day.

Obviously, the earth doesn't keep all this heat. If it did, life would be impossible on this planet. The earth gets rid of as much heat as it collects.

"Over a year or 10 years, the radiation exchange balances out," Dr. Suomi explains. "But we don't know what happens month by month, or whether there are significant effects on the weather if for a week we get more or less heat than the earth surrenders to space.

EFFECT OF CLOUDS A FACTOR

"Clouds and snow reflect a good deal of heat directly back to space. What happens to weather if the United States is covered with lots of cloud for a week or so?

"Suppose the oceans get more sunshine than usual, for lack of clouds. You would think there would be more evaporation and so more rain would have to fall somewhere. Or do the oceans, perhaps, store heat in such a way that short-term changes in incoming radiation don't make any real difference? We'd like to know."

To help resolve such questions, the sunshine satellite will measure the heat coming to the earth from the sun; the heat reflected by clouds, snow, and water and radiated into space by the earth and its air.

These measurements can be correlated with weather events on earth.

Making 90-minute trips around the world, the satellite will report radiation measurements over land and sea, by day and by night. It will provide knowledge not obtainable in any other way.

HEAT FLOWS TO POLES

The tropics collect more heat than they surrender. The polar regions surrender more than they receive from the sun. Heat moves from the equator toward the poles to be dissipated. These heat migrations are the basic mechanism of our weather.

Dr. Suomi and a team of enthusiastic assistants have the sunshine satellite about set to go.

It carries four little sensors—metal balls suspended at the tips of long antennas. The sensors measure temperatures, which in turn depend upon the amount of radiation.

Two of the sensors are about the size of table tennis balls, painted black and white. Two others are much smaller, and protected by metal blinders. The blinders can shade the sensors at times from direct rays of the sun, which cast a sharp shadow, but still allow them to measure radiation coming back from the earth.

The sensors are so designed that they separately can measure the sun's incoming radiation, reflected radiation, and heat surrendered by the earth.

Thermistors, tiny electrical thermometers, record the temperatures in the sensors. This message is transmitted along wires through the antenna and recorded as signals on a 1-pound tape recorder.

The tape recorder gets readings every 30 seconds, which means about every 150 miles of the satellite's journey. When the satellite passes over a recording station, it will be commanded by radio to broadcast its findings. The data from one roundtrip are broadcast to earth in 10 seconds, then the recorder starts storing new data.

If powered by a solar battery, the satellite should be able to talk to earth for about a year, Dr. Suomi said.

TO COUNT LIGHTNING FLASHES

Its findings are expressed in mathematical equations, and it will report 230,000 equations in about 100 days. These will be processed in a computing machine.

The satellite will also record hits by micrometeorites and try to count lightning flashes on earth. It will be tuned to record certain bursts of radio noises created by lightning flashes.

The team building the equipment for this satellite includes Prof. Robert J. Parent, Prof. Wayne Swift, Harry Miller, Peter Schoffer, Charles R. Stearns, E. J. Romare, William Hauser and Andrew Grondahl.

The Wisconsin satellite will be No. 4 in the Vanguard series, and is scheduled to be launched within the International Geophysical Year, which ends December 31.

United States Geographic Center in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, South Dakota is understandably gratified that the admission of Alaska to the union of States will shift the Nation's geographic center to our State. It is just another example that, sooner, or later, all good things gravitate to South Dakota.

Should Hawaii become the 50th State, the geographic center of the Nation as a whole will shift only 9 miles, and will still remain in South Dakota, according to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The new geographic center will be located near Castle Rock, S. Dak., in Butte County, in the westernmost part of the State. Castle Rock consists of one store, and the population is not very large. But all the residents are unanimous in their gratification over this new recognition.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not blame the Senator from South Dakota for being proud that the new center of the United States will be in his State. But I want him to understand that the center of the world is my home town.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not know about that. I suppose it depends on where one begins his calculation when he wants to locate the center of the earth.

Mr. AIKEN. Any map will prove it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The statement of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey is the authority for the statement I have made today.

Mr. President, recently the Rapid City, S. Dak., Daily Journal published an article by Mr. Ed Niciejewski describing the whereabouts of the new center and the impact which this news has had upon the small community of Castle Rock.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTLE ROCK NOT "UPPITY" OVER BEING CENTER OF UNITED STATES

(By Ed Niciejewski, Journal staff writer)

CASTLE ROCK.—A road and a map are uppermost in the minds of residents in this community nearest the Nation's new geographic center.

A sweep of a mapmaker's divider puts Castle Rock near the Nation's balance point when Alaska is admitted into the Union. All nine permanent residents of Castle Rock hope the distinction will put them on South Dakota's map for all time.

"Here's Mason up the road without even a postoffice and they're always on the map. We've had a post office since 1910 and we're on some maps but not on others," declared Mrs. Francis Jacobsen.

POPULATION

The Francis Jacobsens account for most of Castle Rock's population. Included in the family are Mr. and Mrs. Jacobsen; their 3 children, Patricia, 17; Merle, 13, and Harlan, 11; Jacobsen's mother, Mrs. Mabel Jacobsen, and their ranch hand, Herman Pargas.

Rounding out the census are Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Eichler, who run a combination general store, post office, and filling station. Not counted on the impromptu census are Mr. and Mrs. Wortham Marten, Chattanooga, Okla., and their children Linda, 13 and Janet, 11. The Martens are in Castle Rock only during the summer harvest season.

As attention of the Nation swings to Castle Rock, its residents were amused and detached.

"If they put a monument up here, then maybe they'll build a road to it," declared Mrs. Francis Jacobsen, waving a hand generally at State Highway 79 which constitutes Main Street.

From the Belle Fourche River to the south, State 79 shoots straight across plains to the north, a seemingly endless ribbon of white and dustry gravel.

Impact of tourists and the curious coming to Castle Rock as result of the new designation didn't particularly worry anyone.

"What would they come up for? There's nothing to see here and this is too far away from everything," one resident opined.

Pargas offered an impromptu thought on the cartographer's computations. "It's better to be in the middle of the United States than to be on the outside of it," he said.

UNCONCERNED

Eichler reflected the hamlet's general unconcern. "I haven't thought about this," he said, "but it will be good for Butte County. It will be good for the county and it will be good for South Dakota. I don't know why, but it will be."

Mrs. Mabel Jacobsen admitted surprise at the information but, like others, wasn't particularly concerned. In her 70's, Mrs. Jacobsen came to Castle Rock in 1910 and served as postmaster for 34 years before retiring in 1948. She and her husband were the immediate area's second settlers.

Comment from the mayor was not available—Castle Rock doesn't have one. A query for this official prompted 13-year-old Merle to ask: "Mom, who's the big shot here?" His brother Harlan commented: "We're all mayors here." The boys felt 3 cats and 2 dogs should be included in the census.

If the action in distant Washington should bring civilization to Castle Rock it would be a shame in some ways.

NO PROBLEMS

The village has no juvenile delinquency problems; recession and crime are merely words in newspapers. Its residents are forthright and friendly with true western hospitality. Spend an hour with them and you'll think you have known them all your life.

Because the law requires it, Henry Jacobsen, a nearby rancher, was elected justice of the peace, and Henry Carlson, another rancher, was designated constable.

"They really don't do anything because there is nothing for them to do, but the law says we have to have the offices," explained Mrs. Francis Jacobsen, who is town clerk. Nearly everyone in town holds some office or other.

Two Top Peak, clearly visible from Castle Rock's only east and west street, may be near the Nation's actual new center. Only 11 miles away by air, it may as well be 10 times that distance so far as accessibility is concerned.

To reach Two Top Peak from Castle Rock a tourist would have to start several miles north of town and proceed west. Winding around buttes and through draws, the graded road gradually peters out to twin ruts, separated by an island of grass. A rain turns the ruts into quagmires.

FEW PEOPLE

Scattered on the hillsides are rocks as large as homes and aside from curious cows and wildlife the rough country is nearly devoid of life. Adjacent to the peak are several ranches owned by the Kinghorn brothers.

Last week a pilot from Weber Aviation in Rapid City and I planted a sign near the Nation's geographic center the easy way—by flying there.

Twenty-five minutes after taking off from Rapid City, pilot Jerry McDow brought the airplane in for a neat landing on the prairie near Castle Rock. Another hop of 10 minutes brought the craft to another landing near Two Top Peak.

Feeling very much like explorers, we erected a small rock cairn and planted a sign: "New Geographic Center of the U. S. A. Population 0."

A mile away a herd of cattle, unimpressed with the intrusion, foraged among prickly pear for food. The sun beat down and a brisk wind made anchoring the sign difficult.

French explorer and adventurer Verendrye may have trod this spot over 200 years ago.

Gen. George A. Custer's or General Crook's troops may have engaged hostile Sioux or hunted buffalo in this very same pasture in the 1870's.

But at this particular historic moment when we planted the sign, nobody could have cared less.

America Disturbed by Communist Trend in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have brought to the attention of my colleagues the serious problem of increasing Communist penetration of Latin America.

Looking backward, I recall the grim, alarming days of the unlamented regime of Colonel Arbenz in Guatemala. At that time, Communists completely dominated the government. I believe I was one of the first, if not the very first, Member of the Senate to expose the Communist beachhead in that land.

Fortunately, the Communist regime was ousted in Guatemala, thanks largely to the heroism of the late Col. Castillo Armas. But, following his tragic assassination, there have been disturbing indications of Communist efforts at a comeback there, despite the anti-Communist position of the present government.

Communism looms now as a problem in other lands, as well: in the Caribbean, in Central and in South America.

THREE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO COMMUNISM'S GROWTH

Why? For three reasons, I believe:

First. Often, because of conditions which breed communism, which arouse discontent and demand for a change.

Second. Invariably, because communism puts on a false but attractive face. Under the tricky Khrushchev, the Kremlin plays down dictatorial Marxism and plays up so-called socialist democracy, friendship, and aid.

Third. Because whether or not local conditions are good or bad, and whether or not Khrushchev or a Stalinist is in the saddle, the fact is that Communist agents are all over Latin America, working for revolution. These agents are skilled, unscrupulous conspirators, as are the Red agents in the Middle East.

For these and other reasons, we see the paradox of Red signs in many areas of the devout continent.

KHRUSHCHEV MAKING HAY WITH "SOFT-SELL"

Meanwhile, particular success has been achieved by Khrushchev's "soft-sell." His line of soft-pedaling communism, while dangling all sorts of economic offers—trade, loans and assistance—has unfortunately paid off, so far as increasing Soviet ties with Latin America are concerned.

By all reports, the Communists have been making considerable headway recently in Venezuela. In that oil-rich, iron-ore rich land, Reds are infiltrating trade unions, student organizations and other groups and are taking other steps to try to become the balance of power there.

ANTI-COMMUNISTS SPEAK UP AS WELL

Across my desk there come many indications of Communist and fellow-traveller activities there and elsewhere, as well. Fortunately, there come indications, too, of strong anti-Communist voices—inside and outside governments.

I have in my hand, for example, the text of an editorial in the August 5, 1958, issue of the Habana Post entitled "Communism in Latin America," which was prepared, I understand, by Mr. Edward Scott.

I understand that the Habana Post was itself attacked the preceding Saturday, and that hundreds of pamphlets denouncing so-called Yankee imperialism were left there, and on the street after the assault.

The pamphlets asserted that—

Imperialism, with its aggression against the Middle East, seeks to unleash nuclear war against the Soviet Union and all the peoples of the world.

The pamphlets concluded:

Down with aggressive warmongering imperialism. Long live the Soviet Union, defender of peace and liberty.

According to reports, two banners were also left saying, "Yankee troops get out of Yateras"—the waterworks supplying the United States Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay.

I send to the desk the Habana Post editorial, preceded by an Associated Press dispatch of August 3 from Caracas,

written by Larry Allen, entitled "Reds Widen Their Grip in Venezuela."

I have not personally been to either of these countries, so I would not attempt to speak in detail as regards the problem of communism there. But I cite these two newspaper reports as evidences of an all-too-prevalent problem throughout an area which we would like to be the very symbol of good-neighbor relations. We hope that all the lands of the Caribbean and of the rest of Latin America will always be our friends and allies. We of the Senate Foreign Relations Committeee through our subcommittee study and through our regular review intend to give this problem our continuing attention.

I ask unanimous consent that both newspaper items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS WIDEN THEIR GRIP IN VENEZUELA

(By Larry Allen)

CARACAS, August 3.—With incredible speed the Communists have moved into positions in Venezuela where they often dictate the acts of the junta that overthrew a dictatorship last January.

Their organization is closeknit, speedy, and precise. Unless their tactics are halted soon, Venezuelans may awaken one day and find control of the oil-rich nation in Red hands.

The Communists are respected. They have equality with all other political parties. They are consulted by the Government.

There are Communist Party members in all the key trade unions, in businesses and industries, in civic and student organizations, and in the offices of government.

The Communist Party is small. But its agitators are descending upon cities, towns, and villages in every strategic sector of Venezuela, enlisting party members. They incite and enforce strikes.

Communist membership might reach 100,000 by the end of the year. At the moment, the party rolls show 26,000 to 30,000.

Apparently because the number sounds small, the provisional government, headed by Rear Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, waves aside any suggestion the Communists constitute a threat to Venezuela's "new democracy."

Larrazabal said recently Venezuela's Communists were patriotic and nationalistic, and not the byproduct of Moscow's international communism.

As he spoke, two kingpins of the Venezuelan party were in Moscow, presumably getting their orders.

In Larrazabal's view, the Communists helped to overthrow the 10-year-long military dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez last January 23 and therefore are democratic.

But outside of Larrazabal's governing five-member military-civilian junta, there is rising alarm over the Red riptide, particularly within the army.

That might crystallize into action, long before national elections expected in November. There are deep rumblings of discontent among some top army officers and talk the Communists must be stopped.

This already has exploded into one abortive coup.

Gen. Jesus Maria Castro Leon, defense minister in the junta, led a conspiracy July 23 aimed at toppling the government. One of his chief aims was an immediate crackdown on the Reds.

But the Communists and their sympathizers got wind of the conspiracy.

They immediately mustered more than 100,000 Venezuelans. They chanted for Castro Leon's death and the eradication of all conspirators. Castro Leon was forced out and exiled to a job in Washington.

The average man fears to say anything critical or to suggest any action against the Communists. It means attack from most of Venezuela's newspapers.

Even the Roman Catholic Church, often the spearhead against communism, is highly cautious in Venezuela. Only occasionally is there the mildest reference to Venezuelan Communists in the church's organ, La Religion.

It is a great change from 7 months ago when the Communists were outlawed, hunted and generally ignored by the Venezuelan people.

[From the Habana Post of August 5, 1958]

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

An Associated Press dispatch out of Washington, D. C., published in the Courier yesterday stated that officials in Washington were surprised and mystified by the meeting between Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tze Tung, chief of the Chinese Communist Party in Peiping on July 31.

We fail to see why there should be any mystification. With the world in a state of crisis, what is more natural than that Khrushchev, master of 193 million people should discuss events with Mao, who holds in his hand the destinies of 602 million Chinese.

Nor can we see any reason for surprise in the notice served on the Western World by Khrushchev and Mao that they intend to intervene in the internal affairs of the countries of Latin America. Their statement said that the two Communist leaders would give their firm support to the national independence movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

When questioned with respect to the Communist statement, John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, said that he was struck by the fact that the Russian and Chinese Communists were about to undertake a movement of independence and liberation in Latin America. "I thought that if they wanted to spread independence, they could start nearer home," Mr. Dulles added.

The United States Secretary of State's irony probably did not perturb Khrushchev and Mao. They have murdered literally millions of people for merely thinking of freedom and independence. If the Communists ever were to gain control of a Latin American country by liberating it from whatever the Communists believe it should be liberated from, that country would then assume the status of a Hungary, as vassal of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, it would be exposed to the same type of repression as was inflicted on the Hungarians, 40,000 of whom were murdered by Khrushchev's assassins because they wanted to be independent of Soviet rule.

There is a tendency to believe that no Latin American country could be subjugated by the Communists in the same way as Hungary has been enslaved by Moscow. The plain reality is that without the armed aid of the United States, no country in Latin America, including Brazil, could withstand a full scale assault by the Communists, an assault which would come after the state in question had been sown with fifth columns and nests of traitors.

That men would be prepared to die to defend their country is beyond question. But it is not enough to die. The simple act of dying would not defeat the Russian invaders.

Another fallacy is that Russia is too far away from Latin America for it to be an effective conqueror. Modern methods of transportation by air and by sea have annihilated distance and now there is no possibility of defense by geography.

All that stands between any individual state upon which Communist Russia might have designs, and Moscow, is the United States of America, without whose military power the target country would be next to defenseless.

Back in 1936, the Republic of Panama insisted on excluding from its amended treaty with the United States the provision whereby the independence of Panama was guaranteed by the United States. Those who sought this revision said that the guaranteeing of Panama's independence by the United States was an offence to Panama's sovereignty.

When Panama seceded from Colombia in 1903, the United States Navy prevented the Colombians from landing troops in Panama to quell the revolt. That is how the United States first "guaranteed" Panama's independence.

Supposing that the Republic of Colombia now were to demand "anschluss" with Panama. Is there any one naive enough to believe that Colombia could not take Panama in a matter of days? And is anyone naive enough to believe that some nationalistic Colombians have not thought many times about such a possibility?

What is it that prevents them from taking action? Certainly it is not any fear of the Panamanian police force. No, it is the United States of America which is the deterrent—in the same way as it is the United States of America which, without boasting about it or making statements, which would offend the dignity of the Latin America peoples, serves as the bulwark against military aggression by Soviet Russia against any country south of the border.

Now the Russians are lining up with the Chinese to "liberate" certain Latin American States. It should be noted that there are hundreds of thousands of Chinese in all Latin American States and undoubtedly Mao will hope to find among them agents for their new policy of penetration. Most of those Chinese have families in Red China through whom pressure could be brought to bear on those unwilling to collaborate.

This statement by Khrushchev and Mao should not be taken lightly. They obviously intend to intervene directly in the internal affairs of Latin American countries and now is the time for consultations to be had for the purpose of determining what common steps should be taken to meet this new menace to the democratic way of life.

Spotlight on Steel Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is a running argument about the increase in the price of steel and the reasons given for the increase by industry.

Recently there appeared in the publication of the International Association of Machinists—The Machinist—in the August 21, 1958 issue, an article entitled "Spotlight on Steel Profits." This particular article states that the cost of steel production is up $2.38 per ton while the price went up $4.50 per ton. The article also notes the impact of the increase of steel prices on the cost of living.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON STEEL PROFITS: COST UP $2.38, PRICE UP $4.50

The United States steel industry, which raises prices each year and tries to shift the blame to organized labor, is in the spotlight this week.

In the wake of the industry's average $4.50-a-ton price—pushing the price of steel to an all-time high of $150 a ton:

The United Steelworkers revealed that the $4.50 price boost is nearly twice as much as the actual increase in labor costs.

The Justice Department announced that it may call a grand jury to investigate whether the steel companies violated the law despite their denial of a price-fixing agreement.

The United States Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, indicated it would conduct further hearings to look into steel industry prices and profits.

David J. McDonald, president of the steelworkers, explained that the wage increases of 14.9 cents an hour received by union members recently were in line with the long-range growth of productivity in the steel industry, and thus could have been absorbed by the companies without price increases.

Labor economists pointed out further that the higher steel prices far outstripped the wage raises even without considering the productivity increases. It takes 15 man-hours to produce a ton of steel, they explained. On that basis, the total wage package amounted to $2.38 per ton. Yet, the steel companies increase prices by nearly twice that much.

The current issue of Steel Labor also reports that even though the industry has been operating at only slightly more than 50 percent of capacity during the first quarter of the year, the industry "as a whole was able to roll up a fairly hefty rate of return on net worth of 5.7 percent."

"This is a remarkable achievement," the newspaper points out, "never before equaled in the history of the basic steel industry."

United States Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota also scoffed at the steel companies' claims that the price increase was required by higher labor costs.

"Between 1953 and 1957," he explained, "total annual salaries and wages in the steel industry rose by 15 percent. But during the same period, U. S. Steel's net profits rose from $222 million to $419 million—an increase of 89 percent."

Senator HUMPHREY said that it is difficult to see how such corporations as United States Steel are being squeezed on profits when United States Steel's net profits per ton of steel have gone up from $8.85 a ton in 1953 to $17.91 per ton in 1957.

WHAT INCREASE MEANS TO MANUFACTURE

The $4.50-a-ton increase in steel prices will increase costs in metalworking industries, but not nearly as much as many people think. The magazine U. S. News & World Report figured out last week just what the increase in steel prices add to the most of materials in various products. Here are the facts:

Product:	*Increase in costs*
House	$10.94
Automobile	8.10
Refrigerator	.54
Electric stove	.55
Steel desk	.56
Steel cabinet	.45
Washing machine	.30
Table-model TV	.07
Vacuum cleaner	.03

Prize-Winning Essay on Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the National Grange annually sponsors a national highway safety contest. The winning essay in South Dakota was written by a high school senior, Robert Hartshorn, of Buffalo Gap, Custer County—my home county—S. Dak. The subject of the prevention of highway accidents is of interest to everyone these days. Therefore, I ask that Mr. Hartshorn's essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

(By Bobby Hartshorn, State winner in Grange safety contest)

Let us take a few minutes to consider this title, Community Organization for Highway Safety. Highway accidents have reached an appalling alltime high so far this year in our State. At the time of this writing, South Dakota has had 63 highway fatalities compared with 48 at this time a year ago. It is true, the overall picture throughout the Nation is a trifle better than 1 year ago. For the past 3 months, there has been a slight decrease in traffic deaths in the United States; but since there is still room for a great deal of improvement, we should strive to do something about this shameful, needless loss of life. Now, if you were to tell people these were really not accidents, they would probably disagree with you and say that they certainly were not planned; and so they were accidents. But, let us stop and think for a minute. Better than 90 percent of those accidents could have been prevented, so were they really accidents after all?

Now, we all consider our communities, our home neighborhood, a place we are proud of. Our neighbors and friends live there. We miss it when away, and have a feeling of belonging when we return. We would not for the world intentionally hurt or kill one of these people, but we might if we do no more than talk about highway safety. It is our responsibility, and we must do something about it.

Last year our Grange sponsored a motor vehicle checkup in cooperation with the State motor patrol. All vehicles passing through town that afternoon were checked. This seems like a small thing but it was a beginning and worth while in that a few were required to make necessary repairs.

Another thing we are considering is keeping an accurate record of all miles driven in any type motor vehicle by each member of our Grange, and then totaling up the number of accident-free miles that have been driven. I am sure this could easily be extended to include entire communities, not just Granges.

The South Dakota Automobile Dealers Association is currently sponsoring a worthwhile project. Anyone having 2,000 miles (his latest) of accident-free miles may sign up for a chance of winning free prizes, some more valuable than others, but the basic idea is very good.

I feel that driver training courses should be made compulsory in every high school. Practice makes us better at anything we do; and surely it is highly important that we practice driving the right way, without developing wrong habits even more strongly than they are now. Driver training courses are doing just that; teaching people the right way to drive. If communities will begin making organized requests, driver training courses can be made compulsory.

Communities might sponsor a revision in our existing driver's permit law. Surely it is more important that we know something about driving than that we are able to pay for a permit. Why not make it necessary to pass some sort of test, also?

Liability insurance is now required, but there are still those who do not have it. After an accident occurs, it is too late to get the insurance. Wouldn't it be much better to require proof of liability insurance at the time automobile licenses are purchased? If such changes are to be made in our existing laws, it is up to the people to do it; and surely the best way is through community organization.

Many of the films on highway saftey shown in schools, 4–H camps, and so on could well be shown at many public gatherings. It is good for drivers and passengers of all ages to be reminded as well as taught—once in a while.

I believe that the real problem in community organization for highway safety is up to each one of us. Of course you want your community safer. Then why not get busy with some of the ideas I have mentioned? Once you get started you will think of more, probably better than the ones I have mentioned, too. So get busy on this problem now. I challenge you.

Solid Achievements of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Congress of Solid Achievements," published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 17, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONGRESS OF SOLID ACHIEVEMENTS

Congress was in a waspish mood. It was hot, the big job was over and the tedious, end-of-session haggling over last-minute, controversial legislation was wearing patience thin.

Time and again last week the legislative processes on Capitol Hill were interrupted by shouting and argument.

One of the worst fights broke out Thursday night on the Senate floor. Senator CAPEHART, Republican of Indiana, took exception to a speech Senator KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts, made earlier in the day warning the United States was losing the nuclear arms race with Russia.

Senator CAPEHART peevishly asked why Mr. KENNEDY had to "tell the world * * * (and) our enemies." The bitter argument and unsuccessful effort to clear the gallery while the Senators discussed America's military shortcomings postponed a scheduled vote on a $3.6 billion supplemental appropriations bill.

But the 85th Congress aware of its already established reputation as one of the best legislative bodies ever to occupy Capitol Hill and kept in line by able leadership stayed on the job.

THE WEEK'S SCENE

Important legislation which occupied Congress in its homestretch drive last week or still on the calendar included:

Farm bill: The House, after turning a cold shoulder to Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recommendations, reconsidered and approved a measure which would lower price supports on basic crops while maintaining cotton and rice acreage allotments. The Senate didn't like some of the changes the House had made in its bill and indicated full congressional approval would require further conference compromises.

Tax reduction: Senate approval completed congressional action on two tax revision bills. One measure sent to President Eisenhower reduces excise taxes by $42 million annually, exempting from the 10 percent amusement tax all admissions under $1. It also repeals the 20 percent tax on club dues and initiation fees for membership to community swimming pools and skating rinks. The second bill provides $260 million in annual tax relief for small business.

Social security: The Senate turned down a proposed 10 percent increase in old-age benefits and approved the House version calling for a 7 percent increase.

Depressed areas: The House approved in modified form a Senate bill extending $275 million in aid to economically depressed areas. Prospects for a conference compromise appear good.

Reciprocal trade: The Senate approved a 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, regarded as a great personal triumph for President Eisenhower.

New air agency: Acting to insure greater safety in the air, the two Houses agreed to a conference report establishing a new Federal aviation agency. The new agency will combine the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Airways Modernization Board and assume some authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

National debt limit: The Senate Finance Committee approved and sent to the full Senate a measure increasing the permanent national debt ceiling from $275 billion to $283 billion and providing for a temporary ceiling of $288 billion.

Labor: The Senate has approved a bill which would protect union welfare funds and provide for election of officers by secret ballot. Although a similar bill was killed in the House Education and Labor Committee, there is still a chance it will be brought before the House this week under suspension of the rules. Passage would require a two-third vote.

Housing: An omnibus $2.4 billion housing and urban renewal bill is expected to be brought before the House this week, also under suspension of the rules. The measure has been approved by the Senate.

Education: The two Houses last week were at odds on an aid-to-education bill designed to provide the Nation with more scientists. The Senate approved a broad $1.37 billion measure which would provide 23,000 scholarships with maximum annual grants of $250 per student. The House measure, which carried a $900 million appropriation, entirely eliminated the scholarship provision.

Foreign aid: The Senate will vote this week on the House-approved $3.5 billion foreign aid bill.

When it finishes its work—probably Thursday or Friday—the 85th Congress will have completed a session which proved once and for all that the American Government can function quite well as a 2-party coalition.

Its most notable achievements—Alaskan statehood, civil rights legislation, defense reorganization and extension of reciprocal trade—have refuted President Eisenhower's 1956 warning that with Republicans in the White House and Democrats in control of Congress the Nation could expect a cold war of partisan politics that would bring chaos.

There were times, of course, when the bipartisan approach to building a sound legislative program was threatened by party-line politics. The fright generated by a recession and Russia's sputnik invited finger-pointing and blame-placing. But the developing legislative program was snatched back to safety by two remarkable rescuers, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Rafer Johnson Will Return to United States as National Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including herewith in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a further installment report on the current successes of Rafer Johnson in the field of the decathlon in competition in Europe. His achievements are of great significance to the United States because of their quality, the fact that he is an American citizen and the product of American schools, and the further fact that he is a member of a so-called minority group in the United States. The installment I refer to is an article which appeared in the August 10, 1958, issue of the Fresno Bee over the byline of Bruce Farris. I wish to further indulge in a little local pride by stating that Mr. Johnson's predecessor in the field of breaking records in the decathlon was Bob Mathias, an outstanding athlete from Tulare, Calif., a city in my congressional district. Mathias and Johnson were reared only a very few miles apart in California.

The article follows:

RAFER JOHNSON WILL RETURN TO UNITED STATES AS NATIONAL HERO

(By Bruce Farris)

KINGSBURG.—Rafer Lewis Johnson will return to the United States Tuesday to be hailed as a conquering hero following his world record decathlon performances in Russia, but to this small community he is much more than the finest all around athlete in the world.

He is a living example of what can be accomplished in this country through hard work, clean living, determination, and faith.

This town is less than 20 miles from Tulare where in 1948 and 1952 another teenage marvel, Bob Mathias, first rocketed the San Joaquin Valley into the world decathlon Olympic games victories.

The 3,000 residents of Kingsburg have witnessed many of Rafer's mightiest triumphs and many know it is the site of a near tragedy which could have ended this fantastic athletic story before it began.

Here live his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Johnson, who brought Rafer here when he was 11 years old and who have lived, worked, and been an integral part of the community ever since.

Mrs. Johnson, nicknamed Dimples because of her happy disposition, will fly to Los Angeles Wednesday or Thursday where the 6-foot 3-inch, 200-pound, 22-year-old UCLA predentistry student will be honored at a reception. Another welcoming committee will meet him at the Fresno air terminal and the grand climax will come in a hometown reception in Kingsburg's new city park.

These and other triumphs in the East are only part of the 1958 Rafer Johnson story in which the press in all corners of the globe have hailed him as the greatest athlete in the world."

But turn the time machine back to the summer of 1948 when a grim-faced Kingsburg doctor told Rafer's frantic parents he might have to amputate the boy's right foot.

Mrs. Johnson gave this account of the incident the other day:

"Rafer and 2 or 3 of his friends were playing on a conveyor belt at the cannery. They would ride the belt to a point where it turns a corner and then they would jump off. Rafer did not jump in time. His foot was caught in the iron siding on the machine.

"I heard him yell and ran to help. I suppose I would have caught my hands in the belt if a workman had not pulled me back, but all I could think of was freeing my boy.

"They turned off the machine and had to dismantle part of it to get him loose. The sole of his foot was sliced nearly to the end of his heel. One large tendon was all that held it together. They rushed him to the hospital and for a while we thought they would amputate. The doctor finally sewed him up and Rafer was on crutches for nearly a year.

"You know," she reflected, "I still don't know how he pulled through it to compete in athletics."

"Rafer always was active from the time he was a baby," said Rafer's father with a twinkle in his eye. "We named him Rafer because it was the name I always wanted to have and I vowed to name my first born son Rafer Lewis. He always was a good boy and was a fine example for his brothers and sisters to follow. He did and still does everything well.

"You know, I hope to have 2 boys in the 1960 Olympics. Rafer's youngest brother, James, will enroll at UCLA next year and I am confident he can make the United States team in the broad jump or hurdles. I doubt very much if he will try the decathlon. I do think he will be a fine football and basketball player. Rafer also plans to play basketball again this year."

FUTURE IN DENTISTRY

How about the future—after 1960, what then?

"I am certain he will be a dentist," said the elder Johnson. "He has pointed toward that goal since he was a senior in high school. I know he mentioned professional baseball but I don't know how serious he is about it. He has not played baseball since his first year in high school. I remember he used to break a lot of bats when he was in grammar school but he was a pretty good hitter."

Johnson works in the Fishel products plant here run by John Fishel. Rafer inherits his height from his father who is 6 feet, 5½ inches tall.

Rafer was born in Dallas, Tex., and will be 23 years old August 18. He has 2 brothers and 2 sisters.

His father brought the family to California in 1943. They settled in Oakland where Johnson worked at Treasure Island and later bounced from Madera to Chowchilla to Fresno (where he stayed for about 2 months) before settling here.

GOOD STUDENT

"Rafer always has been a good mixer and an excellent student," said Kingsburg Vice Principal Ejnar Peterson. "I don't think studies came easy to him but he is a very hard worker. He made the scholarship society 7 of his 8 high-school semester and earned a lifetime membership.

"He spent a lot of time in athletics during high school (he earned 11 varsity letters)

but he always found time to get all of his school work in on time. He participated in the school plays and other activities and never once during the 4 years was he a disciplinary problem.

"The thing I noticed most about him in athletics was his ability to relax between action. When the play started again he was always alert and ready. Few of us doubted he would be anything but outstanding in anything he tried."

Rafer worked most of his summers for Wilbur Shannon, automobile dealer, or at the California Packing Corp. cannery run by Harold Strand.

ONE OF THE FAMILY

"He is just like one of the family to us," said Shannon. "He worked for me many years and has been a great inspiration to my boy Gary. He always liked jobs with a challenge and he has the ability to do many things. He does most of the work on his own car. He plans to put a new motor in it when he returns next week."

Some of his closest friends are high-school classmates Dale Bengston, Eddie Mascarin, Calvin Johnson, and Guy Troisi. Rafer, Monte Clark, Clarence Treat, and Calvin Johnson formed a singing quartet and specialize in spiritual songs. Rafer is a baritone and his friends say a good one.

Rafer was president of his senior class at Kingsburg High School, and this fall will assume his duties as student-body president at UCLA, a school of more than 17,000 students.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH

He always has been active in the Mission Covenant Church here and is a leader in the campus Crusade for Christ organization in Los Angeles.

Rafer can lay claim—although you would never hear it from him—to one of the largest and most spectacular trophy collections in the world. He has nearly 100 large trophies, some more than 3 feet high, and 3 large cardboard boxes packed 3 or 4 deep with small boxes containing medals won in elementary, high school, and college. He has been honored in nearly every continent in the world and has made two overseas goodwill trips for the United States State Department.

Several San Joaquin Valley athletes had parts in shaping his career which led to his participation in the decathlon.

Troisi, another stellar all-around athlete at Kingsburg, competed against Rafer in track events from elementary school age on.

"Guy was much bigger and stronger in those days," said Kingsburg Coach Murl Dodson, "and Rafer had to work on form and technique in an attempt to beat him in the weight events."

Leamon King, Delano High School sprint star, forced Rafer to take up hurdling.

"We knew Rafer couldn't beat King in the sprints, so I switched him to the hurdles," continued Dodson. "He was a natural in that event from the start and it always has been one of his strongest races."

Ducky Drake, his track coach at UCLA, told this reporter during the last invitational decathlon in Kingsburg:

"I think Rafer's biggest asset in athletics is his ability to adjust to the conditions and situations. If I notice he is doing something wrong, I have to tell him only once and he corrects it. It has been this way all the time I have known him. I don't think there is any limit to what he can do."

Kingsburg residents are divided in which path they think he should follow.

URGES FOOTBALL

"I think he should quit track and try football," said one. "He can't eat medals."

Others thought he would be an excellent boxer, a movie actor (which is what Mathias is doing), and others simply say they think he can do anything he puts his mind to.

Rafer is a good bowler, he enjoys fishing, and would like to take up golf if he had more time. Time is one thing which has been scarce for him the past 3 years.

His track career may reach its peak in Rome, Italy, in 1960, where he hopes for a second and most certainly the last time to represent his country in the Olympic games.

Rafer still is a young man, but he already has taken his place alongside such as Jesse Owens, Jackie Robinson, and Kenny Washington, who many feel accomplished more in world diplomacy through their efforts on and off the field of athletics than many statesmen have around conference tables.

THE JOHNSON STANDARD

Rafer Johnson, in compiling his world record total of 8,302 points in Russia recently, bettered the marks of the immortal Jim Thorpe in 8 of 10 events and the marks of Bob Mathias and Vasily Kuznetsov in 6 of the 10 events.

Johnson bettered Thorpe's marks in 8 of the 10 events. He also was ahead of Mathias in 6 of the 10 events when the Tulare Wonder Boy established his high mark of 7,887 in 1952.

The big Kingsburg athlete also bested Vasily Kuznetsov, of Russia, in 6 of 10 events when the Russian set his top mark of 8,014 points this year.

Here is the event-by-event comparison:

Event	Johnson, 1958	Kuznetsov, 1958	Mathias, 1952	Thorpe, 1912
100-meter dash	10.6	10.8	10.9	11.2
Broad jump	23'6¼"	24'6⅜"	22'10⅜"	22'2¼"
Shotput	48'2½"	45'7½"	50'2¼"	42'5½"
High jump	5'10¾"	6'¾"	6'2¾"	6'1⅝"
400-meter run	48.2	49.6	50.2	52.2
110-meter hurdles	14.9	15.1	14.7	15.6
Discus	160'11⅞"	154'9½"	153'10"	121'3⅞"
Pole vault	12'11⅞"	13'1½"	13'1½"	10'7½"
Javelin	238'1⅞"	214'6½"	194'3⅛"	149'11⅝"
1,500-meter run	5:05.0	5:04.0	4:50.8	4:40.1

Export Market for Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening developments for the United States coal industry has been the development in recent years of a strong export market. During 1957 about 55 million tons of coal were shipped to overseas markets, thus providing jobs for a large number of miners.

Recent developments overseas have raised some serious threats to this important export market and unless the trend is checked it could result in a complete loss of these overseas shipments. As a matter of fact, during this year of 1958 we are facing a loss of 12 million tons in exports.

Where does this threat to United States coal come from? It stems from the economic war which the Russians have declared upon the United States and the West in general. Russia and its satellites are going all out to displace United States coal in markets which were built up through hard work and smart, aggressive merchandising.

The saddest part of the story is that many so-called friendly countries are using United States dollars, made available as a part of the foreign economic aid program, in exchange for coal from Russia and Poland.

Other countries which in the past have used United States coal are now making barter agreements under which they exchange their products for Communist coal. In the long run these countries will find that they are paying through the nose for this Communist coal. In barter exchanges, the Russians always charge artificially high prices for their coal or else accept products in exchange at a price far below the prevailing world market.

The United States coal industry has called this serious matter to the attention of the State Department. All sorts of vague promises have been made that proper action would be taken.

Unfortunately, the practice has not stopped. In fact, it has become more prevalent in recent months. Just recently, Argentina concluded a trade agreement with Poland under which Polish coal will be imported to replace about 2 million tons of United States coal each year. Japan's deal with Communist China to use coal from that Communist country instead of United States coal is another example of the type of competition United States coal is facing.

It is my firm belief that the United States Government, in its dealing with countries which are turning to Communist countries for coal, is not exercising its full powers in behalf of this great American industry. We should recognize this is a part of the Russian trade offensive and take appropriate action to counter it.

The coal industry is beset by serious problems at home. The Government encourages the import of residual fuel oils from "friendly" nations despite the fact that this "liquid coal" is competing directly and unfairly with domestic coal.

The Government is encouraging Federal installations to convert from coal to other fuels for heating purposes despite the fact that in many instances coal is a more dependable and cheaper fuel source.

Now, the Government is standing by while the coal industry fights a losing battle with Communist coal in foreign countries. The Government should step in and use all of its influence to help the United States coal industry in the fight it is waging for important export markets against long odds.

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, Constitution Week begins September 17. Every day should be Constitution Day in the minds of all true Americans, because every day we individually, and as a people, profit by the rights and liberties which the Constitution assures us.

We should be thankful that one day is set aside and designated as Constitution Day. It gives each of us as patriotic citizens an opportunity to demonstrate our reverence to this great charter whose provisions protect our liberties. It is day to day tribute to the founders of our Republic, and to all who have made the supreme sacrifice to preserve, protect and defend our precious heritage. It is a day of days to ponder the words of Justice Story of the Supreme Court: "Let the American youth never forget that they possess a noble inheritance, bought by the toils and sufferings and blood of their ancestors, and capable, if wisely improved and faithfully guarded, of transmitting to their latest posterity, all the substantial blessings of life, the peaceful enjoyment of liberty, property, religion and independence.

The structure has been erected by architects of consummate skill and fidelity; its foundations are solid; its compartments are beautiful as well as useful; its arrangements are full of wisdom and order; and its defenses are impregnable from without. It has been reared for immortality, if the work of man may justly aspire to such a title. It may, nevertheless, perish in an hour by the folly or corruption, or negligence of its only keepers, the people. Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit, and intelligence of the citizens. They fall when the wise are banished from the public councils, because they dare to be honest; and the profligate are rewarded, because they flatter the people in order to betray them."

This day should remind every citizen of our Republic, of that great document, the American's creed, by William Tyler Page:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

Every American citizen should read the tributes paid to William Tyler Page, the author of the American's creed in the book by Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, entitled, "The American's Creed."

Shortage of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the nursing shortage problem is quite serious. It is acute in Philadelphia, as well as throughout the country. I believe the situation is so critical that Congress should be urged to study the problem with a view to determining what aid can be extended. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks I am quoting a letter addressed to me by Dr. Pascal F. Lucchesi, executive vice president and medical director of the Albert Einstein Medical Center of Philadelphia. The letter follows:

ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 8, 1958.
Congressman HUGH SCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: Since the northern division of the Albert Einstein Medical Center and other hospitals are located in your congressional district, I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention the nursing shortage problem.

This shortage reaches to virtually all hospitals in the United States. A few months ago, the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor disclosed that the Nation was short 70,000 trained nurses. If anything, the situation has worsened since then. It is acute in Philadelphia, but this is only one of many cities with a critical nursing shortage.

As you know, many hospitals including the Albert Einstein Medical Center, maintain schools to train nursing students. The schools operate at a financial loss to the institution. At Einstein Center, for instance, the charge to a student for the full 3-year course—including tuition, food, private room, uniforms and books—is $455. A survey made last year by the Center disclosed that it costs us $4,290 per student nurse for the 3 years, including both direct and indirect costs. As you can see, the cost is almost 10 times the charge to the student. We also provide a number of free scholarships.

Thus, you can see that hospitals such as ours are doing their best to supply nurses for the ill persons of the Nation.

However, because of steadily rising costs in all operations, hospitals have reached the point where we are financially unable to increase our burden in this respect.

It would seem that the time has come for Congress to study this problem and to provide some help. There is more than a moral justification for Congress to step in at this point.

As a matter of fact, the armed services and Veterans Administration do not train any nurses, but draw heavily on the trainees of the civilian hospitals.

As institutions operated by patriotic Americans, our civilian hospitals are proud to have our trainees enter military service and the VA.

However, I do not believe the shortage and financial problem, as I have outlined it above, is fully recognized. I think if Congress is made aware, it will take steps to provide nursing scholarships, at least to the extent that our graduates go into Government nursing service. This would help to bring more girls into nursing and, thus, to reduce the appalling shortage faced by the Nation.

I am writing as an individual, speaking only for the Albert Einstein Medical Center. But it is a fact that national organizations in the fields of medicine, hospital administration and nursing have all taken cognizance of the shortage and the need.

Anything you can do to bring the facts to the attention of the entire Congress would be most helpful at this time.

Respectfully yours,
PASCAL F. LUCCHESI, M. D.,
Executive Vice President and Medical Director.

Watershed Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my weekly newsletter Keenotes for the week of August 11, 1958:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Conservation of soil and water is one of the most pressing problems facing the country today. Soil and water are not inexhaustible. We cannot expect the United States to retain its position as the world's preeminent nation if we squander these two precious resources.

It is because of the compelling urgency of the soil and water problem that I have strongly supported the watershed development program—an entirely new cooperative approach to the problem of saving of water and soil and making the maximum use of them and, at the same time, preventing damaging floods.

Congress created the watershed development program in 1954, making it possible for the first time for local, State, and Federal agencies to enter into agreements to control the flow of water in an entire watershed. A number of pilot projects were authorized, many of which are now nearing completion.

On the basis of a recent study I have made on the effects of this program, I am convinced that it has been one of the most successful conservation programs ever undertaken. The cost has been extremely modest, local initiative has been emphasized, and the role of the Federal Government minimized.

The program operates on the theory that floods can be minimized and the maximum amount of water retained on the land if the problem is attacked at the headwaters of small streams. Dams to retard the flow of water during flooding are built and channels of small streams are cleared of underbrush, straightened and deepened to speed the flow of water. In addition, farmers in the watershed area build farm ponds, plant trees, and

begin other practices designed to check the flow of water over their lands.

The Salem watershed in West Virginia was one of the first of the pilot projects undertaken. It is now practically completed and will be dedicated on September 11. The experiences in watershed development are dramatic proof that the program will work.

During recent heavy rains, after most of the work was completed, the level of floods was considerably reduced, thereby greatly reducing property damage. Also, water receded much faster after flooding rains. The flow of water across farmlands, which used to carry away tons of rich topsoil, was slowed down considerably.

About seven projects in West Virginia are either under construction or in the planning stages. Others, including the Brush Creek watershed in Mercer County, are being considered now.

One thing I like about the program is the fact that local interests must initiate the projects. Local groups must also help defray the costs of construction and maintenance. The program seems to have won wide acceptance on the part of farmers and other interested parties.

When the watershed approach is applied nationwide, it should be possible for the Federal Government to avoid having to build costly downstream flood control dams. If the water can be retained in the upper reaches, the problems of many downstream areas will be solved.

I regard the watershed legislation as an example of what can be accomplished for our people when all agencies of Government get together in a cooperative venture. Not only can money be saved but local and State initiative is preserved.

I was gratified to have had the opportunity to work and vote for this program in Congress, and I will continue to do everything I can to see that it is carried out as rapidly as possible.

Consideration of Legislation Under Suspension of the Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, previous commitments made in my district make it imperative that I return to Indiana after today's legislative business has been completed. For these reasons, I wish to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

First, the move on the part of the majority leadership in attempting to consider 35 bills under suspension of rules was most unfortunate. Several of the measures were worthy in principle but the bills were both poorly drafted and wholly inadequate. Under suspension of rules, the House Members have no opportunity to either debate in detail or to offer perfecting amendments.

I sincerely believe that people desire some legislation that would correct the abuses of certain labor unions as exposed by the Senate Labor Rackets Committee. However, S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives bill, fell far short of correcting any of these evils. In fact, the House Committee on Labor and Education voted 22 to 7 against reporting the measure. I joined the many Members who had hoped that an acceptable bill could have been prepared and discussed with an open rule. This would have been fair to labor, management, and to the Members of the House of Representatives.

In the second place, there were many bills which had been considered in committees that had not been listed for votes in the House. The railroad retirement bill had been reported out of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and some action should have been taken on it. In fact, in the committee I had supported a compromise measure that was reported to be at least reasonably acceptable. I had wanted to vote in support of some such measure because the railroad retirement fund had been placed in an actuarial hazard by action of the previous Congress.

Also, I join others in deploring the fact that so many millions and billions of the taxpayers' dollars were threatened by many of the bills on this list of 35 suspensions.

Finally, if these bills had not consumed the time of the House, then conference reports of bills which had passed both the House and the Senate could have been accepted. For 8 years I have worked for a flood-control program for the upper Wabash River Valley. I have voted each time for the authorization bill and this year the Congress sent and acceptable bill to the President which he signed into Public Law 85–500. I also voted for the appropriation bill for the rivers and harbors program. The conference committee report could have been presented and, of course, if a recorded vote would have been taken, I would vote yes again. I have asked the pair clerk to pair me in favor of this bill if a vote is taken. For that matter, my voting record has been established by past votes if any conference reports require further rollcalls.

Upon my return to the district I shall be called upon for reports on the work of the 85th Congress to many groups. It is going to be very difficult to find many actions deserving of praise. It is apparent that it was one of the "spend-ingest" Congresses in our history with the Congress appropriating far in excess of the request of the President. Perhaps this Congress will be best known and longest remembered by the necessary legislation that it failed to enact and by the partisan politics that seemed to flavor so many of the legislative proposals.

Travel Rights of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because I so thoroughly agree with the statements and position taken by the B'nai B'rith on the rights of American citizens to travel freely about the world in pursuit of legitimate activities without restriction as to religion, race, or other artificial limitations, I bring the following letter to the attention of my colleagues. In light of recent events in the Near East, the views expressed therein merit our consideration and support:

FAIRFAX LODGE NO. 1566, B'NAI B'RITH,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 11, 1958.
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: One of the cardinal functions of United States sovereignty is the protection of the integrity of American citizenship and of the proper rights of American citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad.

It is a primary principle of our Nation that no distinction among American citizens shall be made on the basis of their individual religious affiliations. Any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access, or any other rights otherwise available to American citizens generally, is wholly repugnant to our laws and intolerable to our principles. This attitude our Government has historically and successfully maintained in its relations with foreign countries on several notable occasions.

Now it is abundantly clear that the integrity of American citizenship has been and continues to be blatantly flouted by a systematic boycott and blacklisting by the Arab League of any American enterprise that maintains business ties with Israel or with Israel firms, and of any business owned by Jews or having Jewish employees.

Moreover, Arab ports are closed to American vessels that stop at Israeli ports, American planes landing in Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territories, and, indeed, no American is allowed entry to an Arab country from Israel except on official business.

As further affronts to our national principle barring distinctions on religious grounds, we cite (1) the refusal by Saudi Arabia to permit the assignment of American citizens, solely because of their religious faith or derivation, to military, diplomatic, or civilian duties for our Government at the Dhahran Airfield, and, additionally, to refuse, for the same reason, American concessionaires to employ certain personnel for work in Saudi Arabia; and (2) the refusal of entry and travel visas by most Arab League states to certain United States citizens exclusively because of their religious faith, or religious derivation.

We deplore this Arab boycott and blacklisting of Americans because it constitutes a serious impairment of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. Continued appeasement and capitulation to it frustrate efforts of the United Nations to achieve peace in the Middle East, foster conflict which undermines the efforts of our own Government to allay tensions in that area, and implies American sanction for a most intolerable form of international intimidation.

We therefore call upon the President of the United States to proclaim to all nations that our Government tolerates no distinction based on religious faith among its own citizens, just as it makes none among the citizens and subjects of any other country, and that it regards any such distinctions directed against American citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations. We also urge the President to instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to protest the Arab boycott and organize resistance to it in the U. N.

We urge further that the President and Secretary of State reassert the prerogative of our Government, and take immediate steps

to safeguard that right, to assign qualified American citizens to military, diplomatic, or other service within any foreign country regardless of that country's objection to such citizens on grounds of religious faith or affiliation.

We also call upon the President and the Secretary of State to insure that in their execution, application, and administration, all treaties, conventions, or executive agreements entered into or renewed between any foreign state and the United States shall expressely provide that no American citizen shall, solely because of religious affiliation or derivation, be denied the advantages of travel, employment, or trade, or any other benefit made possible by such documents.

Very truly yours,

FAIRFAX LODGE No. 1566,
B'NAI, B'RITH,
PHILIP R. SCHAFFER,
President.

Oil Imports and the New Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 30, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the domestic oil industry is still suffering from excessive oil imports. At a time when the domestic industry should be expanding its exploratory and development activities, the reverse is true. Overall drilling operations for the Nation as a whole are down 10 or 12 percent. Wildcat drilling, the forerunner of new oil reserves, is down some 20 percent. Production during the first half of this year likewise is down some 10 percent below last year.

These trends are a warning of real danger ahead if the domestic industry is to be looked upon, as in the past, as an assured source of supply for all needs, including an expanding economy as well as emergency requirements.

For the past year, the administration has been endeavoring to correct this situation. Under the defense amendment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, the President inaugurated the present voluntary program to limit imports. Some good has been accomplished. The continuing deterioration of the domestic industry makes it clear that further action is needed.

The recently enacted Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 gives further guidance and direction to the President with respect to this oil import problem. The new amendments to the defense amendment spell out through specific guidelines and definite standards the intent of Congress with respect to importations of any commodity into this country which threaten the national security.

Mr. Speaker, under this new authority, the President and other administration officials concerned have the responsibility to adjust the present oil import program so as to bring it into conformance with the new law. Under this new authority, the President has ample authority to reduce imports to levels which will permit the domestic industry to carry on a program of exploration and development adequate to serve the national security and a growing economy.

I urge the President to review the program to this end. I am confident that he will do so and that further early action will be taken to reduce oil imports.

The new law is specific and definite. For the first time, Congress wrote into the law that derivatives or products of an article such as crude oil must also be considered if imports of the basic article are such as to threaten the national security. I believe this provision of the new law requires that the President now take action to bring oil products within the import limitation program.

The necessity for early action to limit imports of oil products is obvious. Under the voluntary program, crude oil imports have been substantially reduced under the peak levels reached this time last year. But oil products, which have not been within the program, have increased at an alarming rate and have offset the gain made in reducing crude oil imports. In 1954, total product imports were less than 400,000 barrels daily, amounting to about 6 percent of domestic production. During the first 6 months of this year, product imports averaged almost 650,000 barrels daily, amounting to 10 percent of domestic production. Product imports not only displace the domestic oil producer, but they likewise displace the domestic oil refiner and the domestic laborer who works in a refinery.

Most important, the new law contains specific standards to guide the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the President in determining the level of imports that endangers the national security. Primary among these standards is requirements of growth of the industry involved necessary to provide for the national security. In determining whether or not an industry is growing adequately the President and the Director must consider the investment, exploration, and development necessary to assure such growth. In addition, they are required to consider the impact of imports upon the economic welfare and condition of the domestic industry concerned.

IT'S TIME TO ACT

The record of decline rather than growth on the part of the domestic oil industry during the past 2 years makes it clear that further action to limit imports is now necessary under this new provision of law. The intent of Congress in this regard was made definite and unmistakably clear in both the House and the Senate. When this matter was before the House, Congressman MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had this to say:

> If drilling and exploration activities do not reach a satisfactory level, then under this provision, the President or his designate would have the responsibility of reevaluating existing programs for the regulation and control of imports to see that they meet the requirements of the new standards in the committee bill.

I believe the administration is fully cognizant of the full meaning of the new law. This is borne out by the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles before the Senate Finance Committee. At that time the above statement of Congressman MILLS was presented to the Secretary and he was asked if he agreed with that statement. He answered in the affirmative. In view of the legislative history together with the expressed understanding of Secretary Dulles, I am confident that the administration will act to carry out the purpose of this provision.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the present voluntary program has brought about a substantial reduction in crude-oil imports. Despite this accomplishment, because of the drastic reduction in domestic production, imports of crude oil as well as products continue in my opinion to be excessive. The President's Cabinet Committee in 1955 found that the ratio of imports to domestic production that existed during the year 1954 was the maximum safe level from the standpoint of national security. I believe that experience since then fully confirms the soundness of this finding. Imports since 1955 have continued to exceed the 1954 ratio and during this time operations of the domestic industry have declined to a serious and dangerous degree. It seems to me that this experience is persuasive in leading to the conclusion that imports, both crude oil and products, should now be limited to the 1954 ratio.

It is hoped those in the executive department will take quick and effective action to carry out the intent of Congress and give the domestic oil industry the additional protection it needs to regain its No. 1 place in the economy and defense of our Nation.

Saturday Review Critic Much Impressed With Ashland, Oreg., Shakespearean Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the August 10, 1958, edition of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune:

DRAMA CRITIC IMPRESSED WITH FESTIVAL

Henry Hewes, 41-year-old drama editor and critic of the Saturday Review magazine, said Friday he was agreeably surprised and much impressed with the Ashland Shakespearean Festival.

He singled out the company's devotion to its work, the intelligence of its direction and some of its characterizations, and the high quality of its speech for special mention.

Hewes, who served under the critic John Mason Brown, before taking over his position on the internationally famous magazine 3 years ago, arrived in Ashland Thursday evening.

He had previously visited the Shakespeare festival in San Diego, Calif., and plans an article discussing the two enterprises. He saw The Merchant of Venice, Thursday night, heard tapes of King Lear, Friday, and attended Troilus and Cressida Friday night.

Hewes said he approved highly of producing Shakespeare's lesser known works, since it forced people to think freshly. He said people brought too many preconceptions to the better known plays, and tended to miss the intellectual challenge. "In England," he said, "they have so much Shakespeare they don't think about it."

He criticized, on the other hand, the festival's liberal recreation of the Elizabethan stage. He said it was the only reproduction this literal in the United States, that it was nice to have one such example but that he preferred a more imaginative setting. He described the effectiveness of a stage which would appear starkly Elizabethan at the outset, then gradually depart from it through elaboration of shifting of the set as the play progressed.

He also discussed the omitting of intermissions. He said it was a good thing to have in one place, since plays were produced this way in Shakespeare's time, but that it required a very devoted public.

"If a production is first-rate," he said, "I like to go on without intermissions. I get wound up in the play." Asked if he had missed the breaks during The Merchant of Venice, he replied, "I got my second wind."

More than 100 people overflowed the Gresham Room of the Ashland Public Library Friday afternoon to hear Hewes lecture on some principles of Shakespeare production. He emphasized realism, or "real things happening to real people" in the words of George Bernard Shaw.

"Find modern equivalents for Shakespeare characters, don't make them like men from Mars," Hewes said. "A touch of earth here and there never hurt Shakespeare," he added.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my weekly newsletter Keenotes for the week of August 3, 1958.

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The 2d session of the 85th Congress, which is rapidly drawing to a close, has been marked by three distinct moods:

1. Congress reconvened amid deep public concern over the tremendous Russian advances in science and technology as evidenced by the launching of two earth satellites.

2. Public concern shifted early in the spring from this grave national problem to the growing threat of a serious economic recession.

3. In recent weeks, attention of official Washington and the public has shifted to foreign affairs and particularly to events in the Middle East which have created the most serious war threat since Korea.

This has, indeed, been a momentous session of Congress and, contrary to some who have tried to label this a do nothing Congress, I believe this session will go down in history as one of the most productive in recent years.

In many respects, Congress was ahead of the administration on matters relating to outer space. Congress demanded that positive action be taken so this country could overtake the lead which the Russians had taken in this vital field. Both Houses appointed special committees on space and astronautics and let it be known in no uncertain terms that they wanted a single new agency to direct United States activities in space. The result has been the creation of a new agency on space and astronautics, and in the future all activities will be closely coordinated. This should save money and, more importantly, save time in space developments.

I am sorry that the sense of urgency seems to have disappeared. We are still behind the Russians and constant driving and pushing will be needed to overtake them. I am sure that the Congress wil not neglect this issue.

People are alarmed over the high level of unemployment and other indications of an economic downturn. Recently, there have been signs of an upturn, which is good news to all of us. But here, too, I am afraid that the sense of urgency has gone out of this problem. We are not out of the economic woods despite the optimistic indications. A sound, prosperous America is absolutely essential if we are to maintain our freedom.

An atmosphere of gloom was apparent when events in the Middle East assumed crisis proportions. There is no denying that the situation is extremely grave. As much as any of us might deplore the necessity for sending American troops into a danger area, we can agree, I am sure, that we all must support the stand taken by the President. Many people here believe the gravest dangers are now passed. This may be true, but the fact remains that this is a crisis that will be with us for a long time. We cannot afford to allow any temporary easing of the crisis to lull us into any feeling of false security.

Eleventh Anniversary of the National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 11th anniversary of the United States National Student Association, one of our most important nationwide organizations of young people.

A study of this fine organization will show that our young people are concerned—and deeply—with the great issues of our life and times.

They are concerned, as young people of our Nation have always been, with the enduring values of our civilization and they are today, as ever, prepared to defend our country to the death. In wartime these young people make up the bulk of our armed services and to question their loyalty is a disservice to our country.

The United States National Student Association is a confederation of student governments of colleges and universities throughout the country. Its national leadership—this year as in previous years—has been elected by the National Student Congress, comprising delegates elected by the member schools of the association.

In a statement of evaluation adopted by the three major deans' organizations in the United States National Association of Womens Deans and Counselors, the American College Personnel Administrators at their meeting in St. Louis last spring, declared that the United States National Student Association has led the mobilizations of the unions of students of the free world in combatting the partison propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the Communist-led International Union of Students. The statement went on to say that the United States National Student Association strives to symbolize the youth of the free world to the students in those critical areas where the battle of ideas has not yet been resolved, and has demonstrated that experience in democracy aids students in combatting influences that would undermine or destroy our way of life.

President Eisenhower wrote the United States National Student Association, when it received a $25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation for the sponsorship and execution of a project on student responsibility in higher education, that—

I was glad to learn of the National Student Association's proposal for developing in the student community a better knowledge of the issues confronting higher education—issues that there emphasized in the recent report of the Committee on Education Beyond the High School. It is very satisfying to me to see the responsible and mature reaction of your organization to these problems. The fact that your program provides opportunity for enlisting the fresh thinking and vigorous dedication of a million young people in our colleges and universities makes this one of the most promising efforts undertaken in this area of endeavor.

The delegates to the 11th annual congress of the United States National Student Association will assemble August 20, 1958, on the campus of Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio. I extend to them on this occasion greetings and best wishes for their continued good works, in consonance with their constitution which declares it is the purpose of their organization to foster the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of students to the school, the community, humanity, and God, and to preserve the interests and integrity of the Government and Constitution of the United States of America.

I include here some statements and background information from The American Student—Profile and Promise 1947–57, a publication of the United States National Student Association, for the information of my colleagues:

GREETINGS

Representing a vast and lively constituency, your organization has done much to direct the traditional energies and free spirit of students toward constructive interest in community, national, and international affairs. As you enter your second decade of service I am sure you will continue to advance the building of good citizenship and responsible government, the foundations of freedom and world peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States.

Almost a year ago, the world was shocked, yet thrilled, by the valiant effort of the Hungarian students to free their nation from the insufferable yoke of Communist tyranny. Although the students were tragically unsuccessful in their attempt to gain freedom and justice, they dramatically reminded the world of the idealism of youth.

American students share with students throughout the world a common vision and attitudes of hope and optimism for the future. They want to live in a world that will be fair to them. They seek a world of peace and opportunity so they can rear their families in a normal way without fear and anxiety. American students do not want war on the unsettling threats of war. They do not want a nation torn internally by class struggle or racial tensions. Americans, young and old, seek a world at peace, in which they can contribute their share to the welfare of all.

The United States National Student Association has developed and matured during the past 10 years. Through your adherence to the principles of your organization and a large measure of enthusiastic willingness to work, the horizons of Americans students have been broadened and the Nation and world have profited.

RICHARD NIXON,
Vice President of the United States.

The association has not only done much to stimulate the student community's interest in national and international affairs, but has provided a valued and time-tested institutional framework by means of which students throughout the country can make their valuable contribution to the life of the Nation. From the ranks of those who have been active in the association has come a most outstanding group of young men and women who are already shouldering major responsibilities in journalism, law, politics and the sciences. The Nation is indebted to the National Student Association for its contributions to our national life. My sincere hope is that you will continue to meet the challenges of our times in the same forthright and courageous spirit as you have during the past 10 years.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senator from Massachusetts.

USNSA is to be commended on its valuable contribution to campus activities in the past. We who are interested in the well-being of our college students look to your group for continued cooperation and guidance in this vital area.

Your keen and active interest in all phases of student life eminently qualifies you for this role.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
United States Senator from New Jersey.

You have much to be proud of on this, your 10th anniversary. In the international field you have increased the understanding between students of many nations, promoted a truer picture of the United States, and provided workshops and seminars for the education of students interested in international affairs.

On the domestic scene your fight for legislation to meet our educational needs is commendable, and I urge you to continue it. May I also suggest that you consider carefully the implications of the current trend of our society toward conformity, stagnation and complacency. You can be instrumental in stimulating students and promoting individual thought and achievement. The challenges you face are enormous. They can only be met through the full play of inspiration and ingenuity.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
United States Senator from Pennsylvania.

FROM THE ADDRESS BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

Too many persons in the United States have gotten the country club attitude. Instead of working hard, with only brief intervals for rest and relaxation, we spend most of our time at the club.

Too many Americans are timid and lack the imagination necessary for world leadership. Wherever men seek freedom, they look to us to set high standards. When we fail to show the qualities of leadership, the whole world becomes flabby.

You, as students, can set new standards of inspiration, conviction, and idealism for our Nation. Don't be afraid to be dissenters. Don't be unwilling to take intellectual risks, to dare, to pioneer, to challenge.

Too many people who talk about the need for good government are unwilling to get into politics and get it. Both of our major parties can stand a world of improvement.

You, as students, should not hesitate to get involved in political issues. Politics needs more students.

We politicians don't have all the answers. We're not geniuses.

Your voice will be heard if you want it to be heard. In some cases, you can be heard before Congress more easily than before a township board.

To be effective, your resolutions or your personal position should be well documented. You should expect and be able to withstand criticism. In making your views known, don't substitute popularity for leadership.

The National Student Association can become your voice in Congress, State legislatures, or city councils whenever you will it.

Perseverance pays off. Opposition to fingerprint provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act by United States National Student Association and other organizations has lead to their repeal in the Senate, and the House will soon follow. We've inched along where we should have made real yardage, but we have made progress.

You young people can be the social conscience of older society. You should be filled with convictions to the point where it bothers your parents.

There's plenty of work that remains to be done which directly affects you as students. The educational plant of America—public, private, parochial—is in trouble. The National Government, as I see it, has responsibility and a singular role to perform in the educational process.

The performance of our United States National Student Association help sustain my faith in youth. The record of the association over the past decade speaks for itself and is proof enough of the fine caliber of our young adults. Intellectually and spiritually United State National Student Association members deserve recognition as general spokesmen for American youth.

On the homefront, USNSA has spearheaded basic improvements in all aspects of campus life, promoting the cultural, social, and physical welfare of students. Member student bodies have joined together to tackle mutual problems and to stimulate democratic student government. Most important, USNSA brings us a dynamic, articulate student voice in national affairs. * * * What better way of supplementing student civic responsibility and offering vast educational opportunities?

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator from Wisconsin.

Certainly in today's complex world nothing is so important as it is to motivate young people to take upon themselves the obligation of greater service to their fellow citizens. It is with this in mind that I wish to congratulate your organization on providing for the students of America a greater opportunity of service.

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Chairman, Young Republican National Federation.

You are engaged in a task which is of profound significance to the welfare of our Nation and to the caliber of its contributions to the well-being of peoples everywhere. By making democracy work on the campus; by helping to eradicate prejudice, discrimination, and ignorance from student life; by broadening the horizons of your fellow students to understand their international responsibilities; by developing a political consciousness and sense of responsible political activity as the first duty of citizenship; and by raising educational standards and promoting serious academic endeavor you are improving the quality of the society in which we live.

Our Nation and the entire free world desperately need young leaders such as yourselves who care about the problems of society and who by becoming skilled in the art of politics and the techniques of democratic government are capable of doing something about them. That is why the National Student Association and you are so important to the world of tomorrow.

DAVID A. BUNN,
President, Young Democratic Club of America.

The National Student Association is doing a great work and it is more important than ever before that students in every part of our country realize the vitally important role they must play in working for world understanding and freedom.

Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

National advisory council: Wallace M. Alston, president, Agnes Scott College; Willard W. Blaesser, dean of students, University of Utah; Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations; M. Porter Butts, director, College Union, University of Wisconsin; Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor; Christine Y. Conaway, dean of women, Ohio State University; Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, C. S. C., president, University of Notre Dame; Reinhold Neibuhr, vice president, Union Theological Seminary; Walter P. Reuther, president, UAW; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College; Harold E. Stassen, special assistant to the President of the United States; Robert M. Strozier, president, Florida State University; E. G. Williamson, dean of students, University of Minnesota; O. Meredith Wilson, president, University of Oregon.

National advisory board: James Dougherty, chairman, professor of history, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Philip Berry, former USNSA national affairs vice president, Detroit, Mich.; Douglass Cater, Washington editor, the Reporter magazine, Washington, D. C.; Philip Des Marais, executive vice president, St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La.; Jack R. Gibbs, research professor, University of Delaware, Newark, Del.; Marguerite Kehr, educator, Washington, D. C.; John Lang, Jr., secretary to the Honorable Charles Dean, of North Carolina, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; James A. Lewis, vice president for student affairs, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Charles McCracken, dean of students, Trenton State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.; Glenn A. Olds, director, Cornell United Religious Works, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Financial advisory board: Ruth Geri Hagy, chairman.

Travel advisory board: John J. Simons, chairman.

International advisory board: Stanford L. Glass, chairman.

THREE HUNDRED FORTY-FIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, WITH A TOTAL ENROLLMENT OF 965,000 STUDENTS CONSTITUTE THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

CALIFORNIA-NEVADA-HAWAII

California Institute of Technology, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles City College, Loyola University, Mills College, Mount St. Mary's College, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Los Angeles, University of Hawaii, University of Southern California.

CAROLINAS-VIRGINIA

Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina; Belmont-Abbey College; Bennett College; Bridgewater College; Claflin College; Clemson College; Columbia College; Converse College; Davidson College; Duke University (Women's Student Government); East Carolina College; Fayetteville States Teachers College; Furman University; Greensboro College; Hampton Institute; Hollins College; Lenoir Rhyne College; Lynchburg College; Mary Baldwin College; Mary Washington College; North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering; Queen's College; Randolph-Macon Women's College; Salem College; Sweet Briar College; University of North Carolina; University of South Carolina; Virginia State College; Winthrop College; Wofford College; Women's College, University of North Carolina.

GREAT NORTHWEST REGION

Central Washington College of Education, Eastern Washington College of Education, Marylhurst College, Montana State University, Reed College, Seattle Pacific College, Southern Oregon College of Education, University of Alaska, University of Idaho, University of Portland, University of Washington, Washington State College.

GREAT SOUTHEAST

Agnes Scott College, Barry College, Clark College, Georgia Institute of Technology, Morehouse College, Savannah State College, Shorter College, Spring Hill College, University of Miami.

GREAT SOUTHWEST

Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical, Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal, Bishop College, Dillard University, Houston-Tillotson College, Oklahoma City University, Our Lady of the Lake College, Phillips College, Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Southwestern University, Tulane University of Louisiana, University of Oklahoma, University of Texas, Xavier University.

ILLINOIS-WISCONSIN

Augustane College; Barat College of the Sacred Heart; George Williams College; Lewis College; Mount Mary College; Mundelein College; Northwestern University; Rockford College; Roosevelt University; Rosary College; University of Chicago; University of Illinois; University of Wisconsin; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Wheaton College.

IOWA-NEBRASKA

Central College, Grinnell College, Iowa State College, Simpson College, State University of Iowa, University of Dubuque, Wartburg College.

KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

Ballarmine College, Centre College of Kentucky, Fisk University, George Peabody College, Kentucky State College, King College, LeMoyne College, Maryville College, Nazareth College, Southwestern at Memphis, Transylvania College, University of Louisville, Vanderbilt University.

MASON-DIXON

American University; Catholic University of America; College of Notre Dame of Maryland; Coppin State Teachers College; Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross; Howard University; Loyola College; Maryland State Teachers College, Frostburg; Maryland State Teachers College, Towson; Morgan State Teachers College; Trinity College; University of Baltimore; Washington College.

METROPOLITAN NEW YORK

Barnard College; City College of New York, Baruch Day; City College of New York, Baruch Evening; City College of New York, Main Day; City College of New York, Main Evening; College of New Rochelle; Columbia College; Columbia University; Fordham College; Fordham School of Education; Good Counsel College; Hunter College, Bronx; Hunter College, School of General Studies (evening); Manhattan College; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart; Marymount College, New York City; Marymount College, Tarrytown; New York University, Heights; New York University, School of Education; New York University, Washington Square; Notre Dame College of Staten Island; Pace College; Pratt Institute; Queens College; St. John's College; St. John's University College; St. Joseph's College; Sarah Lawrence College; Wagner College; Yeshiva College.

MICHIGAN

Bay City Junior College, Flint Junior College, Ferris Institute, Hope College, Marygrove College, Mercy College, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Northern Michigan College of Education, University of Michigan, Wayne State University.

MINNESOTA-DAKOTAS

Augsburg College; Bethel College and Seminary; Carleton College; College of St. Benedict; College of St. Catherine; College of St. Thomas; Concordia College; Dickinson College; Gustavus Adolphus College; Hamline University; Huron College; Hibbing Junior College; Macalester College; North Dakota Agricultural College; St. John's University; St. Mary's College; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Yankton College.

MISSOURI-KANSAS

Cottey College; College of Emporia; College of St. Theresa; Fontbonne College; Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg; Lincoln University; Marymount College; Maryville College; Mt. St. Scholastica College; St. Benedict's College; University of Kansas; University of Kansas City; University of Missouri; Webster College; William Jewell College.

NEW ENGLAND

Albertus Magnus College; American International College; Babson Institute of Business Administration; Bennington College; Bradford Junior College; Brandeis University; Brown University; Colby College; Colby Junior College; Dartmouth College; Emmanuel College; Garland Junior College; Harvard University; Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate Council; Hillyer College; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mitchell College; Mt. Holyoke College; Mt. St. Mary's College; Newton College of the Sacred Heart; Pembroke College; Quinnipiac College; Radcliffe College; Regis College; St. Joseph's College; Simmons College; Skidmore College; Smith College; State College, Keene, N. H.; State Teachers College, Bridgewater, Mass.; State Teachers College, Castleton, Vt.; State Teachers College, Framingham, Mass.; State Teachers College, Salem, Mass.; State Teachers College, Westfield, Mass.; Trinity College; University of Bridgeport; University of Maine; University of Rhode Island; Wellesley College; Wheaton College; Wheelock College; Worcester Junior College.

NEW JERSEY

College of St. Elizabeth; Douglass College; Drew University; Farleigh-Dickinson College; Jersey City Junior College; Rutgers University; St. Peter's College; Seton Hall University; State Teachers College, Newark; Upsala College.

NEW YORK STATE

Alfred Agricultural and Technical Institute (of State University of New York); Alfred University; Bard College; Canisius College; College of St. Rose; Cornell University; D'Youville College; Erie County Technical Institute; Harpur College; Hartwick College; LeMoyne College; Niagara University; Orange County Community College; Rochester Institute of Technology; Rosary Hill College; Russell Sage College; Siena College of St. Bernardine; State Teachers College, Brockport; State Teachers College, Buffalo; State Teachers College Cortland; State Teachers College, Fredonia; State Teachers College, New Paltz; Union College; University of Buffalo; University of Rochester; University of Rochester, School of Nursing; Vassar College.

OHIO-INDIANA

Antioch College, Baldwin-Wallace College, Capital University, College of Wooster, Defiance College, Denison University, DePauw University, Fenn College, Fenn College (evening session), Indiana University, John Carrol University, Muskingum College, Oberlin College, Ohio State University, St. Mary's College, Taylor University, University of Notre Dame, Ursuline College, Wilberforce University, Wilmington College, Youngstown University, Western College for Women.

PENNSYLVANIA-WEST VIRGINIA

Alderson-Broaddus College, Allegheny College, Alliance College, Beaver College, Bethany College, Bryn Mawr College, Cedar Crest College, Chatham College, Chestnut Hill College, Dickinson College, Drexel Institute of Technology, Franklin and Marshall College, Gannon College, Grove City College, Harcum Junior College, Immaculata College, Juniata College, Lincoln University, Lycoming College, Mercyhurst College, Mount Mercy College, Pennsylvania State University, Rosemont College, St. Francis College, St. Vincent College, Seton Hall College, Sheppard College, Swarthmore College, Temple University, University of Pennsylvania (women's student government), West Virginia State College, West Virginia University, West Virginia Wesleyan College.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Colorado State College, Colorado Women's College, Loretto Heights College, Regis College, University of Colorado, University of New Mexico.

UTAH

Brigham Young University, College of Southern Utah (of Utah State University), University of Utah, Utah State University, Weber College.

Benton, Pa., Air Force Base Wins Air Force Trophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of August 12, 1958, which discloses that the Benton (Pa.) Air Force Station has been awarded a trophy for proficiency by the Air Defense Command:

Benton Air Force Station became the first Aircraft Warning and Central Squadron in Eastern Air Defense Force this week to win the Air Defense Command's coveted "Mag-

gie" trophy awarded periodically for maximum performance of highly sensitive and costly radar equipment. Presentation of the trophy, which derives its name from the magnetron, an integral magnetic-type tube, was made yesterday to Capt. I. E. Bitterman, 648th AC&W squadron commander, by Lt. Col. Vita Fedorovich of the ABC Directorate of Electronics.

Officers and key noncommissioned officers present at the awarding of the trophy were: Lt. Joseph Marchese, electronics officer; Lieutenant Colonel Fedorovich; S. Sgt. Stephen Lizbinski, maintenance noncommissioned officer; Capt. Bitterman, M. Sgt. Frank Shipley, noncommissioned officer in charge of radar maintenance, and M. Sgt. John Polillim, noncommissioned officer in charge of communications.

Competing with some 150 radar sites in air defense, Benton Air Force Station was cited for keeping the magnetron operational for 636 hours without decrease in radar height finding capabilities. The average life span of the fixed frequency pulse-type oscillator lies in the neighborhood of 400 hours. The achievement, all the more noteworthy because of the magnetron's ultra-sensitivity requiring special techniques in shipping, handling, installation, and maintenance, was described as a direct result of unit teamwork.

The Air Defense Command instituted the Maggie award to inspire such teamwork and to spur maximum air defense at minimum cost to the American taxpayer. Less frequent replacement of the magnetron at the more than 150 stations across the country will result in considerable annual defense spending.

Humane Slaughter Is Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 15, 1958:

HUMANE SLAUGHTER IS PASSED

The humane slaughter bill has passed Congress at last, after decades of struggle. It now needs only the President's signature, which we hope he will soon affix, to become law.

Anyone who has ever visited an ordinary slaughterhouse may well wonder why it has taken 30 years for Congress to agree to the simple principle that an animal ought to be rendered genuinely insensitive to pain before it is butchered. Of course there has been opposition from some of the meatpacking houses because they feared that such methods (either electric stunning or carbon dioxide gas) would be very costly, although this has not proved to be the case in the long run. But this kind of opposition should never have been able to frustrate the very widely held conviction that needless cruelty is an affront to our civilization. And it is not just professional animal lovers who think this. Man is a part of nature, and indignity of cruelty to nature inevitably, in one way or another, sullies human dignity.

Perhaps no bill in recent history has had so many loyal and hard-working supporters. Many of these people, like Mrs. Christine Stevens of the Animal Welfare Institute of New York, were representatives of the humane societies. Many others were simple citizens with a conscience. Together they have literally bombarded Senators and Representatives with messages, which, apparently, have at last made their point. They formed a lobby, if you like, but it was a lobby of conscience. Animals, after all, have no vote.

The bill does not require meatpackers to slaughter humanely, but it does forbid Government agencies to buy meat which has not been so slaughtered, which is close to the same thing. The major packinghouses, which do so much business with the Government, will have to conform. Finishing touches in the form of an expanded bill, may be added at a later date. But the principle has been accepted, and that is the important thing.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, slums and blight have long been a scourge of our cities Scarcely a community has escaped their ravages.. They have spread so far and so fast and their costs have become so great that they have become a problem of national concern.

Congress recognized that slums were a national menace when it enacted the Housing Act of 1949. That act provided for Federal financial assistance for slum clearance and redevelopment, but this program, as originally conceived, was only a partial answer. The President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs found in 1953 that slums were spreading faster than they could be removed, and called for a program to prevent as well as to eliminate slums and to rehabilitate areas that could still be saved.

Congress responded with the Housing Act of 1954, which opened the way to a new total approach by providing Federal aid for slum prevention through conservation and rehabilitation, while continuing assistance for clearance and redevelopment. This new approach, which combines community, private, and Federal resources in a unified effort, is known as urban renewal.

Urban renewal begins with the community itself. First, the community must survey its total problem and draw up its own blueprint for effective action. This is known as the community's workable program for urban renewal. The workable program is, in brief, a plan of action for and by the community itself. Federal assistance is used to help the community carry out its plan when local and private resources alone are not sufficient to do the job. To qualify for major types of Federal aid, a community must have a workable program approved by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

TYPES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The types of Federal assistance available to communities for urban renewal include:

First. Planning advances to finance survey and planning work necessary before actual operations in the project area can begin.

Second. Temporary loans to provide the community with working capital in acquiring slum areas and preparing them for redevelopment.

Third. Capital grants of up to two-thirds, or under certain conditions three-fourths, of the net cost of projects. The net project cost usually is the difference between the cost of acquiring the land and preparing it for redevelopment, and the return from its resale at fair value to private redevelopers.

Fourth. Relocation payments to families, individuals, and businesses for moving expenses and losses of property resulting from their displacement by urban renewal projects or other governmental action.

Fifth. Demonstration grants to aid communities in studying, developing, testing, and reporting methods of slum prevention and elimination that will be of value to other communities in solving urban renewal problems.

Sixth. Urban planning assistance grants to State planning agencies to provide planning assistance to communities of less than 25,000 population which lack the funds and facilities for performing this work. Such grants may amount to half of the cost of this work. Similar grants are available to official State, metropolitan, and regional planning agencies for planning work in metropolitan areas and in urban regions, and in areas affected by disasters and expansion of Federal installations.

Seventh. An urban renewal service to provide technical advice and assistance to communities in preparing their workable programs and in carrying out other urban renewal activities.

Eighth. To encourage private investment in financing new housing and rehabilitation of existing residential structures in urban renewal areas, section 220 of the National Housing Act provides for special Federal Housing Administration insurance. This type of insurance can be used only in areas with urban renewal plans approved by the local governing body and certified by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator as eligible for this assistance. Similarly, under section 221, FHA is authorized to insure loans on liberal terms for new and rehabilitated private housing anywhere in the community to rehouse families displaced by urban renewal projects or other governmental activities.

Ninth. Low-rent public housing is provided for families of low income displaced by urban renewal projects. The Public Housing Administration, a constituent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is authorized, on application of the local housing authority and approval of the local governing body, to make loans and pay annual subsidies for public housing projects, within the maximum number of units authorized by Congress.

PROGRESS MADE

Since the Housing Act of 1954, urban renewal has made substantial progress. At the end of the last fiscal year on

June 30, 1958, there were 543 federally assisted projects underway in 328 communities throughout the United States. All of the $1.2 billion in capital grant funds made available to the Urban Renewal Administration through fiscal 1958 had been reserved, contracted for, or disbursed. Net reservations of capital grant funds for projects during the year totaled $300 million, an increase of $62 million over 1957. These reservations included both new projects and increases for projects already underway.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, an urban renewal planning advance of $65,975 and a capital grant reservation of $642,817 for Springfield have been approved, as have a $44,880 planning advance and a $211,260 capital grant reservation for Florence. Eugene has an application which is still pending.

Five communities and one metropolitan area in the Fourth Congressional District are benefiting from the urban planning assistance program. A grant of $11,500 has been approved for the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. Grants for urban planning assistance to other communities in the district have been approved as follows: Albany, $9,000; Coquille, $1,200; Grants Pass, $2,000; Sutherlin, $6,400; Sweet Home, $2,000. Applications for urban planning assistance for Medford and North Bend are pending.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by George Costello entitled "What's Urban Renewal," from the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review of July 22, 1958, as follows:

WHAT'S URBAN RENEWAL?

(By George Castillo)

A phrase which will become more and more familiar to Douglas County residents in future years is urban renewal.

At present, only two towns in the county are in a position to show much interest in it, but as the county grows and towns expand in population, it may become a vital phrase.

The two towns most likely to have immediate interest in Douglas County are Roseburg and Reedsport. Roseburg has cast only a passing look, being more interested at the moment in working out a planning program. But Reedsport, squeezed between the Umpqua River and the hills is taking a studied look at a need for making better use of its land.

The subject of urban renewal has become a subject for consideration by cities of the Nation because of a Federal program which apparently puts urban renewal in the realm of practicability.

It is designed to promote a self-help program whereby cities can convert the blighted and deteriorated tax-losing sections into new and revenue-producing industrial, commercial or residential districts. On the face of it, it sounds like good business.

SCOPE IMPOSING

The scope of the Federal program is imposing. It calls for complete elimination of areas in which houses have deteriorated to the point where it is feasible to raze and rebuild rather than to try to improve them.

The program is designed to (1) conserve good housing in cities through the use of codes and ordinances effectively enforced; (2) rehabilitate substandard units by encouraging the owners to remodel in accordance with the building and housing codes of the community; and (3) allow demolition of buildings too old, run down or dilapidated to lend themselves to recovery.

When demolition has been completed in an area, it would be replatted in accordance with good city planning and then sold to individual home owners, contractors and developers for reconstruction.

A program of such sweeping scope, is, of course, too much for a city. The cost of buying all the property, for example, in perhaps an 8-square block area of Roseburg would bankrupt the city. The additional costs of razing houses, carrying on studies and replatting would make it impossible.

Congress in 1954 recognized both the need and difficulties and authorized a broad program of Federal urban planning assistance. It agreed that the Government could help pay for financing surveys and planning work necessary, furnish working capital for acquiring land and structures in a blighted or deteriorated district, site clearing and preparation for redevelopment. It also agreed to furnish capital for preparation of the razed areas for sale to private enterprise.

TWO-THIRDS WOULD BE PAID

The difference between the return received from the sale of the renewed lands and the total cost of carrying out the project would be the project's net cost. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of this cost and the city must pay the other third through cash, land, public facilities, demolition or other work contributed to the project operation.

Several towns in Oregon have already launched efforts to take part in the program. Portland and Springfield have received approval for survey funds and have launched the surveys. Eugene has applied for funds for a survey, and Florence and Reedsport are currently whipping up enthusiasm for projects.

Besides making sense in getting the best use from potentially valuable urban land, such projects should give cities a new start on orderly planning, which I feel is necessary to properly handle the great population increases expected in the Northwest.

It will cost less now to prepare for that orderly development than to try to patch on a piecemeal basis when developments have already taken place.

Wilkes-Barre Clergyman Will Celebrate 25th Anniversary of Pastorate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of August 13, 1958, which comments on the silver anniversary of the pastorate of Rev. F. W. Trumbore at St. Clement's Episcopal Church, Wilkes-Barre, to be celebrated on September 14:

JUBILEE OF PASTORATE

A special service and reception on September 14, marking the 25th anniversary of the pastorate of the Reverend F. W. Trumbore at St. Clement's Episcopal Ccurch, calls attention to an important milestone in the history of the 90-year-old parish.

When a clergyman spends a quarter century or more in a charge, there is little need to heap encomiums on him, for his record of service invariably speaks for itself. This certinly is true in the case of the Reverend Mr. Trumbore.

The passing of time has tended to cement the colse ties between him and his congregation, to which he has devoted 25 of his 30 years in the Episcopal priesthood. A churchman of considerable capacity, he has found his field of labor in South Wilkes-Barre and vicinity especially challenging, presenting him with many opportunities for service.

Despite his modesty and unselfishness, his spiritual leadership has asserted itself in many spheres. He has been equally successful as an administrator.

A native of Bethlehem, the Reverend Mr. Trumbore is an accomplised musician. The community itself has benefited from his talents through the Bach festival and other programs to which he has lent his talents.

It will be especially gratifying to the 400 members of St. Clement's Church on this occasion to know his fruitful career has a good many years to go in the normal course of events.

Census Shows Recession Slows Move From Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the flight of farmers from the farm with the implication that the reason therefor has been other than normal distress situations on the farm. A statistical review covering several decades last past will reveal that the greatest exodus from the farm occurs during periods of general prosperity and that the only periods when farm population has increased in recent history have been periods of depression.

This conclusion is borne out by recent reports from the Census Bureau. These reports are discussed in the attached article which appeared in the August 10, 1958, edition of the Fresno Bee:

CENSUS SHOWS RECESSION SLOWS MOVE FROM FARMS

WASHINGTON.—The Census Bureau today said the recession may have slowed down the flights of farmers from the land.

A Bureau report said the farm population dropped by 1,430,000 to 20,827,000 between 1956 and April 1958. This decline marked the resumption of a long-term downtrend which was halted temporarily from 1953 through 1956.

The Bureau said, however, information from other sources indicates "the economic recession may have caused some return of workers to farm areas and partially retarded movement away from farms."

SEVENTEEN-PERCENT DROP

In the past 8 years, the farm population has dropped by 4,231,000, or nearly 17 percent. Whereas 1 in every 6 Americans lived on a farm in 1950, the ratio this year was 1 in 8. In 1910 every third American was a farm dweller.

The Bureau said over the years it has dropped many homes from the farm category because the occupants no longer made a business of farming.

Thus some people have been dropped from the farm population without actually moving.

LAND CONVERTED

Much land which formerly was farmed has been converted to residential and industrial property.

The principal reasons for the decline in farm population, however, are changes in farm technology and more opportunities in other fields of employment.

The 1958 survey shows 40 percent of the workers living in farm homes were employed off the farm, compared with 30 percent in 1950.

Since 1950, the number of farm residents between the ages of 20 and 24 has declined by one-third.

Small Business Hits the Jackpot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a memorable Congress for the interest of small business. On the House side, much credit must go to Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN of the Small Business Committee, and it is important on both sides of the aisle for the constant efforts to convince the appropriate committees for the need for specific action. The results of the session's action are well sumarized in an article in the Sunday New York Times of August 17, on the front page of the business section. I enclose it, not only for the information of my colleagues, but I hope for wide distribution among thousands of small-business people who can and should be directly and favorably affected by the accomplishments of this Congress:

SMALL BUSINESS HITS THE JACKPOT—NEW LEGISLATION GOES LONG WAY IN PROV'DING TAX AND FINANCING RELIEF

(By Richard Rutter)

The ways of Congress probably are more predictable than is a slot machine. But there are times, it must be admitted, when there is a certain tantalizing resemblance.

Ask the Nation's 4 million small-business men. For nearly 5 years they—or rather their very articulate spokesmen in and out of Congress—pulled all the levers in an effort to win some measure of financial aid. They got lots of publicity and sympathy, but little else. Then, in the closing days of the 85th Congress: jackpot.

Chances are even the small-business lobby is rather taken aback by the bonanza. It consists of 3 important measures dealing with loans and tax relief. One has been signed into law, another is on the President's desk, and the other is expected to be there soon.

SBA NOW PERMANENT

In some ways, the first new piece of legislation may be the most far reaching. The Small Business Administration was set up in 1953 at a temporary agency to assist smaller concerns obtain credit. It has now become a permanent independent Federal agency.

The ceiling on the individual loans it may grant has been raised from $250,000 to $350,000. The interest rate charged has been reduced from 6 to 5½ percent. The little fellow now has a permanent big friend at court, so to speak.

The significance of the second new piece of legislation was dramatized in Atlanta, Ga., last week. The Citizens & Southern National Bank announced that it had authorized the investment of $325,000 in capital in a new corporation to be sponsored by the bank and formed for the express purpose of providing venture capital for small and expanding business. This was the quick reaction to the passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The $325,000 put up by the Atlanta Bank will be augmented by $115,000 from interested individuals or corporations in that State, plus $60,000 from Citizens & Southern affiliates. The private investment will thus amount to $500,000, and the total initial funds to some $1 million including loans and investment aid from the Small Business Administration.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS AUTHORIZED

Under the new law, that agency has been given $250 million in loan authority to furnish long-term equity capital to small business. The funds will not go directly to the individual entrepreneurs but to investment companies such as the one planned in Georgia. These concerns, in turn, will funnel long-term capital to small companies unable to obtain the needed financing elsewhere.

The investment companies must be formed by at least 10 persons, have a minimum capital and surplus of $300,000, half of which they they can get from the SBA and limit loans to not more than 20 percent of borrower's capital.

The recession notwithstanding, tax relief for the average taxpayer never got to first base in this session of Congress. With a minimum of fanfare, however, small business got several breaks:

Faster tax writeoffs on new equiument in the first year after its purchase.

Extension from 2 to 3 years of the period for which a loss may be carried back and applied against previous income, to gain a retroactive tax refund.

Ten years instead of 15 months in which to pay estate taxes on a business held by a few persons.

An increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained, instead of being distributed, without stiff tax charges.

Why all this attention to the small business?

The Small Business Administration defines a small business as follows: A wholesaler with annual sales of less than $5 million; a retailer or a dealer in services with volume of less than $1 million; a construction company whose annual receipts for the preceding 3 years have been less than $5 million; a manufacturer with 250 or fewer employees. Manufacturers with between 250 and 1,000 employees are classed as small or large depending upon the type of activity.

NINETY-EIGHT PERCENT OF COMPANIES ARE SMALL

On this basis, the overwhelming number of all American enterprises—more than 98 percent—fall into the small-business category. They account for a good 35 percent of all dollar sales. So it's impossible to talk on the American economy without taking full note of small business.

In recent years about 360,000 new enterprises have been started annually. At least 99 percent are small operations. Each year between 325,000 and 340,000 concerns have passed into limbo. And the vast majority of them have been small. The result has been a net increase in the business population of about 50,000 new companies a year.

The unfortunate majority have gone under for various reasons. Chief among them have been poor management, stong competition, lack of experience—and lack of credit. Until very recently there has been an almost complete dearth of knowledge about the importance of this last problem, and some economic observers have insisted that it was no problem at all. They contended that sound operators could obtain all the credit they needed, and that unsound ones had no business being in business.

Last year the research staff of the Federal Reserve System studied the whole matter of credit availability for the little fellow. The first installment of a massive report was delivered to interested congressional committees this spring. The survey is still continuing, and will not be completed until some time next year at the earliest.

THEY HOE A TOUGH ROW

Some conclusions, however, do seem evident from the Fed's findings so far. Generalizations are risky, but the consensus is that small companies are up against greater financial difficulties than the bigger ones. Their credit standings are lower, they find it much harder to get long-term loans and equity capital. Interest rates are higher, maturities shorter. The pinch is severest for those concerns that are able and willing to grow but are stymied by lack of funds.

Commercial banks are by far the chief source for small-business financing. Insurance companies, mutual funds, investment trusts, and institutional investors largely shy clear of small borrowers. Even the Government has contributed comparatively little. At the end of last year, for instance, the combined loan and commitment total for the SBA and the Veterans' Administration was 4 percent of the $6,900,000,000 in small loans outstanding by member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

That's all the more reason why the measures just enacted by Congress should gladden the heart of the corner butcher, tailor, and antique-candlestick seller. The establishment of private investment companies in particular may signal the beginning of a real breakthrough in the field of equity financing.

Nantucket Owner Hits Senate Quiz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again, I am glad to commend the Southtown Economist of my district for giving a factual and comprehensive report about the Nantucket Restaurant, also in my district, located at 10437 South Western Avenue, Chicago.

I certainly am sympathetic to and share Harold Reade's reaction to the treatment he received by the Senate Rackets Committee when he testified before this committee recently. Mr. Reade is the owner of the Nantucket Restaurant and I know the problems he has had with the labor union. It took plenty of courage to refuse to sign a sweetheart contract and I admire Reade for his fearlessness. Also, men who can still go through what he has experienced for some time and still be fair and just in their appraisal of the overall situation, should be applauded. This is Americanism in action.

My viewpoint is similar to restaurant owner Reade's feelings and that is I am opposed to racketeering in the unions but not to the unions, themselves. I am proud that my father pioneered for the rank-and-file labor union member

in the days before sweetheart contracts and I am sure if my father were alive today, he would back me to the hilt, and perhaps push me further than I have gone. The entire labor field has changed. Many good things have come to the rank and file who deserved it. But the tactics so prevalent of late and the fear which has been borne in the heart and minds of many, many members of organized labor is a sad commentary. The situation has developed sufficiently that if the exploitation is not corrected and ethical behavior restored, the gains won through the splendid effort of many honorable labor leaders, will be completely lost.

I would like for the RECORD to reflect the account of Harold Reade's experience in Washington and also to show, as per a Sun-Times story recently, that the Nantucket owner was not once seduced into signing a sweetheart contract.

I would like to reiterate some remarks I made on the floor of this Chamber this week. There should not be any adjournment until we have done something to correct problems in the labor field.

The articles follow:

[From the Southtown Economist of August 6, 1958]

NANTUCKET OWNER HITS SENATE QUIZ—SAYS SENATOR KENNEDY AND COMMITTEE COUNSEL KENNEDY BELITTLED RESTAURANT OPERATORS

United States Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and his brother Robert, counsel of the Senate Rackets Committee, were charged yesterday by E. Harold Reade, proprietor of the Nantucket Restaurant, 10437 Southwestern Avenue, with deprecating honest witnesses in the Chicago "sweetheart contract" probe.

Still smarting from the rebukes he received in Washington, Reade told the Englewood Kiwanis Club at a luncheon in the Southtown YMCA that "the Kennedys in particular tried to drag Chicago restaurant people down to the level of hoodlums to take some of the heat off of the unions."

Evidently referring to the Senate Rackets Committee or its aids, Reade said:

"Those fellows don't always play the game on top of the table. They use some devious ways. Some of the things are not handled right."

Reade, who refused to sign a sweetheart contract and whose restaurant was picketed from October 1955 to November 1957 by a restaurant employees' union, said he "cooled his heels" outside Counsel Kennedy's office for days waiting to testify at the Rackets Committee in the hearing.

He stated:

"When I was finally called to the stand, I was introduced as less than cooperative and less than honest.

"This was totally undeserved and followed the Kennedy pattern of dragging restaurant owners down to the level of the hoodlums."

Reade said the Rackets Committee counsel used a phony wage scale to show that restaurant owners saved thousands of dollars a year by not paying union wages or by signing sweetheart contracts. Reade stated:

"The committee quoted from a contract negotiated with night clubs. There is no established wage scale for waitresses because they work under different conditions in various places. One restaurant pays a waitress more because she does the work of a bus boy in addition to waiting table, or helps out in the kitchen by making the salads the customers order."

"I have not yet found one restaurant man who knew he was saving money by not paying the union wage. I am not against the unions. I am against racketeers.

"I believe a great deal of good could come from the Senate investigation, despite the things about it I find objectionable, if the public could be sufficiently aroused to demand that conditions be corrected."

Reade said some good had already been accomplished. He stated:

"Governor Stratton and Mayor Daley have finally decided we need an antiracket picketing law in Illinois although they weren't for one during the last session of the legislature. And Chicago judges are at long last issuing permanent injunctions against unwarranted picketing although I was denied one."

Reade said:

"If I had gotten the full protection of laws already on the books the picket line would have been taken off my restaurant the first month."

He continued:

"The master-in-chancery ruled against us, recommending we get a limited injunction with all the teeth pulled out and that we pay half the cost of the trial. He had accepted the testimony of hoodlums as against that of honest men."

The speaker also denied the published report that the unions had a majority of the employees of the Nantucket when the picket line was set up.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of July 21, 1958]

TWENTY-FIVE CAFES HERE ON SWEETHEART CONTRACT LIST

WASHINGTON.—Following is the list of 25 Chicago area restaurants released Friday by the Senate Rackets Committee.

The figures are amounts the committee claims each restaurant saved annually by avoiding union wages through sweetheart contracts.

Julians, 103 East Chicago, $9,900; Escape, Harlem and 29th, Berwyn, $4,200; Johnny's Steak House, 501 South Wabash, $11,000; Mickelberry's Log Cabin, 2300 West 95th, $19,600; Flanders Tea Room, 7501 South Exchange, $9,800; Richards, 3011 Harlem, Berwyn, $3,300; Beverly Woods, 11532 South Western, $21,000; Embassy, 6144 Cermak, Cicero, $2,000; Klas, 5734 Cermak, Cicero, $4,600; Esrig's Coffee Shop, 600 South Dearborn, $6,000; Nielsen's, 7330 West North, Elmwood Park, $8,200; Jack's Grill (a chain), $13,000; Homested, 12126 Vincennes, Blue Island, $8,500; Rupcich's, 4040 East 106th, $14,800; Peter Pan (a chain), $10,900.

Old Prague, 5928 Cermak, Cicero, $5,300; Allgauer's Fireside, 7200 North Lincoln, Lincolnwood, $14,700; Allgauer's Ridge, 6666 North Ridge, $5,600; Chris Carson's, $13,500; Martinique, 2500 West 94th, Evergreen Park, $33,100; Segal's, 8276 South, South Chicago, $11,000; De Mar's restaurants (three), $27,100; The Surrey, 10459 South Western, $1,100.

The total annual savings listed by the committee for the 25 restaurants is $258,500.

Transfer of Federal Land to the Rosebud Sioux Tribe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 14, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill at the request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, which provides for the transfer of 10,233.45 acres from the Federal Government to the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

This is property which was purchased by the Federal Government for school purposes on the Rosebud Reservation and has long since served its purpose for school use. During the past years, it has been leased by the tribe to non-Indian ranchers with a portion of the rental going to the tribe. It is my understanding that this land was purchased out of profits from the school herd, and for that reason is actually Indian property, or tribal property.

My purpose in introducing this bill at this late date is that the committee to whom the bill is assigned may have the benefit of an early report in the next session of Congress in order that early action can be taken by the House.

Wilkes-Barre Broadcasting Co. Executive Will Receive Benjamin Rush Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of August 14, 1958, which discloses that Mr. Roy E. Morgan, executive vice president of Wyoming Valley Broadcasting Co., will receive the Benjamin Rush Award presented annually by the Medical Society of Pennsylvania to the lay individual who has contributed outstandingly to the health of the citizens of Pennsylvania:

MORGAN WINS RUSH AWARD—MEDICAL SOCIETY NAMES LOCAL MAN

Roy E. Morgan, Forty Fort, executive vice president of Wyoming Valley Broadcasting Company, WILK, Wilkes-Barre, has been selected to receive the 1958 Benjamin Rush Award presented annually by the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania to the lay individual who has contributed outstandingly to the health of the citizens of Pennsylvania. The award will be made in Philadelphia October 14 at the State dinner during the 108th annual session of the medical society.

"As moderator of the Safeguard Your Health television series of the Luzerne County Medical Society for three seasons, Morgan has contributed his talent, time, and effort to health-improvement projects for the people of northeastern Pennsylvania," declared Dr. James W. Boyle, of Luzerne, president of Luzerne County Medical Society.

A native of Nanticoke, Morgan was graduated from Hanover Township High School and Pennsylvania State College; he has been a newspaper reporter, college administrator, and professor, and during World War II he served as assistant chief, Gasoline Rationing, OPA, in Washington, D. C. He is immediate past president of Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters.

Morgan has been active as president of Family Service Association and is a director of United Fund, Community Concert Association, Municipal Merger Commission, Cerebral Palsy Association, and Wyoming Valley Hospital. He is past president of Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club and immediate past lieu-

tenant governor, Division 15, Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International. He is a Mason, a member of Westmoreland Club, is married, and has two children.

The State Benjamin Rust Awards are in the form of a large medallion featuring a bas-relief portrait in bronze of Dr. Rush, distinguished Philadelphia physician and patriot, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Nominees for the State award included organizations and individuals who had previously been selected to receive miniature medallions awarded individually by county medical societies. A committee composed of members of the board of trustees of the State society made the State award selections.

Address by Hon. Nelson S. Dilworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Nelson S. Dilworth, State senator of California, before a public meeting in Palm Springs, Calif., celebrating the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, together with a resolution of the Senate of California, authorizing publication and distribution of his address:

SENATE RESOLUTION 196, RELATIVE TO THE FREEDOM FOUNDATION AWARD TO SENATOR NELSON S. DILWORTH

Whereas the Senate of the State of California has been honored through the selection of one of its members, the Honorable Nelson S. Dilworth, to receive the George Washington Honor Medal awarded to him by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge with the additional recognition of second place in national competition in public addresses that help to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life; and

Whereas th Freedoms Foundation exists to create and build an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and of our indivisible "bundle" of political and economic freedoms inherent in them, and to inspire love of freedom and to support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker, and by that fact posssor of certain inalienable rights; and

Whereas the Freedoms Foundation selects as its awards jury recognized leaders and the most highly esteemed of our citizens from all parts of the Nation, the jury of 30 which made the award herein referred to including 14 members from among the justices of the supreme courts of the various States of the Nation; and

Whereas the award to Senator Nelson S. Dilworth specifically states that the trustees, directors and officers of Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge announce with pleasure the selection of Hon. Nelson S. Dilworth by the distinguished National Awards Jury to receive the George Washington Honor Medal for Our Constitution, Have We Outgrown It?, an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life; and

Whereas the address for which this honor was awarded was delivered at Palm Springs in California, at a public meeting in celebration of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Honorable Nelson S. Dilworth has served the people of Riverside County and the State of California as a patriotic public servant for many years and as a member of the legislature since 1937: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That it congratulates its distinguished member upon the receipt of this well-earned honor; and be it further

Resolved, That the address of Senator Dilworth, Our Constitution, Have We Outgrown It?, be printed in today's Journal; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to present to Senator Dilworth a suitably prepared copy of this resolution, and to have printed for general distribution 1,000 copies of his address.

OUR CONSTITUTION, HAVE WE OUTGROWN IT?
(By Senator Nelson S. Dilworth)

Mr. Chairman, friends and patriots; it is a great privilege to come here at the invitation of so great an organization to share with you a few thoughts on the most urgent question or decision before the American people today. At this time of the year on or near the anniversary of the Constitution of the United States it is a wise custom for the people of the United States through the leadership of their most distinguished patriotic organizations to give thought to the blessings and benefits that have come to us through the operation of the principles of government and liberty firmly established by the Constitution.

In my introductory sentence I referred to "the most urgent question, before the American people." Unfortunately the American people are questioning the merits of the Constitution today as never before. Wherever it is discussed there are those who would sacrifice the great eternal principles of the sovereign rights of the citizen for the temporary and illusive benefits of the all-powerful state.

Today I want to try to bring to you a clear and present delineation of the matchless achievements of the American people working in the protective framework of our Constitution. To set out on so great a task it is imperative that we refresh our knowledge of the events immediately preceding the Constitution, events which were the founda-on which it was built.

Our Nation was founded on faith in Almighty God our Creator and a belief in His book. Liberty and freedom cannot be preserved without a belief in the God who created them. Liberty and freedom never have been preserved without belief in God and they never will be. Worship of God is necessary to build character in men to enable them to preserve freedom. It is a truth that we tend to become like what we worship.

In all history, our Declaration of Independence is the most humble and reverent declaration of human rights and responsibility the world has ever recorded. There it stands. No words of mine or of any man can add to it or take away from it the glory of its truth and reverent reliance on God's protection and assistance.

We cannot too often return to the sublimely courageous phraseology of the great Declaration. Let me quote a significant selection.

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

"We therefore the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

What could be more solemn and dignified than these words penned in a time of great strife and bitterness? Who could add to one line or sentence? Today it is our obligation to live up to these high sentiments. If we neglect these great principles of human relations and are apathetic to their emulation and preservation, we shall lose in time the incalculable benefits that have flowed from them. Without the Declaration there could have been no Constitution and without the Constitution there could have been no such freedom and prosperity as we know it.

I call upon you as my witnesses here today that there is no place in the Declaration of Independence that guarantees any results. This document and the Constitution only safeguard an opportunity for the American people to establish and maintain liberty and to provide national defense against all attack within or without. They will not work themselves. We cannot have liberty and peace without noble effort and self-sacrificing service any more than we can have bread without labor and toil. These great documents are entirely in the language of opportunity, a chance to achieve for the people of America.

So, tonight, let us look at our Constitution and attempt to identify its fruit in our modern American way of life. What has the Constitution enabled the American people to accomplish toward realizing in government the ideals of the Declaration: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?

First we have accomplished freedom of life. We have established effective curbs on the police and military forces of our country. The citizen cannot be placed in jeopardy for life or liberty by the police or even by any judge against the will of the accused. Every citizen may count on this security. The people have withheld from Government officials and reserved to themselves in the form of juries the right to judge the guilt or innocence of their own neighbors. Americans have established the greatest consideration and fairness toward those accused of wrongdoing ever known to exist in this world. Even for petty offenses the citizen accused can demand a trial by a citizen jury of his peers within the jurisdiction of his alleged offense. This vital feature of American liberty is not equaled in other governments.

Other great powers are withheld from our Government officials by the people. Leaders of the national Government are powerless to alter the Constitution if they are faithful to their solemn oaths to uphold and defend it. Only by referring proposed amendments to the elected legislatures of the States or to elected conventions can amendments be effected.

The history of liberty the world around has been the story of resistance by the people to the encroachments of their own government. No matter how well intentioned, human beings in public office, some of them at least, tend to expand their power and enlarge their activity. In no other country have the people more safeguards, more weapons to strengthen their resistance by peaceful means to such trespass of the liberties which have been reserved to the people by the Constitution.

In the Constitution itself there are numberless checks and balances to safeguard our country against arbitrary caprice in official acts. Congressional action is subject to Presidential veto. The veto may be overridden by a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress. The President must obey the laws duly enacted and must uphold the Constitution. If he fails, Congress by the process of impeachment may remove him from office. The President may not touch a single dollar in the Treasury without first receiving an appropriation by Congress. The powerful House of Representatives in Congress is required to come before the people for election or removal every 2 years. In almost 170 years no one has subverted our constitutional processes and today our Government is the oldest national government in the world without major change in its fundamental makeup.

Another check or balance on the Presidential power is that the most important appointments made by the President are subject to the approval and consent of the Senate. Thus the important policy decisions of the American Government are for the most part the result of the concerted action of several or even many officials.

Historically the last word in the defense of the Constitution has been the prerogative of the judiciary with the final resort being the Supreme Court. Acts of Congress may be challenged in the courts by any citizen and if the courts find that they they are in conflict with the Constitution, the congressional act is void. So we have a government of laws made by many rather than one official and all subject to the scrutiny of the courts as to their conformity with the Constitution.

The security of the American citizen in his constitutional rights is our Nation's most outstanding and unique political accomplishment. So much for our political institutions.

Equal or perhaps greater significance attaches to the economic results that have followed the security of our citizens in political rights. The best characterization of our rights is the phrase in the Declaration, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But life would be undesirable without liberty and liberty unenjoyable without the opportunity to seek happiness and contentment. Happiness and contentment ordinarily include securing a home, shelter, food, clothing, and a gainful occupation and other property rights. We hear much of the rights of freedom of speech and press but not so often do we consider the vital necessity of the right to possession of property lawfully acquired. This is securely established in the Constitution but is little glamorized because it is not often challenged in regard to the possessions of the average family.

The right to be secure in the ownership of a home of your own, the right to labor and to keep the product of your labor or business has so inspired the American men and women that they have produced an abundance of good living nowhere equaled in all the world's history.

American industry, the teamwork of capital, management, and labor, produces in such abundance for American markets as to make our Nation the financial banker of the whole world. American industry did not grow big by regulation, but by service rendered. Competition is the most stimulating regulator ever found.

Both the investor and the laborer are guaranteed the right to organize and to cooperate together to increase their gains. Under free enterprise, the people, all of the people, of the United States have a greater purchasing power—have more, buy more, possess more, and use more food, clothing and housing and everything else—than all the people of Europe and Asia combined. These are obvious and very practical achievements of the American people under our constitutional liberties.

Hours and days of labor are reduced. Working people ride to work in automobiles instead of walking or riding a bicycle as in other countries. Clothing is purchased with one-third the hours of labor that are required in the most favored countries of the eastern world. Our homes are larger and filled with labor-saving equipment unknown in other lands. Also we have achieved the widest distribution of good living standards among more of our people than elsewhere.

Another result of our unprecedented industrial production is that it has become our greatest bulwark of defense. Not only was our country able to produce the vast store of arms and ammunition for our Armed Forces in the late World War but great quantities of armament were supplied to our allied free nations. Freedom is as vitally important to us for the preservation of our national existence today as when the Constitution was written 170 years ago.

Perhaps an even greater product of American freedoms is the cultural advancement in our country. Fraternal lodges, service and luncheon clubs, recreational clubs and charitable organizations abound in every city, town, and hamlet. All are developing new heights of service. Religion of many faiths may be freely exercised within our country and is a potent, great, and lasting influence for good.

We tax the successful to make possible services to the less fortunate. Competition is real in America but we do not tread down those who are less successful. We have a thousand humane laws for the benefit of those who are unfortunate or handicapped. Our provision for those in need exceeds the rewards of skilled laborers in four-fifths of the rest of the world. These services are made possible by the production and skills of the successful.

Another distinctive thing our Constitution has done is that it has attracted as immigrants to this land over 22 million people. This is unique in all the history of mankind. They have left their loved native lands and the homes of their childhood, parted from kindred and friends to cross the wide seas to come here and swear allegiance to our Constitution. Gladly they have brought their little ones, their families and posterity to leave them in the keeping of the American people under our Constitution.

To do this, to make such a drastic change in their life's surroundings means two things: Life under our Constitution had great attractions for them and life away from the benefits of our Constitution was one of privation, hardship, and lack of opportunity.

What would you take for the privilege of living in America? What would induce you to leave America once for all never to return? Oh, yes, the Constitution makes a difference. Let's keep it unimpaired. Don't let the agents of a foreign enemy talk you into weakening it or subordinating our Constitution to any foreign ideas.

I could go on and on and recite the familiar things that we take for granted but that are only possible because of our political framework, our Constitution, but my time is passing quickly. Let me tell you some things that are not the prime cause of our American achievements. First, too much credit is given to our natural resources. They do not exceed those of many other populous lands. Russia has many times the standing timber than America ever had. We have only a small percentage of the mineral, coal and oil deposits of this world. Our acreage of good agricultural land is less than 6 percent of that in the world. No, it is not the material land within our borders that has made us great; it is true that we have developed our resources and made good use of them, more so than other peoples, but that is American industry, thrift, and energy spurred on by the possibility of enjoyment of one's own achievements.

Another thing that cannot explain our material success is our location, far from the principal markets of the world. We are halfway around the world from the greatest population centers. We have been materially successful in spite of our isolated location, not because of it.

Again, no one can attribute our prosperity and material success to military conquest. We hold and rule no conquered land. Along our farflung land frontiers our neighbors dwell peacefully and unafraid, without forts or defenses of any kind. The American Constitution is the greatest peace document ever produced by men. Our weaker neighbors pay us no tribute, but dwell secure under our protection from the greed of conquest by totalitarian countries. The flow of wealth is not from the weak to this powerful Nation, but from us to the weak and underdeveloped countries.

Again, let us look at the throngs of people coming to America. Of necessity we have had to wisely limit the number, but they are coming by hundreds of thousands every year, the poor and oppressed of other lands, the refugees from political dictatorships, and the ambitious youth who seek to escape the limitations of social and economic restrictions across the seas. Yes, there is a constant movement of population from even the mildly socialistic countries seeking the opportunities of free enterprise in America.

But let's look at the other side. Who is leaving America? Who are fleeing from America? Who are leaving with no thought of returning? They are so conspicuous I could almost name them to you, the Gerhardt Eislers and others who have been caught in the attempt to destroy America. I wish we could get enough action, official and judicial action, careful but firm, that would run out a lot more of these conspirators that plot to destroy all that we hold dear.

Obviously our Constitution is a very important document to a great many people. It was Abraham Lincoln who said, "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide." But we have a duty to uphold and protect our freedom for it was Edmund Burke who first told us, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." But what evil do we face, do you ask.

Karl Marx declared, "Christian brotherly love has been tried for 18 centuries and found wanting. I will found my movement on a more dynamic force, class antagonism." This is the challenge the world faces today. This is the battle cry of the impatient conquerors of 800 millions abroad, as they cast their envious eyes at our riches.

And how are we to meet that challenge? First we must meet it with the truth. The truth about America and its greatness and how we achieved it must be carefully taught to all of our youth and made available to all adults. Where communism and other forms

of government have to be considered, the destructive evils that are inseparable from Communist operation must be included on a truthful and factual basis.

The American people are willing to fight Communist attacks on free men overseas but have not awakened to the need to defend leaders and institutions in our homeland from obviously Communist-inspired attacks. Our most dangerous enemies are not marching under foreign flags but infiltrating here in our affairs.

Of what avail is it that American youth win costly victories on bloody foreign battlefields if we at home allow similar enemies to discredit our Constitution and weaken the faith of our people in our American institutions that make our American economic system productive and beneficial to all of us.

Our enemies wage the cold war by word of mouth and by the printed page to weaken, deceive, and divide their prospective victims. They announce the liberation of the people of any country they conquer. They proclaim their new dictatorships to be people's democracies. They call their despotism republics. Communists have stolen the language of freedom and successfully perverted it to serve their own methods of conquest and subjection. They use our most precious words to enslave unsuspecting peoples.

Fortunately our courts have held that our Constitution is clearly not a suicide pact. The thoughtful men who frame the words and spirit of this great charter of our freedom had no thought of guaranteeing unrestrained action to those who are working to destroy our freedom and substitute the Soviet dictatorship or any other form of centralized power.

Our State and national lawmakers have acted to restrain those who plot the overthrow of our Constitution. The courts have convicted large numbers of those accused but our vigilance must continue.

And for us, what is there for us to do? First we must use our freedom of speech to help preserve our freedom. We must speak out in defense of our Constitution and in defense of our American production system. Of course, there are inconveniences. America is growing. Like our highway construction there are detours, temporary, of course, on our way of life. But I maintain that America is 90 percent all right and the other 10 percent is under construction.

When folks read a newspaper or book they like to look at the pictures even though they skip through the reading matter. So they may not pay too close attention to what we say, but if our lives are neighborly and helpful, and our loyalty to our country is obvious in all our daily actions, the influence of us all cannot be anything but helpful and an inspiration to others to greater loyalty.

Also, every American should be ready to give a reason for his faith in the Constitution. He should read it and study it. He should know it from beginning to end. Get from your libraries the fascinating story of how it was written. Learn to know and tell others about the interesting lives of Madison, Jefferson, Washington, and Hamilton and the others.

There is only one stronghold of freedom militarily able to resist the power of world Communist dictatorship today, and that is our country built on our Constitution.

Will you not serve in its defense in peace as unselfishly as many of you have served in war? Speak out effectively but kindly for the preservation of the Constitution and American freedoms. Have we outgrown our Constitution? Perish the thought. It is true that America has grown from 3 million souls to 170 million under the form of government based on our Constitution, but the Constitution has grown with America in usefulness and effectiveness. All of its principles of political procedure are sound and productive of rich benefits to the people. The stirring events of the long years of our Republic have so vindicated the wise and just rules of our immortal Constitution that I sometimes wonder if we have grown in appreciation as much as the Constitution has grown in importance and power for good to all the world. Shall we not always swear our undying loyalty to that document described by the English statesman, Gladstone, long years ago, "The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

This Constitution of 1789 gave strength and permanence to the infant Republic and taught it to walk. In the youthful years and adolescent stages of our political development the Constitution restrained the impetuous leaders and guided them in a safe path.

Then through the great hour of sacrifice and trial when brother resisted brother, the Constitution was the beacon star of a peaceful settlement and reconciliation. Through the great wars with Spain and Germany, our Constitution gave great strength to our morale and fighting spirit. And can one say less of the war in the Pacific, where was marshaled the greatest fleet of naval warships, the mightiest army of men, and the most powerful aerial squadrons of all time until General MacArthur landed in Japan and set up a military government. And what was the result? In a few years that proud nation accepted peace with a modified Government influenced by our Constitution. Today, again free and sovereign, the Japanese cherish their new freedoms derived in spirit from ours.

What gretater service could be rendered by our Constitution than to serve as a basis of reconciliation and peace among men. God grant that we as a people may grow in understanding and helpful living under our Constitution to worthily interpret to the world its basic principles of peace.

Not only have we not outgrown our Constitution, but as we face a future filled with new problems it is the greatest hope of men.

It is the chart and compass of men of good will whose motives are love and mercy for all men everywhere. Amid the night of wars and preparations for war our Constitution serves as the guiding light from the North Star as American leaders blaze new trails toward peace.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written about the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is one of the great men of this country. One of the most recent of such writings is an article which appeared in the August 7 issue of the Los Angeles Times written by Bill Henry. I submit this article for the benefit of the other Members of the House:

BY THE WAY, WITH BILL HENRY

WASHINGTON.—To most Americans, who seldom, if ever, get to see the House of Representatives in action and if they do probably don't know who is presiding, SAM RAYBURN is just that fellow with the gavel who bobs up on TV every 4 years at the Democratic National Convention and bangs for law and order whenever some of his excitable fellow Democrats get out of line. That's not the half of it.

MR. SPEAKER

Our Mr. SAM has been Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man, longer even than the celebrated Joe Cannon, and beyond that he has been a Member of the House longer than even he cares to remember. If you think he runs the convention with an iron hand, you should see him running the House. Mr. SAM knows the rules forward and backward, he understands the strange ways of his conferees both in committee and on the floor, and he is able to judge to the width of a cat's whisker exactly how far to let things go before he steps in and sets the boys on the right track if they show signs of breaking out of the reservation. What Mr. SAM says, goes.

PROGNOSTICATOR

So it was a good thing, this week, to attend Mr. SAM's daily press conference which he holds for about 3 or 4 minutes each day just before he steps out onto the floor to open the day's session. Mr. SAM's time is in demand and there is always a jam of people trying to get in to see him but somehow he regularly leaves time for Fishbait Miller, the House doorkeeper, to call the gentlemen of the press in for a moment before the business of the day gets underway. You walk in and Mr. SAM is more or less buried in a big leather chair behind his desk, usually with House Majority Leader MCCORMACK of Massachusetts alongside him.

THE SCHEDULE

So somebody asks when the Congress is going to go home. Says Mr. SAM with some finality, "we're going to stay here until we're through." He is pressed for something more definite than that and he rattles off a list of bills on the schedule for the day. When he finishes he says he guesses that's just about the load of poles for the day, which apparently is the way they sum things up down in Bonham, Tex., where he comes from. This reminds somebody about the education bill—scholarships for the deserving youth. Mr. SAM is not too sanguine or, apparently, too enthusiastic. He mutters something to the effect that we got to educate everybody—make them smart. You gather then the old Texas schoolteacher thinks you can't make a smart guy out of a dumb cluck.

IN OPERATION

He looks at the clock and sees he has about 30 seconds to get to the floor, whack the gavel and turn the dominie loose with the opening prayer so he gets up and starts for the door. Somebody asks about the eight Texas counties that had been invited to secede from Texas and join New Mexico. Old SAM just snorts and opines that there's a lot more nonsense than sense in the world these days. Out on the floor he gets things going, then disappears but when it looks as if the Republicans are about to defeat a Democrat sponsored bit of legislation he slips into a seat on the floor from which he can easily get to the microphone for one of his rare floor appearances.

Reply From Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 15, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in response to numerous inquiries, I am enclosing the reply of the Chairman of

the Federal Communications Commission concerning the Commission's position on the content of the material offered to the public by broadcasting stations:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1958.

This is with further reference to your letter of June 9 and acknowledges your letter of July 23, 1958, concerning the Commission's program responsibilities. In your letter of June 9 you refer to the Commission's deferral of action upon the applications for renewal of licenses of certain of the Atlanta, Ga., radio stations because of programing matters. In both of your letters, you raise essentially three questions: (1) Does the FCC make a systematic check on radio programs; (2) does the FCC feel that it has enough legislative authority to act in this area; and (3) if not, what enabling legislation might the Commission deem necessary to fulfill its responsibility for good programing?

Referring first to the Atlanta, Ga., stations, it is true that after considering the applications for renewal of licenses of the Atlanta radio stations, the Commission deferred action on certain of them and directed the staff to address letters to the licensees of the stations inquiring with respect to the questions raised as to whether the stations' programing was in the public interest. The staff sent such letters to the licensees and the Commission has now received replies from all of the stations. At the present time, the staff is reviewing the replies and it is expected that in the near future, the Commission will give further consideration to the staff's recommendations.

As you may know, section IV of the renewal application (form 303), a copy of which is enclosed, constitutes the applicant's statement of program service. This section is completed and filed by each of the more than 4,000 licensees when they apply for renewal of licenses, and serves to give the Commission a picture of their over-all programing operations. Over the past 18 months the Commission has carefully reviewed its authority over programing and has considered various proposals for the revision of said section IV. At the present time, the Commission's staff is considering revisions of the section proposed by an industry committee of the Bureau of the Budget. It is believed that the staff will be prepared to report on these proposals to the full Commission in the early fall.

I have had occasion within the past few days to comment with respect to the Commission's authority in the field of programing. In testifying before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary with reference to H. R. 10378, making inapplicable antitrust laws to certain professional team sports, I said in part:

"No doubt this committee is aware of the restrictions in section 326 of the Communications Act that prevent the Federal Communications Commission from exercising the power of censorship over radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station. This, of course, includes television. The restrictions on the Commission exercising censorship are indeed broad and this Commission feels that generally it has no authority either to prevent a particular program being presented or to require that the station broadcast any particular program. The policies of this Commission have been, where feasible, to further the broadest possible variety and balance in the programing of radio and television stations, and to further the public interest, convenience and necessity whenever possible where it relates to broadcasting. The absence of direct authority and statutory jurisdiction over specific programs has not been construed as disabling this Commission from adopting policies to encourage overall improvements in programing as distinguished from encouraging or discouraging any particular program. We see nothing in the bill which leads us to believe that Congress intends that this bill shall modify the Commission's jurisdiction as to programs."

Enclosed is a copy of my formal statement which may be of interest to you.

I believe that the foregoing fully answers the questions you have asked. I am pleased to know of your interest in the matter of broadcast programing and the Commission's role with respect thereto. If you have further questions concerning this subject, I shall be glad to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman.

(Formal statement referred to by the Chairman is also appended.)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. DOERFER, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, ON H. R. 10378, MAKING INAPPLICABLE ANTITRUST LAWS TO CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (85TH CONG., 2D SESS.), JULY 15, 1958

My name is John C. Doerfer. I am Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and I appear today as a witness in connection with your consideration of H. R. 10378.

The bill under consideration, among other things, would make the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act inapplicable to four organized professional team sports. The inapplicability of those statutes refers to 5 definitive areas, 1 of which is subparagraph 4 of section 1 of the bill, which relates to the regulation of rights to broadcast and telecast reports and pictures of sports contests. Although the quoted subparagraph would appear to deal with the communications field, it does not appear, in any way, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 151 et seq).

No doubt, this committee, is aware of the restrictions in section 326 of the Communications Act that prevent the Federal Communications Commission from exercising the power of censorship over radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station. This, of course, includes television. The restrictions on the Commission exercising censorship are indeed broad, and this Commission feels that generally it has no authority either to prevent a particular program being presented or to require that the station broadcast any particular program. The policies of this Commission have been, where feasible, to further the broadest possible variety and balance in the programing of radio and television stations, and to further the public interest, convenience, and necessity whenever possible where it relates to broadcasting. The absence of direct authority and statutory jurisdiction over specific programs has not been construed as disabling this Commission from adopting policies to encourage overall improvements in programing as distinguished from encouraging or discouraging any particular program. We see nothing in the bill which leads us to believe that Congress intends that this bill shall modify the Commission's jurisdiction as to programs. It seems to us, therefore, that the bill concerns itself primarily with the public interest considerations of antitrust matters relating to professional team sports. We believe that these are policy matters for the appropriate determination of the Congress.

The action on this bill undoubtedly will have a direct bearing on the nature, variety, and amount of sports programing broadcast to the public. In our judgment, the public interest is best served by having available to the public the widest possible choice of programs. The question of whether or not this legislation will result in less sports broadcasting is important to the public, and it is a very pertinent question to which the Congress should give very serious consideration. Sporting events evoke tremendous interest, and they are among the most highly popular programs that are received by the viewing public.

Mr. Speaker, the queston still remains in view of this letter: Does the Commission need a more direct instruction that Congress feels the American public is entitled to reasonably balanced presentations from the radio stations? I think the answer is clearly "Yes."

Wilkes-Barre American Legion Post 132 Awarded Special National Citation for Outstanding Child Welfare Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 18, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, August 13, 1958, disclosing that Wilkes-Barre American Legion Post 132 has been awarded a special citation by the American Legion National Headquarters for carrying out the most oustanding child-welfare program in the American Legion's 12th Pennsylvania district:

POST 132 PROGRAM WINS NATIONAL LEGION CITATION—CHILD WELFARE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY IS RATED MOST OUTSTANDING IN 12TH DISTRICT

Wilkes-Barre Post 132, American Legion, 45 North River Street, has been awarded a special citation by the American Legion national headquarters in Indianapolis for carrying out the most outstanding child-welfare program in the 12th District.

Commander Wendell M. Evans said: "Child welfare is one of the American Legion's major programs and we are proud that our efforts have been honored in this way."

The commander gave credit for winning the award to John McKeown, child-welfare chairman of the post; George L. George, James J. Lavin, John O'Krongoly, Michael B. Rushton, Chelsea Williams, and Frank Roache, all members of child welfare committee.

The special citation was presented to the post by Dr. A. H. Wittman, department child welfare chairman. It is signed by American Legion National Commander John S. Gleason, National Child Welfare Chairman Maurice T. Webb, Child Welfare Director Randel Shake, State American Legion Commander John W. Collins, State Adjutant Daniel Shaub, and State Child Welfare Chairman Dr. A. H. Wittman.

Once each year all American Legion posts are required to submit a report of their work for children and youth. It was on the basis of this report that the local post was selected as having carried on the most outstanding program in the district during the last 12 months.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on criminal confessions in evidence, cleared seven sundry bills for President, and took up a judicial procedure bill on which amendment to limit Supreme Court jurisdiction is pending.

House cleared social security and welfare funds disclosure bills for President and sent Federal scholarship bill to conference.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 16994–17035

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4308–4315; and S. Res. 383–385.

Pages 16995–16996, 17140–17141

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 9407, providing additional opportunity for certain employees to obtain career conditional and career appointments in civil service (S. Rept. 2474);

H. R. 11009, providing for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument, Minn. (S. Rept. 2475);

H. R. 1493, and H. R. 10559, private bills (S. Repts. 2476–2477);

H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, with amendments (S. Rept. 2478);

S. 4198, disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Company, and Houma Canals, Louisiana, with amendment (S. Rept. 2479);

H. J. Res. 654, reimbursement recommendations for certain highways on the Interstate System (S. Rept. 2480); and

H. R. 12728, to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act with respect to third-party liability, with amendment (S. Rept. 2481).

Pages 16995, 17140

Jefferson Memorial—Correction: On page D866 of DAILY DIGEST of August 18, 1958, it was erroneously reported that S. 4085, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., was passed that date on call of calendar. Actually, this bill passed the Senate on August 16, 1958, as reported on page D864 of DAILY DIGEST.

Bills Referred: 11 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 16994, 17035

Calendar Call: Order was entered for call of calendar on Wednesday, August 20, from Order No. 2484 (H. R. 12365, private bill). Page 16994

Coal: Senator Kerr withdrew his motion entered on August 16 for reconsideration of vote by which Senate on August 14 had passed S. 4248, to create a Coal Research and Development Commission. Page 16996

D. C. Juvenile Court: Senator Javits was appointed as a conferee on H. R. 7785, to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the juvenile court of the D. C., in lieu of Senator Morton, excused.

Page 16997

Education: Senate insisted on its amendment to H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958, agreed to hold conference requested by House, and appointed as conferees Senators Hill, McNamara, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, and Allott. Page 17075

President's Communication—Appropriations: Communication was received from President transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $119,300,000 for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and $70,410,000 for the Department of Labor for fiscal year 1959; and $54 million for Post Office Department for fiscal years 1957 and 1958—referred to Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 117. Page 16994

Bills Cleared for President: The following six bills were cleared for President when Senate concurred in House amendments thereto:

Colorado River: S. 3448, to exempt Seedskadee unit, Colorado River Basin project, from acreage limitation provisions of Reclamation Act;

River basin study: S. 4021, to establish the U. S. Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins;

